

Marxist-Leninist Committee The "RECONSTITUTION" of the CMLP Party

Published: **The Bolshevik No.7** November 1971. Reproduced at

<https://1969revolucaressaca.blogspot.com/search/label/%22O%20Bolchevista%22>

Transcription, Editing and Markup: Paul Saba and Sam Richards

Copyright: This work is in the Public Domain under the Creative Commons Common Deed. You can freely copy, distribute and display this work; as well as make derivative and commercial works. Please credit the Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism On-Line as your source, include the url to this work, and note any of the transcribers, editors & proof-readers above.

A manoeuvre to unmask

THE "RECONSTITUTION" OF THE CMLP PARTY

In November 1971 came to us the August (10) issue of the CMLP mass organ "*Popular Unity*" announcing the holding of a Congress that declared the Portuguese Communist Party reconstituted (ml). Without delay, we issued two press releases on the subject, but we limited ourselves: - in the first, to draw the line of conduct that we propose to follow in the new situation created; in the second to emphasize (through the publication of a text that has hitherto been unpublished) the sincerity of the position we have taken in favour of a unification of the communist forces (communiqués transcribed in no. 1 of the "Young Guard", organ of the Communist Youths).

However, we are aware that such communications are not enough. Our militants and comrades of the existing Maoist groups have the right to know what we think for sure about the CMLP "coup de force"; and that is what we propose to clarify now.

So to begin with we must say that the news of the "founding" of the Party has confirmed; in practice, a fear we had long cherished: the possibility of degradation to which Marxist-Leninist groups are subjected if they do not seek to strengthen themselves through a correct and revolutionary unity policy! In fact, over the last few years and in the presence of so many Maoist groups - many of whom with the low political and ideological level we recognized him - we had always feared that some of them would choose to "mask" their limitations and failures behind their authority " would give "him to call himself Party.

Well, so far none of these groups had "derailed" - and fortunately - in that sense. It was the CMLP's courage - cowardly - to take such a one-sided step, thus confirming the *raison d'être* of our fears.

But what then explains why such a step was taken by the CMLP (that is, by the "greatest traditions" group) and not by any of the other Maoist groupings? It is to this question that we will try to answer because even doing so amounts to unmasking the opportunistic nature of the manoeuvre in question and (at the same time) defining the position we have before it ... Just hoping that the effort made not to leave the strictly political terrain serves to end the "game" of the depoliticized sayings, the expressions of contempt, the "grace" and personal attacks on which certain comrades tend!

1. The development of Marxism-Leninism in Portugal

The CMLP was the first Marxist-Leninist organization and was built in 1964. It proposed to create conditions for the reconstitution of the Communist Party in Portugal.

The work of ideological formation and definition of a proletarian political line (as opposed to the revisionist line that prevailed in the Portuguese workers' movement) developed especially through its press agency "*Popular Revolution*" reached, from the first hour, such depth and correctness which led comrades from other sister parties to consider the Portuguese Marxist-Leninist movement as one of the most important and promising in Europe.

The arrests of its most prominent elements in 1965/66 and the fact that only comrade João Pulido Valente had an exemplary bearing, however, represented a tremendous blow that plunged the organization into a crisis it could never win again.

For the first two years that followed, it drifted from right to left, from frenziedism to Trotskyism, from guerrillism to reformism, without finding a way: an attempt made in this direction in 1967 through the First Conference of Marxists- Portuguese Leninists, it was a superficial analysis that did not translate into any practical improvement.

However, until December 1968 the CLMP remained the polarizing nucleus of Portuguese Marxist-Leninist activity. There were desertions but none that truly provided a fragmentation of the Maoist current. It is the Second Conference, held this month and convened by pressure from grassroots organizations (including the "celebrated" Engels body) that is the first serious blow to their unity. Indeed, it is where some of the most representative members of the current Board manage to resign from what was then at the head of the CMLP and to be elected, starting from that point, a work of criticism and sectarian debugging that no longer left. to intensify to this day.

It must be said that many of the criticisms, the corrections, and even the initial purifications were essentially correct. But from the outset all of them (the most just and the least) were marked by deep dogmatism, a total absence of realism and respect for the interests and desires of the working masses, and the result was, of course: - On the one hand the paintings thus expelled (or who willingly departed) formed their own Marxist-Leninist groups (such as the "Communist", the RACs, the Vanguard and, more recently, the "Proletarian Left") while the whole a number of Maoist militants who have been appearing within the country, refusing to align with the

CMLP - among other reasons due to their "politics" of exile - and distrusting the dissident groups (also exiles) formed their own organizations (case of the MRPP, PCML, URML and ARCO); For its part, the CMLP, depleted by the bleeding suffered by paintings, was closing more and more, detaching itself from the realities of the country and its own emigration and falling into an increasingly hysterical "purist" hypercriticism, which was liquidating it.

I mean; rather than realizing that its policy was dividing the revolutionary vanguard, providing for the formation of groups that could attract the masses that could take the initiative in the struggle against capitalism and revisionism or for the organization of workers, the CMLP leadership clung to it. blindly to the idea that none of the other Maoist detachments should be taken seriously; and though he sometimes acknowledged that he had done nothing to open prospects for the formation of the Party, he threw himself angrily at the thesis that only he possessed the truth but those who opposed him, adventurous detractors with no ideological basis!

The line CMLP followed in relation to all attempts at unity - which explains the superb way it has dealt with movements that cast doubt on its directive hegemony or the qualitative superiority it attributed to work abroad over work within the country. - increasingly lost a political base, was increasingly characterized by the inability to assimilate the Maoist theory about the differences between antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions to reduce, in essence to a line based on slander and denunciation:

Already after the Second Conference there was a sister Party who expressed their unbelief as to the fruits that could come of it. This party asserted that there was no historical example of the leadership of a communist organization having fallen into opportunism; BE REPLACED by a revolutionary leadership through movement from the ground up; For this Party all the examples showed that only the split on revolutionary bases can eventually lead to an opportunistic leadership.

... Experience has shown (again) that the thesis of this Party brother was just: - Directorate of LRMC which replaced the Directorate deposed in December of 1968 did not end the opportunism, was limited to only be a case of a replacement opportunistic leadership by another opportunistic leadership!

2. Our position towards the CMLP

Since our appearance as the Marxist-Leninist Committee, we have refrained from publicly attacking the positions of the CMLP. Even more so when we organized (during 1969) intending to join with them.

Indeed, at that time the situation in the Marxist-Leninist movement was, for us, confusing; the struggle of tendencies was fought and coming to light abroad and through the scattered, partial data that came to us we could not keep up with it, we could not define its contours, which is why we were not taking part in her. But if we could not get into the debate that was going on, that did not mean that we would accept to remain inactive, waiting for the moment to clear things up to make our contribution as Marxist - Leninists. So we started to work and naturally, with our

eyes set on the CMLP, ready to connect with our self- criticism for the mistakes we made in the meantime - thinking, as little as we could apprehend, that our positions converged.

Only later, when we realize that, after all, the direction of LRMC informed by a dogmatic and sectarian way that could only lead to the breakdown of the Marxist-Leninist current; only later, when we found that, instead of channelling the energy of the communists around them, of calling into their hearts the struggle of tendencies (which is the very sap of a communist organization), the CMLP leadership wanted, on the contrary, a dead stereotypical organization, based not on the principle of Mao but the anti-dialectical principle "UNITE UNITE-TOGETHER "; only later, do we find that we subject ourselves to an organization that looked down on the organized revolutionaries outside the revisionist group while placing their hopes on the "honest" militants that exist within it; only later, when we saw that we were facing an organization that emphasized the focus of its work on what it did in exile, with disinterest in the interior; Only then, finally, when we took note of all this, did we change our minds and decided to form an independent group; which happened in March 1970.

In any case and as we said before, we have not since publicly attacked the CMLP. Whenever we refer to their leaders and militants, we treat them as comrades, recognizing that even in all sorts of ways we would seek ideological sap from the same root. Even today the CMLP as such (for its past, its traditions) deserves much more consideration than the one it receives from the current Directorate - which did not hesitate to take a step by which it most likely drafted its own ruling death!

But now, all this comradely treatment given to CMLP is over! The period in which we argue that "what unites us is stronger than what divides us"; the period in which we argued that "the discussion of what separates us should be reserved for a more opportune moment", for when we could do it directly, personally; the period in which we placed the CMLP at the level of the other groupings with whom we think we are able to unite in the Party (and even - confess it! - in a better position than many of them); this whole period, we said, has come to an end. The present gesture obliges us!

It is therefore bluntly (or delicately) that we explain what we think of the farce that the CMLP Board has just set up.

3. What we think for sure about the present CMLP manoeuvre

So and in our view why has the CMLP Board proceeded in such a damnable way? Firstly, because in isolation she was abroad, she felt that this was the most effective way of breaking the pressure of the increasing "competition" she felt from other groups, not only in the country but also in her own emigration; that is because, disconnected from the country, without support and with less and less sympathy, she thought this was the way to stop other developing groups, "taking her" militants. Secondly, because, feeling that it was already beginning to be viewed with suspicion by the sister parties, it felt that this was the way to "settle" them and

reinforce the loss of esteem! In short: because otherwise desperate petty bourgeois do not react when they feel the ground running away from them - that is,

In fact, it is easy to follow the line of thought followed by the leaders of the CMLP: - "The name of our organization still enjoys a certain prestige: it gained from the fact that it was the first and did an ideological work that, it was simply brilliant in its early years! The draft program and draft statutes we brought to light are pieces of unparalleled political and theoretical scope ... We have no support for the proletariat, no clandestine technical apparatus, no capacity in order to impose ourselves - by our own activity - as the leading and aggregating force of the communists ... but what is the point in this, there was a congress and that's it ... the party is done!

For the CMLP Board nothing else counted! What was important to her was not to launch the true Communist Party capable of making the Socialist Revolution in Portugal, capable of organizing the workers in the struggle against revisionism, capitalism and imperialism, capable of opening, in the short term, the 4th front of combat required by the peoples of the colonies! The important thing was to "win" the other groups; or rather, the important thing was to show (more to herself than to others) that if she was being defeated in the dispute over authority with them, she was not convinced, however, and was not willing to "shudder".

... The next day all Marxist-Leninist groups might think they had the same ingredients; they could all become so many parties ... The Marxism-Leninism they would surely claim would thus be swept away in the mud ... The working class would be thrown into chaos and confusion ... But none of this mattered; none of this feared the CMLP Board.

Or could it have been unable to see that, in fact, the other groups had equal (and even stronger!) Triumphs to launch themselves into a similar farce? If so, we regret so much blindness as it is of the utmost evidence that nothing, absolutely nothing, of what the CMLP Board had, would lack any of them to take the same step.

In fact, it is true that CMLP enjoyed (or enjoyed) a certain prestige! What? What has been gained in the past ... But this does not belong exclusively to you: it is the general heritage of all Portuguese Maoists.

It is also true that the work developed in the "*Popular Revolutions*" has reached a theoretical level. The CMLP takes pride in this. But was it the current board that wrote them? No! It has so little to do with the directorate that drew them up that it hastened to change the name of its central press body. The "*Popular Revolutions*" therefore constitute, in the same way, a general patrimony of all Portuguese Maoists and not a private property of the CMLP Board that "made" the Party!

It is also true that the draft Program and Statutes have already been published by the current CMLP Board. But is it her authorship and ownership? Again, no! What's good about these projects wasn't done by the CMLP Board, and what is done by it (and that's little, it's true) is almost always not good - as you can see by comparing them to our project editions and which fully correspond to the original version.

Concrete and as stated above, nothing else has the CMLP; and we have already seen that this does not belong to you. Everything else discovered by your

management is nothing but fantasy and demagogy; and fantasy and demagogy, the most natural is that the other groups have no difficulty in disenchanting ... We, for example, to imitate it "only" we lack the courage - will! - to betray the interests of the proletariat which, in the present situation, requires that no efforts be spared to try to unify the communist forces!

Finally, this is what we think of the "power stroke" of the CMLP Board.

4. Concluding

Does all this mean that we consider the step the CMLP Board has taken to be hopeless? No! the CMLP could correct her mistake and avoid being thrown into the "dustbin of history"! How? Resigning and publicly criticizing himself for his manoeuvres. We simply and sincerely do not believe that you have the courage to do so. Lenin liked to quote that "the truth is revolutionary"; but once we have seen the shamelessness the CMLP has come to, we are convinced that they will not care what Lenin said or did not say.

This is why we argued further back that, now, our contradictions with the current CMLP Directorate are no longer non-antagonistic, but definitely antagonistic. For us this is a bad thing and not a good thing but we will not take the cravings for the realities and it will be as antagonistic contradictions that we will treat them (if the practice - or the subsequent events - show that we were wrong we will also be the first to change our behaviour).

Neither in the "*Popular Unity*" issue announcing the "founding" of the Party, nor in any other CMLP document published so far, are there any appeals to the militants of other revolutionary Maoist organizations (asking for their membership). The appeals are all directed at the "honest revisionists" within the Cunhal group. The CMLP Board proceeds, like the ostrich: It thought that closing its eyes to reality could deceive it!

For our part, we consider that, quite the opposite, within Cunhal's band (after fifteen years of treason - according to the "*Popular Unity*" itself) what there is deserves no appeal. For us today Marxist-Leninists exist primarily in the various Maoist groupings.

For it is for them (including the supporters and militants still in the CMLP) that we appeal ... to help us unmask the deceit launched by the CMLP Board on the Portuguese Communists.

**NO TO THE OPPORTUNISM OF THE CMLP STEERING MANEUVER!
LIVE THE FUTURE COMMUNIST PARTY OF PORTUGAL (ML)!**