

This section of our pamphlet will try to express the views of the PRRWO on what today is the most important of struggles taking place within the Communist movement in the U.S.A. The Central Task of Communists, Party Building. Today everyone is "agreed" that Party Building is the central task. But when we get down, roll up our sleeves and start digging into how concretely we're going to bring the party into being, this is where, along with many other questions, the Genuine and the Sham depart and on questions of principle, we see clearly we're not all "agreed".

In the interest of uniting with all that is honest and revolutionary, we present the following analysis of how we see the development of the question of Party Building for the U.S.A., historically and what we believe should be the road ahead.

Included in this section, we will discuss in detail the lines of the major national communist organizations on this question - RU, OL, the Guardian, PSP, and the CL. As well as show throughout our pamphlet why we're in unity with our close comrades of the BWC and all other comrades to build the Party and make revolution.

At the close of this section we will present an analysis of the development of our organization - our strengths and shortcomings, to be examined closely by all our comrades, for unity and Bolshevik criticism.

BRIEF HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF HOW PARTY BUILDING BECAME THE CENTRAL TASK SINCE THE DEGENERATION OF THE "CP"USA (R)

By the end of the 1950's, it had become clear that the "CP" USA, retreating to the traditions of the Second International betrayed the U.S. proletariat and oppressed masses here and throughout the world, becoming a Party of peace and not of war.

Totally unfit to carry the worthy name of Communist Party, it began to fight for social reforms and not social revolution. A revisionist leadership had usurped the party, collaboration with the ruling class, putting forward the treacherous policy of peaceful transformation. In every despicable form you can think of the productive forces theory had raised its ugly head.

Many honest cadres fought, fought hard, to keep the CPUSA from degenerating, after almost 30 years of trying to lead the working class and oppressed masses against the ruling class. It stands out, most especially in the history of the party in the role it played in organizing the masses during the depression years in the 1930's.

We cannot go into all the reasons that the Party went revisionist, here, that is a task that our new party will undertake.

One thing is certain, the betrayal of the "CP"USA caused tremendous setbacks for the struggle of the international proletariat against the bourgeoisie, for without the party we can't even speak of overthrowing imperialism, the system which exploits and oppressed the majority of the world's people.

Hence, for approximately the past 24 years, the U.S. proletariat has been confronted with the task of organizing its Party along a revolutionary political line. An independent workers party, educating the workers and oppressed masses in the spirit of revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie for the seizure of state power - to establish on a firm foundation the dictatorship of the proletariat. This party must be the party of Leninism, a party of a new type.

Attempts to reconstitute the Party have taken place since the latter 1950's.

Some committed Communists, along with some hidden political swindlers made such an attempt through the formation of a P.O.C. Unfortunately this attempt failed as the P.O.C. degenerated into a sectarian sect, not to complete the task it had set out to do.

In the early 60's another attempt was the formation of the Progressive Labor Party, which constituted itself as the Workers Party.

The PLP, soon after its constitution also degenerated into the marsh of opportunism, revising Marxism-Leninism under the cover of a left dogmatic mask; the ugly face of Trotskyism which was to plaque the U.S., another betrayal to the mighty cause of the working class.

These enemies, which did take under its wings honest revolutionaries attacked and denounced the world wide struggle against imperialism being waged by the heroic peoples in the national liberation struggles, the weak links of imperialism. Classically like all Trotskyites, the PLP claimed that the world revolution was a one step sweep, and therefore, the national struggles for liberation were reactionary - not proletarian, that all nationalism was reactionary.

Under this counter-revolutionary policy, the PLP denounced the heroic struggles of the people of Vietnam, Cuba, Laos, Cambodia and attacked the leading socialist countries in the world, the People's Republic of China and Albania.

In the U.S., they attacked the revolutionary struggles of Black people and all other oppressed national minorities. They demagogued about the working class when in actuality by the end of the 1960's, it was clear that PLP was a renegade organization serving in all their words and deeds, the interest of the bourgeoisie. (See "Road to Revolution 111", PLP, published 1969).

Today the PLP, the "CP"USA and all other Trot and revisionist organizations stand as a direct obstacle in the path of the proletariat and its goal, and as agents of the bourgeoisie, they must be smashed and swept aside forever.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

It would be idealism, however, clear and simple, to fool oneself into believing that due to the fact that PLP, "CP"USA and other organizations have been proven bankrupt; the lines, trends, and tendencies which they represent are not to be found within the ranks of the proletariat and the revolutionary movement in general, just as it is idealist and totally metaphysical to think, as some try to sell us today (e.g., CL) that no Marxist-Leninist existed in this whole period.

The fact is that in the struggle against opportunism and directly from the ranks of the proletariat many communists have developed.

However, the fact also remains that the reason we don't have a Party today, the fact that the class is divided and unorganized (the political leadership of the masses is directly related to the opportunist theories that have deviated and set back the revolutionary motion in our country). Lenin put it this way:

"The unity of the proletariat in the epoch of social revolution can be achieved only (our emphasis) by the extreme revolutionary party of Marxism and only by a relentless struggle against all other parties."

No blame can be placed on the masses of people. Some political swindlers insist that all these years they have been waiting for the objective conditions - they mean, for the party to come out of the mass movement.

The fact is that the masses have continued to wage struggle. It is a universal law that where there is oppression, there is resistance.

Conditions for the masses of people have worsened. U.S. imperialism has been on the steady decline. Capitalism has gone to its highest development; its doom is inevitable. That is why the great Lenin said, "Imperialism is the eve of social revolution."

Our Chinese comrades have analyzed correctly that revolution is the main trend in the world today. Throughout the world, the U.S. imperialists and the U.S.S.R. social imperialists are suffering defeat. The U.S. ruling class has steadily stepped up its exploitation and oppression of the U.S. proletariat and oppressed masses.

The people have fought back, in the form of strikes, union-led as well as wildcat strikes, as the union bureaucrats showed their treacherous true colors. Many spontaneous struggles have developed against the attacks on the living standards of the class, struggles for better housing, schools, against unemployment, etc.

From the struggles of the oppressed nationalities, Black, Puerto Rican, Mexican, Dominican, Asian and others, we have learned and gained valuable experience.

The struggle of women, youth, the anti-war movement, especially among the petty-bourgeoisie, have aided and given support to the people of the world against a common oppressor. The disintegration of the regime, naturally the bourgeois parties riddled with corruption, is a reflection of a decaying, dying class - e.g., the Kennedy assassinations, Watergate (for an analysis of Watergate, see another section of this pamphlet).

RELATION OF THE OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE FACTORS OF THE REVOLUTION

All these things confirm the Marxist-Leninist teachings, and, as Stalin elaborates on the question of strategy and tactics, there are two aspects of the working class movement, the objective and subjective sides:

"The objective side of the movement, or the spontaneous element, is the group of processes that take place independently of the consciousness and regulating will of the proletariat."²

Stalin continues to say:

"Strategy has nothing to do with those processes, for it can neither stop nor alter them; it can only take them into account and proceed from them."³

Out of the many struggles of the masses, many people gravitated first as anti-imperialists, further developing into consciously taking the processes of struggle into account, understanding these from the point of view of the Marxist-Leninist-Mao Tse Tung theory, dialectical and historical materialism, the only theory which can explain not only why things happen, but how to proceed to change the world we live in today. This has been the developing, conscious side of the movement. Stalin goes on to say:

"But the movement has also a subjective, conscious side. The subjective side is the reflection in the minds of the workers of the spontaneous processes of the movement; it is the conscious and systematic movement of the proletariat towards a definite goal. It is this side of the movement that interests us,

because unlike the objective side, it is entirely subject to the directing influence of strategy and tactics."⁴

The left opportunists within our movement divorce the subjective side from the objective processes that are taking place, e.g., CL, with its insistence that the world must go through a one-stage revolution, when objectively conditions in some countries make it imperative that they go through two stages; such was the case of New Democracy in China, which removed obstacles in the way so that today a mighty socialist country exists. Basing everything on subjective desire, the left opportunists break the idea, the dialectical relationship between objective and subjective factors, proving themselves as metaphysicians and hurting the cause of the class. (More on CL later)

But the most dangerous of trends in the world today is the right opportunist trend, reflected in the policies of the leading revisionists in the world, the U.S.S.R. social-imperialists, and in the country by the "CP"USA. Within the communist movement in the U.S. today, right opportunism is manifested in lines which we will document.

The right opportunists insist that revolutionary theory comes from within the spontaneous movement of the masses; they do this to keep the class-conscious proletarians from leading the class forward. They oppose the building of the vanguard of the class; they deny the leading role of the party, and have a disdain for Marxist-Leninist theory.

They claim they are "learning from the masses," "creatively applying" that they are "one with the masses," when in actuality they are tailing behind the most backward sectors, worshipping every spontaneous struggle that develops, and creating theories to cover their criminal attempt to delay the proletariat's onslaught on the bourgeoisie.

Such, for example, is the line that the central task has been to build the "revolutionary unity, consciousness and organization of the working class," developed and pushed by the RU. The European revisionists agree with this implicitly: They,

"Under the pretext of establishing the unity of the working class, the revisionists have not only given up exposing the right-wing leaders of social democracy, who are the principal splitters of the class, but they (our emphasis) are getting closer to and gradually fusing in with social democratic parties; they are doing their utmost to strike up an alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie, with the Christian democrats and all other reactionaries."⁵

Under the guise of the central task - "Build the revolutionary unity, consciousness and organization of the class" - the RU has helped retard, and with this line opposed, the building of the party.

Today they "agree" the central task is party building. They try to cover themselves by saying that they were "slow" and didn't "emphasize enough party building." (See Red Papers 6, RU publication)

We ask you honestly, RU, how could you put correct emphasis on party building, when in deed, not always in what you say but in deed, you have revived Bernstein's catchwords: The movement for you has been everything, the final aim nothing.

You have been very happy to build yourselves up on paper organizations like UWOC, the many "anti-imperialist" newspapers you build in the country; under the guise of anti-imperialist politics, you covered your economism straight up. Your workers' committees to "throw the bum out" were frauds like every "support" group you've formed to worship this or that struggle. Many honest people, eager to move the struggle ahead, joined in these efforts. The more advanced saw through your opportunism and realized that you were not so eager to build the only organization that could lead the proletariat and all its organizations and allies and through its program, map out the strategy and tactical questions we face in the American revolution. You were "slow" and "didn't emphasize enough" building the party.

You criticized OL for left sectarianism, when they put forward party building as the central task, when behind closed quarters you were trying to merge with the OL because on line you both basically represented a right line and you have more agreements than not. (More on the OL later on)

In fact, you struggled to push the OL more to the right, and get the rest of us, whom you saw as your practical workers, to support you in this. We repudiated this, and quickly you have turned around and accused us of dogmatism, left sectarianism, etc. You were seeking hegemony of this right line.

In our July, 1972 Congress of the PRRWO, we put forward the principal task of communists as the formation of a multi-national communist party. Bob Avakian, of the National Central Committee of the RU, speaking at this same Congress, stated:

"During the course of this assembly, we have talked about the question of how to forge a proletarian line, and we've come to unity around the fact that we have to begin laying the base for the eventual formation of the multi-national party based on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought."

Further on, he continues:

"At the same time, we feel that, at the present time, the basis has not been laid to form a multi-national communist party, much as many of us may like to see it formed as soon as possible. We believe that in this pre-party period, it is necessary to have both multi-national and national Marxist-Leninist organizations (and here it is placing party building on an objective fact - Ed.) because of the uneven development of the national struggles and the overall class struggles, and the fact that their merger has just begun."⁷

Not because of our unpreparedness, our amateurishness and belittling of theory, not because of the opportunism which has caused the divisions of the class. None of these reasons was given and so we united PRRWO-BWC-RU to "build the revolutionary unity, consciousness and organization of the class," and for another 1½ years, our work was set back, as we worshipped the spontaneous movement and tailed, rather than interjected scientific socialism into the spontaneous movement by preparing the advanced, class-conscious proletarians and revolutionary intellectuals to truly lead the mass movement forward, concentrating our efforts on building a Bolshevik Party as the central task in close relationship to the other two tasks.

At the Second Congress of the Communist International, 1920, Lenin presented the following:

"The present stage in the development of the international communist movement is marked by the fact that in the vast majority of capitalist countries, the proletariat's preparedness to effect its dictatorship has not been completed, in many cases, has not even been systematically begun. From this, it does not, however, follow that the proletarian revolution is impossible in the immediate future; it is perfectly possible, since the entire economic and political situation is most inflammable and abounds in cases of sudden flare-up; the other condition for revolution, apart from the Proletariat's preparedness, viz., a general state of crisis in all the ruling and in all the bourgeois parties, also exists. However, it does follow that the communist parties' current task consists in accelerating the revolution, in intensifying the preparation of the proletariat. On the other hand, the facts cited above from the history of many

socialist parties makes it incumbent on us to see that "recognition" of the dictatorship of the proletariat shall not remain a matter of words. Hence, from the point of view of the international proletarian movement, it is the communist parties' principal task at the present moment to unite the scattered party in every country (or to reinforce or renovate the existing party) in order to increase tenfold the work of preparing the dictatorship of the proletariat. The ordinary socialist work conducted by groups and parties which recognize the dictatorship of the proletariat has by no means undergone that fundamental revolution, which is essential before this work can be considered communist work and adequate to the tasks to be accomplished on the eve of proletarian dictatorship."

It was under this type of leadership that the Comintern helped the Communists of most countries to build their parties in close connection with the struggles of the masses of the people.

But was it, as the RU tries to peddle, that the objective conditions were not ripe? Absolutely not. It was the betrayal of the revisionists within the parties, especially in the capitalist countries, and with the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, which set the struggle back.

Today, as Lenin analyzed then, the general crisis of imperialism has, in fact, accelerated. He said, and it's been confirmed by objective reality, the other conditions for revolution, apart from the preparedness of the proletariat, exist.

OUR EXPERIENCE CONFIRMS THE EXPERIENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT

Have we, the PRRWO and the BWC, been divorcing theory from practice; has our history been one of book-worshipping; have we been armchair revolutionaries? The RU says that we are dogmatists, that we want to build the party in isolation from the masses. They say we have contempt for the masses; all we want to do is study.

This outright lie and slander, along with many other distortions of BWC-ATM-PRRWO which they've been spreading all over the country, is further proof of the RU's unwillingness to change or make self-criticism; instead, they blame others for their own incapacities in training even a handful of proletarians in the science of making revolution.

No, we have not blamed the people or our practice among the people for our errors. The fact is, and we emphasize this point, the PRRWO, in unity and struggle with our close comrades of the BWC, examined closely our errors.

In examining our history, we were able to understand Lenin's teachings that worshipping spontaneity is the ideological root of all opportunism. What did this mean concretely? As we were running around behind every struggle, our leading bodies were almost totally untrained in the science of Marxism-Leninism and, therefore, we were not effectively training the cadres of our organizations in revolutionary stands, viewpoint or method of giving conscious leadership to the spontaneous movement. Most of our leaflets and propaganda materials were not an example of political agitation and propaganda reflecting a scientific understanding of the problems in the world, in the U.S. today, or how to begin to resolve them. At best, we had an embryonic understanding of our problems and how to answer the questions of the day in theoretical or practical terms.

Without a grasp of the science, our struggle against opportunism within our own organizations (and no one can deny that we have struggle against opportunism within our organizations - e.g., James Forman's expulsion from BWC, Felipe Luciano's from the YLP), many times were superficial and not thorough, so that the very same lines would come up in new and stronger form. But this is not to deny that truth was developing in a forward motion against falsehood.

But without a grasp of the science, formulating our political positions was like building a house with paper and glue. We were always running the risk that our political positions would just be nominal, being left to the interpretations and distortions of opportunists inside and outside the organizations, as well as being influenced by those who called themselves our friends, peddling to us positions like "Nation of a New Type" on the Black national question, or, as we've already explained, the supposed central task of communists, "Build the revolutionary unity, consciousness, etc." We make clear that we understand fully that the basis for our errors has been our own internal weaknesses, just as our strengths are to be found in the majority of our cadre, who honestly learn from our mistakes, criticize them and move forward in an unswerving devotion to the cause of the class.

We have learned from our experiences. The RU teaches nothing when they phrase-monger about "learn from the masses."

From the summed-up experience of the international proletariat, in the science of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought and its concrete application, we've learned that communists must not be the rearguard, but must build a vanguard party as the advanced detachment of the invincible force of the proletariat for its emancipation.

The RU, through its theory of stages, "end of one period into a crossroads," and all this other foolish nonsense, and their proposal of party building for a brief period (Red Papers 6) is

similar to the economists of Russia, whom Lenin fought so hard. Thus, the RU glorifies the unpreparedness and amateurishness which have plagued us for all these years. They act as if we have to build a big trade union, and therefore, it was all right that for all these years the task of building the party has been sabotaged by opportunists of all shades - themselves and other right forces on the one hand; on the other, the dogmatists of the CL in their elitist, isolated party, and their sham congress in September of this year.

The party of Leninism is neither a big trade union nor is it a circle of "advanced theoreticians" who make themselves the motive force of history, and not the masses. The party of Leninism, says Stalin:

1. The party is the vanguard of the working class.

"The role of vanguard can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by revolutionary theory."⁹

2. The party is the organized detachment of the working class.

"Under the capitalist system, the party's tasks are huge and varied. The party must lead the struggle of the proletariat under the exceptionally difficult circumstances of inner as well as outer development; it must lead the proletariat in its attack; it must withdraw the proletariat from the blows of a powerful opponent when the situation calls for retreat; it must imbue the millions of unorganized non-party workers with the spirit of discipline and system in fighting with the spirit of organization and perseverance."¹⁰

3. The party is the highest form of class organization of the proletariat.

"The party is the highest form of proletarian class association whose political leadership must extend to every other form of organization of the proletariat."¹¹

4. The party as the weapon of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"The proletariat needs its party, first of all, as its general staff, which it must have for the successful seizure of power. But the proletariat needs the party, not only to achieve the dictatorship, it needs it still more to maintain, consolidate and extend its dictatorship in order to attain complete victory of socialism."¹²

5. The party is the expression of unity of will, which is incompatible with the existence of factions.

6. The party is strengthened by purging itself of opportunist elements.

"The theory of 'overcoming' opportunist elements by ideological struggle within the party; the theory of 'living down' these elements within the confines of a single party are rotten and dangerous theories that threaten to condemn the party to paralysis and chronic infirmity, that threaten to abandon the party to opportunism, that threaten to deprive the proletariat of its main weapon in the fight against imperialism."¹³

Surely this is not the kind of party that is built in a "brief period" or that comes out of worshipping and tailing behind the mass movement.

SUMMATION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the U.S., pregnant with revisionism, it's no wonder all opportunists are frightened stiff of the coming into being of the mighty party of the proletariat. For all the forces who say (most especially RU), "The only thing PRRWO and BWC offer is to build the party," we make our stand clear: It is not a matter of an offer; it is a matter of conscious planning and preparation, our duty as communists in keeping with the responsibility to our class. Furthermore, you can accuse us of being dogmatists all you want; we will continue to polemicize against your bankrupt line and bring scientific socialism to the advanced workers and revolutionary intellectuals who demonstrate in word and deed their unbounded devotion to the cause of the class.

You don't consider this practice! Well, you get tiresome; your advice will reach fewer and fewer receptive ears as you continue to worship spontaneity. We believe that a good percentage of your cadres will join the struggle to prove you bankrupt and dump you into the garbage can of history. We call on them to take note of your vacillating nature in how you "suggest" (Red Papers 6) that the party be based on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought.

All communists know we must fight for and insist that the party be based on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought. No one can build a genuine party by going against the interests of the class; you won't be an exception.

The PRRWO unites firmly on line with BWC-ATM and all true communists in the communist movement of the U.S.A. to build our party firmly rooted in the proletariat. Every factory shall be a fortress. The working class will be trained in

political exposure through propaganda and agitation in a fight that shakes the foundations of capitalism at its very heart, internally, until the bourgeoisie and its state apparatus are crushed and replaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat. Making revolution in the U.S. is our international responsibility and the U.S. multi-national working class will not abandon its duty. Instead, it will wave high the banner of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought, and in deed, carry out resolutely and without delay, the American Revolution for socialism and finally on to communism.

MARXISTS-LENINISTS UNITE!!

BUILD THE PARTY!!

SWEEP ALL PESTS AWAY!!

FOOTNOTES:

1. Collected Works of Lenin, Russian Edition, Vol. 26, p. 50.
2. Collected Works of Stalin, "On the Question of Strategy and Tactics", Vol. 5, p. 163.
3. "Ibid", p. 163.
4. "Ibid", pp. 163-164.
5. The Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern Revisionism, "Europe Pregnant with Revisionism".
6. "Resolutions of the Congress of the PRRWO", 1972.
7. "Ibid".
8. Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. 31, "Theses on the Comintern's Fundamental Task", pp. 188-189.
9. Foundations of Leninism, "The Party"
10. "Ibid".
11. "Ibid".
12. "Ibid".
13. "Ibid".

We see it necessary and important to take time in this part to briefly sum-up the history of our organization and the developments since our historic Congress of July 1972. Since it would be impossible to sum-up all our 5 year history, we will just go through the major changes and struggles that have brought us up to the present period: the period of Marxist-Leninists Unite for the formation of a genuine multi-national communist party to lead the proletariat to seize state power, for the establishment of socialism. In the course of our history we have gained valuable experiences, made tremendous contributions to the communist movement, as well as committed serious errors which when proven bankrupt, we have moved to repudiate in the interest of the proletariat.

We would like to share with the whole of the communist movement our errors as well as our contributions so as to further the unity of Marxist-Leninists in the struggle against U.S. imperialism and USSR Social-Imperialism. The class struggle in our organization has been intense, in our relentless struggle against opportunism of all shades, both right and left opportunism, always moving forward towards a better understanding of the science of the proletariat, Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRRWO

In the late 60's and early 70's, the objective spontaneous movement of the oppressed Puerto Rican national minority in the fight against racism, national oppression as well as class oppression and for the recognition of the struggle for national liberation of Puerto Rico, was at a high level. Puerto Ricans were struggling for better housing, decent education, against the violent police repression, against the injustices committed in the U.S. ruling class penal system and struggling hard to maintain their jobs, since they along with Blacks, were always first fired, last hired. Puerto Ricans were struggling against the corrupt union officials who more and more every day show their true class interest, that as the same of the capitalists, who year after year, presented the workers with a clear sold-out contract. Puerto Ricans found themselves on picket lines fighting along with their class brothers and sisters. Puerto Ricans learned from the examples of the Afro-American people in their fight for self-determination, and marched in masses, protesting the colonization of Puerto Rico as well as the liberation of other colonies and dependent countries from the U.S. imperialists.

This was the objective situation at that time. Of course, since the CPUSA had treacherously betrayed the working class and oppressed nationalities in their struggle against the vicious monopoly capitalist class, without a subjective factor, the struggles had no communist leadership. The masses were painfully groping in the dark. It was out of this very concrete and objective condition, that the vital need for organized struggle arose. It was out of this vital need that the YLP-PRRWO arose.

The organization in the main developed from Puerto Ricans, Blacks, Dominicans, Mexican-Americans from the working class, students and unemployed proletarian youths. There were a few petty-bourgeois intellectuals. The early principles of our organization were to "Serve and Protect the People." And as such we proceeded to try to give leadership to the struggle of the oppressed Puerto Rican national minority, always connecting it to the overall struggle of all oppressed and exploited people. The early garbage

126

offensives, the student conferences, health conferences, free Puerto Rico committees, preventative medicine programs, demonstrations at the UN to demand that the colonization status of Puerto Rico be put on the agenda before the whole of the world's people educated the masses as well as ourselves, for we learned both from the positives and the negatives. We learned how to organize mass activities, how to prepare speeches, how to retreat orderly from the vamping police. Some activities were spontaneous, others were well organized.

This was all the process of growth of a young revolutionary organization, who had no clear defined ideology and who did not understand the importance of study. But our determination, sacrifices, sincerity and love for the masses of the people as well as our open criticisms of our work, gave us credibility among the masses, as well as among the young communist movement. The other factor was that, although we did belittle the importance of theory, we did not altogether ignore it. In studying faithfully the teachings of Mao Tse-Tung from the Red Book, we developed the ideological (although primitive) basis for proletarian positions to later combat erroneous ideas in the Organization. As a result of our objective development, and to emphasize once again the lack of a centralized revolutionary organization of professional revolutionaries, our consciousness could only be embryonic and as such we were destined to worship spontaneity. But with our perceptual understanding, we proceeded to prepare to consolidate the Organization into a disciplined revolutionary organization based on the principles of democratic centralism and criticism and self-criticism. "Truth develops in the struggle against falsehood." "A relentless struggle against opportunism begins."

EARLY IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLES OF THE PRRWO-YLP

The first early struggle of an ideological nature developed as to whether or not we would be a study group or a mass organization. The struggle centered around Diego Pabon, one-time chairman of the Organization, a right opportunist, who, although he upheld that our main task was the theoretical training of the membership and that we should therefore study the works of Lenin, had as his purpose to lead us straight into the hands of the revisionist CPUSA. His motive was to create a Puerto Rican Study Group directly linked to the CPUSA. In fact, he brought a leading member of the CPUSA to talk to us. In his approach you could also see how he raised theory to knock theory, for he dogmatically insisted that we study all of the 40 volumes of Lenin and do nothing else. In the struggle against Diego, the opposition in the Organization was not dialectical, but diametrically opposed. The placing of practice over theory, the denial of the dialectical relationship between theory and practice led to a malady that was to be with us for a long time and was the root for worshipping spontaneity. For Chairman Mao teaches us:

"The creation and advocacy of revolutionary theory plays the principal and decisive role in these times of which Lenin said: 'without revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement.'"1

Our early studies included everything from Mao, Che, Fanon, to Kim II Sung. The curriculum itself was indicative of the struggle in the organization and of our primitiveness.

The next major struggle was against Felipe Luciano's bankrupt line. Felipe, the then Chairman of the organization, had a distaste for theory which clearly came out in his claiming that the Black Panther Party had isolated themselves from the masses by introducing Mao Tse-Tung Thought to Third World People, who could not relate to that "theory." It wasn't the people who could not relate to it, it was Felipe. He wanted our organization to abandon the study of Mao. Felipe claimed that the Black Panther Party was sectarian for not uniting with the reactionary Black nationalists. Felipe's demotion in August 1970 (later purged in 1971) was brought on in the struggle against crisis orientation and charismatic leadership. Crisis orientation was the method of work at that time. It meant that during periods of intense flow things would work well, but in between, nothing would function. Nothing but spontaneity straight up. Charismatic leadership was the method of leadership whereby the organization would be as strong as the personality of the leader, Felipe. When there was no personality around, there would be no leadership. Nothing but petty-bourgeois individualism, ideological self-cultivation and adventurism. The advanced elements waged a relentless and tireless struggle against this opportunism and put forward the study of theory, particularly dialectical and historical materialism. Today we can see how Felipe has degenerated more and more into an adventurist and careerist element displayed in the recent role he took in the reactionary film "Badge 373" where he plays a "P.R. revolutionary" and degrades the national liberation struggle of P.R. and the revolutionary movement of the oppressed Puerto Rican national minority inside the U.S.

The training of cadres was raised and a party school was established, with a curriculum on studies such as On Practice, On Contradiction, Mao's Military Writings and Stalin's Dialectical and Historical Materialism.

But we were still weak in understanding that the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-Tung Thought comes from without and that as a science it must be pursued as such. Our study continued to be spontaneous. As a result of many struggles inside our organization and with other organizations in the communist movement, over positions we held-- such as the divided nation theory which said that Puerto Ricans in the U.S. were part of a divided nation -- a solid study of Marxism-Leninism and arming our cadres with it surged again in September of 1971. It resulted with us outlining our problems to be:

1. We are not integrated with the daily lives of the people, especially the working class.
2. We have not armed the cadres with proletarian ideology, with a Marxist-Leninist-Mao Tse-Tung Thought analysis, methods of thinking and methods of work.
3. We need to strengthen collective life.
4. We need to strengthen democratic centralism and criticism-self-criticism.

Our not having studied Stalin on the National Question led us to adopt the line of Browder and Co. on the Puerto Rican National Question. This erroneous and opportunist theory was a clear deviation from Marxism. It led us to make erroneous plans and policies such as opening a branch in Puerto Rico and that we were the party of the proletariat. In the middle of all this, we were preparing to hold our "Party Congress" at which we were going to proclaim ourselves the Puerto Rican Revolutionary Party. But as a result of the struggle inside the organization and struggle with other organizations in the communist movement, comrades began to question these theories. Objective reality forced us to study for the organization was headed towards chaos and disorder.

We began intense study of Stalin's national question, the criteria for a nation, and saw that in fact, Puerto Ricans in the U.S. were not part of a divided nation, but part of the multi-national proletariat, and that our responsibility as part of the multi-national proletariat was to demand the liberation of the colonies and give resolute aid to the struggles of the oppressed nations by struggling against U.S. imperialism inside the U.S.

Upon studying Foundations of Leninism, on "The Party" (by Stalin), we saw that we could not call a Congress to declare ourselves the Puerto Rican Party, but that our central task as communists was to educate and organize the working class and to build the party of the proletariat. In the course of the struggle, however, due to the fact that we had not mastered the dialectical approach to struggling over political lines, many errors were made. Honest comrades who were raising correct positions became one-sided in their approach, making it difficult and drawn out. The dishonest, opportunist and wavering elements tried to seize control of the situation, knowing that their days were limited, by promoting subjectivism and narrowness. It resulted in a split in the organization in May of 1972, 2 months before the Congress was to take place.

The split marked our dealing death blows to anti-Marxist lines and with the split came the advance of Marxist-Leninist lines which united the advanced around our tasks and gave us the basis to turn the Congress from the Puerto Rican Revolutionary Party into one that would proclaim our task to be to "create the conditions for the formation of the multi-national party" (PRRW Congress Resolutions, July, 1972). This party was defined further as a communist one, guided by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-Tung Thought. (Shortly after the Congress we deviated from the central task and adopted the line to build the revolutionary unity, consciousness and organization of the working class -- to be later elaborated on in the part on the National Liason Committee).

The Congress was a culmination of many quantitative changes into a qualitative leap forward for our organization. It marked a higher theoretical understanding of Marxism-Leninism and the beginnings of repudiation of erroneous lines. As Chairman Mao teaches us:

"All our cadres, whatever their ranks, are servants of the people and whatever we do is to serve the people. How then can we be reluctant to discard any of our bad traits. Our duty is to hold ourselves responsible to the people and if mistakes occur, they must be corrected. That is what being responsible to the people means."²

From our primitive study and analysis, we advanced at the Congress our political positions on certain questions and united our ranks on the basis of our political line. Our stands on some of them were clear as far back as two years ago.

ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

All over the world, the main tendency is revolution and the triumph of socialism. The Congress Resolutions go on to say:

"The leadership of the world revolution are the national struggles in the colonies and neo-colonies. The national struggles can only be successful if led by the working class."³

SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM AND REVISIONISM

"The Russian Revolution marked the beginnings of the revolutionary era. But in the 50's, the petty-bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie took power in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and they proceeded to sell out the world revolutionary movement in favor of peace and economic competition with the U.S. Using Marxism-Leninism, they revised Marxist-Leninist ideology and practiced to establish capitalism in the Soviet Union. We call this phenomenon "revisionism". Little by little, the Soviet Revisionists began to unite with and support revisionists in other countries and control countries through "mutual aid". Soviet revisionism evolved into social-imperialism. (Socialism in words, imperialism in deeds). Today Yankee imperialism (U.S. imperialism) and social-imperialism are uniting and at the same time are in competition with each other to divide the world between the two of them."⁴

ON PUERTO RICO

"In Puerto Rico, the large proletariat which has been firm, with about 200 years of historical struggle, has sufficient strength to direct the struggle for national liberation and socialism. Being a capitalist colony, Puerto Rico is confronted with socialism as the next stage."⁵

PERIOD AFTER THE CONGRESS

Although the Congress was a vital and important step for the organization, the presence of worshipping spontaneity was still to plague us. We kept struggling with the forms it took and not with its ideological roots. After the Congress, sharp two-line struggles ensued as to whether or not we were a communist organization or a workers organization. The holders of the line that we were a workers organization put forth that our task was to integrate ourselves with the masses and that our cadres had to be sent to the factories to transform.

As such the line of integrating ourselves with the masses is correct, for communists must be one with the masses. We must go to the masses, take the ideas of the masses (scattered and unsystematic ideas) and synthesize them with the weapon of Marxism-Leninism and turn them into systematic and concentrated ideas - then go to the masses and propagate the ideas until the masses embrace them as their own and turn them into action.

However, the holders of the line that we were a workers organization were clearly coming from the economist viewpoint of worshipping the spontaneous movement of the masses and not one of bringing scientific socialism to the advanced in order to build firm ties with the masses and give the revolutionary working class movement a deliberate and organized character.

The theory that consciousness comes from within in relationship to cadre remoulding is the theory of trade unionism.

This line was defeated by the majority who reaffirmed that we were a communist organization, and as such the ideological remoulding of our cadres comes from the study of Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-Tung Thought and its concrete application and through criticism-self-criticism as the weapon to correct our mistakes, and that yes we have to train cadres who do not fear difficulties in the heat of the class struggle, but face the mighty storm.

"The development both ideologically and practically of every cadre is the very life of the Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization. We are all cadres and as such, ours is the task of proletarian revolution. We must build our organization which will struggle for the building of the multi-national communist party, which will lead the class struggle of the proletariat. We must therefore build our organization on the basis of reality, defeating idealism and applying from the masses to the masses."⁶

Another significant struggle was the one over Palante. After the Congress we struggled over what was our responsibility to the oppressed Puerto Rican national minority. We saw clearly that there existed in the communist movement a division of labor and that because we came out of that struggle, we had to inject consciousness to this national movement as well as struggle in the communist movement, that to raise the banner for the national liberation struggle of Puerto Rico was not just the task of the PRRWO. However, in not understanding how to merge the struggle against national oppression with the overall struggle of the multi-national proletariat for socialism, we committed a right error. We set for ourselves as the central task of the organization to build national forms of mass organizations around these general principles:

1. Defense of democratic rights
 - A. Right to speak our language
 - B. Struggle for bi-lingual programs that really teach our history and culture
 - C. Right to mobilize freely and agitate for the national liberation struggle of Puerto Rico, i.e. the right to freedom of movement.

Although it is correct to struggle for these things, we liquidated Palante's communist role by turning it into an "anti-imperialist newspaper" of the "masses". This line led to making Palante a mass organization with a communist core within it that was united around the above stated principles. Reality proved this to be incorrect. And as a result

today Palante is once again our organ.

As well as committing right errors and right deviations, we have also made left errors (most especially in this period). Many left errors obviously were made in struggling with the right. However, they were made and we do not want to leave the impression that every struggle in our organization resulted in the correct Marxist-Leninist positions. In our early periods our left errors were characterized by sectarianism, most especially to the other organizations within the broad revolutionary movement, in the Puerto Rican sector of that movement. Of course, that logically flowed out of us thinking that we were "the Party." Later other left deviations such as the left-wing communist position on trade unions -- developing dual organizations (in opposition to union, but outside the unions and not relating to the unions) -- the slogan of "Workplaces Belong To Those That Work Them" -- reflected this tendency. In the recent period of struggling with the modern economists we also have made left errors. In still not fully understanding the dialectics between theory and practice, we have to a certain extent belittled practice.

However, to sum -up, the overall thing we in the PRRWO have suffered from historically has been the lack of theory. We certainly have not been armchair revolutionaries or book-worshippers. In our history which has consisted of many line struggles, however, the Marxist-Leninist position has also been battling with incorrect tendencies and as a result today, the PRRWO is a multi-national communist organization, dedicated to the education and organization of the class. Today we are firmly fighting to implement Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions and to build the party of the proletariat.

The different tendencies, trends and lines in our organization are a reflection also of the struggle within the communist movement for the clarity of the Marxist-Leninist line: for the building of the Party to lead the masses; and against the modern economist line that claims that the party develops spontaneously. This brings us to the period of the relations with the RU, The National Liaison Committee and the "Broken Alliance".

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE NATIONAL LIASON COMMITTEE AND HOW THE "NEW LINE" ON THE PARTY BUILDING AS THE CENTRAL TASK OF THE COMMUNISTS DEVELOPED

"Every generation of Marxists-Leninists in the U.S. has been confronted with great ideological, political and organizational tasks. In July, 1972, during the YLP-PRRWO Congress, four organizations came together to try to work out a common program. The organizations were the PRRWO, RU, IWK, BWC. The basic principles of unity were: anti-revisionism and upholding Mao Tse Tung Thought, anti-Trotskyism, and a vagueness about joint-city strategy and tactics. (We would like to emphasize the principles that united us on the National Liaison Committee - adherence to the science of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought, struggle against opportunism, and party building.) There was also verbal agreement (though not in deed) on the concept that every one of the organizations were 'subordinate to what was coming into being' (meaning the multi-national communist party). (Life proves today that the RU was not subordinate to what was coming into being. In fact, the RU thought that they were the party and wanted both the BWC and the PRRWO to 'submerge' ourselves into the RU.)

"The main programmatic thrust of the NLC (National Liaison Committee) was to be joint work on a city-wide basis where the organizations coexisted, mainly in New York, Philly, Detroit and Chicago. But the main work of the NLC turned out to be struggling for unity on the line. From the outset, the main questions struggled around were the national question and party building. Additionally, there was struggle for clarity of the strategy for proletarian revolution, the UFAI, and the central task of communists, which we all agreed at that time was the building of the revolutionary unity, consciousness and organization of the working class. The first sharp ideological struggle broke out with the IWK, the RU, PRRWO and the BWC, who felt that the IWK manifested tendencies towards Bundism (isolation from the American workers movement, while pushing all Asian concepts). Moreover, it was felt IWK resisted basing its work on the industrial proletariat and workplaces (a principle of unity we forgot to mention earlier), while favoring to work more in the 'community.' None of these contradictions were resolved, and unity finally degenerated when the IWK refused to attend any further NLC meetings and discontinued working with the local workteam in New York."

"After the NLC helped the BWC consolidate around the RU position on the national question, the RU put forward a proposal for forming 'The Party.' The essence of the proposal was that it was necessary to organize workteams of the most developed cadres from each organization ('flying squadrons', as they were called) to go about the country organizing and recruiting various independent 'collectives' who were just out there. In the meantime, the various secretariats of each organization would merge and form an interim committee that would be the basis for the Central Committee of the new Party. All of this would be topped off in about a year at a Congress where the party would be called into being with a program and permanent leading body elected. The BWC and PRRWO put forward the line that said that a 'collective' of this type would be mainly white and petty-bourgeois and that we should concentrate our attention on the industrial proletariat. (To add, both the PRRWO and the BWC made clear to the RU that they had to Bolshevize their organizations and purge their ranks of opportunist and careerist elements.)

"In addition, we maintained we should strengthen the role and work of the BWC and PRRWO in the revolutionary national movements and as communist organizations as a first step towards party building. The RU disagreed with this view, saying that the time was now to form the party before other 'opportunist elements' (meaning the CL and OL) formed the party first." 7

The RU's rush was not because they really saw the need to build the party of the proletariat as the central task, but rather it was because they were rushed to build a Menshevik party, before being exposed. Their 'party' would be one where every striker could proclaim himself a party member, a party not based on the advanced, for the RU has never, even until today, said that the work of the party must be based on factory nuclei.

To continue:

"In the meantime, and just prior to that time the RU attacked the slogan, 'Black Workers Take the Lead' and the concept that a Black communist was both a communist and a revolutionary nationalist. The leadership of the BWC and PRRWO took opposing positions to that of the RU, but the RU held to its position and even went one step further by saying that the BWC and PRRWO leadership were degenerating into Bundism and bourgeois nationalism." (The PRRWO has yet to sum up the errors made in struggling with RU's revisionist line on the national question. We do not hold, however, that we made Bundist errors, as the RU claims we did. We are sure that left errors, errors of narrow nationalism, were made, for, in struggling so ruthlessly against the right, one is bound to make left errors, if one is not vigilant.)

"This struggle quickly escalated into a struggle over how the national question related to carrying out the central task itself, the building of the revolutionary consciousness, unity and organization of the class and its leadership in the United Front came into question itself."

Given the fact that there was a complete breakdown on how to advance the question of party building and the opportunist nature of the RU's proposal, the BWC and PRRWO secretariats were thrown into study and struggle on the question of party building and the central task. This, along with the summing up of the weaknesses and errors and history of both organizations, led the BWC and PRRWO secretariats to conclude, after much study and struggle, that the central task of communists was indeed to build the party. This made us see even more clearly how the RU was in fundamental error on some of the most important questions facing the U.S. proletarian revolution and the root cause of all their (and our own errors, the bowing to spontaneity and belittling the conscious element, 'the logical basis of all opportunism') opportunism."

This sharp struggle was what led to the "Broken Alliance," for the concrete situation calls for all Marxists-Leninists to build a genuine Bolshevik Party. This is the main and central task at this time, and must be done inseparably connected with the spontaneous revolutionary movement of the working class.

10

- But still today the RU has not learned from its errors, and proceeds to belittle the importance of theory and of the advanced element. This is because the RU is not making errors of ignorance, but, in fact, has a consolidated right opportunist line. The RU today claims that both the PRRWO and BWC are separating theory from practice and have become nothing but dogmatists "who want to build the party isolated from the masses," that the PRRWO and BWC, in saying that since the treacherous betrayal of the revisionist CPUSA, the central task has been the building of the party (our emphasis) is to say that theory has played the principal role for 24 years. Why does the RU sink to such opportunist tricks and distortions? Where can they document that this is what PRRWO and BWC are saying? Isn't it a fact that what both organizations are saying is, "We, the cadres and leadership of the BWC and PRRWO and genuine communists throughout the movement, must work wholeheartedly and resolutely at fulfilling our revolutionary responsibilities with all due haste, place the question of building a genuine multi-national communist party based on the fundamental principles of M-L-MTTT and the revolutionary experience of the U.S. on the order of the day."?

Where does it say separated from the masses? Isn't it a fact that what the BWC and PRRWO and all genuine communists have laid out is that the task of the class-conscious fighters of the proletariat is to bring scientific socialism to the advanced so as to give the spontaneous movement a conscious character? We communists do not have a distaste for the struggles of the masses; what we do have a distaste and hatred for is for the revisionists and opportunists who want to keep the masses tied to the wings of the bourgeoisie. We do hold to the teachings of Lenin:

"To bow to the spontaneous movement and belittle the importance of consciousness is to insult the workers drawn to consciousness as to light, and lower the value of theory in the eyes of the party; that is, to depreciate the instrument which helped the party to understand the present and foresee the future, and, in the third place, it meant to sink completely and irrevocably into the bog of opportunism."¹¹

But let us examine RU's practice. What has been their role historically in the mass movement? Where are the advanced they claim to have made? Historically, RU's role in the mass movement has been one of tailing and worshipping the spontaneous movement, and not of giving it conscious leadership. Let us see for ourselves; let the concrete facts prove our point.

In the November 4th Coalition in New York, the RU was too cowardly to come out clearly against the CPUSA, and tried to cover themselves by insisting that "we just unmask the revisionists through their practice," which must be done, for no one negates that you must expose the revisionists through their words, as well as their deeds. However, when we wanted to struggle for the clarity of M-L, when we wanted to draw the line of demarcation with the revisionist theories of the CPUSA and with other groups that supported them, the RU called us "sectarian" and "ultra-left." Why was the RU opposed to opening this struggle? Could it have been, perhaps, that their own right opportunist, revisionist line was going to come to light, or perhaps the RU didn't want to ruin their chances at later joining with the CPUSA. In a leaflet handed out by the RU in the CPUSA's celebration of Mayday this year, 1974, this is what the RU had to say: "A call to those

veteran fighters who still want to make revolution" was the title of the RU's leaflet. It goes on to say that the RU was proud to proclaim that "many of us in the RU are 'red diaper babies'" and goes on to say, "We are here today because we want you to join us in upholding the old revolutionary spirit of Mayday." Treachery! Nothing but pure treachery and an insult to M-L!

Or does the RU call their advance in the mass struggle, their paper organization, UWOC? "Jobs or Income Now" was their favorite slogan. You, the RU, raised only the economic issues and did not fulfill the communist responsibility to thoroughly expose the bourgeois state and educate the masses that capitalism means unemployment and increased attacks on the working class. But let us continue to show you, if you will permit us, in your most recent summation of your practice (in your famous theoretical journal, Red Papers 6):

"The RU in the Bay Area decided to try to begin building support for the strike and issued a call for the creation of Farah Strike Support Committees (FSSCs). We initially approached the ACWA, but the union wanted no part of such support groups. We then decided to go ahead and build independent FSSCs. We sought to unite workers, Chicano movement forces, to work out some principles of unity and what the major practical focus of FSSCs would be."¹²

So first, the RU tries to unite with the union bureaucrats, asking them to help build support committees, then proceeds to unite all those that can be united to build independent FSSCs. RU looks like magicians; if this trick doesn't work, pull another out of the hat; never mind the ultimate goal. From there, the RU goes on to tell the work done by the FSSCs in building the strike. They say:

"Seeing all of the development, the ACWA leadership was forced to offer minimal support, while doing little on its own to build the boycott. In March, 1973, the ACWA and ad-hoc committee of union bureaucrats called for a mass demonstration in front of Mervyn's department store in San Pablo, Calif. (a major retailer of scab Farah pants). The FSSCs and the RU members in them overestimated the strength of the union bureaucrats and their desire and ability to mobilize support for the strikers."

"So, while the picket line was a success (over 300 people turned out to tell Mervyn's to 'Take those damn slacks off the racks'), the FSSC relinquished the day's program to the union bureaucrats."¹³

But who was it that really was responsible for the fact that the day's program was surrendered to the bureaucrats; was it the FSSC? Was it, in fact, the so-called communists, the RU, that was so impressed with the 300 people that turned out, that things like politics did not matter? After all, why should it, since to the RU to give conscious leadership is "dogmatic 'n' left," and will isolate us from the masses. We must rely on the wishes and will of the masses; education of the masses is pure dogmatism. "The masses learn from their own experience." This, it seems to us, goes against the

teachings of Lenin, who says that the workers of themselves can only develop trade union consciousness and not social democratic consciousness. This is an example of how RU says it prevented this struggle from strictly becoming trade unionism. Is it on these advances that RU sees building the party? On the advances of bargaining for the better labor sale of the working class? But the people don't need you, the RU, to do that. They have their own trade unions which will always keep them in the narrow confines of trade unionism. Are you talking of building a party of a large trade union? For we know a party is the advanced detachment of the class and a recorder of the spontaneous struggles. This is what Stalin has to say on the subject:

"But, in order that it may really be the advanced detachment, the Party must be armed with revolutionary theory, with knowledge of laws of the movement, with a knowledge of the law of revolution. Without this, it will be incapable of directing the struggle of the proletariat, leading the proletariat. The Party cannot be a real party if it limits itself to registering what the masses of the working class feel and think, if it drags at the tail of the spontaneous movement, if it is unable to rise above the momentary interest of the proletariat, if it is unable to raise the masses to the level of understanding the class interest of the proletariat." ¹⁴

But do we hear the RU saying they are having other problems in their mass work, other than that they overestimated the union bureaucrats? Do we hear them saying that, in the famous work in the post office, they are having such problems as:

"But Outlaw wasn't able to unite Black and white workers as well as it should have to win the strike. We had struggled within Outlaw for an understanding of the national question, but we hadn't been able to get it to deal with national oppression in a broad enough way and haven't been able to involve many Black workers in it, although they were active in the strike." ¹⁵

Perhaps, aside from the fact that all you raise is trade union politics, it could be your stand on the national question in relationship to Black people. Perhaps it's because of your own racism and national chauvinism. You, who try to liquidate the national question, the question of self-determination, always look to blame someone else.

So, when summed up, your advances in mass work have amounted to nothing but tailing behind the most backward. You have denied the advanced workers in those struggles the only weapon that can end the misery of the working class, i.e., M-L-MTTT. You, the RU leadership, have been criminal to those hard-working cadres who sincerely wish to truly give leadership to the masses. It is criminal, for as Stalin says:

"It is such theory that our cadres need, and they need it as badly as they need their daily bread, as they need air or water." ¹⁶

The PRRWO's Relationship to the National Continuations Committee

With the break from the Revolutionary Union and their consolidated right opportunist line, the PRRWO continued in the spirit of party building to further train the cadres to be genuine Bolsheviks, in the interest of the proletariat. It was in this spirit that we united with the Black Workers Congress to enter the Continuations Committee that was developed out of the Conference of North American Marxists-Leninists for the building of the party around these principles: 1) Adherence to the science of Marxism-Leninism; 2) A struggle against revisionism, which is headed by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the CPUSA; 3) The struggle to build a multi-national Marxist-Leninist communist party to lead the U.S. working class to overthrow capitalism and establish socialism; 4) The resolutions which were approved by the May Conference and printed in Marxists-Leninists Unite. These four points were to be the basis for minimum political unity for all organizations on the National Continuations Committee for local committees and for individual Marxists-Leninists. By the time we entered the National Continuations Committee, a struggle had ensued on the question of the fourth principle, as to whether or not Marxists-Leninists had to have minimal unity with the resolutions passed at the Conference. After struggle in our organization, we united that Marxists-Leninists cannot just unite on three principles that were not up for debate (adherence to the science of Marxism-Leninism, the building of a multi-national communist party, struggle against opportunism), but, in fact, must unite on the basis of political line, for it is in the application of Marxism-Leninism that we can further draw the lines of demarcation, see the correct from the bankrupt. Our understanding of the resolutions at that time was that it was a minimal principle of unity, struggle, unity and, as such, we entered on the local Continuations Committee on the basis that we will unite with what is genuine and disunite with the sham, and that party building must be closely linked with the political line. We agreed that we would carry on an investigation of the political lines of the different organizations in the Continuations Committee, most especially the line of the Communist League, as well as wage struggle on some of the resolutions passed, which either we were not completely clear on, or disagreed with.

At the same time, we agreed to work towards the Party Congress in September. Upon the meetings we had with the Communist League's National Leadership, we found out that we had some definite disagreements with their line (although at the beginning we had been impressed, particularly with their training of cadres), most specifically the way they saw the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Negro colonial question. CL claims that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not a slogan for the vast majority, but for communists, and, "It is possible to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat by combining several parties in the apparatus." There it is, the theory of a multi-party system - a Trotskyite position, pure and simple. As the work continued, new developments began to take place. We began to see that the CL's attitude towards struggle was one of not struggling, but of dogmatically insisting things would be resolved in the Congress of the Party.

We began to see that they would not admit their mistakes openly, in the spirit of promoting unity, but that the opposite was the fact, one of promoting disunity. When people wanted to struggle on the resolutions, we were

handed the line that they were not up for debate. The straw that broke the camel's back came when CL put out, in their People's Tribune for May (section on the International Report), a clear attack on the Communist Party of China and on the international line of the communist movement, and puts forward that imperialism is the main trend, not revolution.

Right after this, the Communist League's June edition of the People's Tribune comes out with the article, "Class Struggle in the Soviet Union," which says it is childish to believe that capitalism has been restored in the U.S.S.R. Once again, this goes against the international line of the communist movement. (For an in-depth analysis of CL's Trotskyite line, see the section on the lines of different organizations on Party Building, Strategy and Tactics for Proletarian Revolution, the International Situation and Domestic Situation, and the National Question. We also suggest that the readers see the BWC pamphlet, titled, The Struggle Against Revisionism and Opportunism: Against the Communist League and the Revolutionary Union.)

After this, we fell into sharp contradiction with the CL, who seemed to have hegemony on the Continuations Committee, since anyone who disagreed with CL's positions were soon purged, or resigned. We began to examine clearly their lines, and more and more saw that they are bankrupt. The CL then moved to establish democratic centralism in the Continuations Committee, saying that it had been agreed to all along, completely contradicting the newsletters. In Newsletter #2, this is what is said:

"These points of unity also act as the organizational guide for the democratic relations between organizations on the committee and other Marxists-Leninists."

This was something we, as Marxists-Leninists, could not hold to. The question of democratic centralism is a question of the party. When political unity is achieved through the formation of a party of a new type, then democratic centralism will be the organizational basis of relations. This was another attempt on CL's part to stifle the ideological struggle that was coming to the fore on their political line, which was unmasking their Trotskyite plan of party building, a party totally isolated from the masses. The BWC openly began to struggle against the policies in the NCC and was purged from the NCC. Our position as an organization was that we supported wholeheartedly the BWC and we could not be a party of anything that was not in the interest of the proletariat; we could not adhere to democratic centralism - the Continuations Committee was not the party - and we maintained that the relations of organizations must be democratic relations. On the basis of these political contradictions and due to the fact that the atmosphere was not one of unity, struggle, unity to achieve higher levels of unities, but one of splittist actions by the CL, we, the PRRWO, resigned from the Continuations Committee.

Although we have not done a total sum-up of every event in the Continuations Committee, we have summed up that entering the NCC was incorrect, for to fully expose the treacherous line of the CL and their sham attempt to build the party, it was not necessary for us to join the NCC. The CL has been out there for everyone to see for years. Their Trotskyite line has a historical development, and, as such, their journal, the People's Tribune, has been stating their positions. Their most blatant and crude

attack on the line of the international communist movement was not the first signal of their treachery as an organization. We criticize ourselves for having committed such an error. We recognize that our responsibility was to have studied the CL line thoroughly, engaged in polemics over the burning questions facing the communist movement and proletarian revolution. Most especially, we should have studied what period we were in, and the concrete road ahead towards party building. That we should have done this was of prime importance, in light of the fact that we had just broken off with the right opportunist line of the RU, which undoubtedly gave rise to left errors, for we do feel, as an organization, that it was left impetuosity that was the basis of our entering the NCC.

It is clear that both the National Liaison Committee and the National Continuations Committee have been sham attempts to build the party. The RU, through the National Liaison Committee, wanted to build a mass party, a party where every "striker" could proclaim himself a party member, a party not based on the advanced detachment of the class and, therefore, could not be directly linked with the masses; and CL's attempt, through the National Continuations Committee, to build a party in isolation from the masses, a party based on a few "theoreticians." Today, the RU claims that both the BWC and PRRWO must make criticisms for "following the CL," as if we have ever been fearful to criticize ourselves for our errors and as if the RU has tried to struggle with us on the line of the CL. For the first one, we were not "following and mouthing" the CL line. For the second proclamation of the RU, the only thing you attacked of the CL line was that they upheld party building. In fact, over the political line, you never struggled. Should we remind you now how you refused to debate CL publically? In fact, both you and the CL have a lot in common; both of you do not want to build a truly genuine Bolshevik Party, but a party corroded with opportunism.

Today the RU is sending their number one flying squadron, Bob Avakian, to try to unite as many as possible to build a mass party, especially anyone who is against the PRRWO, the BWC and the ATM, and any other genuine communists.

To conclude and re-emphasize what has been re-emphasized throughout this pamphlet, the PRRWO upholds that we are in a period of Marxists-Leninists uniting for the formation of the party of the proletariat, the party of Lenin, the multi-national communist party of a new type. Ours has been the road of many twists and turns; we have made advances and have suffered setbacks, but in the course, we have gained the finest Bolsheviks, staunch cadres whose sole purpose in life is the emancipation of the working class. We recognize that the party can only be built in the ruthless and relentless struggle against all shades of opportunism. We believe our work must consist of bringing scientific socialism to the advanced, to lead the spontaneous revolutionary movement of the masses. The base of our work must be in the industrial proletariat. We must concentrate our work in the factories, on establishing factory nuclei.

"Only by maintaining the closest contact with the masses of workers will the party be able to lead them into the battle at the necessary moment." ¹⁸

"Every factory must be our fortress." ¹⁹

MARXISTS-LENINISTS UNITE!!

Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization
August, 1974

FOOTNOTES:

1. On Contradiction, Mao Tse-Tung.
2. --
3. Resolutions of the Congress of the PRRWO, July 1972.
4. "Ibid".
5. "Ibid".
6. Statement from the Central Committee of the PRRWO.
7. "Criticism of National Bulletin 13 and the Right Line in the RU", Document written by the BWC and PRRWO.
8. "Ibid".
9. "Ibid".
- 11.
12. Red Papers #6, p. 117, "Farah Strike Support Committee"
13. "Ibid".
14. Foundations of Leninism, Stalin.
15. Red Papers #6.
16. --
17. Newsletter #2 of the National Continuations Committee.
18. "Letter to a Comrade", Lenin.
19. "Ibid".

LINE STRUGGLE ON PARTY BUILDING IN THE U.S. COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

" Today, the movement in the U.S. is in a similar position to that of the revolutionary movements in the capitalist countries following the sell-out of the Second International. Today, as then, opportunism has developed into social-imperialism and has joined the ranks of the imperialist. Today, as then, revolutionary Marxism is being 'revised' to suit the interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Today, as then, the corrupt trade union bureaucracy and labor aristocracy provides the main social basis of this revisionism in the workers movement. Then, the heroic Bolsheviks led the world revolutionary movement in struggle against these scoundrels under the guidance of the great Lenin. Today, the Chinese Communist Party and the Party of Labour of Albania lead the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists in struggle against their revisionist off-spring under the guidance of the great Mao Tse Tung and courageous Enver Hoxha. the Albanians say:

'In our Party's opinion, the urgent current problem of the day is not reconciliation and unity with the revisionist, but separation, a clean break from them.'

Lenin said:

"Unity is a great cause and a great slogan. But the workers cause needs the unity of Marxist not unity of Marxist with the opponents and distorters of Marxism. Unity with the opportunist and the revisionists is unity of the proletariat with the national bourgeoisie and splitting of the international proletariat, the unity of the lackeys and division of the revolutionaries.'

In most countries of the world, new Marxist-Leninist parties are springing up to replace the worn-out revisionist ones. Genuine Marxist-Leninist have no reason whatsoever to feel pessimistic or isolated-- in the international Communist movement there exist today, an unbreakable unity of Marxist-Leninists the world over."

In the U.S. today, the genuine Communist forces must take on the historical task of defeating all forms of opportunism which is trying to stop the creation of a genuine multi-national Communist Party.

We have on the one hand, left opportunist, Trotskyite. forces which try to swallow advanced. honest elements into an "elitist"

party" isolated from the masses; and on the other hand, we have the right opportunist, revisionist forces, which under the guise of "relying on the masses," build a party through the spontaneous struggles.

In order for the genuine Marxist-Leninist to create a Bolshevik Party, we must unite Marxist-Leninist and wage a resolute struggle against all forms of opportunism - in particular, right opportunism, for it being the main danger in the world today.

Lenin, as well as other great Marxist-Leninist, like Stalin, Mao Tse Tung, and Enver Hoxha, teach us that Marxism grows strong and develops in struggle with revisionism and opportunism.

"One of the indispensable conditions in preparing the proletariat to win victory is the protracted, determined and merciless struggle against opportunism, reformism, social-chauvinism and all bourgeois influences and trends of this kind, which are inevitable as long as the proletariat is acting in the conditions of capitalism. Without this struggle, without a complete preliminary victory over opportunism in the labor movement, we cannot begin to talk about the dictatorship of the proletariat."

2

And if comrades allow us again to quote Lenin prior to the convening of the 2nd Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.:

"How to begin the building of a united party of the working class was a question on which opinions differed. Some thought that the building of the Party should be begun by summoning the Second Congress of the Party, which would unite the local organizations and create a Party. Lenin was oppose to this. He held that before convening a congress it was necessary to make the aims and objects of the Party clear, to ascertain what sort of a party was wanted, to effect an ideological demarcation from the 'Economist' to tell the party honestly and frankly that there exist two different opinions regarding the aims and object of the Party - the opinion of the 'Economist' and the opinion of the revolutionary Social-Democrats - to start a wide campaign in the press in favor of the views of revolutionary Social-Democracy - just as the 'Economist' were conducting a campaign in their own press in favor of their

own views - and to give the local organizations the opportunity to make a deliberate choice between these two trends. Only after this indispensable preliminary work had been done could a Party Congress be summoned."

3

Lenin put it plainly:

"BEFORE WE CAN UNITE, AND IN ORDER THAT WE MAY UNITE, WE MUST FIRST OF ALL DRAW FIRM AND DEFINITE LINES OF DEMARCATION." 4

Comrades, let us proceed to analyze and begin to draw the lines of demarcation of the opportunists and revisionist forces present today in the revolutionary movement of the U.S.

The Revolutionary Union (RU), along with the October League (OL), and the Guardian represent the dangerous right opportunist tendency of economism and uphold the opportunist "theory of spontaneity."

"The theory of spontaneity is a theory of opportunism, a theory of worshipping the spontaneity of the labour movement, a theory which actually repudiates the leading role of the vanguard of the working class, of the party of the working class."

5

"The theory of worshipping the spontaneity of the mass movement raises to a principal the present 'narrowness' and 'amateurishness' of most of the Marxist-Leninist groups, it is the theory of the 'line of least resistance,' of not seeing the importance of raising the masses' political consciousness, of 'belittling the role of the conscious elements', it is the theory of tailing behind backward elements of the class, it is the 'ideology of trade unionism' it is the 'logical basis of all opportunism.'"

6

The RU with it's new brief, temporary central task of party building is one of the finest opportunist holding tight to this theory. Comrades, to begin with let us quote the RU as to how they see party building.

"The most important thing we want to emphasize is that this unified general staff can only be created through active participation in class struggle. It cannot be created, as the groups we referred to earlier think, by theoretical debate or, as some of these groups have done, by simply declaring themselves the Party or the sole basis of the Party."

7

Or if you prefer to have it clearer:

"We believe this Party can only be created by all of us working together to further build and consolidate the united front under proletarian leadership. The genuine revolutionary forces must begin to engage in common practice, side by side, and, on the basis of summing up that practice, engage in comradesly and constructive ideological struggle to forge a united line, strategy, and tactics, to develop various kinds of workers organizations - national and multi-national forms, etc. That, we believe, is the correct, non-sectarian way to build a Party!"

8

To begin with, the RU has a tremendous fear of ideological struggle (theoretical debate). Yes, we agree that Party building must be done through active participation in class struggle, bringing Scientific Socialism to the working class, etc. but ideological struggle and drawing lines of demarcation is a pre-requisite in the building of the Party. The RU sees Party building only through the United Front Against Imperialism. So that when they speak of the dialectical relationship between strategy and tactics and Party building, they put forward a correct task of developing forms of workers organization. But the bankruptcy of their line comes when they negate to put forward that Party building is the central task and replace it by placing emphasis on building a united front, and in particular, developing workers organizations.

Lenin defined a workers' organization as follows:

"A Workers' organization must in the first place be a trade organization; secondly, it must be as little clandestine as possible (here, and further on, of course, I have autocratic Russia in mind). On the other

hand, the organization of revolutionaries must consist first, foremost and mainly of people who make revolutionary activity their profession (that is why I speak of organizations of revolutionaries, meaning revolutionary Social-Democrats)." 9

But this isn't all. Lenin goes on to say that:

"A Social-Democrat must concern himself first and foremost with an organization of revolutionaries who are capable of guiding the whole proletarian struggle for emancipation." 10

And this organization of professional revolutionaries is the Marxist-Leninist Party of a new type.

But the RU will bark like dogs and say that their workers' organization was going to be composed of advance workers. RU's conception of an advance worker is clearly defined in Red Papers 5 and reiterated in Red Papers 6 as follows:

"To us, (RU) the advance worker is one who has the respect of his fellow workers, to whom they come when they are in trouble, and need to discuss their problems, whom they rally around when they face a collective problem and who provides leadership in struggle. And this is true even if the individual professes some anti-communism. His anti-communism is socially and media-conditioned and can be overcome through his work with communist precisely because of the devoted practice he has shown towards others." (our emphasis)

11

It is easy to see now why the RU makes "economist" and right errors generally with this essentially tailist conception of an advance worker. There are hundreds of trade union bureaucrats who fit the description. Their definition places emphasis on "respect" and "devoted practice", rather than on political consciousness. It even allows room for the workers anti-communism! It says nothing of the need for ideological and political training which is an absolute necessity if anyone is to grasp the science of Marxism-Leninism. Clearly this leads to "bowing to spontaneity" of the lowest variety which must send the RU cadre running and looking for the most backward and reformist

workers they can find (and we can document this!). This special disregard for theory and the worship of spontaneity is the root of all the RU's opportunist errors and the basic reason for their drift to the right. What seemed then to be a drift to the right, what may have been a right deviation as early as Red Papers 1 has developed into a consolidated right opportunist line. So that to the RU, learning from the masses, their conception of consolidating the advance, undoubtedly means learning from and catering to the backward elements. Allow us again to quote Lenin:

"The history of the working class movement in all countries shows that the better situated strata of the working class respond to the ideas of socialism more rapidly and more easily. From among these come, in the main, the advance workers that every working class movement brings to the fore, those who can win the confidence of the laboring masses, who devote themselves entirely to the education and organization of the proletariat, who accept socialism consciously, and who even elaborate independent socialist theories... who, despite their wretched living conditions, despite their stultifying penal servitude of factory labor, possess so much character and will-power that they study, study, study and turn themselves into conscious Social-Democrats---'The working-class intelligensia.'" 12
(our emphasis)

And further on Lenin continues;

"To reduce the entire movement to the interests of the moment means to speculate on the backward conditions of the workers, means to cater to their worst inclinations. It means artificially to break the link between the fully defined political strivings of the advance workers and the spontaneous manifestations of protest on the part of the masses". 13

And to make it a bit more clearer, Lenin also says:

"...firstly, Social-Democracy has everywhere and always been, and cannot but be the representative of the class conscious and not of non-class conscious workers, and that there cannot be anything more dangerous and more criminal than the demagogic speculation on the underdevelopment of the workers." (our emphasis)

Today, when genuine Marxist-Leninists have clearly defined the central task of Party building, the RU changes their central task of building the "revolutionary unity, consciousness and organization of the working class" to "Party building!"

The RU's former central task of "building the revolutionary unity, consciousness and organization of the working class, etc." was a manifestation of their right line of spontaneity and a cover for delaying the party building motion. Even with them holding that former central task, they've failed to carry it out, for the RU did not bring Scientific Socialism to the working class, they did not disseminate Marxism-Leninism, they did not consolidate the advanced around Marxism-Leninism, but rather, they talked of giving "anti-imperialist consciousness" to the advanced. The RU caters to the backward, liquidated and failed to disseminate Scientific Socialism, belittled the role of the conscious elements, the communist.

Though it is true that communist must build the revolutionary unity, consciousness and organization of the working class, we must make clear that the central task of communist in this period is building the organization of the working class, the Communist Party. The RU, when speaking of the organization of the working class, was not in words nor deeds, speaking of the organization of revolutionaries, the Party. Their workers organization were those such as rank and file, outlaws, etc... Developing workers caucuses, rank and file, etc. are correct task of communist, but again, we must be clear on what is the central task. Party building is done through building the revolutionary unity, consciousness and organization of the working class; communist must get deeply rooted in the workers movement, disseminate Scientific Socialism, and give conscious leadership to the struggles of the working class. The RU's former central task of "building the revolutionary unity, consciousness and organization of the working class" was a guise and justification of their line of spontaneity. The RU put forward that:

"Several yrs. ago, and right up to this historical point, building the new Party was not the main task because the young Communist movement in this country had not accumulated enough practical experience in mass struggle, and also didn't have enough experience in applying Marxist-Leninist theory to summing up this experience in order to advance the mass movement."

But comrades, as was said before the RU is jumping on the band wagon because they don't want to tail behind the communist movement,

and have changed their former central task to the central task of Party building. How does the RU explain the change of central task? Do they repudiate (as we and other Marxist-Leninist organizations and groups have repudiated) their formal central task as being incorrect? No! On the contrary, the RU has further developed their right line, in the process of doing this, has gone as far as distorting and in essence, revising the fundamental truths of Marxism-Leninism. The RU explains their change of central task by saying that we have come to an "end of a period"; a period of spontaneous upsurges, of gaining experiences, etc. Lenin, in What Is To Be Done (conclusion), spoke of different periods in the communist movement of Russia. Lenin defines the 1st period as covering the yrs. 1884-1894.

"this was the period of the rise and consolidation of the theory and program of Social-Democracy... Social-Democracy existed without a working class movement; as a political party it was undergoing a process of fetal development."

16

The second period; 1894-1898

"In this period the Social-Democrats appeared as a social movement, as the "upsurge of the masses of the people. In this period the Social-Democrats went into the working class movement, trained in illegal work and armed with the theory of Marxism, which guided their practice. In this period, the R.S.D.L.P. was formed."

17

The third period; 1897-1898

The third period was a period of disunity, dissolution and vacillation. A period where 'economism' was a large trend. This period was characterized by amateurishness, worshipping the spontaneous struggles, legal Marxist, etc... Lenin, in asking "WHAT IS TO BE DONE?" responded to "liquidation of the thrid period." He put forward that the fourth period would lead to the consolidation of militant Marxism and that Russian Social-Democracy was to become the vanguard of revolutionary proletariat.

18

The RU's explanation of "End of a Period", was not and is not a scientific Marxist-Leninist explanation of the concrete conditions of the communist movement and the working class movement. RU opportunistically distorts the concept of periods and has declared an "End of a Period" in order to justify their worshipping of spontaneity and to change their central task. RU's "End of a Period" was a period where their cadres promoted spontaneous, economist struggles and failed to carry the real task of communists in the working class movement. In order that the RU will not come out and say that we are "dogmatically" applying Lenin's explanation of periods in Russia to the conditions of the U.S., we make clear that the period in which we find ourselves in is the period of disseminating Scientific Socialism, building factory nuclei, merging the communist movement with the spontaneous struggles of the working class, uniting Marxist-Leninist, drawing lines of demarcation against all forms of opportunism, and developing a programme and the U.S. multinational Communist Party which will lead the masses to proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and on to communism.

How does the RU's theory of "End of a Period" manifest it-self? Well, first of all they call for the Nov. 4th Coalition to join with the revisionist and Trotskyite groups in Jan. 20th demonstration supporting the Vietnamese 9 Point Peace Plan. There RU cadres within the Attica Brigade, an anti-imperialist national student organization, led the Attica Brigade in spraying the pants at Macy's, protesting the Farah strike. Is this not worshipping spontaneity of the worst type? Or how about the "heroic" take over of the Statue of Liberty to "Throw the Bum Out"!

Throw the Bum Out!!! Can you believe it?! Who's the next "Bum" --- Ford?? Is the RU going to throw each "Bum" out one by one until the bourgeoisie disintegrates? Then there's the RU's economic struggles of "Jobs or Income Now", etc. This is not to say that communist do not participate in economic struggles, but we must not fall into economism. Communist do propaganda and agitation around all the spontaneous manifestations of the working class. We must raise the political consciousness of the proletariat (political consciousness meaning Marxism-Leninism and not "anti-imperialist" like the RU speaks of). Communist must conduct political exposures around all attacks of the working class in order to unite and further raise the level of consciousness of the U.S. proletariat.

The RU, in dealing with economic struggles, stirred up mass discontent around immediate issues of the proletariat, but did not conduct political exposures, propaganda and agitation around the economic struggles and link it up with the long range goals of proletariat.

The RU, just dealt with the momentary interests of the proletariat and didn't educate the masses, especially the advanced, of the long range interest of the proletariat -- proletarian revolution

and the dictatorship of the proletariat. They sacrificed the ultimate aims and results for immediate reforms.

These are just a few of RU's activities during their "End of a Period". This is what they're going to sum up to build their party to "lead the masses" into the marsh.

The "worshippers of spontaneity" in the U.S. distort the Marxist theory of knowledge and fling about the slogans: "to the masses", "we must sum-up our own experience", "oppose book worship", etc. They fail to understand what "theory" really is so they inevitably fail in "practice".

Stalin says:

"Theory is the experience of the working class movement in all the countries taken in its general aspects. Of course theory becomes purposeless if it is not connected with revolutionary practice, just as practice gropes in the dark if its not illumined by revolutionary theory" 19

But the RU says "No!" They ridicule Marxism-Leninism and continue to say that they didn't worship spontaneity. They continue to insist that it was an "End of a period". Is it an "end of a period" or is it the economist "Theory of Stages"? The RU's concept of "End of a Period" is very similar, if not the same, to the Russian economist "Theory of Stages" which says that before going to political demands, revolutionaries must cater to the intermediate and backward workers and deal with the economic struggles of the workers, and that once the masses are experienced and ready, then the economic struggles will draw the masses into the political struggles. To give an example of how the RU does it, allow us to quote them:

"One of the crucial and as yet unanswered questions raised by the Unemployed Workers Organizing Committee work and the recent UWOC meeting --- and generally by all our working class work -- is how do we develop broad mass struggle primarily at this stage around economic demands, while at the same time building a solid leadership core of active and advanced workers who, through the course of this mass struggle and in close unity with communists, develop into consciously anti-imperialist revolutionary fighters who help to advance the political struggle and organization of the entire working class". 20

Now the RU recognizes the creation of the Party as the central task. The RU says that Marxist-Leninists must unite all those that can be united to make a program and the party, but only for a brief period ahead.

"The creation of the Party on this basis, then, has become the central task of U.S. communists for a brief period ahead. But this does not mean a retreat from mass struggle. To the contrary, it must be done by building on the advances that have been made, including the advances in linking up with and leading struggle of the class and the masses. And even while recognizing the key link as establishing the Party by summing up work, engaging in struggle on the basis of work, formulating the Programme, etc., we must not fall into a single-minded concentration on this task, or downgrade the importance of the other major tasks." (our emphasis) 21

Well, there it is! The RU with its "temporary, brief, central task of Party building". The central task after the Party has been built is the consolidation of the Party. (See Stalin, Collected Works, Vol. V, "The Party, Before and After," p. 104). To put Party building in this form (RU), is to surrender the Party immediately to the bourgeoisie, for its destruction from without and from within. It seems as if there's a race among the opportunists (OL, CL, etc.) to build a "Party". In essence, these "worshippers" raise the Party so that they can divert the masses from making proletarian revolution.

First of all, the central task of Party building doesn't last a few months or for a "brief period". It took Lenin many years to finally construct a Bolshevik Party. It seems as if though the RU wants to become popular with the masses, build a party, so that they can calmly say that there's a revolutionary party, "leading" the revolutionary masses.

Also, in talking about building a party, the RU makes no mention of ideological struggle and drawing firm and definite lines of demarcation. They just talk about uniting all to make a programme(s) and build a party. They even go to the extent of inviting "individual collectives" --- some of whom are "working in factories and doing political work there", and others of whom "are doing 'serve the people' community work." Now comrades, there are many trade union leaders and economists who do political work -- trade unionism. And as for "serve the people programs"- reformist programs - we find many social workers. If there are communists who are practicing trade unionism and community work, if this is where RU sees the advanced elements who just "wait to see the flow and direction of things", if this is what the RU unites with to talk about their "own ideas and experiences" of bowing to spontaneity, and from this to build a party, then truly, RU's party will be a Party of the masses, a Party that is derived from the spontaneous movement, a Party that tails behind the masses, a Menshevik Party.

And this talk of an "End of a Period" and a new "brief period of party building" is clear opportunism.

"In the book, What the Friends of the People Are, Lenin outlines the main task of the Russian Marxists. In his opinion, the first duty of Russian Marxists was to weld the disunited Marxist circles into a united Socialist worker's party." 22

Frederich Engels in Selected Correspondence clearly puts forward;

"The first great step of importance for every country newly entering into the movement is always the constitution of the workers as an independent political party, no matter how long it takes, so long as it is a distinct worker's party." 23

So it wasn't just recently when "conditions are ripe", when the "crossroads" are made, that the central task became party building. Party building has been the central task ever since the betrayal of the CP-USA. The history of the world communist movement shows that in countries where there is no Communist Party, the need for one is at all times primary.

The RU is also guilty of another very serious error. In Selected Red Papers 1,2,3, the RU mentions:

"The Communist Party must be based on the most oppressed sectors of the working class, built among the most advanced, representing the advanced interests of the proletariat as a whole. In this way the minority of labor aristocrats, who do actually benefit from imperialism by acquiring enough to own stock or a little real estate, can be neutralized and, parts of it, won over." (our emphasis) 24

What exactly is the labor aristocracy? Are communists supposed to "neutralize" them or try and get "parts of it, won over"? This is what Comrade Lenin has to say on the labor aristocracy.

"This stratum of bourgeoisified workers, or the labour aristocracy," says Lenin, "who are quite philistine in their mode of life, in the size of their earnings and in their entire outlook, is the principal prop of the Second International, and, in our days, the principal social (not military) prop of the bourgeoisie. For they are real agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement, the labour lieutenants of the capitalist class..., real channels of reformism and chauvinism."

"... It is they principally, that constitute the

source of factionalism and disintegration the source of disorganization and disruption of the Party from within... Therefore, ruthless struggle against such elements, their expulsion from the Party, is a prerequisite for the successful struggle against imperialism."

(Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, p. 115-116)

(our emphasis) 25

So we do not "neutralize" or try to win over sectors of the labour aristocracy. On the contrary, we wage a "ruthless struggle against such elements" for "their expulsion from the Party, is a prerequisite for the successful struggle against imperialism." But then again the RU may want to put forward that we don't have to follow Stalin's criteria.

Comrades, the RU put forward "Principles of Unity" to unite all who can be united around creating such a programme and Party. On the principle of the National Question, they put forward the following:

"-- from the standpoint of achieving minimum unity to build the Party -- it is not necessary to hold strictly to Black people being a nation in terms of the five criterias laid out by Stalin."

(Red Papers 6 --- p.10) -our emphasis- 26

Is it not outright revisionism to put forward that communist do not have to follow Marxist-Leninist principles on the national question as laid out by Stalin? Stalin, in explaining the five principals of a nation also put forward very clearly:

"It is only when all these characteristics are present that we have a nation."

(Marxism and the National Question -- p.53 of Selected Works of Stalin, Cardinal Publishers) 27

When the PRRWO and the BWC left the National Liason Committee, the Guardian in an article explained this action as a "broken alliance". In this article, the Guardian applauded and supported the erroneous lines of the RU which came out in the May 1974 issue of Revolution. The Guardian has been siding with the right opportunist analysis of the RU. In the Guardian issue of August 14, they again came out in support of the RU's analysis of the communist movement.

"One period- the period of pre-party formation is coming to an end. The next period --- unifying the Marxist-Leninist forces and building a new communist party -- is just beginning." (Guardian, Aug. 14, 1974-p.7)

(our emphasis)

28

So, they too say that the central task of Party Building has

just emerged due to the development of the objective processes.

The Guardian, though, is a bit clearer with their right opportunist line, especially as seen in how they give credibility to the revisionist CP-USA.

"At all times, it is absolutely essential to differentiate between those who have been tricked by revisionist ideology-- not only among the working masses, but within the left generally and even within the ranks of the CP-USA-- and the active ideologists and promulgators of this brand of counter-revolution."
(Guardian, Aug. 14, 1974, p.7) -our emphasis- 29

The Guardian says that the struggle against opportunism and revisionism has "been pursued in a mechanistic fashion." Thus, they leave room to say that "even within the ranks of the CPUSA" we can win over the honest elements "tricked by revisionist ideology." Is this not conciliation towards right opportunism? We believe it is.

The RU also conciliates to the "CPUSA; on May Day 1974, they put out a leaflet--- refer to our section on the Brief Sum-up of the History of our Organization.

The economism of the Guardian is also seen in the following:

"The Marxist-Leninist will not develop their influence among the masses by standing aside from these struggles or by merely pooh-poohing them as meaningless reforms. At all times, the conditions of life of the working class are a prime question for the communist."

"It is the job of the communists not only to show that they are every bit as effective as the revisionists or other social reformers in fighting for the people's needs-- but that they are, in fact, better than them." (Ibid.) 30

Pure economism! Pure, pure economism!!! It is not the task of communists to "tactically" fight for palpable, immediate, economic results. Communists do not bow to spontaneity and more than that, we are not in competition with revisionists, opportunists or social-reformers in accomplishing the "needs" of the people. The needs of the masses will only come about with the overthrowal of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The only acts that communists do with revisionists and opportunists is to struggle against them, purge them from our ranks, and expose their hides. Also the revisionists and opportunists do not serve the "needs of the people", but rather serve the interests of the bourgeoisie. As Communists, we struggle for immediate demands, but

we don't sacrifice the long range objective.

It truly is an unpardonable sin, on the part of the Guardian, for giving so much credibility to revisionism and opportunism.

The Guardian, like the RU and all other opportunist forces, uphold the theory of spontaneity, of belittling the role of the conscious element and belittling the role of theory. The following is a statement made by a Guardian speaker:

"A party of revolutionary practice is ever wary of the dangers of ultra-left adventurism and sectarian dogmatism and understands that the struggle to develop and implement the mass line of the Party is the critical testing ground for revolutionary theory." (Guardian, April 4, 1973)

31

The October League has gone from one form of opportunism, to the other form, from left to right, though in essence, the line was right opportunism all throughout.

The OL doesn't outrightly speak of an "End of a Period" as the RU and the Guardian. They've held central task of party building for quite a while. But they've held it in words, and not in deeds. Why? They too have been carriers of the theory of spontaneity. They fail to disseminate scientific socialism in the working class movement; fail to establish factory nuclei and sees the party being built through the united front. They too follow the economist "theory of Stages" by building the economic struggles and then "lending it a political character." In explaining the role of communists in the working class movement, the OL says:

"It is here that communist must be most active. It is here that the daily work of building the rank-and-file caucuses and intermediate or city wide organizations must be done, pushing forward, step by step, in accordance with the existing conditions, the political consciousness of the workers and the trade unions in general."
(Party Building in the U.S. -- OL(ML))

32

The OL makes no mention of establishing factory nuclei, which is one of the first tasks of communists in consolidating the advance workers and in organizing the workers.

But even in the question of trade unions, the OL calls for uniting with one section of the labour bureaucracy against another section - the "progressive" sector as opposed to the "reactionary" sector. The RU, in criticizing the OL on this, puts forward the same opportunist line which says that the communist mobilize the rank-and-file, raise their political consciousness through struggle, and on this basis, win over and unite the trade union leaders to the side

of revolution. Thus, we have the OL and the RU creating conditions for communist to unite with the trade union bureaucracy, or rather, the labour aristocracy. (See section on Strategy and Tactics -- OL and RU's line.) The OL also goes further on and says that a "division of labor" is needed in order to unify the working class.

"Within the Party and the present communist organizations, there must be a type of "division of labour."

"The white communists must take on the main responsibility for work among the white workers and especially for combating chauvinism and in that way push the unity of the class forward."

"...their (the 'minority cadre' -ed) special duty is while working among the class as a whole, to work among the monority workers and combat narrow nationalism which directs itself against the monopolies." (Party Building in the U.S. - OL(ML)) 33

And when they explain the division of the working class, the OL places the blame on white workers.

"The seperateness in general can be attributed to the opportunism and history of white chauvinism which has plagued some sections of the movement and backward levels of large sections of the white workers." 34

To begin with, communists take on the responsibility of dealing with advanced elements. It isn't that white communist deal only with white workers, or Black communists deal only with Black workers, etc. Communists unite with the small number of relatively active and advanced workers and rely on them to raise the level of the intermediate elements and win over the backward elements. As for the division of the working class, Stalin, in Foundations of Leninism puts forward that it is the labour aristocracy who creates the divisions "for they are real agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement, the labour lieutenants of the capitalist class real channels of reformism and chauvinism." So it isn't just that white workers are the cause for division of working class, but rather the labour aristocracy, trade union officials, and of course the opportunist forces, the same people who they (OL and RU) want to unite with.

In the struggle against the left, the OL puts forward that all the "ultra-lefts" want is to unite with a "handful of advanced workers."

Comrades, we're in agreement that the left opportunists forces isolate themselves from the masses, but one thing for sure, the task of communist is exactly to unite and win over advanced workers to the revolutionary struggle.

The OL, as well as all the other right opportunist forces place the main danger today on "dogmatism", "sectarianism", and "left opportunism".

"However, while modern revisionism, or right opportunism, is the main ideological enemy which confronts the world revolutionary movement, within the newly emerging communist movement here the main danger is "leftism" and "sectarianism". Without a staunch struggle against sectarianism, dogmatism and ultra-leftism in general, all the cries for a new Party won't mean a thing. (OL Party Building in the U.S. p.11) 35

Let us listen to Mao on this topic:

"At the same time as we criticize dogmatism, we must direct our attention to criticizing revisionism. Revisionism, or right opportunism, is a bourgeois trend of thought that is even more dangerous than dogmatism. The revisionists, the right opportunists, pay lip-service to Marxism; they too attack "dogmatism". But what they are really attacking is quintessence of Marxism." (On Literature and Art - Peking Edition) 36

In the revolutionary movement in the United States, we also have other right opportunist forces which also aid in dividing the multi-national working class. In particular, there's the Puerto Rican Socialist Party which claims to be Marxist-Leninist, yet they revise and distort Marxism-Leninism completely.

To begin with, the PSP makes Marxism-Leninism look like eclecticism. In Appendix A (eleven programmatic principles) of "Desde Las Entranas", the PSP explains their theoretical framework as follows:

"The teachings embodied in the revolutionary work of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Bolivar, Marti, Betances, Hostos, Mao, Ho Chi Minh, Ernesto (Che) Guevara, Fidel Castro, Camillo Torres, Fanon, Sandino and Albizu Campos are fused as the broad theoretical framework of Puerto Rican Socialism, in the context of historical materialism." 37

Now isn't this eclecticism of the finest type. PSP, a supposedly Marxist-Leninist "revolutionary party" has even bourgeois elements in their "broad theoretical framework" for their "Puerto Rican Socialism."

The PSP also claims to be the "party", the "sole representative" of the Puerto Rican workers in the United States as well as in Puerto

Rico. Their conclusion comes from their logic (and not Marxist-Leninist) of saying that Puerto Ricans in the U.S. are part of the Puerto Rican nation. Thus, one party for one nation. They too, like the RU, say that we cannot apply Stalin's five principles on the national question "mechanically" or "dogmatically".

The PSP's line is very similar to a dangerous right opportunist trend in Russia, during Lenin's time known as the "Bund".

"The Bund laid claim to a special position within the Party. It demanded to be recognized as the sole representative of the Jewish workers in Russia. To comply with this demand would have meant to divide the workers in the Party organization according to nationality, and to renounce common territorial class organization of the workers." (History of Communist Party of the Soviet Union - Calcutta p.38) 38

But this isn't only it. In reference to strategy and tactics in the U.S. they explain it as follows:

"Its (PSP-ed) primary role in the United States is to unleash, in all its fury, that national liberation struggle in the very centers of the North American cities and to incorporate our people into the struggle for the revolutionary transformation of North American society." (Desde Las Entranas) 39

What ever happen to proletarian revolution? Or who is the main blow directed against? Or how about all the other characteristics of a Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics? The PSP does not mention none of this. They mention a few rhetorical works here and there, and "puff", they think that the "North American society" will have a "revolutionary transformation."

On the question of workers struggle in the U.S. the PSP strives for more democracy in the unions and for more Puerto Rican in trade union leadership.

"Consequently, the struggles of the Puerto Rican workers for better salaries and working conditions must be accompanied by the struggle for democracy within the unions, against their characteristic discrimination and racism!" (Desde Las Entranas) 40

And to make their aims clearer, In Claridad, July 21, 1974 a member of the PSP Central Committee said:

"One of the problems is our exclusion from major decision making roles within the unions by the

union bureaucracy."

"There have been very few efforts to create cross-union mechanisms which could politically and programatically unite most Puerto Rican union leaders." 41

The PSP, which talks of a disunited "left" and claims that it will aid the left by "injecting anti-imperialist content" in the revolutionary movement, is a party following the line of the Second International. The Second International in the time of Lenin fell into opportunism. Kautsky, one of the leading figures put forward the Productive Forces Theory which says that socialism will replace capitalism as the productive forces developed. It says that an armed overthrow of the bourgeois state is not necessary in order to gain socialism. It advocates the peaceful transition into socialism. The Second International was also characterized by its centrism, conciliation and class collaboration. They did not see the importance of ideological struggles and lines of demarcation against opportunism. To the Second International, everything can be justified. The Second International dealt with the immediate aims of the working class and solely advocated for reforms. To them the mass movement was everything, and the final aim, nothing.

The PSP does not engage in polemics internationally and nationally. They say that they don't interfere in the ideological struggles of the American left. In reference to the international ideological struggles, the PSP says:

"We will not take part in the power disputes within the socialist camp and the so-called Third World." 42

Also, in their Appendix, the PSP talks of Puerto Rican style socialism. In reference to the dictatorship of the proletariat the PSP says the following:

"The political power to be established in the Socialist Republic of Puerto Rico does not necessarily have to be a single party at the start. If in the course of our revolutionary struggle diverse political forces participate in the determination of victory, it is probable that a plural leadership will assume command in the building of socialism. In the last instance, what will determine the one-party or multi-party character of the socialist regime is whether, in the revolutionary situation proceeding the seizure of power, the vanguard is dispersed in several organizations or concentrated in only one." (Desde Las Entranas) Appendix A, #IV 43

The PSP has declared that they "will not take part in power

disputes within the socialist camp and the so-called Third World." What power dispute and what socialist camp are they speaking of? Are they speaking of the disputes between the revisionist forces led by the USSR and the two great socialist countries, China and Albania? Or would they much rather see "detente" between revisionist forces and the Marxist-Leninist forces? Then they speak of the socialist camp. At the Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly, Chairman of the Delegation of the People's Republic of China, Teng Hsiao-Ping, brought forward China's line on the International situation:

"As a result of the emergence of social-imperialism, the socialist camp which existed for a time after World War II is no longer in existence."

44

And what type of position has PSP taken in saying that they won't participate in "power disputes". Isn't it the task of communists to make Marxist-Leninist analysis of the world situation, of the forces that take part in the molding of the present situation and in that process, taking positions and exposing all the opportunist and revisionist forces. Yet, the PSP comes outright and vascillates and takes a centrist position.

But, comrades, we don't think that the PSP vascillated. On the contrary, they have and are, in essence, aiding both Soviet social-imperialism and U.S. imperialism.

Being that PSP's "socialism" has a "theoretical framework" of individuals such as "Betances, Fidel Castro, etc." and being that their going to have a "Puerto Rican style of socialism", they have come up with a Trotskyite view of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Stalin, in having polemics against Leon Trotsky, says:

"What is this special form of alliance (the dictatorship of the proletariat-ed). What does it consist of? Does not this alliance with the toiling masses of other non-proletarian classes generally contradict the idea of the dictatorship of one class?

"This special form of alliance lies in the leading force of this alliance, in the proletariat, that the leader in the state, the leader within the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a single party, the party of the proletariat, the party of the communists, which does not and cannot share power with other parties."

45

In reference to the armed overthrow of the bourgeoisie in the proletarian revolution, the PSP liquidates it and talks of armed

struggle only if it can "contribute" to the struggle of the Puerto Ricans or will use revolutionary violence only "to the extent and with the conditions that the circumstances call for". Whatever happened to the words of Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto, which says:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling class tremble at a communist revolution. The Proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a whole world to win." 46

Comrades, it is obvious that PSP is not a Bolshevik Party, that it has "Bundist" tendencies and that the PSP has a revisionist line on many questions and unites with the CPUSA(R) as seen in the Oct. 27th slogan "Bicentennial Without Colonies". The PSP with their petty-bourgeois nationalism, places nation above class throughout their analysis in "Desde Las Entranas". They too fall in the Bernsteinian camp of the "movement is everything, the final aim is nothing."

Comrades, in the revolutionary movement in the U.S., there also exists another dangerous tendency. This tendency is represented by the Communist League (CL). Sometimes the "right" likes to hide themselves under the mask of the "left", and under "ultra" revolutionary estimates of the objective situation. This "left" danger is a product of and closely bound up with the whole state of the communist movement. "One tendency covers another."

The CL too is one of the forces upholding the central task of Party building for over five years. But how is it that they see Party building?

The CL, with its chairman acting as if he were the "new Lenin" in the U.S., "has been raising the party just to smash the party".

The CL under the guise of criticizing the openly right opportunist forces for bowing to spontaneity, has raised the task of Party building. The only problem is that the CL wants to create a party in isolation from the masses. The CL in essence is calling for a trotskyite party, an elitist party of some 'purest' intellectuals supposedly to be found within their organization. The CL views the Party building process by adopting the trotskyite 'theory of cadres'.

"According to this "theory", the communists should not act, should not approach the masses and organize them, but they should shut themselves up in their cells and engage only in theoretical education."

"The 'theory of cadres' was particularly stigmatized as defeatist and opportunist, for it isolated the communists from the masses, kept them as a sect trailing behind the masses and would finally lead to the dissolution of the Party."

48

The trotskyite and sectarian tendencies of the CL can especially be seen in their unprincipled polemics among the communist movement and in particular, their splittest activities within the Continuations Committee.

The CL with their Continuations Committee only unites with those who conform to their wishes. With their "image" they try to co-opt honest advanced elements into their Party building process.

The CL through the Continuations Committee has tried to do a similar task to that of a trotskyite group in Albania which was led by Andrea Zisi.

"Andrea Zisi had undertaken the task of merging the Albanian communist groups with his 'party' and forcing them to accept his anti-Marxist line."

49

Comrades, at this point it is clear that the CL will be creating a party of dogmatists, an elitist party, a trotskyite party. It is clear that the dialectics that they're so fond of talking about in the "Dialectics of the Development of the Communist League" is nothing but pure Hegelian dialectics. (Refer to the BWC's pamphlet "Struggle Against Revisionism and Opportunism...")

"The CL line is not some 'freak line' as some like to characterize it. It is the twin brother of the RU line and fundamentally no different. Both seek to isolate the communist forces from the proletarian vanguard. The RU line by "tailing" the vanguard, and the CL line by coming nowhere near it." 50

Allow us to quote Mao again:

"At the same time as we criticize dogmatism, we must direct our attention to criticizing revisionism. Revisionism, or right opportunism, is a bourgeois trend of thought that is even more dangerous than dogmatism. The revisionists, the right opportunists, pay lip-service to Marxism; they too attack "dogmatism". But what they are really attacking is the quintessence of Marxism." 51

FOOT NOTES

1. BWC pamphlet Black Liberation Struggle, Black Workers Congress and Proletarian Revolution
2. Enver Hoxha, Albania Today, Jan-Feb. issue, p.38-39
3. Stalin, History of the C.P.S.U. (B), National Book Agency, Calcutta, p.27-28
4. Ibid.
5. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, Foreign Languages Press, Peking (FLPP), p.23
6. BWC, Black Liberation Struggle, Black Workers Congress and Proletarian Revolution. p.37
7. RU, Red Papers 5, p.7
8. Ibid. p.8
9. Lenin, What Is To Be Done, (FLPP), p.138
10. Ibid., p.144
11. RU, Red Papers 5, p.7-8
12. Lenin, Retrograde Trend in Russian Social Democracy, p.281
13. Ibid.
14. Lenin, "Apropos of the Prefession De Foi", Collected Works, Vol.4, p.291
15. RU, Red Papers 6, p.6
16. Lenin, What Is To Be Done, pp. 221-223
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, FLPP, p. 22
20. RU, National Bulletin #10, RU document on UWOC work
21. RU, Red Papers 6, p. 5
22. Stalin, History of CPSU(B), p. 17
23. Engels, Selected Correspondence

24. RU, Red Papers 1,2,3, p. 45
25. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism (FLPP), p. 115-116
26. RU, Red Papers 6, p.10
27. Stalin, Selected Works, Cardinal Publishers, "Marxism and the National Question", p.53
28. Guardian, Aug. 14,1974, p.7
29. Ibid., p.7
30. Ibid.,
31. Guardian, April 4,1973
32. Party Building in the U.S. - OL(ML)
33. Ibid., p.16
34. Ibid., p.16
35. Ibid., p. 16
36. Mao, On Literature and Art, Peking Edition.
37. "Desde Las Entranas", Appendix A, (eleven programmatic principles)
38. Stalin, History of the CPSU(B), Calcutta, p.38
39. "Desde Las Entranas"
40. Ibid.
41. Claridad, July 21,1974
42. "Desde Las Entranas", Appendix A, principle #XI
43. Ibid., Appendix A, # IV
44. Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly, (Peking Ed.)
Peking Review, # 16, 1974
45. Stalin, Leninism, p.271
46. Marx and Engels, Manifesto of the Communist Party (FLPP), p.76
47. History of Party of Labour of Albania, p.33
48. Ibid., p.88
49. Ibid., p.47
50. BWC, Struggle Against Revisionism and Opportunism, p.4
51. Mao, On Literature and Art, Peking Edition