"Marxism-Leninism" or Reactionary "Theory" (A Reprint) (The following article contains excerpts from an earlier article by T. V. Vangard of April-May, 1933 entitled "Basic and Superstructure in Class Society, Article II.")

"The political naïve, Harry Newton's and Eldridge Cleaver's 'conversion to Marxism-Leninism' may appear as unusual if not astonishing. But there is nothing extraordinary and most certain, notable and critical aspect of the petit-bourgeois lumpen demagogues to petty-bourgeois 'Marxist-Leninist' theorists.

Indeed, the number of intellectuals and embryo-intellectuals who make a living as 'Marxist- Leninists' or 'Marxists' has increased in the last few years. This army of pettifoggers constitutes an international as well as multinational conglomeration of agents of the 'Entente' imperialist powers and their allies, who, from the guage and in a wide variety of political and ideological guises peddle an identical brand of 'revolutionary' reformism.

The entire catalogue of intellectual chatter and a 'learned' sophistry is represented by the mendacity and prostitution of petty-bourgeois demagogues of the bourgeoisie. At the head of the hierarchy of the 'Marxist-Leninist' par- ties and organizations are the leaders of the bureaucratic lot, basically speaking. Their vanity and moral numbness and 'sophistication', their supposed hetero- geneity, is a simple matter of identification with the specific division of labor assigned to them as individuals or as groups of individuals. The lead the people, who subscribe to the particular denomination of the 'Marxist-Leninist' party - "Maoist", "Khourshidevich", "Controlle" or what-have-you. But this is not their background, in their ideology and in what they are as one indivisible entity.

It is a particularly important characteristic and feature of the class of his shamming politicians that they all, in individuals and groups, answer to the generic term 'Marxist-Leninist'.

This term ("Marxist-Leninist") was adopted by each and every opportunist pseudo-communism, with which Lenin was associated. Lenin, when he was living and made claim to his "ideological mantle and theoretical heritage" as soon as he died in 1924. In fact the term "Leninist" when Lenin was still alive was used negatively and deliberately by Trotsky, Stalin, Kamenev, etc. This was out of political, political values, which included Joseph Stalin (who now has become the dead horse and function whispering goat of "Marxism-Leninism" or "lib- chant?"), Leon Trotsky (then Lenin constantly reviled as "Juda Trotsky" and "clamorizing Trotsky"); Karl Radek, the pompous Polish "Marxist-Leninist" in collaboration with the French, whom (together with Stalin), Lenin had to direct the main battle of his shaming politician in his famous "April Thesis"; Grigory Zinoviev, who together with Kamenev attempted to sabotage the call for armed struggle on the eve of the October Revolution; Nikolai Buk- harin, who in the most gross manner anatrophized the "Theorisation of the October Revolution as well as the hurdles of the entire personal- ities preceding as "titans of the October Revolution" the "putative God-seekers Maxim Gorki and Anatoly Lunacharsky, etc., etc. No need to forget for one moment the new avatar of Bolshevik, the Chinese communist, the present "Red China" and "present era," the "great thought" himself - Mao Tse-tung.

That the term "Leninism" up till the time of Lenin's death was used "derisively" is some- thing that Lenin himself was quite aware of and we might add just a shade of that fact. In his book "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution" Lenin showed how the bourgeois use the term Leninist with quotation marks borrowed from the Martovs, Trotsky, Martynov, and so on, the Bolsheviks, led by the Lunacharskys, Gorkys, Bogdanovs, etc.

The articles entitled "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy" and "The Triumph of Leninism" (the "Theorization of the Bolsheviks", No. 72), set forth the opinion on Social-Democracy held by the Bolsheviks. The general bourgeois opinion, which is either valoreless or valueless for the bolsheviks, is not too strongly recommended every Bolshevik to read these articles in full and ponders over every sentence in them. We shall reproduce first of all the most important propositions contained in both these articles.

"It is fairly difficult," writes the "Dobrovolnye", for an out- side observer to grasp the real political meaning of the disagreements that have split the Social-Democratic Party into two factions. A definition of the "Majority" faction as the more radical and unwavering, as distinct from the "Minority" which is the so-called Social Democratic faction. In the interests of the cause, however, and in any case would not provide an exhaustive characterization. Before describing the two forms of the Social-Democratic Party, we shall consider the questions by the Lenin faction. The following characterization would make it appear to us to be too simple. The fundamental political temper of the "Majority" is a struggle revolution, rebellion for the sake of rebellion, eagerness to stir up insurrection among the popular masses by any and every means and to seize power immediately in their name, to a certain extent this brings the "Leninists" close to the Socialist Revolutionaries. The new theory of the "Majority" is an attempt at the idea of the class struggle as the sole force and lever of revolution involving the whole people, while adhering in practice to the principles of the Social-Democratic doctrine, the "Leninists" are, on the other hand, thoroughly imbued with the narrow-mindedness of revolutionism, renouncing any practical work except the preparation of an immediate insurrection, ignoring on principle all other forms of legal and semi-legal agitation and every species of practically-useful, comprehensive, with other oppositional trends. The Minority, on the contrary, while steadfastly adhering to the doctrine of Marxism, at the same time preserves the realistic elements of the Marxist world outlook. (Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in Democratic Revolution, published in 1905, Selected Works, Volume I.)

Lenin never, but never even hinted at anything resembling a claim to a special recognition as a Marxist. Regardless of his position, he was the protagonist of the proletarian revolution Lenin under- stood that he had never made one slight, narrow foundation of the science of Marxism that was not already in the works long before he became a Marxist. He was a real great of the proletariat and bourgeois "revolutionizing" as an "ideological" formation of all of us as a "Leninist."

Lenin regarded Engels as a great Marxist but he never re- ceived personalist superciliousness, a proletarian science called "En- gels," in fact he was ac- quainted with the English and humble speech on the oc- casion of Karl Marx's birthday whose main proposition was "I always played second fiddle to Marx." He was also corresponded with Frederick Engels' significant note appended to his "Lod- wig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy" which read as follows:

Here I may be permitted to make a parting explanation. Lately repeated reformist diversions have been made to my share in this theory, and so I shall make it my business to say a few words to have set- ting this point. I cannot deny that both before my death and forty years' collaboration with Marx I have been aware of the advantage in lying the foundations of the theory, and more so now, being sixty years old and having seen out my days. But the greater part of its leading basic principles, especially its essential character, you may be assured, have not been altered - at any rate with the specific special fields Marx could very well have done without. What Marx accomplished I would not have achieved, Marx was original, new furthored and took a wider and quicker view than all the rest of us. Marx was an extreme radical at best. Without him the theory would not be for what it is today. This is what he bears his name (Footnote on Engels' "Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosop- phy," Marx-Engels Selected Works, Vol. 3, 1949).

Lenin obviously thought so too. But those political oppor- tunist's and imposters of better that than anyone else cannot employ their absurd insignif- icance designated and exploited the plan of elevating Lenin to the pedestal of 'Marx-ist' or 'Lenin- ist'." (Footnote to "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in Democratic Revolution" published in 1905, Selected Works, Volume I.)

Lenin had devoted particular attention to the concrete, living and developing social-industrial demonstration, demonstrating that there is no need to make a narrow foundation for the idea that was necessary to this end. He further developed the Marxist-ist leadership of the mass of the toilers in town and country with the idea that the overthrow of the tsarist and capitalist, but also in the work for the "organization of the proletariat of the tsarist." (Ibid., Vol. 3, p. 181.)

In a philosophical dictionary elaborated by some of the most prominent "professors and scholars" of that enlarged system the term "Marxist-Leninist" is defined as an "ideological formation of all of Lenin's teachings concerning the possibility of the initial victory of socialism in a few countries, or even only, and the impossibility, under the imperialist conditions, of a simultaneity of the socialist revolution in all countries. He also developed further the pivotal ideas of Lenin in the "organization of the country and of the collectivization of agriculture," worked out the path of its reconstruction in the country- side. This could not be done without the onslaught of the kulaks as a class through gen- eral collectivization. The problem of the peasantry is another of the basic questions dealt with by Marx, Engels, and Lenin. The peasantry has taken a new form of treat- ment in the "works of Stalin," which was the ideological development of capitalist encirclement. He armed the party and the" class struggle" in the new "edge of the laws of class strug- gle under new conditions and political and ideological development of the proletarian state in the defense of emerging communism. In part-
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In March of 1808 Lenin wrote a short article exposing the "liberal" methodology of adulterating Marxism. That article is full of relevance in these days when the pseudoscientists (who have become worldwide and massive) have been reprinting the article in an unaltered form.

"Marxists would do well to more closely study the writings of Lenin, " the rejoinder of the death of Marx by influential politicians." Organizing various, especially in the liberal world, not only by the influence of the masses of well-informed official, titular professional...

"We shall begin our review with Russkiye Vedomosti. This is the most satirical (and droll), the most scientific (and free from reality) of all professional newspapers. Its short article on the 200th anniversary of Karl Marx's death (May 4, 1918) is written in a predominantly dry word style—"objective," as it is called in the language of the "journalistic" and "extraordinary." The writer of the article tries to confine Marx to a few facts. As an impartial historian, he is prepared to give Marx his due—at least as far as the past is concerned, a past which is already dead and can be spoken of in a lifeless way. Russkiye Vedomosti admits Marx to be a 'revolutionary', a 'man of science,' an 'outstanding legislator,' a man of 'extraordinary gift for organizing the masses. But this recognition applies to the past; for Marx's views are paths are not necessary,' i.e., new paths for the labor movement and the "old Marxism." What these new paths are, the paper does not say so many words—that is too subjective a question for any subjectivist, and the "old Marxism" is already dead. The only thing that matters is the manifestation, the "new" humanism, the German Social-Democracy—
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cular the writings of Stalin on the national-colonial question have attracted the best pages in all the best pages in the literature of Marxism in this field.

"Working on the problem of the relation of the epoch of socialism to that of communism, Stalin has shown the condition necessary for the realization of social democracy from socialism to communism. Unleashing the struggle for communism, the basic conditions of scientific communism have already been established. The struggle has received explicit formulation in the activities of the U.S.S.R. This Stalinist constitution sums up the momentous expediency of all the efforts of the last generation in the U.S.S.R., where the basic aspects of such difficult problems as the relationship between socialism and communism, the relationship between socialism to communism and the question of the antagonism between the bourgeois and the proletariat, the relationships, and more like the "originals" of those "theories" of the "liberal" ideology of the bourgeoisie who insist that Marx explained "only and only the social relations of
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THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

A Critique of Leninism

by Horace W. Tarbell
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in the world of "Maoism"...
"Leninism"...

(Continued from Page 10)"...mitred them to zigzag ideologically, whenever a party line change became expedient: an eminently flexible tactic of political terms of power.

The flexibility is Marxian, as Karl Marx and his first-generation followers conceived it, although it has little issue... "(Harry Schwartz, New York Times Encyclopedia Almanac)

In Harry Schwartz's distortion of Marx, Lenin, and Marxism, the Mensheviks appear as the genuine Marxists and the real followers of Marx. On the other hand, Stalin, Molotov, Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Kosygin, Mikoyan, Tito (the Titoist G那只 Hali) are supposed to be the true disciples of Marx and Lenin. Lenin is painted as the iconoclast of Marxism, as the unvarnished version of the species. Hence, according to Schwartz, much of the problem today is that Stalin, Khrushchev, and their ilk, have preserved Marxism without Lenin, for much of the reason that the Mensheviks that preceded them presented nothing but the antithesis of his "Leninism." In fact, Schwartz Lenin's conception of the peasant question represented... the Mensheviks and Lenin's policies on the peasant question — in fact, the most fundamental questions of the proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the all-powerful alliance has social-political connotations in Marx's concept of the revolutionary structure of the working class together with a new version of the peasant war.

According to Schwartz, "dichotomy" and "apartheid" between Marx and Lenin on the question of the peasants, with social antagonism and disregard of the peasant question goes beyond the realm of political argument. Schwartz dismisses the period of parasitism and despoticism in Russian history and ignores the great contributions made by Marx and Engels, not only to the development of such as such, but precisely on the historical factors of revolutionary unity between the working class and the vast majority of the rural producers — the poor peasants.

Two decades of social and historical experience within which time two great Revolutions occurred (the Revolution of 1848 and the Revolution of 1917), and Engels to make the basic and initial formulation of the Russian Revolution of the working class and the peasantry. The social-historical ingredients of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Applying to the lessons of Revolution of 1848, Marx wrote in The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, p. 434...

"...that ought to be enough to give the lie to the New Socialist Tihonov, who has delivered the peasant from the blood tax — would have given a chance to the peasant to transform his present blood suckers, the notary, advocate, and priest, into salaried communal agents, effective for himself. It would have freed him of the tyranny of the landlord and the church and the prefect; and would put enlightenment by the obligation of society — the commune, and the French peasant, is, above all, a man of renown. He would find it extremely reasonable that the wealth of the prefect, instead of being extortion by the taxgatherer, should only depend upon the enlightened artist of the parishes' religious instincts. He would have abolished the commune which rules the Code of the commune and that rule alone could have saved the French peasant.

"...the peasant was a Bonapartist when the Great Revolution, with all its benefits to the working class, was in progress in France in the middle of Napoleon. This delusion, rapidly breaking under the blows of the peasants, was very noble to the Hapsburg, this pretender to the throne, because it did not have to give up to the peasants, to the French peasants, the old and the poor who are the proprietors in it an encreissement of the feudal social order. In 1848, however, he had burdened his plot of land with the additional burden of the tax levied in the new system; and then he did so without compensation, while now he has fomented a civil war against the revolution, which is to say that he has added five millions of indemnity to the old five millions of indemnity paid to the Prussian. The commune, on the other hand, in one of its first declarations, made it clear that the true origin of the war would be made to pay its cost. The commune would combat this transaction, as above all, a man of renown. He would find it extremely reasonableness that the wealth of the prefect, instead of being extortion by the taxgatherer, should only depend upon the enlightened artist of the parishes' religious instincts. He would have abolished the commune which rules the Code of the commune and that rule alone could have saved the French peasant.

The peasants, therefore, find their natural allies in the urban proletariat, whose mission it is to support the bourgeois order of society. (Karl Marx, The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, p. 434)

In conclusion, this article presents a clear and comprehensive picture of the revolutionary implications of the peasant question in Russia, the need for a radical transformation of the rural economy and the peasantry's role in the revolution. It highlights the historical context and the political strategies of the time, emphasizing the importance of the peasant question in the context of the broader proletarian revolution.
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THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL must enter into a temporary alliance with the Russian, Ukrainian, and other, both in united heterogeneous, but must and must unconditionally pre- serve the independence of the countries in their respective formal groups... "(Lenin, "Probatory Draft of the Second Colonial Question" -- for the Second Congress, International, Selected Works, Volume I, pp. 352, 354, 335, 351, 357)

"And again... "The interests of the working class and the struggle of the proletariat against capitalism demand complete solidarity and the working class in all nations; they demand that the nationalistic alliances be removed. It is necessary for every nationality to be repelled..." (Lenin, "The Commune and the Peasantry" -- for the Congress, International, Selected Works, volume I, pp. 354, 351)

It makes no difference to the bourgeois the way that the revolution is carried out, whether by a bourgeois revolution or by a socialist revolution. The one thing is to be sure that the bourgeois order of society is preserved.

The bourgeois, which naturally comes out as the hegemonic leader in the beginning of every national movement, terms the support of all nations and not the support of one nation against another. But the policy of the proletariat in this respect is quite different (in other words) supports the bourgeoisie only a definite and temporary alliance against the policy of the bourgeoisie.

Therefore, precisely against the bourgeoisie, the proletariat advances their principle of support, which is based on the policy of the bourgeoisie; they always give the bourgeoisie only conditional support.

The bourgeoisie most is interested in the fact that the interests of the given demand—hence the perennial policy of coming to terms with the bourgeoisie of other nations to the detriment of the proletariat. For the proletarians, the only thing is to strengthen class against class. To that end, they do not and they will not forgo the mass of those in the spirit of consciences democracy and Social.

This may not be the "practical" for the opportunists, but it is the only condition that will permit the maximum of national equality within the general framework of the feudal landlords and the nationalist bourgeoisie.

The main task of the proletariat in the national question is "impractical" from the standpoint of the national bourgeoisie of every nation, because, being opposed to all nation, the demand "abstract" equality, they demand of the colonial states, their privileges, no privileges, however slight.

The bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations will call upon the proletariat to support its aspirations unconditionally on the condition that its demands are "practical."

The proletariat is opposed to the idea that the national bourgeoisie of every nation on the condition that its demands are "practical."

In conformity with its fundamental tasks of fighting against bourgeois democracy and of exposing its falsities and hypocrisy, the Communist Party, as the most consistent and most unrelenting fighter against the struggle of the proletariat for the achievement of its social purposes in the field of politics, must fight for the revolution of the proletariat for the achievement of its social purposes in the field of politics, must fight for the revolution of the proletariat of the colonial states." (Ibid., p. 350-351)

"Six years later (June-July 1920), Lenin concentrated these Marxist guidelines to the National and Colonial Question in his "The Commune and the Peasantry"..." (Lenin, "Probatory Draft of the Second Colonial Question" -- for the Second Congress, International, Selected Works, Volume I, pp. 352, 354, 351, 357)

"And again... "The interests of the working class and the struggle of the proletariat against capitalism demand complete solidarity and the working class in all nations; they demand that the nationalistic alliances be removed. It is necessary for every nationality to be repelled..." (Lenin, "The Commune and the Peasantry" -- for the Congress, International, Selected Works, volume I, pp. 354, 351)

The Commune was perfectly right in telling the peasants that "its victory was only their own. The Republic and the revolution of the peasants were the liberating force for the whole of the love of the French peasant for the men to whom, after 1917, it had paid any indemnity of indemnity. In the eyes of the French peasant, the very word of the French peasant or the French proprietor is in itself an encreissement of the feudal social order. In 1848, however, he had burdened his plot of land with the additional burden of the tax levied in the new system; and then he did so without compensation, while now he has fomented a civil war against the revolution, which is to say that he has added five millions of indemnity to the old five millions of indemnity paid to the Prussian. The" (Karl Marx, The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, p. 434)