

# **BE A PARTY OF THE WORKING CLASS AMONG THE PEOPLE**

Report by Milton Rosen Opening Pre-Convention Discussion,  
March 1968

## **Preface**

This report deals primarily with a few big obstacles within the party and among the people that impede class consciousness. The most significant of these is our limited base-building. Despite some progress, this vital work is weak. If we are to be prepared for a long, hard battle against the enemy, we must have confidence in the masses—and especially in workers. Because our party members are generally young, they are enthusiastic. This is excellent. However, this will soon turn into its opposite if they aren't fortified by ties and experiences with the people. Obviously young people are limited in experiences. Even the fact that our line seems to be generally correct, will turn into the opposite if the party has no real base. We must drive this home continuously!

I would like to make some comments about myself. I believe that all the weaknesses displayed by party members are also exhibited by myself. The differences between myself and others is one of degree. I do not believe that any party escapes the imprint of its leaders—especially its chairman. This includes weaknesses as well as strengths. Even after 22 years of trying to help build a revolutionary movement, I believe that one of my main motives still is self-serving. That is, I do my work more to satisfy something within me than to serve the people. Nonetheless, I would say that the biggest reason that I have been able to do the little I still do over these 22 years is that some part of my devotion stems from the fact that I really believe the

working people will, eventually, defeat imperialism. I have never been a world-beater making ties among people. But, all my life, I have had some few close ties, as a boy in the neighborhood and school, in the army, at work, where I live, in the CP and in the PLP. Most of my "communist" relations evaporated over the years. All of my CP friends went completely to the other side. While I have been greatly encouraged by the growth of PLP, it still doesn't sustain me, yet, as much as other experiences in my life. These can be summarized in the following way: I have seen all sorts of people "come through" for me and for others under all sorts of difficult circumstances. This is in addition to the general revolutionary sweep in the world, which—to me—is still more of an objective phenomena. I really believe, in my bones, that the workers and students will eventually "come through." I believe in this based on the most limited experiences. Today, our party members have a far greater opportunity than I did to do, and go, much further—both ideologically and politically (ties with the people). They are receiving better training all around. But advance, granted it will happen, must not be self-serving, but in the interests of the people. Fulfillment should come through serving the people. No one in our party has achieved this yet. Nor do many of us grasp this point completely. It is very easy to maintain the values of the ruling class, only obscured by a thin veneer of militancy or self-sacrifice. Some members may view their working in a big factory in the same way that someone puts money in the bank. Working in industry becomes a status symbol within the party rather than another good act in the process of serving the people. Some middle class person may view his living in a slum like the rich view their Park Avenue address. Years ago, if you asked most white or Black CP members who lived within two miles of Bedford-Stuyvesant where they lived, they didn't mention the street; they just said "Bed-Stuy." Status—that's what they're after. It was the "in thing" in the CP to live there. This is a hard thing to defeat—self-serving. I feel that I have a long way to go. I try, with ups and downs, to curb this. I don't feel sure that I'll ever win completely. Now I feel I can still be useful to the party.

I believe I will remain so. But this is tied very closely to what everyone else does as well as my own individual effort to improve. In other words, the stronger our base, the more confidence will develop among us all.

This is a very limited attempt at a few self-critical remarks. I could go on. I just didn't want anyone in the party to feel that the "leader" was spouting orders to others. I am part of the process. And I want to underline the entire matter of relations with the people.

Milt Rosen

#### Begin a Real Transformation—Work and Study

Since our founding convention a number of serious changes have occurred in the world, in our country and in our party. It will be useful to examine some of these developments to see where we are and to help us decide how to improve our work.

The transformation of our Progressive Labor Movement to the Progressive Labor Party was, objectively, a very serious step. Whether we understood it or not, we were telling the ruling class that we were organizing under the banners of Marxism-Leninism in order to crush them. (Certainly the ruling class understands this act.) At the time, our members, in the main, were a group of middle-class students. We had all the characteristics of such a group: rootless and baseless; isolated for the lack of previous political strategy, and sectarian to the core because we had no real working class outlook. Moreover, individualism was rampant, and it expressed itself most sharply in the pathetic way in which many of us lived. We didn't work, we didn't build political bases, and we were generally lazy. Joining the movement or party was still a step toward personal fulfillment, and not a step to defeat the enemy, let alone serve the people.

Our principal strategy, up until the time we became a party, was to rely on open mass agitation for socialism coupled with various activities which were often militant and spectacular, but not always helpful in base-building. Much of this work was useful, because it brought our ideas boldly to the people. Our boldness encouraged others to various levels of defiance against the ruling class. But over-reliance on it helped maintain our isolation from the working class.

The key ideological breakthrough of the convention was posing the question of having a serious party, or having more of the same. What differentiated the two was whether or not the party was to be a party of the working class, or whether it would preserve all the same middle-class aspects of other new formations among Black and white student types. We chose to become a party of the working class. For PLP this was a profound decision. Because, to accomplish this meant not a partial transformation of the party, and the individual member of the party, but a total transformation of both. Therefore, when we evaluate our progress during the last few years it must be viewed from this vantage point. What have we done, or what are we doing, to become a real Marxist-Leninist party?

One of the first steps in this arduous protracted process was simply to go to work. Work at least would give us a greater sense of discipline and put us in touch with people. Work would give us the contact and experiences among the working class which could nourish and expand our political consciousness. Working could be the first real step toward becoming a real party, and not a collection of political playboys. In the beginning we were very timid about pressing this process. Indeed, working was a revolutionary step. As in all processes, distortions developed. Many felt that working for the party was going to work. If you worked for the party this allowed you to work full time among the masses. For a while we had almost as many working for the party as working in factories. By and large, working for the party meant keeping busy to accomplish little or nothing.

After allowing this to go too far, the leadership, laggardly, intervened, and stopped this distortion. Today, most of our members who can or should work are doing so. And, here and there, we have begun initial work toward industrial concentration. That is getting people to work in areas which over the long-run are vital to our perspective. All this has shown that our members are willing to start the long process of transformation to become real communists.

Being Marxist-Leninists we know that merely working is not the final solution to problems. With our program of bringing the party closer to the working class we initiated a more comprehensive educational program within the party. All of our people study a little. And most of our clubs have involved non-members in Marxist study groups. Our study reflects our over-all limitations. It is often not concrete nor related to our work. And it usually requires very little from teacher and student. This encourages superficiality and learning by mimicking rather than struggle.

The process of work and study has helped us develop the long-range strategy that political power can be seized in our country only when a significant section of the working class becomes politically conscious. Consequently our immediate strategy is governed by this outlook. Our attempt to develop a worker-student alliance is a manifestation of this. In the Black liberation movement we recognize that the present level of the struggle is national in form and class in content. We say that national struggle must eventually give way to class struggle, and that in the long-run we will try to unite the entire working class.

This class outlook is still the main contradiction between us and many good forces within the "New Left" and in the Black Liberation Movement, in as much as their ideology is still based on bourgeois ideas. And, of course, it is the principal contradiction between us and the enemy. The ruling class is well aware of the danger of a revolutionary working class outlook, because their political survival depends on passivity at least among the working class.

So since our founding convention we could say that we have moved closer to the working class. We have raised our ideological level, developed more of a long-range class outlook, and we have improved ourselves organizationally. However, this improvement can only be viewed as partial and fragmentary. We have only scratched the surface of becoming a party of the working class. A total transformation is a process. We have made the initial toddling steps.

#### The International Revolutionary Movement Helps Us Grow

At our founding convention we made certain political estimates. Based on our estimate of the national and international situation we said the class struggle is sharpening, and that our party could grow if it overcame its weaknesses. At the time we pointed out that the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam was part of a world-wide counter-revolutionary strategy of the U.S. We felt that the war was against the interests of most Americans and that opposition would surely mount as the consequences of the war were felt in the country. The war has turned out to be the primary contradiction in our country today, sharpening all aspects of the class struggle.

The rapid growth of opposition to the war is today a fact. More people than ever are actively opposed to the war, and millions of others have been moved to other actions partially because of the war. Since the founding convention, the Black Liberation Movement has mushroomed all over the country. Strikes against the "national interest" have been the largest since 1953.

Internationally the past period has been characterized by the sharpness of the class struggle. Several things stand out as vital. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) in China is the most significant feature. Here the struggle by the working class to hold state power goes on sharply even after the seizure of state power. The lessons of this revolution are basic for what is the use of winning power if

the old ruling class can always take it back? In the course of this revolution, certain old questions have been posed in a new light. These are questions that are very germane to our work, even though we are in our infancy. The question of how to serve the people, the relationship of the party to the people has everything to do with some of our problems. We have a vital stake in the outcome of this Proletarian Cultural Revolution. If it is lost revisionism will gain a vast, vise-like hold over the revolutionary movement. The revisionist defeat of China would be a terrible set-back to us and to all revolutionaries. Of course we are partisan in this historic event. Naturally we wish the revolution well and hope for its victory. The GPCR is a significant expression of class struggle, not only in China but in the world. It shows that the international capitalist class will never give up. The complete defeat of imperialism can occur only after Marxist-Leninist ideology triumphs among the people. So the GPCR is a mass movement acting to correct errors. Errors are not corrected administratively but by mobilizing the masses under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninists in the party. To insure victory, the working class and its vanguard must be firmly in the saddle, resolutely defeating bourgeois ideas and forces at each stage. Any let-up will be exploited by the defeated class and its international allies. No party can be immune from revisionism as long as the class struggle exists.

The GPCR based on the Thought of Mao Tse-tung, has made an invaluable contribution to all revolutionaries by bringing this question home so sharply. By waging the war against revisionism in their country the Chinese are serving all workers and oppressed people. To merely attack revisionism in the Soviet Union would have only a limited value. To vigorously oppose revisionism in China is the essential struggle against international imperialism and modern revisionism.

People's War in Vietnam has proven its invincibility. The Vietnamese people are giving a profound demonstration in revolutionary action. We cannot say too many times how this

revolution has inspired and encouraged anti-imperialist and revolutionary developments the world over. We have been in the forefront of compelling the U.S. to get out of Vietnam now, despite all obstacles, and this has shown our class consciousness. Internationalism, the support of the revolutionary process everywhere, the subordination of the local struggle to the over-all class struggle, is a sign of growing maturity. In the final analysis internationalism, the knowledge of the fact that the working class and the oppressed people are united in a common cause and against a common international enemy, gives the working class a great deal of leverage. It enables the revolutionary forces on a world scale to concentrate its strength against a common enemy as well as to vigorously develop the revolutionary process at home. Obviously our complete support of the people in Vietnam has helped our struggle at home. This struggle has not only raised our own consciousness but also raised the understanding of millions of our people.

We would be foolish to overlook setbacks in the international movement that took place in this past period and not try to summarize what they mean. Counter-revolution has scored several significant temporary victories: Indonesia, Algeria, Cuba and the complete transformation of class power in the Soviet Union and in all the eastern European countries except Albania. Additionally, U.S. imperialism has launched attacks in the Mid-East, Latin America and Africa.

Generally speaking, we should view the international revolutionary movement in this way. Because of the importance of the Cultural Revolution in China, and the overwhelming significance of Vietnam the international movement is strategically stronger. Marxism-Leninism is stronger because it is more thoroughly developed than ever before. The concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat has been clarified and strengthened. People's War has been proven to be a vital contribution to the arsenal of Marxism-Leninism. The understanding of how to fight revisionism in a revolutionary party by clarifying the relationship of the

party to the people is invaluable. Three little words—"Serve the people"—if properly understood and applied are a weapon for the working class of incalculable force. So, in fact, if the international movement is smaller in numbers than before, its development is higher than ever. Newly emerging revolutionary forces all over the world can benefit enormously from the Thought of Mao Tse-tung. They can avoid the mistakes of Indonesia, the Algerians, and the Arab world, to mention a few.

Today the interrelationship between armed struggle (People's War) and the fight for the winning and holding of the dictatorship of the proletariat is clearer than ever. It can more easily be grasped as an integrated whole instead of in isolated fragments. It is precisely this interrelationship which is being vigorously obscured by the "new" revisionists in Latin America. Castro and Debray have opened a full assault on Marxism-Leninism. Only by understanding the entire question of the dictatorship of the proletariat can Marxists-Leninists be able to guide the revolutionary process through its different stages to a successful conclusion.

The lessons of People's War in Vietnam are so profound that even if the revisionists were able to betray this revolution tomorrow, the international movement would have learned indispensable lessons. One of the key ones would be how the vanguard plays its independent role within a revolutionary united front, how it should transform the national revolution into a class revolution.

Consequently, the international movement is strategically stronger, while in several places it has become tactically weaker.

#### 'Left-Wing' Liberals Oppose Workers' Dictatorship

Finally, at our founding convention we posed liberalism as the main ideological danger to the developing radical movements. But we estimated that liberalism had received

a crushing defeat and had lost a great deal of its potency. This was an over-estimation. Liberalism is a more durable duck than we thought. While a good deal of the newly emerging radical and revolutionary forces have recognized the danger of liberalism, their failure to develop revolutionary consciousness—even class consciousness—enables the liberals, a la RFK, to endure politically. So even though many recognize the dangers of liberalism, the ruling class still preserves its class strength through the illusions of liberalism. If you don't develop a really fundamental alternative to capitalism, you inevitably regress. RFK and his ilk simply waits until your gas runs out, and is there all ready to tow you away. We have estimated that RFK and company pose the main danger to the anti-war movement, and for that matter to all movements in this country, the carrot and the stick still works. The ideological struggle against liberalism must go on sharply, even though we have won limited victories.

In our country the class struggle is sharpening. However, liberalism inside and outside of the movements pose the main danger to the revolutionary process. It impedes a further development of the class struggle. Liberalism inside the movement has many guises. Sometimes it takes the open form of revisionism CP or SWP style. Sometimes it takes the "independent" radical form of Studies on the Left, Monthly Review, National Guardian and various New Left publications. The essential quality of liberalism as it appears within the movement is that it opposes a working class outlook—hence opposes the dictatorship of the proletariat. So this really leaves the people the "choice" between the good and bad imperialists. Without a revolutionary outlook, "the lesser of two evils theory" must endure, no matter how people may speak against it. There is only one alternative to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie—the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is why the struggle against those who consciously oppose revolutionary ideology must be waged vigorously and sharply, preventing them from misleading tens of thousands of good people who can be won through mutual experiences against the class enemy.

If our party is to continue to make slow but steady progress there are several things we must curb and eventually defeat. Sectarianism, the main way revisionism appears in our party, is the main weakness in our party today. This is reflected in the low level of base building in all of our work, in each area. We must say self-critically that we could have done much better these past few years than we have done. We could not have become a mass party, nor could we have become decisive in any area of work, we could be bigger and with more influence than we now have. A careful examination of almost every member of the party will show that he has a limited political base and is not doing a hell of a lot to change this situation. How can you serve the people if you have no relationship, or extremely limited relationships, with them? Under these circumstances, membership in the party is primarily a selfish act, and while that may be a valid point of departure it isn't good enough if we are talking about defeating U.S. imperialism. Selfishness, or a "what's in it for me" attitude, is the essence of revisionism. Lack of base can sometimes be dismissed as mere ineptness. More often, it manifests an ideological deviation. Unwarranted isolation is diametrically opposed to class consciousness. Class consciousness has nothing to do with how well you can vocalize Marxist-Leninist propositions. It has everything to do with your relations to people, and how they can eventually be moved into battle against the class enemy.

#### Whom Do We Serve?

At each step of the way we must evaluate our commitment to building the party and serving the people. Our fulfillment as individuals can best be accomplished to the degree we make the party the central thing in our life. Sectarianism can best be described as fear of the people, or lack of confidence in the people. Since we aspire to be a working class party, lack of ties, no matter in which area you work, means a lack of confidence in the working class. And, while you may verbally oppose all the middle-class

notions in other groups or periodicals you essentially share their outlook. Moreover, we do not want our members to view their participation in the party as a "sacrifice." Being in the party is a great opportunity to do something useful with your life. It can give you an unprecedented opportunity to serve the people. If you view your activities as an infringement on your personal prerogatives—hence a sacrifice—you are still completely under the influence of the enemy. You are not making very much progress. Your progress can best be measured in terms of your relationships with other people, especially, non-party people. To overcome individualism and to achieve collectivity means defeating narrow selfish motives. For most of us developing relations with the people is an effort. Bourgeois ideology trains us to be loners, cynical of everyone else, particularly with people who do not fall over to agree with us.

If we want to overcome narrow "craft" interests in the various areas in which we work, if we want to win people to think in terms of how their actions should be designed in order to aid the entire class, then obviously we must train ourselves to view all of our actions from the point of view: "Is it helping the party to build and grow"? If we cannot do that, then we will be unable to win the masses to our line. When we go among the people and tell them we are communists they usually take us at our word. They evaluate us far differently than they evaluate other people. After all, we give them new yardsticks for judgment. If you claim you are for all the good things, but in your actions are not, the people will see this. This will compound their cynicism and reduce their desire for change. To the people you will simply be another guy who talks big and acts small. Workers have plenty of experience with this phenomenon in the unions. Many students and intellectuals are already using this yardstick to evaluate various bourgeois institutions.

We have a great responsibility to overcome our shortcomings and win a commitment to long, protracted revolution. In the past we tended to leave the matter of evaluation of one another to ourselves in the party. We have partially

developed self-criticism and criticism. But even if we developed it fully within the party this would still give us an insular view of one another. In the coming period we should encourage people whom we know personally or work with politically and know personally to give their impressions of us as communists. We should train ourselves that being in the party means loyalty to the people. We should train ourselves to encourage the people's participation in our development. This would also tend to prevent the party from becoming a club. The party would be better oriented to improve its work and the work of its members if we had more insight into what non-party forces thought of us. We should encourage this no matter what the "risks"!

#### Personal Relationships Key to Basebuilding

In our quest to build bases we should take a closer look at one another. We should start from the ground up. Like, "who do you know"? "What is the nature of the relationship"? In doing this we should take a broader view of what constitutes a political base. Many of us come from campus activity, where the action is usually hot and heavy, and personal living is less than stable. We think in terms of knowing people solely on an action basis. However, if you live in a community or work in a shop you build your relations based on a long range commitment to the shop or neighborhood. The pace of struggle now may not have the intensity of campus struggle. While we should certainly try to know and work with those who are active, it is important to have many relations in the shop or community with people who may not be active at all now. It is impossible to predict who will rise to the fore in the long run. It is valuable to have relations with people of a "purely" personal character. The fact that people like you on a personal basis, knowing you are a communist, is important to you and them. Even if they do not agree with you politically, their relationship with you will often lead them to defending your right to function. This can often lead to enhancing your ability to function in any area.

At a later date, under different circumstances, experience with you and confidence in you could lead to a transformation in someone you thought to be passive. Having a wide circle of relations gives the party more maneuverability. Your relations with people should lead to enlightenment for them. As a communist you should impart confidence in the eventual overcoming of this society, which destroys the fabric of life. You can help people change, just as they help you change. Don't forget, we are not building a narrow minority movement. We are opposed to an elitist concept of historical change. Eventually we hope to involve tens of millions in sharp struggle. Where are they to come from? They are not about to fall from the sky. They are going to be those who at the moment don't often seem interested in changing society. But we say that sooner or later objective processes will sharpen the contradictions between most working people and the system. Then whom will the people work with and trust? Those whom they know and have confidence in.

What are we doing today to make trust in us a reality tomorrow? Are we becoming "tribunes of the people"? In other words, do we participate in all the seemingly endless struggles the people go through until their consciousness is more fully developed? Do people see us as totally interested in the affairs of the people? Are we respected, if not necessarily agreed with? Can anyone in our shop, school, or community come over to us in complete confidence on any matter, knowing that he will be listened to and helped? Do workers say about us, "I don't agree with that guy, but you got to respect him because he always tries to help. Maybe I better pay attention to his ideas."

#### Integrating the Fight for Reforms With Revolutionary Basebuilding

To avoid becoming merely "do-gooders," to become real revolutionaries requires class hatred. We have to fight the system not because "these poor need help" but because we are actually part of the working class and are oppressed by the system.

Are we learning how to align the fight for reforms with our revolutionary framework? Or do we abstain from struggles on reforms because it will "confuse the people"? because "the ruling class can co-opt success"? Perhaps some of us use this notion, that reforms should not be fought for, as a crutch to avoid struggle and ties. We ought to ask ourselves what issue is being fought over today that isn't a reform. Communists introduce revolutionary consciousness into the struggle for reforms, and use any victory as an example that the strength of the people is limitless. If this or that issue is won, we can go further, constantly sharpening the class struggle. This is an important preparation for revolution. The alternative to this is "the worse the better" notion. In other words, generally our work must start at the level people are at, with the issues that concern them. For an example, in a shop would you start with wages and conditions or the war and socialism? On a block would it be housing, sanitation, schools and racism or the war or socialism? Would you ignore questions regarding academic freedom and student-faculty problems when fighting the war on campuses? However, we would introduce revolutionary and anti-imperialist ideas into immediate struggles, and show the interrelationship. But we must use many issues to bring people into battle against the ruling class, and through these battles we learn together.

Several examples from our work in the shops make this clear. We have followed a line of working on, and helping to initiate struggles on, the issues closest to the workers: on-the-job grievances, safety, overtime, company hearings, wages, etc. These certainly are not revolutionary issues. Yet through activity around these issues, and our members participating fully in this activity, we have been able to start raising the larger, more long-range issues. This reveals us as left-wingers and communists to the workers in a way that means they won't reject us, even if most of them (at this point) don't agree with our long-range solutions.

In one area, where a comrade has been working for six years, he has consistently fought on the shop issues, the

sellouts of the union mis-leaders, the contract struggles, etc. He has won a reputation as a fighter (and been elected steward) and was able, in the course of moving with the workers in struggle, to point out the relation to the war, to the capitalist parties, and even (among some workers) that socialism is the only answer. Thus, this comrade is able to take the floor at large union meetings and point out the phony Kennedy line advanced by the leadership on the war, is able to attack them sharply over their support for imperialism in the Arab-Israeli war, and is able to call for support for Bill Epton in a political campaign. All this does not cause him to be isolated from the workers precisely because they know him as one who produces against the boss in the immediate class struggle. Without the latter he would be "dead" as far as a base among the workers is concerned; but this way he is someone to be listened to and is able to influence a few workers over to his position. At the very least the workers in his local and his shop recognize the value of having a communist leading their fight and make it difficult for the boss or the union mis-leaders to red-bait him out of his job. Of course, the next step is to recruit to the party, which becomes a test of how much influence is being exerted on more advanced issues.

In another more recent example, a club in one industry has been able to initiate struggle in their shops over purely economic questions—wages, overtime, enforcement of the union contract. While they constantly talked to workers about more political issues in the course of making friends with them, it was not until the actual on-the-job class struggle against the boss was launched (and partially won) that the workers saw our comrades as necessary to their success on economic questions. And in preparation for, and during, these reform-type struggles, our comrades were able to make the workers aware that they were communists, in PLP, and attempted to relate long-range solutions to the current struggles with some workers. They are now able to sell CHALLENGE to their fellow workers, and while many may disagree with the advanced line, they respect our comrades as fighters who produce and stand up to who they all agree

is the enemy—the boss. And gradually a few of the workers will be won over and recruited to the party. But again, without the fight on reform issues, there would have been no basis to relate the longer-range, revolutionary ideas or sell our revolutionary newspaper.

Still another example exists in a basic industry where one comrade helped launch a small-scale struggle that has won some victories (saved one worker's job, for instance), propelled him into a shop steward's position, created the real necessity in the workers' minds for a permanent caucus to fight all the time, and given a good basis for our comrade to fight racism as a divisive weapon of the bosses. All this has enabled him to raise our line on the war, and established a left-wing or "red" reputation for him without isolating him from the workers. On the contrary, they have drawn closer to him (electing him steward) and he has been able to give our literature to some workers in the course of these struggles (and brought one worker into a PL study group). None of this would have been possible without actual struggle for economic reforms, because it is only through such struggles that lessons can be taught (both on the weaknesses after defeats and the counter-attack to be prepared for after "victory"). This enables the struggle to be raised to a higher level. In the course of these low-level reform struggles, more advanced points are won beyond just the reforms themselves: in the latter two of the above-mentioned areas the workers realized that drinking and stealing put them in jeopardy with the boss—and therefore puts the whole struggle against the boss in jeopardy—and some stopped (which puts them in a better position to conduct more advanced struggles). Workers also realize the destructive nature of racism in real terms, not based on intellectual theorizing (although the latter plays its part). And they begin to realize that "reds" are not the ogres they're painted to be but, in fact, are very necessary (or at least useful) to their own struggles. This is a great leap forward.

In any event, the conclusion from these and other ex-

periences is clear: we participate in (and help launch) reform-type struggles in order to raise the struggle to the next highest level. This IS the job of a revolutionary. Not raising the level is opportunist. Not participating in most reform struggles is sectarian. Both help the enemy.

See who you can win to your side by going up and down the block hollering "Socialism—let's seize state power neighbors." But if you do the necessary spadework, and when objective conditions change, this seemingly ridiculous act could take on real meaning. Never write off the masses and their ability or capacity for struggle. Either we learn to love, honor, respect, and rely on the masses, or we close shop.

What makes us think that we can postulate to the workers about selfishness-like don't take that poverty money, because you weaken the struggle; or telling skilled workers that they have to fight for the rights of the unskilled in the shop or weaken their own battle; or tell white workers the paltry, temporary crumbs that may come from white chauvinism should be cast aside for class unity; or tell Black workers the road to freedom can be achieved, eventually, by establishing class unity—that setting up a Black bourgeoisie hating whitey solves nothing; or tell the working class that their allegiance must be to oppressed workers in Vietnam, and not the oppressive U.S. bosses? We want workers to subordinate what appears to be their immediate interests for the good of the entire class at home, or even the international working class, but are we willing to subordinate what seems to be our immediate interests?

If we are going to defeat U.S. imperialism we all have to enter into the struggle wholeheartedly. We must use all our initiative, thoughtfulness, and discipline. While the general work of the entire party can help the individual member to build a base, in the final analysis each member has to produce. No one can do it for you. Party directives, articles, and agitation are helpful, but these devices cannot do the job. Without real base-building the party will shrivel

up and die. If the individual member doesn't build a base the same fate awaits him politically. Oh, there are always rationales, always issues to "struggle" on, but finally you run out of dodges.

### Build People's Organizations

Naturally a broader view of base-building must include more than just individual ties. It should include some examination of forms. At the moment there are a couple of objective problems to deal with. In recent years there has been little success for anyone who tried to build organizations in working class communities. For the most part there is strong resistance by workers to community organization. This resistance, in part, is based on cynicism and the lack of political development to overcome cynicism. Also, many people still have strong illusions about the state. They still rely on the state to solve their problems.

So very often you see the contradiction between powerful mass action, and lack of organization. This is most apparent in the ghettos. Hundreds of thousands act against the system spontaneously, in an extremely sharp way. But two weeks after the action only the tiniest segment considers organization. Most often it is the government and their nationalist stooges who move in to mis-organize the community. Too few good forces act organizationally. This failure to organize against the state in a serious way indicates more faith in the system than meets the eye, real faith. This is becoming more obvious with the spate of Black candidacies across the country, including the South. Illusions about the parliamentary process still run deep in the country. Deeper than we realize.

In the past we put a lot of emphasis on open agitation. Our ability to grow from this has been very limited. People in the community are not generally ready to organize directly against the war, or under revolutionary banners, although huge numbers are opposed to the war, and some forces are deadly opposed to the system. Therefore, we must con-

tinually probe for the level around which people are ready to organize. Any consistent struggle against the system is useful. Within these efforts all sorts of political lessons can be drawn by us and the people. This is why we should consider building organizations that are more geared to the every day problems people face, and relate the larger political questions to them. Education, housing, sanitation, women's problems, prices, etc. are all questions which bear organizational investigation. In the past we have been too quick to pass up existing groups which might have some potential, like PTA's or Tenants Councils.

Of course this proposal will provoke the cry of opportunism. However the essential question is how do you play a vanguard role in a mass organization? How do you "work with and struggle against?" In student work we are seeking out forms of struggle and organization which do not necessarily start out from the point of opposition to the war.

We are working under the assumption that the majority of students can eventually be mobilized against the system. At this point, the majority are not ready to organize against the war. Many are ready to fight for various aspects of academic freedom, (more student-faculty control of the schools), and will generally support working class battles. So within these issues we should find the forms to work with more people. And in the course of this work we develop the ways and means to raise the consciousness of more people.

#### Develop New People's Leaders

In the course of expanding our ties in an all around way—personally, politically, organizationally—we will be beginning to solve a very pressing problem. This is the scarcity of new peoples' leaders who are ready to fight the system, at least in a limited way. Within the working class especially, this is a burning question. Where are the new leaders in the Black Liberation Movement? Not many. You might count them on your two hands. Where are the new leaders in the labor movement? Few and far be-

tween. Where are the new leaders in the various communities? Let's face it. The old has-beens or the newer never-wases are still around. They still control most of the existing organization. While this helps to explain the cynicism mentioned before, it doesn't excuse us from trying to solve the problem. People's leaders will not descend from Mars. We must have a conscious policy of bringing new leaders forward. And, when new decent forces do spring up we must try and prevent their corruption by the old-line leaders and the government. If we don't intercede more skillfully we will always be able to say with some certainty that virtually any new leader is a "phony." This "truth" will be a pyrrhic victory for us. Until the people have real leaders their struggle will be throttled by the state. Smugness will not overcome this problem. Only close political-personal relations based on struggle can begin to change this situation.

Given this objective reality—little organization and leadership—within the working class, we must take a closer look at the development of the United Front.

#### The United Front

First, let's review a few things about the united front. Our revolutionary efforts can't succeed without the development of the united front. Each stage of the revolutionary process requires a united front. This is true because at any stage large numbers of people will not necessarily be under our direct leadership, or agree with the long-range strategy of the party. But many forces will be willing to work with the party on short-range goals, or even on intermediate goals. Within these struggles we must try and win the confidence of these people and win more and more to the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat. So the united front is a contradiction. It is the unity of opposites.

What are some of the characteristics of this situation? Unity with some is transitory and unstable. At some stage

of the game, as the struggle against the enemy grows sharper, those who haven't advanced their consciousness will split. This is good because those who are left are at a higher level. And this development must grow and grow. Each new stage of the struggle should see more forces, more politically developed, and able to break with those who would retard the struggle.

At each stage of the struggle we must determine what is the correct slogan to organize the united front around, and with whom to unite. Also, while there may be one overriding question, there may be other questions in various areas to organize the united front around. The slogan to organize around must be principled, and must sharpen the struggle against the enemy. We should avoid the two classic errors by realizing (1) The united front is not a popularity contest. (2) The united front cannot be a replica of the party program.

In the anti-war movement "U.S. get out of Vietnam now" is the slogan around which we are trying to build the united front. We believe this slogan fits the conditions mentioned above. We try and work with forces who either believe this correct or at least can be won to this premise. It is important that they have either a base among the people or influence. Naturally there will be some forces who do not believe this slogan correct, but, because they have no base, try and coopt the united front by claiming allegiance to the slogan. We should try and prevent these forces from penetrating the united front and mis-leading it.

In the labor movement today, especially at the shop level, the conditions of the united front are different. Here we would start out at the level of sharper union efforts against the boss. Within these struggles we would relate the question of the war, either publically or individually, or both, depending on the tactics required.

In the Black Liberation Movement the war has emerged more centrally as a key aspect of the united front. But,

even here, the essential question of the united front for the Black Liberation Movement is super-exploitation.

#### Flexibility Within the United Front

Very often a united front on one question can lead to a broader united front on other questions. This can lead to involving more people in struggle and winning more people to the more fundamental point. The recent Brooklyn College experience is very germane. At the school the united front—PL and SDS—were acting against some aspect of the war. The school attacked. The students defended the right of the united front to carry on its actions without harrassment. The school called the cops. The focus of the united front shifted momentarily away from the war to "cops on campus and student-faculty control."

The anti-war forces acted flexibly within this new front to help make these two issues central, while relating them to the war. They were also able to show very clearly the role of the police and school authorities in regard to the state. Ten thousand students supported the strike and the anti-war united front. Many of these students previously supported the war or were passive. Because of this broader involvement some changed their minds and some were won over from passiveness to opposition. The SDS grew, we will grow, opposition to the war will grow, and opposition to the administration will grow. Naturally, there will be attacks and complications. But the action proved our basic premise that the majority of students can be won to struggle against the system. At some point the contradiction will sharpen, provoking action even at this middle class bastion. Here we saw a good example of how the united front flexibly applied, raised the consciousness of thousands. Consolidation and consistency becomes the next stage.

In united front work the idea of "struggle with—struggle against" must be skillfully applied. We must be very sharp against those who consciously betray the struggle, like

Socialist Workers Party, Communist Party, Guardian, Monthly Review, etc. At the same time we must use wisdom in winning those who are influenced by the wrong line, but who are essentially honest. Distinguishing between friends and enemies, it is called. Perhaps two ways could be used to evaluate the united front. Did we grow in influence and numbers? Did the center grow likewise, including more vigorous leadership?

#### United Front is Built From the Base Up

There must be two strategic premises guiding our united front work today. The united front, in the main, must be built from below. Therefore we are helping to build left-center coalitions in every area of work. We say build from below because our estimate is there are few real people's organizations championing the needs of the people—and damn few leaders who take this path. Here is where our united front policies are interrelated with our base-building. Base-building is bound to help develop people's leaders and organizations. Building people's formations to fight the enemy in different places, at different levels, means building the center. We unite with this center to defeat the ruling class and its stooges among the people, advancing the struggle to new levels. In this fight we raise our consciousness and that of the forces with whom we are fighting. In doing this we build our party, and win more of the direct leadership of the workers. As this process grows our leadership spreads to wider and wider sections.

Even after the seizure of state power, the united front is a strategic weapon to defeat revisionism and imperialism. Under different conditions it is still necessary for the Left to unite with the Center to defeat the Right.

In trying to judge the long-range tendency of attempts by communists at united front work in this country one would have to conclude that the long-range weakness was right opportunism. This is not to say that Left-sec-

taritarianism was not (and won't be) a problem. But to get the best appraisal of what is most likely to happen requires a long-range view of historical weakness. We didn't invent this concept of taking a long-range view—Lenin did.

So even in our initial steps we are making both mistakes at once. If you agree with the idea of "struggle with-struggle against," and that the long-range tendency has always been right opportunism, then you must conclude that "struggle against" was, and probably will be, weak. Within the anti-war movement, for example, we have waged a struggle against the CP-SWP forces; while they have footing and influence, still it is easier to hit them because the militants whom we want to influence can more easily see their deviation. Hence they are an easier target. And even if the CP-SWP axis adopts a more militant line—like "get out"—this can still be seen through more easily.

It is also not too difficult, at this point, to attack liberalism in the anti-war movement. If we attack RFK & Co., people won't get up tight about it even if they don't agree with us. In any event, the more radical forces, for the moment, agree that RFK is rotten.

Where we get the most static from militants, forces whom we are trying to win, is where we have differences with them, and where we fight for our own line. When we advance a class line, it will not be immediately accepted by radicals. When we reject tactics like "resistance" because these tactics will not only isolate radicals from workers, but from other students and intellectuals that could be won, our line will also be momentarily rejected by many.

By advancing a class line and tactics that will strengthen and broaden the base we are, in fact, advocating the only genuine militancy. This is so because these are ideas necessary to win. In the face of opportunism many of us will retreat. Some of us will panic, and suddenly nothing we say or do will seem right. Why? Because at the moment many do not agree. "Struggle against" becomes a sometime thing. It is easier to be popular.

Our fight for a class line within the anti-war movement is in no way contradictory to the aspirations of those who want to defeat the U.S. policies. In fact, it helps them from being drawn into various traps by the enemy to crush the movement. However, when you oppose something which appears to be militant, or forces who genuinely desire militancy but who are being side-tracked, the cry of "arrogance" or something like it will arise.

For example no matter how we hailed the struggle of the Vietnamese, the moment we questioned and criticized their taking Soviet "aid" we were attacked as "arrogant." Why? Because most people with whom we work do not understand, as yet, the dangers of a united front with the Soviets. Even though some people in the party were willing to go along with the line, although they disagreed, they finally couldn't go along with it because of the character of their base. Lydegraf and Coe for example had for their base mainly ex-CP people or similar types. They couldn't take the gaff from their friends and both ended up attacking the party.

So it is true that in fighting deviations there are temporary losses. But these losses are more than offset through strengthening the party and the people's movements in practice and ideologically. This is not an instant process. When we conducted an ideological struggle against Studies on the Left many condemned our articles criticizing them. Some did it politically, some raised "style" questions. Today these articles are used in our study in many places in the party because events seem to prove our line. Our party was strengthened and many forces in the New Left were aided, and rejected the Studies line of parliamentarianism.

A clear polemic against what appears to be popular ideas is like swimming up-stream, going against the tide. And that's what is going to be in store for us for a long time. If we present ourselves and our ideas carefully and develop our work well, slowly but surely we will gain more

and more footing and win the initiative. Struggles against deviations—particularly seemingly non-class ideas, which are really ruling class ideas covered up by militancy—are going to be with us for a long time. And it is necessary to always distinguish between the mis-leaders and those who are mis-led. If attacking those who mislead implies that those who are misled are in error by accepting mis-leaders, this is a real act of friendship—because without trying to point out that which is correct we would be of little value to the people.

One of the aberrations developing in our efforts to broaden out community work or industrial work is the tendency to become popular at all costs. Make ties one way or another, good or bad. So if we adopt a line in the community around the war which is the same as the CP or someone like them, it's O.K. because we are "good guys." We know what we are doing. Or if in a shop, we go along with all kinds of racism and anti-communism when we might be able to fight it, that's O.K. because we are "good guys" and we do not want to be isolated. But "glorious isolation" is far better than advancing opportunism.

Once again, remember that we can be corrupted not only directly, but through our base. We are developing ties not merely to have them, but to slowly but surely try to raise revolutionary working class ideas with those with whom we work. In correcting sectarianism let's not swing over to opportunism. This will be a constant danger in the period ahead.

The most important point in any of these polemics is our political ties, our relations with the people whom we are trying to win. Here the "struggle with" becomes dominant. Without these ties any polemic will just turn people off. There will be no force to clarify matters for those who have no crystallized opinion.

This is the essence of our sectarianism: our relations

are still too limited and fragile to win people to our line in many cases. In the face of disagreement we flounder. We are more at home dealing with obvious opportunist errors, but we are thrown off by Right errors covered by a militant veneer.

The united front is the most difficult strategy to apply. You need a base. You must be able to work with people who not only don't agree with you, but may even be vigorously anti-communist. And there is a thin line between opportunism and sectarianism. The correct line is very hard to achieve. Errors are bound to occur. The work must be evaluated continuously to achieve the right mix. To use an unscientific term, you need common sense.

#### Strengthen the Party: Defeat Servility

Inner-party struggle is vital to the life of our party. Inner-struggle is made necessary by the weaknesses that we bring into the party and by the weaknesses that exist in the people with whom we are working. The influences on us are not just the open efforts of the ruling class. We are also influenced by the ruling class through the people we are trying to win.

At this point we want to try and deal with two important contradictions which we have not mastered yet. One is servility and discipline. The other is individualism and collectivity. Servility is really an essential aspect of bourgeois society. When the ruling class prattles about individuality and initiative they are really only referring to themselves. They train the working class and the students and intellectuals to be servile. (There is a trifle more latitude for students and intellectuals. But actually this is skin deep. Latitude is only allowed in trifles, so long as it is harmless and shows up on profit charts.) We are taught to be used to having other people think for us and direct us. We are trained to be mentally lazy. Problems and decisions are usually solved or made by someone else. Even individual problems are settled in a bad way. If

you have a little money you go to the great wizard, tell him your troubles while he strokes his chin. Supposedly he illuminates the contradiction for you and steers you to the "solution." While the myth is created that "you solved your own problem," the reality is that you were driven to the couch. If you don't have money to throw away on Dr. Cronkite you drink or take dope. And in some cases you do it all. The essence of this is servility, because you do not relate your contradictions to the system, and you capitulate to some form of non-struggle.

When you join the party you are faced with the idea of democratic centralism. While some may complain about the centralism the truth is that many like it. The antagonism to centralism is only skin deep. Centralism is really what we are accustomed to and what we have been trained to accept. The party leaders often like this, deep down, because it makes the task of "leading" so much "easier." So, in the party, you can easily arrive at a boss-worker relationship. Bureaucratic-centralism can easily develop from democratic centralism if we are not alert. Keeping quiet will replace inner-party struggle if we are not alert.

But servility goes even further in robbing the party of vigor and creativity. People are often loath to act unless told what to do and guided at each step. Even very simple work, like selling literature, requires an order from the boss. Obviously this is debilitating. Under these circumstances direction and leadership, which are necessary, really become orders from the boss. The collective aspect is gone because collectivity really belongs only to the party leaders in the same way democracy really belongs just to the ruling class.

More membership participation must be encouraged and welcomed. The responsibility for correction is the leaders!

Because our party stems from a large middle-class group we bring another deviation into the party—individualism-anarchy. In rebelling against the boss-like domination

in life we come to believe our mothers and fathers who told us that we are geniuses and wonderful. Some never really meant their accolades. They were trying to establish their status through their children in their middle class world. "Murray, you are the smartest boy alive. You'll be a lawyer, at least." So now when we participate in party discussion we will never relinquish our point of view. We will never shut up. Secondary differences are elevated into primary differences. "The party must be defeated because they don't agree with us. If we can't defeat the party from within we must do it from without." So beating the party becomes some immature people's battle.

There is a common denominator between servility and individualism-anarchy. Usually it is manifested by not carrying out the party line among the people. By staying isolated the individualism is hard to curb and defeat. Or, if a base is being built, it is not really for the party. It is a personal base, to be used not in the interest of the party, but in the interest of the individual. Kingdoms and fiefdoms are being built. Eventually, these are taken over or handed over to the enemy. After all, it is the enemy's ideas that are predominant.

In all this there is a thin line between what is good and what is bad. Liberalism in the party is wrong and so is autocracy. Perhaps we could summarize this question in the following way. Everyone should be active and developing ties based on a collective determination of perspective and line. We each should fight all proposals we don't agree with. We should question all that is not understood. We should accept all the decisions of the party for a time but insist on reevaluations based on experience. None of us should accept anything that challenges basic Marxist-Leninist concepts, as for example, the need for revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, proletarian internationalism, U.S. imperialism is the main enemy of the people of the world, PLP is a party of the working class and class struggle is the driving force of history.

Many times in the past we have raised the idea of being constructive in inner-party struggle. It is imperative to have a friendly, non-sarcastic attitude. If there isn't an open, friendly atmosphere this will distort the fight over differences. We still have many instances of nastiness and organizing others against "them" and for "our" position. When things like this happen, people should intercede. Don't wait for the leadership. Put down rudeness and attempts to organize for one's position outside of regular discussions.

Remember that every difference can't be resolved immediately or just through reasoning. This means that comrades have to decide what they think is right and what wrong. This means that someone has to accept the decision, subordinate his position to others, maintain an open mind and see what experience teaches. This means that the minority cannot conduct a nasty, wise-guy, on-going struggle against the line when others are trying to apply it. Time and experience must be allowed to really get a good idea of the validity of a particular effort.

Proper relations between members is essential to party growth. Take nothing, and no one, for granted. Consider all your actions from the viewpoint of how they affect others. The idea is to help one another, not to destroy one another. The latter is the road to success in the bourgeois world. In our world helping the people, helping each other, is our success.

More people must come forward to be responsible for building the party. More have to view all their actions from the point of view of what is good for the party. Obviously, no deviation from Marxism-Leninism helps this. Fighting deviations within ourselves and within others means helping to lead the party. A thorough-going collective outlook will enhance our inner struggle. Inner struggle is, after all, aimed at strengthening all of us.

In the coming period we have to improve our recruitment

procedures. First our recruitment should stem more from contacts we are making in activity. We must put the question of joining the party as the most important step in that person's life. Joining the party means a qualitative change between the individual and the ruling class. As stated earlier, you are challenging the ruling class to a life and death struggle. At least, the enemy understands it this way. Therefore he hates you. Of course his tactics vary, from period to period. So we shouldn't let this momentary period of limited bourgeois democracy for some to fool us.

#### Perspective—Performance—Perseverance

When people join the party a perspective should be worked out with them based on the needs of the party. The perspective should also be determined by the skills, abilities and desires of the member. This perspective should go beyond just tomorrow! This means that the party group into which the person is recruited should have a perspective. The candidacy period can really become meaningful only if there is some way to gauge the person. In trying to carry out something in particular, and by discussing the perspectives of the club and individuals, the new member can make a better judgment as to whether he wants to stay in the party. It is in the pre-recruitment period that we should get to know as much as possible about the person, so the club can better evaluate membership, not the candidacy period.

In recruiting we should not have the ridiculous idea that we are looking for a perfect communist. Where do we have perfection now? Becoming a good communist is a long-term process. The fight for commitment is constant. Who in our party doesn't have to fight for his commitment? Don't create standards for new members that we have not yet achieved in old members. Some yardsticks to be used: Know your person well. Is he active? Is he stable? Does he agree with the basic ideas our party is founded on? Personal and political shortcomings, if they are not crucial, have to be overcome in time—in the party, in struggle among the masses.

In the past we have made both possible errors: sometimes too liberal and sometimes too demanding. As in every question raised here too our skill, thoughtfulness and maturity must be developed.

#### Chauvenism—Who Needs It?

Another deviation which exists in our party is white chauvinism. This doesn't have the overt crass forms that one finds in American life. Nonetheless chauvinism exists! If it is not fought it will grow, because the ruling class is sharpening up its racist axe in the face of sharp struggle by Black people in the U.S., and oppressed people all over.

There are three main forms in which it develops in the party. (1) The failure to advance the needs and aspirations of Black people if this seems to fly in the face of temporary needs of white workers. (Of course there is a tactical question involved concerning length of time in a place and progress in base-building. But let us assume this tactical question is settled.) We are not in a popularity contest. Our ideas have to be publically advanced if we are to eventually see them become dominant. In fighting any deviation among the masses our position in the beginning will not be popular. Naturally, the ability for our ideas to get a decent hearing depends on our relations with white workers. If such relations don't exist you have fallen down on the key aspect of the battle. Many, perhaps most, white workers believe that Black workers' advancement, in any form, takes bread out of their mouths. This idea has been consciously planted by the bourgeoisie and in the narrowest sense seemingly confirmed by life.

But racism is one of the bulwarks of the white workers' own enslavement. So by persisting in the fight against racism we will win white workers in the long run. Because if they want to achieve their aspirations they must eventually develop unity with Black workers.

Recent events in the schools in New York have posed

this particular question sharply. There is a sharp contradiction between teachers and the state over working conditions. There is a sharp contradiction between the parents and the state and the parents and the teachers. (Contradictions within contradictions.) At the time of the (1967) strike the secondary contradiction between parents and teachers was sharpened. The state and its various stooges have done this. But the union and the workers have done this also by venting their racism. So the key contradictions between the parents and the state and the teachers and the state gets somewhat derailed. Winner—the state.

In the course of the teachers' struggle against the state our people and friends can't see how to reverse this trend of parents and teachers fighting each other. To some extent they play down the racism of the teachers and the union, and don't hit it nearly hard enough. A feeling is generated that if you attack racism among the teachers you may be hurting the class struggle aspect, as well as endangering your own relations with teachers. People often see only the nationalist deviation. But the nationalist deviation, which must be combatted, thrives primarily because of chauvinism. Which is the main danger to the working class, chauvinism or nationalism? We say chauvinism! If you are going to make a one-sided error, for crying out loud, make it combatting chauvinism.

At our past convention there was a strong Black nationalist tendency. This was encouraged by chauvinism. Black people were brought into the party and to the convention for "composition." They were not ready for the party. White people shouldn't work in the ghetto. However, in our work this has gone too far. Under the guise of following the party line, and by bowing to nationalism many white members in the party have little or no contact with Black people. In reality many people feel relieved that they don't have to have relations with Black people. "After all if white people scrutinize us closely because we are communists, Black people will do it more so. We really have to be on our toes. Who needs it?" There is great truth

that Black people will judge us carefully. Why shouldn't they? And that's how we are forced to think and learn and change. Do we want it handed to us on a silver platter? Do you think it will be handed to you on a silver platter?

We believe white communists can influence Black workers, especially in industry where the oppressor is more obviously a common one. While white communists must mainly develop ties with white workers, and not fawn over Black workers, they must eventually become the unifying force between the two.

In brief, chauvinism is displayed in our party by not fighting as sharply among workers where we can; by not developing ties with Black workers and trying to recruit them; and by pandering to nationalism. Marxism-Leninism is the science of the working class, Black and white. While the nationalist current places obstacles in the fight for Marxism-Leninism among Black people, it can be overcome by a resolute fight against chauvinism in and out of the party.

#### Understanding the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

Within the radical movement and within the Black Liberation Movement the key concept to fight for and win is the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the concept which draws the greatest fire from various forces. But if we are to win this fight for a working class outlook we have to be clear on this question ourselves. There are only two classes in the world today that are capable of holding state power and who actually hold state power: the bourgeoisie or the working class. There are no in-betweens. Any political development is judged by evaluating its class-power implications. And where there have been revolutions we can determine their nature by seeing which class really holds state power. Ask yourself this question: "Who holds state power in Algeria, Ghana, Guinea, Soviet Union, Cuba, China, Albania?" Only in

China and Albania do the workers hold state power. What other class holds it in the others if you agree that it isn't the working class?

Some people think that revolution can be successfully carried out without Marxism-Leninism, that is, without a party, and without the strategy of the dictatorship of the proletariat. There are revolutions and revolutions. There are working class revolutions, and bourgeois democratic revolutions. There are National Democratic revolutions which may or may not be transformed into Socialist revolutions. If they are not, power may simply be transferred from one section of the bourgeoisie to another. Such is the case of Algeria. The reason why so many people in and out of the movement can be taken in by Debray is precisely because they do not understand this question. Many people in our party don't recognize the counter-revolutionary role of Debray. They can't understand that Castro and company have launched an all-out assault on Marxism-Leninism in this hemisphere. It is hard for people to understand revisionism when it doesn't come precisely labeled revisionism, if it isn't stamped "made in Moscow or Yugoslavia." But clearly if revisionism is to succeed it must fool the people. Therefore, in each period, in each country, it takes on that coloring most helpful to conceal itself. It trades on the hopes of the people, it builds itself on these hopes, but actually revisionism works against them. Does anyone believe that revisionism openly opposes Mao in China? The red flag is used to obscure the red flag. Mao is "drowned in a sea of Mao." So today the newer variety of revisionism drowns revolution in a sea of "revolution."

How is it done? Can anyone who claims to be a revolutionary come before the Latin masses and oppose armed struggle? The Soviets are completely discredited because of this. So modern revisionism advocates "armed struggle." But the armed struggle is separated from the concept of People's War. In this way Marxism-Leninism and the dictatorship of the proletariat are opposed. All you need

are a few good guys and a gun. Where has armed struggle in and of itself won state power? If that were all that was necessary Al Capone would have been President. Armed struggle is an important aspect of the revolutionary struggle. But it must be based on People's War, the mass line leading to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Revolutionary violence is not limited to terrorism. Revolutionary violence must be a matter the people embrace.

• •

We believe the strategy we are pursuing to be generally correct. It can be improved, and is being improved by experience. More significant adjustments are needed in our trade union program. It was here that we had the least experience, and it was here that the revisionist influence was strongest.

Our main changes have to take place in ourselves, in the way we try to carry out our line. That is why this report deals with those aspects more directly related to base-building.

The principal manifestation of revisionism in our party really comes from a limited ability to transform ourselves and become real forces of the working class. In the final analysis our line can best be demonstrated in life by how many workers we can move into battle against the enemy. If we can't do it today what are we doing now to make it possible tomorrow? This is what will really distinguish us from those petty bourgeois forces within the Left whom we are carrying out an ideological struggle against. Are we really different than they are? Do we mean what we say? Base building is the only way for us to carry the day and in the long run make the revolution. The battle won't be won on the pages of the magazine. That can help. But action in life is the basic answer.

If there has been repetition or you have heard this song before, ask yourself why? It is because we are not doing

well enough in becoming a party of the working class. The concept is not yet clear enough in anyone's mind. Without a base everything turns out to be a hollow joke, an exercise in romanticism. We know, even where we have tiny toe holds, the influence we can exert. From our most limited experiences in the schools, communities, factories we can see the power of Marxism-Leninism even if applied in the minutest doses. We have been a positive influence on almost all the new political developments in the country. But this is scratching the surface. We can be wiped out one way or another unless we do better. We have progressed. But we have not made indestructable ties to the workers. We are not serving the ruling class but we are not as yet thoroughly committed to the working class. We are moving in the right direction, but we must do better...better...better.

Unlimited opportunities await us. Hundreds of millions are fighting U.S. imperialism everywhere. Millions in our country are beginning the long march.

Wipe out obstacles in the party!

Build a base for the party!

Be a party of the working class among the people!

Serve the people, not ourselves!

