



"Without a Revolutionary Theory
There can be no Revolutionary Practice!"

5 - Questions

To The Provisional Organizing Committee

Innumerable questions have been directed at us, in letters to the editor. Lack of space does not permit us to print an answer to all. We have selected five key questions for this issue and in subsequent issues will attempt to answer as many as space will allow.

Q. Could you give us a brief statement of the aims and purposes of the Provisional Organizing Committee?

A. Our aim and purpose is explicit in our name. Our organization is called "The Provisional Committee for the Reconstitution of the Communist Party". Clearly, we do not consider the existing organization, which still clings to the name of CPUSA, as a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist vanguard Party. The line and policies of that organization do not conform to the principles upon which Communist Parties are founded. The line of the CPUSA is most akin to that of the Yugoslav League of Communists, which in the opinion of the world Communist movement, is not to be considered a Marxist-Leninist vanguard-type of organization. Demagogically, the CPUSA "joins" in this opinion. But the CPUSA today is in fact a Social-Democratic, reformist organization, similar to Tito's party.

We make no arrogant claims to being a "party". We merely represent one of the many groupings and movements which are inevitably developing within and outside of the CPUSA as a reaction to the political and ideological bankruptcy which has overcome its leadership. Our aim is to forge ahead in our movement, and later join in a constitutional convention with any other movement which is fighting for the creation of a genuine Communist vanguard party.

Q. What progress are you making in that direction?

A. Our founding conference took place on Aug. 16-17, that is less than two months ago. We are beginning to reach tens and hundreds of people, especially workers. Among these, there are some who are still members of the Party, others who left the Party in protest against the revisionist policies of the leadership, and still others who have never been members of the CPUSA. Growth and expansion in area where previously we had no influence, points towards the possibilities that lie ahead. Our monthly publication, *The Marxist-Leninist Vanguard*, has received a hearty welcome throughout the nation.

Q. What is your movement's approach to the rank and file membership of the CPUSA?

A. We make a fundamental distinction between the leadership and membership of the CPUSA. The membership of the CPUSA is essentially sound ideologically. It was the leadership, and no one else, which was and continues to be responsible for the revisionist, anti-working class policies which were adopted and are still being pursued. The overwhelming part of the membership left the Party in disgust, but those who remain as a rank and file do so only because the leadership demagogically promises to reestablish the Party as a real Marxist-Leninist vanguard. We know that it is only a matter of time before the bulk of those still remaining in the Party

(Continued on page 2)

EDITORIAL

THE THREAT TO PEACE

We Communists are firmly convinced that peace can be preserved, however, this can only be done if the adherents of peace know where the danger of war is coming from and who is the enemy of peace. If our struggle for peace in these United States is to succeed, then we partisans of peace must expose and frustrate the advocates of war in our country. We must lay the responsibility of the war danger where it belongs — on the U.S. Government — on American Imperialism.

Commenting on the situation in the Taiwan Straits, indignant public opinion in many countries holds Washington solely responsible for the mounting tension. Throughout the Socialist camp public opinion has sharply condemned the U. S. provocation.

In the Arab world there is anger at Washington newest adventures. In many Asian and African countries press opinion has unequivocally castigated the United States Government.

Republic of Indonesia points out that the "cloud over the Taiwan Straits is the result of deliberate provocative activities engineered by the United States.

In the United Arab Republic the editor in chief of Al-Massa writes: "It is important for us to know that American Imperialism, and its agent Chiang Kai-shek, are the ones who started this tension."

The Indian paper *Leader* states: "It is part of China and Peoples' Republic is entitled to

take possession of the Island."

The *Free Press Journal of Bombay* writes: "No self respecting Government can tolerate the presence of rebel forces backed by foreign intervention on the islands lying off its mainland." For the Indians and Africans who have had experience enough with colonialist domination in every conceivable disguise, the right and wrong of the Taiwan question is easily distinguished.

In the Philippines a columnist writing for the *Manila Chronicle* says that, "Quemoy and Matsu are as much part of China, as Staten Island is a part of the United States", and that the Chinese people are "legally entitled to control Quemoy and Matsu."

In the western countries many more people every day, including various spokesmen for Imperialism are beginning to realize that the U. S. pretexts for intervention don't have a leg to stand on. The *London Evening Paper Star* remarked: "The right of any normal government to rid itself of a wasp's nest on its door step like this would be upheld by most people." And asks: "Can that right be denied to Red China?"

In the United States, Senator Wayne Morse member of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee stated: "The United States does not have one scintilla of International Law right on Quemoy or Matsu Islands," he added that if we attempt to "defend" them; "we will be branded again and rightly so as an ag-

gressor nation."

What the future holds in store for the U.S. aggressors however is not merely utter isolation but also complete defeat as well. And while the overwhelming majority of the worlds peoples recognize who the main enemy of peace in the world is, we note the position of the *Worker Sunday* Sept. 14th issue in the editorial page it states: "Since the Korean war the Eisenhower-Dulles policy has brought us to the brink a number of times. But, we were never so close to the perilous edge as now, with the new Dulles Doctrine declaring virtually that America will go to war to save Quemoy and Matsu for Chiang Kai-shek" (emphasis ours). Notice the typically Social Democratic position of making Chiang Kai-shek the main culprit.

And then in the *Worker* of Sept. 28th, we read:

"The rock bottom realities of the Formosan Danger became clearer to Americans last week when they distinctly heard Madame Chank Kai-shek urge the nuclear bombing of her own people as she argued for a U. S. plunge into war over Quemoy and Matsu." And further, "Unfortunately Madame Chiang Kai-shek spoke at though she felt the encouraging presence of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles at her side."

And this month we read in the *Comet* published by the Queens county committee of the Communist Party in the October issue: "Shall American Boys Die

For Chiang Kai-shek?"

"A grave danger confronts the American people on the coast of China, armed air and naval forces face each other across the Formosan Strait and only a single shot from them or from us may launch World War."

Notice the phrase, "and a single shot from them or from us". This is the way the leadership of the Communist Party "struggles" for peace.

This line is no different than that of the N. Y. Post. Can anyone dispute the fact that the leadership of the CPUSA again joins with its political kinfolk on the N. Y. Post, that is with right Social Democracy.

The N. Y. Post on Sept. 28th printed a cartoon in their newspaper showing Chiang Kai-shek and his wife riding a rickshaw pulled by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles with a comment by Chiang stating: "The best part is that he (Dulles) is paying us for the ride".

What the Post says in one picture the leadership of the CPUSA echoes but with the added difficulty of having to demagogically dress it up a bit.

This type of demagoguery serves only to shield American Imperialism from its responsibility for the war threat it poses in the world today. The leadership of the CPUSA shares in that responsibility. As for us we shall strive to expose and frustrate American Imperialism who is the main threat to Peace in the World!

WFTU Appeals for Peace

Reflecting the profound feeling of the workers of the world, the Executive Committee of the World Federation of Trade Unions meeting in special session on July 26 and 27, 1958, in Prague, vigorously condemns the American and British armed intervention in Lebanon, Jordan and Libya and affirms its solidarity with the Arab people who are the victims of aggression which is seriously endangering world peace.

The Executive Committee greets the workers and people of Iraq who have freed themselves from the imperialist yoke, overthrown the monarchy and made their country a Republic.

The armed intervention by the United States and British governments in the internal affairs of the Arab countries proves that these governments hold their international engagements in contempt. Their acts violate the Charter of the United Nations. Once again they are showing their desire to settle relations between states by the use of force. The imperialists of the United States and Britain are trying to maintain the supremacy of the capitalist monopolies in the Near and Middle East so that they may continue to reap huge profits from inhuman exploitation of the workers and by pillaging the wealth of the

Arab countries.

The workers are roused to indignation by the action of the governments of the German Federal Republic and other capitalist countries: who are placing their territories at the disposal of the American and British aggressors.

The workers warmly welcome the peaceful steps taken by the Soviet Union; her firm stand has halted the imperialists' plans for all-out aggression against the Arab countries. The Soviet Union has warned world public opinion of the imminence of a full-scale conflict. The workers hail the decision of certain governments who have protested against this aggression or against American and British aircraft flying over their territories.

Long live united action by all workers against imperialist aggression in the Middle East!

Long live the assembly of all workers to support the Arab peoples and compel recognition of their national rights!

Long live the united struggle of the peoples for Peace, National Independence and Social Progress!

The Executive Committee of the World Federation of Trade Unions
Prague, July 27, 1958.

Franco Prisoners Appeal to UN

Following is the complete text of the document sent to the United Nations' Economic and Social Committee by the prisoners of Burgos.

• • •

"The Spanish political prisoners in the Central Prison of Burgos who have suffered imprisonment in the Franco jails for innumerable years forward this Petition to this international organization so that it can, by all means at its disposal, carry through an investigation of the prisons in Spain, and of this prison in particular. They will thus be able to prove not only our existence and internment, but also the treatment we receive.

"Following the latest statement made by the Spanish Chief of State (Franco) to the French newspaper *Le Figaro* in which he arrogantly stated that there were no political prisoners in Spain, that the treatment given by the Spanish fascist state to Republicans and Democrats is similar or even better than that given to Falangists, a new wave of terror has been unleashed against all prisoners, and particularly against those in the Central Prison of Burgos.

"We are constantly victimized by fascist terror and repression. We are denied normal communi-

cations with our families. Our letters to relatives and friends are curtailed and censored. We are denied all means of legal defense — we are not even permitted to use existing legal penal rights, limited as they are. We are kept isolated and refused newspapers and magazines printed by the regime. Even scientific and technical magazines are denied us.

"We are unjustly punished as in the case of Eduardo Villegas Vega, Socialist Councillor from Madrid during the Republican Government; Jose Luis Fernandez Albert, Communist, an officer in the Republican Navy and Lt. Col. in the French Maquis, and Enriquez Marcos Nadal of the Confederacion Nacional del Trabajo (National Federation of Workers), leader of the Railroad Workers Union in the C. N. T., an officer of the French Maquis and who was decorated by the 8th Allied Army.

"All of us have been in prison for more than 12 years. We were tried by War Councils without due process of law and condemned for 30 years — for political beliefs — as can be verified by the proceedings of the so-called trials.

"We have communicated with the Chief of State, unequivocally indicating the falseness of his

5 Questions to P.O.C.

(Continued from page 1)

catch up with the false promises and demagoguery of the leadership.

The strivings for a real Communist party in the heartland of world imperialism is not a matter of subjective will of individuals. This is a matter of social and historical necessity. The only way the leadership of the CPUSA can once more reestablish the Party on a Marxist-Leninist basis is by self-critically recognizing the great harm that has been done by their projection of the reformist policy and the revisionist line which was adopted at the 16th Party convention. The leadership is doing nothing of the kind, and we feel assured that sooner or later, the remaining rank and file must leave them and seek the only way out of this mess: the reconstitution of a real Marxist-Leninist organization outside of the politically bankrupt CPUSA.

Q. What about the international Communist movement? The leadership of the CPUSA claims its support. What are your opinions on this?

A. I'm sure that Tito was making similar claims back in 1955 and 1956 before his Pala speech. Indeed both the CPUSA and the CPC in the past referred to Yugoslavia as an integral part of the camp of socialism. But Tito and his cohorts repudiated Marxism-Leninism and refused the honor of being a component part of the camp of socialism. As a result, thousands upon thousands of Yugoslav Communists

were able to understand for the first time that it was Tito's regime and not the camp of socialism that was responsible for the split in 1948. Tito's main commodity, which he daily bartered to the imperialists, is his claim to being a "Communist." What better way was there to expose him than the insistence of the CPUSA and the CPC that he act as a Communist and adhere to the tried and tested principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Greetings on anniversary dates by Communist Party do not by themselves prove endorsement, nor agreement with policy. At the time of the Convention, greetings from Communist Parties throughout the world were received by the CPUSA. That does not mean that those Parties agreed with the line of the Convention. The leadership of the CPUSA has resorted to deception in the past as regards information to other Communist Parties. For instance, in *Peking Review* we read, an article to the effect that the CPUSA had endorsed the 12 Party Declaration. Who gave the Chinese comrades such information? Is that a fact? Of course not. These are the facts. This is what Eugene Dennis said: "We reject . . . the sectarian view of those who look upon the Declaration and its conclusions concerning universally valid Marxist-Leninist principles as a dogma and a substitute for our own independent theoretical and political work." (Resolution approved by N. C., Feb.

1958) And here is what Bob Thompson stated: "Certainly our Party is not called upon to endorse the 12-Party Declaration, and it should not endorse as its own that Declaration." (*Political Affairs*, Jan. 1958). The international movement did help in pulling the CPUSA leadership out of a revisionist crisis on two different occasions. During the Lovestone (1929) and the Browder (1945) revisionist mess. We do welcome any effort made by the international movement to help the American Communists get back into the revolutionary groove, but, as in the case of the Yugoslav Party, the CPUSA is already beyond the line of salvation.

Q. Would you give us your opinion of the Independent Socialist Unity Ticket in the N. Y. election. Does your Committee support or reject this movement?

A. At a N. Y. State Board meeting last December (1957) the leader of the Party organization in N. Y., George Charney, raised the slogan of a "Socialist Unity" electoral ticket in 1958, which would include the Trotskyites and the Communists. Neither Ben Davis nor anyone in his faction opposed this proposal. The only ones who did were Comrade Marino and myself. We stated that under no circumstances should we agree to join the Trotskyites. They are counter-revolutionaries and wreckers and nothing else. We object to this 'socialist-minded' mish-mash in general, but are

willing to join honest socialists on specific issues of the fight for reform. However, when it comes to the Trotskyites, we state categorically that we want to disassociate ourselves from 'unity' with them under any guise."

Subsequently, what Charney proposed in December 1957, was realized by Ben Davis in June 1958. The so-called "Independent Socialist Party" ticket is nothing else but a Trotskyite gimmick to further their wrecking influence in the labor movement and in the Communist ranks. Just examine that array of names in the "Continuation Committee" of the "Unity Conference" and observe the preponderance of Trotskyites and also the smattering of "Ben Davis' faction" representatives included in it. Like Marxist-Leninists the world over, we condemn Trotskyism as the most deadly enemy of the revolutionary working class movement. The fact that it appears concealed in the so-called "Independent Socialist Unity" ticket does not make Trotskyism less dangerous.

There are many honest sympathizers of the Communist movement who have been taken in by the so-called "Independent Socialist" ticket maneuver. Their support represents a form of protest against the present revisionist line of the CPUSA and especially against the Party leadership's opportunist electoral policy of tailing the Democratic Party.

Vanguard

Published by the Provisional Organizing Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party.

Editor:
A. Marino

Address:

Armando Roman
167 E. 2nd Street
New York, N.Y.

Franco Prisoners

(Continued from page 1)

statements to the French newspaper since the official documents in our possession clearly affirms the political character of the crime we are supposedly accused of.

"We repeat that the fascists intend to repeat in Burgos what they have done in the prisons of San Miguel de los Reyes and in el Dueso. That is, to transport the most outspoken and fearless to special punitive institutions, to isolated prisons, where they will be submitted to all types of terror and repression.

"It is for these reasons that we request that the Economic and Social Committee of the United Nations Organization send to Spain a Commission that will expose first, the very fact of our existence as political prisoners, and second, whether or not the treatment given us meets with that stipulated by the League of the Rights of Man.

"Nevertheless, with respect to this problem we wish to ask this very important Committee to keep in mind that the Franco authorities are very clever in preparing visits (to prisons) for international commissions. Thus, what these Commissions visit and see is only that which the authorities have already prepared in advance.

"For this reason, and also to prevent deceit on the part of the authorities, we are of the opinion that said Commission should be present in the prison and prison yards. That they should interview those who volunteer or that the Commission itself choose those whom they wish to interview.

"The political prisoners in the Central Prison of Burgos wish to inform the United Nations Organization, of which the Spanish Government is a member, that their purpose is not to change present regulations, nor weaken the international rules of prison procedure. In any case, we wish to make clear that all responsibility, which may come about as a result of acts that may change the present order of things, will fall upon the shoulders of the Franco Government, since its every deed and action is aimed at forcing the political prisoners to adopt desperate measures.

"We trust that our Petition will be accepted by this important Committee and that it will use all of its influence to prevent the continuation of this fascist repression of which we political prisoners in this prison, as well as our families, are subjected to, and that they will intercede in behalf of a broad movement for amnesty that will reunite us with our families."

Central Prison of Burgos (July 15, 1958). This Petition was signed by Eduardo Villegas Vega, Socialist; Jose Luis Fernandez Albert, Communist; Enrique Marcos Nadal of the C. N. T. and 500 other prisoners of diversified political ideology.

Letters to Editor

Editor:

Please send me the documents of the Committee and a copy of the newspaper VANGUARD. I would like to be kept informed of what's going on.

Fraternally,

G. P.
Arizona

Editor:

Enclosed you will find five dollars to cover the cost of a subscription to VANGUARD and subsequent literature. We are already in possession of Vol. 1, No. 1 and Two Roads. Please forward other available material, including suggested reading material in *Peking Review* if you can. No hurry. . . you must be very busy.

Faith in ourselves and our Class is the key, historically-necessary condition for progress; faith-born and tested in struggle, and crystallized into a revolutionary scientific theory, capable of enormous flexibility within the limits set only by principle (Marxist-Leninist Principles).

Don't be afraid to make mistakes — but keep moving and correct them as fast as you can.

Fraternally,

F. S., Brooklyn

Editor:

I was very much impressed by your paper, and was surprised that so much was accomplished in the little time that I was

away.

These, in my opinion, are the fruits of a correct line of struggle and collective leadership.

I am willing to work in any phase of the struggle where I may be needed. Besides carrying out the line of the Conference in my trade-union work, I will endeavor to win my Party club to the political line of the Conference.

Comradely,

Mac, New York

Editor:

At last American Communists are beginning to emerge from the stifling cocoon woven by the old Party bureaucrats. What a breath of fresh air was your first issue, with its news of the August Conference! This was electrifying — I am sorry I missed hearing about it in time to attend.

I would like to see your Committee get down to specifics: an analysis (Marxist-Leninist) of the economic situation in the United States; the Jewish question; etc.

Yours for success,

A. G., Akron

An economic analysis is being prepared and will be published in a subsequent issue. A Report of the Provisional Organizing Conference on the Jewish Question was published, and we are mailing you a copy.

Editor

October 19, 1958

Dear Editor:

In the last two issues of the *WORKER* Hy Lumer belatedly takes up the question of the Soviet Union and the Jewish people, as expressed in the sharp criticisms by R. Palme Dutt of the British C.P., and by Meir Vilner of the Israeli C.P. of the book by Prof. Hyman Levy, "Jews and the National Question".

In taking up this question, however, Lumer is obviously embarrassed by the need to conciliate the leadership of the Communist Party, heavily enmeshed in precisely the "bourgeois nationalism" of which he accuses Hyman Levy. In consequence of which, where Vilner says that "those who conduct frenzied propaganda against. . . the Soviet Union" on the score of the alleged matter of the "suppression" of Yiddish culture are "nurturing hatred against the Soviet Union," Lumer retreats in advance on this question by mollifying the bourgeois nationalist elements. He states, in his review of the Levy book "There is room for differences over certain current policies, such as the reluctance (in the Soviet Union) to print books in Yiddish or to establish a Yiddish newspaper."

This role as conciliator is further emphasized by a complete failure to point out the role that has been played in this question

by the entire Party leadership, which includes Novick, Schappes, Ben Davis, etc. without a peep of dissidence or protest from any of the so-called left, from Foster to Weinstein to Evvie Weiner and back again.

Lumer's efforts to cover up the leadership's opportunism on this question will fail, and further steal our determination to expose revisionism and conciliationism, on this question as well as all others.

Comradely,

Izzy Farber

EDITORIAL NOTE: The Provisional Committee has available the full texts of the Vilner article, and of the resolution passed by the Conference on the Jewish question, which fully exposes the role which the revisionists have played on this question. Copies on request.

HELP WANTED — Experience unnecessary

We need news items of general interest, cartoons and reports of your experiences in the shops, trade unions, and industries you are active in.

WRITE IT UP FOR THE VANGUARD!

THE RISE AND FALL OF JIMMY HIGGINS

At a branch meeting in Brooklyn, following our August 16th, 17th Conference.

Comrade organizer:

I nominate Comrade G. to be branch organizer of this club. He has a magnificent record of achievement selling the *Worker*. Comrade G. accepts and says:

I want to thank all of you for this honor.

Last weekend I attended the best Communist Conference in my life in the Party. I want to work along those lines here. . . dead silence. . .

Comrade organizer: I make a motion we remove Comrade G. and refer this to the County committee.

NOTICE!

Out of town P.O.C. organizers are requested to submit all materials for the VANGUARD by the 30th of the month.

Articles should be limited to 1000 words or less.

"Without a Revolutionary Theory

There can be no Revolutionary Practice!"

Send for our literature:

- ◆ FOR A REVOLUTIONARY POSITION ON THE NEGRO QUESTION
- ◆ REPORTS FROM AUGUST CONFERENCE
- ◆ TWO ROADS
- ◆ AGAINST REVISIONISM

Principle "Tactics"?

In the ideological struggle within the workers' movement, conciliationism serves revisionism in about the same way that revisionism serves openly bourgeois ideas on the ideological front of the general class struggle — by attempting to minimize the importance of theoretical principles.

For instance, if the liberal bourgeoisie insists upon the "gradualist" line (which is incompatible with the dialectical materialist view of the struggle for Negro liberation), then the revisionists find that "It is therefore not the task of Communists . . . to impose upon the Negro people new forms of struggle and tactics alien to their historic development as a people." (Main Political Resolution, 16th National Convention of the PCUSA.) At the same time, the revisionists tell the Party that "we must assure the early completion of the study and reassessment (read: revision — ed.) of our previously asserted theoretical position on this question." (Ibid.)

Now, the conciliators, in their turn, raise the slogan (for the purpose of protecting a revisionist line) for "an end to bickering over nebulous abstractions", as Benjamin D. Davis put it, (Party Voice, April, 1958. On such a basis, the "Left"-conciliator leadership of the old Party demands the suppression of the "illegal documents" (as they called them) which had been prepared by the Marxist-Leninist caucus. And, wheels within wheels, there were still among the conciliators, some who at least privately, "upheld" the right of the caucus to publish its views, but immediately insisted that we should not permit this question to lead to a split.

Whatever the stage, whatever the form then, conciliationism has shown the same characteristics: 1) a determination not to permit a division over ideological principles, no matter how crucial or basic they may be; and 2) the subordination of principles to "tactics", i.e., unity with open or disguised alien class ideology.

In various other documents we have discussed the "Left" conciliators. But there is one aspect of this phenomenon so far neglected. That concerns the special category of conciliators who at one time or another were themselves a part of the Marxist-Leninist caucus movement. We call them the neo-conciliators.

The neo-conciliators have not, in fact, brought forward any essentially new arguments against us. They rely upon the same contentions that we have heard from the beginning from "friendly" elements among the "Left" conciliators.

However, it would be a most serious error to fail to give special attention to these secondary contributions of the neo-conciliators. For these elements have

appeared to be closest to us, and therefore, for the time being at least, are most likely to be the immediate channel for the promotion of opportunist deviations among us.

The neo-conciliators' special refinements of the "tactics-over-principle" cause, obviously corresponds to the fact that these elements have all — at one time or another — operated as a part of the Marxist-Leninist caucus, the so-called "ultra-left".

Others may say that the 16th Convention line can be rehabilitated and made to fulfill a Marxist-Leninist function. But the neo-conciliators will openly denounce the 16th Convention, and then use the very prestige they thus gain to argue for reliance upon factional maneuvers at the top as the means of "saving the Party." Thus they embrace the "tactics" of the 16th Convention, itself — "unity" of the bureaucrats and exclusion of the membership from the determination of basic policy.

Aren't there question of basic principle involved in this struggle: The Party leadership's refusal to endorse the 12-Party Declaration; the suppression of Harry Haywood's recent polemic on the Negro question; the abandonment of the concentration policy; etc., etc.? How can principled questions be answered in a Marxist-Leninist way merely by playing the "tactics" game among factions, which the neo-conciliators themselves know to have one common characteristic: the rejection of Marxism-Leninism? It calls to mind the man who "sat on a rock and sought refreshment from his thumb."

Others, more openly compromised by long co-habitation with the various schools of conciliationism and revisionism, may be to a certain extent under "glass-house" restrictions on throwing stones at leading personalities of the Marxist-Leninist group. But the neo-conciliators are able to use their prestige and record of association as former caucus members in order to divert the struggle for a Marxist-Leninist Party, by resorting to aspersions against the personal character and motives of the leaders of that struggle.

Those who encounter these "arguments" will ask:

If one is a bureaucrat, a self-seeker, an adventurer, does he not guarantee his own undoing to the extent that he promotes the struggle for the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism? Therefore, if one is governed by narrow, personal, careerist ambitions, will he not logically tend to desert — rather than defend — the caucus movement? Would not such a congenial bureaucrat tend rather, to swim in the waters of revisionism and conciliationism, where he could be "unencumbered" by principle? Or again, is the struggle for Marx-

ism-Leninism private property, or is it not so to speak in the public domain? Has any "caucus bureaucrat" attempted to prevent, or even to discourage, the presentation of any ideological argument bearing on the struggle for a Marxist-Leninist Party?

Has it not been rather, the caucus, almost exclusively, which with its limited facilities, has consistently attempted to promote this discussion, even publishing and distributing points of view with which it was not fully in agreement?

But "bureaucracy" charges against the caucus leaders have been invariably accompanied by abandonment of discussion of the principle issues.

Again, in this connection, it is being proved that the exaltation of "tactics" over principle is the cover for the conscious or unconscious abandonment of principle on the part of those who, for one reason or another, will not openly repudiate the principle.

If the line of the neo-conciliators was merely a matter of poor logic, it would fairly soon be corrected, for they are no less intelligent than those who disagree with them. Unfortunately, the key to their particular line lies in important ideological errors. Those errors also happen to be precisely those most closely connected with the Party leadership's neglect of the lessons of the historic 20th Congress of the CPSU in regard to the "cult of the individual" and "the worship of authority."

Their addiction to the poisonous "cult-of-the-individual" ideology paralyzes them in the face of the inescapable Marxist-Leninist task of criticizing Foster in the full terms called for. It induces a fatal hesitation in those who contemplate the prospect of building a new leadership free of the "hardy perennials," who have had three revisionist deviations shot out from under them in thirty years.

The neo-conciliators' worship of authority is, of course, closely associated with their "cult-of-the-individual" habits. However, it is also and especially manifested in their tendency to excuse their abandonment of tasks of the struggle for self-correction by U.S. Communists, by allusions to possible pronouncements to be made by the international movement regarding the situation in the U.S. The neo-conciliators seem not to be disturbed by the fact that this has led them to make common cause with the "independence" folks of 16th Convention fame, in their denunciations of the "ultra-left."

No one has fought so hard as we for acceptance of the corrective criticism made by fraternal Communist Parties. We refer those who question this as-

sertion to "Two Roads," particularly the section on proletarian internationalism. We have the confident hope that such fraternal help will continue in spite to the supercilious disregard with which certain Party leaders receive it. But at the same time, history proves that in the absence of a deep-going struggle within the Party on the basic ideological questions at issue, the benefit of foreign Parties' advice is soon dissipated, because the true value of that counsel resides not in formal authority or prestige, but in the force of its Marxist-Leninist principle. Those who are stupefied by the worship of authority, no matter how often their feet may be set on the correct path will soon be led astray again. Only those who are determined to fight their own battles for Marxism-Leninism are worthy of fraternal criticism, and capable of defeating revisionism with that help.

Finally, a word must be said about an argument advanced from a seemingly quite different point of departure. It runs as follows:

"A year ago, or even before, the caucus rejected proposals to withdraw from the Party. This difference even led to a split within the caucus. Now the caucus decision of a year ago is being proved wrong by the present recognition that our split with the Party has become inevitable. The obvious inconsistency proves that the caucus was in error last year."

It is our opinion that those who think they see an inconsistency in the position of the caucus today as compared with a year ago, either miss the essential points of the struggle or ignore changes in the external condition of that struggle, or do both.

The aim was, is and will be first to draw the line of demarcation between revisionism-conciliationism, on the one hand, and Marxism-Leninism on the other, by carrying on a thoroughgoing ideological struggle. Secondly, the aim was, is and will be to bring about the existence of a Marxist-Leninist Party. Consider, in the light of this two-fold principle, the changes in the conditions of development of the struggle a year ago and today:

A year ago, there was one caucus, the one in New York. Today, after a year of ideological struggle, there is a coordinated national caucus movement with a number of centers.

A year ago, the historic 12-Party Declaration and the international offensive against revisionism had not come into existence. Today, the caucus, basing itself upon the 12-Party Declaration has achieved a high degree of political unity in opposition to the revisionist-

conciliationist 16th Convention line.

A year ago the extreme Right was in control of the party, nationally. The Foster-Davis group was still not challenged on a broad front of ideological issues for the membership. Today, the "Left" conciliators in their unity with the Center have attained dominance in the National Committee and have exposed themselves in their support of the 16th Convention and their refusal to endorse the 12-Party Declaration.

A year ago, as we have noted, the lines of demarcation were not clearly drawn, especially between the "Left"-conciliators and the caucus on ideological questions. Today, as well as these lines drawn that the "Left"-conciliators are organizing expulsions of the caucus leaders.

A year ago, the caucus movement could develop within the Party. Today it cannot.

Thus, what the neo-conciliators attempt to discredit as being inconsistent, is in fact, the result of consistent adherence to Marxist-Leninist principles.

On the other hand, what of the consistencies of these, our accusers? Some of them at least, have for some time already, been operating within a working arrangement with the Center—"Left"-conciliator leadership of the old Party. Here indeed, we can see "consistency" — a consistency which proves that in this struggle, there is only one alternative to a Marxist-Leninist line, and it starts with conciliationism.

MEMBERSHIP—

Any person who agrees with the political line of the Provisional Organizing Committee, who actively participate shall be eligible for membership.

Rights and Duties of Members.
All members have the right and duty to help in the determination of policy.

All members have the right of election and being elected.

All members shall have the right to freely criticize any officer or member of the Provisional Organizing Committee.

DUES—

A minimum of 50c per month shall be paid by all members.

SUGGESTED READING

"Struggle Against Yugoslav Revisionism". Series in Peking Review.

No Enemies

You have no enemies, you say?
Alas, my friend, the boast is poor;
He who has mingled in the fray
Of duty, that the brave endure,
Must have made foes! If you have none,
Small is the work that you have done.
You've hit no traitor on the hip,
You've dashed no cup from perjured lip,
You've never turned the wrong to right,
You've been a coward in the fight

Guess Who?

A free sub will be sent to the first person that mails us the name of the author to this poem:

VANGUARD

c/o A. Roman
167 East 2nd Street
New York, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$1.00 for a year's subscription

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____

() I would like additional information about the Provisional Organizing Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Party.

In Refutation of Modern Revisionisms' Reactionary Theory of the State

By WANG CHIA-HSIANG

The following article appeared in the June 16 issue of "Hongqi" (Red Flag), fortnightly theoretical journal issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. —Ed.

The Renmin Ribao editorial "Modern Revisionism Must Be Repudiated" pointed out that one of the fundamental points in modern revisionism, as typified by the programme put forward by the leading group in Yugoslavia, is its substitution of the reactionary theory of the state standing above classes for the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state.

The imperialists have always sought to cover up the nature of the state as a class dictatorship in order to wreck the revolutionary working-class movement. They describe the state under bourgeois dictatorship as "standing above classes," "belonging to the whole people" and "democratic," and slander the state under proletarian dictatorship as "totalitarian" and undermining democracy. Now that socialism and imperialism stand out in sharp contrast, with socialism in the ascendant like the sun rising and imperialism in murky decline, the working people under capitalist rule are turning towards socialism increasingly, the imperialists' lies are more than ever losing their power to deceive, and the anti-Communist nonsense of the Social Democrats is proving more and more incapable of helping the imperialists. It is at such a time that the Yugoslav revisionists, donning the cloak of Marxism-Leninism, have come forward to serve imperialism, particularly U. S. imperialism, by peddling the bourgeois theory of the state standing above classes, so as to repay U. S. imperialism for its "reward" of large sums of American dollars.

State power in an imperialist country is a means of serving the handful of monopoly capitalists and exercising dictatorship over the overwhelming majority of the people. Yet the Yugoslav revisionists are at great pains to conceal the dictatorship character of the imperialist state power. They say that in the capitalist world "the state increasingly controls the activities of capital" and "restricts the role of private capital" that "the role of the state as that of a regulator also grows" (Draft Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia) and that "the state is no longer the apparatus of a certain class in capitalist society; it no longer reflects or upholds the special interests of that class" ("Has Capitalism Changed?" by R. L., October 1956 issue of the Yugoslav magazine The Truth About Us). Glorifying imperialist state power in such a fashion, are they not toeing the line of the imperialists?

The outstanding feature of our age is the transition from capitalism to socialism. Through revolution in one form or another, the working class must smash the bourgeois state apparatus, set up the proletarian state apparatus and replace bourgeois dictatorship by proletarian dictatorship. Marxist-Leninists, therefore, have always held that seizure of state power is the crucial question in the proletarian revolution. Using sophistry, the Yugoslav revisionists insist that state capitalism in the capitalist countries is a "factor of socialism," that socialism is taking form within the capitalist system, and that the bourgeois state

apparatus is also changing in this direction. Subsequently, there is no need for the working class to carry out proletarian revolution, to smash the bourgeois state apparatus or to set up its own state apparatus. They claim that by "exercising incessant pressure" on the bourgeois state apparatus and working to "exert a decisive influence" in it, the working class will be able to "secure the development of socialism." They are spreading this nonsense about "peaceful evolution" from capitalism to socialism in order to create ideological confusion within the ranks of the revolutionary working-class movement, to paralyze, corrode and sap the revolutionary will-power of the working class and Communist Parties in the capitalist countries, and to prevent proletarian revolution. This being so, what trace of Marxism-Leninism do they show, what markings other than those of an accomplice of the imperialists?

Since the Great October Revolution, one-third of mankind has smashed the bourgeois state apparatus and established their own states of proletarian dictatorship. The proletarian dictatorship in these countries is fundamentally different in nature from dictatorship by all exploiting classes. It is the dictatorship of the many over the few, dictatorship for the building of socialist society free from exploitation of man by man. It is the most progressive, and also the last, dictatorship in human history which is undertaking the greatest and most difficult historic task of eliminating classes, and it is forging ahead in conditions of most complex struggle, along the most tortuous road ever known in human history.

With a history of only forty years, it is impossible for the dictatorship of the proletariat to avoid making some partial mistake or another, in the course of its advance. Whatever the mistakes, since proletarian dictatorship is the system of the people themselves, it will learn from mistakes and correct them by itself. But the Yugoslav revisionists, following the imperialist reactionaries, venomously attack the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. They call the state system of the socialist countries "bureaucracy and bureaucratic statism." They fiercely attack the Communist Parties in the socialist countries for holding the leading position and exercising the leading role in the life of the state and slandering direct leadership and supervision by the Communist Parties in these countries over the work of the state as giving rise to "the growth of bureaucracy in the Party" and "statism." A mere glance shows that the weapons used by the Yugoslav revisionist countries come from the arsenals of the imperialists. It is just because they brandish these antiquated weapons in the name of "Communists," with the status of a "socialist country," and under the cloak of Marxism-Leninism, that they win special approval and paeudits from the U. S. imperialists.

All the classical writings of Marxism-Leninism show that socialist state power is the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e. the proletariat organizing itself as the ruling class. After seizing power, the proletariat must exercise dictatorship through its own state apparatus over the vanquished exploiting classes, carry on the class struggle in the new conditions and solve the problem of whether the socialist road or the capitalist road will

win out, so as to eliminate classes. But the Yugoslav revisionists maintain that socialist state power should not be an instrument of force, should not exercise dictatorship over the class enemy and should not conduct struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads. At the same time, they make no little fuss about the so-called question of democracy, attacking the socialist countries under the pretext of promoting "democracy." Tito has manufactured the pretext that "we are always emphatically against regarding the proletarian dictatorship as mere force," as though there were only dictatorship and no democracy in the socialist countries. Since the class enemy still exists in the period of transition and there are antagonistic contradictions between them and the proletariat, contradictions between the enemy and ourselves, dictatorship must be exercised if solved. As to democracy, all democracy is merely a form of class rule. Democracy that is divorced from proletarian dictatorship can never be democracy under the socialist system. In essence, bourgeois democracy is dictatorship by the few over the great majority, the working people, while proletarian dictatorship means democracy for the great majority, the working people. Either the enemy wipes us out or vice versa; either bourgeois democracy or proletarian democracy. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a unity of dictatorship and democracy. Comrade Mao Tse-tung once said: "Democracy for the people and dictatorship over the reactionaries, when combined, constitute the people's democratic dictatorship" (On People's Democratic Dictatorship); "dictatorship does not apply in the ranks of the people. The people cannot possibly exercise dictatorship over themselves; nor should one section of them oppress another section"; "under the people's democratic dictatorship, two different methods — dictatorship and democracy — should be used to resolve the two kinds of contradiction of different nature — those between ourselves and the enemy and those among the people." (On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People). By opposing democracy to dictatorship while chattering about abstract democracy, denying the necessity of dictatorship over the class enemy, the necessity of struggle between the socialist and the capitalist roads, the Yugoslav revisionists are simply trying to create confusion within the socialist countries in co-ordination with the subversive activities conducted against these countries by the imperialist countries.

Under the pretext that Stalin had made individual mistakes on the question of proletarian dictatorship, the Yugoslav revisionists exultantly exaggerated these mistakes to attack the proletarian dictatorship in the socialist countries. It never occurs to them that in doing so they are simply showing their revisionist colors. True, Stalin once made the appraisal that, as a rule, class struggle in the transitional period "grows increasingly acute," and this appraisal, interpreted as continuous expansion of the class struggle can bring detrimental results to the socialist cause. But this does not mean that to correct this mistake one must deny the class struggle in the transitional period, the struggle to decide whether socialism or capitalism will win. The facts show that the class struggle to decide which will win out continues not only throughout the initial stage of the proletarian dictatorship, when capitalist ownership is being eliminated and socialist ownership established, but also,

on the political and ideological fronts, after the question of ownership has been completely solved.

In the struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism, there are contradictions between the enemy and ourselves and contradictions among the people. Sometimes, of course, the class struggle in the transitional period is tense and at other times relaxed, marked by ups and downs. At one stage, the situation may tend for a while to relaxation after the proletariat wins a round in battle and the class enemy is forced to retreat. But the class enemy is never resigned to extinction and will, in given conditions, launch fresh attacks on socialism. These ups and downs in the class struggle will repeat themselves many times over a period. Nevertheless, with the advance of the socialist revolution, the general trend is towards the gradual weakening of the class struggle till it dies out.

The Yugoslav revisionists deny this objective law and spread the slander that the socialist countries aggravate the social contradictions by means of the power of the state. What interpretation can be placed on his other than that they are helping the imperialists and opposing proletarian dictatorship and the elimination of classes?

The Yugoslav revisionists particularly attack as the source of all evils, the democratic centralism practiced in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. They deceitfully drag in the experience of the "Paris Commune" and distort the lessons drawn from it by Karl Marx as being the elimination of centralism. This is an insult to Marx and to the French proletariat who raised the banner of the Paris Commune. As Lenin said, "there is no departure whatever from centralism" in Marx's summing up of the experience of the Paris Commune. (Lenin: The State and Revolution). In the socialist countries it is democracy, i.e. democratic centralism, not dictatorship, that is practised among the people. Among the people, democracy and centralism, decentralization and centralization of power — these are unities of opposites. Democracy means democracy under centralized guidance, not extreme democratization; centralism means centralism based on democracy, not absolute centralization. Decentralization means apportionment of power under unified leadership, not anarchy; centralization means concentration of power on the basis of bringing into play the activity and initiative of the lower organizations and the rank and file, not absolute centralization which restricts and hampers this activity and initiative. It is wrong to emphasize one aspect to the denial of the other. True, over-centralization or over-decentralization may occur in the course of Socialist construction owing to lack of experience. But this is only a question of how democratic centralism is applied, not an inevitable result of proletarian dictatorship. In slandering centralism in the proletarian states, the Yugoslav revisionists merely reveal their ulterior motives in attacking the socialist countries. As to the so-called "social self-government," which they assert to be an absolute boon, it is enough to quote what Engels said: "It is absurd to speak of the principle of authority as being absolutely evil, and of the principle of autonomy as being absolutely good." (Engels: On Authority). And, as Engels pointed out, whoever sticks to this absurd concept is actually

servicing the reactionaries.

The Yugoslav revisionists are particularly energetic in attacking the management of economic affairs by the socialist state. According to them, if the proletarian state authority manages the national economy, the state becomes a means of hamstringing the development of socialism. This is extraordinary logic. Has there ever existed a state that does not manage economic affairs? So long as the state exists it must manage economic affairs in one way or another. The queerest part of the logic is this — when the Yugoslav revisionists talk about the tightening of economic control exercised by the state authority in the imperialist countries they see nothing wrong in this. On the contrary, they spare no words to eulogize and glorify this as a "factor of socialism." Yet when they come to the economic control exercised by the state authority in the socialist countries, they roundly condemn it and smear it as "the source of bureaucracy and bureaucratic statism." Is this not revealing as to the reactionary nature of the Yugoslav revisionists' attack on state management of the economy in the socialist countries? In the classical works of Marxism-Leninism it is pointed out, time and again, that the proletarian state, as the representative of society, must organize the socialist economy. Why must the proletarian state manage the economy? The reasons are: 1 — to wage the struggle between the two roads, to secure the triumph of the socialist road over the capitalist road; 2 — to carry through the class line and the class policies of the proletariat in all economic work and 3 — taking the interests of the whole country and all the people into consideration — to ensure the planned, proportionate development of the socialist national economy in accordance with the objective laws of socialist economic development.

Precisely as a result of planned state management of the national economy, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have made tremendous achievements in their economic construction. It goes without saying that in the state management of the economy there should be a proper division of function and co-ordination between the central and local authorities. Unified control and planning by the central authorities must be correctly linked with the activity and initiative of the local authorities and the masses. But whatever the way in which the central and local authorities divide their work of economic management, and however the working people play their part in this management, this is a question of concrete forms of economic management. It is not a question of whether to abolish the proletarian state's function of economic management. What meaning can there be in the Yugoslav revisionists' talk about abolishing the economic function of the proletarian state? Apart from its trickery to mislead people, it simply means undermining and abolishing the economic foundation of the proletarian state, i.e. socialist ownership by the whole people; doing away with planned economy; throwing overboard the proletarian class line and class policy of socialist economic development; abolishing the unified leadership and supervision which the proletariat exercises over the socialist economy through the Communist Party and the state apparatus; restoring capitalist methods of administration and management; and preserving and restoring freedom for the bourgeoisie to facilitate its comeback.

(Continued next issue)