

HAMMER & STEEL NEWSLETTER

FEBRUARY 1965

No.2

This issue of Hammer & Steel contains the following statement from the New England Party of Labor.

"The New England Party of Labor condemns the proposed Moscow Conference. Such a proposed conference is illegal and disruptive because:

1. Some of those invited have no right to call themselves Marxist-Leninists. They have violated Marxist-Leninist principles of the '57 Declaration and the 81-Party Statement on U.S. imperialism as the main enemy, on revisionism as the main theoretical danger, on Titoism as alien to Marxism-Leninism.
2. Some of the Parties invited have publicly slandered Marxist-Leninist Parties and have failed to publicly correct themselves in word and deed. The CPSU and others have vilified the Communist Party of China and the Albanian Party of Labor. The correct Marxist-Leninist attitude toward the Albanian Party of Labor involves not only proper relations between Parties, but relations of large states to smaller states. The peoples of many non-Socialist states in Africa, Asia and Latin America are waiting to hear the content and tone of the CPSU's retraction of its slander against Albania and the Albanian Party of Labor. Millions are also waiting for retraction of the absurd, divisive charges regarding the Chinese Party and war.
3. The CPSU is no longer the leading force in the Marxist-Leninist movement and does not have the authority to call a conference of the world's M-L Parties.

The New England Party of Labor regards the question of a leading Party as a very important matter. We regard discussion and agreement on this question as indispensable to M-L unity. The question of leadership in the world M-L movement is far more important than whether

this or that group of revisionists decide to hold a conference. For the M-L forces of the world represent what is new, growing and powerful while the modern revisionists represent what is old and dying, i.e. the imperialist stage of capitalism and its ideas in the working class movement.

The Albanian Party of Labor is a Marxist-Leninist Party which has successfully faced many severe tests. The Albanian Party of Labor raises the question of a leading Party and its interconnection with M-L unity. Comrade Hoxha called for discussion on this question in his speech at the 20th anniversary of Albania's liberation, Nov. 28, 1961.

In our opinion, the question of a leading Party is key to correct relationships between Parties. Both Marx and Engels had a great deal of interest in the attempts made at organizing a revolutionary movement in the United States. They did not hesitate to criticize their contemporaries in our country. Comrades Lenin and Stalin, during the period of the Third International, gave important theoretical assistance to U.S. Marxists. After World War II the Duclos letter from the Communist Party of France opened up the partial struggle against Browderism in the CPUSA. Unfortunately, as the Chinese comrades have pointed out, there was insufficient discussion in the world M-L movement on Browderism, an error that later aided the growth of Titoism and Khrushchevism.

No Marxist-Leninist in the U.S. has ever denied the need of constructive criticism for U.S. comrades from the rest of the world M-L movement. The uneven development of capitalism and the resulting different circumstances in various nations are the objective reasons why M-L movements develop unevenly and cannot share equal responsibility for theory. In the U.S. where capitalism came late on the scene, had favorable circumstances for growth and became, after World War II, the main enemy of all peoples, there are numerous pressures and special difficulties facing U.S. Marxist-Leninists. There are also new great opportunities providing we steel ourselves against the pressures and overcome the special difficulties.

Until Khrushchev's distortions, Marxist-Leninists agreed that the German Marxists played a leading theoretical role during the latter

part of the 19th century. From the turn of the century until after World War II it was clearly the Russian Marxists who played the leading role. When the revolutionary movement correctly stressed the defense of the first Socialist nation it was inevitable that the CPSU had special theoretical tasks. It was correct that its tremendous prestige was utilized to advance and unite the Marxist-Leninist movement.

The responsibility of every Marxist-Leninist Party to the world Marxist-Leninist movement is great. Without such a sense of responsibility, opportunism and revisionism are bound to develop. Can we therefore also conclude that all Parties have equal responsibility? Does a Party in a capitalist society, always threatened by repression, have an equal opportunity for research and study as a Party in a Socialist country, that is, as a Party in power? Or does a Party in power in a small Socialist country have an equal responsibility with that of a Party twenty times as large--for publications or aid to other Socialist countries, for example? We think the answers are in the negative.

In several nations where there were formerly Marxist-Leninist Parties with records of struggle there is no national Party today. The United States is an example. There are M-L forces in the U.S., but no one can say there is a national Marxist-Leninist Party. The Chinese comrades have well stated that the Socialist countries are the concern and "property" of the working class and oppressed peoples of the world. Does it not also follow that the international working class movement, all Marxist-Leninist forces, have the duty to assist the U.S. comrades to build a Marxist-Leninist Party?

There are several Parties that have been shattered by the imperialists and their revisionist agents. It is of little use to Marxism-Leninism to pretend this is not so or to further confuse the situation by saying that all Parties have an absolute equal role--even Parties that do not yet exist.

Khrushchev said at the 21st Congress of the CPSU, "All the Communist and Workers Parties are equal and independent. All of them bear responsibility for the destiny of the Communist movement, for its failures and successes." By denying the great responsibility of the CPSU, Khrushchev sought a free hand in wrecking the unity of the Marxist-Leninist movement. He well realized that without leadership and discipline, based on common theoretical objectives, ideas hostile to Marxism-Leninism would flourish. At the same time he practiced the worst kind of interference and disruption in other Parties. Khrushchev rejected Marxist-Leninist leadership by discussion and polemics in favor of bourgeois dictation, of commandism, of bribery.

While Khrushchev espoused the doctrine of absolute equality he also put forward the concept of winning the workers in the capitalist world, not by class struggle primarily, but mainly by the prosperous example of the Socialist worker. The example of the Socialist worker stuffed with goulash would fill the worker in the capitalist world with envy and topple all the capitalist governments, said he. But since Khrushchev presumed (before his agricultural "theories" had produced so many crop failures) that the Russian worker would have the most goulash what did all this mean? It meant that the CPSU was still the big wheel and everyone else in and out of the Socialist camp were only little cogs.

The international Marxist-Leninist movement should set an example to the working class in the various countries. It should not be an example of bragging about goulash while millions are living in semi-starvation in Latin America, Asia and Africa. It should be an example of struggle against U.S. imperialism, main enemy of the world working class and Afro-American liberation movement. Such an example will demonstrate to the workers of the world that their class interests require unity and anti-imperialist leadership. The 81 Party statement repeated some of the wrong formulations of the 21st Congress (CPSU) on leadership and relations between Parties. The world Marxist-Leninist movement, by discussion in and between the Parties, should eliminate those errors and formulate new and correct policies.

The New England Party of Labor rejects the Khrushchev thesis of no leadership, no democratic centralism in the world Marxist-Leninist movement. We believe that equality, in the sense that every Party has a contribution to make, depends on correct leadership. The question is not whether to have leadership, but who is qualified to lead and how do they practice that leadership.

The CPSU was the leading Party in the world revolutionary movement when the key struggles against capitalism were fought in the West. With the Chinese revolutionary victory in 1949 both the area and nature of the focal contradiction changed. The area of key struggles became Latin America, Africa and Asia. The struggle for the existence of one Socialist country no longer represented the main contradiction in the world. The Chinese revolution produced a substantial quantitative change and soon led to a qualitative change in the world relationship of forces. It spurred to further heights a new focal contradiction--the national liberation struggles versus imperialism, headed by U.S. imperialism. The new focal contradiction plus the growth of the Socialist camp from one to thirteen nations posed the question of whether the CPSU could continue to lead the world Marxist-Leninist movement. For the CPSU developed in a capitalist nation which had entered the imperialist stage and oppressed other peoples.

It is clear that in every imperialist nation the problem of bourgeois ideology in the ranks of the working class is serious. It will take generations of sharp class struggle after the great October revolution, and coming revolutions in other imperialist nations, to eliminate the poison of great power and white chauvinism. Every bit of evidence we have indicates that it was primarily Russian great power chauvinism that made the CPSU, after Stalin's death, a fertile ground for the seeds of revisionism. Failure to maintain and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat within the Soviet Union coupled with failure to expose and counter U.S. imperialism with its H-bomb blackmail caused the revisionist weeds to grow rapidly.

The Marxist-Leninists in the Soviet Union have a difficult, bitter struggle ahead to eradicate revisionism in the CPSU. It would be wrong to negate the achievements of the CPSU under the collective leadership headed first by Lenin and then Stalin. It would be equally

wrong to create illusions that the geographical location and the experience of the CPSU makes it possible for them to now play the leading role in struggles concerning Viet Nam, the Congo, Latin America and Algeria. Every Marxist-Leninist in the world looks forward to the day when the CPSU and the Soviet people will once again uphold Marxism-Leninism, once again join fully in the struggle against U.S. imperialism. One of the steps necessary for such a development is for the CPSU to face up to historical development, to self-critically examine its line and ask if the peoples of the world can follow its leadership. For example, let us cite Breshnev's evaluation of the U.S. presidential elections delivered Nov. 7, 1964, "The presidential elections which have just taken place in the U.S. showed most convincingly that the majority of the American people also have the interests of peace at heart, that they are tired of the cold war. The defeat of the U.S. "wild men" is a good lesson for all who advocate the policy of adventure and reaction." Such hopes for L.B. Johnson are not the words of the leading M-L Party.

The leading Marxist-Leninist Party must have the following characteristics: 1) It must be large enough and tested in struggle sufficiently so that the imperialists cannot wipe it out by bombing, etc., or capture it ideologically as in Yugoslavia. 2) It must be geographically located and historically developed so it unites the Socialist camp and the national liberation struggles. 3) Of all Marxist-Leninist Parties it must be best able to apply the science of Marxism-Leninism in behalf of the struggles raging in Latin America, Africa and Asia. It must have the trust and the respect of "the peoples in those areas. The Chinese Party meets these qualifications. The Chinese Communist Party has a generally correct line, has developed large numbers of outstanding theoreticians and is a great tribune of international solidarity.

Some may oppose the concept of a leading Party on the grounds that it will dull the initiative of other Parties. What is our actual experience in the struggle against revisionism? The Albanian comrades were the very first to recognize the full implications of the attacks on Stalin and many other errors of Khrushchev and the CPSU leaders. Does it take any credit away from the great Albanian Party to say that it was the task of the Chinese Party to

Use its far greater resources for writing and circulating both its own and Albanian material in order to mobilize the Marxist-Leninist camp to the dangers of modern revisionism? We feel that the leadership of the Chinese Party guaranteed that the efforts of the Albanian Party bore full fruit. We wish that the Chinese would publish even more Albanian articles in their magazines printed in English..

Some will say that any Party can make mistakes and that when mistakes are made by a Party in a leading role they do large damage. We believe that if proper organizational forms are worked out, that if the leading Party is conscious of its special need to listen to criticism, then not mistakes but even greater Marxist-Leninist contributions will be the chief result.

The question of aid to newly liberated nations and to Socialist nations is involved with the question of a leading Party. Khrushchev first formulated the "all Parties are absolutely equal line" then attempted to impose his revisionist line on Albania by an economic blockade and by breaking state relations. Without more clarity on the role and responsibility of leadership and democratic centralism in the Socialist camp it seems inevitable that the question of who gets aid and how much is in danger of being left solely up to the large nations and their Parties. Undoubtedly, learning from the horrible lesson of Khrushchev, the Marxist-Leninist camp will never again allow the question of aid and state relations to be decided by unilateral action of any one Party or nation.

Once the leading role of the Chinese Party is recognized by all components of the Marxist-Leninist movement then we can expect more timely, more powerful, more united blows against revisionism and imperialism. Once a proper relationship between Parties is established then we can expect the more rapid growth of Marxist-Leninist forces.

As indicated, the Party of China correctly noted that the world Marxist-Leninist movement erred in not probing deeper into the reasons for Browderism. There is an organization called Progressive Labor in the U.S. that, in our opinion, slanders Stalin, condones Trotskyism, practices adventurism, refuses to conduct

real struggles against revisionists and revisionism and aids the CPUSA revisionists leadership by serving as its safe, respectable, non-theoretical opposition. It does all this in the name of friendship for China. In our opinion the Browderites heading PL are dangerous, not least of all because they claim friendship with China. Marxist-Leninists in the U.S. should ask that the Chinese Party, as the leading Party, discuss the line of Progressive Labor. This will certainly strengthen the ideology of the Marxist-Leninist movement in the U.S. and throughout the world. If there are still important differences after the discussion, we would most certainly ask the Chinese comrades to seek the opinions of comrades from other Parties in order that more theoretical light be thrown on this question. That is an example of how we think relations in the world M-L movement can be improved.

Our conclusions would be: Every Marxist-Leninist Party has a joint responsibility to its own working class and to the international movement against imperialism and for Socialism. Unity of the world M-L movement requires leadership and a leading Party. Marxist-Leninist journals, discussion, international conferences are needed to develop Marxist-Leninist theory and unity. This can best be achieved by first of all recognizing and implementing the leading role of the Communist Party of China.

U.S. imperialism is committing aggression against North Viet Nam. It is still inflicting sadistic cruelty on many innocent people in South Viet Nam. U. S. imperialist propaganda is aimed at separating the Socialist camp and the national liberation movements from China. Its tactic is to destroy the liberation movements and the Socialist countries one at a time. Let the M-L, the national liberation forces, the anti-imperialist forces in the capitalist countries reply, paraphrasing the Afro-American spiritual, "China is our leader, we shall not be moved.

Issued By: Hammer & Steel, Box 101, Mattapan Station, Boston, Mass.

Subscription Rate: \$1.50 per year