

June 1980

Towards the Development of the
International Marxist-Leninist Trend:
a Contribution to the Criticism of the
Revisionism-Centrism of
Mao Zedong Thought and the
Party of Labor of Albania

Kansas City Marxist-Leninist Cell

Kansas City Revolutionary Workers

Collective



Typo corrections have been entered.

ERRATA (important typographical errors):

1. p. 9, add to the very top of the page: petty bourgeoisie, the non-monopoly bourgeoisie, were united with. Mao supported the bourgeois national interests in the colonies and imperialist nations.¹³
 2. p. 21, 1st full paragraph, 3rd line from bottom, should read: that plants can't do without animals...
 3. p. 37, quote from Lenin, 9th line from top, should read: conditionally demands) or of...
 4. p. 37, 3rd paragraph, 2nd line from bottom, eliminate the phrase: "the aspect of the contradiction,"
 5. p. 85, quote at the bottom, 14th line down should read: verbal protests, but by...
 6. p. 95, inset quote from Hoxha, end of the 2nd line should read: ...formulated correctly
 7. p. 110, top line, should read: now that neither...
 8. p. 113, Note 15, 2nd line, eliminate: "the Rebel Worker, and"
- NOTE: other typographical errors--also a reflection of amateurishness--have not been included.
-

CONTENTS

Preface	i
I. The Marxist-Leninist Theory of Knowledge and "Mao Zedong Thought"	1
✓A. On the Dialectical Materialist Theory of Knowledge	1
✓B. Marxism-Leninism	4
✓C. Mao Zedong Thought--Revisionism on the Theory of Knowledge	6
or, Nick Revisited	
II. Materialist Dialectics and "Mao Zedong Thought"	15
✓A. Materialist Dialectics	15
✓B. Laws of Dialectics	18
✓C. Mao Zedong Thought is Metaphysics which Serves the Interests of the Bourgeoisie	34
III. How Mao's Empiricism, Idealism and Metaphysics Provided an Ideological Foundation for the "Anti-Revisionist Communist Movement"	55
IV. The Sham "Break" with Soviet Revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought by the Centrist Party of Labor of Albania	61
✓A. The Opportunism of the "Break" with Soviet Revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought	61
B. The PLIA's International Program, Strategy and Tactics is a Centrist Continuation of Soviet Revisionism and is in Strategic Agreement with Mao Zedong Thought	67
✓C. The PLIA Unites with Mao Zedong Thought Ideologically	89
V. The Role of the Party of Labor of Albania's Revisionism-Centrism in the "Anti-Revisionist Communist Movement"	103
✓Conclusion	107
Notes	109

Preface

This paper represents the beginning attempts to rid ourselves of revisionism, right opportunism and centrism, and set ourselves on a Marxist-Leninist course. It is by no means a document free of errors. No one, when he first wakes up and sees he has been taking the wrong path, can immediately have real clarity; it is at first a matter of getting on the right course. Once on the right course much of the old remains and it is a while before the old is rooted out, major deviations basically eliminated, clarity reached and Marxist-Leninist practice carried out. What is important is that we must take the necessary steps for elimination of the old and development of real clarity and truly Marxist-Leninist positions on major lines of demarcation, and carry this out in practice.

Yes, our groups have been taking the wrong course, as nearly all the established "Marxist-Leninist," "anti-revisionist" groups in the movement have taken and continue to take. Our course has been one of revisionism, right opportunism and centrism with Mao Zedong Thought and PLA centrism as our ideological foundation. Mao Zedong Thought ideologically led us to cooked up formulas where we tried to frame reality into ideas and formulas already in our head, to seeing things metaphysically, not in their motion, and thus not seeing the essence of processes; to negating Marxist-Leninist principles; to negation of theory and thus spontaneity; to a narrow view of practice and thus economism; and more that we will bring out in the paper. Ideologically PLA centrism had the same affect as Mao Zedong Thought. The PLA too taught us to "adapt" Marxism-Leninism to conditions, to approach analysis in terms of formulas, to underrate theory and worship the mass spontaneous movement. The influence of the PLA especially taught us the art of phrasemongering, of throwing around M-L in words and carrying out opportunism in deeds. Mao Zedong Thought (MZT) and the PLA affected us politically and organizationally. Through revising Marxist-Leninist principles the dictatorship of the proletariat was negated, the international strategy and tactics were opportunist, the building of the vanguard proletarian party and its leadership of the masses was negated. Both MZT and the PLA taught us the centrist slogan "unite don't split." The guiding centrist line was to seek unity and work out differences, to avoid open polemics, to make politics dependent on "fraternal relations," rather than to draw lines of demarcation, to split from opportunism and revisionism, to engage in open polemics and to base fraternal relations on correct politics.

Mao Zedong Thought was supposed to have "creatively developed" Marxism-Leninism for the conditions in China. MZT supposedly was eventually to have "developed" Marxist-Leninist principles universally. There was supposed to have been a break with the revisionism of the CPSU by the CPC and PLA. Today we see that none of this was the case, that MZT and the PLA's views are an extension of revisionism and no break had been made. We, who followed MZT and the PLA, thus had not really broken with revisionism as we had thought, and were not really following a further development of Marxism-Leninism, but a revision of Marxism-Leninism. Actually our groups, and others in the "anti-revisionist" movement took a centrist position of trying to combine MZT with Marxism-Leninism. Our groups, for instance, would have questions of some of Mao's lines which did not seem to correspond to Marxism-Leninism (M-L), but rather than sharply draw out the distinctions and recognize the revisionist nature of MZT, we tried to interpret MZT in a way in which it seemed to correspond more with what M-L had to say. What this ended up in was watering down M-L and thus losing the revolutionary essence of it. This can be seen in our past practice of seeing the excessively economist practice of such groups as the Communist Party (M-L), the Communist Party U.S.A., and Communist Party U.S.A. (M-L), the Revolutionary Communist Party U.S.A.,¹ but not seeing our own economism or justifying the economism of

other groups who hadn't joined the larger parties and whom we thought would compose the truly proletarian party. And both our groups would take a little from Mao, a little from M-L such as thinking, "Mao's view of cure the sickness to save the patient is correct, but so is the Leninist view of purging opportunist elements." What this ended up with in essence is agreeing with Mao, and this can be borne out in our practice within the communist movement and in our own organizations.

Our past history has been one of spontaneity, economism, reformism, neglect of the leading role of theory, failure to build the vanguard party of the proletariat. All these deviations were bequeathed from the historic tendencies in the U.S. communist movement, the objective conditions of enormous superprofits and the resultant large split in the working class and large privileges to the petty bourgeoisie, and the international revisionism and centrism of the CPC and PLA, the lack of Marxist-Leninist leadership internationally. Along with this went our own organizations' class background of labor aristocracy and petty bourgeoisie. We always realized our right opportunism in words, but never broke with it, always falling back to it, caving in to it. This too had its roots internationally in the centrism, especially of the PLA. In addition, we saw all this right opportunism in the communist movement and rather than breaking from it, we tried to work with it, tried to change it from within. We even fancied that an M-L center and party could be built from such material. We are beginning to realize the error of centrism here and our need to make a resolute break with revisionism and opportunism.

In light of our beginning break with revisionism, right opportunism, centrism, we have some criticism of our past practice and views on how to move in the correct direction in the future. First, there was our economism, reformism and spontaneity in the working class movement. We are presently summing up our work in this area and will have more details in the future. What we know at this time is that we have been proceeding spontaneously, no correct theory on our tasks was developed and followed, we were not doing work to win advanced workers --we didn't even have a line on where advanced workers were and how to win them (our view of the character of advanced workers is the description Lenin gave in A Retrograde Trend...*). We now know that essential to conscious work to win advanced workers is a line on the split in the working class in the U.S. (the split in the working class is a fundamental line of demarcation of M-L, but is something Mao and the PLA never dealt with). Also essential is an M-L line on party building and our tasks. Finally, correct stands on major lines of demarcation are essential to winning advanced workers.

Another criticism we have of our line and practice around party building is our failure to build an organization of professional revolutionaries. Only an organization of professional revolutionaries can form the core of a revolutionary proletarian party. Our failure to develop such was connected to our economist line of mass work and implantation of petty bourgeois intellectuals and students into the factory. (KCMLC did not have such practice, although they did not struggle hard against KCRWC's practice.) Rather than implanting intellectuals and students into the factories and other mass organizations, we need to be winning advanced workers (and advanced workers don't require us to be working in the factory to see the correctness or incorrectness of our line and practice). Concentrating on "factory work," "mass work" has meant a failure to develop a professional revolutionary organization, and this has led to many internal problems and errors in our work. We have been unable to provide M-L leadership and build the party locally or nationally since our members lacked the theory, skill and sometimes the dedication to do so. In order to correct this we have to stop implanting ourselves, develop ourselves and advanced workers theoretically and

* Lenin Collected Works (LCW), Vol. 4, pp. 255-285

practically into Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries, allow only those who are really dedicated to proletarian revolution to be in our organizations, and unite with each other and other organizations only on the basis of having drawn the major lines of demarcation.

One last criticism is our "unite to demarcate" line. We had been in the "anti-revisionist movement" since our inception. We were anti-Trotskyite, anti-Soviet revisionism, anti-Chinese revisionism, held to party building as the central task, and we thought that those groups who took the same route were "genuine" and the party could be built from them. Since the large organizations were definitely revisionist and opportunist, we thought that the party could be made of the "small circles," linking them up. This looked at the quantity of the circles, not the quality of them. This type of view did not look at the lines of demarcation involved in anti-trotskyism, etc., whether groups really had M-L lines and practice on major issues and whether there weren't other forms of revisionism and opportunism against which lines of demarcation had to be drawn (such as MZT). Thus on the basis of a few extremely vague and general lines of demarcation, which groups really didn't adhere to in practice, we began calling for fairly high levels of organization such as carrying out a joint party building plan. As we have said, we ignored much of the right opportunism we saw before our eyes, ignored the questions coming to the fore around MZT and plunged ahead trying to get groups to build the party together. Kansas City Marxist-Leninist Cell (KCMLC), formerly the Wichita Communist Cell (WCC), pushed forward a Multilateral Conference on Party Building (MJLC) with the hopes of uniting a few groups attending it around a "party building plan."² This line was so off-base it led to a complete practical failure. Many groups disunited with whatever Leninist lines we had at the time (such as our developing views on the international strategy and tactics, the character of the party) and because they weren't building the proletarian party, but preferred to talk about it while continuing mass work or their intellectual pursuits, our approach to settle matters on the question of party building and attack it in a conscious, planned way, was also opposed. Finally, many of the groups saw the coming split around MZT and were busy preparing to make the best possible outcome of such a split, keeping as many forces with them in the swamp of MZT as possible. Thus, in this period, even when we had developing differences with these centrist groups, differences which were taking us away from centrism, our own centrism, especially around party building kept us in bondage to these groups, and thus kept us from sharply breaking with opportunism. We can now see the danger and opportunism in centrism when we see the practical failures in party building--how we kept ourselves from breaking with opportunism and how this prevented us from establishing the Marxist-Leninist line on major lines of demarcation, winning advanced workers to it and developing the core of professional-revolutionaries.

It is not like our "unite to demarcate" line went along unopposed. Demarcation and the U.S. Leninist Core (both now the Bolshevik League)³ correctly criticized this in their "A Joint Counterproposal to the Multilateral Conference on Party Building." They correctly held that the conference of the type we were pushing for (and the type which occurred) was right opportunist and centrist, and that:

"The main purpose, content, and focus of a conference on party building must be to have an open and all-embracing discussion, to hold sharp and principled ideological struggle on the key questions related to our principal task of Party building. We are only for a conference if its method is open polemics and its aim is to draw clear lines of demarcation. Otherwise, the struggle for a genuine Party will not be furthered, but liquidated." (p. 11, slightly revised edition, March, 1979)

The conference should have centered around drawing the major lines of demarcation in party building with MZT entering into all areas. By major lines of demarcation we mean lines on outlook and method, the party, party building, international strategy and tactics, the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. But while we now see this as the way the MJLC should have gone, then we thumbed our noses at the criticism and forged ahead.

Even after our failures at the MJLC, we stubbornly clung to our line of joint activity before the proper lines of demarcation had been drawn. We tried to start up a joint journal. Before too long we saw the numerous differences between us and the group involved and the journal never developed.

NJS
 Finally, last fall even though we were beginning to see the split around MZT, and how most groups would continue to uphold MZT while we were not going in that direction, we entered into a National Joint Study (NJS) around the question of the "Mao-Hoxha Differences." There was much wrong with the study: it was non-polemical, hurried, often didn't get down to the real issues involved, and the groups involved were strongly pro-Mao, but we decided to participate since we thought it would be a form by which we could develop our line and possibly even win others away from MZT (perhaps winning a few individuals and splitting groups). Again we were wrong. The NJS formalities took way too much of our time and we continued to struggle with groups over related issues. As a result the real issues around MZT and the PLA were not given the attention they needed. Additionally, groups never had a Leninist critical attitude and method and merely used the study as a way to consolidate their already existing pro-Mao views or to "criticize" Mao in a sham PLA way. Still, we made drawing lines of demarcation subordinate to some organizational form. While this polemic, which was originally written as our views for the NJS, may have a positive effect on a few individuals involved with the NJS, it could have developed faster and better outside the NJS and its content has developed outside the bounds of the NJS, thus its effects are not the result of having participated in the NJS.

While we can say, "At last we are coming to see the errors of our ways," we must also be highly critical of the time it has taken us to see this and of the problems we will have in really breaking with revisionism, right opportunism and centrism. It is obvious that we should have come to these views much earlier: it is Mao Zedong Thought and PLA centrism which kept us from taking up these issues critically and developing correct views. We have been inundated with MZT and PLA centrism and will have to wage a staunch struggle to break with such in theory and practice.

But we are not alone in the struggle to Bolshevize ourselves. More than the practical failures of our line, the criticism of MZT and centrism from Demarcation and the U.S. Leninist Core, later the Bolshevik League, and the Bolshevik Union⁴ have helped us begin such a break. We look forward to the future struggle to break thoroughly with revisionism, opportunism and centrism.

We are not continuing in the NJS. We would only continue if we thought it was a vehicle for drawing lines of demarcation. It is not, because it has hindered us developing an understanding of things, and groups in the NJS are not giving any indication of taking up the Marxist-Leninist line. They are continuing wholesale in the swamp of MZT and the only splits will be between PLA centrism and MZT. We will continue to draw lines of demarcation around the very questions being taken up in the NJS (the dictatorship of the proletariat, the party--which we have already drawn lines around), plus more such as the international strategy and tactics which the NJS won't touch with a 10 foot pole, and will do so much more expediently given the fact we won't have to waste our time arguing over the ques-

tions, procedure, etc. We are stopping our bilateral struggle with the rights and centrists, and are concentrating on developing our understanding of Marxism-Leninism, on propagandizing this understanding, and on open struggle against revisionist and centrist trends. We hope to develop bilateral relations with groups and individuals breaking with MZT and PLA centrism, but even here we will concentrate on open polemics.

In this initial analysis of MZT and the PLA, and their effect nationally and internationally, we centered around Mao and the PLA's philosophic-ideological basis, and some of the practical and political results of such. We struggled for philosophy to be the first subject in the NJS and it was correct that it was made such since we had followed Mao's outlook and method and this is basic to everything else. What was incorrect in the NJS was the way in which it was treated, as "dialectics," without materialism. Even though this was criticized after the study got underway, only one group that has written a paper so far has tried to defend Mao's views on materialism and the theory of knowledge. We studied this first and found Mao and the PLA to be totally revisionist in this area.

A note should be made regarding the general development and content of the paper. At first we were trying to stick close to the NJS deadline, a deadline that was ridiculous and which the coordinators still assert in their summation of the section on philosophy was "realistic." This deadline was that philosophy would be studied and papers written up within three months. Of course when you only deal with dialectics and you continue with MZT perhaps this is "realistic." For someone trying to break with MZT and examine dialectical materialism it is not. Anyway, the first section (I. The Marxist-Leninist Theory of Knowledge and "Mao Zedong Thought") was written under this time pressure, which was incorrect, and it is not as developed as it should be. Throughout the course of studying and working on the paper, we more and more threw away our MZT and centrist way of thinking and doing. The paper, which was written as we did our study, thus develops similarly. A major change we have noticed is our ability to do independent analysis and to reflect that in writing. The paper becomes more and more analytical as it goes. In fact, we received criticism on part I from those locally to whom we had distributed it. It was criticized as short on analysis, and we agreed. It is part of our MZT and PLA heritage to put forward views in a positional, phrasemongerish way and there is still a current of this in the first section, and even throughout the paper, but lessening as the paper progresses.

We can honestly say that this is the first time we really studied the Marxist-Leninist outlook and method. It is our first real insight into dialectical materialism. In the past Mao's "On Practice" and "On Contradiction" reigned in light of the "difficulty" of Lenin's Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Philosophical Notebooks (Works, Vol. 38), Engel's Anti-Duhring, Dialectics of Nature, and even though we had studied Stalin's popular essay Dialectical and Historical Materialism and Lenin's "Karl Marx." Because we are just breaking from "On Practice" and "On Contradiction" we are still weak in our understanding and usage of dialectical materialism and there are likely errors in the paper. We plan to continue some study of dialectical materialism and also to begin a study of economics. Here we had professed to be communist organizations for several years and had not really studied and grasped the basic laws of Marxism-Leninism, let alone Marxist-Leninist principles!

Now that we have determined the revisionist nature of MZT and the PLA philosophically and ideologically, and in general, politically and organizationally, we plan to develop more of the particulars. We are currently starting a deeper study on the international situation and will some time later begin one on the dictatorship of the proletariat. Just because we recognize some of

the current revisionism and opportunism and can relate it to certain past revisionism and opportunism doesn't mean that we know all there is to know about it and have purged ourselves of it. Also just because we recognize some of the general deviations around the dictatorship of the proletariat in China and Albania which points to these countries never having the dictatorship of the proletariat, does not mean that we have a very developed understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat, nor that we have learned from history in this respect.

One of the hallmarks of centrism internationally (e.g. the PLA) and nationally (e.g. the Marxist-Leninist Party U.S.A., formerly the Central Organization of U.S. Marxist-Leninists, and the CPUSA M-L)⁵ is to feign a break with MZT, but to continue to carry out MZT in practice, or to be "critical" of Mao--he was "60-40" or "40-60" (e.g. "Some Comrades in the Bay Area," Ex-MLC, Red Dawn Committee)⁶--but also to continue to carry out MZT in practice. The same phenomenon will occur with the PLA--breaking with them in words but carrying out PLA centrism and opportunism in deeds. We realize "our historic tendency" towards centrism and are struggling against such a "break" with MZT or the PLA. We reject both the sections of the international centrist trend grouped around centrist-MZT and the PLA. We see MZT and the PLA as thoroughly revisionist, right opportunist and centrist and are struggling to deepen our theoretical grasp of Marxist-Leninist principles, and MZT and the PLA's violation of them, and change our practice to that of carrying out Marxist-Leninist principles.

Kansas City Marxist-Leninist Cell
 Kansas City Revolutionary Workers Collective

May 1980

I. The Marxist-Leninist Theory of Knowledge and "Mao Zedong Thought"

A. On the Dialectical Materialist Theory of Knowledge

Mao Zedong sums up his article "On Practice" as being the "whole of the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge." Our view is that Mao's theory of knowledge has nothing in common with dialectical materialism. Below, we will briefly outline the basic features of the Marxist theory of knowledge. Later in this document, we will show how Mao deviates fundamentally from this Marxist theory.

Lenin stated that, "All knowledge comes from experience, from sensation, from perception."^{*} The problem before us, then, is to examine that process of getting from initial sensations to the development of human knowledge.

How should we understand sensation from a materialist point of view? Sensation, as Lenin put it, is the direct connection between consciousness and the external world. It is from our sensations exclusively that we derive mental images and pictures of the external world--of matter. Thus, our sensations are a reflection of matter. Consciousness is a product of the development of matter. Forms of consciousness--perceptions and thoughts--reflect the external material reality. Nothing can develop in our consciousness except as a reflection of the material world. Thus, matter is primary, consciousness secondary.

"This is materialism: matter acting upon our sense-organs produces sensation. Sensation depends on the brain, nerves, retina, etc., i.e., on matter organised in a definite way. The existence of matter does not depend on sensation. Matter is primary. Sensation, thought, consciousness are the supreme product of matter organised in a particular way."
(V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", Lenin Collected Works Vol. 14, p. 55)

As stated earlier, perceptions and thoughts are forms of consciousness. Sensation is one aspect in the process of reflection. Consciousness is a further step. Consciousness represents forms which are created in the operation of the processes of the brain. Perception is how we are initially aware of the material reality reflected by our sensations. Thought is a more abstract reflection of reality than perception.

Here we should mention the role of the development of labor in the process of thinking. Man is a social animal, his whole mode of life is social. Labor is the basis of our social activity. It was basically through this form of activity that human's perceptions became more encompassing, and the brain became more and more developed. Social labor also gave rise to the need for speech. The development of thought and speech--through the development of labor--marked a definite advance in human development. For with this development, humans could transform their perceptions and thoughts into ideas.

Ideas are formed according to the needs of social interaction. They are not simply the reflection of the features of external objects presented to our senses. Our needs in social activity require us to form concepts about our activity and about the world itself. Since these ideas are not mere reflections of our senses--that is, there are no perceptible objects that correspond directly to them--they are abstract ideas. Abstract ideas relate to perceptible objects, but do not

*V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", LCW Vol. 14, p. 127

always correctly correspond to reality. Thus, Lenin said:

"The approach of the (human) mind to a particular thing, the taking of a copy...of it is not a simple, immediate act, a dead mirroring, but one which is complex, split into two, zig-zag-like, which includes in it the possibility of the flight of fantasy from life; more than that; the possibility of the transformation...of the abstract concept, idea, into a fantasy (in the final analysis--God). For even in the simplest generalization, in the most elementary general idea...there is a certain bit of fantasy." (LCW, Vol. 38, p. 372)

Ideologies are formed from systems of abstract ideas. Ideology, being a social product, reflects the ideas of groups of people representing different social origins and classes. But just as abstract ideas do not always correctly reflect material reality, though they are based on matter, neither does ideology. Thus, different classes develop different ideologies which reflect their material and social interests.

As we have seen, our ideas do not necessarily correctly reflect material reality and can give rise to illusions, or falseness. Ideas are true when they correspond to objective reality. There exists objective truth. This is truth that is independent of humanity. Lenin said:

"The existence of the thing reflected independent of the reflector (the independence of the external world from the mind) is a fundamental tenet of materialism. The assertion made by science that the earth existed prior to man is an objective truth." ("Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," LCW Vol. 14, p. 123-124)

Lenin asked, "Can human ideas, which give expression to objective truth, express it all at one time, as a whole, unconditionally, absolutely, or only approximately, relatively?"* In fact, truth is both relative and absolute. It is relative in that how we express it depends upon our subjective capacity to arrive at truth at a particular historical moment. It is absolute in that what we express is objective reality, existing independently of our knowledge of it.

"It is clearly seen that for dialectical materialism there is no impassable boundary between relative and absolute truth...From the standpoint of modern materialism, i.e., Marxism, the limits of approximation of our knowledge to objective, absolute truth are historically conditional, but the existence of such truth is unconditional, and the fact that we are approaching nearer to it is also unconditional." (ibid, p. 136)

Knowledge represents ideas that correspond with material reality. These ideas, in order to be considered genuine knowledge, must be developed in such a way that their correspondence with reality is proven and tested. The development of knowledge ultimately depends on the development of social production; i.e. social production gives rise to knowledge of social activity, philosophy, the sciences. Knowledge develops as a result of the summing up of practice. Historically, the masses, due to exploitation and oppression have not been able to do this. Those whom the masses, in essence, feed and clothe, generally the "leisure class", the intellectuals, have summed up the human practice. This split in mental and manual labor has thus greatly pushed forward the development of knowledge, but has also led up many blind alleys, and these blind alleys have been used to serve the interests of the ruling class. The sum total of human's knowledge, therefore, is relative to the stage of development of production.

*V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," LCW Vol 14, p. 122.

The criterion of practice is at the basis of knowledge. The acquisition of knowledge in human society derives from the sum total of the practical activities of the members of society. Without such practical activities, no knowledge could develop. Thus Lenin said, "The standpoint of life, of practice, should be first and fundamental in the theory of knowledge."* Practice, as Lenin sees it, is conscious, human social activity. Through this practice arises the demand for ideas that correspond to the various subjects and conditions of our practical activities. Thus social practice compels humans to develop and perfect their knowledge. In order for knowledge to truly advance, human ideas must relate as closely as possible to objective reality. Practice, in the sense discussed here, is what determines this. So, the process we see is that social practice demands the development of ideas that relate to objective reality, and whether or not these ideas correctly reflect reality is determined by social practice.

"Of course, we must not forget that the criterion of practice can never, in the nature of things, either confirm or refute any human idea completely. This criterion too is sufficiently 'indefinite' not to allow human knowledge to become 'absolute', but at the same time it is sufficiently definite to wage a ruthless fight on all varieties of idealism and agnosticism. If what our practice confirms is the sole, ultimate and objective truth, then from this must follow the recognition that the only path to this truth is the path of science, which holds the materialist point of view." (Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", LCW Vol 14, p. 142-143)

We can never, because of our subjective limitations, have knowledge of everything. But this does not mean that we can not draw definite laws from our objective truths. These laws express both the absoluteness and relativity in truth. There is relativity to the absoluteness of truth, and absoluteness within the relativity of truth. By adhering to definite scientific laws, what Lenin called "the path of science", we come closer and closer to objective truth. As we will see in the following section, this is how we use the science of Marxism-Leninism.

* Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", LCW Vol 14, p. 142

B. Marxism-Leninism

From the above discussion we have seen that human knowledge advances as it strives to create ideas in accordance with the continuing development of social production and other forms of social activity arising from this. Thus, prior to the rise and development of capitalism and the proletariat there could be no proletarian ideology, no Marxism. However, with its development, along with the further development of natural science, humans were able to work out definite laws of the development of capitalism and the proletariat. This was the task that fell to Marx and Engels. Because of the advancing state of knowledge, Marx and Engels were able to 1) in the field of philosophy utilize the achievements of eighteenth-century philosophy, most notably Hegel and Feuerbach, and develop dialectical materialism, 2) continue the work of Smith and Ricardo in economics and develop, in Capital a theory of the economic system of capitalist society, and 3) take the strivings of the utopians such as Owens and St. Simon and develop a theory of scientific socialism, which has as its foundation the doctrine of class struggle, the dictatorship of the proletariat as the transition to the abolition of classes generally--world communism. This represents the essence of Marxism.

With further development of the forces of social production the capitalism of Marx's time matured into imperialism. Corresponding to this change was further development of Marx's theories on the nature of society and class struggle. This was the accomplishment of Lenin. Thus Leninism became the "Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution...the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular."* Leninism represented something new and distinctive in the general treasury of Marxism. We now had Marxism-Leninism.

Since Lenin's time human knowledge has continued to advance alongside the forces of production, social activity and natural science. Accordingly there can be further enrichment of the science of Marxism-Leninism. However, the developments in society since Lenin's time have not been epochal. We're still in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. Thus Lenin's theory and tactics of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat--the principles of Leninism--still remain valid, and Marxist-Leninists today must strictly adhere to them.

Marxism-Leninism is based on certain historical laws of the development of class society that have been verified by social practice. It represents objective truth. As with any objective truth, practice cannot confirm or refute its ideas completely, but there is the essential "definiteness" within Marxism-Leninism to qualify it as the science of proletarian revolution. Definite laws have been established, through social practice, on the relationship between labor and capital, the motion and development of classes, philosophy, strategy and tactical principles of the proletariat, dictatorship of the proletariat, the party of the proletariat. These laws represent objective truth. Lenin said:

"The sole conclusion to be drawn from the opinion held by Marxists that Marx's theory is an objective truth is that by following the path of Marxian theory we shall draw closer and closer to objective truth (without ever exhausting it); but by following any other path we shall arrive at nothing but confusion and lies." ("Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", LCW Vol 14, p.143)

This is why genuine communists strive to protect the orthodoxy of Marxism-Leninism. This is not dogmatism, as many claim. Dogmatism occurs when we stress only the absoluteness of truth, and deny its relativity. Thus Lenin said that:

* Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, FLP, p. 2-3

"In the theory of knowledge, as in every other sphere of science, we must think dialectically, that is, we must not regard our knowledge as ready-made and unalterable, but must determine how knowledge emerges from ignorance, how incomplete, inexact knowledge becomes more complete and more exact." ("Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", LCW Vol 14, p. 103)

Empiricists deny the proven historical laws of Marxism-Leninism as having an absoluteness. Empiricism relates to relativism in that it relies exclusively on our own observations and refuses to acknowledge the underlying laws of motion. As a result, empiricists fail to assimilate the objective lessons of past practice and can only lead to failure to carry out proletarian revolution.

C. Mao Zedong Thought--Revisionism on the Theory of Knowledge

Lenin says that by following the path of Marxism we come closer and closer to objective truth. This is how Marxism-Leninism should be used in all countries. It provides a theoretical guide of objective laws applicable to all revolution. Thus, in China, the task of the Marxist-Leninists was to apply these laws to the concrete conditions in China. Mao Zedong did not do this. In order to cater to bourgeois and petty bourgeois nationalism and exceptionalism, he revised the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. In place of these principles Mao inserted his own eclectic theories of revolution. Of course, Mao did not go about this process of revising Marxism in a haphazard way. His new theories for the "concrete conditions" of China had to have some legitimacy as Marxist theories. Thus, a philosophical basis had to be established to show how Mao was only "creatively developing Marxism," not revising it.

As is stated just above and will be shown shortly, Mao was a Chinese exceptionalist and a nationalist (of petty bourgeois origin). Mao's aspirations only went as far as bourgeois democracy; his outlook would not allow him to correctly apply the principles of Marxism-Leninism to carry out the stages of the Chinese revolution under proletarian leadership. Without this theory China's revolution could not develop past the democratic stage, carry out the socialist revolution and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. But in order to have a cover as a revolutionary leader, Mao had to cloak himself in Marxist-Leninist garb. Thus, what he desired was a "national" Marxism--a Marxism devoid of its fundamental principles and tailored to fit Mao's bourgeois nationalism. That this is fact is evidenced when we examine the original 1930's versions of Mao's main philosophical works. Here is some of what Mao had to say:

"A Communist is a Marxist internationalist, but Marxism must take on a national form before it can be applied. There is no such thing as abstract Marxism, but only concrete Marxism. What we call concrete Marxism is Marxism that has taken on a national form, that is, Marxism applied to the concrete struggle in the concrete conditions prevailing in China, and not Marxism abstractly used... Consequently, the Sinification of Marxism--that is to say, making certain that in all of its manifestations it is imbued with Chinese peculiarities, using it according to these peculiarities--becomes a problem that must be understood and solved by the whole Party without delay." (S. Schram, The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung, p. 114)

Here we see quite clearly how Mao denies the universal aspect of Marxism-Leninism by calling it "abstract." But Marxism-Leninism is concrete. It represents concrete laws of proletarian revolution, concrete laws that are objective truths. By "Sinifying" Marxism, Mao can appear to use Marxism-Leninism. Thus Mao's only need of M-L was pragmatic--he needed to appear to be Marxist-Leninist.

What this Sinification process ultimately led to was "Mao Zedong Thought." In fact, by the time of the 7th Party Congress in 1945, the Party Rules explicitly stated that the Party was to be guided by the "thought of Mao Tse-tung." Thus, Mao's Thought had replaced Marxism-Leninism. Organizationally, Mao led the CPC through a "rectification" campaign in 1942-43 as a way of assimilating MZT into the party, and combatting "dogmatism." As we will see later on, what Mao advances in opposition to "dogmatism" is empiricism and fundamentally opposed to Marxism-Leninism.

Mao Zedong Thought was born and nourished as a denial of the universality of Marxism-Leninism. In our view, Mao's philosophy was developed essentially to attempt to give some Marxist legitimacy to this denial. Some examination of the basis of Mao's theory of knowledge will begin to show our point.

Earlier we quoted Lenin as saying that practice is at the basis of the materialist theory of knowledge. What should be made crystal clear here is that for Lenin, practice represents the sum-total of human practice on a historical scale. He is not referring to individual practice, nor the practice of an individual country. Knowledge, which is ideas that have tested in practice, again in a historical sense, represents objective truth. This objective truth, then, becomes the basis for further knowledge. Thus, knowledge, through continuous historical practice, advances to higher and higher levels. It is not a process whereby every new knowledge that is gained is done so in isolation from past knowledge.

In Mao's theory of knowledge, the first thing that strikes us is that "practice" is immediate and narrowly defined. This is manifest in all of Mao's writings as the denial of universal human practice already summed up in M-L principles. Theoretically this is shown in such statements as:

"Theory and practice can be combined only if men of the Chinese Communist Party take the standpoints, concepts and methods of M-L, apply them to China, and create a theory from conscientious study of the realities of the Chinese Revolution and Chinese history."
(S. Schram, The Political Thought of Mao Tsetung, p. 120)

"Theory" is the standpoint, concepts and methods of M-L. "Practice" is the conditions in China and finding these out. Practice is the basis of theory. Thus, while M-L must be "applied" to China, it must be subservient to the "conditions" in China which is the real thing which pushes the development of the "creation" of "theory" forward. Mao denegrates M-L principles to the point of calling them "concepts." Thus, Mao's theory developed from the Chinese conditions, and M-L was accepted or rejected (in essence M-L was rejected) according to "conditions" in China. A theory developed from such narrow practice is subjectivist. It cannot be objective since it did not take broad reality into account. It cannot reflect reality. It is subjective idealism.

For Mao, practice is not the sum-total of human experience that Lenin spoke of. While one must personally take part in things, it is not only or mainly the personal experience which is the practice. One must "personally experience" the practice of many in order to be using practice as the basis of knowledge. This was Lenin's view of practice and Lenin's practice. Mao's practice is practice in China, and in particular, individual, personal practice. It is to this personal practice that he ties the development of knowledge. Mao says:

"If you want to know a certain thing or a certain class of things directly, you must personally participate in the practical struggle to change reality, to change that thing or class of things, for only thus can you come into contact with them or phenomena; only through personal participation in the practical struggle to change reality can you uncover the essence of that thing or class of things and comprehend them...If you want knowledge, you must take part in the practice of changing reality. If you want to know the taste of a pear, you must change the pear by eating it yourself." (our emphasis)
("On Practice," Four Essays on Philosophy, Peking edition, p. 7-8)

What is obvious here is that the basis of knowledge for Mao is one's personal experiences. Practice has now been reduced to individual experiences which have no apparent awareness of any previous knowledge. So when Mao criticizes "dogmatism," he is criticizing it for not being a "national" Marxism. It is only "abstract" Marxist-Leninist principles. Mao has no use for these principles because, as one can see from the above quote, knowledge for him is based on one's own experiences. Thus knowledge for the Chinese party is based on the experiences of the CPC, and

China, and not the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism. This is why Mao called for the "Sinification" of Marxism.

Mao's "theory" comes from his own practice, the practice of the CPC and the masses in China. Thus it represents subjective idealism in the form of empiricism. Empiricists, as we have pointed out, deny the proven historical laws of Marxism-Leninism as having an absoluteness. To Mao, Marxism-Leninism was not to be followed, for that was "dogmatic." In spite of all his quotes speaking to Marxist-Leninist principles, Mao never theoretically or practically agreed with them and considered Leninism to be a "Russification" of Marxism. "When we see how Lenin and Stalin integrated the universal truth of Marxism with the concrete practice of the Soviet revolution and thereby developed Marxism, we shall know how we should work in China."* By advocating that Leninism was nothing more than the adoption of Marxism to conditions in Russia, Mao had his excuse for not following all the principles Lenin elaborated through his summation of international experience. Mao could then "Sinify" Marxism as an apparent legitimate Marxist method.⁷

We will briefly go over some of the principles Mao negated and the practice he carried out in place of this. Many of these are dealt with in more detail throughout the paper.

1) Mao negated Marxist-Leninist principles of the proletarian party. He allowed and even encouraged opportunists, revisionists, "the bourgeoisie" (!), to be in the party, to "struggle" things out.⁸ This denies the proletarian composition and content of line and practice necessary for the proletarian party. Mao negated the guiding role of theory and the vanguard role of the party to the masses. He advocated spontaneity. Mao made the party's practice dependent on mass views rather than the party guiding and developing the views of the masses. He taught that M-L theory was dogmatic and "book worship," that one most importantly should learn from "experience."⁹

2) Mao revised Marxism-Leninism on national liberation. He did not develop the leadership of the proletariat in the struggle but saw the peasantry as the vanguard. He relied on the bourgeoisie, allowing bourgeois-democrats and their line in the party, and made "alliances" with the bourgeoisie based on capitulation to the bourgeoisie. Since the proletariat could never get in lead and was subordinated to the bourgeoisie, the revolution could only remain bourgeois and could not develop into socialism.¹⁰

3) Mao negated Marxism-Leninism on socialism. He viewed the bourgeoisie as an ally in socialism rather than the bourgeoisie and bourgeois relations being the target of the revolution. He kept the bourgeois line in the party, the bourgeoisie in the state and allowed them to continue economically. With these views the proletariat can never struggle against and eliminate the bourgeoisie, it always has to be subservient to bourgeois aims.¹¹

4) Mao negated the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the peasantry, the only way the proletariat can develop socialism. He replaced this with "New Democracy" and the "people's democratic dictatorship," the people being all classes including the bourgeoisie.¹²

5) Mao propagated such bourgeois strategy and tactics on an international scale. The proletariat of all countries should be subservient to the bourgeoisie because the "main enemy" of the world's "peoples" was first one (the U.S.), then both (the U.S. and Soviet Union), then the other (S.U.) big imperialist power. International strategy and tactics is the struggle between "the people" of the world, including the bourgeoisie and most imperialists, and "U.S. imperialism" or "Soviet social-imperialism." Who the struggle was against at any given time was due to who the CPC considered "reactionary" (to them!), and this changes. Even within the country currently the "main enemy" it was only the monopoly bourgeoisie that was the enemy and all sorts of reactionary class forces such as the entire

* "Reform Our Study" MSW Vol 3, p.24

the bourgeoisie, the non-monopoly bourgeoisie, were united with. Mao supported the bourgeois national interests in the colonies and imperialist nations. 13

To Mao narrow practice is primary, and the practice of the CPC and China is what is decisive. Thus, Mao Zedong Thought is "correct", since it is knowledge tested in the practice of the Chinese revolution. But if one denies universal practice and the laws derived therefrom, then any practice, if it achieves the anticipated results, is "correct." It does not have to accord with any previously developed knowledge--if it "works," it is "correct." This is a thoroughly pragmatic outlook, for pragmatism denies objective reality, objective laws and objective truth. Thus, the essence of Mao's theory of knowledge is empiricist and pragmatic, and Mao advocated Chinese exceptionalism.

The fact that M-L must be subservient to "our practice" is also shown in Mao's view of the development of knowledge in "On Contradiction":

"As regards the sequence in the movement of man's knowledge, there is always a gradual growth from the knowledge of individual and particular things to the knowledge of things in general. Only after man knows the particular essence of many different things can he proceed to generalization and know the common essence of things. When man attains the knowledge of this common essence, he uses it as a guide and proceeds to study various concrete things which have not yet been studied, or studied thoroughly, and to discover the particular essence of each; only thus is he able to supplement, enrich and develop his knowledge of their common essence and prevent such knowledge from withering or petrifying. These are the two processes of cognition: one, from the particular to the general, and the other, from the general to the particular. Thus cognition always moves in cycles and so long as scientific method is strictly adhered to each cycle advances human knowledge a step higher and so makes it more and more profound." (Four Essays on Philosophy, Peking edition, p. 37)

? Mao here also did not deal with knowledge as a universal quality. He dealt with the development of knowledge in an individual. Regardless of his token exposition of the development of human knowledge (which wasn't correct as we will show shortly), he right below this goes on to talk about how dogmatists do not understand how "we" have to study the particularity of contradiction before "we" can adequately know the universality.

"Our dogmatists...do not understand that we have to study the particularity of contradiction and know the particular essence of individual things before we can adequately know the universality of contradiction and the common essence of things, and that on the other hand, they do not understand that after knowing the common essence of things, we must go further and study the concrete things that have not yet been thoroughly studied or have only just emerged. Our dogmatists...regard general truths as emerging out of a void, they turn them into purely abstract unfathomable formulas, and thereby completely deny and reverse the normal sequence by which man comes to know truth." (ibid, p. 37)

Therefore "we" must each develop knowledge. Human knowledge, unlinked with "our" practice, is knowledge out of the void, and is abstract unfathomable formulas. The only real knowledge to Mao is that derived from "practice" which is "ours." This is the "normal" sequence by which man comes to know truth."

But Mao has quite an incorrect view of how man comes to know truth. Mao's theory of knowledge denies the "constant motion toward the development of universality" and makes the particularity as important or more important than the uni-

versality. Knowledge then goes in "cycles" from the (individual) and particular to the general and from the general to the particular, each "cycle" a higher level. But this defies the laws of nature and of the development of knowledge. As Engels says:

"Dialectical logic, in contrast to the old, merely formal logic, is not, like the latter, content with enumerating the forms of motion of thought, i.e., the various forms of judgement and conclusion, and placing them side by side without any connection. On the contrary, it derives these forms out of one another, it makes one subordinate to another instead of putting them on an equal level, it develops the higher forms out of the lower...Individuality, particularity, universality--these are the three determinations in which the whole "Doctrine of the Notion" moves. Under these heads, progression from the individual to the particular and from the particular to the universal takes place not in one but in many modalities..." (Dialectics of Nature--Notes, Progress Pub. ed., p. 223,226)

Thus, nature and human knowledge develops from the lower to the higher, and the individual and particular are lower forms of knowledge, the universal higher. All knowledge goes in this direction and this direction alone. It does not go from higher to lower, from the universal to the particular. We apply the universal to particular situations or use it in the development of other universalities, but it cannot be further developed. We want to be clear that the universal is applied to particular, but where we disagree with Mao is that this "further develops" the universal. Once the universal is developed, it grasps the essence of the particular. Further application of the particular cannot "develop" the "knowledge of the common essence," but adds new dimensions to the universal, new shades of understanding of it, but the essence remains the same. Also, knowledge developing in an area interconnected will develop a universality which, linked up with the universality may develop a deeper universality which connect the both. But, that again, is going from the individual to the particular to the universality. Again, Engels:

"In this form (universality) the law attains its final expression. By new discoveries we can give new illustrations of it, we can give it a new and richer content. But we cannot add anything to the law itself as here formulated. In its universality, equally universal in form and content, it is not susceptible of further extension: it is an absolute law of nature." (our parenthesis) (ibid, p. 225)

It is not true, as Mao advises, that we must understand the particular essence of each thing in order to understand the universal. In fact, we cannot understand the essence of the particular without understanding the universality. Mao belittles the word "essence." Essence is linked with higher knowledge, with a view of the inner working, the motion, the connection and transitions of things. This cannot be arrived at from an understanding of the individual or particular. We must go farther than our understanding of phenomena represented in the individual and particular and develop knowledge to the point where it has a real grasp of things, and that is the universal. Once we know the universal (through the necessary knowledge of the individual and the particular) we know the essence of the particular and then are able to apply this universal to the particular. Therefore, Bistovf in order for Mao to understand how to carry out revolution in China, he first had to know the universality of proletarian revolution and apply this to China. But Mao's line is the opposite: in order to know the essence of proletarian revolution, one had to know the "essence" of revolution in China first. Mao right from the beginning denies objective truth, objective knowledge and M-L principles." But he cements this even further in his "going from the general to the particular" where he is then able to "supplement, enrich, and develop his knowledge of their

common essence and prevent such knowledge (universal truth--ed.) from withering or petrifying." Imagine an understanding of the essence of something, a law of nature or society as "petrifying" or "withering" ! To Mao, all knowledge is relative and it is through the particularity that the essence is first discovered and secondly developed. Thus, in reality, Mao negates the real universality, the real essence of things, especially the laws related to M-L and M-L principles, but develops principles out of particularity and then applies these principles to not only his revolution but others, since his development "supplement(s), enrich(es) and develop(es)" the "essence" of Marxism-Leninism.

What Mao is really talking about is good old induction and deduction with an emphasis on induction and a view that induction is the start of every particular analysis. Going from the particular to the general is induction and going from the general to the particular (or other generals) is deduction. Induction and deduction are surely used in the development of knowledge, but they are not the summation of how knowledge develops universally. Again Engels:

"These people have got into such a dead-lock over the opposition between induction and deduction that they reduce all logical forms of conclusion to these two, and in so doing do not notice that they 1) unconsciously employ quite different forms of conclusion under those names, 2) deprive themselves of the whole wealth of forms of conclusion in so far as it cannot be forced under these two, and 3) thereby convert both forms, induction and deduction, into sheer nonsense." (ibid. p. 226)

Engels also correctly points out that between induction and deduction, induction is not even the predominate form of scientific discovery. Finally, induction and deduction are not dialectical thought. Higher animals induct and deduct. Dialectical thought is the process of going from lower to higher thought and requires drawing out the universality, the connections, interconnections, transitions, motion, the essence of things while induction and deduction are only mechanical processes the mind goes through in going from lower to higher thought and drawing out the universality.

Mao's dividing of the development of knowledge into perception and conception, and his description of this in "On Practice" is likewise a "simplistic fallacy." Knowledge develops "through the stages of sensuous consciousness, and next, perception, to understanding,"*is the general way we should view the process. In the process of getting from perception to understanding is where human knowledge goes from the individual to particular to universal. It is not that we just "repeat (impressions) many times" or "think it over" as Mao describes in order to arrive at understanding (actually to come up with some subjective idealist concept or understanding). In order to really understand something we must go through a complicated process of the development of a lower level of knowledge to higher. It is a process of utilizing already existing knowledge in the development of new. It is the conceptual process which is difficult and can lead down blind alleys.

"Thus cognition rolls forward from content to content. This progress determines itself, first, in this manner, that it begins from simple determinateness and that each subsequent one is richer and more concrete. For the result contains its own beginning, and the development of the beginning has made it the richer by a new determinateness. The universal is the foundation; the progress therefore must not be taken as a flow from Other to Other. In the absolute method the Notion preserves itself in its otherness, and the universal in its particularisation, in the Judgement and in reality; it raises to each next stage of determination the whole mass of antecedent content, and

* Hegel, from Lenin's "Conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic", LCW Vol 38, p. 169.

by its dialectical progress not only loses nothing and leaves nothing behind, but carries with it all that it has acquired, enriching and concentrating itself upon itself..." (Hegel, from Lenin's "Conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic", LCW Vol 38, p. 231)

Nor are concepts necessarily reflective of the essence of something as Mao alleges. Concepts are only how our mind integrates its perception of reality in order to try to deal with reality. Actually, we can develop quite faulty or incomplete concepts when we do not develop a higher understanding of something. Lenin remarks on views of Hegel on the different levels of conceptual thinking:

"(1) Ordinary imagination grasps difference and contradiction, but not the transition from the one to the other, this however is the most important.

(2) Intelligence and understanding. Intelligence grasps contradiction, enunciates it, brings things into relation with one another, allows the "concept to show through the contradiction," but does not express the concept of things and their relations.

(3) Thinking reason (understanding) sharpens blunt difference of variety, the mere manifold of imagination, into essential difference, into opposition. Only when raised to the peak of contradiction, do the manifold entities become active (regsam) and lively in relation to one another--they receive* acquire that negativity which is the inherent pulsation of self-movement and vitality. (LCW Vol 38, p. 143 *The word "receive" is crossed out in the MS.)

We are not fooled by Mao later on bringing in "indirect experience" as a part of the development of knowledge. This is another token gesture of his which blows up in his face when examined carefully. Human practice, summed up in human knowledge, is not "indirect experience," it is knowledge, proved and tested correct in practice, it is objective truth, it is not just someone else's "experience" which has not been proved to be correct universally and which can be accepted or rejected by us in the development of "our knowledge." The fact that Mao uses the same word, experience, for knowledge (indirect experience) and perception (direct experience) shows his disregard for human knowledge and his pragmatic use of it in the development of "his" "knowledge."

Of course Mao thinks cognition is "thinking it over" since that is how he and MZTer's cognize. They turn their backs on human knowledge, on practice as a whole, concentrate on their own "knowledge" and "practice", and do not bother to develop their concepts beyond the level of "ordinary imagination" or "intellegent reflection."

Mao uses an example to show his view of the development of knowledge. Some people from outside Yen-an come there for an observation tour. From getting around a few days, they are able to observe certain visible phenomena. Mao calls this the stage of perception. But then:

"When the members of the observation group have collected various data and, what is more, have 'thought them over', they are able to arrive at the judgement that 'the Communist Party's policy of the National United Front Against Japan is thorough, sincere, and genuine.' Having made this judgement, they can, if they too are genuine about uniting to save the nation, go a step further and draw the following conclusion, 'The National United Front Against Japan can succeed.'" ("On Practice", Four Essays FLP, p. 5)

What does this example show? First, what human knowledge was used in the observation tour's development of knowledge? Mao does not mention this. Were M-L principles around national liberation, and strategy and tactics of such used? Not

hardly: these people went by their empirical observations and "thought them over." M-L did not enter in. The development of knowledge is thus reduced to subjective impressions through empiricism. Finally, the criterion of truth remains within the subjective realm: the correctness or incorrectness of the party's line is up to its "sincerity and genuineness" and is up to whether the observation tour unites with it or not, and the correctness or incorrectness of the observation tour is determined by whether they are "genuine about uniting to save a nation." This is Context mockery of the materialist progression of knowledge and criterion of truth.

What Mao has outlined is the development of spontaneous consciousness. It is true that the masses learn through their own experiences, many extremely bitter ones at that. But just in order to reduce these to a minimum and move proletarian revolution through stages is M-L a definite necessity. However, as to how scientific--Marxist-Leninist-- knowledge is developed, Mao is absolutely wrong, only spontaneous consciousness is described.

Empiricists, of course, deny the importance of theory and theoretical development. They disdain knowledge obtained from sources other than one's own experience. They oppose "book-worship." Mao said:

"What sort of knowledge is the students booklearning? Even supposing all their knowledge is truth, it is still not knowledge acquired through their own personal experience but consists of theories set down by their predecessors in summarizing experience of struggle for production and of the class struggle. It is entirely necessary that students should acquire this kind of knowledge, but it must be understood that as far as they are concerned such knowledge is in a sense still one-sided, something which has been verified by others but not yet by themselves." ("Rectify the Party's Style of Work," SWM Vol 3, p. 39) (our emphasis) Well??

Again, Mao's denial of objective truth, of universality, is brought out here. ?? To Mao, knowledge is "someone else's", it is "one-sided" unless we verify it ourselves. Knowledge is dependent upon our subjectivity rather than knowledge being dependent on objective reality which can only be known through universal human practice. To M-L's, knowledge is only one-sided when it is taken off the track of its correct spiral development and goes off into a straight line. This occurs when our method of its development is one-sided.]!

"Human knowledge is not (or does not follow) a straight line, but a curve, which endlessly approximates a series of circles, a spiral. Any fragment, segment, section of this curve can be transformed (transformed one-sidedly) into an independent, complete, straight line, which then (if one does not see the wood for the trees) leads into the quagmire, into clerical obscurantism (where it is anchored by the class interests of the ruling classes). Rectilinearity and one-sidedness, woodenness and petrification, subjectivism and subjective blindness--voila' the epistemological roots of idealism. And clerical obscurantism (philosophical idealism), of course, has epistemological roots, it is not groundless; it is a sterile flower undoubtedly, but a sterile flower that grows on the living tree of living, fertile, genuine, powerful, omnipotent, objective absolute human knowledge." (Lenin, "On the Question of Dialectics", LCW Vol 38, p. 363)

And subjectivism has its roots in dogmatism and empiricism. Mao's empiricism (denial of objective truth, denial of theory being tested in universal practice and universal practice being summed up in knowledge, denial of the universality) is the one-sidedness, not the knowledge of Marxism-Leninism. Mao Zedong Thought has indeed been the woodenness and petrification, the sterile flower which has been growing on the living tree of human knowledge and Marxism-Leninism.

With Mao Zedong Thought orientation, cadres of the CPC could have no basis to know whether Mao Zedong Thought was correct or not. The determination of genuine and sham in the CPC was not who upheld Marxism-Leninism, but who made the best use of the Red Book. Unfortunately, MZT became an international revisionist trend, and had a profound effect on the U.S. movement. This effect of MZT is the subject of the following sections.

II. Materialist Dialectics and "Mao Zedong Thought"

A. Materialist Dialectics

"Dialectics, so-called objective dialectics, prevails throughout nature, so-called subjective dialectics, dialectical thought, is only the reflection of the motion through opposites which asserts itself everywhere in nature, and which by the continual conflict of the opposites and their final passage into one another, or into higher forms, determines the life of nature." (Engels, Dialectics of Nature, Progress Pub., p. 211)

The dialectical materialist viewpoint and method sees nature and our reflection of nature as a dialectical process. Nature is in essence dialectical: that we come to use dialectics as our method of looking at nature in order to see its essence flows from this. Thus human thought, through reflecting reality, can become dialectical. We touched on the difference between mechanical thought and dialectical thought in the prior section. In this section we will go deeper into dialectics, especially to show how nature, mind and society is dialectical, to uncover the laws of dialectics and to show how Mao does not follow these, but has a developed philosophical method of metaphysics which he used to justify the lack of proletarian leadership in the Chinese revolution, to deny proletarian hegemony of the party and state and promote the bourgeois development of Chinese society. Again, as in his theory of knowledge, Mao's dialectics are supposed to be a higher development of Marxism-Leninism. As with his theory of knowledge, this had to be put forward since Mao revised Marxism-Leninism on dialectics.

How is nature dialectical? Nature is matter in constant motion, constant change. This matter in motion is not anarchistic, disconnected, but coordinated, connected. All matter in motion is related, processes have a cause and effect relationship. The processes of nature, from elements to less complex inorganic compounds, to combinations, more complex inorganic compounds, to organic compounds, to the organization of the cell, duplicability, reactivity--the development of life, from less complex life (unicellular) to more complex life, etc., such processes go from a lower to higher level. Thus matter in motion has developed and is developing higher forms out of lower. This universal development is a self-movement of matter. Nothing set matter in motion. All motion of matter is due to the relationship between different forms of matter, struggle between and transition from one form to another. Thus the cause of motion is contained within the motion itself. The self-movement of matter is due to the development of opposing tendencies within the thing itself. Such forms of opposition are: attraction and repulsion (positive and negative are forms of this), anabolism and catabolism, necessity and chance, cause and effect, etc. Such opposites are the self-movement of atoms, chemical reactions, organic life, evolution, human society, etc.

The examination of the motion of a process is done so as to disclose these opposing tendencies within a process, the relationship, which tendency flows from which, which gives rise to the other, which one negates the first, what relationship between them pushes forward the process. Since things are processes, they came from somewhere because of certain relationships and are going somewhere because of relationships; dialectics as a method of investigation, discloses such relationships and reveals the real process at hand. But this is easier said than done. We at first, catch the immediacy of a process through our need to identify something. It is this act of identity which sets the basis for a metaphysical

view of a thing. We end up identifying a moment of the thing, we separate the thing from other things. With this metaphysical method our understanding of the thing may "work" for a short period, but as the thing changes, (because it is part of a process with contradictions) we make errors and must change our concept of that thing if we are not to continue making them. To view a thing dialectically, it is viewed as a process which undergoes changes due to contradictions within the nature of the process.

Thus, what is important in trying to grasp reality is to discern the motion in what may appear to be a stable thing. Discerning the motion of something is seeing the essence of it, it is seeing its internal contradictions, its contradictions with other things, and how these contradictions have developed, where the contradictions will lead. Corresponding to this, there are laws of dialectics. These laws are the dialectics of processes themselves, i.e. they were discovered through the study of nature, mind and society. The early Greeks were among the first to elaborate basic laws of dialectics. Their laws could not do more than reflect things very generally and somewhat distortedly since science had not developed to the point where nature had been studied to any great extent. As science developed toward the end of the middle ages and flourished with the industrial revolution, it brought forth more and more evidence to show the dialectical character of nature. Thus, Hegel had this wealth of information to go with in his elaboration of dialectics. Hegel's dialectics essentially reflected the real processes in nature and mind and it is the Hegelian dialectical method which to this day is the only method which correctly reflects reality. However, the criticism of Hegel is that he himself did not apply his method to reality. Hegel was an idealist, an idealist who could not get away from there being some preexisting idea, the "Absolute Idea" which nature was realizing. Thus, although Hegel saw that the mind must reflect nature, he saw this as necessary because nature was realizing the "Absolute Idea" which our mind would eventually reflect. Hegel saw the "Absolute Idea" in his own works and thus his categories came before reality. In the end Hegel arrived at metaphysics and idealism, but his way of getting there, as reflected in his writings, was dialectical, and often times bordering on materialism. Lenin remarks in his "Conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic":

"It is noteworthy that the whole chapter on the 'Absolute Idea' scarcely says a word about God (hardly ever has a 'divine' 'notion' slipped out accidentally) and apart from that--this NB--it contains almost nothing that is specifically idealism, but has for its main subject the dialectical method. The sum-total, the last word and essence of Hegel's logic is the dialectical method--this is extremely noteworthy. And one thing more: in this most idealistic of Hegel's works there is the least idealism and the most materialism. 'Contradictory,' but a fact!" (all emphasis Lenin's) (LCW, Vol. 38, p. 234)

Marx and Engels were Hegelians and their brilliant ability to analyze nature and society should be taken to this part of its source. But remaining Hegelians would not have lead to such analyses. Marx and Engels had to negate the Hegelian idealism and metaphysics in order to take dialectics to its highest level, as a method for examining nature, the mind and society in order to understand such and change it. Marx and Engels recognized the incorrectness of Hegel's idealism and metaphysics, and the correctness of such materialist stands as Feuerbach's.

Feuerbach held that, "Nature exists independently of all philosophy. It is the foundation upon which we human beings, ourselves products of nature, have grown up. Nothing exists outside nature and man, and the higher beings our fantasies have created are only the fantastic reflection of our own essence."* Feuerbach

* Engels, Ludwig Feuerbach, International Pub., p. 18

saw that the Hegelian "Absolute Idea" was none other than such a fantasy, a belief in the existence of a creator. But Feuerbach rejected Hegel wholesale, including the dialectical method, and still clung to another form of idealism by putting religion into human relations rather than explaining them materialistically. Feuerbach elaborated the basic materialist stand, but was really unable to apply this outlook in practice and also could not be dialectical. Marx and Engels took Feuerbach's correct basic materialist outlook, rejecting his idealism and metaphysics. They became materialists and "rescued" dialectics from the destruction of idealism. Marx and Engels' development into materialists also is the source of their analytical ability. Without both a dialectical method and a materialist outlook one's examination of a process inevitably leads to one-sidedness and idealism.

So, as far as the laws of dialectics goes, the laws Hegel developed, and which Marx and Engels further developed by showing that they are laws of the development of nature, mind and society and should be used in a materialist analysis of such, are still the "most comprehensive, the richest in content and the most profound doctrine of development."*

* Lenin, "Karl Marx," On Marx and Engels, FLP Peking, p. 11

B. Laws of Dialectics

There are many laws of dialectics and the scope of this paper does not permit a discussion of all of them. What we hope to do here is briefly address the main ones, applying them to processes, especially processes of human society.

"It is therefore, from the history of nature and human society that the laws of dialectics are abstracted. For they are nothing but the most general laws of these two aspects of historical development, as well as of thought itself. And indeed they can be reduced in the main to three:

The law of the transformation of quantity into quality and vice versa;
The law of the interpenetration of opposites;
The law of the negation of the negation."

(Engels, Dialectics of Nature, Progress Pub., p. 62)

These three law can be further broken down into elements of dialectics which correspond to these laws:

- "1) the objectivity of consideration (not examples, not divergences, but the Thing-in-itself).
- 2) the entire totality of the manifold relations of this thing to others.
- 3) the development of this thing, (phenomenon, respectively), its own movement, its own life.
- 4) the internally contradictory tendencies (and sides) in this thing.
- 5) the thing (phenomenon, etc.) as the sum and unity of opposites.
- 6) the struggle, respectively unfolding of these opposites, contradictory strivings, etc.
- 7) the union of analysis and synthesis--the break-down of the separate parts and the totality, the summation of these parts.
- 8) the relations of each thing (phenomenon, etc.) are not only manifold, but general, universal. Each thing (phenomenon, process, etc.) is connected with every other.
- 9) not only the unity of opposites, but the transitions of every determination, quality, feature, side, property into every other (into its opposite?).
- 10) the endless process of the discovery of new sides, relations, etc.
- 11) the endless process of the deepening of man's knowledge of the thing, of phenomena, processes, etc., from appearance to essence and from less profound to more profound essence.
- 12) from co-existence to causality and from one form of connection and reciprocal dependence to another, deeper, more general form.
- 13) the repetition at a higher stage of certain features, properties, etc., of the lower and
- 14) the apparent return to the old (negation of the negation).
- 15) the struggle of content with form and conversely. The throwing off of the form, the transformation of the content.
- 16) the transition of quantity into quality and vice versa. (15 and 16 are examples of 9)"

(Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic," LCW, Vol. 38, p.221-2)

And finally, these laws and elements can all be wrapped up into one basic law:

"In brief, dialectics can be defined as the doctrine of the unity of opposites. This embodies the essence of dialectics, but it requires explanations and development." (ibid, p. 223)

But what do these laws mean--the "unity and struggle of opposites", the "transition of opposites", "quantity into quality and vice versa", the "negation of the negation"? Let us go through these laws and elements in more detail and bring out how these laws are at work in nature and society.

The unity and struggle of opposites (or unity or identity of opposites) is the basic law of development. It shows the reason for the self-movement of things; it explains processes, it gets to the essence of the processes. Lenin described the identity of opposites this way:

"The identity of opposites... is the recognition (discovery) of the contradictory, mutually exclusive, opposite tendencies in all phenomena and processes of nature (including mind and society). The condition for the knowledge of all processes of the world in their 'self-movement', in their spontaneous development, in their real life, is the knowledge of them as a unity of opposites. Development is the 'struggle' of opposites." ("On the Question of Dialectics" LCW Vol 38, p. 359-360)

What we are concerned with here is a process of development. As Lenin states, this process begins with recognition of the contradictory tendencies in all phenomena. These tendencies, however, are not statically opposed to one another. There is a development of opposition, development of one out of another. All phenomena are in a state of constant motion. This motion represents the struggle of opposites, which is absolute. Lenin uses examples of opposites such as + and - in mathematics, action and reaction in mechanics, positive and negative electricity in physics, etc.* What he seeks to show here is how these opposite tendencies and the struggle between them causes development. Lenin is not saying that, for example, in an electrical current there is a simple coexistence between a positive and negative charge. The point is that the struggle between the opposite tendencies is the prime cause of the development of a thing.

There are two basic essential parts to this law. One is to recognize that within and "as a result of" one thing arises its opposite. This is recognition of difference, connection between that difference, and the transition from the one to the other, the negation of one by the other. This is the 'struggle' part of opposites. It recognizes the existence or inevitable existence of opposites in all processes. The other part of this law is seeing the "unity", "identity" of opposites. This part recognizes the connection between the old and the new, it sees that two different (opposite) things are united in their opposition, they are related, they have a cause and effect relationship, one negates the other. It also sees the old in the new, the retaining of one in the other. The "unity" of opposites is not the metaphysical view of just seeing opposites, but is seeing the development of opposites, the development of one out of the other, the origin of one thing in relation to others, seeing cause and effect, seeing that opposites are part of a process. The "struggle" of opposites is not seeing a back and forth to opposites but the unfolding of opposites, the relationship they have to each other, the negation of one thing by another, the transition of opposites. Hegel describes the unity of opposites as such:

"Thus all opposites which are taken as fixed, such as, for example, finite and infinite, or individual and universal, are contradictory not by virtue or some external connection, but rather are transitions in and for themselves, as the consideration of their nature showed... Now this is the standpoint which was referred to above, in which

* "On the Question of Dialectics" LCW Vol 38, p. 359.

a universal first term considered in and for itself shows itself to be its own Other... But the Other is essentially not the empty negative or Nothing which is commonly taken as the result of dialectics, it is the Other of the first, the negative of the immediate; it is thus determined as mediated,--and altogether contains the determination of the first. The first is thus essentially contained and preserved in the Other.--To hold fast the positive in its negative, and the content of the presupposition in the result, is the most important part of rational cognition;...The first or immediate term is the Notion in itself, and therefore is the negative only in itself; the dialectical moment with it therefore consists in this, that the distinction which it implicitly contains is posited in it. The second term on the other hand is itself the determinate entity, the distinction or relation; hence with it the dialectical moment consists in the positing of the unity which is contained in it." (Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic. LCW Vol 38, p. 225-227)

This passage was quoted in Lenin's notes on Hegel's Science of Logic, and in reference to the last quoted paragraph he wrote: "'in itself'=potentially, not yet developed, not yet unfolded." Here we can see more how the unity and struggle of opposites represents a process. This process involves something dying away and that which is being born. Development is the struggle between these two tendencies. We can not simply state the phenomenon as something being both dead and alive at the same time, nor does it do us any good to make profound revelations that life and death are a "unity of opposites." Every thing has an essence, and within that essence is the germ of its opposite. Engels, in discussing life and death said:

"Already no physiology is held to be scientific if it does not consider death as an essential factor of life, the negation of life as being essentially contained in life itself, so that life is always thought of in relation to its necessary result, death, which is always contained in it in germ." (Dialectics of Nature, Progress Pub. p.295)

To sum up, there are two considerations to the law of identity and struggle of opposites. In looking at a thing, we must see that from it will develop its opposite and that the opposite will contain the thing in it. This is the "struggle" of opposites (the one becoming the other) and the "unity" of opposites (the other having come from the one and retaining the one). This struggle of opposites is not just a back and forth thing but a progressive development of the "other" until it negates the first thing. And the unity of opposites is not that they both exist together at the same time within one thing, although this is an aspect of the development of the struggle of opposites, nor is the unity of opposites that the essence of the process is a combination of both, but that the development of one thing is due to another, the development of the new pushes aside the old, and the new thing retains the old as an essential part of it.

Lenin stresses several elements which are connected to the unity of opposites. The objectivity of consideration is an element. In looking at something we must look at objective reality. In order to do this we must take the materialist outlook and we must look at it as a whole. We must look at it historically, and look at all sides of it. If we look at a moment of it, or an aspect of it, we are sure

not to grasp it since its essence is not its moment or one aspect, but the contradictions which it is composed of which cause its unfolding and developing (#1 of Lenin's elements above). Moreover, if we only see contradiction and do not understand these opposing tendencies, their struggle, connection and the motion to transform one into the other, we still will not understand that process (#'s 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9). We must see the interconnection between this thing and others. In fact, the relations between things are many and universal. We cannot understand a process unless we know its relationship to other processes and the effects of other things on it and it on other things (#'s 2,8,12). Both in the relation of things to each other and of opposites in things (things to each other is actually also a relationship of "opposites"), we must not see a coexistence of opposites and relations, but a causality and interlinking (#12).

We will try to draw out a couple of ways in which nature is dialectical. Let's take the relationship between anabolism and catabolism in living organisms. Anabolism, the construction of energy containing (potential) chemicals, gives rise to catabolism, the breaking down of chemicals and release of energy, and vice versa. A building up process contains within it a breaking down process and vice versa. The constant building up and breaking down is essential to living matter which must expend energy. And among the two "opposite" ends of the living organisms, plant and animal, the ways of doing this are interconnected and opposing. Plants develop energy directly from the sun and use this and store this within them. Animals get their energy from plants, break it down and use it and store it. In animals the act of breaking down plant energy is at the same time the act of developing high energy bonds. There are also organisms which get their energy from decomposing both plant and animal (dead) tissue. Plants use the by-product of animal energy break down--CO₂--in their energy build up, while animals use the by-product of plant build up in their energy break down--O₂. The decomposing organisms give off by-products, such as nitrogen, which both plants and animals use. We can easily see that such "opposition" is not empty but is full of the opposite in it. We can also see that scientists are interested not just in the fact that plants can't do without ~~plants~~^{animals} and vice versa, but are interested in why this is so, what the relationship between plants and animals is, what the contradictions within plants and animals are, etc.

When we speak of the unity of opposites in society, the bourgeoisie and proletariat or capitalism and socialism come to mind. We know of no better explanation of the contradiction between bourgeois and proletariat than that written by Marx:

"Proletariat and wealth are opposites. As such they form a single whole. They are both begotten by the world of private property. The question is what particular place each occupies within the antithesis. It is not sufficient to declare them two sides of a single whole.

Private property as private property, as wealth, is compelled to maintain itself, and thereby its opposite, the proletariat, in existence. That is the positive side of the contradiction, self-satisfied private property.

The proletariat, on the other hand, is compelled as proletariat to abolish itself and thereby its opposite, the condition for its existence, that which makes it the proletariat, i.e., private property. That is the negative side of the contradiction, its restlessness within its very self, dissolved and self-dissolving private property:

... Within this antithesis the private property-owner is therefore the conservative side, the proletarian, the destructive, side. From the former arises the action of preserving the antithesis, from the latter, that of annihilating it.

In any case, in its economic movement private property drives towards its own dissolution, but only through a development which does not depend on it, of which it is unconscious and which takes place against its will, through the very nature of things, only inasmuch as it produces the proletariat as proletariat, misery conscious of its spiritual and physical misery, dehumanisation conscious of its dehumanisation and therefore self-abolishing. The proletariat executes the sentence that private property pronounced on itself by begetting the proletariat, just as it executes the sentence that wage-labour pronounced on itself by begetting wealth for others and misery for itself. When the proletariat is victorious, it by no means becomes the absolute side of society for it is victorious only by abolishing itself and its opposite. Then the proletariat disappears as well as the opposite which determines it, private property." (quoted in "Conspectus of The Holy Family by Marx and Engels," LCW, Vol. 38, p. 26-27)

What should be seen here is that Marx did not simply say "the bourgeoisie and proletariat are a contradiction, you can't have the bourgeoisie without the proletariat, the bourgeoisie and proletariat struggle with each other." This is not the point of dialectics. In fact, this is the essence of metaphysics. The whole point of dialectics is not to identify opposites, but to see opposites within identity, thus to understand what the essence of the process is, what the contradiction is leading to. The bourgeoisie gives rise to the proletariat. The proletariat negates the bourgeoisie and itself. The opposition to the bourgeoisie and its negation arises within it, and the opposition (negation) of the proletariat arises within the proletariat as a product of and a negation of the bourgeoisie. Through this understanding we see the inevitability of relations which contain neither bourgeoisie nor proletariat, neither exploiter nor exploited, a classless relations of production. When we look at it in a metaphysical way of a unity and struggle of bourgeoisie and proletariat we end up with "class struggle."

"It is often said and written that the main point in Marx's teachings is the class struggle; but this is not true. And from this untruth very often springs the opportunist distortion of Marxism, its falsification in such a way as to make it acceptable to the bourgeoisie. For the doctrine of the class struggle was created not by Marx, but by the bourgeoisie before Marx, and generally speaking it is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. Those who recognize only the class struggle are not yet Marxists; they may be found to be still within the boundaries of bourgeois thinking and bourgeois politics. To confine Marxism to the doctrine of the class struggle means curtailing Marxism, distorting it, reducing it to something which is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. Only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is what constitutes the most profound difference between the Marxist and the ordinary petty (as well as big) bourgeois. This is the touchstone on which the real understanding and recognition of Marxism is to be tested." (Lenin, State and Revolution, FLP Peking, p. 39-40)

Marx and Engels also show how capitalism develops its own negation--communism:

"By more and more transforming the great majority of the population into proletarians, the capitalist mode of production brings into being the force which, under penalty of its own destruction, is com-

pelled to carry out this revolution. By more and more driving towards the conversion of the vast socialised means of production into state property, it itself points the way for the carrying through of this revolution. The proletariat seizes state power, and transforms the means of production in the first instance into state property. But in doing this, it puts an end to itself as the proletariat, it puts an end to all class differences and class antagonisms, it puts an end also to the state as the state." (Anti-Duhring, International Pub. p. 306)

But this was shown by history to be "hasty".

"What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has developed on its own foundations, but, on the contrary, just as it emerges from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birth marks of the old society from whose womb it emerges. Accordingly, the individual producer receives back from society--after the deductions have been made--exactly what he gives to it...Hence equal right here is still--in principle--bourgeois right,...one man is superior to another physically or mentally and so supplies more labour in the same time, or can work for a longer time... Further, one worker is married, another not, one has more children than another, and so on and so forth. Thus, with an equal performance of labour, and hence an equal share in the social consumption fund, one will in fact receive more than another, one will be richer than another, and so on...

But these defects are inevitable in the first phase of communist society as it is when it has just emerged after prolonged birth pangs from capitalist society. Right can never be higher than the economic structure of society and its cultural development conditioned thereby.

In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour has become not only a means of life but life's prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of cooperative wealth flow more abundantly--only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!" (Critique of the Gotha Program, FLP Peking, p. 15-17)

The unity of opposites here is not that capitalism can't exist without communism. This is another childish metaphysics, for capitalism did exist without communism (by communism existing we mean the lower stage of communism as was the Soviet Union before capitalist restoration). The unity of opposites is, for one, in that capitalism necessitates, gives rise to communism (which Marx showed would occur before socialism ever existed). Another essential part of the unity of opposites is that communism arises from capitalism and is not an empty negation of it. Communism negates capitalism, is essentially different from capitalism, and yet initially contains certain capitalist elements and grows out of and is based on other capitalist elements. This does not mean that capitalism, as a system, or the bourgeoisie as a class or elements of a class continues to exist under communism. Capitalism as a system, as a mode of production, and the bourgeoisie as a class, are eliminated as the first step in communism (the lower stage of communism, or socialism). But communism still has its roots in capitalism: 1) the existence of communism relates back to capitalism (and going back further to all preexisting systems); 2) thus communism inherits certain forces of pro-

duction from capitalism which further develop under communism; and it 3) inherits certain bourgeois relations of production which change into communist relations. Engels shows vividly how it is the contradictory tendencies within capitalism which gives rise to its opposite--communism. Thus the self-movement of this process is brought out.

One of the things about dialectics that is hard to grasp is that something negates something, is opposite something and yet contains the first within its essence. It is hard because there is a natural inclination to be one-sided on this very essential aspect of dialectics. There is a tendency to be exclusionary, a tendency to see empty negation, not recognizing the interconnection, origin, basis, of this thing, and thus not seeing the remnants of the first in it. Or there is a tendency to be eclectic, seeing two things coexisting in the thing, seeing the two tendencies as quantitative, one controlling the other and seeing the essence of the thing as such coexistence, rather than seeing the essential negation. A grasp of the correct relationship is essential to Marxism-Leninism. Let us analyze one more process.

"In its first phase, or first stage, Communism cannot as yet be fully ripe economically and entirely free from traditions or traces of capitalism. Hence the interesting phenomenon that Communism in its first phase retains 'the narrow horizon of bourgeois right.' Of course, bourgeois right in regard to the distribution of articles of consumption inevitably presupposes the existence of the bourgeois state, for right is nothing without an apparatus capable of enforcing the observance of the standards of right.

It follows that under Communism there remains for a time not only bourgeois right, but even the bourgeois state--without the bourgeoisie!

This may sound like a paradox or simply a dialectical conundrum, of which Marxism is often accused by people who do not take the slightest trouble to study its extraordinarily profound content.

But as a matter of fact, remnants of the old surviving in the new confront us in life at every step, both in nature and in society. And Marx did not arbitrarily insert a scrap of 'bourgeois' right into Communism, but indicated what is economically and politically inevitable in a society emerging out of the womb of capitalism."

(Lenin, State and Revolution, FLP Peking edition, p. 117-8)

Lenin is not saying the bourgeoisie is in the state, for the bourgeoisie has been eliminated (in the first stage of Communism or socialism, the bourgeoisie is expropriated and the ownership and control of production is in the hands of the proletariat), nor is he saying the proletariat isn't exercising a dictatorship over exploitative elements and that exploitative elements would be allowed to exist and propagate their ideology (for he is speaking of the dictatorship of the proletariat where exploitative elements and their ideology are suppressed), but Lenin is saying that the state will remain bourgeois, its essence will contain that aspect, as long as bourgeois right exists (the distribution of social wealth still contains bourgeois relations). In the "first stage of socialism" there is not a coexistence of bourgeoisie and proletariat for the proletariat has eliminated the bourgeoisie as a class and is proceeding to eliminate all bourgeois relations and thus itself as well. Neither can the proletariat negate bourgeois influence completely in the first stage of Communism, for bourgeois relations remain to be eliminated.

The law of quantity into quality and vice versa is already a law of the unity of opposites, but it is a very important one and should be addressed. Quantity and quality are a unity of opposites, and first each side should be looked at in order to understand the relationship.

Quality: all processes are something, they have a quality. Quality is determined by difference. But this is not empty difference, it is a difference which includes similarity. Quality is a particular universal. Quality, being different from other things, has its own particularity. This particularity is known through its universality. A quality is identified through its difference to some things and its sameness to others. It is part of a universal and this universal is a particular. We can see this when we identify something as a part of a "species" such as "a collie is a dog" or "this is a table." The quality of something cannot be isolated from other processes. Other processes enter into the development of a particular quality. A table, if composed of wood, is interconnected to the growth of trees. Dogs are composed of many organic processes and chemical relations. Thus the quality of something is composed of many different qualities. In order to identify quality we must identify its essential properties, or essential qualities. Every "thing" should be seen for not just its appearance, but for what is beneath its surface. The essential quality of something will only be seen through an understanding of all its qualities, their interconnections and interactions, thus seeing what these qualities add up to. In other words, related to the discussion we had on the theory of knowledge, we only know something when we go from the individual, to the particular to the universal. If we stop at the individual or particular, we only know one quality or many or even all of the qualities of the thing, but we have not seen the relationship between qualities which give the quality that special essential quality. Simplistically, if we only look at the hair, or teeth, etc. of a dog, and do not develop our knowledge to the universal nature of dogs, we will not know a dog.

Thus quality has a definiteness, but this is not an isolated definiteness, but quality in relation (as a result of, connected to) other quality. "Quality is chiefly property in this respect, that it shows itself as an immanent determination in an external relation."*

The quality of something is a particular definiteness. "Determinateness, taken thus isolated and by itself as existent determinateness, is Quality..."** However, as we have already seen, nothing is static, definiteness is relative, and it is the same here. Quality is always changing, one quality changes into another quality. This is due to the fact that quality has a definite limit, any passage beyond the bounds of that limit results in the transformation into a new quality.

"'Limit (is) simple negation or first negation' (Every Something has its Limit) 'while Other is at the same time negation of negation... (Something, taken from the point of view of its immanent Limit--from the point of view of its self-contradiction, a contradiction which drives it (this Something) and leads it beyond its limits, is the Finite)' When things are described as finite,--that is to admit that their not-Being is their nature ('not-Being constitutes their Being')." (Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic," LCW Vol 38, p. 109-110)

The cause of self-movement of a thing is due to contradictions in it. The unity and struggle of opposites is what leads to one quality superseding another.

* Hegel, Science of Logic, Vol. 1, Macmillan Co. 1929, p. 126

** Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic," LCW Vol 38, p. 108

What gives quality its limit, what promotes development toward such limit? Quantity, as the opposite of quality plays a role in this.

Quantity is definiteness without difference. As far as quantity is concerned 20 apples are the same as 20 oranges or 20 pounds of apples the same as 20 pounds of oranges, it is the quantity which is important. Also, where quality has a limit, quantity does not. Quantity (without reference or association to quality) can increase or decrease without changing quality. However this limitless and definiteness without difference exists only insofar as quantity is not connected up to quality. In reality, there is no quantity in general, but quantity connected up to a particular quality. Even mathematics, which deals with quantity in general, is applied to determinate quality. More simple qualities can be represented in mathematical (quantitative) ways, but the more complex the quality, the more difficult and less reflective of the complex process will a mathematical formula, be; e.g. one can use math in determining angles, spacial relationships, etc., but it becomes impossible in describing a living organism or human society. Attempts to describe such quality through quantitative means leads to a non-understanding of such quality:

"The richer in determinateness, and hence in relation, thoughts become, the more confused, on the one hand, and the more arbitrary and senseless, on the other hand, becomes their representation in such forms as numbers...(Symbolism sometimes is) a convenient means of escaping from comprehending, stating and justifying the conceptual determinations." (Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic," LCW Vol 38, p. 117, 119)

There is a quantity within quality then, although we cannot relegate quality to a quantitative relationship. The quantity within quality determines the limits of quality. On the other hand, there is quality within quantity and such quality determines the quantitative development. Quantity passes into quality and vice versa. Different quantities of the same substance can lead to a change in quality. And the quality of the thing leads to particular quantity and change in quantity. Let us deal with each of these relationships and transitions.

First, quantity into quality. Within quality is a definite number or amount of that quality. Increase or decrease of this quantum will lead to qualitative change. This is strikingly brought out in such areas as chemistry:

"If for example, as is done in chemistry, we denote an atom of carbon by C, an atom of hydrogen by H, an atom of oxygen by O, and the number of atoms of carbon contained in each compound by n , the molecular formula for some of these series can be expressed as follows:

- C_nH_{2n+2} --the series of normal paraffins.
- $C_nH_{2n+2}O$ --the series of primary alcohols.
- $C_nH_{2n}O_2$ --the series of the normal fatty acids.

Let us take as an example the last of these series, and let us assume successively that $n=1$, $n=2$, $n=3$, etc. We then obtain the following results (omitting the isomers):

- CH_2O_2 --formic acid boiling point 100° ; melting point 1°
 - $C_2H_4O_2$ --acetic acid boiling point 118° ; melting point 17°
 - $C_3H_6O_2$ --propionic acid boiling point 140° ; melting point--
 - $C_4H_8O_2$ --butyric acid boiling point 162° ; melting point--
 - $C_5H_{10}O_2$ --valerianic acid boiling point 175° ; melting point--
- and so on to $C_{30}H_{60}O_2$, melissic acid, which melts only at 80° and has no boiling point, because it does not evaporate at all without decomposing.

"Here therefore we have a whole series of qualitatively different bodies, formed by the simple quantitative addition of elements, and in fact always in the same proportion...

These series, however, are only one particularly obvious example; throughout practically the whole of chemistry, even in the various nitrogen oxides and oxygen acids of phosphorus or sulphur, there are instances of 'quantity being transformed into quality...' (Engels, Anti-Duhring, International Pub., p. 139-140)

Within society, quantity into quality is manifested in such things as the development of classes, i.e. the proletariat did not exist as a class until a certain number of peasants, handicraftsmen, etc. were expropriated and turned into wage workers. This change was not a mere change from small, scattered workers to a large number of more connected workers, but a qualitative change to the establishment of a class of socialized, disciplined, yet exploited and oppressed workers, with the potential to realize such a position and change it. As Marx says, the fusion of many forces into one single force, creates a "new power," which is essentially and qualitatively different from the sum of its individual parts. Further, the growth of contradiction between this class force and the bourgeois class leads to another qualitative change from the working class being a class "in itself" to a class "for itself." The qualitative change between capitalism and socialism is due to the growth of contradictions within capitalism which lead to it reaching its limit, and a new quality emerging. As another example, Engels in Anti-Duhring brings out how it is not any sum of money or value which can be transformed into capital, but a certain definite minimum which must exist.

The build up of quantity should not be seen just as a build up of quantities within the process, but a build up of the contradictions. Quantitative change always has a quality to it. The development of the proletariat as a class was a result of the contradictions arising from the developing bourgeois relations and the developing bourgeoisie. The contradictions between the feudal and bourgeois relations, between landlord-peasant and the bourgeoisie intensified (quantitatively) leading to the quantitative changes in the wage workers into a proletarian class.

The intensification of the particular contradictions in a process, the build up of quantity of a particular quality, brings out more and more the limits of that quality. Under capitalism, as contradictions intensify, the limits of capitalism are clearly revealed. Also, in a period of quantitative build up the quality does not remain static. There are qualitative changes within the general quality. Capitalism has not stayed the same as it initially was. Even capitalism has made qualitative changes. These changes stay within the overall limits of capitalism, however, until there is an overall qualitative change into socialism. Capitalism's development into imperialism has meant a significant qualitative change for capitalism, but that has not meant that capitalism, in general has changed. The development into imperialism signifies that capitalism has reached its limit, and the era of imperialism is also the era of socialist revolution, the era of qualitative change of capitalism into socialism.

Thus, the quantitative build up, the intensification of contradictions, reaches the point where the quality reaches its final limit and must pass into a new quality. This period of the new quality superseding the old is different than the one preceding it. In a period of quantitative change, there is a more gradual build up; in a period of qualitative change, there is rapid change, "leaps." Thus, quantitative, gradual change leads to sudden leaps, breaks in continuity. Now, as we said above, no process goes on and on with quantitative change only until there is this qualitative leap. Within the quantitative change there are qualitative

Wasn't the Textbook of Marxist Phil. - adequate?

leaps going on. Our above example of capitalism growing into imperialism, yet remaining within the bounds of capitalism, brings this out. There have been certain leaps within capitalism. But the overall leap is the period in which, in human society, revolution occurs, and one great system is changed into another. These periods of revolution, which may span years or decades, are stormy, violent times in which the contradictions are so sharp, so intensely played out, in which the violent struggle of these contradictions leads to their resolution, the old contradictions are abolished and new contradictions appear.

We should briefly deal with two deviations regarding the relationship between quantity and quality. These are to either look one-sidedly at the "leaps" in society, and the other is one-sidedness regarding the gradual development. The first is manifest in ultra-left, anarchist type deviations, the second in reformism, economism, revisionism, right opportunism.

This last deviation should be dealt with a bit more since it has been the major problem internationally (and nationally) in the communist movement. The view which sees quantitative change as being the only type of change, works for that type of change, sees that "gradually" this change will lead to qualitative change. This view blurs over the qualitative difference between capitalism and socialism and really does not work for qualitative change. This is related to the "coexistence of opposites" view we talked about earlier, and its political deviation of seeing a never-ending "class struggle."

Quality is also transformed into quantity. The particular quality of something determines the quantitative change. In evolution the ability for a particular species to undergo quantitative build up in a particular direction, leading to qualitative change, is due to the quality of its genetic pool interacting with the quality of the environment. Particular qualities which adapt to new or changing environment, lead to quantitative build up of those qualities due to gradual elimination of qualities unable to adapt, until the quality of the species has changed. In evolution one can see how both quantity and quality are important and how they interpenetrate.

Quality into quantity can be seen in social development as well. While under capitalism the productive forces are more and more stifled because of the contradiction with the relations of production, the quality of socialism unleashes the development of the productive forces because of the elimination of some of the contradictions between productive forces and the relations of production, and the progressive elimination of others. The quantitative development of production is totally related to the quality of the mode of production. In our earlier discussion on the development of the wage workers into a class of proletarians, and then later into a class-conscious class, we can see, in the first case, that the development into a class led to quantitative changes, led to the development of spontaneous clashes with the bourgeoisie. Quality led to quantity. Quantity--more and wider clashes between classes led to the development of socialist consciousness as first elaborated by certain privileged sectors of society and secondly taken up by the proletarian class itself. Quantity into quality.

It is important to see that quantity is not abstract, general. Quantity is always connected to a particular quality. Thus, the quality of a process should be our first concern. Part of such concern is quantity since quantity is a part of quality and all quality has a quantitative minimum, but this puts quantity as decisive only in relation to quality and the purpose of quantity to be to develop quality, which is still putting quality first. When the proper quality exists, it will be the basis for further qualitative change which will further develop quality. This is why the saying, "Quality first and then quantity,"* is correct, and any empha-

* Stalin, Works, Vol. 5, Red Star Press edition, p. 73

sis on building up forces before the qualitative basis has been laid, is incorrect. However, there can also be deviations which don't see the importance of quantity in determining quality. Such deviations lead to a "purist" approach to development. Only some abstract quality is required regardless of what the level of development is at the time. This tends to lead to a skipping of stages, to not seeing the quantitative build up and the qualitative changes which occur within a general quality, such as not seeing the need for a democratic stage in a revolution which requires such.

Thus we have shown the particular nature of quality and quantity, how within each nature exists the other, how they transform into each other, and have briefly touched on some problems of not having such an understanding of quality and quantity. We want to reiterate, that to know the essence of something requires knowing the unity of quality and quantity, especially knowing the limits of quality, for in knowing such we know the development of the old quality, the development into the new quality, i.e., we know the motion of something.

Finally we come to the law of the negation of the negation. The negation of the negation is "an extremely general--and for this reason extremely comprehensive and important--law of development of nature, history and thought."* The law of the negation of the negation is "the spiral motion, the general progressive development of processes." Linked to the law of the unity of opposites, it is how "processes which in their nature are antagonistic, contain a contradiction, are the transformation of one extreme into its opposite; and finally, as the kernel of the whole process, the negation of the negation."**

The negation of negation is "the progression of contradiction; it shows the actual development and transformation of opposites. "A process goes through the development of contradictory opposites which transform into each other." This transformation becomes the negation of the negation. "In a process there is the development of an opposing tendency which negates the "first" tendency, and which is then negated itself to bring forth the new process, new contradiction. The law of the negation of the negation thus clarifies the opposites, the contradiction, the transformation, the new contradiction.

Since the negation of the negation is a progression of contradiction, the negation we are speaking of here is not "empty" negation, but negation which carries the other tendency along with it. We are speaking of a "sublation" of the opposites and a synthesis as the result. By sublation we do not mean "coexistence", but a carrying over of the opposing tendency as a part of the very nature of the new tendency (not alongside, but a part of). By synthesis we do not mean a "coexistence" of the two tendencies at the end, but a return to the first at a higher level through having gone through the opposite, thus part of the opposite is in the nature of the synthesis, but again not the two tendencies sitting side by side within the synthesis.

Examples?

The negation of the negation is "change in quality." From one quality to another to the final quality in the process. This passing from quality to quality to final quality brings out the essence of the process, shows its motion. "The result of the negation of the negation, this third term, is 'not a quiescent third term, but, as this unity' (of contradictions), 'is self-mediating movement and activity...'"***

* Engels, Anti-Duhring, International Publishers, p. 154

** Ibid., p. 153-4

*** Lenin, quoting Hegel in "Conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic," LCW Vol. 38, p. 230

There is general progressive development involved in the negation of the negation. In the transformation of opposites and development of new contradiction, in the change in quality of things, this is, in general, from lower to higher forms, it is generally progressive.* Such an upward progression, is general, not particular, since we all know of much which doesn't progress forward, but may take steps back or die out. But in general, can we say things in general progress? We can. In the progress of organic life, life has become more and more complex, evolving higher forms out of the lower, even though in some cases an organism takes an evolutionary sterile road. In human society the same has been the case; society has progressed forward, with particular setbacks along the way, but the general clearly showing progression.

Finally, the negation of the negation is "a process of development" in which the process repeats the starting point at a higher stage. It is a process of development by which there is an apparent return to the old. In content we have something new, which carries some of the features of the old. "That this unity, as well as the whole form of the method, is a triplicity is wholly, however, the merely superficial and external side of the manner of cognition".** Here, we must warn against using the negation of the negation as a formal scheme with which to force on reality and trying to construct the negation of the negation in things. Even Hegel who ended up constructing reality around such a triad, warned of such a method:

"Formalists, it is true, have also seized upon triplicity, and have held fast to its empty framework; and this form has been rendered tedious and of ill-repute by the shallow misuse and the barrenness of modern so-called philosophic construction, which consists simply in attaching the formal framework without concept and immanent determination to all sorts of matter and employing it for external arrangement. But its inner value cannot be diminished by this vapid misuse, and it must still be deemed of high value that the outward form of the rational has been discovered, albeit not understood." (Lenin quoting Hegel, "Conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic, LCW Vol. 38, p. 230)

Engels elaborates examples of the negation of the negation in Anti-Duhring:

"Let us take a grain of barley. Millions of such grains of barley are milled, boiled and brewed and then consumed. But if such a grain of barley meets with conditions which for it are normal, if it falls on suitable soil, then under the influence of heat and moisture a specific change takes place, it germinates; the grain as such ceases to exist, it is negated, and in its place appears the plant which has arisen from it, the negation of the grain. But what is the normal life-process of this plant? It grows, flowers, is fertilised and finally once more produces grains of barley, but not as a single unit, but ten, twenty or thirty fold. Species of grain change extremely slowly, and so the barley of today is almost the same as it was a century ago.

*Discussion of the Second Law of Thermodynamics and recent discoveries in contradiction to this are outside the scope of this paper. A dialectical materialist discussion of modern science and this particular controversy is sorely needed, (since Engel's Dialectics of Nature and Lenin's Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, no other work of this nature has been carried out), but we are not in a position to undertake the task, nor is it absolutely necessary to do so to elaborate our point. We have layed out sufficient evidence here to show the negation of the negation as a law of nature.

**Lenin quoting Hegel in "Conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic," LCW, Vol. 38, p.230

"But if we take an ornamental plant which can be modified in cultivation, for example a dahlia or an orchid: if we treat the seed and the plant which grows from it as a gardener does, we get as the result of this negation of the negation not only more seeds, but also qualitatively better seeds, which produce more beautiful flowers, and each fresh repetition of this process, each repeated negation of the negation increases this improvement. With most insects, this process follows the same lines as in the case of the grain of barley. Butterflies, for example, spring from the egg, they pass through certain transformations until they reach sexual maturity, they pair and are in turn negated, dying as soon as the pairing process has been completed and the female has laid its numerous eggs. We are not concerned at the moment with the fact that with other plants and animals the process does not take such a simple form, that before they die they produce seeds, eggs or offspring not one but many times; our purpose here is only to show that the negation of the negation takes place in reality in both divisions of the organic world. Furthermore, the whole of geology is a series of negated negations, a series arising from the successive shattering of old and the depositing of new rock formations. First the original earth-crust brought into existence by the cooling of the liquid mass was broken up by oceanic, meteorological and atmospherico-chemical action, and these disintegrated masses were deposited on the ocean floor. Local elevations of the ocean floor above the surface of the sea subject portions of these first strata once more to the action of rain, the changing temperature of the seasons and the oxygen and carbonic acid of the atmosphere. These same influences acted on the molten masses of rock which issued from the interior of the earth, broke through the strata and subsequently solidified. In this way, in the course of millions of centuries, ever new strata are formed and in turn are for the most part destroyed, ever anew serving as material for the formation of new strata. But the result of this process has been a very positive one: the creation, out of the most varied chemical elements, of a mixed and mechanically pulverised soil which makes possible the most abundant and diverse vegetation." (Internatibnal Pub. p. 149-150)

"It is the same, too, in history. All civilised peoples begin with common ownership of the land. With all peoples who have passed a certain primitive stage, in the course of the development of agriculture this common ownership becomes a fetter on production. It is abolished, negated and after a long or shorter series of intermediate stages is transformed into private property. But at a higher stage of agricultural development, brought about by private property in land itself, private property in turn becomes a fetter on production as is the case today, both with small and large land-ownership. The demand that it also should be negated, that it should once again be transformed into common property, necessarily arises. But this demand does not mean the restoration of the old original common ownership, but the institution of a far higher and more developed form of possession in common which, far from being a hindrance to production, on the contrary for the first time frees production from all fetters and gives it the possibility of making full use of modern chemical discoveries and mechanical inventions." (Ibid. p.151-152)

The negation of the negation is also "the way human thought has progressed in general." First, the negation of the negation in thought is the grasping of the motion of contradiction. "Thesis-antithesis-synthesis" is no more than the human mind getting a grasp of the opposition in identity and where such opposition is going, thus being able to reflect the actual motion of the process. This way of reflecting reality does not necessarily (and not usually) come about at once or in one person's mind. "One has to think dialectically in order to think in such a way, and this is not common." As Lenin says:

"They chase words, without thinking about how devilishly complicated and subtle life is, producing entirely new forms, which we only partly 'catch on' to...People for the most part (99 percent of the bourgeoisie, 98 percent of the liquidators, about 60-70 percent of the Bolsheviks) don't know how to think, they only learn words by heart." ("To Inessa Armand," LCW, Vol. 35, p. 131)

However, human thought, as a whole goes through such a process. Let us look at the development of our understanding of the general nature of reality. At a certain point in human development we had a basic grasp of the dialectical nature of things. The ancient Greeks, in particular, elaborated a primitive view of dialectics. But this view lacked for a very thorough understanding of the world. As scientific experimentation developed, such a view was negated as humans became absorbed with the particularity of things, with learning the nature of many things. A period of antithesis to dialectics--metaphysics, dominated human thought. Then the development of the understanding of particulars developed to the point where interconnections had to be made and dialectics once again came on the stage, in particular through German idealism culminating in Hegel, and finally becoming the closest method of reflection of reality through dialectical materialism as developed by Marx. This time dialectics carried with it the prior knowledge, the "wealth of the particulars" which enriched it. Thus we had a thesis-antithesis-synthesis, or something which is negated and then there is a negation of the negation.

"Thus we have once again returned to the mode of outlook of the great founders of Greek philosophy, the view that the whole of nature, from the smallest element to the greatest, from grains of sand to suns, from Protista to man, has its existence in eternal coming into being and passing away, in ceaseless flux, in unresting motion and change. Only with the essential difference that what in the case of the Greeks was a brilliant intuition, is in our case the result of strictly scientific research in accordance with experience, and hence also it emerges in a much more definite and clear form." (Engels, Dialectics of Nature, Progress Pub. p. 31)

This process is directly related to the discussion of the individual-particular-universal we had in the section on the theory of knowledge. The development of human knowledge through the individual, particular to the universal can also be seen as a form of the negation of the negation in human thought. Taking the same discussion we just had on the development of dialectics, we can see that the initial Greek views were the individual. This was developed into metaphysics which developed the particular. Out of this developed the dialectics of the universal which contains the knowledge of the individual and particular.

"The first of these is Greek philosophy. Here dialectical thought still appears in its pristine simplicity, still undisturbed by the charming obstacles which the metaphysics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries--Bacon and Locke in England, Wolff in Germany--put in its own way,

and with which it blocked its own progress, from an understanding of the part to an understanding of the whole, to an insight into the general interconnection of things. Among the Greeks--just because they were not yet advanced enough to dissect, analyse nature --nature is still viewed as a whole, in general. The universal connection of natural phenomena is not proved in regard to particulars; to the Greeks it is the result of direct contemplation. Herein lies the inadequacy of Greek philosophy, on account of which it had to yield later to other modes of outlook on the world. But herein also lies its superiority over all its subsequent metaphysical opponents. If in regard to the Greeks metaphysics was right in particulars, in regard to metaphysics the Greeks were right in general. That is the first reason why we are compelled in philosophy as in so many other spheres to return again and again to the achievements of that small people whose universal talents and activity assured it a place in the history of human development that no other people can ever claim. The other reason, however, is that the manifold forms of Greek philosophy contain in embryo, in the nascent state, almost all later models of outlook on the world. Theoretical natural science is therefore likewise forced to go back to the Greeks if it desires to trace the history of the origin and development of the general principles it holds today." (Engels, Dialectics of Nature, Progress Pub., p. 45-6)

not "individual"
The quote doesn't demonstrate K-C-K's contention

The negation of the negation is "a law which is not especially hard to understand when one sees such a process occurring in nature, society and thought." Why then is it scoffed at by so many? It is because the negation of the negation is so blatantly a revolutionary law. While the other laws of dialectics are also revolutionary, they can fairly easily be transformed into metaphysics, the revolutionary character removed from them and then used as such. For instance, the unity of opposites can be the "coexistence" of opposites, with the resulting "class struggle" point of view." But it is hard to turn the negation of the negation into reformism, gradualism, etc. and thus instead it is dismissed as "Hegelian verbal jugglery," or it is relegated to a particular process which only occurs under given conditions, these conditions thus not occurring too frequently. Or it is used, but used totally in a formalistic, incorrect way which really negates it. In such a case it is used opportunistically to "prove" a new quality has emerged when it really hasn't, thus the old quality is continued under the guise of the new.

But Engels admitted this

The negation of the negation is an extremely important law of dialectics which must be carefully used in analysis of real life and not formalistically applied. When it is used correctly it shows the real progress of things and brings out the inherently revolutionary character of nature, mind and society.

K-C-K view it as a universal law, apparently, occurring in all processes at all times. Go beyond Engels in this respect. But see p. 52-

C. Mao Zedong Thought is Metaphysics Which Serves the Interests of the Bourgeoisie

Mao Zedong says:

"...the existence of each of the two aspects of a contradiction in the process of the development of a thing presupposes the existence of the other aspect, and both aspects coexist in a single entity; second, in given conditions, each of the two contradictory aspects transforms itself into its opposite...That is to say, in given conditions, each of the contradictory aspects within a thing transforms itself into its opposite, changes its position to that of its opposite...Without 'above', there would be no 'below'; without 'below', there would be no 'above'...Without the bourgeoisie, there would be no proletariat; without the proletariat, there would be no bourgeoisie."
("On Contradiction," Four Essays on Philosophy, Peking ed., p. 60, 61, 62)

"There are several metaphysics to such views." First, Mao treats identity (unity) as coexistence, as two existing within one (Mao used to say one divides into two but what is the big difference?) in a static relationship, which exists until conditions develop to transform these opposites. Also, the existence of each aspect presupposes the existence of the other. Thus far Mao has been unable to explain how these contradictions came to exist within one entity (especially at the exact same moment), how the conditions will arise which will transform these into each other (will they come from outside the process?), and what will happen once they have transformed. Mao cannot do this because his idea of the unity of opposites is in identifying opposites in processes and "profoundly" saying "without life there can't be death," etc. To Mao this is the profound essence of the unity of opposites. We have already showed how this says basically nothing, it does not get to the essence of a process but only looks at what is obvious, it cannot explain the self-movement of the process. "Ordinary imagination grasps difference and contradiction, but not the transition from the one to the other, this however is the most important."* How would Marx have seen the development of socialism from capitalism if he would have run around looking for an opposite to capitalism? Since socialism didn't exist he would have had to look for a long time. But the point is that Marx set out to understand capitalism and contradictions within capitalism and as a result found socialism growing out of capitalism. "Of course the Maoists will all yell, "But capitalism divides into the bourgeoisie and the proletariat!" This is true. But it is not in the relationship between the proletariat and bourgeoisie that Marx discovered the essence of capitalism and its contradictions. It is in the commodity in which Marx unraveled all the contradictions of capitalism. Again, let us not look for opposites and think we've found something when we've discovered some. This is not dialectics. Materialist dialectics is a study of objective processes, which will reveal hundreds of contradictions and processes in one process and we must find the cause and effect relationships and discover the essence of the process from this. (A side note related to what we just said: Mao says that a "simple" process will contain only one contradiction.** This negates the particular within the universal, the infinite in the finite, since you can never break anything down to one contradiction. Even one contradiction can be broken down into contradictions within each tendency, ad infinitum. Mao obviously can't see this when he remains content with having found a set of contradictions.)

Mao can't show the self-movement of a process because of another incorrect view of the unity of opposites. It is not true that the existence of one aspect

*see p. 12 of this paper.

**"On Contradiction," Four Essays on Philosophy, Peking ed., p. 61

presupposes the existence of the other. This again is metaphysical. What then caused these two aspects to fall out of the sky and appear? It has to be some external thing. One thing can "exist" without the other "existing." In fact, the whole point is that one thing develops out of the first, as a result of the first (the first having developed out of something also), that such development leads to the negation of the first by the second. This is what happens in contradiction, not some simple coexistence of opposites. Opposites will appear in all processes, and the conflict which thus appears will result in the transformation of opposites, the negation of one by the other; but the "coexistence" of opposites is relative, ever-changing, with constant motion towards the transformation; the resolution of the contradiction, the arise of a new contradiction. Dumb

Which brings us to another metaphysic of Mao's view of the unity and struggle of opposites. Mao can't show how opposites transform because of their own contradiction, since the transformation occurs under "given conditions." In other words, the transformation of opposites is due to certain "conditions." Mao tries to cover over this theoretically later on, but it comes out clearly here. And we have to ask--what conditions? External conditions? And if the conditions are internal, what gave rise to them? Mao misses one of the main points of dialectics that the self-movement of a process is due to the contradictions within the process, that the "conditions" for the transformation are created by the opposites and their relationship. How those opposites came to be and their continued existence is related to other processes, but if they exist, the transformation is due to internal development and relations. ?

Mao tries to justify his metaphysics with a quote by Lenin. We now have Mao turning to sophistry to bolster his argument. Mao quotes Lenin as saying:

"Dialectics is the teaching which shows how opposites can be and how they happen to be (how they become) identical--under what conditions they are identical, transforming themselves into one another,--why the human mind should take these opposites not as dead, rigid, but as living, conditional, mobile, transforming themselves into one another." (Ibid. p. 60)

This quote is taken out of "Conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic" which it is unfortunate Mao did not study and comprehend, or he understood and ignored and consciously revised. Whichever, the outcome is revisionism. Lenin is not saying that the unity of opposites depends on "certain conditions" but that we must study what conditions the unity of opposites rests on, conditions meaning the relations between the opposing tendencies and what conditions brought the contradictions into being. He is also not saying that a transformation is dependent on "certain conditions," but that we must find the conditions (again relations) which the opposites give rise to, which cause the transformation (negation) of one by another. Why does Lenin say dialectics is the teaching which shows how (not that) opposites can be, happen to be, become identical? Is he saying that opposites existed which were not identical? Obviously not--this would be the worst metaphysics. To the astute student of dialectics, who has not been or is getting away from his MZT brainwashing, Lenin is bringing out the development, unfolding of opposites in all processes, and the existence of one opposite has its identity with the other. Lenin is not saying that opposites come into being and then there is an identity to them. Lenin is showing how our ideas often approach something in this way, i.e., we often see opposites before we see them as interconnected, as part of a process, before we see the cause and effect relationship, and that one must see the identity of opposites. Lenin then says we must understand what this identity is--what conditions are, meaning what relations brought the contradictions into being, what the relationship between ?

opposites are and what gives rise to the transformation, the negation of one opposite by another. The last part of Lenin's statement speaks for itself, and although Mao repeats "living, conditional, mobile, transforming" later on, it is clear that his method is "dead, rigid."

Mao can in no way explain how these opposites got into this unity of opposites or how they will get out. And he can't explain how these things occurred because if he did he would at the same time have to explain those mysterious "certain conditions" for this unity and transformation and then the whole point of Mao's "dialectics," to "identify" opposites would be negated. This inability to explain the contradiction has its purpose and practical consequences. The role of the bourgeoisie and bourgeois ideology under socialism and regarding the party provide clear examples. For one, Mao denies that the socialist revolution smashes the bourgeoisie as an exploiting class and expropriates its means of production. According to Mao, any talk of eliminating the bourgeoisie is metaphysical, since "without the bourgeoisie there can be no proletariat," etc.* But the bourgeoisie is eliminated as an exploiting class, it is deprived of its possession of the means of production. The expropriation does not in any way diminish the bourgeoisie's hatred for socialism. In fact, their resistance increases and must be ruthlessly suppressed. But the bourgeoisie is not kept around as an exploiting class so that there exists Mao's "unity" of opposites. Nor does the proletariat allow "poisonous weeds", the ideology the bourgeoisie promotes, to exist. The dictatorship of the proletariat is exactly that--a dictatorship over any and all exploiting elements and their ideology. Mao's view of the contradiction of the proletariat and bourgeoisie is kept at the level of identifying opposites and insists that these opposites must both exist. If Mao looked into the relationship he would have to admit what Marx and all M-L's see: the proletariat negates the bourgeoisie and itself. This Mao does not want to see, so we have a philosophy which does not allow us to see such. Mao's philosophy and political views definitely complement each other. There is no comparison between Mao's view of keeping the bourgeoisie around as the unity of opposites of bourgeoisie and proletariat and Marx's elaboration of the contradiction we quoted earlier (in the section on Laws of Dialectics). In fact, Mao's view of keeping the bourgeoisie around can clearly be seen as bourgeois. It is the bourgeoisie which is the conservative side, the bourgeoisie wants to keep itself and the proletariat around.

Another example of Mao's views on identity of opposites is the "two-line struggle". Here we have the same reasoning: there cannot be the proletarian line without the bourgeois line, for to say as much would be metaphysical and a breach in the unity of opposites. Thus, the bourgeois line must be represented and allowed to develop, but kept under control. The correct, dialectical view of the party is that it emerges from and in opposition to bourgeois society, it thus retains this origin as part of its essence, but it essentially opposes the bourgeoisie and bourgeois line in a truly M-L party. That is not to say there are no contradictions within the party and that bourgeois positions are not put forth. But the party must eliminate any bourgeois views which surface. The essence of a proletarian party is a constant movement towards eliminating bourgeois thought from the party. And a proletarian party does not allow different platforms, factions to exist. Mao's view is diametrically opposed to the essence of the proletarian party. Mao instead chose to promote bourgeois ideology right inside the party and to allow the party to carry out these lines. He played the game of factions--using Zhou against Lin, Lin against Deng, and so-on. As a result, the CPC throughout its history was filled with factions led by all sorts of revisionists and opportunists and the resultant practice of the party was revisionism.

And the
Cl ?

*see "On Contradiction", Four Essays on Philosophy, Peking-FLP, p. 32, 61, and S. Schram, Chairman Mao Talks to the People, p. 216

What we have found so far, and what we will continue to find is eclectics in place of dialectics. Lenin says that eclecticism is, "an unprincipled, or sophistic selection made arbitrarily (or to please the powers that be) of now one, now another argument", and that it, "is the easiest way of deceiving the masses; it seems to take into account all sides of the process, all tendencies of development, all the conflicting influences, and so forth, whereas in reality it presents no integral and revolutionary conception of the process of social development at all." Lenin is describing Mao to a tee. Mao tries to take into account both the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the party, the state and in economic relations, and therefore he seems to be all-sided in all these things. In reality, as we have shown, he has no integral and revolutionary conception of these processes of social development.

We can bring out another description of eclectics by Lenin which fits Mao's unity and struggle of opposites:

"His theoretical attitude is: 'on the one hand, and on the other', the one and the other'. That is eclecticism. Dialectics requires an all-round consideration of relationships in their concrete development but not a patchwork of bits and pieces...

...why is Bukharin's reasoning no more than inert and empty eclecticism? It is because he does not even try to make an independent analysis, from his own standpoint, either of the whole course of the current controversy (as Marxism, that is, dialectical logic, unconditionally demands) or of the whole approach to the question, the whole presentation--the whole trend of the presentation, if you will--of the question at the present time and in these concrete circumstances. You do not see Bukharin doing that at all! His approach is one of pure abstraction: he makes no attempt at concrete study, and takes bits and pieces from Zinoviev and Trotsky. That is eclecticism." ("Once Again on the Trade Unions", LCW Vol. 32, p. 91, 95)

The Maoists will argue that whereas Mao does see opposites coexisting in an entity, he does not view this as a static coexistence. Mao's dialectics, they say, recognizes "principal and secondary aspects" of contradictions, and understands how a quantitative buildup in the secondary aspect can lead to it becoming the primary aspect. Contradictory aspects thus change positions with each other. Mao does not stop here. He adds, "The principal aspect is the one playing the leading role in the contradiction. The nature of a thing is determined mainly by the principal aspect of a contradiction, ~~the aspect of a contradiction, the aspect which has gained the dominant position.~~"**

What is the "principal aspect" of the contradiction? If this were the one on the rise, the part of the contradiction which is actively pushing forward the contradiction, such terminology could come close to reality. But even here, such a view would not see that the reason why one aspect is progressive is due to its relationship to the other aspect, it would not see how that aspect developed out of the first, it would not understand the role of the two aspects, what their struggle is and what will become of this struggle. Looking at a contradiction in terms of principal and secondary does not give us an understanding of the essence of the contradictions and the tendencies in it and the motion of the

* The State and Revolution, FLP Peking, p. 24.

** "On Contradiction", Four Essays on Philosophy, p. 54.

tendencies. " It is a static relationship (even if it changes sides) which doesn't explain real relationships and reasons for contradiction. Mao, in addition, did not even view the rising tendency as the driving force, as the impetus for the "struggle" of opposites. Mao saw the "principal aspect" as "mainly" determining the essence of the thing. The dialectical view of essence is that a process has contradictions within it which are changing this process and eventually, the opposite of this process will appear. The essence of something is not "mainly" determined by its dominant aspect but by all its important contradictions and where they are leading it. Finally, related to this last point, Mao makes the "principal" and "secondary" aspects capable of going back and forth in a thing. Accordingly the essence of something can go back and forth. This is also misleading. For the essence of something to change, it must change into a different thing. Now, the essence of a thing can include a vacillatory nature, but that is part of its essence and is thus always there. Something with a vacillatory nature is much different than something which is in essence one way or another. M-L tactics treat these situations quite differently. Another Maoist twist to this treachery is that all members of a particular thing do not have to have the same essence, because one can have one aspect principal, another secondary. Thus all members of a "species", or class, or strata of a class do not have a particular essence which applies to all.

Let us take some examples of the "principal aspect." Mao sees the principal aspect in capitalist society as the bourgeoisie.* This means that the bourgeoisie mainly determines the essence of the society. But the essence of capitalism is that it is developing its own negation. How can the bourgeoisie negate itself? How can the bourgeoisie mainly determine society? It alone can't. The bourgeoisie, in fact was only the medium by which the contradictory essence of capitalism developed. Therefore we must really see the essence of capitalism in the contradiction between the forces of production and relationship of production. Is one of these the "principal aspect" which determines the essence? No. They both have their role in the contradiction and it is the contradiction which determines the essence.

Next, taking Mao's bourgeoisie who determines the essence of and plays the leading role in capitalism, we run further into trouble in trying to explain how we get from capitalism to socialism. Here, Mao explains, the proletariat changes places with the bourgeoisie, becomes the dominant aspect. Here, we are supposed to have a change in essence with the same contradiction preserved, only the aspects changing dominance. But in dialectics when there is a change in essence the first tendency has been negated, and it only exists in germ as part of the new essence. A different process exists. What Mao denies is that the mutual transformation of the opposites is a resolution of the contradiction. A new contradiction emerges. With the socialist revolution, the bourgeoisie does not simply exchange places with the proletariat. The bourgeoisie, as a holder of enormous means of production and state power, is smashed and ceases to exist as the bourgeoisie of the old society. The proletariat, too, is no longer the proletariat of the old society. The new proletariat exercises state power and has the means of production of the expropriated bourgeoisie at its disposal. It may be argued that Mao does indeed talk about a qualitative change occurring when opposites change places. But if the bourgeoisie remains intact, or is only partially dismantled and "controlled", if no expropriation of the bourgeoisie occurs, if the bourgeoisie is seen as being part of the "people" if it just "behaves", then what qualitative change occurs? The change is essentially quantitative. And indeed, with Mao's line of reasoning and action, a qualitative change from bourgeois society could not have occurred in China.

* "On Contradiction," Four Essays on Philosophy, Peking ed., p. 55

Why? How are we to explain the aspect which determines the essence, which plays the leading role in something, ceasing to play the leading role? How can something not leading, overcome and defeat the leading? The only way is through something external to the contradiction. By external, it does not have to be outside "bourgeois" or "proletariat." Looking for an explanation of the development of a contradiction within each of the aspects is also external to the contradiction. And sure enough, Mao sees a change "in the bourgeoisie" and "in the proletariat" which leads to this transformation. And another quantitative change in each tendency at that. Very cleverly Mao has played "a metaphysical trick" on us and separated the identity between the proletariat and bourgeoisie in order to "explain" how something which is on the bottom gets to the top and vice versa.

Mao says, "in the period of the socialist revolution, exploitation of the working class for profit constitutes one side of the character of the national bourgeoisie, while its support of the Constitution and its willingness to accept socialist transformation constitute the other."* What follows then is if the principal aspect of a particular national bourgeois is exploitative, he is no good. If the principal aspect is supportive of the Constitution, then we can unite with him. This whole scheme denies "the general essence" of the bourgeoisie--that it is exploitative by nature and has no interest whatsoever in developing socialism. Exploitation is the essence of the bourgeoisie.

Consider one other example. Mao said:

"Of the two opposing aspects of a unity in struggle with each other, one must be principal and the other secondary. In our state which is a dictatorship of the proletariat, poisonous weeds should of course not be allowed to spread unchecked. Whether inside the Party or in ideological or in literary and art circles, we must endeavor to make sure that fragrant flowers and Marxism occupy the chief and dominant position. Poisonous weeds and what is non-Marxist and anti-Marxist must be kept in the subordinate position... Seen from this viewpoint, the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend is beneficial, not harmful." (SW Vol. 5, p. 370-371)

First of all, this relates to our earlier discussion of Mao asserting that the bourgeoisie and bourgeois ideology are necessary in the party and under socialism in order to maintain the "unity of opposites". And in this vein Mao attacks Stalin as being metaphysical:

"Stalin failed to see the connection between the struggle of opposites and the unity of opposites. Some people in the Soviet Union are so metaphysical and rigid in their thinking that they think a thing has to be either one or the other, refusing to recognize the unity of opposites." (SW Vol. 5, p. 369)

[In fact, a thing is essentially either one or the other. Mao raises up this business about principal and secondary aspects in order to preserve a place in the party and under "socialism", for the bourgeoisie. If we accept the attitude that it is necessary for the bourgeois line to be preserved in the party, for example, we will never develop the vigilance needed to fight for and maintain unity around the single M-L line. If this single proletarian line is not maintained, if factions are allowed to exist, if democratic centralism is not preserved, if opportunists remain inside our ranks, then the essence of what * "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People," Four Essays on Philosophy, Peking ed., p. 82

we have is an opportunist party, revisionist in principle, undisciplined and unable to lead the exploited masses to victory. This is what the Chinese party became. And it became such a party as a direct result of Mao's "dialectics". Stalin was not metaphysical for wanting to maintain the monolithic unity of the party. He correctly held that only such a party could achieve and maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Mao's "dialectics" actually ends up in a balancing act, with the two opposites metaphysically separated from each other, rather than penetrating each other, and then the two opposites metaphysically stuck together, side-by-side, within a "contradiction", rather than the two opposites being the contradiction, which leads to transformation of opposites and a new contradiction.

Mao said that new qualities emerge as a result of his switching of sides "within" a contradiction.* We said they don't. Let us get into Mao's line and practice around quantity and quality. One of the major deviations on this question that we've pointed out is the view that sees essentially only quantitative change, and sees that gradually this change will lead to qualitative change. This deviation finds such forms as the evolutionist view of Kautsky, who saw socialism coming about as a gradual development out of capitalism (imperialism). The basic error of this view is that it only recognizes the quantitative changes in the aspects of the existing contradiction. It doesn't recognize the leap necessary to get to a new quality, and doesn't see the qualitative difference between the two things. To Kautsky, socialism grows out of capitalism and eventually capitalism varies very little from socialism so that capitalism really becomes socialism. Of course with this view, socialism as a quality is distorted, as well as capitalism, the differences between the two are merged. Mao precisely held to such views, and it is interesting to note that he found Kautsky's Class Struggle, to be one of the most important books in his life.** In spite of his talk about China having developed socialism--a qualitatively new society--he held to an evolutionist view of the change from capitalism to socialism.

Lenin said that the dialectical materialist concept of development "alone furnishes the key to the 'self-movement' of everything existing; it alone furnishes the key to the 'leaps,' to the 'break in continuity,' to the 'transformation into the opposite,' to the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new."*** The "leaps", which are the transformation of quality, is what Mao in reality fails to acknowledge. Of course, in his writings, Mao speaks quite a bit about how the class struggle leads to social revolution which abolishes the old society and establishes the new. But Mao can only see this leap in form, and superficially. He cannot see that the content of the new leap calls for a new quality. What Mao can see is the quantitative changes in the aspects of the contradiction. He sees the proletariat being "more numerous" than the bourgeoisie, he sees it "growing simultaneously" with it, he sees that the proletariat "gradually gains strength". But what Mao fails to see is what happens regarding the leap, when the proletariat seizes power. What has to happen for a qualitative change to occur is that the bourgeoisie is abolished as an exploiting class and "exploitation of man by man ends." This change occurs not so much because of a quantitative build up in each of the aspects of the contradiction, but because of a quantitative build up in the contradictions of capitalist society. When a qualitative change occurs a qualitatively new society emerges. This society represents a new contradiction with a new pair of opposites. Mao says only that "the bourgeoisie...changes its position to that originally occupied by its opposite".**** Hence, no really new quality

* "On Contradiction," Four Essays on Philosophy, Peking ed., p. 54-55

** Vsevolod Holubnychy, "Mao Tse-ting's Materialistic Dialectics," The China Quarterly, July-September 1964, p. 17

*** LCW, Vol. 38, p. 360

**** "On Contradiction," Four Essays on Philosophy, Peking ed., p. 62

exists. The proletariat has grown quantitatively until it becomes the "principal aspect" over the bourgeoisie. By Mao keeping the bourgeoisie around as his "unity" of opposites with the proletariat, the same contradiction exists in Mao's "socialism" as in capitalism. How then, is socialism different? The bourgeoisie is "secondary" and the proletariat "principal," say the Maoists. But, these are purely quantitative relationships, with a purely quantitative change, and that doesn't change anything! Mao thinks quantitative change is qualitative change!

From slow quantitative change to fast quantitative change, that is Mao's actual line and practice. And after the fast quantitative change we have slow change again. Once the bourgeoisie and proletariat switch places and the proletariat is on top, the contradiction will eventually disappear, the contradiction will evolve into something else. "Thus the contradiction between bourgeoisie and proletariat, between capitalism and socialism will grow into socialism." Keep the contradiction around because we must balance things out and eventually there will be a cancelling out of opposites. When this will happen, of course, is decades, even centuries according to Mao, and how this will happen, of course, is "a mystery." So Mao did not see qualitative leaps and he was a gradualist, a reformist, a "peaceful roader" when it came to socialism. (We will not deny that Mao did ~~not~~ see contradictions between feudalism and capitalism and he fought these contradictions out to some degree, but he certainly treated the struggle between capitalism and socialism differently. And his gradualist, reformist philosophy which "appears" to have leaps and changes in it did not contradict his practice.)

Let us look closer at Mao's practice regarding quantity and quality. In practice, we can see how Mao's understanding of the transformation of opposites--the transition from quantity to quality--is once again a handmaiden to his political views. Politically, Mao's aspirations for China did not go beyond bourgeois democracy, the capitalist mode of production prevails and state power is held by bourgeois classes. This, essentially, is as far as China's revolution went. Mao's CPC, however, claims that China went over to the dictatorship of the proletariat during the 1950's. We found that China did not achieve a proletarian dictatorship, and that what occurred overall was the consolidation of power by China's progressive bourgeois democrats--power that had been wrested from the old feudal hierarchy. A detailed discussion of how socialism did not exist in China is not within the scope of the present document. What we do intend to show briefly here is that after the bourgeois democratic revolution a transformation of opposites did not occur in China; after the new quality of bourgeois democracy and capitalism (from the old mainly feudal quality) under New Democracy, a new quality of socialism did not come into being. Along with this, we will expose how Mao used his revisionist "dialectics" to portray China's revolution as a qualitative change from a feudal to a socialist one. PAB
11/2

How does Mao summarize the transformation of opposites practically? He states:

"If the bourgeoisie and the proletariat cannot transform themselves into each other, how come that through revolution the proletariat becomes the ruler and the bourgeoisie the ruled? For instance, we stood in diametrical opposition to Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang. As a result of the mutual struggle and the mutual exclusion of the two opposing sides, a change took place in our status and theirs, that is, they turned from the ruler into the ruled." (MSW, Vol. 5, p. 368)

As can be seen, for Mao the transition from quantity to quality comes about

because of a "mere exchange of place." His reasoning is that the bourgeoisie, which was once the "principal aspect" of the contradiction has now become the "non-principal aspect." The proletariat is now the "principal aspect," thus a new quality appears. Of course, from a Marxist-Leninist standpoint, this is not at all a new quality. We've shown this process above. As well, we've already shown how Mao denies that the mutual transformation of opposites represents a resolution of the contradiction and the emergence of a new one, with new opposites. What remains to be seen, then, is what did exist after the revolution in China, since Mao and his cohorts did go from being the ruled to being the rulers. Mao once said:

"Our country at present practices a commodity system, the wage system is unequal too, as in the eight grade wage scale, and so forth. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat such things can only be restricted. Therefore if people like Lin Piao come to power, it will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system." (Basic Understanding of the CPC, p. 219)

Mao wasn't kidding here! It would be easy to rig up the capitalist system in China because it had never been dismantled. The transition from the democratic revolution to the socialist revolution cannot occur until the proletariat resolutely removes the bourgeoisie from power and expropriates it. The democratic revolution cannot "grow into" the socialist revolution and the working class cannot share power with the bourgeoisie and let the bourgeoisie exist if it is to develop the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. The question of the working class attitude toward the bourgeoisie under socialism is one of Marxist-Leninist principle. Lenin said:

"Having overthrown the bourgeoisie and conquered political power, the proletariat has become the ruling class; it wields state power, it exercises control over means of production already socialized; it guides the wavering and intermediary elements and classes; it crushes the increasingly stubborn resistance of the exploiters." (LCW, Vol. 30, p. 115)

"What is the significance of this workers and peasants revolution? It's significance is, first of all, that we shall have a Soviet government, our own organ of power, in which the bourgeoisie will have no share whatsoever." (LCW Vol. 26, p. 239)

"On the contrary, a 'coalition' (alliance) between the working and exploited classes, on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie, on the other cannot be an 'honest coalition' because of the radical divergence of interests between these classes." (LCW Vol. 26, p. 333) (our emphasis)

What we have seen clearly in the Leninist line is that the bourgeoisie and proletariat have diametrically opposed interests under socialism, that the proletariat and poor peasantry cannot share power with the bourgeoisie, and that the dictatorship of the proletariat must ruthlessly crush the inevitable resistance of the bourgeoisie. Failure to carry out this line in conducting the revolution means that a true dictatorship of the proletariat and poor peasantry cannot be established.

Mao's line (which as usual pleads "peculiar Chinese conditions") is quite the opposite of Lenin's. His view of the bourgeoisie in China is well known: the contradiction with the bourgeoisie is non-antagonistic; the bourgeoisie, through "unity-criticism-unity" can be educated to accept socialism; it is necessary

not bourgeoisie - KC-KC makes no distinction.

to have "long-term coexistence and mutual supervision" with the bourgeois parties.⁹ Given Mao's line, how could a dictatorship of the proletariat ever exist in China? But then, why should it? After all, this was never Mao's intention. Instead of moving directly into a form of the proletarian dictatorship after the democratic revolution, Mao introduced his revisionist "New Democracy". New Democracy was not a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but served to consolidate the power of the new rulers, the bourgeois-democrats. Let's examine some of Mao's views on New Democracy.

"The politics of New Democracy which we advocate consists in the overthrow of external oppression and of internal feudal and fascist oppression, and then the setting up not of the old type of democracy but of a political system which is a united front of all the democratic classes." (MSW Vol. 3, p. 230)

"Some people are suspicious and think that once in power, the Communist Party will follow Russia's example and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and a one party system. Our answer is that a new democratic state based on an alliance of the democratic classes is different in principle from a socialist state under the dictatorship of the proletariat. (MSW Vol. 3, p. 234)

"Our general programme of New Democracy will remain unchanged throughout the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, that is, for several decades." (MSW Vol. 3, 235)

In the early to mid-1950's, the CPC began to refer to China as a socialist country, with a dictatorship of the proletariat. It even began to refer to the dictatorship of the proletariat as having begun after 1949.¹⁰ But regardless of what the CPC called China, in fact the same type of coalition government with the bourgeoisie remained. There was no qualitative transformation of China out of a bourgeois-democratic revolution.

New Democracy, as Mao clearly states, is not a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. // Somehow, according to Mao, through education, unity-criticism-unity, and other measures, the bourgeoisie will gradually be integrated into socialism. Of course, this won't end the struggle between the two lines, and between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Nor will the bourgeois parties cease to exist. Class struggle will continue endlessly. Eventually, New Democracy, which is a bourgeois society, will gradually "evolve" into socialism, which will then gradually evolve into communism. Such is the evolutionist essence of Mao's line on transition from quantity to quality. ✓ How?

In 1964, years after they were supposed to have gradually evolved from a bourgeois dictatorship and capitalism into the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism, Mao said:

"The basic idea of Marxism-Leninism is that you must carry out revolution. But what is revolution? Revolution is the proletariat overthrowing the capitalists, the peasants overthrowing the landlords, and then afterwards setting up a workers' and peasants' political power, and moreover continuing to consolidate it. At present, the task of the revolution has not yet been completed; it has not yet been finally determined who, in the end, will overthrow whom. In the Soviet Union, is not Khrushchev in power, is

not the bourgeoisie in power? We, too, have cases in which political power is in the grip of the bourgeoisie; there are production brigades, factories, and hsien committees, as well as district and provincial committees, in which they have their people, there are deputy heads of public security departments who are their men. Who is leading the Ministry of Culture? The cinema and the theatre are entirely in their service, and not in the service of the majority of the people. Who do you say is exercising leadership? To study Marxism-Leninism is to study the class struggle. The class struggle is everywhere; it is in your Institute, a counter-revolutionary has appeared in your Institute, are you aware of this or not? He wrote a reactionary diary filling a dozen or so notebooks, everyday he cursed us, shouldn't he be considered a counter-revolutionary element? Are you people not completely insensitive to class struggle? Isn't it right there beside you? If there were no counter-revolution, then why would we still need revolution?" (Talks with Mao Yuan-hsin", Chairman Mao Talks to the People, p. 243)

What more can be said for the philosophy of someone who seized power, shared it with the bourgeoisie (and the bourgeoisie was already in the party so clearly even the CPC's control was not proletarian), allowed the bourgeoisie to exist, denied that the dictatorship of the proletariat would exist for decades, than a few years later said they had somehow developed into socialism with the dictatorship of the proletariat, and then a decade later still said it hadn't been decided who "would" overthrow who! The only thing more that could be said was put forward by Lenin:

Mao
the
proletariat

"The petty-bourgeois democrats, those sham Socialists who have replaced class struggle by dreams of class harmony, even pictured the socialist transformation in a dreamy fashion—not as the overthrow of the rule of the exploiting class, but as the peaceful submission of the minority to the majority which has become conscious of its aims." (State and Revolution, FLP-Peking, p. 29.

But Mao's philosophy is supposed to be a "higher development" of dialectical materialism. His view of the "principal contradiction" is supposed to give M-L a new revolutionary content and lend to revolutionary analyzes of situations. Since we have already shown Mao's interpretation of dialectical materialism to be conservative and bourgeois, we would expect the same from any "new development" of dialectical materialism in the "principal contradiction". Mao describes the "principal contradiction" as:

"There are many contradictions in the process of development of a complex thing, and one of them is necessarily the principal contradiction whose existence and development determine or influence the existence and development of the other contradictions... there is no doubt at all that at every stage in the development of a process, there is only one principal contradiction which plays the leading role...while the rest occupy a secondary and subordinate position. Therefore in studying any complex process in which there are two or more contradictions, we must devote every effort to finding its principal contradiction. Once this principal contradiction is grasped, all problems can be readily solved. (Mao Zedong, "On Contradiction," Four Essays on Philosophy, p. 51, 53)

For Mao, the principal contradiction is extremely important, yet nowhere in this article, "On Contradiction", (or anywhere else for that matter), is there a presentation of how to analyze a process and determine it. This is a serious criticism in itself but it becomes, in Mao's terminology, a "secondary contradiction", because his "principal contradiction" is wrong for developing M-L strategy, wrong in essence.

In "On Contradiction", Mao talks about how the essence of a process is determined by a fundamental contradiction, which "becomes more and more intensified as it passes from one stage to another in the lengthy process." (p. 43) As an isolated statement this is not incorrect. However, Mao immediately tells us that there are...

"...numerous major and minor contradictions which are determined or influenced by the fundamental contradiction, some become intensified, some are temporarily or partially resolved or mitigated, and some new ones emerge; hence the process is marked by stages." (Ibid., p. 43)

According to Mao, the principal contradiction, "determine(s) or influence(s) the existence and development of the other ("secondary") contradictions", "plays the leading role", and undergoes a "qualitative" change with the passing of one stage to another in a complex process. Yet, also according to Mao, it is the fundamental contradiction that "determine(s) and influence(s)" the "major (principal?--ed.) and minor contradictions". [It would seem that the principal and fundamental contradiction are one and the same to Mao:] "...in capitalist society the two forces in contradiction, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, form the principal contradiction. The other contradictions...are all determined or influenced by this principal contradiction"; (p. 51); "...when the capitalism of the era of free competition developed into imperialism, there was no change in the class nature of the two classes in fundamental contradiction, namely, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie..." (p. 43) In spite of the fact that Mao tends to use principal and fundamental contradiction interchangeably, they can't possibly be the same because Mao clearly states that the principal contradiction changes from stage to stage in a complex process, while the fundamental contradiction, the essence of the process, intensifies from stage to stage but remains basically unchanged. Mao's incorrect terminology, if it was just that, would simply be another defect. But there is something more than just confused terminology involved in the interchangeable use of principal and fundamental contradiction.

Mentioning the fundamental contradiction provides an appearance of taking the strategic interests and strategic objectives into account. The interchangeable use provides a smokescreen so that it may seem that the strategic (fundamental) is (somehow) being taken into account in the tactical struggles. One thing is clear from reading Mao is that the principal contradiction is the main thing, "plays the leading role". What should be strategy and the strategic objective is subordinated by Mao to tactics--his "principal" and "secondary" contradictions. Mao's "stages" are generally tactical periods.*

*In the interests of consistency, which does not exist in M-L literature in this area, we use period in a tactical sense to distinguish the ebb and flow of revolution during a given stage. Period becomes the smaller block of time, frequently several years. Generally speaking, there are several periods within a given stage of the revolutionary process, while a revolutionary process, (in a narrow historical context), may have more than one stage, e.g., the Russian revolution, which had a second, socialist stage. In the U.S., there is a one stage proletarian

The Chinese revolution was a very long bourgeois-democratic, anti-imperialist revolution. Mao describes this revolution as having passed through certain "stages". Mao is definitely talking about tactical periods:

"Take the process of China's bourgeois-democratic revolution, which began with the Revolution of 1911; it, too, has several distinct stages. In particular, the revolution in its period (notice Mao uses period and stage interchangeably--ed.) of bourgeois leadership and the revolution in its period of proletarian leadership represent two vastly different historical stages. In other words, proletarian (in reality, petty-bourgeois dominated--ed.) leadership has fundamentally changed the whole face of the revolution, has brought about a new alignment of classes, given rise to a tremendous upsurge in the peasant revolution, imparted thoroughness to the revolution against imperialism and feudalism, created the possibility (it remained just that!--ed.) of the transition from the democratic revolution to the socialist revolution, and so on. None of these was possible in the period when the revolution was under bourgeois leadership. Although no change has taken place in the nature of the fundamental contradiction in the process as a whole..." (Ibid., p. 44)

It is, of course, not our intention here to analyze the Chinese revolution and delineate the various tactical periods in the first stage: this is beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, from the above quote, it should be clear that the strategic objective in the Chinese bourgeois-democratic, anti-imperialist revolution has not changed. However, Mao states that during each tactical period ("stage") there, "...must be (a) principal contradiction playing the leading and decisive role, while the rest occupy a secondary and subordinate position."* By making some tactical objective play, "the leading and decisive role", this obviously places the strategic objective and strategic understanding of class forces into the background. Without the strategic understanding in the forefront it is not possible, from a proletarian standpoint, to correctly work out tactics. But according to Mao, strategy is "secondary and subordinate" to the "principal contradiction", which is some tactical problem Mao has brought to the fore. Mao disunites with Stalin who summed up the M-L principle that, "Tactics are a part of strategy, subordinate to it and serving it."** But with Mao, we get such pragmatic tactical slogans as, "unite all who can be united", which liquidates a general M-L strategic orientation of class forces, liquidates the main blow against the compromising forces (i.e., those forces who would compromise the strategic objective). In sum, Mao inverts the relationship between the strategic objective and the tactical objectives, subordinates strategy to tactics, thus revealing, in essence, tactics-as-a process, instead of tactics-as-a-plan. One side of Mao's tactics-as-a-process can be found in his empiricism and bowing to spontaneity (from the right), which Lenin so incisively criticized ideologically in What Is To Be Done? Perhaps part of the reason for Mao's fixation on the imme-

revolution. The transition from socialism (which in itself is the transition from capitalism to classless society), to communism would be another stage. In a broader historical context, all revolutionary processes consist of more than one stage. The conventional use of the the term two-stage revolutions, which we think is correct, has to do with the proximity of the one stage to the other, the passing over of a bourgeois-democratic, anti-imperialist revolution into a proletarian (socialist) revolution without a lengthy time lag.

* Mao Zedong, "On Contradiction," Four Essays on Philosophy, Peking edition, p. 53

** J. V. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, Peking edition, p. 86

diate was because, according to him, he was "hungry for success" and wanted "quick results" like Confucius and Mo-tzu.* This is nothing more than the expression of naked opportunism, the sacrificing of the long-term, strategic interests of the Chinese and world proletariat for some immediate, tactical "success"--the line of least resistance to obtain "quick results." e.g. 20 years of armed struggle

Mao's subordination of strategy to tactics is to be found in his petty-bourgeois nationalism. Consider the above quote again. What "process" does Mao give as an "example" (which is typical)? The bourgeois-democratic revolution. The process that must be analyzed and elaborated in those colonies and nations requiring a two-stage revolution is precisely the two distinct stages as an indestructable whole. It could be objected to that Mao did this later, with his "New Democracy" and during the "stage" of "socialist construction". Let us briefly sum up in essence how Mao dealt with the "principal contradiction" under "socialism".

It is well known that Mao held that the principal contradiction under "socialism" is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Here is what Mao had to say about this contradiction at a time when allegedly "socialist construction" (really state capitalist construction) was going on:

"...the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie belongs to the category of contradictions among the people. By and large, the class struggle between the two is a class struggle within the ranks of the people, because the Chinese national bourgeoisie has a dual character. In the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, it had a revolutionary as well as a conciliationist side to its character. In the period of the socialist revolution, exploitation of the working class for profit constitutes one side of the character of the national bourgeoisie, while its support of the Constitution and its willingness to accept socialist (sic) transformation constitute the other. The national bourgeoisie differs from the imperialists, the landlords and the bureaucrat-capitalists. The contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working class is one between the exploiter and the exploited, and is therefore antagonistic in nature. But in the concrete conditions of China, this antagonistic contradiction can, if properly handled, be transformed into a non-antagonistic one and be resolved by peaceful methods. However, it can change into a contradiction between ourselves and the enemy if we(!) do not handle it properly (sic) and do not follow the policy of uniting with, criticizing and educating the national bourgeoisie, or if the national bourgeoisie does not accept this policy of ours". (Mao Zedong, "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People", Four Essays on Philosophy, p. 82.

We know Mao's "principal contradiction" is tactical, thus his stated differences with the national bourgeoisie are tactical and not of a strategic nature. In the above quote, Mao expresses a strategic orientation toward the national bourgeoisie; yet, typical of Mao, he does not lay out the strategic objective of the stage of socialism, i.e. to abolish classes generally--actual classes with respect to the ownership and control of the means of production, mental and manual labor, town and country, class relations, and class ideas. Mao does not do that because then he would have to try to explain how a contradiction that is truly "antagonistic in nature" can "in the concrete conditions of China" be "resolved by peaceful methods". Mao's "peaceful transition" line, which is in essence the same

*Mao Zedong, quoted in Chairman Mao Talks to the People, Stuart Shram editor, p. 120.

counter-revolutionary line Bukharin advocated in the Soviet Union for the kulaks, reveals that his differences with the national bourgeoisie are not of a strategic nature. The attempted trick by Mao in the above quote is in not defining "socialist transformation". How is it in the objective class interests of the Chinese national bourgeoisie to "accept" elimination of their very privileged existence? Mao is silent. How is it that the Chinese national bourgeoisie will "accept" living by laboring instead of living by exploiting wage-labor? "Freeing" himself of elaborating the scientific strategic objective of socialism and a general strategic orientation of class forces, Mao is free to assert anything he pleases. The only reason the national bourgeoisie "accepts" "transformation" is because it is really state capitalist transformation under the guise of a society of friendly "people". Mao advanced the tactical weapon of the "principal contradiction" between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat precisely in order to subordinate the latter to the former while the bourgeoisie was exercising its dictatorship all along, and eventually had no need for the petty bourgeois centrists as the events after Mao's death reveal. Naturally, subordination of strategy to tactics always results in a great setback, which the Chinese proletariat suffered under Mao Zedong Thought and his "principal contradiction".

Mao is not adverse to class struggle and even bringing the tactical "principal contradiction" between the proletariat and bourgeoisie to the fore. Remember that this contradiction is "non-antagonistic" if "handled properly". Thus, a certain balancing can be obtained. The national bourgeoisie does not have full control and can be kept in check (it wasn't), and certainly the proletariat is kept at bay and subordinated to the bourgeoisie through Mao's petty bourgeois centrists. Here is a portion of Mao's "thought" in 1964, allegedly during "socialism":

"Let them go in for capitalism. Society is very complex. If one only goes in for socialism and not for capitalism, isn't that too simple? Wouldn't we then lack the unity of opposites, and be merely one-sided? Let them do it. Let them attack us madly, demonstrate in the streets, take up arms to rebel--I approve all of these things. Society is very complex, there is not a simple commune, single hsien, a single department of the Central Committee, in which one cannot divide into two (or combining the bourgeoisie and proletariat into one "socialist" society--ed.)....In our state at present approximately one third of the power is in the hands of the enemy or of the enemy's sympathizers. We have been going for fifteen years and we now control two thirds of the the realm. At present, you can buy a (party) branch secretary for a few packs of cigarettes, not to mention marrying a daughter to him. There are some localities where land reform was carried out peacefully, and the land reform teams were very weak; now you can see that there are a lot of problems here." (Mao Zedong, Chairman Mao Talks to the People, p. 216, 217)

According to Mao, the bourgeoisie is right in the state, but this is a "good thing" because it represents a "unity of opposites". Mao advised over and over that the bourgeoisie was right in the CPC, but he never advised to clear them out of the party, he never did clear them out of the party. Thus the CPC had to have factions, and have factions it did:

"Do we have a party outside our Party? I think that we do, and that we have factions inside the Party. We used to criticize the Kuomintang, who said: 'No party outside the Party is autocracy; no factions

inside the Party is nonsense.' The same applies to us. You may say that there are no factions in our Party, but there are." (Ibid., p. 263)

Mao went on to say that: "It is just a question of which faction is the majority and which is the minority." Yet, according to those centrists "guided by" MZT all this is "organizational leniency" and not revisionist theory and practice, or it is two-line struggle, etc. Yet, what Mao writes and what happened flies in the face of these assertions. "Apparently life is too comfortable in imperialist, superprofitted America to need to come to grips with objective truth."

Mao advised that "class struggle was the key link," meaning that tactically at that point in time it was necessary to check the bourgeoisie, to keep it from taking over altogether. Mao's line and practice had led to this. In spite of his statements about "class struggle is the key link," or phrase-mongering about the "dictatorship of the proletariat in China", Mao's line and practice did not extend beyond petty bourgeois class struggle.

— Lenin did develop and correctly employ the key link* or main link, the key or main tactic in the interconnected web of immediate tasks. Lenin's key link differs radically from Mao's "principal contradiction" because, in the first place, Mao submerges strategy to tactics-as-a-process. Stalin sums up the Leninist theory on the key link with an important illustration:

"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 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..."

In the period of the formation of the Party, when the innumerable circles and organizations had not yet been linked together, when amateurishness and the parochial outlook of the circles were corroding the Party from top to bottom, when ideological confusion was the characteristic feature of the internal life of the Party, the main link and the main task in the chain of links and in the chain of tasks then confronting the Party proved to be the establishment of an all-Russian illegal newspaper (Iskra). Why? Because, under the conditions then prevailing, only by means of an all-Russian illegal newspaper was it possible to create a solid core of the Party capable of uniting the innumerable circles and organizations into one whole, to prepare the conditions for ideological and tactical unity; and thus to build the foundations for the formation of a real party." (J. V. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, FLP Peking edition, p. 95-96)

Lenin advanced the Iskra plan at that time in Russia in order to facilitate the building of a proletarian party capable of leading the overthrow of the autocracy. Thus, the Leninist key link is some tactic that facilitates tactical objectives which are subordinate to and serving strategy. Mao's "principal contradiction" as shown earlier subordinates strategy--essentially liquidates proletarian strategy--

*In the past, we tried to apply the key link in a tactical sense, and also to develop a strategic orientation to party building through singling out a strategic party building task as key. This latter line of thinking is presently under analysis as is our entire party building line as we break with the revisionism-centrism of "Mao Zedong Thought" and the PLA.

in favor of keying on some tactical objective. However, the keyed on tactic cannot be correct because M-L class analysis of forces and general strategic orientation are not guiding this process. Hence, the MZT "principal contradiction" is different in essence from the Leninist key link, although there may appear to be similarities. They are just that: appearance. Mao, and his MZT followers in the U.S. (and elsewhere), refuse(d) to develop and employ Marxist-Leninist strategy. What is M-L strategy? Again, Stalin with the principle and an illustration which remains valid today in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution:

"Strategy is the determination of the direction of the main blow of the proletariat at a given stage of the revolution, the elaboration of a corresponding plan for the disposition of the revolutionary forces (main and secondary reserves), the fight to carry out this plan throughout the given stage of the revolution...

Third stage. Began after the October revolution. Objective: to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a base for the defeat of imperialism in all countries. The revolution spreads beyond the confines of one country; the epoch of world revolution has begun. The main forces of the revolution: the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all countries. Main reserves: the semi-proletarian and small peasant masses in the developed countries, the liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries. Direction of the main blow: isolation of the petty-bourgeois democrats, isolation of the parties of the Second International, which constitutes the main support of the policy of compromise with imperialism. Plan for the disposition of forces: alliance of the proletarian revolution with the liberation movement in the colonies and the dependent countries.

Strategy deals with the main forces of the revolution and their reserves. It changes with the passing of the revolution from one stage to another, but remains basically unchanged throughout a given stage." (J.V. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism. pp. 84, 85-86)

Why do the Maoists avoid M-L "strategy" in general and in particular the main blow? An essential reason is that ^{and Lenin?} class conscious proletarian forces must include the MZT'ers (in essence) as part of the main blow. A substantial portion of the main blow must be directed at the centrist followers of Mao Zedong.

Mao disagrees with the negation of the negation. On the one hand, he never deals with it--his major philosophical writings, On Practice and On Contradiction, omit it without mention. On the other hand, in "Talks on Questions of Philosophy"* he states outright that he disagrees with "Engels" on this. He should make it clear that he disagrees with Marx, Engels and Lenin on this since they all used the negation of the negation. But to disagree with Marx and Lenin is another thing, right Mao! And perhaps Mao is worried about that little talk he thinks he is going to have with Marx when he dies (See Chairman Mao Talks to the People, Pantheon Asia library, p. 154). Anyway, Mao cannot bring himself to agree with the negation of the negation. Mao says, "There is no such thing as the negation of the negation. Affirmation, negation, affirmation, negation...in the development of things, every link in the chain of events is both affirmation and negation."*

As with all of his philosophical views, Mao's denial of the negation of the negation serves to justify his opportunist political positions. Rather than breaking

* Chairman Mao Talks to the People, p.226

new philosophical ground, as some claim, Mao's views only show that his philosophical outlook is not in accordance with Marxism-Leninism. What we can see here is that his views on the negation of the negation is consistent with and follows the pattern of his opportunist conception of the unity of opposites.

Can Mao's affirmation-negation, etc. explain the course of development of contradiction? No. No more than he could explain the transformation of opposites. What is the contradiction here? Affirmation and negation? Where is this contradiction leading too--affirmation-negation?? To Mao, "affirmation and negation" are only opposites. They stand in relation to each other only as other things, not in any way as having roots in each other, or being a part of each other or negating each other. So we cannot see the relationship between the opposites and we do not see any sublation occurring or synthesis arising as a result. So far we have empty, separate, opposites. Motion is going from one opposite to another, in a metaphysical, disjointed way. Mao's examples bring this out: ???

"Slave-holding society negated primitive society, but with reference to feudal society it constituted, in turn, the affirmation. Feudal society constituted the negation in relation to slave-holding society but it was in turn the affirmation with reference to capitalist society. Capitalist society was the negation in relation to feudal society, but it is, in turn, the affirmation in relation to socialist society." ("Talks on Questions of Philosophy", Chairman Mao Talks to the People, p. 226)

So slavery, feudalism, capitalism and socialism are just affirmation-negation, each is both in their different relations to each other. This is so far away from a dialectical approach which reflects the development of one system out of another, the negation of the old, the development of the negation within the negation, and finally the return to the old at a higher level. Mao was too concerned with the fact that in form those systems are opposites to each other, picking two systems out at a time to compare, that he missed any discussion of the content of each scheme which again, identifies opposites, but cannot see opposites within identity, cannot elaborate the relations and the resultant motion.

ch Mao eventually has to admit that, "Naturally, in the process of development everything is not all that pure." * And he goes on to give examples of the remnants of past systems in newer ones. Mao had to concede to the very dialectics of life that he omits from his outlook. It is precisely the impurity of life, the opposites arising within something, the new thing carrying the old within it, that is the dialectics of the material world. Having metaphysically separated opposites into polar ones, then having to concede to the relativity of polariness, Mao then sticks his polar opposites together into one thing as his "unity" of opposites, and as his "synthesis".

"What is the method of synthesis? Is it possible that primitive society can exist side-by-side with slave-holding society? They do exist side-by-side, but this is only a small part of the whole. The overall picture is that primitive society is going to be eliminated."

With his polar opposites Mao can only see synthesis as a combination of two opposites rather than a new quality which is the result of the development of opposing tendencies, negation, the carrying of the first within that negation and the negation of the negation which carries aspects of the negation and returns to the old content at a higher level. Mao sees a preservation of the opposites rather than the negation of both opposites and a new process emerging.

*Ibid. p. 227.

It is ridiculous to say that primitive society exists side-by-side with something else and is going to be "eliminated". It "in essence" has been negated, and this means that it may exist in a few cases in the world and aspects of it have carried through in culture, but it has been negated by class society. And when class society is negated, we will again have a classless society, as was primitive society, only at a much higher level, having all the intervening technology and developed forces of production, science, etc.

Clearly, Mao's denial of the negation of the negation must be related to his metaphysical "principal" aspect, with aspects switching sides. As we have shown, a change of place, even from a secondary to a dominant position, does not mean a new quality. A switching of sides with its quantitative change and preservation of quality, obviously has not contained any "negations", anywhere in it, let alone a "negation of the negation"!

The thing most significant about Mao's denial of the negation of the negation is the denial of progression, of the spiral movement of processes and his preservation of contradiction. Affirmation, negation, affirmation, negation, putting them side by side (Mao's "unity") or stacking them on top of each other (Mao's "interpenetration") as Mao does, leads to preservation and circular development. Of course Mao theoretically and occasionally mentions progression, but philosophically and practically he negates it.

As we've stated above, the negation of the negation shows in general, how development is progressive. This general progression is not in a straight line, as reversals do occur. As well, simply because the negation of negation does not always occur in particulars, or through our own manipulations we can halt or even destroy steps leading to the negation of the negation, or if we use the negation or negation in a purely mechanical, incorrect way, all this does not mean that it is not the general course of development. As Engels states:

"Negation in dialectics does not simply mean saying no, or declaring that something does not exist, or destroying it in any way one likes... I must therefore so construct the first negation that the second remains or becomes possible." (Anti-Duhring, p. 155)

By denying the negation of the negation, Mao actually denies the forward motion that generally characterizes dialectical development. As a result, Mao's "dialectical" development is consecutive and cyclical rather than revolutionary and spiral. Mao's cycles can be seen clearly in his characterizations of both socialist society and the internal life of the party. Mao says:

"To talk all the time about unity is a 'pool of stagnant water'; it can lead to coldness. We must destroy the old basis for unity, pass through a struggle, and unite on a new basis... It's like this with the Party, and it's like this too, with classes and the people. Unity--struggle--unity: this means we have done our work." ("Talks at Chengtu" Chairman Mao Talks to the People, p. 108)

Actually this view of Mao's capsulizes his whole view of dialectics. We have a "unity" of two opposites, they are polar, in balance, in harmony together. They pass through a stage of disunity and struggle, they work things out and they enter into a new phase of harmony and unity. Quantity changes to... a different quantity (tempo-wise), which gives rise to a new quantity. But Mao says it is a "new" (qualitative) unity. How can the unity be new when all we did was agitate the

N of
the
N:

* opposing sides a little? Mao said nothing of one side (within the unity or within the struggle) negating the other. And always we go from unity to unity. This is strange in a world of contradictions which shows daily that struggle, change is absolute and any harmony is very relative, temporary and unstable! Moreover, Mao's unity-struggle-unity shows his view of thesis-antithesis-synthesis as being "unity" (coexistence) of two opposites rather than a form of the negation of the negation where opposites are negated and a new process arises. Mao's end result, as always, is a preservation of the contradiction: unity (preservation)-struggle (within preservation)-unity(preservation at a higher level). As an example of this preservation, Mao says:

"The present great cultural revolution is only the first; there will inevitably be many more in the future... 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." (Peking Review, No. 22, 1967, p. 38)

Rather than a ^{''}deepening of the general negation of the negation, the elimination of classes, which should occur if you are under socialism (socialism is the transition period to communism and as such it is the period of the negation of class society which negated primitive communalism), instead we have a preservation of the very contradictions needing to be negated. The bourgeoisie as a class is not being eliminated, and the bourgeoisie is not kept out of the party. Things thus balanced, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat get to fight it out over and over again. Each of these "struggles", rather than expelling the bourgeoisie, expropriating it, taking power from it, is merely a beating back to a point of "balance"; the struggle does not result in the establishment of an M-L line in the party, nor in proletarian dictatorship or socialism. Instead we continue with a bourgeois party and capitalist state. The "balancing" act is actually a subordination of the proletariat to the bourgeoisie. Thus, the "cultural revolutions" go on and on, the proletariat never in power, the bourgeoisie essentially in power.

Mao's view of "two-line struggle" gives similar results as the above example. Using Mao's reasoning, the bourgeoisie and proletariat must be balanced in the party, the proletariat really subordinate to the bourgeoisie. Thus the party is not really qualitatively different than bourgeois parties. To Mao, no spiral development occurs in the establishment of the proletarian party. Then, during the life of the party, "two line struggle" must continue, the party never ridding itself of the bourgeois line. Factions are "independent of man's will". Since there will always be two lines, there will always be factions. The struggle never leads to spiral development--that is, removal of the bourgeois line, bourgeois individuals, smashing of factions, the establishment of the M-L line and proletarian discipline and unity--but cyclical development, the "two line struggle" and factions over and over again. The CPC and China are both good examples of what Mao's denial of negation of the negation leads to in practice.

Mao must disagree with the negation of the negation because it stands for the resolving of the contradiction, for the revolutionary leaps, for the upward progression, while he stands for preservation of the contradiction, quantitative change, cyclical development. Mao did not bother to try to refute the negation of the negation as a law of nature. He just simply dismisses it. His followers, however, feel that this needs an explanation. The negation of the negation is not a general law since there are so many cases where, "the negation of the negation doesn't hold", they explain. Even cases in which the negation of the

* contrasts sharply w/ K-C's expectations of socialism.

negation is used incorrectly and opportunistically such as the Communist Labor Party's view that the Soviet Union is socialist since the negation of the negation occurred there, is brought up as a refutation of the negation of the negation as a law of development. What is not understood is that the negation of the negation in terms of establishing classless society never occurred in the Soviet Union, and therefore setbacks could occur. And as far as the negation of the negation not holding in many cases, we have already explained that it has to be seen as a general law and all particulars do not necessarily follow it. Just because plants in general produce seeds which, in general, develop into new plants, doesn't mean that each particular plant follows this. "But, for some the woods cannot be seen for the trees."

We have proved that the negation of the negation is a law, and, most important for communists, one which shows the bright future of classless society. Such argumentation by Mao's followers falls flat and all that is left is the reformist, conservative essence of MZT. And, if Maoists still try to get by with their "explanation", we can only say to them: "don't call yourselves communists then," since you deny communism, the negation of negation in society, and you don't deserve the name. And we must add what Engels had to say to Duhring:

"The law of the negation of the negation, which is unconsciously operative in Nature and history, and until it has been recognised, also in our heads, was only clearly formulated for the first time by Hegel. And if Herr Duhring wants to use it himself on the quiet and it is only the name which he cannot stand, let him find a better name. But if his aim is to expel the process itself from thought, we must ask him to be so good as first to banish it from Nature and history and to invent a mathematical system in which $-a \times -a$ is not $+a^2$ and in which the differential and integral calculus are prohibited under severe penalties."
(Anti-Duhring, p. 156)

III. How Mao's Empiricism, Idealism and Metaphysics Provided an Ideological Foundation for the "Anti-Revisionist Communist Movement"

Since the inception of what came to be known as the "anti-revisionist communist movement," most of the organizations have taken "Mao Zedong Thought" as their ideological basis, even though MZT may not be stated as such. Mao Zedong Thought, with its simplistic formulas and catch-phrases, became a substitution for Marxism-Leninism. The works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin were shunned for the most part as being "too difficult." Mao's writings, on the other hand, were "easy to understand." As a result, the movement developed amid gross theoretical deficiencies. As we've stated before, Mao's writings were not only simplistic, they were revisionist. Thus, by taking MZT as our theoretical guide, rather than the orthodoxy of Marxism-Leninism, we were bound to violate the principles of Marxism-Leninism. In accordance with MZT, M-L was not really "applicable" to current conditions in the U.S. The important principles of M-L were thrown out the door for the "development of theory from our practice." In addition to this, since MZT directly revised M-L principles, these revisions were the ones that were taken up. This is how we got programmatic views of "unite all who can be united" instead of a political economy, class analysis of the country, and analysis of the National and Woman Questions, based on M-L principles, which points out the allies, indirect reserves, and where the main blow should be aimed. This is how we got views that the national liberation movements are the "principal contradiction" in the world today, denying the need for proletarian leadership of those movements, for the need to carry the struggle to and through proletarian socialist revolution, and denying socialist revolution in the capitalist and imperialist countries.

One of MZT's biggest contributions to the movement's degeneration was Mao's line on the theory of knowledge. Whereas for Mao knowledge was based on his practice and that of the CPC, our knowledge, then, had to be based on our "practice." Whereas Mao aimed most of his fire at the "dogmatists and book-worshippers," the movement took aim against "the separation of theory and practice." As a result, the concept of practice became one of the worst vulgarizations of Marxist terminology in the movement, and the actual practice matched this.

We've established that practice represents the sum-total of human experience. For communists, Marxism-Leninism represents knowledge whose basis is the practice of the world-wide communist and working-class movement. Thus the basis of our knowledge of the laws of revolution already exists. Our own, personal practice is not the basis of our knowledge as Mao insists. But, following Mao, the credo of our movement was that a group had to be out in force "among the masses", or else be branded "closet communists"--guilty of separating theory from practice, of dogmatism, of book-worship. The concept of practice was reduced to involving ourselves in the spontaneous mass movements. In fact, however, this outlook does not convey a materialist understanding of practice. Everything an organization does is its practice. And every organization does something. Thus, there is no such thing as this or that group doesn't engage in practice. The question for our movement became whether or not an organization did "practice" in the Maoist sense. The question should have been what kind of practice did a group have. Let's examine this in light of party building and our corresponding tasks.

The Leninist line in the initial stage of party building was summed up this way by Stalin:

"The principal task of communism in Russia in that period was to recruit into the Party the best elements of the working class, those who were most active and most devoted to the cause of the proletariat; to form the ranks of the proletarian party and to put it firmly on its feet. Comrade Lenin formulates

this task as follows: 'to win the vanguard of the proletariat to the side of Communism.'" "Propaganda as the chief form of activity." ("The Party Before and After Taking Power" and "Political Strategy and Tactics" both SCW Vol 5, p. 104 and 83)

Stalin also spoke of the need to work out a scientific programme, map out a general strategic orientation, and develop tactical principles. The practice of the movement should have thus corresponded to the tasks; weld the core of professional revolutionaries, do M-L theoretical work to develop the programme, strategy and tactics, develop propaganda, identify, win and train advanced workers, etc. This line ran into stiff resistance in the movement because it opposed the Maoist orientation. This line, after all, would lead to "book-worship," to repudiating the "mass line." Mao wants us to be one with the masses, and thus it is "sectarian" to concentrate on the vanguard. The result of this line was that most of the movement's energy went into an assortment of anti-imperialist coalitions, fight-back committees, "free-this-person and justice-for-that-person" coalitions, caucuses and strike committees, etc. The core was not welded. The vanguard was not won.

Since "practice" is being among the masses, and a large portion of the masses in this country are workers, a big view of the movement was that intellectuals and students should "go into the factories." A large part of the ideological basis of this was the advanced capitalist country's MZT version of "going to the countryside" which was Mao's advice to the intellectuals there to give them the "practice" they needed and get rid of their one-sidedness. Intellectuals and students here especially felt the need to be in the factories because of some difficulty in getting petty bourgeois jobs, and the type of jobs in the working class which could be obtained were not that far from their own economic status (i.e. these jobs were labor aristocratic or extremely benefitted--more analysis needs to be done on this). There was some economic interest in going into the factories. Also, the dominant spontaneous tendency being reformism and economism, and the working class movement in an ebb, they felt they needed to push forward economic struggle. They felt they must help develop the working class movement itself so they could "lead" the economic struggle. The anti-theoretical outlook in the U.S. also added to such motion. So intellectuals and students went into the factory, tried to become "workers", and engaged in economist work. Rather than doing what they can best do for workers--develop the ideological basis and political line, and take this to advanced workers, in order to begin fusion and develop the consciousness and organization of the working class (which does not necessitate being in the factories), the intellectuals tried to "lead" the workers at what workers are able to do themselves --carry out the economic struggle. This MZT line of "implantation" or "proletarianization" meant all or nearly all of the members of organizations would be engaged in plant work. Or if a group had more of a petty bourgeois basis members would be implanted in various coalitions and mass organizations. The theoretical development and skills of members thus remained underdeveloped because of this, the movement has literally negated the development of professional revolutionary organizations, organizations whose members are theoretically developed, ideologically grounded in Marxism-Leninism, skilled in carrying out propaganda and agitation and in organizing the working class. The development of professional revolutionary organizations is so opposed to "proletarianization", "implantation" or any concentration on mass work, that "professional revolutionary" is not even a phrase in the movement's vocabulary.

Also with regard to party building, the Leninist line of drawing lines of demarcation with opportunism and revisionism was thrown out in favor of "unite, don't split." This orientation stems from Mao's famous formula conceived in 1942: unity-criticism-unity. As Mao put it:

very general

"The essential thing is to start from the desire for unity. For without this desire for unity, the struggle is certain to get out of hand. Wouldn't this be the same as 'ruthless struggle and merciless blows'? And what Party unity would there be left? It was this very experience that led us to the formula: 'unity, criticism, unity.'" ("On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People," Four Essays on Philosophy, Peking ed. p. 88)

For Mao the essential thing is to start from the desire for unity at any cost, thus compromises are predicated. An essential matter for developing the M-L trend is to draw lines of demarcation against all varieties of revisionism and opportunism, to unite only on the basis of carrying out the M-L line in practice. This is Marxist-Leninist unity. Lenin elaborated the correct orientation on this question as follows:

"Unity is a great thing and a great slogan. But what the workers' cause needs is the unity of Marxists, not unity between Marxists and opponents and distorters of Marxism." (Lenin, "Unity," LCW Vol 20, p. 232)

It wasn't the Leninist line that was followed in the "anti-revisionist" movement, it was the MZT line of "unite, don't split," "unity-criticism-unity," "unity-struggle-unity," etc. This basic MZT line was implemented with MZT dialectics, i.e. metaphysics.

Thus, 8 parties?

As we previously showed, Mao treats identity as coexistence, as two existing within one. "Two-line struggle" within "the party," within "the movement," and within the circles, is one prominent illustration of this. Mao's "dialectics" holds that the proletarian party must contain both a bourgeois line and a proletarian line as its "unity of opposites." Such a unity finds its expression in various factions within "the party," "the movement," and the circles. No need to worry about this, the important thing from the MZT viewpoint is to make sure that the "proletarian" line is the "main aspect." Should this line become the "secondary aspect," it must struggle to return to the dominant position again. This phenomenon repeats itself endlessly in a metaphysical circle, rising only to higher levels of organized opportunism. This petty bourgeois thesis prevents the proletariat from ever achieving the class-conscious, iron unity of will and action around the M-L line that characterizes the proletarian party. The proletariat absolutely needs such a party to maintain and develop the proletarian revolutionary line in practice, to overthrow the bourgeoisie and smash its state power, to establish the dictatorship and build socialism, to suppress and eliminate the bourgeoisie, progressively eliminate bourgeois relations and eventually achieve classless society. Mao's thesis, which is a theoretical justification for the social-democratic party, if followed, would result in the rapid degeneration of proletarian parties and organizations by legitimizing the organizational existence of petty bourgeois and bourgeois factions and elements rather than purging them. The bourgeoisie always seeks dominance, and once achieved, suppresses the proletariat, continuing to suppress any dissent that threatens (or seems to threaten) their rule. Bourgeois and petty bourgeois factions in a bourgeois-revisionist party do not in general threaten bourgeois-revisionist or bourgeois rule, except where such a party is a fifth column.

— Mao's concept of "two-line struggle" and the resulting opportunism has held sway in our movement since "the movement's" inception. This has meant that when recruiting or merging has taken place in the movement, it has often occurred with the vaguest of principles as a basis of unity. All differences are left to be settled by the two-line struggles. Thus, as an example, the Revolutionary Union in 1975 and Workers Viewpoint Organization in 1976 (both staunch Maoist groups to this day) attempted to recruit KCRWC into their proposed parties, although differences existed on a number of important questions. Their view was that we should join the party anyway, and all differences would be settled through the line

struggle. The result of this type of practice has been a movement with organizations characterized by factionalism, flabbiness and compromised in principle, and unable to become Bolshevik, fighting organizations of the proletariat. There has been an inability to draw clear and principled lines of demarcation with opportunist lines since these lines are necessary to maintain Mao's "unity of opposites." In this situation it is inevitable that groupings and factions will appear. As well, an organization that is formed with a line based on the lowest common denominator, and that refuses to purge factions and rid themselves of opportunist lines, can only give unprincipled and opportunist leadership to the proletariat.

NS
↓

Another example of MZT dialectics can be seen from examining how the Multi-lateral Conference on Party Building (MJLC)² came to be. We "reasoned" that the MZT-oriented small circles had not yet "consolidated" their practice of bowing to spontaneity, economism, reformism, etc. True, this was their "main aspect." Still, there was promise in them because their "secondary aspect" was opposition (objectively revisionist-centrist) to trotskyism, Soviet revisionism, the (new) "theory of the three worlds" and the rights in the CPC, etc. The MJLC was to center and did center on the character of the party, how to build the party. Through struggle (which turned out to be more "positioning" than anything else) we thought some circles would "come to their senses" and take up organized theoretical work and struggle, etc., and in this way we could convince them to abandon their bowing to spontaneity, economism, reformism, etc. Thus, their "main aspect" would become Marxist-Leninist, the prevailing disunity would be "transformed" into unity, at least for some circles. This would exert pressure on other circles to abandon their rightist ways. The MJLC was a complete practical failure. Lost in all the mental shuffle of "main aspect," "secondary aspect," and "transformation" was: what was the essence of all the MZT-oriented small circles from the standpoint of M-L principles in their concrete application? "We were all revisionist-centrist with shades of difference. They still are." Marxist-Leninist unity cannot be built with the centrists, let alone the open rights, because centrism is lip-service to Marxism-Leninism--and frequently it wasn't and isn't even that--and revisionism and opportunism in practice. That's why the practice of these MZT-oriented circles (including those politically following, embellishing, and justifying the PLA's revisionism-centrism) remains economist, reformist, and social-chauvinist. Marxist-Leninist unity can only be built by drawing lines of demarcation in practice against all departures from Marxsim-Leninism, especially centrism and rightism. As much as we tried, we couldn't make any real headway in building up the M-L party because we were ideologically "guided" by MZT and it kept taking us in a circle, corresponding to Mao's metaphysics. Finally, with repeated empiricist, practical failures and theoretical criticism from others, we began to study MZT and M-L ideologically. Initial efforts in assimilating Marxist-Leninist ideology have enabled us to make some headway in breaking with centrism ideologically, politically and organizationally. "We have a long way to go." But as Marx remarked in the "Preface to the French Edition" of Capital: "There is no royal road to science, and only those who do not dread the fatiguing climb of its steep paths have a chance of gaining its luminous summits."*

?
Another tenet of MZT which is widely proclaimed in the "anti-revisionist communist movement" is the theory of the "principal contradiction." As we explained previously, no where in Mao's writings does he instruct his readers on how to analyze a process and determine its "principal contradiction." Yet, finding such a contradiction, according to Mao,** is the key to solving all complex problems. A good example of how Mao's line works in practice can be made using the four basic contradictions in the world. These are between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between oppressed nations and imperialism, among the financial groups and powers, and between capitalism and socialism. The MZTers hold that the

* Marx, Capital, Vol 1, International Publishers, p. 21

**And the PLA: see Ndreci Plasari, "The Vanguard and the Socialist Construction," Albania Today, 1972

"principal contradiction" in the world since WWII is between the oppressed nations and imperialism. In the struggle for self-determination many colonies and semi-colonies have achieved political independence and this was progressive, and even revolutionary development in many cases. However, these struggles were led, without exception, by bourgeois forces, some by bourgeois-revisionists. These struggles in no way eliminated imperialist exploitation and oppression which is increasing, it changed its form, and opened wide the class struggle at home. The proletariat in these colonies possibly could have entered into principled, temporary alliances with many of these bourgeois forces, combatting any bourgeois-revisionism, educating the mass of the proletariat and peasantry in a proletarian-revolutionary spirit, but never merging with the bourgeoisie. The MZTers hold that: since the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism was and is the principal contradiction and its resolution determines the resolution of all the "secondary contradictions," since these movements were and are nearly all "thoroughly revolutionary," the movements in the oppressed nations and their leadership should be supported unconditionally (or petty bourgeois "critically"), the contradictions within these movements should be treated as "secondary," which always boils down to "non-antagonistic." In other words, the main blow should not go against the compromising parties within these movements, thus insuring, spontaneously, bourgeois or bourgeois-revisionist leadership. Therefore, according to the Maoist principal contradiction, according to such metaphysics, the oppressed nations forever remain oppressed. The MZTers "forget" that imperialist exploitation and oppression, capitalist exploitation and oppression can only be eliminated by passing on to the socialist revolution:

If no wc.?

"Leninism has proved, and the imperialist war and the revolution in Russia have confirmed, that the national question can be solved only in connection with and on the basis of the proletarian revolution, and that the road to victory of the revolution in the West lies through the revolutionary alliance with the liberation movement of the colonies and dependent countries against imperialism. The national question is a part of the general question of the proletarian revolution, a part of the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat." (Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, Peking edition, p. 73

Quotes it but throws it out

The fundamental thing is to carry out a revolutionary-proletarian program (minimum and maximum program where appropriate) strategy and tactics in every nation and colony without exception, for the proletariat in the oppressing nations to support the movements in the oppressed nations in a proletarian manner, and vice-versa.

With Mao's "principal contradiction," all the U.S. proletariat can do is uncritically support or "criticize" in a petty-bourgeois manner the bourgeois and bourgeois-revisionist leadership in the oppressed nations, e.g. national liberation support (the bourgeoisie) committees: to do otherwise would be "national chauvinism." This is the case because the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is a "secondary contradiction" and must wait for the mythical day when the never-ending "principal contradiction" is resolved or magically "transformed" into something else. Thus, it is impossible for the U.S. proletariat to now begin to mount a revolutionary class struggle and overthrow the U.S. imperialist bourgeoisie. Sure enough, all the centrists and rightists, who follow MZT or MZT via the PLA or some other brand, do not promote building the vanguard party, do not promote proletarian revolution. The biggest contribution the U.S. proletariat can make to the oppressed nations, the international proletariat, of which we are one section, is to overthrow U.S. imperialism and this is what unceasingly must be worked for and will eventually be achieved. But to the imperialist privileged and bribed petty bourgeois and labor aristocracy in the "anti-revisionist communist movement," it is more comfortable to concentrate on supporting bourgeois and bourgeois-revisionist leadership in the forever oppressed nations, which

??

forever remain the "principal contradiction." They swear they are not social-chauvinists, especially the centrists are outraged at such a conclusion. This is only a protest that everyone be judged not on the content and essence of their activity, but on the luxurious basis--literally--of good intentions. We carried out social-chauvinist activities by actively promoting Mao Zedong Thought and the PLA's revisionism-centrism. This is the disgusting objective truth.

Along with the principal contradiction goes the principal aspect of a contradiction. The principal aspect of a contradiction is a particular favorite of the "three-worlders" and centrists on the international situation. As we've stated in our polemic, trying to figure the principal aspect of a contradiction generally leads us to deny the essence of a thing. Instead, we only see a thing superficially, in its quantitative state at the moment. This occurs most often in assessing the "third world" leaders and determining whether or not they deserve the support of the Marxist-Leninists. A good example is Khomeini. As the argument goes, when Khomeini acts in opposition to the Shah or the superpowers, we should support him. When he acts in a reactionary manner, we oppose him. It all depends on his "principal aspect" at the moment. With this view one cannot see the essence of Khomeini--that he is a reactionary and any political moves he makes are only to further reactionary interests. Such leadership we never support, but view their contradictions with other enemies as indirect reserves, and we aim the main blow at them.

These are but examples of how empiricist and metaphysical MZT replaced orthodox Marxism-Leninism in our movement. There are many others. We've mentioned one such Maoist catch-phrase--oppose bookworship. Unfortunately, this homily simply put an official Maoist stamp of approval on our economism and disdain for theoretical work. Likewise "from the masses, to the masses" (the mass line). This view of MZT is that the "masses" decide the correctness or incorrectness of a line. The masses, in any given place or country will not necessarily know the correct from incorrect line. In fact, the masses tend toward the dominant ideology which is not proletarian. It is a long hard struggle to win the masses to the correct line. How could the line develop "from the masses" then? The line should not depend on what the masses think of it, but whether it is objectively true. "From the masses, to the masses" is a tailist line, a line of spontaneity, which was already refuted as bankrupt by Lenin. The correct way to view the relationship to the masses is as learning from the masses, which means both learning from criticism of the masses when it is correct, and also learning from the masses' mistakes and summing this up for them. The correct relationship between communists and the masses is one of communists leading the masses, not tailing them. The MZT revision on the relationship between communists and the masses was avidly taken up in the movement, and this meant tailing the masses and lowering the level of the work to the level of the masses was in accord with MZT. Any propaganda which had a shred of M-L in it was quickly branded "stereotyped Party writing."

Some revisionist lines of Mao include "unite all who can be united," "unite the many to defeat the few," "two-line struggle," "united front against imperialism" as the strategy for U.S. revolution, and others. The point is that by denying the body of knowledge already in existence on these questions, by denying orthodox Marxism-Leninism, we were denying the Marxist theory of knowledge and laws of dialectics. We were substituting Mao's practice, or just as bad, our own practice, in place of the principles of Marxism-Leninism applied to concrete conditions. This is not to say that our practice, the practice of the U.S. communist and working-class movement, has no value in the process of knowledge. The particulars of the U.S. revolution can enrich our knowledge of Marxism-Leninism. But our own narrow practice can never serve as a basis for our revolution. This basis already exists--it is Marxism-Leninism.

IV. The Sham "Break" with Soviet Revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought by the Centrist Party of Labor of Albania

A. The Opportunism of the "Break" with Soviet Revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought

It was the Party of Labor of Albania's criticism of Mao Zedong Thought in Imperialism and the Revolution (by Enver Hoxha) which came out in 1978 in Albanian and 1979 in English, that led to the current debate in the "anti-revisionist communist movement" and thus led to some formally breaking, others in motion to really break with Mao Zedong Thought. Prior to this only Soviet revisionists, trotskyites, and such groups as Ray O. Light¹⁵ and Communist Workers Group (CWG)¹⁶ were critical of Mao Zedong Thought. With the Party of Labor of Albania (PLA), criticism for the first time reached international importance within the "anti-revisionist communist movement." The PLA's criticism, too, came at a time in which they had completed their blows at the "three worlds theory" and as far as the "anti-revisionist communist movement" they enjoyed much prestige. They were considered the "leading party" and were looked up to for theoretical guidance.

Since the PLA has opened wide the question of Mao Zedong Thought there have been those who have continued to uphold Mao Zedong Thought in words and deed, those who condemn MZT in words and carry it out in practice, and those who are really breaking with it. The PLA, regardless of having initiated the struggle, is not among those really breaking with MZT. Rather, aspiring to gather many parties into a sham break with MZT and continuing false "Marxism-Leninism," they form internationally the leadership of a section of the centrist trend. This section of the centrist trend (also centrist are those who uphold MZT but not the revisionist "extremist" outcome of it such as the "three worlds theory"--e.g. the RCP) is especially dangerous since "it appears, the most of any section, to be Marxist-Leninist." Thus in any discussion of MZT and breaking with it, an examination of the PLA's theory and practice regarding MZT and Marxism-Leninism is very important.

The PLA's criticism of Mao Zedong Thought in Imperialism and the Revolution is wide-ranging. It covers criticism of Mao around the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialism, the party, connections to the "three worlds theory." This criticism is mainly assertions, and is only tactical differences the PLA has with Mao. It also touches on Mao's philosophy, but is more assertive, "most lacking and thus most phrasemongering and impotent here." While the PLA can point out some of the political errors of Mao because of tactical political differences we will get into later, they have great difficulty in criticizing the strategic views and ideological basis, since ideologically and strategically they do not essentially differ with MZT. The same empiricist, pragmatic, metaphysical-idealist outlook and method and same bourgeois strategy is at the basis of the PLA's political line. The PLA's criticism of Mao ideologically is so weak that the only detailed discussion of Mao's philosophy we have found is written by the PLA's fraternal party, the "Communist" Party of Canada ("Marxist-Leninist"), in their January 15, 1979 issue of People's Canada Daily News ("Usher in the Year of Stalin"). In fact the PLA's pragmatism and empiricism goes so far that there are few articles, pamphlets or books written by them which deal with Marxist-Leninist outlook and method, either reviews of Marxism-Leninist works or struggle against non-M-L outlooks and methods.

Until recently (1978-present, starting with their July 1978 "Letter of the CC of the Party of Labour and the Government of Albania to the CC of the Communist Party and the Government of China") the PLA offered no criticism of MZT ideologically or politically. Moreover, there were heaps of praise of "comrade" Mao, the

CPC and "socialist" China. Some of the most notable of the PLA's praise are:

"On the basis of the immortal teachings of Marxism-Leninism and relying firmly on the revolutionary struggle and efforts of the Chinese proletariat, Comrade Mao Tsetung founded the glorious Communist Party of China, the faithful vanguard and leadership of the Chinese working people, which he led for more than 50 years on the road of great victories.

Comrade Mao Tsetung is the great strategist of the Chinese revolution. Applying and developing the teachings of Marxism-Leninism in the conditions of China, he provided the Communist Party of China and the Chinese revolution with a correct strategy which led them to victory through a heroic people's armed struggle extending over 25 years...

...our two parties, our two peoples and our two countries are linked in a deep revolutionary friendship. This friendship was forged by our two Marxist-Leninist parties, by Chairman Mao Tsetung and Comrade Enver Hoxha. It has withstood every test, for it was created, born and tempered in the struggle for the same ideals of the revolution and socialism, is based on the common ideology, Marxism-Leninism, and on proletarian internationalism, has been strengthened and tempered in the common struggle and battles against imperialism and world reaction, against the two world gendarmes, U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, and in the resolute and consistent struggle against modern revisionism...

...In commemorating the 83th anniversary of birth of comrade Mao Tsetung, this great Marxist-Leninist and proletarian revolutionary, the Albanian people and their Party of Labour express their firm conviction that, as comrade Mao Tsetung has said, our two parties and our two peoples will stand together, fight together and triumph together, in the interests of our two countries, and the cause of socialism, the revolution and Marxism-Leninism." ("The Name and Work of Comrade Mao Tsetung are Immortal", Albania Today, Jan-Feb. 1977)

So far we would have it that, at least in words, the PLA used to agree with Mao and developments in China. But the PLA now would like to make it look like they really had problems with things all along, they just couldn't figure everything out, nor open up what they did know for public debate. The latest major document of the PLA concerning MZT and international developments, Enver Hoxha's Reflections on China, thus lays out these doubts and internal struggles with the CPC and Mao. Even if we take the PLA's word in having had these disagreements and doubts all along (which in many cases we can't as we will show later), we are still only left with centrism. What is it but centrism which cannot figure out Marxism-Leninism from non-Marxism-Leninism? What is it but centrism which tries to work with something alien to the proletariat, which is afraid of bringing deviations out into the open and drawing firm lines of demarcation from it, of splitting from it? If the PLA really had all the problems with MZT they speak of in Reflections on China, while at the same time they were praising Mao and the CPC to the skies as above, we can only consider this a crime against the international proletariat. According to the PLA, at the exact same time they were publicly calling Mao a great Marxist-Leninist, such as in the article of Jan-Feb. 1977 Albania Today above, in Enver Hoxha's diary (Reflections...) Mao was referred to as "social-democratic and opportunist."* Enver Hoxha can try to make it look like he was "different" from Mao all along, but he only digs himself a deeper hole with such opportunist admissions as are in Reflections on China.

Which brings us back to the fact that the PLA did finally come out and openly criticize MZT. We should be clear that this was not done on an M-L basis. Why, when for years everything publicly was just fine with Mao, the CPC and

*Proletarian Internationalism, Vol 1, No. 7, p. 112 (COUSM-L ed. Vol 11, Part D, p. 112)

China, was it time in 1978 to come out against all these things? Clearly, the fact that the CPC had moved all the way to the right, with the rights consolidated in power, and aid to Albania being cut off--these were the valiant "Marxist-Leninist" principles behind the PLA's move. While the revisionist-centrist Mao was alive and the centrists and rightists balanced out in the CPC, the CPC taking more centrist positions, and as long as aid continued to Albania, Enver, and the PLA, sent their best wishes and salutations. Even when the rights in China consolidated their position by a coup against the centrists (represented by the "gang of four") in October 1976, the PLA was only critical of the foreign policy of the CPC (the "three worlds theory"), which as we will see was most detrimental to their national interests, and for nearly two years remained silent about the internal situation in China, and continued fraternal relations with the CPC. So much for the "principled" PLA which bases its politics on economics and namely the economics of the national interests of Albania. ≅ CWG

In reality, while disagreeing with the CPC tactically, the PLA's strategy was the same and continues to be the same. Going back to the PLA and CPC's "break" with revisionism and the establishment of the "anti-revisionist communist movement," the PLA makes a big fuss in Reflections... about how slow and vacillatory the CPC was in the "break." But what big difference is there in the CPC taking until 1964? to openly criticize Soviet revisionism and the PLA doing it in 1960? The PLA "principledly" signed two documents (1957 and 1960 Moscow statements) with the Soviet revisionists and signed the last one while at the same time "criticizing" the Soviets. During the 1960-64 period the PLA is critical of the CPC (privately) for vacillating, and yet the PLA earlier had no desire to come out against the Soviet revisionists until the Soviets began bullying them and going soft on Yugoslavia (a threat to Albania). M-L political differences were not the real reason for the PLA's "break." Once again it was the fact that Albanian "independence" was being threatened, both in terms of direct Soviet intervention and through the developing ties between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. The PLA had to break because of national interests, not because of any proletarian internationalist principles. The thrust of their speech at the Meeting of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow November 16, 1960 (where they signed a revisionist-centrist declaration with the revisionists) is that they have centrist differences with the "modern revisionists" over the correct view of "peaceful co-existence" and over "peaceful transition," they disagreed with being friendly to Yugoslavia, they disagreed with the Soviet attack on the CPC, with the attack on Stalin, but they have never disagreed with the CPSU on "major issues" and they wanted to work out their differences and see the CPSU and the CPC work out their differences.

"On many political issues of first rate importance, our socialist camp has held and holds identical views. But, since collective consultations have not become a regular habit, on many occasions it has been noted that states from our socialist camp take political initiatives, not that we are opposed in principle to taking initiatives, but these initiatives very often affect other states of the socialist camp as well. Some of these initiatives are not correct, especially when they should be taken collectively by the members of the Warsaw Treaty...

...There is not the least doubt that the ideological differences have been and are grave, and that these have arisen and have been developed between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist Party. These should have been settled in due time and in a Marxist-Leninist way between the two parties concerned...

...The stand of the Party of Labor of Albania and that of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on all the most important issues of the international communist and workers' movement and of foreign policy have been

identical.' (PLA quoting CPSU and agreeing with it--ed.) Of what then are we guilty? Our only 'crime' is that we had the courage to oppose openly, at an international communist meeting (and not in the marketplace) the unjust action of Comrade (sic) Khrushchev, our only 'crime' is that we are a small and poor country which, according to Comrade Khrushchev, should merely applaud and approve but express no opinion of its own. But this is neither Marxist nor acceptable. Marxism-Leninism has granted us the right to have our say and we will not give up this right for any one, neither on account of political and economic pressure nor on account of the threats and epithets that they might hurl at us...

...I wish to emphasize that the Party of Labor of Albania and the Albanian people have shown in practice how much they love, how much they respect and how loyal they stand to the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and that when the Party of Labor of Albania criticizes the wrong doings of certain Soviet leaders, that does not mean that our views and our attitude have changed. We Albanians, take the courage as Marxists to criticize these comrades not because we hate them but because we think highly of them and because we love above everything else the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people." ("Reject the Revisionist Thesis of the XX Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Anti-Marxist Stand of Khrushchev's Group! Uphold Marxism-Leninism," (title obviously written later--ed.), The Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern Revisionism, p. 28, 45, 55, 99)

The PLA's main point in the speech was that the CPSU was not struggling correctly with them and the CPC, had taken a hegemonistic position in the international communist movement, and if the CPSU corrected these organizational errors they would be able to work out the political differences which were emerging. As true centrists, the PLA was content to co-exist with the CPSU as long as each could have its own political line and not try to "force" a unified international line on all communist parties. Rather than breaking from the CPSU along the lines of Marxist-Leninist principles, the PLA broke because of being unable to continue to unite with them without having to fall into the Soviet orbit and agree with the Soviet line. The PLA's big break with revisionism in 1960 was to tell the revisionists they couldn't push them around anymore. Even a year later the PLA wrote:

"Differences had existed between our Party of Labor and the Soviet leadership even prior to June 1960 on some questions of ideological and political nature; however they have not exerted any negative influence on the relations between our two socialist states, between our two Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Party of Labor of Albania has always declared, and declares now, too, that the experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the experience of its congresses, including here also the 20th and 22nd Congresses, have been, are and will always be a great help on our road for the up-building of the socialist and communist society. However, as regards some special theses of principle of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union our Party has not been and is not of the same opinion with the Soviet leadership, just as it is not also at present as regards some special questions of the 22nd Congress or of the new programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union approved by the 22nd Congress. Is not our Party entitled to this? Is this not consistent with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism? Can this be considered as an anti-Soviet attitude, as they are trying to accuse us?...

...That is, according to some Soviet leaders, the criterion of loyalty towards Marxism-Leninism, towards communism and proletarian internationalism, is allegedly the attitude towards the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Can such a logic be Marxist?...

...According to the Leninist principles governing the relations between Marxist parties, however important the congress of a party may be, however great and authoritative the party of a country may be, the decisions of its congress are binding only for its members. In the international communist movement all the parties--the Moscow Declaration points out--are equal and independent, they work out their policies proceeding from the specific conditions of their countries and guiding themselves by the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The attempt to make the decisions of the congress of a party as international norms binding for all the parties is a crude violation of the principles of equality and independence of the Marxist-Leninist parties; it is in open contrast with proletarian internationalism...

Whether our Party stands or not on the positions of Marxism-Leninism, this is by no means determined by its critical attitude towards some theses expressed by the leaders of some fraternal parties..." ("Speech Delivered at the Tirana Festive Meeting Commemorating the 20th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution on November 7, 1961" The PLA in Battle with Modern Revisionism, p. 128-130)

The big difference between the CPC and PLA over "breaking" with the Soviet revisionists was over how soon to do it and was a result of when the Soviets became a threat to their national interests. The Chinese just held hopes of being able to work with the revisionists longer than the PLA due to a stronger economic position in relation to the USSR. And as we can see in speeches of the 1960-64 period even the PLA had hopes of changing the situation, and mainly saw it as a problem of "comrade" Khrushchev and the "Khrushchev group." The PLA even continued to remain in the Warsaw Pact until after the Czechoslovakian invasion of 1968. And Hoxha has the nerve to complain about the slow and vacillatory break by the CPC!

The PLA finally called for a break with the CPSU in 1966.* Until then, the PLA had promoted hopes of unity with the Soviet revisionists. It was the Soviet revisionists who were splitting and the PLA was critical of this.

"As late as April 1963...our Party emphasized: 'If N. Khrushchev is in favor of the settlement of differences and consolidation of unity, he should show this by deeds, should take real and not fictitious steps, to remove all the obstacles he has created in the relations between our two parties and our two countries'...

...Through their views and deeds the modern revisionists have made the existing differences increasingly sharper and deeper, have constantly undermined unity, have plunged themselves deeper and deeper into the mire of betrayal and disruption. With all this they have made the calling of the international meeting of the communist and workers' parties even more difficult, they have postponed it even further. Greater efforts and a longer time are now required to prepare the necessary conditions for the calling of a meeting that would truly serve the Marxist-Leninist unity of the socialist camp and the communist movement...

* see "Excerpts from the Report on the Activity of the Central Committee of the PLA" submitted to the 5th Congress of the PLA on Nov. 1, 1966, from The PLA in Battle with Modern Revisionism

...Under these circumstances there is no other way left for the Khrushchevite revisionists: they must carry the split with Marxist-Leninists through to the end..." ("An Open Letter to the Members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" published in Zeri I Populit, Oct. 5, 1964, from The PLA in Battle with Modern Revisionism, p. 239, 243, 246)

A line of breaking with the Soviet revisionists was not followed even when the Soviets had manifested their revisionism for years. During this period of the calls for working things out, struggling out the differences, preventing a split among "Marxist-Leninists," the political differences were downplayed and the organizational differences centered on. In 1966 the PLA put out the call to break and from that point on the political differences were brought out more.

B. The PLA's International Program, Strategy and Tactics is a Centrist Continuation of Soviet Revisionism and is in Strategic Agreement with Mao Zedong Thought

Neither the PLA or CPC really broke with revisionism or opportunism. The 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations, which the PLA and CPC always held were basically M-L, were revisionist through and through. These statements are directly related to the views of the PLA and CPC since then, as we will soon see.

According to Hoxha, in Imperialism and the Revolution, the PLA "courageously" waged an "...implacable and principled struggle against Soviet revisionism..."* immediately upon its appearance. Apparently Hoxha "forgot" that in 1966 he concluded that Soviet revisionism did not arise and develop all at once and "...neither did the Marxist-Leninists (sic) recognize the nature of revisionism in one day, but through a whole historical process" because of all the "...refined forms, manoeuvres, tactics and methods..." and "disguises"*** of the Soviet revisionists. These latter "reasons" are, of course, very similar to the recent preposterous explanation given by the PLA as to why they couldn't figure out the CPC and Mao Zedong Thought for decades. Perhaps, in the years to come, we will read that the PLA, right from the start, waged an "implacable and principled struggle" against Chinese revisionism. By "courageously" repeating such modest assertions, the actual opportunist-centrist struggle of the PLA will be "transformed" into "purity" and become the official record for that centrist section of the international centrist trend which the PLA leads.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956 was the congress of a bourgeois-revisionist party, a concrete political manifestation that the dictatorship of the proletariat did not exist in the Soviet Union, proof that capitalism had been restored in the Soviet Union. Also in 1956, the Soviet Union invaded Hungary in order to keep the latter within the social-imperialist camp. However, even in 1964, the PLA told the "comrades" in the CPSU that they faced the "...grave risk of degenerating...into a revisionist bourgeois party," that the "...Khrushchev group are turning...the Soviet socialist state into a dictatorship of the Khrushchev clique" and "...have taken a very dangerous step back towards capitalism."*** Some of the "comrades" replaced Khrushchev with Brezhnev-Kosygin.

Even a partial examination of the line of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, which is all we are able to do in this paper, reveals gross revisionism. For example, the essence of communism, as representing the class interests of an international class--the international proletariat--was brazenly passed off as nationalism, bourgeois and petty bourgeois class interests, the pitting of proletarians of different nationalities against each other:

"In their activity under modern (revisionist--ed.) conditions, all the Communist parties based themselves on the national peculiarities and conditions of every country, giving the fullest expression to the national interests of their peoples." (Floyd, Mao Against Khrushchev, p. 231)

Lenin opposed this line, which justifies nationalism, national oppression, and the interests of the ruling classes:

* Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, COUSM-L ed. p. 7

** The Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern Revisionism, p. 193

***Ibid., p. 260, 259

"In conformity with its fundamental purpose of combating bourgeois democracy and exposing its falsity and hypocrisy, the Communist Party, as the conscious champion of the struggle of the proletariat for the overthrow of the bourgeois yoke, must base its policy in the national question too, not on abstract and formal principles, but, firstly, on an exact estimate of the specific historical situation and, primarily of the economic conditions; secondly, on a clear distinction between the interests of the oppressed classes, of the toilers and exploited, and the general concept of national interests as a whole, which implies the interests of the ruling classes; thirdly, on an equally clear distinction between the oppressed, dependent and subject nations and the oppressing, exploiting and sovereign nations, in order to counter the bourgeois-democratic lies which obscure the colonial and financial enslavement--characteristic of the era of finance capital and imperialism --of the vast majority of the world's population by an insignificant minority of the richest and advanced capitalist countries." (emphasis added) (Lenin, Lenin on the National and Colonial Questions, Peking ed., p. 21, 22)

Stalin in his 1913 article "Marxism and the National Question" pointed out the need to counter "...nationalism with the tried weapon of internationalism, with the unity and indivisibility of the class struggle" and that:

"Whether the proletariat rallies to the banner of bourgeois nationalism depends on the degree of development of class antagonisms, on the class consciousness and degree of organization of the proletariat. The class-conscious proletariat has its own tried banner, and has no need to rally to the banner of the bourgeoisie." (Stalin, Marxism and the National-Colonial Question, Proletarian Pub., p. 17, 32)

But in 1956, the bourgeois-revisionists of social-imperialism try to convince the international proletariat that "Communism" means for them to unite behind and defend "their own" bourgeoisie. Naturally, such a state of affairs would be to the advantage of imperialism, the international bourgeoisie, and especially the powerful (and disguised) Russian social-imperialist bourgeoisie.

The PLA had and has no complaints against this nationalist line in principle as to do otherwise would jeopardize their bourgeois-revisionist position over the Albanian proletariat. In fact, the PLA has consistently maintained this line and practice.* One of the major early criticisms the PLA had of the Khrushchev-led CPSU, after the Sputnik and ICBM (Intercontinental Ballistic Missile) successes in 1957, was that they were not pursuing aggressive enough policies to enhance and enlarge the social-imperialist camp and were overemphasizing negotiation (of spheres of influence) with U.S. imperialism. The bourgeois interests at play here for the PLA were that the stronger the social-imperialist camp in general and the Soviet Union especially, the more capital could be exported to Albania:

"The Soviet Union has always aided us in a generous way through credits and by all other means. New Albania could not be built without this aid, first and foremost, from the Soviet Union and from the other countries of People's Democracy." (The Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern Revisionism, p. 62)

It is noteworthy that the PLA claimed for years that it received substantial "internationalist aid" from "socialist China." However, after this "internationalist aid" was cut off (which we and others following the PLA's petty bourgeois

* For example, see Albania Today, no. 6 (31), 1976, p. 44

centrism, erroneously protested*), the PLA launched its double-barrelled, centrist criticism of the CPC and "Mao Zedong Thought." Without the restraining influence of exported capital, of exported experts, which were "...paid handsomely by the Albanian people (read: proletariat--ed.),"*** the PLA "dialectically" discovered that "socialist China" had not been socialist after all. The quandary for the PLA it would seem is how to explain this "internationalist aid" from social-imperialist China, the export of capital in general from imperialism? In the future, they could, of course, assert that "socialist Albania" had been built up "single-handedly" by the "patriotic Albanian people." But for now that might not float. Hoxha succinctly summed up the PLA's historical, general line on imperialism when, in 1979, he asserted that there were "...well-intentioned..."*** imperialisms. Imperialism becomes a political policy which certain bad-intentioned imperialists pursue. Apparently, the well-intentioned imperialists, having somehow freed themselves from the economic laws which govern their existence as a class, are able to pursue noble objectives. Thus, the export of capital, which economically means imperialist exploitation, becomes "well-intentioned internationalist aid." This is a typical Kautskyite view which divorces politics from economics, which denies that politics is the concentrated expression of economics. According to the PLA, since imperialism is a subjectivist policy some imperialists pursue, it is theoretically possible to reform imperialism rather than the absolute necessity for the class-conscious proletariat to led the overthrow of imperialism as an economic, political, and social system. With regard to this Kautskyite view, Lenin pointed out that:

"Katusky's obscuring of the deepest contradictions of imperialism, which inevitably becomes the embellishment of imperialism, leaves its traces in this writer's criticism of the political features of imperialism. Imperialism is the epoch of finance capital and of monopolies, which introduces everywhere the striving for domination, not for freedom. The result of these tendencies is reaction all along the line, whatever the political system, and an extreme intensification of existing antagonisms in this domain also. Particularly intensified become the yoke of national oppression and the striving for annexations, i.e., the violation of national independence (for annexation is nothing but the violation of the right of nations to self-determination)." (Lenin, Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Peking edition, p. 146)

The PLA's Kautskyite, centrist line has had and has a purpose, and that is to enable the patriotic Albanian bourgeoisie to maintain a certain degree of economic and political independence from imperialism. The Albanian proletariat has a different historic mission.

In 1955 initially, and thereafter, the PLA had problems with the Soviet revisionist's growing rapprochement with Yugoslavian revisionism, because the latter had (and tried afterwards) to annex Albania. The 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956 declared that Yugoslavia was engaged in "...socialist construction,"**** thus reversing the previous verdict. Hoxha and the PLA had some problems with Khrushchev's unprincipled and opportunist attack on Stalin, especially after the June 1960 Bucharest Meetings when Khrushchev and Company used the "struggle" against the "cult of the individual" to attempt to "...overthrow the leadership..."***** of the PLA! In 1961, Hoxha claimed that the PLA only rejected

* This refers to the "Joint Statement in Opposition to Cutting Off of Aid to Socialist Albania by the Government of China," which was organized by Demarcation³, and signed by six circles following PLA centrism.

** "Letter of the CC of the Party of Labour...of Albania to the CC of the Communist Party...of China," People's Canada Daily News, Vol. 8, No. 172, Aug. 5, 1978, p. 2

*** Hoxha, Albania is Forging Ahead Confidently and Unafraid, p. 29

**** Floyd, Mao Against Khrushchev, p. 230

***** The Party of Labor of Albania in Battle With Modern Revisionism, p. 61

"...some of the theses of the 20th Congress...* of the CPSU. Years later, the PLA stated that the 20th, 21st, and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU were revisionist. Regarding the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations, the PLA maintains that they "... made no concessions whatsoever on the main issues which were connected with the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism" and that while there were "...certain incorrect conclusions and erroneous theses," only "...concessions on partial matters (were made) for the sake of unity..."** in the social-imperialist camp.

As it turns out, the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Delcarations take their ideological and political nourishment from the social-imperialist 20th Congress of the CPSU. Given the scope of this paper, we can only elaborate some of the more important similarities between these documents, noting that some concessions were made to the revisionist-centrists of the PLA and CPC in the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations. One such concession was on Yugoslavian revisionism, which was "condemned" as revisionism and opportunism, not included in the list of "socialist" countries, and Yugoslavia said to be "...in danger of losing the revolutionary gains..."*** Even on the surface it is absurd for the PLA to contend that the 1957 and 1960 Declarations are different in essence than the social-imperialist congresses of the CPSU. From the 1960 Moscow Declaration:

"The historic decisions of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. are not only of great importance for the C.P.S.U. and communist (sic) construction in the U.S.S.R., but have initiated a new stage in the world communist movement, and have promoted its development on the basis of Marxism-Leninism." (The China Quarterly, 1961, p. 52)

Yet the PLA must try to make it appear--through assertion--that they forced the Soviet revisionists to unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism because otherwise they might have to explain why they united with declarations that were revisionist in principle and how their line is now different from these declarations. Their line and practice is basically the same as these declarations (only with more centrism), just as these declarations are basically the same as the social-imperialist 20th Congress of the CPSU.

We showed earlier how the 20th Congress of the CPSU substituted nationalism for "Communism." The 1960 Moscow Declaration does the same thing: "The aims of the Communists accord with the supreme interests of the nation."**** In addition to what was said earlier on this subject, it is important to note that while nation-building in general is a progressive, historical development, nations are a passing phenomena which will "wither away" as world communism develops.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU, and the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations all advocate, in varying ways, the "peaceful transition to socialism." From 1960:

"Today in a number of capitalist countries the working class, headed by its vanguard, has the opportunity, given a united working-class (meaning the lower stratum and the labor aristocracy--ed.) and popular front or other workable forms of agreement and political cooperation between the different parties (sic) and public organizations (such as the police and army?!--ed.), to unite a majority of the people, win state power without civil war and ensure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people." ("The 1960 Moscow Statement," The China Quarterly, 1961, p. 48)

* The Party of Labor of Albania in Battle With Modern Revisionism, p. 129

** Ibid, p. 8

*** The China Quarterly, 1961, p. 50

**** Ibid, p. 42

From Lenin:

"...the teaching of Marx and Engels concerning the inevitability of a violent revolution refers to the bourgeois state. The latter cannot be superseded by the proletarian state (the dictatorship of the proletariat) through the process of 'withering away,' but, as a general rule, only through a violent revolution...The necessity of systematically imbuing the masses with this and precisely this view of violent revolution lies at the root of all the teachings of Marx and Engels. The betrayal of their teaching by the new predominant social-chauvinist and Kautskyste trends is expressed in striking relief by the neglect of such propaganda and agitation by both these trends."
(Lenin, State and Revolution, Peking edition, pp. 24-25)

These three documents mention that history has reached a "new epoch" or "new stage" (doesn't this sound similar to the "theory of the three worlds"?). In this new stage of restored capitalism, of social-imperialism, of course, Leninism doesn't apply, although it is formally mentioned. Imperialist wars are no longer inevitable as Lenin* and history teaches, they can be "curbed." This means peaceful national liberation struggles too! Instead of the class struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism, to abolish classes generally, "The Communist Parties regard the fight for peace as their prime task."** This is part of the Russian social-imperialist line of "peaceful coexistence" (which, believe it or not, is passed off as "Leninist"), and is designed to allow social-imperialism enough time to overtake its chief rival, U.S. imperialism, and then forcibly redivide the world (a process developing rapidly today, leading to imperialist WWII). Interestingly enough, "...a definite section of the bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist countries..." is to be included in the "...united front of peace supporters..." in order to "...preserve world peace."*** Imperialism is not reaction all along the line regardless of the political system as Lenin taught! And in the "new stage": "The Soviet Union is successfully carrying on the full-scale construction of a communist society."**** No need to worry: "Today the restoration of capitalism has been made socially and economically impossible not only in the Soviet Union, but in the other socialist countries as well."***** According to revisionist and centrist principles, there is certainly nothing wrong with the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations. Improving the strength of the social-imperialist bloc was in the class interests of the patriotic Albanian bourgeoisie, which is why the PLA united with these declarations. The only differences were how best to achieve this. But the PLA got off the boat with Russian social-imperialism, at least temporarily, after the latter tried to install unpatriotic control over Albania. } ch

When we take a look at the reformist strategy in the 1960 Moscow Declaration it becomes clearer where today's revisionist and opportunist parties in the imperialist countries, as part of rightist and centrist international trends, take their cue:

"The working class, peasantry, intellectuals and the petty and middle urban bourgeoisie are vitally interested in the abolition of monopoly domination (sic). Hence there are favourable conditions for rallying these forces." (The China Quarterly, 1961, p. 44)

* "...imperialist wars are absolutely inevitable under such an economic system as long as private property in the means of production exists." (Lenin, Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Peking edition, p. 5)

** "The 1960 Moscow Statement," The China Quarterly, 1961, p. 37

*** Ibid, p. 36

**** Ibid, p. 29

***** Ibid, p. 31

As "leading" examples of this basic revisionist and reformist strategy today, consider the following within U.S. imperialism: the CPUSA has applied this almost to the letter with their infamous "anti-monopoly coalition"; the CP (M-L) accomplishes this through the rightist interpretation of "MZT" and the "united front against (Soviet social-) imperialism"; the RCP USA is less charitable* ~~theoretically~~ toward the non-monopoly bourgeoisie and the highest level of the petty bourgeoisie and labor aristocracy, but accomplishes basically the same thing through a centrist interpretation of "MZT"; the splintered CPUSA (M-L) and the MLP-USA practice "MZT" via Hoxha, by reformism and the "struggle" against "fascism" respectively. These "Communist" parties are part of the following revisionist and centrist international trends respectively: Soviet revisionism (overt social-chauvinists); Chinese revisionism (overt social-chauvinists); revisionist and centrist trend, the covert social-chauvinists--the left-wing of "Mao Zedong Thought", and Albanian revisionism-centrism.

Stalin's elaboration of the general, Leninist view of strategic class forces in Foundations of Leninism remains valid, ~~if~~ regardless of the contention by the CPSU, CPC, PLA et al. that some "new epoch" or "new stage" of world history beyond imperialism and proletarian revolution has been arrived at:

"...the epoch of world revolution has begun. The main forces of the revolution; the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country (this does not exist today--ed.), the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all countries. Main reserves: the semi-proletarian and small-peasant masses in the developed countries, the liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries. Direction of the main blow: isolation of the petty bourgeois democrats, isolation of the parties of the Second International, which constitute the main support of the policy of compromise with imperialism. Plan for the disposition of forces: alliance of the proletarian revolution with the liberation movement in the colonies and the dependent countries." (Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, Peking edition, pp. 85-86)

(We should add that we consider, as Lenin said,** that the split in socialism is the fundamental question of modern socialism, and are presently studying this subject intensely.)

To illustrate further how matters had degenerated by the 1960 Moscow Declaration, this statement targets the "main blow" internationally at the "...capitalist monopolies..." and:

"In some non-European developed capitalist countries which are under the political, economic and military domination of U.S. imperialism, the working class and the people direct the main blow against U.S. imperialist domination, and also against monopoly capital and other domestic reactionary forces that betray the interests of the nation. In the course of this struggle all the democratic, patriotic forces of the nation come together in a united front fighting for the victory of a revolution aimed at achieving genuine national independence and democracy, which create conditions for passing on to the tasks of socialist revolution." (The China Quarterly, 1961, p. 44)

* Practically, exactly how much "less" becomes clear to those who saw "The Chariman"--Bob Avakian--try to "win over" Tom Snyder, upper petty bourgeois host, on the "Tomorrow" show.

** See "Imperialism and the Split in Socialism," LCW, Vol. 23, pp. 105-120

mark
blow
This is a bourgeois-nationalist, revisionist line through and through. Just compare their "main blow" to the Leninist main blow elaborated by Stalin above. This revision by the CPSU, CPC, PLA et al. is, of course, not without good reason, i.e. to try to keep the main blow from falling on them--the compromising-revisionist parties out of power and the revisionist parties in power.

The above quote out of the 1960 Moscow Declaration (and the body of this statement even more) sets up a revisionist "Chinese Wall"* between stages of revolutionary struggle because genuine national independence from the imperialist system and proletarian democracy is only possible through socialist revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat (and poor peasantry). But for the new heroes of the Second International, they make as "conditions" for the "socialist revolution" things which can only be realized by socialist revolution! Thus, socialist revolution is "theoretically" barred, bourgeois leadership in "the revolution" is guaranteed, the bourgeois ruling classes in the neo-colonies are protected, and imperialist exploitation and oppression are assured. This line has revisionist-centrist continuity to the line of the 7th Congress of the PLA in 1976 and the PLA's practice all along.

The PLA et al. are really in agreement with Mao Zedong's "New (meaning for the first time, Bourgeois) Democracy" as shown from the 1960 Moscow Declaration:

"The urgent tasks of national rebirth facing the countries that have shaken off the colonial yoke cannot be effectively accomplished unless a determined struggle is waged against imperialism and the remnants of feudalism by all the patriotic forces of the nations united in a single national-democratic front...The working class...resists reactionary attempts to check social progress." (The China Quarterly, 1961, p. 41)

"Social progress," which the PLA uses often these days, is a code word for capitalism under bourgeois dictatorship. There are, of course, bourgeois-democratic tasks, but the essential question is whether they will be carried out under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat and poor peasantry. The former means a lengthy stage of capitalist development while the latter means a short period of state capitalism with progressive socialist transformation. The neo-colonial bourgeoisie is incapable of overthrowing imperialist domination because it must act according to the laws governing capitalist relations and it is a weak class compared to the imperialist bourgeoisie. The general line quoted above is the time-worn Menshevik line that Lenin polemicized against in Two Tactics of Russian Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution. The Mensheviks wanted the liberal bourgeoisie to assume leadership of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and take power with the proletariat at its tail, while Lenin and the Bolsheviks argued that the bourgeois-democratic revolution would achieve full scope only if the bourgeoisie recoiled, the proletariat won leadership of the peasantry, and carried the struggle on to the socialist revolution. Lenin clearly expresses what the bourgeois-revisionists, the international bourgeoisie, what imperialism objects to in "Marxism and Revisionism":

"The experience of alliances, agreements and blocs with the social-reform liberals in the West and with the liberal reformists (Cadets) in the Russian Revolution, has convincingly shown that these agreements only blunt the consciousness of the masses, that they do not enhance but weaken the actual significance of their struggle, by

* See Foundations of Leninism, Peking edition, pp.31-32, for Stalin's excellent critique of this line, a line which is virtually identical to the line of the Second International.

linking fighters with elements who are least capable of fighting and most vacillating and treacherous." (Lenin, "Marxism and Revisionism," Against Revisionism, Progress Publishers, p. 116)

ch [The 20th Congress of the CPSU, the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations (the PLA and CPC all along) all support the "Five Principles" (first elaborated by the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India), which try to facilitate the bourgeoisie in the oppressed nations making a better deal with the imperialist bourgeoisie while dulling the class-consciousness of the revolutionary masses (of proletarians and peasants) with petty bourgeois illusions of capitalism and imperialism. When Nixon went to China in 1972, this chief executive of U.S. imperialism "united" with these "Five Principles" at the very time U.S. imperialism was pursuing naked imperialist aggression in Southeast Asia:

"There are essential differences between China and the United States in their social systems and foreign policies (social-imperialist and imperialist respectively—ed.). However, the two sides agreed that countries, regardless of their social systems, should conduct their relations on the principles of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states, non-aggression against other states, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. International disputes should be settled on this basis, without resorting to the use of threat of force." (SINO-U.S. Joint Communiqué, Peking edition, February 28, 1972, pp. 4-5)

These "Five Principles" are an ultra-embellishment of imperialism as just a policy which bad-intentioned imperialists pursue. As Lenin explained:

"The essence of the matter is that Kautsky detaches the politics of imperialism from its economics, speaks of annexations as being a policy 'preferred' by finance capital, and opposes to it another bourgeois policy (the "Five Principles"—ed.) which, he alleges, is possible on this very same basis of finance capital. It follows then, that monopolies in economics are compatible with non-monopolistic, non-violent, non-annexationist methods in politics. It follows, then, that the territorial division of the world, which was completed precisely during the epoch of finance capital, and which constitutes the basis of the present peculiar forms of rivalry between the biggest capitalist states, is compatible with a non-imperialist policy. The result is a slurring-over and a blunting of the most profound contradictions of the latest stage of capitalism, instead of an exposure of their depth; the result is bourgeois reformism instead of Marxism." (Lenin, Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Peking edition, pp. 110-111)

Not only was the content and essence of the PLA's "unity and struggle" with Soviet revisionism and Chinese revisionism itself revisionist and centrist, but their line and practice on "principled struggle" is permeated with opportunism through and through. With respect to Soviet revisionism, Hoxha sums up their line and practice (which was the same in essence with Chinese revisionism):

"...N. Khrushchev attacked us at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In this way, he first, unilaterally, made public our disputes, providing weapons to the enemy and assuming thereby a heavy historic responsibility as a splitter of the unity of the international communist movement and of the socialist (-imperialist—ed.) camp." (The Party of Labor of Albania in Battle With..., p. 125)

In other words, the disputes among these bourgeois-revisionists, these social-imperialists should have been ironed out in private behind the backs of the international proletariat. Consider the following quote from Lenin which reflects his practice in Russia and internationally:

"Open polemics, conducted in full view of all Russian Social-Democrats and class-conscious workers, are necessary and desirable in order to clarify the depth of existing differences, in order to afford discussion of disputed questions from all angles, in order to combat the extremes into which representatives of various views, various localities, or various 'specialities' of the revolutionary movement inevitably fall. Indeed, we regard one of the drawbacks of the present-day movement to be the absence of open polemics between avowedly differing views, the effort to conceal differences on fundamental questions." (Lenin, "Draft Declaration of Iskra and Zarya," LGW, Vol. 4, 328)

And Stalin's views:

"Some say that the exposure of its own mistakes and self-criticism are dangerous for the Party because they may be used by the enemy against the party of the proletariat. Lenin regarded such objections as trival and entirely wrong," (emphasis added) (Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, Peking edition, p. 19)

✓ Open polemics must be upheld as a Leninist principle. It is very convenient for the revisionists and revisionist-centrists to avoid open polemics as they choose. The revisionist-centrists "criticize" the rights thus appearing to be "Marxist-Leninist." But in reality this is just a cover for their own essential rightism. Ideological and political unity is thus maintained with revisionism and opportunism, which includes various forms of organizational unity. Centrism greatly inhibits the development of the Marxist-Leninist trend, which is slowly developing these days. "All-out, open polemics must be launched against centrism, showing how centrism is really a shield for rightism, in order to cause a break with revisionism-centrism ideologically and politically and a split with it organizationally. This is essential to draw clear lines of demarcation and promote the development of the Bolshevik trend."

Previously we brought out examples ("well-intentioned" imperialisms, "Five Principles" of ultra-embellishment of imperialism) showing how the PLA (sometimes slips and reveals their actual line which) separates imperialist politics from imperialist economics, "explains" imperialism as just a policy, a la Kaul Kautsky, their ideological mentor. Another area where the PLA slips up and where they reveal their political continuity with "Mao Zedong Thought" is in defining imperialist annexation, imperialist armed aggression, terrorist tactics as an integral part of bourgeois democracy as fascism. The PLA goes even further and mentions that class antagonisms are a "policy." These Kautskyite departures from Marxism-Leninism are quite illuminating and therefore bear some examination.

Mao Zedong's "Solemn Statement" of May 20, 1970, "People of the World, Unite and Defeat the U.S. Aggressors And All Their Running Dogs!," reads in part:

"While massacring the people in other countries, U.S. imperialism is slaughtering* the white and black people in its own country. Nixon's

* This is a reference, at least in part, to the then recent killings by the Ohio National Guard at Kent State University and by various police forces at Jackson State University in Mississippi.

fascist atrocities have kindled the raging flames of the revolutionary mass movement in the United States. The Chinese people firmly support the revolutionary struggle of the American people. I am convinced that the American people who are fighting valiantly will ultimately win victory and that the fascist rule in the United States will inevitably be defeated." (Worker's Advocate, May 15, 1975, p. 4)

The PLA glowingly commented on Mao's statement and went on to embellish it in places, such as mentioning recent demonstrations in the U.S. which condemned "... the war policy pursued by the Nixon administration abroad and...oppose(d) the policy of social and racial oppression within the country," where there were "...clashes with the fascist police..." all of which showed that:

"...the war in Indochina has turned into a political war in the United States, into a war between the people's masses on the one hand, and the ruling classes with the Nixon government in power on the other."
("Historical Document in Support of the Anti-Imperialist Struggle of the Peoples--Editorial by Albanian paper Zeri i Popullit," Peking Review, No. 22, May 28, 1971, p. 9)

It is beyond the scope of this paper to analyze the spontaneous mass movements of the 60's and early 70's. However, it is clear that the CPC and the PLA did not promote the development of Marxist-Leninist theory and leadership, but instead promoted the worship of spontaneity as they attempted to cultivate petty bourgeois and labor aristocratic adherents who would take up propaganda and agitation of their bourgeois-revisionist class interests, their foreign policies. A significant minority of those active in the spontaneous mass movements did spontaneously adopt "Mao Zedong Thought," and the PLA's revisionism-centrism (others gravitated to Soviet revisionism) because, overwhelmingly, this defended their present imperialist privileged and bribed class interests. This was an objective phenomenon and had little to do with a conscious awareness of this process, with the exception of opportunist leadership, given the lack of the Marxist-Leninist trend to vigorously combat "Mao Zedong Thought" and the PLA's revisionism-centrism.

The assertion by Mao Zedong that there was "fascist rule in the United States" is, of course, "extremely ridiculous and absolutely preposterous from the standpoint of Marxist-Leninist theory on the state" applied to U.S. imperialism. What was meant by the phrase "...fascist rule...will inevitably be defeated" was that the imperialist bourgeoisie would come to their senses and accept defeat in Southeast Asia, that some well-intentioned bourgeois politician, such as George McGovern, would win the imperial presidency! The phrase "fascist atrocities" covers up the universal nature of imperialist aggression as a fundamental component of the imperialist system irregardless of the political system (i.e. dictatorship of the bourgeoisie through bourgeois democracy or fascism, Russian autocracy, etc.). This is the meaning of Lenin's analysis which we quoted earlier:

"Imperialism is the epoch of finance capital and of monopolies, which introduces everywhere the striving for domination, not for freedom. The results of these tendencies is reaction all along the line, whatever the political system, and an extreme intensification of existing antagonisms in this domain also." (Op cit.)

What is really aimed for by the CPC, PLA, etc. is an imperialism that will carry on the business of exploitation and oppression "peacefully," on terms suitable to the neo-colonial bourgeoisie. Naturally, such bourgeois reformist strivings

extolled in petty bourgeois phrases would find a receptive audience among the imperialist-privileged petty bourgeoisie and bribed labor aristocracy. The only way out of imperialism, whatever the political system, is the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie, through the necessary stages or phases of class struggle.

The PLA has continued to uphold the Kautskyite line on imperialism as evidenced by the following from their 7th Congress in 1976:

"Ever since the end of the Second World War, US imperialism has been pursuing a criminal policy and carrying out criminal activity against communism and the freedom and independence of the peoples." (Albania Today, No. 6(31), 1976, p. 36)

✓ This curious assertion bears deeper examination in the future. However, we can say that the Puerto Rican proletariat and peasantry will be interested to learn this little bit of bourgeois-revisionist history! We must by all means rectify the 1928 & 1930 Comintern resolutions which summed up Afro-American national oppression, the developing motion, and elaborated the right of self-determination in the Black Belt South! The genocide against Native Americans, carried out over the centuries under the watchword "The only good Indian is a dead Indian," apparently began "since the end of the Second World War"! We want to be clear that these are only examples of the colonialism pursued by the U.S. bourgeoisie before, during, and after the development of monopoly capitalism, imperialism, which took place around the turn to the 20th century. One of the main characteristics of the development of capitalism into imperialism is that:

"...the division of the world is the transition from a colonial policy which has extended without hindrance to territories unseized by any capitalist power, to a colonial policy of monopolistic possession of the territory of the world which has been completely divided up."
(Lenin, Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Peking ed., p. 105)

To leave no doubt that the PLA continues the revisionist-centrist, Kautskyite tradition of "Mao Zedong Thought," where politics are divorced from economic reality, where imperialism is a policy of fascism, we read in a recent article entitled "The fascist nostalgia of Nixon" that Nixon "...demands the implementation of the fascist policy of aggression and war, intervention and coups d'etat, that were carried into practice for four years on end."* As if to speak to the "well-intentioned" bourgeoisie they assert that, "The officials of Washington have learned nothing from the defeats of the old American (fascist-ed.) policy of aggression and war, of domination and intervention. The deepening of this bankrupt policy..."** Can imperialist's "learn" not to follow a "bankrupt" political policy which flows from their economic class position within the highest and last stage of capitalism, i.e. imperialism? This question is very much on the minds of those centrist-reformers who follow Kautskyism without Kautsky, who follow "Mao Zedong Thought" without Mao Zedong.

The PLA has continuously maintained the old "MZT" version of the "theory of the three worlds," opposition to "...the policy and activity of the imperialist bourgeoisie of the two superpowers..." which is the "...only correct basis..." for determining Kautskyite-centrist strategy and tactics:

"A principled stand on this fundamental question constitutes the only correct basis for defining a consistent and revolutionary strategy

* People's Canada Daily News, April 12, 1980, p. 4

** Ibid

and tactics, and the criterion for assessing who are the progressive forces, and separating them from the reactionary forces."

(Hoxha, "Report on the Activity of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania," Albania Today, No. 6(31), 1976, p. 36)

The crude, Kautskyite formulation, opposition to "...the policy and activity of the imperialist bourgeoisie of the two superpowers..." is sometimes presented in more refined?centrist terms as the "united front against the two superpowers." Nonetheless, this is the PLA's tactical line because the blocs led by the two most powerful imperialist powers are the "main enemy" to the patriotic Albanian bourgeoisie (which is definitely selling the Albanian proletariat short!). As far as the tactical alignment of class forces is concerned this means the "reactionary forces" consist of: the monopoly capitalist class of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism; "the internal reactionary, anti-patriotic forces...who are selling and subjugating their countries to foreigners, and liquidating their national sovereignty"* in the imperialist and capitalist countries of NATO and the Warsaw Pact; the internal reactionaries in "some" other countries who can be identified by "...the pseudo-democratic and anti-popular positions of the leading groups of some states which participate among the 'non-aligned'..."**; the "labour aristocracy" who turn out only to be the chiefs of the trade unions in the imperialist and capitalist countries; most of the social-democratic leaders; some of the revisionists, revisionist-centrists, and opportunists. All other classes and strata become "the peoples of the world," the "progressive forces." In the imperialist countries, in addition to "some" "well-intentioned" monopoly capitalist classes, this includes such "progressive forces" as the non-monopoly bourgeoisie, who are part of the imperialist bourgeoisie and the target for overthrow and expropriation in the proletarian revolution. In the neo-colonies--the developing capitalist countries who have long ago achieved political independence or have recently won such--the local bourgeoisie ("unpatriotic" and "patriotic") and imperialist interests are the target for overthrow and expropriation in the proletarian revolution with anti-imperialist and anti-feudal tasks. (In the imperialist and capitalist countries that have fascist or military dictatorships (bourgeois or bourgeois-feudal), the proletariat there has a strategic task of toppling these unrestricted terroristic forms of rule, intertwining and passing on to the socialist revolution.) In the imperialist and neo-colonial countries, the petty bourgeoisie in general cannot be an ally of the proletariat, only sections of it such as the poor peasantry can be an ally. Instead, "the unstable nature" of the petty bourgeoisie must be neutralized, if possible. Such neutralization is accomplished through aiming the main blow*** at the petty bourgeois and bourgeois parties which compromise the revolution and have an influence on the petty bourgeois and proletarian masses. The proletariat is the only really revolutionary class in society. Contrary to the PLA, MZTers, etc., the skilled workers in imperialist countries, who make up the bulk of the traditional labor aristocracy, are actually part of the upper strata of the working class and are not revolutionary****. The semi-proletariat and poor peasantry are class allies of the proletarian movement world-wide. The national liberation movement in the colonies and oppressed nations lacking political independence is an ally of the proletarian movement world-wide. It is, of course, beyond the scope of this paper to deal with the class forces in the colonies, to deal thoroughly with the questions of

* Ibid, p. 37

** Ibid, p. 38

*** We use this term in the same sense as Stalin did in the section on "Strategy and Tactics," in Foundations of Leninism.

**** As indicated earlier, we will be developing an analysis of the fundamental question of modern socialism (Lenin) and will critique various revisionist and and revisionist-centrist lines and practice in this crucial area.

main reserves, neutralizing certain strata, winning over elements from certain strata, etc. The point in what we have laid out is that the PLA's tactical alignment of class forces, is not Marxist-Leninist at all, but includes as "progressive forces" classes and strata who are (part of) the target of the proletarian revolution, strata who are part of the bourgeoisie's main reserves or who oppose imperialism from a reactionary standpoint, strata who need to be neutralized if possible, etc. Such are the revisionist-centrist "fruits" of taking as the "only correct basis" for strategy and tactics, the Kautskyite basis of opposition "...to the policy and activity of the imperialist bourgeoisie of the two superpowers..."

The fundamental problem with the PLA's strategy and tactics is that it proceeds from the principle of bourgeois-nationalism based on the class interests of the patriotic Albanian bourgeoisie. Of course, this is fundamentally opposed to the general Marxist-Leninist principles of strategy and tactics, which Stalin elaborated in his 1921 article "Political Strategy and Tactics":

"The general principles of communist strategy and tactics. There are three such principles:

a) The adoption, as a basis, of the conclusion, arrived at by Marxist theory and confirmed by revolutionary practice, that in capitalist countries the proletariat is the only completely revolutionary class, which is interested in the complete emancipation of mankind from capitalism and whose mission it is, therefore, to be the leader of all the oppressed and exploited masses in the struggle to overthrow capitalism. Consequently, all work must be directed towards the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

b) The adoption, as a basis, of the conclusion, arrived at by Marxist theory and confirmed by revolutionary practice, that the strategy and tactics of the Communist Party of any country can be correct only if they are not confined to the interests of 'their own' country, 'their own' fatherland, 'their own' proletariat, but, on the contrary, if, while taking into account the conditions and situation in their own country, they make the interests of the international proletariat, the interests of the revolution in other countries, the corner-stone, i.e., if, in essence, in spirit, they are internationalist, if they do 'the utmost possible in one (their own) country for the development, support and awakening of the revolution in all countries' (see Lenin's book The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky).

c) The adoption, as a starting point, of the repudiation of all doctrinairism (Right and Left) when changing strategy and tactics, when working out new strategic plans and tactical lines (Kautsky, Axelrod, Bogdanov, Bukharin), repudiation of the contemplative method and the method of quoting texts and drawing historical parallels, artificial plans and lifeless formulas (Axelrod, Plekhanov); recognition that it is necessary to stand by the point of view of Marxism, not to 'lie down on it,' that it is necessary to 'change' the world, not 'merely to interpret' it, that it is necessary to lead the proletariat and be the conscious expression of the unconscious process, and not 'contemplate the proletariat's rear' and drag at the tail of events (see Lenin's "Spontaneity and Consciousness"* and the well-known passage in Marx's Communist Manifesto to the effect that the Communists are the most far-sighted and advanced section of the proletariat). "

(Stalin, Works, Vol 5, Red Star Press ed., p 81-82)

* This refers to V.I. Lenin's book What is to be Done? (see LCW, 4th Russ. ed., Vol 5, p 319-494).

It is important to understand concretely how the PLA's bourgeois-nationalism is manifested. For this purpose, we will examine the essential errors in the PLA's practice on the recent inter-capitalist-imperialist conflicts in Southeast Asia and the temporary derailment of the Iranian worker's and peasant's revolution by clerical-feudal reaction. In the course of this examination, the PLA's pragmatic shifts from centrism to open rightism will be demonstrated.

After the successful expulsion* of the U.S. imperialists from Kampuchea, petty bourgeois-revisionists, led by Pol Pot, ruled Kampuchea. They developed a closer alliance with Chinese social-imperialism. After the successful expulsion* of U.S. imperialism from Vietnam, the Vietnamese bourgeois-revisionists reunited imperialist-divided Vietnam and established bourgeois-revisionist rule throughout the country. They developed a closer alliance with Russian social-imperialism. The Vietnamese revisionists did not order a withdrawal from certain Kampuchean border areas after U.S. imperialism was expelled. Although we are unable to present an exact appraisal of the border conflicts, undoubtedly they had to be the result of nationalism by the Kampuchean and Vietnamese revisionists. Chinese social-imperialism and Russian social-imperialism served to intensify the nationalist inspired border conflicts. At this critical time, the PLA played a centrist role and covered for the "lefts" in Kampuchea, the rights in Vietnam and China, and indirectly for Russian social-imperialism. In early 1978, the PLA published an article entitled "A Conflict Alien to the Lofty Interests of the Peoples of Vietnam and Cambodia," in which they gave the impression that disagreements between two socialist countries and M-L parties had developed which were due to Soviet social-imperialism and U.S. imperialism instigating some bourgeois-nationalism and chauvinism. Furthermore, the disagreements could be resolved on the basis of proletarian internationalism, and the PLA called...

"...on the two countries, the two peoples, to cease all actions which infringe (on) the lofty interests of the two nations, socialism, the revolution and their freedom, and solve the disagreements, which led to the armed conflicts, through friendly talks...We hope that the sister People's China, too, which at the time of the war of the Indochinese peoples against U.S. imperialism was their great supporter, will now mediate so that armed fightings should cease, that the conflicts and disagreements should be solved in a fraternal way and without interference from outside." (Albania Today, 1(38), 1978 p. 60-61)

The only way the nationalist inspired border conflicts could have been resolved in a proletarian internationalist manner was if the ruling parties had been genuine Marxist-Leninist parties of the proletariat, and this could only have occurred through the Kampuchean and Vietnamese proletariat overthrowing "their own" revisionist dictatorships. This was also already on the agenda for the Chinese proletariat. At this critical time, the PLA played the role of the centrist snake who attempted to portray the long-standing revisionist betrayals in M-L colors, to keep class-consciousness from the proletariat, to keep the proletariat from fighting for its own class interests. The PLA's covert social-chauvinist line contributed to the proletarians and peasants killing each other in the then-escalating armed clashes, in the subsequent Vietnamese social-imperialist invasion and occupation of Kampuchea, in the following Chinese social-imperialist aggression against Vietnam. Naturally, the PLA's line went up in smoke with later events, so as usual they lied about what they had said, and they covered for and sided with Vietnamese and Soviet social-imperialism.

* The content of the struggles of the workers, peasants, revisionists, etc. against U.S. imperialism needs to be reexamined in the context of demarcating against revisionism and revisionism-centrism in order to promote the development of the genuine Marxist-Leninist trend world-wide.

Not being restrained by exported capital from "sister People's China," in early 1979, the PLA wrote an article entitled "The Chinese leadership with Deng Xiaoping at the Head has Launched a Military Attack Against Vietnam." The PLA noted that when the Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia this "...demonstrated in practice that the Soviet Union had now been transformed completely into an imperialist superpower."* It was only after this event that the PLA withdrew Albania from the Warsaw Pact. Their line covers for Soviet social-imperialism which had come into being many years earlier. In a Kautskyite cover? for Mao's revisionism-centrism, the PLA noted that the "...attack on Vietnam is a logical consequence of the social-imperialist line formulated by the Chinese leadership long ago, when Mao Tsetung and Chou En-lai were alive, and now put into practice by Den(g) Xiaoping and Hua Gou-feng,"**which stemmed from "(t)heir imperial dreams, their great-power obsession and war-mongering ideology (which has) blinded their eyes and obscured their judgement."*** Again, politics is not the concentrated expression of economics, politics is divorced from economics. Imperialism is an evil policy which can be turned off and on at will. This is a petty bourgeois democratic line which is opposed to imperialist "excesses," but not the foundation of imperialism, private property in the means of production.

Now to the heart of the rewrite of their line:

"Even in the war against American imperialism ("...the savagest enemy of the peoples and all mankind..."), the Chinese leadership, irrespective of certain minor aid which it may have given, obstructed and damaged the anti-imperialist struggle of the people of Vietnam...When the first conflicts occurred on the Cambodian-Vietnamese border, the view of socialist Albania was, and the whole world is witness to this, that the disagreements between the two neighbouring countries should be settled through talks and without the interference of the Chinese or the Soviet social-imperialists. But this was not done. On the contrary, the Pol Pot group, on Peking's urging, day by day, published communiques in Phnom Penh in which it reported that thousands of Vietnamese were being killed by its army in Vietnamese territory...In our opinion, the people and patriots of Cambodia were a bit slow to overthrow this clique which was completely linked with Peking and in its service...the question must be asked: why have the Chinese imperialists allegedly the right to defend the barbarous and fascist group of Pol Pot, and Vietnam has not the right to support the revolutionaries and the people of Cambodia to build a free, independent and sover(ign) country? The Vietnamese government has officially and publicly denied the Chinese claims that it is allegedly aiming to set up a federation of Indochina and has declared that Vietnam desires that the peoples of this zone should live free in friendship and each independent in its own country." (Albania Today, 2(45), 1979, p. 64, 65)

Before, U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism were the "main enemy," but now the former is the "savagest enemy." Choices have to be made. Before, "sister People's China" was that "great supporter" of the "two peoples" who should "mediate," but now "irrespective of certain minor aid it may have given, the CPC obstructed and damaged the anti-imperialist struggle of the people of Vietnam," and "the view of socialist Albania was, and the world is witness to

* Albania Today, 2(45), 1979, p. 63

** Ibid., p. 64

*** Ibid, p. 63

this, that the disagreements between the two neighbouring countries should be settled through talks and without the interference of the Chinese or Soviet social-imperialists." Before, the disagreements between the socialist countries and M-L parties were to have been resolved on the basis of "proletarian internationalism," but how was this possible with the "fascist group of Pol Pot"? In the space of a year, during which "internationalist aid" from "socialist China" was cut off, they evidently underwent a "dialectical" transformation and became fascists! As to the PLA's views on the activities of the Vietnamese and hence the Russian social-imperialists, Lenin had this to say about their ideological mentors, which applies to the recent inter-capitalist-imperialist conflicts in South-east Asia:

"The Mensheviks deceived the people in a most despicable manner by calling this war a defensive or revolutionary war. And by approving the deception practiced on the people, is approving the part played by the petty bourgeoisie in helping capital to trick the workers and to harness them to the chariot of the imperialists. Kautsky is pursuing a characteristically petty-bourgeois, philistine policy by pretending (and trying to make the masses believe the absurd idea) that putting forward a slogan alters the position. The entire history of bourgeois democracy refutes this illusion; the bourgeois democrats have always advanced and still advance all sorts of 'slogans' in order to deceive the people. The point is to test their sincerity, to compare their words with their deeds, not to be satisfied with idealistic or charlatan phrases, but get down to class reality. "An imperialist war does not cease to be an imperialist war when charlatans or phrasemongers or petty-bourgeois philistines put forward sentimental 'slogans,' but only when the class which is conducting the imperialist war, and is bound to it by millions of economic threads (and even ropes), is really overthrown and is replaced at the helm of state by the really revolutionary class, the proletariat. There is no other way of getting out of an imperialist war, as also out of an imperialist predatory peace. (Lenin, Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, Peking ed., p. 74)

The PLA called on the great, fraternal Chinese people to refuse to follow the chauvinist leadership now at their head into imperialist wars or even world war: "We have hopes that the Chinese people will not permit such a thing, that they will not allow themselves to become answerable to history for such a thing."* This is a most disgusting and hypocritical statement on the part of the PLA. All those years when Mao Zedong led the revisionist-centrist betrayal of the Chinese proletariat, protecting himself and others, Deng and the rights, and the "patriotic" Chinese bourgeoisie, the PLA was singing loud praises of this, facilitating the betrayal. It is precisely those who claim to represent class-conscious proletarian interests that have to be held accountable first and foremost. It is precisely the centrists, who cover their rightism and that of the rights, who have to be a substantial part of the main blow, because they are here covert, there overt representatives of the bourgeoisie. They shield the bourgeoisie.

The PLA's line-practice on the class struggle in Iran has been just as counter revolutionary. Shortly before the terroristic-monarchy of the Shah was toppled, the PLA published an article entitled "A rotten regime with an inevitable end." Here we are given a liberal dose of centrism:

"...rarely mentioned are the political and demogical manoeuvres which the regime is resorting to, to escape from the anger of the suppressed people. In the current events in Iran, extensive publicity is being

* Albania Today, 2(45), 1979, p. 66

done by the bourgeois and revisionist press about the so-called activity of the 'opposition,' which is made up of religious chieftains and a part of the bourgeoisie together with the intellectuals which are linked with it. Exposing this situation, they are raising their voices, and are calling on the people to fight, because, allegedly, they are the ones who will serve the people if they come to power. But these are only vain illusions. The religious chieftains are utilizing the anger of the people to preserve their own privileges and even extend them. This is also the character of the self-styled 'liberal bourgeoisie.' All the facts show that this road of replacement of one exploiter with another is not what the Iranian people want. It is clear that the overthrow of the hangman regime of the Shah will be an enormous victory for the Iranian people, but not everything. Real salvation, stresses Zeri I Populit, is that which the genuine patriots, the progressive and revolutionary Iranian forces with the Workers' and Peasants Communist Party of Iran at the head, are propagating and fighting for, the road of armed struggle until the overthrow of the reactionary regime, for genuine national and social liberation." (People's Canada Daily News, October 31, 1978, p. 3)

Characteristically, the PLA speaks in non-class terms⁷ and their actual line on peaceful "genuine national and social liberation," as with the 1960 Moscow Declaration, is a harmony of class forces under capitalism, under the actual dictatorship of the "patriotic" neo-colonial bourgeoisie, with the upper petty bourgeoisie granted substantial concessions. Mao Zedong called this "New Democracy," the PLA calls this "the revolution," sometimes throwing in, literally, "and socialism." More on this later. In the above passage, the PLA talks about the "...so-called activity of the 'opposition,' which is made up of religious chieftains and a part of the bourgeoisie together with the intellectuals which are linked with it..." who want the "...replacement of one exploiter with another (which) is not what the Iranian people want." As shorthand, "people" can be interpreted as proletariat and poor peasantry (although this is not what they mean),⁷ thus the PLA's line is M-L in words in so far as it infers that the struggle of the religious chieftains (another non-class term), liberal bourgeoisie and its intellectuals is reactionary opposition. The Marxist-Leninist conclusion to be drawn from this inference is that the main blow should have gone against these class forces precisely to keep them from gaining hegemony in the struggle to topple the Shah's reactionary regime, to paralyze the reactionary opposition of the bourgeoisie and upper petty bourgeoisie who form their social base, to win over any workers, poor peasants and lower petty bourgeois anti-imperialist elements under their influence, to enable the proletariat and poor peasantry to seize state power. This did not happen as, contrary to the PLA, the Iranian proletariat lacked, and still lacks its Bolshevik party. Thus, the feudal-clerical-reactionaries, headed by Khomeini, in league with the Iranian bourgeoisie, which is reactionary, came to power with the downfall of the Shah and his lackey Bakhitar, Khomeini and the religious hierarchy are just as reactionary politically as the Iranian bourgeoisie, who supported the Shah except for some of his "excesses." Economically, Khomeini and the religious hierarchy, who represent feudal relations in the countryside and the upper petty bourgeois strata (e.g. the Bazaar merchants) in the cities are reactionary, with the Iranian bourgeoisie a progressive force in comparison. All these class forces compromise, in one form or another, the struggle against imperialism. They are not allies of the Iranian proletariat, the international proletariat. The downfall of the Shah's regime was a revolutionary advance for the Iranian proletariat in terms of political liberty, and a blow against U.S. imperialism; however, the accession to political power of the feudal-clerical-reactionaries and the reactionary Iranian bourgeoisie (with the former increasing their political power) was a counter-revolutionary development. dogmatic

At this critical time, the PLA dropped much of its centrist disguise in an article entitled "The Iranian Working Class Came Out on the Battlefield, Overthrew the Shah and Shook the Capitalist World":

"From various sides efforts are being made to give the Iranian revolution a religious colour. Of course, it is impossible to deny the subjective influence of the Shiite religious sect in the events of Iran, and it has played a positive role in the overthrow of the feudal regime of the Pahlavi empire. But it was not religious ideology which led the broad masses of the people (which masses, which classes and strata?--ed.) in the uprising and the fight against the Shah...They rose up and shed their blood for the overthrow of the monarchy and the establishment of a democratic republic in the country, for the nationalization of the oil and its use on behalf of the development of the national economy and for the people, for putting an end to dependence on foreign capital and the breaking off of all enslaving economic, military and political agreements with foreigners, be they American, Soviet, British or Chinese, for the strengthening of a sovereign and independent state, for freedom of the press and of assembly, for the elimination of the feudal corruption and the punishment of oppressors and exploiters, for social quality and justice, etc., etc.,..World capitalism is insisting strongly on the word 'Islamic' and distorting the true character of the revolution in Iran because it wants to set the peoples one against the other, to set the Muslim believers in opposition to the Christian believers. It is labouring to describe the Iranian, Arab and other peoples as backward and fanatical peoples and to give their anti-imperialist liberation struggle a retrogressive tinge." But the Iranian revolution demonstrated clearly that the fundamental question of the peoples in this zone, that which requires and forms their unity, is the struggle for liberation from the feudal-bourgeois yoke and the domination of American and Soviet superpowers, and from Israel. It is the imperialist superpowers, the USA and the Soviet Union, and China which are inciting the division of the Arab and Persian peoples and not permitting them to gain and safeguard their freedom, independence and sovereignty...First of all, the events in Iran showed that the motive force in this revolution of a democratic character was the Iranian proletariat, which came out in the streets and shed its blood in battles with reaction, displaying its own invincible strength not only in the struggle against the Shah, but also against foreign imperialism...In order to take progressive positions, the people of Iran will have to destroy all the structure and superstructures of the feudal monarchy of the Shah and replace them with a new structure and superstructure, appropriate to the country, and not borrowed from the so-called bourgeois democracy which in essence is anti-popular. They will have to make great efforts to prevent feudalists and bourgeoisie from infiltrating all these institutions, but must take them over themselves and ensure that their most trustworthy representatives will carry out the great social and economic reforms...Undoubtedly, the working class of Iran, which has shown itself to be so heroic, courageous and mature at this stage of the revolution, will know how to form sound alliances with progressive, democratic, revolutionary and anti-imperialist elements and forces, regardless of whether they may be religious, but who have not failed to fight with determination against the monarchy and the Shah...Always bearing in mind the interests of their own homeland as well as the interests of other peoples of the world who are fighting for freedom, they ("the Iranian people") will know how to wisely take advantage of circumstances such as the present ones and those which

will be created. A country in revolution, which has such a weapon in its hands as oil, which has such a valiant people that overthrows an old and rotten world to build a new world is able to resist all enemies." (People's Canada Daily News, March 10, 1979, pp. 2-4, or see Albania Today, 2(45), 1979)

At this late point in the paper it is tempting to let the above stand as a literary monument to the PLA's political bankruptcy and allow the reader to sort through the numerous, glaring and subtle instances of revisionism-centrism. This is what we will do for the most part, noting that the PLA has covered for and sided with the feudal-clerical-reactionaries and the "patriotic" neo-colonial Iranian bourgeoisie, against the Iranian proletariat and poor peasantry, against the international proletariat. What the PLA has done here is embellish petty bourgeois and bourgeois nationalism, which is reformist to the bone in its economic relationship to imperialism, in "anti-imperialist" colors, depicted further struggles which are entirely reformist and leave imperialism and the bourgeoisie, imperialist and capitalist exploitation and oppression intact. The Iranian proletariat needs to lead and win the struggle for political liberty, passing to the struggle for state power and the dictatorship of the proletariat and poor peasantry, the proletarian revolution with anti-imperialist and anti-feudal tasks.

What the PLA's version of "the revolution" amounts to is a reformist struggle for more capital on the part of the "patriotic" neo-colonial bourgeoisie, and the upper strata of the petty bourgeoisie. What the PLA attempts to do is: portray the economic reform struggle of the bourgeoisie and upper strata as worthy of proletarian support which it is not; mix in the economic reform struggle of the bourgeoisie and upper strata with necessary and revolutionary struggle for political democracy, or else liquidate the latter altogether as was the case with the lengthy quote on Iran. The PLA's line and practice insures bourgeois leadership of "the revolution" and liquidates the socialist revolution, which insures capitalist and imperialist exploitation and oppression of the proletariat and poor peasantry. This is the meaning of, "Now economic decolonialization has been placed on the order of the day, and there is nothing which can stop this new revolutionary process which has emerged on the world stage,"* which was elaborated by Hoxha at the 7th Congress of the PLA in 1976. Lenin's criticism and analysis is most important:

This is analysis!

"...finance capital, in its striving toward expansion, will 'freely' buy and bribe the freest, most democratic and republican government and the elected officials of any country, however, 'independent' it may be. The domination of finance capital, as of capital in general, cannot be abolished by any kind of reform in the realm of political democracy, and self-determination belongs wholly and exclusively to this realm. The domination of finance capital, however, does not in the least destroy the significance of political democracy as the freer, wider and more distinct form of class oppression and class struggle...it is necessary to formulate and put forward all these demands, not in a reformist way, but in a revolutionary way; not by keeping within the framework of bourgeois legality, but by breaking through it; not by confining oneself to parliamentary speeches and verbal protests, ~~but~~ by drawing the masses into real action, by widening and fomenting the struggle for every kind of fundamental, democratic demand, right up to and including the direct onslaught of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, i.e. to the socialist revolution, which will expropriate the bourgeoisie." (Lenin, Lenin On the National and Colonial Questions, Peking edition, pp. 3-4)

* Albania Today, No. 6(31), 1976, p. 39

To critique the PLA's line on imperialist wars, on developing imperialist WWII, we first quote their basic line on this:

"Peace and international security in Europe and in the world are not achieved through the establishment of 'harmony' or 'balance' between the superpowers, but through struggle against imperialist pressures and intervention, through efforts for the liberation of the peoples, through the strengthening of national independence and sovereignty... The important thing is that the peoples should not fall into fatalism, become passive observers and be caught unawares; they must be prepared for the worst and fight to prevent it from occurring. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that imperialism and the war-wongers must be weakened through the revolutionary and liberation struggles of the peoples. If an aggressive imperialist war cannot be prevented, then it is the task of the revolutionaries and the proletariat to turn it into a liberation war." (Hoxha, "Report on the Activity of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania," Albania Today, 6(31), p. 42, p. 44)

Stupid → According to our present-day* Kautskyites it is possible to avoid imperialist wars under imperialism! No, peace and security in Europe and elsewhere can only be achieved by overthrowing imperialism and capitalism world-wide, by overthrowing the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, by establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat (and poor peasantry, where appropriate) and building socialism on a world-scale. In the imperialist countries, the practical result of the PLA brand of social-chauvinism, and others as well, is that there is not the struggle for proletarian revolution, there is not proletarian preparation now for civil war when the inevitable imperialist wars, including imperialist WWII, break out. In an imperialist war among imperialist countries, it is not the task of the proletariat in these countries to engage in the predatory imperialist bourgeoisie's "liberation war," as the social-chauvinists advise. It is, of course, possible that an imperialist war might be transformed into a national-liberation war and vice-versa, but this has to be determined on the concrete developments**. In the capitalist neo-colonies that are politically "independent" (not politically-militarily annexed), the neo-colonial bourgeoisie is generally tied to imperialism. The bourgeoisie there engages in various national-chauvinist activities on its own behalf and that of its imperialist partners. Thus, there is a tendency for the neo-colonial bourgeoisie to involve "their" country in imperialist wars for their class interests. Prior to such imperialist wars, the proletariat in these countries needs to be waging class struggle for the proletarian revolution with anti-imperialist and anti-feudal tasks, and in many cases for the preliminary struggle for political liberty. When such imperialist wars break out, the proletariat would use this opportunity to overthrow "their own" bourgeoisie. However, there is the possibility that an imperialist war involving a neo-colony might be transformed into a national-liberation war, and it is theoretically possible that a national-liberation war involving a non-imperialist country (a neo-colony) might be appropriate from the outset, e.g. in a proletarian-led struggle to overthrow "its" bourgeoisie, one or another imperialist power might intervene on behalf of its little brother and its bank account, in which case the class struggle against the bourgeoisie would be combined with national defense against imperialism. It must be analyzed what economics and politics the war is a continuation of to determine the stand of the class-conscious proletariat. Here again, from the PLA and other social-chauvinists we get the ahistorical, categorical "liberation war." As a concrete example, the PLA recently called on*** the

* This is a continuation of the revisionist line of the Moscow Declarations.

** See Lenin's "The Junius Pamphlet," LCW, Vol. 22, pp. 305-319

*** See "Hands Off Iran," reported in People's Canada Daily News, January 2, 1980

Iranian proletariat and poor peasantry to rally behind the Khomeini-led feudal-clerical-reactionaries (and the Iranian bourgeoisie) in the face of U.S. imperialist-led pressures and threats, instead of the Iranian proletariat and poor peasantry escalating the struggle to win political liberty, the struggle to overthrow "its" ruling reactionaries. Actually, imperialist war against Iran by U.S imperialism (or Soviet social-imperialism) is 10 times more likely in the event of a mounting class-conscious, proletarian-led struggle or victory. In the colonies, i.e. the oppressed nations lacking political self-determination, the proletariat strives to lead the national-liberation struggle and may enter into a temporary alliance* with "its" bourgeoisie, providing the bourgeoisie wages a revolutionary struggle against imperialism and does not hinder the class-conscious proletariat from educating the proletariat and mass of peasantry in a proletarian-revolutionary spirit. (As will be shown shortly, the PLA did not do this in their national-liberation (anti-fascist) struggle, i.e. they liquidated proletarian independence.) Lenin's criticism of the social-chauvinists around imperialist WWI retains its validity against the social-chauvinist trends today, including that section of the social-chauvinist and centrist trend which the PLA leads:

"All philistines and all stupid and ignorant yokels argue in the same way as the renegade Kautskyites, Longuetites, Turatis and Co.: 'The enemy has invaded my country, I don't care about anything else.'** The Socialist, the revolutionary proletarian, the internationalist, argues differently. He says: 'The character of the war (whether it is reactionary or revolutionary) does not depend on who the attacker was, or in whose country the 'enemy' is stationed; it depends on what class is waging the war, and of what politics this war is a continuation. If the war is a reactionary, imperialist war, that is, if it is being waged by two world groups of the imperialist, rapacious, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie, then every bourgeoisie (even of the smallest country) becomes a participant in the plunder, and my duty as a representative of the revolutionary proletariat is to prepare for the world proletarian revolution as the only escape from the horrors of a world war. I must argue, not from the point of view of 'my' country (for that is the argument of a wretched, stupid, petty-bourgeois nationalist who does not realize that he is only a plaything in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie), but from the point of view of my share in the preparation, in the propaganda, and in the acceleration of the world proletarian revolution.'

That is what internationalism means, and that is the duty of the internationalist, of the revolutionary worker, of the genuine Socialist." (Lenin, Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, Peking edition, pp. 79-80)

* See Lenin On the National and Colonial Questions, Peking edition, p. 33

** "The social-chauvinists (the Scheidemanns, Renaudels, Hendersons, Gomperses and Co.) absolutely refuse to talk about the 'International' during the war. They regard the enemies of 'their' respective bourgeoisies as 'traitors' to...Socialism. They support the policy of conquest pursued by their respective bourgeoisies. The social-pacifists (i.e., Socialists in words and petty-bourgeois pacifists in practice) express all sorts of 'internationalist' sentiments, protest against annexations, etc., but in practice they continue to support their respective imperialist bourgeoisie. The difference between the two types is unimportant, it is like the difference between two capitalists--one with bitter, and the other with sweet words on his lips."

And so?

The PLA waged a revisionist-centrist struggle with Soviet revisionism, broke tactically with Russian social-imperialism when the "...mother-Party..."* tried to place Albania under unpatriotic neo-colonial or colonial control, and helped forge an international revisionist-centrist trend under the leadership of Mao Zedong Thought. "For their efforts, the patriotic Albanian bourgeoisie received political support and "well-intentioned internationalist aid" from social-imperialist China." Thus, during the CPC's revisionist-centrist period, before the swing toward alignment with the U.S. imperialist-led bloc in the early 1970's, the CPC and the PLA showered each other with public praise, and significant capital was exported to Albania. For example, when Mao Zedong wrote "People of the World, Unite and Defeat the U.S. Aggressors and All Their Running Dogs!" (which doesn't even formally mention the proletariat, let alone its leading role, doesn't criticize the bourgeois-revisionist parties or the bourgeois-liberation movements, etc., in short, is a revisionist-centrist rendition of the "theory of the three worlds"), the PLA united** with this statement gushingly, embellishing it somewhat. When Nixon went to China in 1972 and the "Sino-U.S. Joint Communiqué" was developed, Chinese social-imperialism clearly embarked on the road of rapprochement and alliance with the U.S. imperialist-led bloc. The PLA, of course, did not and could not openly criticize and condemn this development in a Marxist-Leninist manner. Did not, because to do so would jeopardize the "well-intentioned" social-imperialist aid that was flowing in. Could not, because the PLA shares the same strategic objective as the CPC, i.e. maintenance of bourgeois-revisionist rule. The PLA slowly began to cultivate the development of adherents in various "parties" and groups in different countries to counter the CPC's motion. The more the CPC moved openly to the right, moved their common "theory of the three worlds" to the right, the more the PLA became "pure" revisionist-centrists. This "brand new" "theory of the three worlds" conflicts with the PLA's bourgeois-nationalist interests since it strengthens the U.S. imperialist-led bloc, which poses problems for Albania's political independence. After Mao Zedong's death in September 1976, the PLA held its 7th Congress in November 1976. It was clear by then that no pro-PLA centrist faction would win out in China, so the PLA began an open, albeit muted, indirect, and revisionist-centrist criticism of the "theory of the three worlds." Issued in July, 1977, "The Theory and Practice of the (Bourgeois-Democratic, Bourgeois-Revisionist) Revolution" is probably the most centrist document in the course of the struggle, but revisionist-centrist nonetheless. It is interesting to note that the PLA did not directly respond to the CPC's reply, Peking Review #45, 1977. More sympathy could be gained by allowing the CPC to make the break, which occurred the following summer when the CPC cut off "well-intentioned" social-imperialist aid to Albania. Not restrained by the prospect of losing exported capital, the PLA began an open campaign against the CPC which reached a high point with the international distribution of Imperialism and the (Bourgeois-Democratic, Bourgeois-Revisionist) Revolution, the revisionist-centrist criticism of Mao Zedong Thought. The PLA maintains ideological and political components of MZT. Imperialist World War III is looming on the horizon and the PLA has not aligned with any imperialist bloc--yet. Imperialist war is the central problem facing the patriotic Albanian bourgeoisie. Although the PLA has many revisionist-centrist parties that look to it for leadership, as the PLA's practice shows and World War I proved, the covert social-chauvinists do and will increasingly provide political comfort to "their own" bourgeoisie. Should the PLA join an imperialist alliance, the parties in that bloc could be of some assistance in rallying "their" proletarians to slaughter the "other" proletarians, in defense of the patriotic Albanian bourgeoisie. In any event, what is the PLA to do?

* The Party of Labor of Albania in Battle With Modern Revisionism, p. 60

**See Peking Review, May 21, 1971, p. 4-5, and May 28, 1971, p. 8-9

C. The PLA Unites with Mao Zedong Thought Ideologically

The failure to break with Soviet revisionism, the same bourgeois strategy of the CPC with differences around tactical questions, has its basis in non Marxist-Leninist ideology. As we said earlier, there is little written by the PLA on ideological-philosophical questions and what is written is scattered throughout their writings. Yet in Imperialism and the Revolution the PLA is critical of the philosophy of MZT and tries to give the impression they have a Marxist-Leninist outlook and method.

One of the first things the PLA is critical of is "Mao Zedong Thought" and Mao's negation of Marxist-Leninist principles.* They critically mention the Sinification of Marxism and the raising up of "MZT" as the highest stage of M-L in the present era. This was a strange criticism given their past positive view of "MZT." Before Imperialism and the Revolution came out the PLA held that:

"The role and contribution of the CPC and the PR of China in the struggle for the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat and peoples of all the world is colossal. Today, China is an invincible stronghold of socialism, the powerful base of revolution, the standard bearer of Marxism-Leninism, the steel pillar and reliable shield of our revolutionary common cause...The enemies are hoping in vain to discredit great People's China. Under the leadership of the Communist Party of China and Mao Tsetung' thought she is marching triumphantly ahead." ("Excerpts from the Report on the Activity of the Central Committee of the PLA" Submitted to the 5th Congress of the PLA on Nov. 1, 1966, in The Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern Revisionism, p. 231)

"The rich experience of the Chinese revolution, which constitutes a valuable contribution to the treasury of the theory and practice of the revolutionary movement of the world proletariat, is summed up on a scientific basis, according to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, in his (Mao's) thought and teachings." ("The Name and Work of Comrade Mao Tsetung are Immortal," Zeri i Populit, in Albania Today Jan-Feb 1977; see also Some Questions of Socialist Construction, p. 83-4, 92)

Now either the PLA lied all the years it upheld Mao and his "thought," his "valuable contribution," and his "application" of M-L to China, or they really believed what they said. Either way, given the fact the PLA did no self-criticism for any of its actions around Mao, shows it does not really care for the M-L principles it alleges to uphold, but rather uses these principles pragmatically. Either they saw the negation of M-L principles in Mao all along but pragmatically overlooked it for "higher" economic reasons, or they did not see Mao's revisionism and have had to pragmatically cover over a basic ideological insufficiency of their own by denying this. Without a full self-criticism and examination of ideological errors (and none of this bunk about "enigmas"), their criticism of MZT is purely sham."

Actually, "evidence shows" that the PLA is "just striking a pose in regards to this criticism of MZT, that it follows basically the same empiricist, pragmatic, spontaneous outlook and method. Two well-known sources reflect this--History of the PLA and "The Vanguard of the Revolution and Socialist Construction." (Albania Today 1972). In the history, early examples of spontaneity occur in the building of the Albanian party. A close examination of the history brings out that the Party was built from below and that mass work, not the development of profession-

*see Imperialism and the Revolution, COUSM-L ed. p. 108

↓
Idealist
Method
↓
al revolutionaries, was stressed in the period of party building. This went so far as to concentrate on attempting to lead the democratic-anti-imperialist revolution before the party was formed, before a communist program and strategy was laid out (putting forward the objective, allies, main blow of the first stage of the revolution), before the vanguard of the proletariat was consolidated. Then, in 1939, according to the PLA the building of the party from above (which they had not been carrying out) was fruitless. The masses and the mass movement would decide the building of the party.

"The rank and file members of the communist groups were becoming more and more aware that unity could not be achieved through sterile talks among chiefs but through a common struggle against the fascist invaders. This gradually pushed the political and ideological differences into the background...

The political success of these demonstrations exerted a great influence on public opinion in the country...The struggle of the Albanian communists themselves created, at last, favorable conditions for founding their party. Among the ranks of the communist groups there had sprung up professional revolutionary cadres who had been able to rise above the disputes among the groups, had definitely embraced the line of an uncompromising war against the fascist invaders and traitors to the country, and had striven to unify the Albanian communist movement on this basis.

...The instructions issued to the group members at the time contained, among others, such exhortations as "As people who love your country, integrate with the masses, win their sympathy, come to terms with them and prepare them for an armed national movement." (p. 70, 84, 85)

After being emerged in mass work for two more years and differences were "pushed back" from this, time was ripe for founding the party. The party was founded in 1941 on the basis of bourgeois nationalism and an MZT-type strategy of "unite all who can be united" ("to unite all honest and anti-fascist persons regardless of their religious beliefs, political opinions and trends...for an independent, free and democratic Albania" and "Unite with all the nationalists who really want a free Albania, with all the honest Albanians who want to fight against fascism"*), rather than an M-L strategy clearly defining allies, main blow, and rather than a program which brought out the two-stage nature of the revolution and the objective of the second stage, the socialist revolution.

While the trotskyite liquidationist line (at least it is such as the PLA presents it) was struggled against, the PLA never in the history of party building struggled against a neglect^o of the consolidation of the vanguard and its theory. To them the trotskyite "theory of cadres" was the only danger and only deviation in this period. We hear this over and over again in the History... But the danger which had engulfed them became a rightist, bowing to the spontaneous movement, failure to develop Marxist-Leninist theory and cadres. Leadership of the democratic anti-imperialist revolution was definitely needed, especially under conditions of fascist invasion, but skipping the stage of the consolidation of the vanguard and its theory cannot lead to Marxist-Leninist leadership of the revolution. Tactics towards the swift consolidation of the party without leaving the masses without any leadership needed to be developed, but the initial abandonment of party building in the years 1935-1939 and then the unprincipled merger of groups in 1941 on the basis of "mass work" were not such tactics. Rather they were the Menshevik strategy of leaving the working class and oppressed masses without communist leadership, of being satisfied with the spontaneous bourgeois development of society.

* History of the PLA, p. 94, 121

Listen to the way the PLA describes the development of its programmatic-strategic views in "The Vanguard of the Revolution...":

"When the Party was founded, it laid the basis of its political line for the period of the National Liberation War. The First Conference of the Albanian Communist Party, held in March 1943, summed up the revolutionary experience accumulated during the 15 months of its existence, and on this basis, worked out the general line more deeply and extensively giving the Party a more or less complete program. However, this program was still incomplete. It was completed later on, always through the summing up of the struggle to carry out the strategic and tactical tasks defined earlier." (Albania Today 1972)

The PLA has been so disdainful of guiding theory that it felt a firm program was not needed at the founding of their party and that it did not need to be worked out except a stage at a time, and even then, it did not need to be clearly stated:

luring "Thus, when we speak of the political line, of the program of our Party at a given stage of the revolution, we do not find it in one single document, report, decision, or resolution of a Congress, Conference or plenum of the CC of the Party, but in many documents and materials of the leading organs, in various works by comrade Hoxha. These documents and works contain a summing up of the experience accumulated in the tide of the revolution and socialist construction, and, on this basis, the program has been enriched, deepened and extended." (Ibid.)

It is precisely this type of view which justifies spontaneity. To the PLA programs are worked out bit by bit, they come from "experience," they do not need to be clearly elaborated. Marxist-Leninist programs are developed out of the experience of the working class movement internationally and historically, most of which has already been summed up in Marxist-Leninist principles. We develop programs to guide our practice, our experiences do not develop our programs except to modify them when they do not completely conform to reality. Making their programs develop out of their experiences totally negates Marxist-Leninist principles and leaves practice within the realm of spontaneity. Such views have their practical connections and consequences. The PLA did not carry out socialist propaganda in the first stage of their revolution (the anti-imperialist, democratic). In fact, they admittedly considered it inappropriate:

"The Communist Party of Albania did not call for the intensification of the class struggle within the country, nor did it launch slogans calling on the people to rise against the landlords, tribal chieftains, and the bourgeoisie; to the end, it directed its main efforts against the fascist invaders. The class struggle was intensified by the open treachery of the exploiting classes." (History of the PLA, p. 233; see also E. Hoxha, SW Vol 1, p. 94)

Following "the system of unification from below up,"* the party cadres lacked a basic M-L foundation. A task listed at the founding congress was "to uplift the cadres ideologically, theoretically and politically by imparting to them the M-L theory..."** They didn't have this before becoming members! Of course, without a program, this is difficult! This situation continued at the First Consultative Congress in April 1942 where:

* Enver Hoxha, SW Vol 1, p. 6

** History of the PLA, p. 88

"A full understanding of the structure of our organization and how the Party is run has not yet been formed. This is due to many causes, and in particular to the fact that the comrades do not have a good understanding of Marxism-Leninism..."(Enver Hoxha, SW Vol. 1, p. 8)

Note that what was important was that the members did not know about organizational matters; knowing a Marxist-Leninist program and carrying it out was not mentioned.

The party never did rectify the lack of Marxist-Leninist education. In 1948 Hoxha admits their emphasis on practical work and "concrete tasks of the post liberation years" caused them to neglect the work to raise the ideological level of cadres. He suggests the main task of the Party to be to assimilate the "basis of Marxist-Leninist theory."* Yet still in 1967 instances are cited in which "...a communist who, although being a good man, devoted to and willing even to sacrifice his life for the Party, betroths his underage daughter, or does not act to persuade his old folk not to fast..."**

This situation of a party composed of members basically uneducated to Marxism-Leninism and M-L principles is complementary to their agreement with Mao that it is "from the masses, to the masses." The PLA says:

"The Party has the right to do what the people want, what the class wants, what the laws permit, what its Marxist-Leninist line permits. Beyond these, it has no right to act. If it goes beyond these confines, then the Party, the communists, embark on the wrong road." (Enver Hoxha, Speeches 1971-73, p. 134)

"The Marxist-Leninist line of our Party is the summing up, along the path of the materialistic Marxist dialectics, of the struggles, aspirations, realizations and revolutionary deeds of the masses. This correct line of the Party is daily enriched by the experience of the masses and materialized in further material and moral benefits.

Hence, the masses create, the Party leads, sums up, educates and again creates. Thus, through this continuous process, the Party and the masses not only create and accomplish, but through this great and fruitful creativeness, get educated, gain experience, improve their knowledge, increase their ability and deepen their determination." (Enver Hoxha, Speeches 1967-68, p. 185-6)

"The further revolutionization of the life of our country...is not an administrative-bureaucratic action but a great revolutionary movement which is carried out with the participation of the broadest masses of the people, by applying the method of the line of the masses, throwing them into mass revolutionary actions...

The strength of the party lies in its links with the masses..." (Foto Cami, "The Further Revolutionization of the Life of the Country and Some Questions on the Theory and Practice of Socialism" in Some Questions of Socialist Construction in Albania and of the Struggle Against Revisionism, p. 91, 125)

According to the PLA they "lead" according to how the masses want them to lead. If the masses already know what they want then who needs leaders?! We have already criticized the "mass line" outlook in the first section on Mao Zedong Thought as a thoroughly spontaneous outlook and will not say more here.

* Enver Hoxha, SW Vol. 1, p. 829-31

**Enver Hoxha, Speeches 1967-68, p. 132

What is important to note is that the PLA has this same line as Mao and they do not really criticize Mao here. This is because all opportunists and revisionists negate the role of conscious Marxist-Leninist ideology, of the need to consolidate the vanguard around this and to impart this to the masses.

The failure to lay out a clear program for the two stages of the revolution, to found the Party and admit cadre only on the basis of agreement with such, to propagate such views and actions among the masses; to instead educate the masses only about the first stage, to consolidate the party and admit members on the basis of agreement with "unite all who can be united" and to tell the masses their fight is against the fascists and leave it at that, is all part and parcel of opportunism and revisionism, of a bourgeois line and practice. While we have not deepened our study to the point of looking at the economic and political structure of Albania very deeply, given the spontaneous bourgeois development of the party and its line, it follows that socialism could not have been built and the dictatorship of the proletariat could not have existed in Albania. NB

These are not just isolated examples torn out of context. First, the entire History abounds with a worshipping of the mass movement. Secondly, all the Albanian writings reflect such an outlook, even when occasionally an article or sentence about the need for "Marxist-Leninist theory" and "Marxist-Leninist principles" is thrown in.

We have said the PLA uses the phrase "M-L principles" occasionally in its writings. It is seldom that a discussion of the content of M-L principles occurs, however. About the only M-L principle the PLA discusses is the need for monolithic unity of the Party. Even here the PLA misses the boat. To draw out one of the principles of the character of the M-L party and emphasize that, without bringing out others, does not lead to clarity and correct practice. If a party does not have Marxist-Leninist theoretical (programmatic, strategic and tactical) correctness, a proletarian and professional revolutionary composition, and does not carry out the line and win the masses to the line, the monolithic unity can not be on a proletarian basis. The proletariat needs monolithic unity only on the basis of the correct line and practice. The PLA "forgets" the other characteristics or puts less emphasis on them precisely because it does not have them. While it may be a party with a monolithic line, it is surely a monolithic bourgeois line and practice. It comes as no surprise to us that the PLA can only criticize the CPC for failure to have monolithic unity when the CPC failed to have any Marxist-Leninist characteristic.

A principle the PLA talks about which it claims is Marxist-Leninist is its idea of "Leninist norms." At this time we are not clear where this "principle" originated (which we intend to find out), but it is not Leninist. The "Leninist norms" the PLA refers to is the practice of co-existence of views and struggle under the table, the type of practice which it wanted to occur with the CPSU and CPC, and which it currently carries out with its "fraternal" parties. It is anti-Leninist to the core. The Marxist-Leninist "norm" is open struggle and splitting from opportunism (including centrism) and revisionism. M-L's understand that no good can come from "fraternal bilateral discussions" in the absence of open struggle against incorrect lines and practice, that communists are not afraid, but consider it a good thing to expose errors within its camp, and that opportunism and revisionism must be thoroughly exposed and a split made from it, whether that means expelling those from a given organization, or splitting from the organization.

We already showed the PLA's failure to follow Marxist-Leninist principles and program, strategy and tactics, and around the building and character of

the party. As far as other M-L principles, the PLA while mouthing the principle, at the same time fails to follow it. Take the M-L principle that the working class is the only really revolutionary class, the only one capable of seeing a revolution (one or two stages) through to completion, the class which leads any other section of a class in carrying out national liberation, democratic or socialist revolution: the PLA tries to phrase this in much of its writings but their true opposition comes out in their view of the "third world" as the leading force (see previous section) and in their view of forces internally:

"The leading force in the front was the working class...The laboring peasantry...remained the broadest base of the Democratic Front...Now it was up to the Albanian youth as the most vigorous and revolutionary section of the people to take the lead in new battles for the rebuilding and socialist construction of our country...'The Democratic Government, which has placed its hopes on you, is confident that you will always be in the vanguard...'" (History of the PLA, p. 255-6)

The PLA says it did not merely "copy" the experiences of the Soviets.* Lenin says the Soviets are a universal form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Just what exactly did the PLA not "copy"? Perhaps it was the fact that in Albania the national liberation councils were not a workers and peasants council but:

degeneration
"The composition of the organs of this uprising harmonized with its national-liberation character. These councils, the Central Committee instructed in June 1942, should include the militant representatives of all the anti-fascist forces regardless of their political opinion and class background. The concept of these councils was acceptable to the masses of the people in Albania. ...the...national-liberation councils...would serve as instruments organizing and mobilizing the people for the anti-fascist war and, at the same time, as the 'nuclei of our future government'." (History of the PLA, p. 126, 107)

The Anti-fascist National Liberation Council set up in 1944 "represented a democratic dictatorship of the revolutionary forces under the direct and sole leadership of the Communist Party."** Funny how Lenin never talked about the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry in vague terms as the "revolutionary forces." Who were the "revolutionary forces" in Albania? Was it the same "working class, poor and middle peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the major part of the medium bourgeoisie of the cities, the patriotic intellectuals and some individual elements from the higher strata"*** that were in the National Liberation Front? While the PLA tries to portray its councils as similar to the Paris Commune and the Soviets, it admits that, "Nevertheless, it preserved its full originality, in conformity with the objective conditions of Albania under the circumstances of the National-Liberation War of the Albanian people."****

It is completely sham for the PLA in its summation in the back of the History of the PLA to say that it never shared power with the bourgeoisie when these councils were set up in the midst of the anti-fascist war with membership (irrespective of class and the class stand of the bourgeoisie and landlords not being struggled against. Most important, to say power was never "shared" with the bourgeoisie (the question should not be whether it was shared, but who had power) requires the party to be proletarian, something which we have shown was not the case with the PLA. The PLA paints the "people's democracy" as a dictator-

* History of the PLA, p. 126

** Ibid, p. 211

*** Ibid, p. 179

**** Ibid, p. 211

ship of the proletariat, and this is incorrect and a serious revision of Marxism-Leninism. Or does the PLA think it can peacefully and legislatively change a "people's democracy" which either does share power with the bourgeoisie (it shares power with anyone who is "democratic" and "progressive"), or which is essentially bourgeois, into a dictatorship of the proletariat? Would this then not be the "peaceful transition" from capitalism to socialism, also a serious revision of Marxism-Leninism?

Stalin?

In their criticism of Mao Zedong Thought the PLA goes on to say that Mao "brought Marxism-Leninism into his work only in the form of mutilated principles and ideas,"* and that:

"In theory Mao accepted some of the basic principles of Marxism. In his official writings these principles and some other matters are formulated in general. In practice however, Mao formulated and defended non-Marxist theses..." (Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, part C, p. 76) *correctly*
"Mao Tsetung thought' is an amalgam of views in which ideas and theses borrowed from Marxism are mixed up with idealist, pragmatic and revisionist principles from other philosophies..." (Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, p. 108)

Precisely what of Mao's official writings reflects Marxist-Leninist principles? And what were the mutilated M-L principles and ideas he borrowed? To Mao, M-L principles are seeing "dialectical materialism" as our guide to action. Everything else is "application" of this M-L principle. By negating M-L principles on programmatic, strategic and tactical questions, on the party, dictatorship of the proletariat, socialism, etc., Mao completely negates his view of "dialectical materialism" as an M-L principle because dialectical materialism shows these to be M-L principles. Mao does not "mutilate" Marxist-Leninist principles, he negates them. He does not formulate M-L principles and "some other matters" correctly. He did not "borrow" views from M-L. *Thus the U.S. bourgeoisie was worried for 25 years about nothing.*

Of course it is the fact that the PLA has the same view as Mao of Marxist-Leninist principles that they are unable to see that Mao "had nothing M-L about him," and is the reason why they define eclecticism as a combination of M-L and non M-L. We showed earlier that eclecticism is an undialectical combination of things, none of which can then be correct. By defining eclecticism this way, and Mao's practice as eclectic, the PLA can get around a Marxist-Leninist criticism of Mao, one that would expose themselves as well. For the PLA too thinks Marxism-Leninism is only the basic "theory" which is "applied" to everything, rather than there being many M-L principles developed from international practice to be applied to things. To the PLA, "Marxism-Leninism was adopted as the vanguard theory which would guide the party in working out its program and in all its activity."** Specifically, "In building socialist society, in explaining and solving social problems which we come across in life, we are guided by the Marxist-Leninist philosophy, by the dialectical laws of the development of society."*** The PLA equates "fundamental principles" with "world outlook and methodology," with the "Marxist-Leninist way of interpreting things and solving problems."**** They mention laws of philosophy, laws of political economy. While laws of philosophy and political economy are some very basic components of Marxism-Leninism, there is much, much more to M-L principles than that as we have shown. It is confining M-L to "dialectical materialism," "philosophy," "political economy" which negates the wealth of universal knowledge it has already developed.

stupid?

NB

* Enver Hoxha, Reflections on China, part C, pp. 75-76

** History of the PLA, p. 88

*** Enver Hoxha, Speeches 1967-68, p. 122

**** Enver Hoxha, Speeches 1969-70, pp. 339-340

It negates the very important principles of programmatic views, strategy and tactics, dictatorship of the proletariat, the party, socialism, imperialist war, etc. But the PLA does not even place much emphasis on philosophy and political economy:

"But what is of greater importance is to learn how to be guided by these laws in life, how to solve the concrete problems facing us on the basis of these laws...The task of the Party School is not just to impart to these cadres of the Party some Marxist knowledge, but to arm them in such a way that they may orientate themselves in life, to form in them that Marxist manner of thinking and acting. Understood in this way, we say that Marxism-Leninism should serve us as a guiding compass." (Hoxha, Speeches 1969-70, p.340)

As with Mao, Marxism-Leninism is "a guiding compass." In their schools the PLA emphasizes the "use" of Marxism-Leninism, not "just" learning M-L knowledge. The same empiricism and pragmatism of Mao is beginning to come through.

In another article around this time, the PLA discusses in the most detail possible for them, what they consider the knowledge of Marxism-Leninism to be. Marx and Engels, among establishing the laws of development of human society, pointed out the methods and possible forms of transforming society, the ways of liquidating capitalism and building socialism and communism. What these possibilities (soviets perhaps) and ways are, the PLA doesn't elaborate. Lenin "continued the cause of Marx and routed the enemies of Marxism...he fought against capitalism in its imperialist stage under the conditions of the development of the great October Socialist Revolution..." Lenin's works are summed up as "the theory of Marx in constant action."* (emphasis ours) The very things which distinguishes a Marxist-Leninist, the upholding of the universal principles Lenin developed under the new conditions of imperialism, is not a part of the PLA's knowledge. They view Lenin just as Mao did--he developed Marxism in the conditions in Russia. The PLA feels Lenin Russified Marxism. Lenin's views were not international principles of significance for the entire era of imperialism and proletarian socialist revolution, applicable in general to all countries. Thus the PLA must "develop" Marxism, "creatively" for Albania. We now have the Hoxhafication of Marxism!

Thus one of the area the PLA considers to be "generally correct" of Mao's official writings is his theory of knowledge. While Mao's views on the theory of knowledge are not criticized, other than the inadequate criticism of MZT, the PLA, in various writings, does lay out its views. The description of the development of theory can be found in the History of the PLA:

"The PLA has been able to play the leading role in the revolution and the socialist construction of the country because it has worked out and consistently applied a revolutionary general line. This line has always responded to the political, economic, social and cultural demands of the masses, the fundamental interests of the people and the Fatherland, and to the interests of socialism on both the national and international levels.

In the working out of this line the PLA has relied on: the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism; the scientific analysis of the internal and external conditions, of the ratio of class forces within the country and at the international level; the revolutionary experience accumulated within the country; the experience of the international communist movement. On this basis it has been able to disclose and to evaluate correctly the fundamental contradictions in the various historical stages of the revolution and to define correctly its own programmatic aims and tasks.

* Enver Hoxha, Speeches 1967-68, pp. 117-119

In the working out of its political line, the Party has always proceeded with cautious steps, has not...enclosed itself in the narrow shell of national exceptionalism, nor has it mechanically copied or used foreign revolutionary experience. It has always been clear that the Marxist-Leninist principles and the revolutionary experience of the other sister communist parties alone cannot provide it with its own complete, ready-made political line. To achieve this, it is necessary for the party of the working class to have accumulated its own great experience, which is gained in revolutionary practice. For this reason, at the beginning of each historical stage, the PLA has been able to lay only the basis of its own general line, and later has enriched and completed it in the practice of the revolution and the socialist construction." (pp. 651-652)

First here we see that the line "responded" to the "interests of socialism" only as a part of many things--the "demands of the masses, the fundamental interests of the people, the Fatherland." This is purely revisionist and nationalist. The party's line takes up the class interests of the international proletariat, and it alone. In the first stage of a two stage revolution, certain of the interests of sections of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry correspond to the proletariat and that is why they become allies. In an underdeveloped country with a peasantry in the second stage the lower peasantry's interests correspond with the building of socialism and that is why they are an ally there. But the party's line does not take up the interests of any class or section of a class other than the proletariat. To do so would be to support bourgeois relations. We win the masses to the party's proletarian line, convince them that the proletarian solution is the best solution for them, but we do not construct our line to fit their interests. As we brought out before, the PLA's line is of a spontaneous, bourgeois nature. As far as the interests of the "Fatherland"--what bourgeois nationalism!

Of course then the next thing the PLA says, that they relied on the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism in working out the line, is false. The noteworthy thing is that these fundamental principles (which they don't follow) are only one of a whole list of things, when they should be the backbone of the line. What is drastically eliminated from the PLA's list is the historical experience of the international communist movement. Their concern is with the current experience of the international "communist" movement and within their country. They are not yet showing as extremely narrow empiricism as Mao but the closeness to him is apparent. Some pragmatism creeps in: what does it mean to take into account the ratio of class forces--does this mean if there are so much of each class, that we do things a certain way, that our practice is dependent on this? Through all this, what is being said is that the "fundamental principles" cannot be directly applied to Albania in the development of its "programmatic aims and tasks," that some new conditions had occurred in the world which had to be taken into consideration. The final paragraph of the PLA's views above confirm all our suspicions. To the PLA, what is really needed is their "own great experience". This theme is repeated in "The Vanguard of the Revolution and Socialist Construction":

"Why has the PLA not worked out a complete and comprehensive program for an historical stage of the revolution right at the beginning of that stage? The sole reason is that at the outset it lacked sufficiently of the necessary experience of revolutionary leadership. This experience is gained mainly in practical revolutionary activity. Neither Marxism-Leninism, nor the experience of a fraternal Party can ever give the working class party of this or that country a political line ready made and complete...While giving first importance to its own revolutionary exper-

ience in working out its political line, the PLA has also profited from the experience of the fraternal parties, of the entire international communist movement. In particular it has gained a great deal from the experience of the Bolshevik Party. Today it benefits especially from the revolutionary experience of the Communist Party of China...The PLA has adapted the revolutionary experience of the fraternal parties to the historic, economic, and social conditions of our country. Any mechanical copying of the revolutionary experience of another party or country, yields nothing but a bad parody with irreparable consequences for the working class Party that permits such a mistake." (Albania Today, 1972)

First importance goes to its "own" experience, and also they use the experience of "fraternal" parties (such as the CPC), and of the entire international "communist" movement. Most important is the PLA's own narrow experience, secondly is the narrow momentary experience of the other revisionist and centrist parties. The most important thing to M-L's, the taking in of the historical experience, is to the PLA, that which cannot be copied or mechanically applied! The PLA can have their fundamental principles, which are only philosophy and political economy, which are never adequately elaborated, but the "experiences of the Bolshevik Party" are not part of the fundamental principles, are not summed up knowledge and they can't be "mechanically applied." The Russian experience is their experience, the Russification of Marxism to the PLA. The PLA must develop its "own" experience. Even the experience of the "fraternal" parties is really the experience of those parties and cannot be "mechanically applied" according to the PLA. But when do principles come out of experience? When and how does experience become universal? These are things the PLA never writes about. Where have we seen this before?!

Just like Mao, the PLA downplays the role of human knowledge in human life. In several articles* they use the primacy of matter over consciousness, the objective conditions as the basis of the subjective, the basis and criterion of theory being practice, as proof of their view of the primacy of their own practice. Behind all this is their narrow view of practice and their real underplaying of the role of theory. Actually it is not much to state the primacy of matter over consciousness, the relationship between the objective and subjective factors, the criterion of truth being practice. What really reflects a Marxist-Leninist outlook is when one understands, and is able to show it in a historical way. With their view of practice and their real underrating of theory the PLA is unable to do this. In one article they amusingly get hysterical over translating a book by Rousseau into Albanian.** Now we are not proposing that Rousseau's book is important enough to translate into Albanian, but the whole attitude they have is one of negating the study of past philosophers since they don't take proletarian stands. While it is not necessary to study such things extensively, real knowledge of the history and content of human thought, the class content of various eras, should be encouraged. Thus possible critiques or summations of or concise readings by past philosophers should be studied. But the PLA says that the only thing we need to know of the past of human thought is what Marx and Engels have summed up. But can we know the world by just studying Marx and Engels' works? Of course the PLA is not advocating just studying M-L works in relation to science, as they themselves rely on bourgeois science. It is just in philosophy, history, economics, social science that the PLA says we can get it all from Marxist works. This is incorrect.

* See "The Objective and Subjective Factors in the Revolution," Albania Today; "Study M-L Theory Linking it Closely with Revolutionary Practice," E. Hoxha, Speeches 1969-70, pp. 313-343.

** E. Hoxha, Speeches 1967-68, p. 187-9

Marxist works sum up much human knowledge. To really understand these summations, knowledge of the particulars needs to be developed, both historically and of present conditions. But knowledge of the "wealth of the particulars" is not important to the PLA when they aren't following the universality anyway and are going by their individual "experience." Also, really understanding the content and putting this understanding into practice, is not as important as being able to formally talk about something as far as the PLA is concerned. They disagree with Lenin who said:

"But it would mean falling into a grave error for you to try to draw the conclusion that one can become a Communist without assimilating the wealth of knowledge amassed by mankind. It would be mistaken to think it sufficient to learn communist slogans and the conclusions of communist science, without acquiring that sum of knowledge of which communism is a result. Marxism is an example which shows how communism arose out of the sum of human knowledge...Proletarian culture must be the logical development of the store of knowledge mankind has accumulated under the yoke of capitalist, landowner and bureaucratic society. All these roads have been leading, and will continue to lead to proletarian culture..." (Lenin, "Tasks of the Youth Leagues" LCW Vol 31, pp. 286-7)

The PLA does not bother to expound materialist dialectics. It talks about it off and on, but nowhere explains it. This is par for the PLA's method itself. The PLA being revisionist and opportunist of the centrist type, seeks to look orthodox, but since it isn't, its orthodoxy is a mere formalism. Thus we see the PLA busying themselves with slogans, phrases, which they cannot explain or follow. Over and over again in Albania Today, Zeri i Popullit, Radio Tirana, we hear of the struggle for national-liberation, the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialism and yet what the content of these struggles are is not often brought out. When content does emerge, the revisionist nature of it can be seen. What emptiness in the worn out phrases the PLA uses over and over again, phrases they use as if in hearing them say "revolution" enough, we would surmise the PLA was revolutionary. The PLA resorts so much to form, they inform us so little of the content of their views, that we swear that 90% of their writings could be thrown out without any loss to an understanding of their line:

PLA does have materialist, proletarian ideas

That the PLA sees form in the lead can also be seen in their view of the Party. Here their view tends to be that with the proper organization of the party, it's line will be fine. While organization and line are interconnected, the overall line is not a result of the organizational form, but vice versa.

This deviation from dialectics in terms of formalism, is related to another metaphysical error of viewing knowledge as only very vague generalities and not seeing that it includes the particulars, the particulars themselves are a universality. An example here is the PLA's "upholding" of the dictatorship of the proletariat. How do they "uphold" it?--in words, in the general sense. In no way do they make that general come alive in its particular. They deny the particular of soviets as a universality, for example. The PLA says the vanguard of the proletariat must be consolidated in the M-L party. Ask the PLA how this should be done universally and they could not give you the experience of the Bolshevik party since that was "their" (the Russian) experience which "does not apply" universally, and of course they could not give you their own experience either since that was "their" (the Albanian) experience; and anyway, bringing out the two "experiences" and comparing them might bring up some uncomfortable differences and raise up some serious questions, so let's just keep things at the level of

slinging slogans around. And we have already seen how Marxism-Leninism is formally philosophy and political economy!

The PLA has been an avid user of Mao's principal contradiction.* This must be another aspect of Mao's thought the PLA found to be generally correct. The opportunist elimination of the struggle for socialism and socialist propaganda in the national liberation war is a product of the "principal contradiction" being between fascists and "the people," and that working to resolve such a contradiction will lead to a resolving of the other. This does not see the interconnections of the contradictions--that while the national liberation struggle will pave the way for developing the socialist struggle, the national liberation struggle can only be completed on the basis of the struggle for socialism, that within the national liberation struggle are a host of contradictions related to the socialist struggle. After the contradiction between "the people" and the occupationists was resolved, bypassing any other political tasks such as instituting the dictatorship of the proletariat and poor peasantry, the next principal contradiction was between the feudal-capitalist economic base and the socialist economic base. Without having done any propaganda about socialism, without having instituted proletarian political power through the dictatorship of the proletariat, economics became the principal contradiction. Of course it is impossible to build socialism without the other things. We see a peaceful transition line creeping in--now we can build socialism without overthrowing the bourgeoisie, smashing the old state apparatus and putting power in the hands of the proletariat. When the socialist economic base had been "completely constructed" the principal contradiction was ideology, thus the only ("main") thing left in order to reach communism was changing the outlooks of people. So we have our political struggle for national liberation and democracy, our economic struggle for socialism and finally our ideological struggle for communism. This is sheer revisionist nonsense: in each struggle for national liberation, for socialism and communism, politics, economics and ideology are all important. "What this principal contradiction does in terms of the struggle for socialism and communism is introduce a peaceful and non-socialist development of society: national liberation merges politically with "socialism"--this wipes out the proletarian seizure of power, the ideological preparation for such; socialism is only ("mainly") concerned with the development of economic relations--this leaves out the equally important continued struggle for the proletariat to retain power, the continued ideological struggle to win the masses to the side of the proletariat; once socialism has been established, the rest of the struggle for communism is ideological--this eliminates the economic and political tasks associated with the development into communism. The principal contradiction is a non-class analysis and invariably leads to leaving out the proletarian tasks associated with each stage of development.

Not to belabor the point, but to show the metaphysical and bourgeois nature of the PLA's principal contradiction, let us see what Lenin said about one stage mentioned here--that of the building of socialism:

"What are the class aims of the proletariat?

Suppress the resistance of the bourgeoisie:

Neutralize the peasantry and, if possible, win them over--at any rate the majority of the laboring, non-exploiting section--to the side of the proletariat;

Organize large-scale machine production, using factories, and means of production in general, expropriated from the bourgeoisie;

Organize socialism on the ruins of capitalism." ("The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" LCW Vol. 30, p. 263)

* "The Vanguard of the Revolution and Socialist Construction" Albania Today 1972

There are clearly political, economic and ideological tasks all intermixed here. Lenin did not say that "economics was the principal contradiction" under socialism, nor did he ever say it in any of his writings, because to do so would be to negate the importance of proletarian rule and continuing the struggle to win over the broad masses under socialism. Of course the PLA's scenario "probably" goes something like this: first stage, "emphasis" on politics--expell the fascists, don't promote the development of the proletarian struggle; second stage, "emphasis" on economics--build up the economic base (on a capitalist basis), the proletariat should not seize power; third stage, "emphasis" on ideology--try to convince people that they live in a socialist country with the dictatorship of the proletariat and they are on their way to communism! And it is especially the PLA's "failure to deal with the question of the relationship of the state to social revolution" that is the problem here and in all their writings. As Lenin said:

"In general, it may be said that evasiveness as regards the question of the relation of the proletarian revolution to the state--an evasiveness which was to the advantage of opportunism and fostered it--resulted in the distortion of Marxism and in its complete vulgarization." (The State and Revolution, Peking ed. p. 123)

In Imperialism and the Revolution the PLA describes socialism as a society in which "antagonistic classes and the oppression and exploitation of man by man are abolished." (p. 113) This confuses the goal of socialism with what exists at a given point in time. Under socialism the bourgeoisie and land owners are expropriated immediately, but it may take a longer time to eliminate differences between the petty bourgeoisie and workers or the peasantry and workers. The PLA says that socialism differs from communism only in its degree of development and maturity, when there are tremendous economic and political differences between socialism and communism. The practical consequences of all this has to be a huge rift between theory and practice--the PLA stating classes and class struggle have already been abolished when they aren't. Philosophically we see a merger of different qualities, a failure to grasp the essence of particular qualities, a failure to see the sublation within the negation, a failure to see real qualitative change from socialism to communism and what the quality is in each system. The PLA admits that "blemishes" of capitalism exist in socialism and that these "do not exist only in the field of ideology in the consciousness of our men, as it is often thought, but in all the fields of the economic, political, social, educational, cultural, organizational life, etc."* But they turn right around and associate these "stains" more within the ideological field. We have not seen where the PLA has discussed the strong economic remnants of capitalism which exist as bourgeois right under socialism.

This merger of qualitative differences and at the same time failure to see the old within the new is very related to their peaceful transition line. You do not really need a revolution when you have only quantitative differences. Nor do you have periods of qualitative leaps within something which gets rid of the old when there is nothing essentially of the old to get rid of. In other words, in the PLA's plan, you need no socialist revolution to go from capitalism to socialism and you need no further qualitative changes to socialism to get to communism. Everything is quantitative, peaceful, gradual.

The errors of the PLA in method--their formalism, failure to identify essence, failure to see different qualities and the leaps necessarily associated with them, failure to see the old in the new and the need for qualitative change within the new leading to a new quality overall, are all errors Mao Zedong Thought makes. In Imperialism and the Revolution the PLA tries to criticize Mao's method

* Some Questions of Socialist Construction in Albania and of the Struggle Against Revisionism, p. 88

and can only come up with Mao's seeing only change of place and not seeing change as spiral and leading to a higher level. Where is the PLA's qualitative change and spiral development? According to them socialism is the highest level possible, with communism only quantitatively higher, and yet they fail to make distinctions between capitalism and socialism and fail to carry out revolution, the leap into socialism. As with everything else, their spiral development is in words only and when examined it crumbles. Of course the PLA is unable to criticize Mao around the need to see the essence of things, around the relationship between quantity and quality, around the negation of the negation. It is especially noteworthy that the PLA never mentions anywhere the negation of the negation as a law of dialectics.

The PLA was close to Mao Zedong Thought, ideologically, politically and organizationally. It's closeness was based on the fact that neither the PLA nor the CPC broke with Soviet revisionism. The PLA at times had tactical disagreements with Mao and the CPC, which it, with typical centrism, failed to even debate openly. Other than these tactical differences, different types of metaphysics and idealism, the PLA has the same bourgeois outlook, method, program, and strategy as Mao and the CPC. The bourgeois nature of the PLA's guidance internationally has had a profound effect on our movement. In our last few pages we want to briefly sum up some of the important problems PLA centrism has caused.

V. The Role of the Party of Labor of Albania's Revisionism-Centrism in the "Anti-Revisionist Communist Movement"

While Mao Zedong Thought took the lead in developing the ideological basis of empiricism, metaphysics, and spontaneity prevalent in the U.S. "communist movement," had a heavy hand in passing tactical differences with the Soviet revisionists off as Marxist-Leninist differences, and thus was the mentor for a special trend of revisionism and right opportunism; the PLA played a treacherous role all along, also passing off tactical differences with the CPSU as strategic, bolstering the CPC's ideological empiricism, metaphysics and spontaneity through their own empiricism, metaphysics and spontaneity, and fostering an attitude of tolerance toward revisionism and opportunism. In short, they all along prevented a break from occurring between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism and opportunism.

Taking things back to the "break" with Soviet revisionism, we can see how the PLA has stifled a true split. "Because of their centrist split we did not bother to study the Soviet revisionist line." In following the leadership of the PLA and CPC, we erroneously assumed that the PLA and CPC had properly summed up Soviet revisionism in those years. In taking part of the leadership of the struggle with the CPSU, the PLA was able to shift struggle to areas which did not get to the real problem and could substitute their own centrist line for the CPSU's. Thus, instead of Marxism-Leninism emerging from the struggle against the CPSU, centrism and other forms of revisionism and right opportunism developed.

Also important in really breaking with revisionism and opportunism is grasping the revisionist take-over in the CPSU. The PLA was a part of stifling this too in their failure to put forward anything more than a Khrushchevite conspiracy, hiding out and coup. One cannot explain historic turning points in terms of conspiracies, deceptions and coups in the manner of bourgeois historians. But given the movement's bourgeois outlook and method, and right opportunism, the PLA's explanation was considered sound. A real analysis of the revisionist take-over in the CPSU and capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union still remains to be done. The KCMLC, formerly the Wichita Communist Cell, once set out to do such an analysis, but were "convinced" through our centrism that such an analysis was not a burning question and that we should look to the PLA and CPC for this analysis since they had already summed it up. Realizing now our centrist capitulation to right opportunism we plan to, "as our abilities permit," take up such an analysis.

Connected to this question of the revisionist take-over in the CPSU, is the whole promotion by the PLA of bourgeois-revisionist countries as socialist, the biggest deception of course is their long standing promotion of China as socialist. Such promotion results in a failure to understand what the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism is. For years we were taught to look to "socialist China" as a beacon example of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. This promotion also leads to a Kautskyite separation of politics from economics (these countries, even China with its "three worlds theory," could have bourgeois international politics and still have the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism). The PLA itself for a year and a half criticized the foreign "policy" of the CPC without any connection of this to the internal situation.

Even a greater bourgeois influence than the promotion of bourgeois revisionist states as socialist was the PLA's friendship and agreement with Mao Zedong Thought and the CPC. The PLA never openly criticized Mao Zedong Thought when it was spreading throughout the world, gaining influence in all corners. Quite the opposite! The PLA lauded Mao Zedong Thought and the CPC, let Mao take the ideological and political lead and corrupt communist movements internationally. On top

of this the PLA lent so much credibility to Mao Zedong Thought in their basic ideological agreement with Mao Zedong Thought. If anyone had doubts as to the correctness of developing theory from one's "experience"--just look at the PLA, the "other" leading "Marxist-Leninist" party and see that it too, has the same practice--why Mao must be correct! The same with "from the masses, to the masses," the party's tailing of the masses--the PLA does that too so we better not worry about whether it's correct or not. Also credible became the opportunist program and strategy of Mao and the CPC since the PLA too had a bourgeois nationalist practice. Briefly, nearly everything Mao Zedong Thought stood for was bolstered by the PLA's support of it in words and the same practice in deeds.

Because the PLA did not struggle against Mao Zedong Thought, but instead bolstered it with their support and practice, there was no voice internationally which struggled for the Marxist-Leninist line and practice. For those new to Marxism-Leninism who had a petty bourgeois and labor aristocratic social basis, who had not gotten rid of bourgeois ideology and practice, it was natural that the PLA and CPC, who put themselves forward as Marxist-Leninists and promoted accepting leadership without an M-L understanding, were followed and looked to as leaders without a Marxist-Leninist understanding of their line and practice. The result of this was years of continued opportunism and revisionism without Marxist-Leninist opposition, and "an inability for the overwhelming mass of "the movement" to think in a dialectical materialist way and act in a Marxist-Leninist manner. //

At a point in which things might have blown wide open--when Mao died and the rights assumed full power in the CPC--the PLA stepped in to put a stopper on M-L development. This was a dangerous time because it called into question many things--why could the rights take over like that? What was wrong with the CPC's practice in the past as a result of having rights in the party? What was the nature of China as a result of this? Did we really sum up the revisionist takeover and restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union? Why did the PLA support the CPC?--and it blew the centrist cover Mao had helped to foster in the international communist movement. The PLA has had to skillfully maneuver things in the past two years in order to prevent a real disclosure of "the bankruptcy of the international communist movement." First they got everyone's attention on the "three worlds theory." Here many groups spent a year or so (coming to erroneous, centrist conclusions) about a thoroughly obvious right opportunist and revisionist line and practice. Meanwhile all the questions about the nature of MZT, the CPC, China, the international communist movement were ignored by the PLA. This gave the PLA enough time to concoct Imperialism and the Revolution and Reflections on China, which gave a centrist criticism to the above questions and which then consummated their efforts at creating a centrist break with MZT and covering over once again the years of opportunism and revisionism in the international communist movement.

MB
But the PLA's centrist influence did not stop there. Their promotion of "Leninist norms" was an added centrist principle we learned. With this principle struggle was "with" opportunism and revisionism rather than against. We developed bilateral relations with groups on the basis of whether they were "open to struggle" or "not consolidated" instead of on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideological, political and organizational lines and practice. With "Leninist norms" struggle with "comrades" was not to be open, polemical, but private, back and forth, sweet pleading. Thus within the "anti-revisionist communist movement" bilateral relations had a historical or regional basis, struggle between groups was blunted and it just was not proper to struggle sharply with "comrades," nor to even publicly denounce incorrect practice unless one consulted with the groups first! Particularly, still amongst the small circles (see MJLC groups in

note #2), if you want to be a part of the "club" you have to tow the line and bite your tongue when it comes to criticism, 'cause if you don't you will be branded as "hot headed," "ultra-left." Wichita Communist Cell (WCC) especially had a reputation for being unable to control themselves and had to be instructed as to movement etiquette. WCC learned too well from their centrist and rightist friends however, and given our centrist tendencies, capitulated to the demands for peace in the family. The PLA's "Leninist norms" were especially useful to the PLA and all centrists in the period after Mao's death in preventing a sharp break with right opportunism and revisionism. Again, WCC's Against the Revisionist Take-Over in China: In Defense of Marxism-Leninism Mao Tsetung Thought and Proletarian Revolution which called for a break with the CPC (albeit there was not yet an M-L understanding of what should constitute the break), was savagely attacked as "premature," "ultra-left," "not following the lead of the PLA" (who was not saying anything openly about the CPC). "Leninist norms" blunt the development of Marxist-Leninist line and create unprincipled unity. Another side to the unprincipled struggle and unprincipled unity was that when open polemics did break out, they were sometimes accompanied by name-calling, fist fights, and in certain instances more violent acts such as occurred in the collapse of the "Revolutionary Wing" (see note #3). Without the open polemics and drawing lines of demarcation, the Marxist-Leninist line cannot emerge, gain strength, and unity cannot be on the basis of a firm M-L line and practice. This is proved over and over again in looking at the numerous opportunist and revisionist parties, the numerous attempts at uniting the small circles.

The centrist principle of "Leninist norms" is all part of the centrist tolerance of opportunism and revisionism, which we picked up from the PLA (as well as the CPC). This tolerance manifests itself in many ways. One way is "a laissez-faire attitude toward theoretically understanding revisionism and opportunism"-- a failure to incorporate Marxist-Leninist principles into one's outlook and to recognize revisionism and opportunism when it exists--but to instead "break" from revisionism and opportunism by repeating general phrases learned by rote. Another way is in not struggling against opportunism and revisionism as a social prop of the enemy, but seeing it more as an aberration of M-L, and thus struggling with it. This becomes strategically manifest in a failure to carry out the main blow against opportunist and revisionist parties and groups. The centrists even theoretically deny the correctness of the principle of the main blow being aimed at compromising parties. The PLA does not include it as part of their strategy. Some U.S. groups, such as Marxist-Leninist Collective (see note #6), at a centrist forum on the international situation in Denver February 1979, questioned its current validity and did not know whether Stalin's elaboration of basic international strategy in Foundations of Leninism (Pek. ed. p. 85-86) was international or for the Soviet Union only! At times, groups such as those who wrote On the Roots of Revisionism (see note #6) even see revisionists as being able to contribute to the development of line! The tolerance for opportunism and revisionism of course means a failure to break with it, means covertly supporting it.

Of the PLA's method, one thing which stands out is the general vagueness of line, the separation of line from practice, the phrase-mongering, all centrist traits. The centrist small circles learned this well. These circles have been at "party building" for years, and haven't hardly gotten off the ground. While "building the party" it seems these circles have been busy doing something else like tailing the mass movement. Ask one of the circles how the party is to be built, what is their plan and they will give you a confused look. To implement their slogan and work out the specifics never crossed their minds. And, oh what obstacles are placed in the way of any group trying to convince them they should do so. To WCC, who struggled for a party building plan, it was told that "key

link" was an ungraspable term, strategy could not be used in party building, the movement should not be centralized yet (there was truth to this, but not from their rightist, liquidationist viewpoint), or there was talk of a plan, but nothing more, in short, "Please leave us alone with your practical attempts to build the party, we prefer practical attempts to build the spontaneous movement." But if anyone were to accuse them of failure to build the proletarian party they would always be able to point to this document here and this paper there which clearly said that they stood for party building.

Finally, having brought up party building, the PLA played a special influential role here since little was known about the building of the CPC. The PLA's party building experience was to negate anything Lenin did in the building of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party. Groups loved to espouse the PLA's overlooking of differences, their "fluid" program, their bottom-up approach. Our groups fell deeply into this, embellishing the PLA's party building in such documents as The Building of the Vanguard Party of the U.S. Proletariat.

From this discussion it can be seen that the PLA played the role of fostering illusions of breaks with opportunism and revisionism, of bolstering bourgeois outlook and method, of promoting centrist political and organizational line and practice, of developing centrist unprincipled "unity": thus they played no small role in thwarting a break with Soviet revisionism, CPC revisionism and opportunism and the long standing international opportunism and revisionism in general, and we can in no way diminish or prettify the treacherous and extremely dangerous role of the PLA. In the future the PLA and its centrist influence must be vigorously struggled against in the U.S. and internationally. "Part of the main blow" must go against the revisionism-centrism of the PLA and their followers in every country.

CONCLUSION

"7. It is the duty of parties wishing to belong to the Communist International to recognize the need for a complete and absolute break with reformism and 'Centrist' policy, and to conduct propaganda among the party membership for that break. Without this, a consistent communist policy is impossible.

The Communist International demands imperatively and uncompromisingly that this break be effected at the earliest possible date. It cannot tolerate a situation in which avowed reformists, such as Turati, Modigliani and others, are entitled to consider themselves members of the Third International. Such a state of affairs would lead to the Third International resembling the defunct Second International."

(Lenin, "Terms of Admission into Communist International," LCW, Vol. 31, p. 209)

"The working class cannot play its world-revolutionary role unless it wages a ruthless struggle against this renegacy, spinelessness, subservience to opportunism and unexampled vulgarization of the theories of Marxism. Kautskyism is not a fortuity, but a social product of the contradictions within the Second International, a combination of loyalty to Marxism in words and subordination to opportunism in deeds."

(G. Zinoviev and N. Lenin, Socialism and War, Geneva, 1915, quoted by Lenin in The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, Peking ed. pp. 2-3)



SECRET

...the Government ... the ...

...the ... the ...

...the ... the ...

...the ... the ...

...the ... the ...



NOTES

1. Communist Party (M-L) (CP M-L), was formed in 1977 and formerly was the October League (OL). The CP (M-L) follows and promotes the Communist Party of China (CPC) past and present. They adhere to all the social-chauvinism of the "three worlds theory" and openly call for strengthening of the U.S. bourgeoisie in order to fight Soviet social-imperialism. Their program and work takes on a complete economist, reformist and social-chauvinist character.

What became the Communist Party USA was formed shortly after the end of World War I (two parties were formed in 1919). The party joined the Third International, but was never able to Bolshevize itself. An important theoretical task is a thorough M-L analysis and summation of this failure and the CPUSA's complete degeneration. The CPUSA promotes Soviet social-imperialism, and revisionism such as the peaceful road to socialism, peaceful coexistence. Their program and work are economist, reformist and social-chauvinist. Thus, it too, unites with the U.S. bourgeoisie.

Communist Party USA (M-L) (CPUSA M-L) was formed in late 1978 and was formerly the Marxist-Leninist Organizing Committee (MLOC), a split off from the Black Workers Congress (BWC). The history of MLOC was to repudiate "...a 'left' opportunist deviation in the MLOC and Trotskyite trend in the working class movement"* in early 1977, halting theoretical work and consolidating mass economist work. They sought the Chinese franchise, but unable to get it, went after the Albanian. Thus Mao Zedong Thought was formally thrown out as no longer useful in the same manner it was dealt with by the PLA. The CPUSA (M-L)'s program reflects Mao Zedong Thought through and through, with broad united fronts and reformism. Recently, pro-MZT forces, and some pro-PLA forces departed this party of centrists.

Revolutionary Communist Party USA (RCP) was formed in 1975 and formerly was the Revolutionary Union (RU). The RCP is founded on the basis of MZT. They call for a broad united front, carry out economist and reformist work. Lately they have taken up adventurist actions and thus combine ultra-left tactics with a rightist strategy. They have taken a leadership role in the formation of an international Maoist-centrist, social-chauvinist trend.

2. The Multilateral Conference on Party Building (MULC) was held in the summer of 1979. The groups attending were: Amilcar Cabral-Paul Robeson Collective (AC-PRC); ex-Committee for a Proletarian Party (ex-CPP); ex-Marxist-Leninist Collective (ex-MLC); Kansas City Revolutionary Workers Collective (KCRWC); Marxist-Leninist League (MLL); Marxist-Leninist Collective (MLC); Pacific Collective (PC); Red Dawn Committee (M-L) (RDC); Revolutionary Workers Collective (RWC); Revolutionary Workers Press (RWP); "Some Comrades in the Bay Area" (SC), publishers of On the Roots of Revisionism (OROR); Wichita Communist Cell (WCC). Workers Revolutionary Organizing Committee (WROC) did not attend. Ideologically the groups were all of the Mao Zedong Thought type. Politically they varied from a right opportunist softness to exponents of Soviet revisionism and the "new" three-worldism (PC), to our centrism. The MULC POU's drew very little lines of demarcation. As an example, the line of demarcation that right opportunism is the main danger was not even included. The struggle during the MULC was not sharp and did not lead to drawing lines of demarcation. The one area in which the sharpest struggle took place was over whether out of some groups attending the MULC a joint study and journal on party building and burning questions becoming lines of demarcation (such as MZT) and a committee to lead this could take place (KCRWC-WCC line), or whether any joint activity at all should take place and we needed to "define" a tendency without advanced workers before joint activity could occur (SC's line). We can see

* Unite!, February, 1977, p. 1

now that neither of the lines were correct: we could not possibly begin tasks of building the center without drawing lines of demarcation and breaking with revisionism, opportunism and centrism, but also that it is not merely a matter of "defining" a tendency, but of actively drawing lines of demarcation, breaking with and exposing revisionism, opportunism and centrism, winning advanced workers, and welding the core of the party. The MULC culminated with most groups agreeing that a National Joint Study (NJS) on the "Hoxha-Mao differences" was important (see p. iv of Preface). This was a proposal by SC, ex-MLC, and ex-CPP toward the end of the MULC. It is interesting that the joint activity line of KCRWC and WCC is being negated by us for one of drawing lines of demarcation, etc., and those groups who were most adamant against joint activity are now carrying out the most joint activity, even to the point of inviting a "legal Marxist" group like MLL to be a part of the NJS. (Groups like SC and ex-MLC came to be "against" MLL being in the study but as leadership decided to include MLL when a vote to exclude was tied. Eventually MLL was voted out of the study by a narrow margin. MLL had earlier been invited to the MULC and coaxed to stay through a tragi-comedy of rightism and centrism of which we were an opportunist part.)

3. Members of Demarcation were once a part of the Workers Congress (WC), and left WC because it was not carrying out the Iskra-plan as WC held in theory. Then they were a part of Red Dawn Committee (RDC). They split from RDC in 1978 over RDC not taking up theory and not drawing lines of demarcation on the international situation (at that time the "theory of the three worlds"). They had some contact with MULC groups. In 1979 they merged with USLC forming the Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks (CUSB). Demarcation took anti-economist and anti-reformist stands and upheld the need to develop a Bolshevik party. They broke with the "three worlds theory" in 1978 and went on to break with MZT following the PLA centrism shortly before they merged with the USLC (early 1979).

The U.S. Leninist Core (USLC): they have their roots in the Young Lords Party which then formed the Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization (PRRWO), and in the Revolutionary Workers League (RWL) which grew out of the Black Liberation Movement. PRRWO and RWL adhered to MZT and the "theory of the three worlds" and prior to 1976 both became a part of the amorphous Revolutionary Wing, a Maoist formation of several "anti-revisionist" groups. Shortly thereafter several right opportunist groups were purged out of the "Wing" (Workers Viewpoint Organization (WVO) now the Communist Workers Party (CWP), and the August 29th Movement now part of the League of Revolutionary Struggle (LRS) who are in partnership and competition with the CP (M-L)) and purges within the PRRWO and RWL occurred (many joining the WVO). The PRRWO and RWL officially merged into the "Revolutionary Wing" (more purges), which became the "Leninist Core of the Revolutionary Wing" in late 1976, which in turn became the USLC. The USLC broke from the "three worlds theory" in late 1977, and from MZT in late 1978 following the centrism of the PLA.

The Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks (CUSB) was formed from a merger of the USLC and Demarcation, upon the basis of a break with MZT and a developing break with PLA centrism. They came out with the book Imperialism, Superprofits and the Bribery of the U.S. "Anti-Revisionist Communist Movement" in mid-1979.

The Bolshevik League (BL) was formed from the CUSB. BL openly broke with the PLA and established a party building plan (following the Iskra plan) with a regular journal Bolshevik Revolution.

Although we recognize certain correct criticism by BL (and predecessors) of MZT and centrism in general and our line in particular, our groups do not have bilateral relations at this time. This is due to questions we raised in 1979 regarding

the objective agent-provocateur activity in the "Wing" which had not been properly summed up by the USLC. Since this the USLC and Demarcation, the CUSB, have responded with Cheap Slanders Will Never Build a Vanguard Party and the Imperialism Superprofits and the Bribery... which we should have responded to a long time ago and will be doing so soon.

For more information on the Bolshevik League write to:
B.L., P. O. Box 1189, Bronx GPO, Bronx, NY 10451

4. The Bolshevik Union (BU), which is based in Canada, was formerly the Bolshevik Tendency which grew out of a split in the journal Canadian Revolution. Although we are not in complete agreement with BU and have many outstanding questions, their principled criticisms and Leninist struggle with us played a significant role in our coming to grips with centrism. The BU has a irregular theoretical journal, Lines of Demarcation, and a regular journal called Proletarian Revolution which is an intermediate to an Iskra-type newspaper. They have recently organized a journal of International Correspondence. Their address is: B.U., P. O. Box 892, Succ. Tour de la Bourse, Montreal, Quebec, CANADA H4Z 1K2
5. Marxist-Leninist Party (USA) (MLP-USA), formerly the Central Organization of U.S. Marxist-Leninists (COUSM-L), is a fraternal party to the Communist Party Canada (M-L), which is fraternal to the PLA. After having been staunch Maoists for years they dropped this formally since the PLA and CPC (M-L) did. They continue the same Maoism of economism, subjective idealism (e.g. the U.S. is "fascist"). Their partners in Canada are working for the broadest united front "against" only a handful of top imperialists. While no one has seen the program of the MLP-USA, their practice is the same as the CPC (M-L). The MLP-USA is of course a rival to the CPUSA (M-L) both of which are bucking for the PLA's revisionist-centrist, social-chauvinist franchise.
6. "Some Comrades in the Bay Area" (they have other names which go through the mails but which are not "public") is a collection of individuals. Some of their members were at one time a part of a Bay Area study on the international situation, and were in a Comintern Study Group, the latter of which culminated in the book On the Roots of Revisionism. Persons in this latter study included pro-Soviet revisionists. They have an intellectualist attitude toward the actual tasks of party building--drawing lines of demarcation, winning advanced workers, developing professional revolutionaries, welding the core--they see party building as "situating" themselves (also known as "defining" a tendency) in the movement, and at the same time they support and carry out economist work with the masses. They are classic economists of the type Lenin described in What is to be done?. They separate the theoretical-political struggle from the economic: they are engaged in theoretical debate, which is only an academic matter of "situating" themselves and separate this from what they see workers should be concerned with--their day-to-day struggle, and support of covert social-chauvinism. They do not develop the class-consciousness of the working class towards its tasks, but give the working class pabulum to chew on while they keep busy trying to position themselves. They follow MZT and after further NJS study to date have reaffirmed its basic correctness (with a few minor errors), but are more critical of the PLA from a centrist MZT viewpoint.

Ex-MLC is a split off from the Marxist-Leninist Collective (MLC), an apparently defunct, economist group, whose original leadership at one time was in the Communist Labor Party (see note 14 below). Ex-MLC split because MLC was not taking up the development of Marxist-Leninist theory, and was engaging in economist work, which is correct criticism of MLC. But, ex-MLC made it a question of how much theory vs. how much practice rather than what theory and practice, thus they don't really have

different theory and practice than the functioning MLC, only more theory in comparison to practice than MLC (see p. 15). Ex-MLC is close to "Some Comrades" and jointly share conclusion with them around Mao Zedong Thought.

"Some Comrades" and ex-MLC promote a centrist unity line and fail to draw lines of demarcation. In theory they deny the main blow (against compromising parties) as part of proletarian strategy; they carry this out in practice by work with revisionists and opportunists from Soviet revisionists to legal Marxists.

Red Dawn Committee (RDC) came out of the Workers Congress, one of the splits in the Black Workers Congress, and the PRRWO (see note 3). They concentrate on local work and local issues, see the development of the class analysis, political economy, programme, strategy and tactics arising out of propaganda and agitation, fail to draw lines of demarcation on important issues, and thus fail to split from opportunism and revisionism, win advanced workers to M-L and develop professional revolutionaries. They are another economist group with Mao Zedong Thought as the ideological basis. While they state Mao made errors regarding two-line struggle and factions in the party, they believe it is "metaphysical" to throw Mao's teachings away entirely. Some of Mao's teachings they are unwilling to throw away are around national-liberation, international strategy and tactics. They are attracted to PLA centrism.

7. See Mao's "Reform Our Study," MSW Vol 3; "Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War," MSW Vol 1, p. 181; "On the Ten Great Relationships" in S. Schram's Chairman Mao Talks to the People, especially p. 82, 84-87; S. Schram, The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung, p. 114.
8. Compare J.V. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism with the CPC's history and line in: A Basic Understanding of the Communist Party of China, Shanghai 1974, p. 46-52, 78-80, 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. Also, look at Mao's views in: "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People", MSR p. 432-451, 462-472; S. Schram, Chairman Mao Talks to the People, p. 147, 183, 263, 158, 263.
9. Compare V.I. Lenin, What is to be Done?, "Tasks of the Youth Leagues" with Mao's "Reform Our Study," "Rectify the Party's Style of Work," MSW Vol 3; "On Practice" and "On Contradiction" MSW Vol 1; "Oppose Book Worship," MSR; S. Schram, Chairman Mao Talks to the People, p. 19-24, 34-36, 82, 85-6, 90, 118-122, 127-30, 154, 158-60, 163-4, 173, 175-6, 181, 195, 204, 210, 212, 219, 235-7, 251, 254.
10. Compare Two Tactics of Russian Social-Democracy, The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, Lenin on the National and Colonial Questions, by V.I. Lenin with Mao's "On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism," "Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War," "Tasks of the Chinese Communist Party in the Period of Resistance to Japan," "A Single Spark Can Start a Prairie Fire" MSW Vol 1; "The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War," "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party," MSW Vol 2; "On Coalition Government," "Resolutions on Questions in Party History," MSW Vol 3; "Oppose Book Worship," MSR, especially p. 45; S. Schram, Chairman Mao Talks to the People, p. 28, 30, 85.
11. The Marxist-Leninist principles on socialist revolution can be found in V.I. Lenin's State and Revolution; "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," LCW Vol. 26. Mao's revisionism can be found in "On

the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People," "On New Democracy" MSW Vol. 2; "Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work," MSR; "On State Capitalism," "Combat Bourgeois Ideas in the Party," "On the Draft Constitution of the People's Republic of China," "The Debate on the Co-operative Transformation of Agriculture and the Current Class Struggle," "On the Ten Major Relationships," "Talks at Conference of Secretaries of Provincial, Municipal and Autonomous Region Party Committees," MSW Vol 5, (actually most of Vol. 5): S. Schram, Chairman Mao Talks to the People p. 216-17, 243.

12. See the same Marxist-Leninist principles and Maoist views as notes 10 and 11 above, especially see Mao's "Tasks of the Chinese Communist Party in the Period of Resistance to Japan," "On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism," MSW Vol. 1; "On New Democracy," MSW Vol. 2; "On Coalition Government," MSW Vol. 3; "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship" MSR; S. Schram, Chairman Mao Talks to the People p. 16, 168-9, 97.
13. For Mao and the CPC's views: "U.S. Imperialism is a Paper Tiger" MSW Vol. 5; "A Programme for Anti-Imperialist Struggle" May 21, 1971, "Historic Document in Support of the Anti-Imperialist Struggle of the Peoples," May 28, 1971, Peking Review; Sino-U.S. Joint Communiqué Feb. 21, 1972; 1957 and 1960 Moscow Statements; The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement. For Marxist-Leninist references see section II and IV of this paper.
14. Communist Labor Party was founded in 1974. CLP promotes an idealist view that capitalism has not been restored in the Soviet Union and carries out economist, reformist and social-chauvinist work.
15. Ray O. Light is an organization which has extremely economist and reformist practice (see ~~the Rebel Worker~~, and The Present Party-Building Movement in the USA and the Materialist Conception of History). They have always been critical of Mao wherever he disagreed with Stalin. They currently support the PLA's "struggle against revisionism" and have similar centrist analysis as the PLA on the international situation. ?
16. Communist Workers Group was in the midwest university town of Lawrence Kansas. They had ties with a Canadian group--Organization of Communist Workers. The CWG always had an intellectualist tendency to stick to themselves and carry out theoretical work with only a short period of polemicizing. They saw themselves as the theoreticians and others they had contact with as the practical workers. They also had a bent towards purism. They came to some correct conclusions on the CPC and PLA several years ago (late 1976-1977) in several issues of their newspaper Forward. At this time they were also critical of the 7th Congress of the Communist International and J.V. Stalin's views of that period, and were going to do a more indepth analysis of the international situation historically. This analysis (Against the Tide) never appeared and virtually no one has heard from them since the fourth issue of Forward. CWG has apparently liquidated.

Kansas City Marxist-Leninist Cell (KCMLC)

Address correspondence to:

Boxholder
P. O. Box 19172
Kansas City, MO 64141

Kansas City Revolutionary Workers Collective (KCRWC)

Address correspondence to:

Boxholder
P. O. Box 1565
Kansas City, MO 64141

50 part of main blow must be at
centrist followers of MZT. (cf 106,
same applies to followers of PIA.