

Political Education- THE NATIONAL COLONIAL QUESTION I

Reading Material:

FOUNDATIONS OF LENINISM

Chapt. VI - National Question

THE RIGHTS OF NATIONS TO SELF DETERMINATION - Lenin

Section 1 - Pages 5-10

4- All

8 - All

10 - All

MARXISM AND THE NATIONAL AND COLONIAL QUESTION - Stalin

Section I - Pages 7-16

Thesis on the Immediate tasks of the Party in Connection with the national problem (All) (separate reading)

Section II - The National Movement

QUESTIONS:

1. What constitutes a nation?
2. Describe the development of nations under conditions of rising capitalism, Imperialism, and socialism.
3. What is the relation of the national movement to the proletarian revolution and why must the proletariat lead the national liberation movement?
4. What is meant by self-determination of nations
 - A. What is a federation?
 - B. What is independence?
 - C. What is amalgamation?
 - D. What is regional autonomy?
 - E. What is a multi-national state?
5. What is the path to self-determination of the Negro colonial peoples today?
6. How does raising the slogan of self-determination in an abstract way aid the bourgeoisie?
7. What changes have taken place since the Bolshevik revolution in form and struggle of the national liberation movement?

NATIONAL COLONIAL QUESTION II

Reading Material:

Stalin- Foundations of Leninism. Chapt. 6, FLP, Peking 1970 pp 70-81

Lenin-Lenin on the National and Colonial Question, Peking, (All)

Mao - On new Democracy, pamphlet, also selected works pp 339-384

Stalin-The October Revolution and the National Question, Calcutta pps. 109-114

Stalin-The National Question in Yugoslavia, *ibid*, pps 170-173

Stalin-The International Character of the October Revolution, *ibid*, pps 191-196

NATIONAL COLONIAL QUESTION II (cont)

Marx-Address to the Central Committee of the Communist League, vol. III Marx-Engels Selected Works

1. Why and when did the national question cease being a part of the bourgeoisie democratic revolution and become a part of the proletarian revolution?
2. Why don't the Vietnamese comrades fight directly and immediately for the dictatorship of the proletariat?
3. Can the bourgeoisie of an oppressed nation lead the nation to victory over national oppression today as the bourgeoisie of the USNA did in 1776?
4. Will there be a period of "new democracy" in the Negro Nation?
5. Why do Marxists-Leninists fight for the independence of oppressed nations and not just self determination? Does this mean separation?
6. How have nations arisen? What social motions created them? Are nations appearing today? Dissappearing? Do they disappear under socialism? Explain.
7. What is the relation between nationalism and internationalism in oppressed and oppressor countries?

WOMAN QUESTION CLASS I

Reading Material:

Origin of the Family-Engels

Selections from Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin On Woman Question
Chapt. I

1. What kind of family or marriage form existed under the system of:
 - a. savagery
 - b. barbarism
 - c. civilization

Describe the means of production in each different stage and what effect did this have on the family structure.

2. What was mother right? What relation did it have to group marriage? What effect did the change in emphasis in production from agriculture to cattle raising have on mother right?
3. According to Engels why were women instrumental in the transition from group marriage to pairing marriage? What new element did pairing marriage bring into the family?
4. What was the origin of monogamy and why was it necessary that it develop under capitalism to a higher stage?
5. What is the relationship between prostitution, adultery and bourgeois morality? How is this an outgrowth of male supremacy.
6. What conditions are necessary before women become emancipated?

WOMAN QUESTION CLASS II

Reading Material:

Selected Readings from Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin

1. What were the conditions of the working class in the capitalist countries when Marx and Engels wrote the Manifesto and how has the bribery of the working class from imperialist super-profits changed the proletarian family relationship?
2. How should the Party fight against the ideology of the ruling class to divide the working class on the basis of sex?
3. How does household drudgery oppress women? Why does this reflect in male supremacy?
4. Why is it important to educate women politically?
5. In what ways did the USSR involve women in the struggle for Socialism? Why can this involvement of women take place only under Socialism? Why not under capitalism?
6. Why have there been different forms of marriage for the three periods of savagery, barbarism, civilization as described by Engels? What is the relationship of the form of marriage to the means of production such as primitive communism, slave society, feudalism, capitalism and socialism?
7. What does Engels mean by "the equality of women thereby achieved will tend to make men really monogamous than to make women polyandrous"? What are the differences between monogamy under capitalism and under socialism?
8. Why is the demand for free love not a proletarian but a bourgeois demand?
9. How are the attitudes toward the birth of children a reflection of the different classes? i. e., peasantry, workers, petty bourgeois, bourgeois and communist.
10. What does Lenin mean when he says: "The communist women's movement must itself be a mass movement, a part of the general mass movement, not only of the proletariat, but of all the exploited and oppressed, all the women who are the victims of capitalism or any other mastery."
11. What are the "appropriate bodies" to carry out work amongst the women?
12. Why must the struggle against male supremacy be waged by both men and women?

WOMAN QUESTION CLASS III

TWO FORMS OF SOCIAL PRODUCTION

Miss Inman begins her book by stating that she differs from others who say that the oppression of women arises from a lack of participation in social production. Miss Inman believes that the oppression of women arises from the material conditions of production. In other words, the oppression of women stems from her participation in social production, and as we will see, this social production is the housework, cooking, cleaning, raising of children, etc.; the household drudgery we have all grown to hate.

TWO FORMS OF SOCIAL PRODUCTION (cont.)

Engels says there are two forms of production. "The production and reproduction of life. This implies on the one hand the production of means of existence (food, clothing, shelter and the necessary tools) on the other hand the generation of children, the propagation of the species." Miss Inman twists this to say that life is produced not merely a biological process, but also by a social labor process, and involves, amongst other things, the raising of children and the necessary tasks requisite to the day-to-day production of the energy of adults. Thus she says that the social labor process includes not only the production of the socially necessary subsistence, but the daily things we do to keep going. She has begun to lay the basis for insisting that women participate in social production at home.

She goes on to say that "maternity is both a social function and a phenomenon of nature under all social systems and cannot take place except through a social labor process." Women are the creators of labor power. That labor power is the only commodity born out of the body of a woman. Women, then, are production workers, since they create commodities. Women also use labour power in the home; the cooking, cleaning etc. Women labor in the home, thus contributing to the value of labor power.

Miss Inman says all "powers", steam power, electric power, wind power cannot be produced or utilized without labor power. She equates the production of these "powers" with the production of labor power. Without the application of labor power, labor power cannot be produced, i.e. bearing of children, cooking, cleaning, etc. "When such workers apply labor power to the other products, food, housing, clothing, etc. for the purpose of producing and with the result that there is produced an entirely new and different product: human energy, the commodity, labor power, that is social production.

She insists that work in the home is social production. She tries to rationalize this by saying that women use raw materials, tools of production, just like any other production worker. "We speak of labor power being her (the wife) product in the same sense as we say that the tires which her husband makes are his product, not as implying that it is her property, but only that it is a product of her toil." "Uncooked inedible foods, the products of other workers, come into the housewife's kitchen in the form of raw materials and by the consumption (i.e. that portion used up, worn out) of a certain amount of tools of production, appliances, kitchen stove, pots and pans, etc, plus the consumption of a certain amount of the housewife's labor power. These raw materials are transformed into the finished product; cooked foods." "In the production of life under capitalism, the value of the commodities consumed by the workers family (that represent their average minimum requirements) and the value of the labor power of the wife expended upon them to render them consumable, reappear again on the market, but in a new form, as the commodity labor power."

Wives, Miss Inman says, are a necessary part of the production of all other commodities, i.e. firestone tires, GM cars, etc., because without her the husbands wouldn't eat, sleep, have clean clothes, etc. Thus he wouldn't be able to get to work and produce. The wife works for the same employer as her husband by supplying him with his day-to-day labor power.

TWO FORMS OF SOCIAL PRODUCTION (cont)

Lastly, she claims that all classes of women are involved in this process. All women; ruling class, working class and peasant women perform this labor process. The subject of women's oppression is broader than any one class. "Class differences and varying economic systems in different countries, do have many effects on this labor process, but such differences do not set this process itself aside." Thus, ruling class women also are exploited under capitalism because they are part of this social production - the bearing and raising of children - and occasionally the cleaning and mending of clothes.

Let us now sum up what Miss Inman says: First, women are exploited because they participate in social production; this social production entails the use of their labor power in the home. Cooking, cleaning, mending clothes, etc. That women are production workers because they produced labor power by having children, and that they contribute to the value of labor power by their work in the home.

WHY NOT?

Under capitalist production we have a form of production called commodity production. A commodity is a product of labor manufactured (produced) for sale and not for one's own use. The commodities have two values, use-value and exchange value. The value (exchange) of the commodity is determined by the amount of socially necessary labor time worked up in it. "The production of commodities is a system of social relationships in which definite producers produce various products (through the social division of labor) and in which all these products are equated to one another in exchange."

Labor power which is a commodity under capitalism differs from all other commodities in the fact that not only does it have value in itself, but it increases value, it produces surplus value. But like all commodities the value of labor power cannot be realized until it is exchanged, until it is on the market. The labor power that Miss Inman speaks about women producing does not conform to these requirements. In the house, the women do not expend labor power. She works hard but labor power is a commodity and a commodity is produced for sale and can only be realized in exchange, she, the housewife, does not sell her labor power to anyone. In fact, it is the private property of her husband. The biological process by which women have children is social in the sense that it contributes to humanity, because without women having children, civilization would come to an end; however, it is not social in the sense of production. It is not a form of social production. It is a biological process that takes place between two people, not the whole of society. Capitalism is not just a thing, it is a definite social relation. If we believe that reproducing children is part of a social labor process, we negate the fact that labor power is a commodity and that it can only be realized in exchange. Why else would a capitalist want it? If he couldn't buy labor power he wouldn't have surplus value. Raising of children and the propagation of the species is important for without it there would be no one. However, reproduction is and was not limited to just capitalism. Reproduction took place long before capitalism came into being. If we are to believe that this process is part of the labor process then we must admit that all women are exploited. Even ruling class women have children and

TWO FORMS OF SOCIAL PRODUCTION (cont.)

have always had children. And even a few of these women take part in the process of raising their children.

Cooking, cleaning, mending of clothes, etc., do not add value to anything. The raw materials of uncooked carrots have no more value after they are cooked than they had before. A dusty sofa has no more value after it is dusted than it had before. Darned socks have no more value. So her assumption that the housewife adds to the value of labor power by doing all these things is incorrect.

The woman does not produce labor power, labor power is part of the relationship between capitalist and worker. The exploitation of labor power arises because of capitalism. A man can be healthy, have clean clothes and live in a clean house, but if there is no capitalist to buy his labor power then it is of no use. Labor power depends upon the capitalist and the capitalist depends on the worker for his profit. (That is, the worker who sells his labor power depends on the capitalist for his existence, and the capitalist depends on the worker's labor power for his profit.)

By what do we determine the value of the work done by the women in the house? In production we do this by the amount of socially necessary labor time needed to sustain the worker. But the housewife works all the time. What she does cannot be broken down into necessary labor time and surplus labor time. The housewife does not exchange her labor power to anyone. She does not produce surplus value. The only value her work has is to her family and no one else. The husband could cook his own meals, clean his own clothes and keep his house in order without a woman and still go to work and produce surplus value. Miss Inman's assumption that the man is dependent of the woman for these things just perpetuates male supremacy. It leaves the door open for saying that housework is a woman's job- no man can do it. If what Miss Inman says is true, that the housework is social labor, why stop it? Why not continue allowing women to participate in this production? Women are not exploited or oppressed if what Miss Inman says is true. What she says makes it sound like we don't need socialism because socialism would put the women into production and Miss Inman feels that women already participate in production. If what she says is true, capitalism isn't too bad.

But as communists we know that the work done in the home is drudgery. The most menial and unproductive work that there is. I would like to quote two paragraphs by Lenin about Household drudgery.

"In the old communistic household which comprised many couples and their children, the task entrusted to the women of managing the household was as much a public and socially necessary industry as the procuring of food by the men. With the patriarchal family, and still more with the single monogamous family, a change came. Household management lost its public character. It no longer concerned society. It became a private service and the wife became the head servant, excluded from all participation in social production. not until the coming of large-scale industry was the road to social production opened to her again; and then, only to the proletarian wife.

"Notwithstanding all the liberating laws that have been passed, women continue to be a domestic slave because petty house work crushes,

TWO FORMS OF SOCIAL PRODUCTION (cont.)

strangles and degrades her, chains her to the kitchen and to the nursery and makes her labor barbourously unproductive, petty-nerve raking, stulifying and crushing drudgery."

So we can see that this production that Miss Inman speaks about is not a social process, but rather it is a private service done by the woman for her man. It has nothing to do with production. We must get rid of this burden on the women. We must involve women in true social production. Every woman must take her place on the production line. They must participate in the creating of the wealth in society and share in it along with the man. Unless this is done, women will always be oppressed. They will always be second class citizens. Miss Inman's formulations give the capitalists a good way of perpetuating male supremacy and keeping the women in their place, in the home. And if needed they can work, but for lower wages, for what good is a woman really for? House work and the propagating of children!

1. Why isn't the work done in the home "expended labor power" Why doesn't the party raise the demand for wages for house work?
2. How does Miss Inman's arguments lead to male supremacy and capitalist domination?
3. What does Engels mean by the two forms of production and how does Miss Inman distort it?

EDUCATIONAL ON SYNDICALISM

READING MATERIAL:

1. Dialectics of the League's Development
 2. Syndicalism disarms the proletariat People's Tribune, vol.3, no.10
1. What are the main historical roots of syndicalism in the USNA? (class roots and organizations). Why is syndicalism the main trend in the left today? Give some concrete examples of how syndicalism manifests itself.
 2. Was the CPUSA ever a party of the working class? How did syndicalism and white chauvinism in the CPUSA manifest themselves in "American Exceptionalism?" (On the Negro question, factionalism, ultra-imperialism)
 3. How does syndicalism in the trade unions divert the proletariat away from revolution and ultimately aid the fascists, and the revisionists? What is the importance of the communist party to the trade union movement?
 4. What role did the Bolshevik Revolution play in the dialectical development of the CPUSA? What role does the Chinese Revolution play in the development of the left today?
 5. Why was the level of the CE qualitatively higher than that of the CPUSA in the development of a real communist party? Why was the break between POC and the CPUSA important in this development?
 6. "Although the theoretical and political projections of the movement are syndicalist, the concrete applications transform it into its opposite with which it is completely united. In practice, syndicalism (which comes from the left) is expressed as modern populism (which comes from the right)" PT vol.3, no.10 Explain this quote in relation to growing fascism.

SYNDICALISM (cont.)

7. Why must Marxist-Leninists base themselves in the most oppressed and exploited and not the trade unions in this period of party building?

OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL READING, Stalin, Speeches on the American CP. (3)
Proletarian Publishers

MASTERING BOLSHEVISM BY J. STALIN

1. What were some of the warning signals of the Trotskyite-Zinovievist bloc? What did these signals and warnings call for? What is real Bolshevism revolutionary vigilance?
2. What is capitalist encirclement, and what are its dangers?
3. What is a political trend in the working class: Why has present day Trotskyism ceased to be a political trend in the working class? Why did Stalin criticize the way some Party members were dealing with former Trotskyites? Where does the strength of the Trotskyites lie today? What were the errors that leading party comrades in the USSR made in relationship to the Trotskyite wreckers? Why were they made? How must the Party and the people fight against Trotskyism?
4. What is the seamy side of success? What are the dangers of success? Why is it important for communists to understand the two sides of success?
5. How are we to liquidate the shortcomings in our work?
6. How can we master Bolshevism?
7. What is the Bolshevik method of leadership, selecting leaders and criticism and self criticism? Apply
8. What does it mean to lead correctly? How can we fight against formal and heartless bureaucratic attitudes developing among our leaders?

CLASS ON THE STRUGGLE AGAINST REVISIONISM by Comrade Kilpatrick

Additional reading: The Dialectics of the Development of the CL

Questions:

1. Show the development of the CPUSA's "anti-monopoly coalition" line from the populism of the 1870's down through the years to today.
2. Review the history of the CPUSA and show how the essence of the struggle in the party was a battle of revisionists vs. syndicalists at least as far as the leadership was concerned. Discuss the effect this had on the development of factionalism. How can we combat factionalism today?
3. Why do some people today push the line of Foster as a "great Marxist-Leninist" today? What was his real role?
4. Why was it so easy for the bourgeoisie to eliminate CPUSA influence in the unions in the late forties?
5. Discuss the international role of the CPUSA in pushing revisionism today and in the past.

Class on: AGAINST LIQUIDATIONISM

Readings:	AGAINST LIQUIDATIONISM by Lenin
Page 212-22	Illegal and Legal Work
237-57	Controversial Issues
262-65	Marxism and Reformism
266-270	The Ideological Struggle in the Working Class Movement
271-32	On The Road
33-38	Conference of the Extended Editorial Board of Proletary
39-46	Liquidation of Liquidationism
56-65	Towards Unity
273-83	Disruption of Unity Under Cover of Criticism for Unity

History of the Communist Party Soviet Union (B) Chapters 4 and 5.
(Bolshevik Short Course)

Questions:

1. What must the party do to prepare for conditions of fascism?
What is the key to the party's survival under these conditions?
2. What conditions allowed the imperialists to single out and attack the CPUSA in the late 40's and 50's?
3. How and at what time did liquidationism show itself in the CPUSA?
How is liquidationism the organizational expression of political deviation and under what conditions does it gain strength?
4. Why are the factory nuclei so important in maintaining the party work under illegal conditions?
5. What does "legal" and "illegal" work mean?
6. How can a party ensure unity and communication throughout its ranks under extreme ? repression?

Class on: UNITED FRONT

Reading material:

1. United Front Against Fascism Dimitrov Chapters 1-3
2. Selected Readings of Mao Tse-Tung p.112 On Contradiction
Section 4: "The Principle Contradiction and the Principle Aspect of a Contradiction"
3. Selected Works of Mao Tse-Tung , Volume II p. 213

Study Questions: Selected Readings

1. How does the struggle on two fronts concern Communists in the United Front? pages 124-125
2. What is the relation between unity and independence in United Front? page 117

Study Questions: United Front Against Fascism:

3. What is the United Front's role in the overthrow of capitalism? How Does that apply to the U.S.? p.29

Study Ques.: United Front v. Fascism (continued)

4. What are the three main purposes of a United Front? p. 33,34.
5. What are the relationships between the working class and their leadership and the other classes in the United Front? p. 37,38.
6. What does Dimitrov say about a United Front of all trade Unions? pages 58-63.
7. What is the United Front government? pages 68-76.
8. How does revisionism damage the United Front? pages 84-87
9. What is Dimitrov's definition of fascism? And how does it come to power? pages 7-11
10. What did Dimitrov lay out as a guideline to U.S. workers in the United Front?

Questions:

Selected Works:

11. What is meant by the slogan: "Help and concessions should be positive, not negative? pages 213-214.

Class on NOTES FROM THE GALLOWS by Julius Fuchik

Questions:

1. What could one little slip of the tongue mean?
2. How was Julius Fuchik arrested in the first place?
3. How did the enemy take the offensive to make the people talk (what tricks) and how do we have to take the offensive now in dealing with the enemy?
4. In talking about the newspaper Fuchik said, "That left each of us more exposed individually, but put the whole apparatus in a safer position?"
5. How can we guard against security slips? Why is it an ideological question?
6. Why must the comrades be self reliant and strong, not like Hitek who was weak before the enemy?
7. The party organization had people everywhere, even in the enemy camps. Compare how this relates to our union and other legal work.

Class on: ENVER HOXHA'S SPEECH TO THE 81 COMMUNIST AND WORKERS PARTIES

1. Why does Hoxha speak here of the Soviet Union as the "leader of the socialist camp"?
2. What was the origin of the "third force" or third world Line?
3. What major new factor has emerged in the world situation since this speech? Has imperialism regained the initiative because of this factor?
4. What is peaceful coexistence? What is the line of Lenin on this and how have the revisionists distorted it?
5. What is the correct way to settle differences between parties? What was the strategy of the Soviet revisionist clique against the communist movement during the time of this speech?
6. Why did the PLA have the strength to oppose modern revisionism? For what special reason do they honor Stalin's leadership?
7. What were the dialectics of the Hungarian counter-revolution in 1956? Why did the Soviet revisionists send in troops?
8. Why was the attitude toward Yugoslavia a key issue in the revisionist attacks on H-L? How did it fit in with the attack on Stalin?
9. Why did the revisionist clique have to attack Stalin?
10. Who attacked the unity of the world communist movement and how?
11. What was the historical significance of this speech?

Class on: Anarchism or Socialism, by Stalin

1. Why is dialectics the method and materialism the theory?
2. What is the relation of reality and consciousness?
3. Why is materialism (Marxism) monistic and not dualistic?
4. Why is Marxism scientific socialism?
5. How is each class guided by its own ideology? What is ideology? How does it arise? Where do ideas come from?
6. What is the relationship between quantitative-qualitative evolution-revolution?
7. What is the difference between economic determination and dialectical revolution?
8. Why did Stalin write this book when and under what conditions? What are the main statements coming out of this book?

Class On: FACTORY NUCLEI

Reading Materials:

1. Lenin: On Organization
2. Letter to a Comrade on Our Organizational Tasks
3. Communist International Documents: Extracts on Factory Nuclei: Volume II, pages 291-294; Volume III, pages 141-149, p. 187-190
Extracts on Fractions: Volume II, pages 66-68, 268-271; Volume III, pages 203-208.
4. "The Relationship Between Street Nuclei and Factory Organizations"; League Organizer, May 1974, Vol. 2, #4, p. 5 and Article on page 1. (Comrades should keep in mind when reading the CI Documents that they cannot be applied mechanically to the particular conditions facing us in this period of Party building).

Questions:

1. Why did Lenin place so much emphasis on the factory nuclei and what does it mean that every factory is our fortress?
2. What are factory nuclei and fractions and explain the relationship between the two? Which is the leading body and why?
3. Discuss the strategic role of the factory nuclei in relation to legal and illegal work, United Front Against Fascism.
4. Discuss the implementation of fractional work and factory nuclei in your practical work; i.e. forms of organization, division of labor, forms of struggle.
5. Based on the history of the CL and its development, the international situation, and our building of a party; discuss the significance of our push towards the development of the factory nuclei.

NEGRO NATIONAL COLONIAL QUESTION

CHAPTER I - Slavery

1. a. Compare the patriarchal slave form as developed in Brazil with the latifundist (capitalist) slavery that arose in the Black Belt of the USNA.
- b. Briefly explain slavery under capitalism as described by Marx in this chapter.
2. What were the basic conditions leading to the emergence of the modern Negro Nation?

CHAPTER II - Civil War

1. Why was the aim of the slave oligarchy to re-organize the union and not to destroy it?
2. Why only when the North produced for export and had to compete with other countries was it possible to abolish slavery? Here explain the relationship of slavery to the Northern bourgeois industries.

CHAPTER III - From the Negro bourgeois democratic national movement to the Negro people's liberation movement

1. What are the political and historic conclusions of the October Revolution? How does it relate to the Negro people's movement?
2. What need dictated the period of reconstruction? Here relate answer to quote on pp.19, "War is the extension of politics by other means." What is "Reconstruction"?
3. In what area did the Northern financial capitalists and the Southern planters find common cause with the passage of the 13th amendment? What agreement was formalized with respect to this common cause? Explain the agreement.
4. Explain the ideology of populism and what role populism played during the Reconstruction. How was populism crushed in the emerging Negro Nation?
5. Discuss and explain the conditions for the defeat of Reconstruction.
6. Briefly discuss the split in the Negro movement. How and why were the aims and roles of the Negro national bourgeoisie different from those of the Negro comprador bourgeoisie? Discuss the significance of the church. How does the fascist offensive relate to the development of the split in the Negro movement?
7. Explain the "fundamental difference" between the position of the CPUSA and the CL on the Negro question.
8. Discuss and explain the following quote (pp 38) "There can be no question that the Negro people's liberation movement has opened the gates of the Socialist revolution... The only course for revolutionaries today is to link the struggle of the Negro masses to the difficult task of establishing such a party... That task can be completed only by bringing into existence a M-L conscious expression of the sub-conscious revolutionary process".

CHAPTER IV - National Evolution of the Negro Nation

1. Why is the peasantry so important to a nation?
2. Discuss the migration of Negroes to the Anglo-American nation and the factors that led to these migrations.

NEGRO NATIONAL COLONIAL QUESTION (cont.)

CHAPTER V - Marxism and the National Colonial Question

1. What was the position of the second International on the national question? What was the Leninist (communist) position on the national question?
2. Can a nation emancipate itself from imperialism without overthrowing its own bourgeoisie?
3. Explain the relationship between the working class of the oppressor nation and the oppressed people of a colony

CHAPTER VI - Theoretical Deviations on the Negro National Colonial Question

1. What is chauvinism? White supremacy and white chauvinism? What is the relation of national chauvinism to the class struggle? What is the specific position of Marxist-Leninists towards white chauvinism? When and why did white supremacy emerge in the USNA?
2. How does the development of the French and English capitalists differ from the development of the USNA capitalists?
3. How are national chauvinism and reactionary cultural nationalism different but the same at the same time?
4. Explain the concepts of "freedom of secession" and "freedom of unity" and who should put forward these demands.

CHAPTER VII - Imperialist Oppression of the Negro Nation and the South as a region

1. What is the relationship between the Negro Nation and the South as a region?
2. Who controls the Negro Nation and the South as a region? How?
3. Enumerate some of the areas in which differences exist between the exploitation and oppression of the Negro Nation and the South as a region and explain how this works.
4. Why must the political solution for the Negro Nation differ from the political solution for the South as a whole?

CHAPTER VIII - Negro National Minority in the Anglo-American Nation

1. Why were Negro workers first recruited to go North? Explain. When did the need for these workers become really great?
2. Why do we say that "the special oppression and super-exploitation of the Negro National Minority is an inevitable link in the imperialist chain?" And why does the Negro National Minority "play a key role in completing the encirclement of the USNA imperialism by the fighting colonial masses"? Explain.

CHAPTER IX - Anglo-American Minority in the Negro Nation

1. Why must a Marxist-Leninist not take a stand entirely and exclusively on the national territorial principle?
2. How is the poverty of the proletariat element of the Anglo-American minority a direct result of the colonial position of the Negro people and the Negro Nation?
3. What do the Anglo-American minority and the Negro people of the Negro Nation share in common?
4. Why is the isolation of the Anglo-American minority a necessary condition for the survival of USNA imperialism?

FASCISM

United front Against Fascism by Dimitriov

1. Do we advocate "united front" against fascism today? Under what conditions and with whom?
2. Many Trotskyite groups claim that this speech was the "origin" of modern revisionism. Refute this slander.
3. What are the differences between the revolutionary Union and the October League united front against Imperialism and the line of Dimitriov and the Comintern?
4. What is the united front? Can it be a permanent alliance?
5. How was the united front policy applied correctly in China, Albania, Vietnam? How was it applied incorrectly in the USNA?
6. What is the Key to victory over fascism?
7. What was the role of the Social Democrats? Who plays that role today in the USNA?

FASCISM AND SOCIAL REVOLUTION by Dutt

Chapter on Italy, Germany

1. What are the particulars that led to the rise of fascism in Germany and Italy?
2. What role does (did) Social Democracy play in the rise of fascism? How do the revisionists today play the same role?
3. Why is the fight against revisionism inseparable from the fight against imperialism?
4. Why does fascism come to power as an attack against the rising proletarian revolution?
5. Can an Imperialist state be bourgeois democratic in form at "home" and fascist in its colonies? Where is this so? (Fascism is Imperialism turned inward).

PRINCIPLES OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNISTS by the Stalin Group (USSR)

1. The bourgeoisie has said that Stalin ruled the Soviet Union through the "Cult of the Personality". Refute this claim. Be specific.
2. Explain the humanitarian policies of the opportunists of the CPUSA.
3. Explain: "Further, the break at the weakest link in the capitalist chain also represented a weakness in the Revolution itself".
4. How did Stalin and the Bolshevik Party deal with the counterrevolution in the years 1934 and 1939?
5. Why is collectivization a concrete expression of the fight for socialism?
6. What happened at the 15th party congress?
7. What did Lenin mean when he said that we would have to pay for our ignorance in different ways?
8. What is the difference between red and white terror?
9. What are the roots of bureaucracy? How did Stalin use the bureaucracy to fight the bureaucracy? How do we see bureaucracy?
10. What are the fundamental differences between the Marxist-Leninist and the opportunist on the question of peace?

PRINCIPLES OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNISTS (cont.)

11. What is the law of uneven development of capitalism and how does it relate to the Leninist theory of revolution in a single country?
12. Why wasn't Stalin responsible for the revisionism in the Soviet Union?

STRATEGY AND TACTICS

READING: The Political Strategy and Tactics of the Russian Communists
J.V. Stalin, Works, Vol. 5, pp 63
Concerning the Question of Strategy and Tactics of the Russian Communists (ibid., pp163)

1. What is meant by "The proletarian movement has two sides"? Fully discuss what these two sides are, using concrete examples. Why are the laws of development of capitalism part of the objective side? Why are the spontaneous struggles of the oppressed classes part of the objective side? Why are strategy and tactics limited to the subjective side?
2. Define: Theory, program, strategy, tactics. Explain their differences and how they relate to each other.
3. What is the Marxist program: explain its two parts. What is the difference between the marxist program and the theory of Marxism?
4. Discuss what Stalin meant by forms of struggle. Apply this today.
5. Discuss the forms of organization in the political sphere. How are the forms of organization adapted to the forms of struggle?
6. Discuss historic turns in the development of Russia, China and the USNA
7. What are the differences between propaganda, agitation and action slogans? Can we have action slogans today?
8. Discuss how the "policy of agreements" is different from making individual agreements.
9. Why was the Russian proletarian revolution able to succeed? What was its strength? What were the weaknesses of the European proletarian revolutions?
10. What are the general principles of communist strategy and tactics? Discuss the dialectic of strategy and tactics in our every day political life.
11. Discuss these terms: "Ripeness of the fruit", "choice of the moment", "trial of strength", "calculation of forces", "offensive tactics", "tactics of orderly retreat".

CLASS ON REVISIONISM

Reading Material: Marxism and Revisionism by V.I. Lenin
Differences in the European Labour Movement by V.I. Lenin
Inherent Contradictions of Party Development by J.V. Stalin

1. Where does revisionism come from? Where does it take root?
2. What is the ideological content of revisionism; in philosophy, in political economy, in politics? Does revisionism today maintain this same content? Give Examples.
3. Why does Lenin say the fight against revisionism is inseparable from the fight against imperialism? How can this fight best be waged?
4. What are the two types of struggle that the bourgeoisie advocates? Why does it pass from one method to another?

REVISIONISM (cont.)

5. How did Roosevelt's "New Deal" consisting of welfare and labor law, reforms such as social security, unemployment insurance, legal recognition of labour unions, strengthen the growth of revisionism in the CPUSA and why?
- 6) How does the Party develop and grow? Give examples from your own experience.
7. Where do the contradictions within the Party come from?

CLASS ON FACTIONALISM IN THE PARTY

Reading Material: Speeches on the American Communist Party by J. V. Stalin
Materials for the 10th Congress CPSU(B) by Lenin, Col. Wrks. V. 32, pp. 241-44
Inherent Contradictions of Party Development by Stalin
On the Struggle Against Revisionism by Admiral Kilpatrick (publ. by the C. L.)

1. Discuss the history of factionalism in the CPUSA. Why were both factions wrong in the period Stalin is discussing?
2. What is the difference between Party democracy and factionalism?
3. How does factionalism tend to become an unprinciples struggle for power? How does it tend to prevent principles political struggle?
4. What are the origins of factionalism?
5. What specific steps must we take to combat factionalism?
6. Describe how democratic centralism is a method of struggle against factionalism.
7. What are the evils of factionalism?

Optional reading: Stalin, Collected Works, Vol. 8, pp. 153-154, pp. 366-370;
Vol. 9, pp. 3-13; Vol. 12, pp. 101-113
Vol. 13, pp. 371-83.

CLASS ON THE PARTY PROGRAM

Reading Materials: The Party Program
RSIET Program, Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 6, 1902, pp. 17-77
The Party Program (1918-19) Part IV, Lenin Selected Works pp. 311-69
also scattered throughout Lenin Collected Works, Vols. 26-28
The Comintern Program, Comintern Documents, Vol. 2, pp. 474-513
Critique of the Gotha Program by Marx
Draft and Explanation of a Programme for the Social-Democratic Party, 1895-6, Lenin Collected Works, Vol. 2 or Lenin on the Trade Unions, pp. 30-53.

Background Reading or assigned history report: History of the CPSU(B), Chs.], 2, 7, & 8.

1. What is a party program? Why do we need one?
2. Why don't we need a maximum and minimum program?
3. What does it mean to say that the united front against fascism is the bridge to proletarian revolution in the USNA?
4. How is it that here in the USNA the bourgeoisie and proletariat confront each other as in no other country?
5. What is the purpose of the specific demands of the program?
6. What accounts for the differences between different party programs, i. e. Communist Manifesto, Comintern Program, etc.
7. Discuss the "form" and "style" of the Programme and why it's important. How is the Program different in this respect from an agitational piece, polemical, leaflet, etc.?

PRINCIPLES OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNISTS (cont.)

11. What is the law of uneven development of capitalism and how does it relate to the Leninist theory of revolution in a single country?
12. Why wasn't Stalin responsible for the revisionism in the Soviet Union?

STRATEGY AND TACTICS

READING: The Political Strategy and Tactics of the Russian Communists
J.V. Stalin, Works, Vol. 5, pp 63
Concerning the Question of Strategy and Tactics of the Russian Communists (ibid., pp163)

1. What is meant by "The proletarian movement has two sides"? Fully discuss what these two sides are, using concrete examples. Why are the laws of development of capitalism part of the objective side? Why are the spontaneous struggles of the oppressed classes part of the objective side? Why are strategy and tactics limited to the subjective side?
2. Define: Theory, program, strategy, tactics. Explain their differences and how they relate to each other.
3. What is the Marxist program: explain its two parts. What is the difference between the marxist program and the theory of Marxism?
4. Discuss what Stalin meant by forms of struggle. Apply this today.
5. Discuss the forms of organization in the political sphere. How are the forms of organization adapted to the forms of struggle?
6. Discuss historic turns in the development of Russia, China and the USNA
7. What are the differences between propaganda, agitation and action slogans? Can we have action slogans today?
8. Discuss how the "policy of agreements" is different from making individual agreements.
9. Why was the Russian proletarian revolution able to succeed? What was its strength? What were the weaknesses of the European proletarian revolutions?
10. What are the general principles of communist strategy and tactics? Discuss the dialectic of strategy and tactics in our every day political life.
11. Discuss these terms: "Ripeness of the fruit", "choice of the moment", "trial of strength", "calculation of forces", "offensive tactics", "tactics of orderly retreat".

CLASS ON REVISIONISM

Reading Material: Marxism and Revisionism by V.I. Lenin
Differences in the European Labour Movement by V.I. Lenin
Inherent Contradictions of Party Development by J.V. Stalin

1. Where does revisionism come from? Where does it take root?
2. What is the ideological content of revisionism; in philosophy, in political economy, in politics? Does revisionism today maintain this same content? Give Examples.
3. Why does Lenin say the fight against revisionism is inseparable from the fight against imperialism? How can this fight best be waged?
4. What are the two types of struggle that the bourgeoisie advocates? Why does it pass from one method to another?

CLASS ON INNER-PARTY STRUGGLE

- Reading Materials: "Self-Criticism" by Stalin, Vol. 11, pp. 31-42
Engels Letter to Mehring, July 14, 1893, # 249 Selected Correspondence pp. 458-62
"8 Points of Criticism and Self-Criticism" from C. L. Party School report on Party of a New Type, pp. 7-8.
"Ideologies in the Working Class Hostile to Communism", Comintern Documents, Vol. 2, 1928, pp. 513-519.
What is to be Done?, Chap. 1, Sec. A "Freedom of Criticism" by Lenin
Foundations of Leninism, Chapter 8, Sec. 6 by Stalin.
Political Agitation and the "Class Point-of-View" by Lenin, in Iskra Period Vol. 4, Book 2, pp. 82-89.
"Memo from the Political Bureau," League Organizer (of the C. L.) V. 2, #2,

1. What is ideology? What is ideological struggle? What is an ideological campaign?
2. How is inner-party struggle based on the tasks of the party?
3. What different tactics are there in the struggle against alien ideology in the party and when and how should each be used?
4. What is the role of propaganda and education in inner party struggle?
5. What is the goal of inner-party struggle?
6. What distinguished inner-party struggle from moral improvement campaigns?
7. How is the class struggle expressed in the party?
8. What is criticism and self-criticism?
9. What are correct and incorrect methods of handling an error in the party?

POLITICAL & ORGANIZATIONAL ASPECTS OF DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM

- Reading Material: On Organisation by Stalin
Democratic Centralism by Nelson P. in Proletariat, Vol. 2, No. 2
Letter to A Comrade by Lenin
Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership by Mao Tsetung

1. How is the program and the principles of the Communist Party arrived at? Why must we stick closely to them?
2. What is the role of organization in the Party? What is the relationship between political line and organization?
3. Why do we set up a division of labor in our collectives? How does that relate to democratic-centralism?
4. What is the relationship between internal and external leaders? Why is it, that without an up-and-down motion of criticism and self-criticism, reports and check-up, can the party become either ultra-democratic or bureaucratic?
5. What is the role of criticism and self-criticism in a political party? How does the party's attitude toward it demote its seriousness?
6. What is the relationship of the part to the whole in party work? Which is dominant and why? Can we do without one or the other?

- Reading Material: Problems of Leninism by Stalin, Section V.
"Left-Wing" Communism, by Lenin, Chapter II.

1. How is the discipline of the party of the proletariat maintained?

POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL ASPECTS OF DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM (cont.)

2. What is the vanguard of the proletariat and what are the tasks of the communist party in relationship to the vanguard?
3. Wherein lies the strength needed for centralism in the party?
4. Why is democratic-centralism necessary for the consolidation of the class and the party?

CLASS ON CLASS STRUGGLE

Reading Material: Our Urgent Tasks by Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 4, pp. 215-220.
Letter of Marx to F. Bolte, Selected Correspondence, #14, pp. 326-29
and Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. 2, p. 422.
Draft and Explanation of a Programme for the Social -Democratic Party
1895-6, Lenin Collected Works, Vol. 2 or Lenin on the Trade Unions,
pp. 30 - 53.
On Strikes by Lenin in Lenin on the Trade Unions, pp. 54 -67.
Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels, Chapter 1, Bourgeoisie and
Proletariat,
What is to be Done by Lenin, Chapter 3.

- 1) What is the role of socialist consciousness and the communist party in the development of the class struggle, of the economic and political movement of the working class?
- 2.) Discuss the role of strikes in the proletarian class struggle. Give concrete examples.
- 3.) What does proletarian education of the working class mean? How do we carry this out today?
- 4.) What does Marx mean by "Every class struggle is a political struggle."?
- 5.) Practically, how do we combine socialist consciousness with the spontaneous working class movement, taking into account the level of consciousness of the proletariat today? Give current examples from fractional work etc. Discuss also in relation to the Party style of work, fractional work, etc.
- 6.) How can the deviations of economism express themselves in fractional work and how do we combat them. Give concrete examples.

CLASS ON PARTY WORK IN THE MASSES

Reading Material: Party Work in the Masses by Lenin, Progress Publishers, 1969.

- 1.) What are the consequences of failing to bring socialist ideology to the working class? How can we win the vanguard of the proletariat to the cause of communism?
- 2.) How can we combine the immediate struggles of the class today with the overall aim of proletarian revolution? How should the factory nuclei conduct propaganda and agitation in the work-place? How can the nuclei work within the trade union? Within other mass organizations such as within the Negro peoples' liberation movement or the movement for equal rights for women?
- 3.) Why is parliamentary work important? How is it carried out?
- 4.) What should be the Party's attitude toward the labor aristocracy before and after the seizure of state power?
- 5.) How do the deviations of sectarianism and economism show themselves in mass work and how can they be combatted?

READING MATERIAL FOR CLASS ON CLASS STRUGGLE

Letter from Marx to Bolte, Selected Correspondence, #14 pp. 326-29

...N.B. as to political movement: The political movement of the working class has as its object, of course, the conquest of political power for the working class, and for this it is naturally necessary that a previous organisation of the working class, itself arising from their economic struggles, should have been developed up to a certain point.

On the other hand, however, every movement in which the working class comes out as a class against the ruling classes and attempts to force them by pressure from without is a political movement. For instance, the attempt in a particular factory or even a particular industry to force a shorter working day out of the capitalists by strikes, etc., is a purely economic movement. On the other hand the movement to force an eight-hour day, etc., law is a political movement. And in this way, out of the separate economic movements of the workers there grows up everywhere a political movement, that is to say a movement of the class, with the object of achieving its interests in a general form, in a form possessing a general social force of compulsion. If these movements presuppose a certain degree of previous organization, they are themselves equally a means of the development of this organization.

Where the working class is not yet far enough advanced in its organization to undertake a decisive campaign against the collective power, i. e., the political power of the ruling classes, it must at any rate be trained for this by continual agitation against and a hostile attitude towards the policy of the ruling classes. Otherwise it will remain a plaything in their hands, as the September revolution in France showed, and as is also proved up to a certain point by the game Messrs. Gladstone & Co. are bringing off in England even up to the present time.

CLASS ON THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

Reading Material: In Volume X of Lenin, Selected Works

- 1) All of Section 2 except "Left-wing" Communism
- (optional) 2) Sections on the National Question and the Agrarian Question, 3 articles

- 1.) What was the political basis for unity and division that created the third international? What is ours?
- 2.) Why did Lenin struggle to keep out the conciliators? How can we today in building the Party?
- 3.) What was the main and most dangerous deviation at this period? What is it today? How did Lenin struggle against both? Show how the Italian question and the IWW question illustrate this?
- 4.) What conditions will we set for membership in the party? Why was it so necessary to set strict conditions for admission to the 3rd International?

CLASS ON PROLETARIAN MORALITY (Article in Proletaria) and Rights of women and children by Enver Hoxha

1. What is morality? How does proletarian morality differ from bourgeois morality?
2. How is morality affected by time, place and condition?
3. Why does saying that there are no differences between men and women exclude the possibility of equality?
4. How will love and sex love change after socialism and during communism?
5. Discuss and explain: "Communists are people of a special mold".
6. Explain how freedom and necessity are an integral part of the question of proletarian morality.
7. Discuss the bourgeoisie's distortion of proletarian morality to refer only to sex relations. What is the relationship between personal and political life?

MARXISM AND REVISIONISM

There is a saying that if geometrical axioms affected human interests attempts would certainly be made to refute them. Theories of the natural sciences which conflict with the old prejudices of theology provoked, and still provoke, the most rabid opposition. No wonder, therefore that the Marxian doctrine, which directly serves to enlighten and organize the advanced class in modern society, which indicated the tasks of this class and which proves the inevitable (by virtue of economic development) replacement of the present system by a new order - no wonder that this doctrine had to fight at every step in its course.

There is no need to speak of bourgeois science and philosophy, which are officially taught by official professors in order to befuddle the rising generation of the possessing classes and to "coach" it against the internal and foreign enemy. This science will not even hear of Marxism, declaring that it has been refuted and annihilated. The young scientists who are building their careers by refuting Socialism; and the decrepit elders who preserve the traditions of all the various outworn "systems", attack Marx with equal zeal. The progress of Marxism and the fact that its ideas are spreading and taking firm hold among the working class inevitably tend to increase the frequency and intensity of these bourgeois attacks on Marxism, which only becomes stronger, more hardened, and more tenacious every time it is "annihilated" by official science.

But Marxism by no means consolidated its position immediately even among doctrines which are connected with the struggle of the working class and which are current mainly among the proletariat. In the first half-century of its existence, (from the forties on) Marxism was engaged in combating theories fundamentally hostile to it. In the first half of the forties Marx and Engels demolished the radical Young Hegelians, who professed philosophical idealism. At the end of the forties the struggle invaded the domain of economic doctrine, in opposition to Proudhonism. The 'fifties saw the completion of this struggle: the criticism of the parties and doctrines which manifested themselves in the stormy year 1848. In the sixties the struggle was transferred from the domain of general theory to a domain closer to the direct labour movement: the ejection of Bakunism from the International. In the early 'seventies the stage in Germany was occupied by a short while by the Proudhonist Muhlberger and in the latter 'seventies by the positivist Dühring. But the influence of both on the proletariat was already absolutely insignificant. Marxism was already gaining an unquestionable victory over all other ideologies in the labour movement.

By the 'nineties this victory was in the main completed. Even in the Latin countries where traditions of Proudhonism held their ground longest of all, the labour parties actually based their programmes and tactics on a Marxist foundation. The revived international organization of the labour movement - in the shape of periodical international congresses - from the outset, and almost without a struggle, adopted

the Marxist standpoint in all essentials. But after Marxism had ousted all the more or less consistent doctrines hostile to it, the tendencies expressed in those doctrines began to seek other channels. The forms and motives of the struggle changed, but the struggle continued. And the second half-century in the existence of Marxism began (in the nineties) with the struggle of a trend hostile to Marxism within Marxism.

Bernstein, a one-time orthodox Marxist, gave his name to this current by making the most noise and advancing the most consistent expression of the amendments to Marx, the revisionism of Marx, revisionism. Even in Russia, where, owing to the economic backwardness of the country and the preponderance of a peasant population oppressed by the relics of serfdom, non-Marxist Socialism has naturally held its ground longest of all, it is plainly passing into revisionism before our very eyes. Both in the agrarian question (the programs of the municipalization of all land) and in general questions of program and tactics, our social-Narodniks are more and more substituting "amendments" to Marx for the moribund and obsolescent remnants of the old system, which in its own way was consistent and fundamentally hostile to Marxism.

Pre-Marxist Socialism has been smashed. It is now continuing the struggle, not on its own independent soil, but on the general soil of Marxism -- as revisionism. Let us, then, examine the ideological content of revisionism.

In the domain of philosophy, revisionism clung to the shirts of bourgeois professorial "science." The professors went "back to Kant" -- and revisionism followed in the wake of the Neo-Kantians. The professors repeated the threadbare banalities of the priests against philosophical materialism -- and the revisionists smiling condescendingly, mumbled (word for word after the latest HANDBUCH) that materialism had been "refuted" long ago. The professors treated Hegel as a "dead dog," and while they themselves preached idealism, only an idealism a thousand times more petty and banal than Hegel's, they contemptuously shrugged their shoulders at dialectics -- and the revisionists floundered after them into the swamp of philosophical vulgarisation of science, replacing "artful" (and revolutionary) dialectics by "simple" (and tranquil) "evolution." The professors earned their official salaries by adjusting both their idealist and "critical" systems to the dominant medieval "philosophy" (i. e. to theology) -- and the revisionists drew close to them and endeavored to make religion a "private affair," not in relation to the modern state, but in relation to the party of the advanced class.

What the real class significance of such "amendments" to Marx was, need not be said -- it is clear enough. We shall simply note that the only Marxist in the international Social-Democratic movement who criticized from the standpoint of consistent dialectical-materialism the incredible banalities uttered by the revisionists was Plekhanov. This must be stressed all the more emphatically since thoroughly mistaken attempts are being made in our day to smuggle in the old and reactionary philosophical rubbish under the

guise of criticising Plekhanov's tactical opportunism*

Passing to political economy, it must be noted first of all that the "amendments" of the revisionists in this domain were much more comprehensive and circumstantial; attempts were made to influence the public by adducing "new data of economic development." It was said that concentration and the culling of small-scale production by large-scale production do not occur in agriculture at all, while concentration proceeds extremely slowly in commerce and industry. It was said that crises had now become rarer and of less force, and that the cartels and trusts would probably enable capital to do away with crises altogether. It was said that the theory of the collapse to which capitalism is heading, was unsound, owing to the tendency of class contradictions to become less acute and milder. It was said, finally, that it would not be amiss to correct Marx's theory of value in accordance with Bohm-bawerk.

The fight against the revisionists on these questions resulted in as fruitful a revival of the theoretical thought of international Socialism as followed from Engels' controversy with Dühring twenty years earlier. The arguments of the revisionist were analysed with the help of facts and figures. It was proved that the revisionists were systematically presenting modern small scale production in a favourable light. The technical and commercial superiority of large scale production over small scale production both in industry and in agriculture are proved by irrefutable facts. But commodity production is far less developed in agriculture, and modern statisticians and economists are usually not very skillful in picking out the special branches (sometimes even operations) in agriculture which indicate that agriculture is being progressively drawn into the exchange of world economy. Small-scale production maintains itself on the ruins of natural economy by a steady deterioration in nourishment, by chronic starvation, by the lengthening of the working day, by the deterioration in the quality of cattle and in the care given to cattle, in a word, by the very methods whereby handicraft production maintained itself against capitalist manufacture. Every advance in science and technology inevitably and relentlessly undermines the foundations of small-scale production

*See Studies in the Philosophy of Marxism by Bogdanov, Bazarov and others. This is not the place to discuss this book, and I must at present confine myself to stating that in the very near future I shall show in a series of articles or in a separate pamphlet that everything I have said in the text about the Neo-Kantian revisionists essentially applies also to these "new" Neo-Humanist and Neo-Berkeleyan revisionists. (See V.I. Lenin, MATERIALISM AND EMPIRIO-KRITICISM. In 1903, Lenin parted ways with Plekhanov who was taking the road of opportunist Menshevism. During the 1905 Revolution in Russia, Plekhanov opposed the Bolshevik position on the character and driving forces of the revolution. At the time of the first

in capitalist society, and it is the task of Socialist economics to investigate this process in all its -- often complicated and intricate -- forms and to demonstrate to the small producer the impossibility of holding his own under capitalism, the hopelessness of peasant farming under capitalism, and the necessity of the peasant adopting the standpoint of the proletariat. On this question the revisionist sinned from the scientific standpoint by superficially generalising from facts selected one-sidedly and without reference to the system of capitalism as a whole; they sinned from the political standpoint by the fact that they inevitably, whether they wanted to or not, invited or urged the peasant to adopt the standpoint of the master (i. e., the standpoint of the bourgeoisie), instead of urging him to adopt the standpoint of the revolutionary proletariat.

The position of revisionism was even worse as far as the theory of crises and the theory of collapse were concerned. Only for the shortest space of time could people, and then only the most shortsighted think of remodelling the foundations of the Marxist doctrine under the influence of a few years of industrial boom and prosperity. Facts very soon made it clear to the revisionists that crises were not a thing of the past; prosperity was followed by a crisis. The forms, the sequence, the picture of the particular crises changed, but crisis remained an inevitable component of the capitalist system. While united production, the cartels and trusts at the same time, and in a way that was obvious to all, aggravated the anarchy of production, the insecurity of existence of the proletariat and the oppression of capital, thus intensifying class contradictions to an unprecedented degree. That capitalism is moving towards collapse - in the sense both of individual political and economic crisis and of the complete wreck of the entire capitalist system - has been made very clear, and on a very broad scale, precisely by the latest giant trusts. The recent financial crisis in America and the frightful increase of unemployment all over Europe, to say nothing of the impending industrial crisis to which many symptoms are pointing - all this is resulting in the fact that the recent "theories" of the revisionists are being forgotten by everybody, even, even, it seems, by many of the revisionists themselves. But the lessons which this instability of the intellectuals has given the working class must not be forgotten.

As to the theory of value, it should only be said that apart from hints and sighs, exceedingly vague, for Bohm-Bawerk, the revisionists have contributed absolutely nothing, and have therefore left no traces whatever on the development of scientific thought.

footnote (continued from page 3)

imperialist war of 1914-18 he supported the Czarist aims in the war, and opposed the October Revolution of 1917. Plekhanov died in 1918 - Ed.

In the domain of politics, revisionism tried to revise the very foundation of Marxism, namely, the doctrine of the class struggle. Political freedom, democracy and universal suffrage remove the ground for the class struggle we were told and render untrue the old proposition of the COMMUNIST MANIFESTO: that the workers have no country. For, they said, since the "will of the majority" prevails under democracy, one must neither regard the state as an organ of class rule, nor reject alliances with the progressive, social-reformist bourgeoisie against the reactionaries.

It cannot be disputed that these objections of the revisionists constituted a fairly harmonious system of views, namely, the old and well known liberal bourgeois views. The liberals have always said that bourgeois parliamentarism destroys classes and class divisions since the right to vote and the right to participate in state affairs are shared by all citizens without distinction. The whole history of Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century and the whole history of the Russian revolution at the beginning of the twentieth, clearly show how absurd such views are. Economic distinctions are aggravated and accentuated rather than mitigated under the freedom of "democratic" capitalism. Parliamentarism does not remove, but rather lays bare the innate character even of the most democratic bourgeois republics as organs of class oppression. By helping to enlighten and to organize immeasurably wider masses of the population than those which previously took an active part in political events, parliamentarism does not make for the elimination of crises and political revolutions, but for the maximum accentuation of civil war during such revolutions. The events in Paris in the spring of 1871 and the events in Russia in the winter of 1905 showed as clear as could be how inevitably this accentuation comes about. The French bourgeoisie without a moment's hesitation made a deal with the common national enemy, the foreign army which had ruined its fatherland, in order to crush the proletarian movement. Whoever does not understand the inevitable inner dialectics of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy which tends to an even more acute decision of dispute by mass violence than formerly will never be able through parliamentarism to "conduct propaganda and agitation" that are consistent in principle and really prepare the working class masses to take a victorious part in such "disputes". The experience of alliances, agreements and blocs with the social-reformist liberals in the West and with the liberal reformists (Constitutional Democrats) in the Russian revolution convincingly showed that these agreements only blunt the consciousness of the masses, that they weaken rather than enhance the actual significance of their struggle by linking the fighters with the elements who are least capable of fighting and who are most vacillating and treacherous. The French Millerandism—the biggest experiment in applying revisionist political tactics on a wide, a really national scale—has provided a practical judgment of revisionism which will never be forgotten by the proletariat all over the world.

A natural complement to the economic and political tendencies of revisionism was its attitude to the final aim of the Socialist movement. "The final aim is nothing, the movement is everything" - this catch-phrase of Bernstein's expresses the substance of revisionism better than many long arguments. The policy of revisionism consists in determining its conduct from case to case, in adapting itself to the events of the day and to the chops and changes of petty politics; it consists in forgetting the basic interests of the proletariat, the main features of the capitalist system as a whole and of capitalist evolution as a whole and in sacrificing these basic interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment. And it patently follows from the very nature of this policy that it may assume an infinite variety of forms, and that every more or less "new" question, every more or less unexpected and unforeseen turn of events, even though it may change the basic line of development only to an insignificant degree and only for the shortest period of time, will always inevitably give rise to one or another variety of revisionism.

The inevitability of revisionism is determined by its class roots in modern society. Revisionism is an international phenomenon. No more or less informed and thinking Socialist can have the slightest doubt that the relation between the orthodox and the Bernsteinites in Germany, the Guesdites and the Jauresites (and now particularly the Broussites) in France, the Social-Democratic Federation and the Independent Labour Party in Great Britain, de Brouckere and Vandervelde in Belgium, the integralists and the reformists in Italy, and the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks in Russia is everywhere essentially similar, notwithstanding the gigantic variety of national and historically derived conditions in the present state of all these countries. In reality, the "division" within the present international Socialist movement is now proceeding along one line in all the various countries of the world, which testifies to a tremendous advance compared with thirty or forty years ago, when it was not like tendencies within a united international Socialist movement that were combatting one another within the various countries. And the "revisionism from the Left" which has begun to take shape in the Latin countries, such as "revolutionary syndicalism," is also adapting itself to Marxism while "amending" it; Labriola in Italy and Lagardelle in France frequently appear from Marx wrongly understood to Marx rightly understood.

We cannot stop here to analyse the ideological substance of this revisionism; it has not yet by far developed to the extent that opportunist revisionism has, it has not yet become international, and it has not yet stood the test of one big practical battle with a Socialist Party even in one country. We shall therefore confine ourselves to the "revisionism from the Right" described above.

Wherein lies its inevitability in capitalist society? Why is it more profound than the differences of national peculiarities and degrees of capitalist development? Because in every capitalist country, side by side with the proletariat, there are broad strata

of the petty bourgeoisie, small masters. Capitalism arose and it is constantly arising out of small production. A number of "middle strata" are inevitably created anew by capitalism (appendages to the factory, home work, and small workshops scattered all over the country in view of the requirements of big industries, such as the bicycle and automobile industries, etc.) These new small producers are just as inevitably cast back into the ranks of the proletariat. It is quite natural that the petty-bourgeois world conception should again and again crop up in the ranks of the broad labour parties. It is quite natural that this should be so, and it always will be so right up to the commencement of the proletarian revolution, for it would be a grave mistake to think that the "complete" proletarianisation of the majority of the population is essential before such a revolution can be achieved. What we now frequently experience only in the domain of ideology-disputes over theoretical amendments to Marx-what now crops up in practice only over individual partial issues of the labour movement as tactical differences with the revisionists and splits on these grounds, will all unfailingly have to be experienced by the working class on an incomparably larger scale when the proletarian revolution accentuates all issues and concentrates all differences on points of the most immediate importance in determining the conduct of the masses, and makes it necessary in the heat of the fight to distinguish enemies from friends and to cast out bad allies, so as to be able to deal decisive blows at the enemy.

The ideological struggle waged by revolutionary Marxism against revisionism at the end of the nineteenth century is but the prelude to the great revolutionary battles of the proletariat

which is marching forward to the complete victory of its cause despite all the waverings and weaknesses of the petty bourgeoisie.

April 1908

V.I. Lenin, MARK, ENGELES, MARKIS: pp 71-79

II. DIFFERENCES IN THE EUROPEAN LABOUR MOVEMENT

The main tactical differences in the modern labour movement in Europe and America may be summed up as the struggle with two main tendencies which depart from Marxism, from the theory that has actually become dominating in this movement. These two tendencies are revisionism (opportunism and reformism) and anarchism (anarcho-syndicalism and anarcho-socialism). Both these deviations from the Marxist theory and tactics which dominate the labour movement are to be observed in various forms and various shades in all civilised countries throughout the history of the mass labour movement of over half a century.

This fact alone makes it clear that these deviations cannot be explained either by accidents, or errors on the part of individuals or groups, or even by the influence of national peculiarities or traditions, etc. There must be some fundamental causes within the economic system itself and in the character of the development of all capitalist countries which constantly breed these deviations. The little book by the Dutch Marxist, Anton Pannekoek, The Tactical Differences in the Labour Movement, published last year, represents an interesting attempt to explain these causes. We will, in our further exposition, acquaint the reader with the conclusions of Pannekoek, which one cannot help recognising as quite correct.

One of the deeper causes which give rise to the periodical differences in regard to tactics is the very fact of the growth of the labour movement. If this movement be measured not by the standard of some fantastic ideal, but considered as a practical movement of ordinary people, it will become clear that the continued enrollment of fresh "recruits" and the drawing in of new sections of the toiling masses must inevitably be accompanied by hesitations in theory and tactics, by the repetition of old mistakes and by the temporary return to obsolete views and methods, etc. The labour movement of every country periodically spends more or less of its reserves of energy and attention and time on the "training" of recruits.

Further. The pace of development of capitalism is not the same in various countries and different spheres of national economy. Marxism is more easily, more quickly, more fully and firmly mastered by the working class and its ideologists in conditions of the greatest development of big industry. Economic relations which are backward or fall behind in their development constantly lead to the appearance of adherents of the labour movement who master only certain aspects of Marxism, only separate sections of the new world outlook, only separate slogans and demands, being incapable of breaking decisively with all the traditions of the bourgeois outlook in general and the bourgeois-democratic world outlook in particular.

Then, a constant source of differences is provided by the dialectic nature of social development which proceeds in contradictions. Capitalism is progressive since it destroys the old methods of production and develops the productive forces at the same time, at a certain stage of development, it delays the growth of these productive forces. It develops, organises and disciplines the workers; and it presses, oppresses, leads to degeneration, poverty, etc. Capitalism itself creates its own gravediggers, itself creates the elements of the new system and, at the same time, these elements, without a "leap", can change nothing in the general condition of things, cannot touch the domination of capital. Marxism, as a theory of dialectical materialism, is capable of embracing these contradictions of actual life, of the history of capitalism and the labour movement. But it is self-evident that the masses learn from life, and not from books, and consequently individuals and groups constantly exaggerate and raise to a one-sided theory and one-sided system of tactics now one, now another feature of capitalist development, now one, now another "lesson" of this development.

Bourgeois ideologists, liberals and democrats, who do not understand Marxism and the modern labor movement, are constantly jumping from one helpless extreme to another. Now they explain that it is all because wicked persons "incite" class against class, and now they console themselves that the workers' party is a "peaceful party of reform." Both anarcho-syndicalism and reformism must be considered as the direct product of this bourgeois world outlook and influence. They both seize upon on side of the labor movement, raise this one sidedness to a theory and declare as mutually exclusive such tendencies or features of the labor movement as form the specific peculiarity of one or another period, of one or another of the conditions of activity of the working class. But real life and real history include in themselves these various tendencies, just as life and development in nature include in themselves both slow evolution and rapid leaps, breaks in gradualness.

The revisionist consider as phrases, all arguments about "leaps" and about principles underlying the antagonism of the labor movement to the old society. They accept reforms as a partial realization of socialism. The anarcho-syndicalists rejects "petty work," particularly the utilization of the parliamentary tribune. In practice these latter tactics amount to waiting for "big days" and exhibit an inability to gather the forces for creating big events. Both the revisionists and anarcho-syndicalists hinder the most urgent business of uniting the workers in big, strong and well-functioning organisations, capable of functioning well under all circumstances, imbued with the spirit of the class struggle, clearly recognizing their aims and trained in the real Marxian world outlook.

Here we will permit ourselves a small digression and remark, in parentheses, to avoid possible misunderstanding, that Pannkoek illustrates his analysis exclusively by examples from West European history, particularly from Germany and France, and has absolutely not had Russia in view. If it sometimes appears that he hints at Russia, this is simply due to the fact that the fundamental tendencies which give rise to definite deviations from Marxist tactics, also manifest themselves with us, notwithstanding the enormous distinction between Russia and the West, in point of culture, modes of life, and historical and economic differences.

Finally, an exceedingly important cause giving rise to differences between members of the labor movement is the changes in the tactics of the ruling classes in general and of the bourgeoisie in particular. If the tactics of the bourgeoisie were always uniform or atleast homogeneous, the working class would have quickly learned to reply by equally uniform or homogeneous tactics. The bourgeoisie in all countries in practice inevitably elaborates two systems of governing, two methods of struggle for its interests and for defence of its domination, and these two methods now replace one another and now interlace in different combinations. These are, first, the method of violence, the method of refusing all concessions to the labor movement, the method of supporting all ancient and dying institutions, the method of uncompromising rejection of reforms. Such is the substance of the conservative policy. The second method is the method of "liberalism", of steps towards the the development of political rights, of reforms, of concessions, etc.

The bourgeoisie passes from one method to another not through the malicious design of individuals and not by accident, but by force of the basic contradictoriness of its own position. A normal capitalist society cannot successfully develop without a stabilized representative system, without certain political rights being granted to the population, which is necessarily distinguished by the comparatively high claims it presents with regard to "culture." This demand for a certain minimum of culture arises from the very conditions of the capitalist mode of production with its high technique, complexity, flexibility, mobility, rapidity of development or world competition, etc. In consequence of this, fluctuations in the tactics of the bourgeoisie and transitions from the system of violence to the system of would-be concessions are peculiar to the history of all European countries for the last half century, and various countries mainly develop the application of one or another method at definite periods. For instance, England in the sixties and seventies of the nineteenth century was the classical country of "liberal"

bourgeois policy, Germany in the seventies and eighties kept to the method of force, etc.

When this method ruled in Germany, a one-sided echo of this system of bourgeois government was the growth in the labor movement of anarcho-syndicalism, or, as it was then called, anarchism (the "Young" in the beginning of the nineties, and Johann Most in the beginning of the eighties). When a turn towards "concession" took place in 1890, this turn proved, as it always has done, even more dangerous for the labor movement, since it gave rise to an equally one-sided echo of bourgeois reformism: opportunism in the labor movement.

"The positive aim of the liberal progressive policy of the bourgeoisie," says Pannekoek, "is to mislead the workers, to introduce a split in the ranks, to transform their politics into an impotent appendage of an impotent, always impotent and ephemeral, would be reformism."

The bourgeoisie, not infrequently, attains its object, for a certain time, by means of a "liberal" policy which represents, according to the just remark of Pannekoek, a "more cunning" policy. A part of the workers and a part of their leaders allow themselves to be deceived by seeming concessions. The revisionists proclaim an "obsolete" the doctrine of the class struggle, or begin to carry on a policy which in fact renounces it. The zigzags of bourgeois tactics cause a strengthening of revisionism in the labor movement and not infrequently lead to differences within it to the point of a split.

All the causes of the kind indicated evoke differences in relation to the tactics within the labor movement and in the proletarian ranks. But there is not and there cannot be a Chinese wall between the proletariat and the adjacent sections of the petty bourgeoisie, including peasantry. It is clear that the transition of individuals, groups, and sections of the petty bourgeoisie to the proletariat cannot but give rise, in its turn, to vacillation in the tactics of the latter.

The experience of the labor movement of various countries helps to elucidate the essence of Marxist tactics on concrete practical questions, and helps the younger countries to distinguish more clearly the true class significance of deviations from Marxism and more successfully to fight them.

INHERENT CONTRADICTIONS OF PARTY DEVELOPMENT

I

First, the question of the struggle inside our Party. The struggle did not commence yesterday, nor has it ended yet. If we take the history of our Party from the time it came into being as a group of Bolsheviks in the year 1903, and if we examine its latest stages right up to the present time, then it can be stated without any exaggeration that the history of our Party is the history of the struggle of contradictions within this Party, a history of the overcoming of these contradictions and of the gradual consolidation of our Party on the basis of overcoming these contradictions. It may be said that the Russians are too quarrelsome, that they love polemics, that they create differences and for that reason the development of the Russian Party is a process of overcoming internal Party antagonisms. This would not be true, comrades. This is not a matter of being quarrelsome; it's a matter of differences over principles, arising in the process of the development of the Party and the process of the struggle of the proletariat.

It means that antagonisms can only be overcome by the struggle for this or that principle, for this or that fighting aim, for this or that method of struggle which leads to the goal. One can and must enter into every kind of compromise with those of a like mind within the Party on questions of current politics, on questions of a purely practical nature. But when these questions are bound up with differences of opinion involving principles, then no compromise, no "middle" line in question involving principles. Either the one or the other principle must be made the basis of the work of the Party. A "middle" line on questions involving principles is a "line" which leads to confusion of mind, a line which glosses over differences, a line of ideological degeneration of the Party, a line of ideological death of the Party.

How do the Social-Democratic parties in the West live and develop? Are there any internal contradictions and differences over principles in those parties? Of course there are. Do they expose these contradictions and try to overcome them honestly and frankly before the eyes of the masses of the party? No, of course they do not. It is the practice of the Social-Democrats to conceal these antagonisms; it is the practice of the Social-Democrats to convert their conferences and congresses into masquerades, into official parades intended to show that all is well within the party; every effort is made to conceal and gloss over the differences within the party. But nothing but confusion and the intellectual impoverishment of the party can result from such practices. This is one of the causes of the decline of Western European Social-Democracy, which at one time was revolutionary, but is now reformist.

We, however, cannot live and develop in this way. The policy of finding a "middle course" on questions of principle is not our policy. The policy of finding a "middle course" on questions of principle is the policy of declining and degenerating parties. Such a policy cannot but result in the Party becoming a mere bureaucratic apparatus beating the air, and detached from the masses. This path is not our path.

The whole history of our Party confirms the postulate that the history of our Party is the history of overcoming internal Party differences and the steady consolidation of the ranks of our Party on the basis of overcoming these contradictions....

It follows that the fight to overcome internal Party differences is the law of development of our Party.

It may be said that this is the law for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and not for other proletarian parties. This would not be true. This law is the law of development of all parties of any considerable size, irrespective of whether they are the proletarian party of the U.S.S.R. or the parties of the West. While in small parties in small countries it may be possible to gloss over differences, to cover them up by the authority of one or several persons, it is impossible to do so in a large party with diversified districts. In such parties development by overcoming contradictions is an inevitable element of growth and consolidation of the party. This is how development proceeded in the past, this is how it proceeds at the present day.

I would like here to call in the authority of Engels, who in conjunction with Marx, guided the proletarian parties in the West through several decades. I refer to the eighties of the last century, when the anti-Socialist laws were in operation in Germany, when Marx and Engels were in exile in London, and when the Social-Democratic organ, *The Social-Democrat*, was published illegally abroad and really guided the work of German Social-Democracy. Bernstein at that time was still a revolutionary Marxist (he had not yet gone over to reformism). Engels kept up a lively correspondence with Bernstein on current questions of Social-Democratic policy. This is what he wrote to Bernstein in 1882:

Apparently, all labor parties in big countries can develop only in the process of internal struggle, in complete accordance with the laws of dialectical development. The German Party became what it is in the struggle between the Eisenachers and the Lassalleans, in which the very friction played the principal role. Unity became possible only when the ruffraff, deliberately fostered by Lassalle as instruments in the struggle, became worn out, and here too it was brought about with too great haste on our part.

In France, those who, while having sacrificed their Bakuninist theories, continue to employ Bakuninist methods of fighting, and at the same time desire to sacrifice the class character of the movement to their social aims must also become worn out before unity will again become possible. To advocate unity under such conditions would be sheer stupidity. Moralising sermons will not prevent infantile sickness, which under modern conditions must be experienced. (Marx-Engels, Selected Correspondence, p. 382.)

For, says Engels in another passage:

Contradictions cannot be concealed for long. They are settled only by fighting them out. (Ibid.)

This is how the existence of contradictions within our Party and the development of our Party through overcoming these contradictions by fighting them out are to be explained.

Where do these contradictions originate from, what are their sources?

I think that the contradictions within proletarian parties originate from two circumstances. What are these?

These are, first, the pressure of the bourgeoisie and of bourgeois ideology upon the proletariat and its party in the course of the class struggle, the pressure to which the more irresolute sections of the proletariat, and that means the wavering sections in the Party, not infrequently succumb. We must not think that the proletariat is completely isolated from society, or that it stands apart from society. The proletariat is part of society and connected with it through its diversified strata by numerous threads. The Party is part of the proletariat, and for that reason the Party cannot escape the contacts and influence of the diversified strata of bourgeois society. The pressure of the bourgeoisie and its ideology upon the proletariat and upon its Party result in bourgeois ideas, morals, habits and moods not infrequently penetrating into the proletariat and its Party through the medium of certain strata of the proletariat connected in one way or another with bourgeois society.

Second, it is the diversified character of the working class the fact that it is made up of various strata. I think that the proletariat as a class may be divided up into three strata:

The first stratum—the principal mass of the proletariat, its main core, its constant part; this is the mass of the "thoroughbred" proletarians, who have long ago cut off all contacts with the capitalist class. This stratum of the proletariat is the most reliable support of Marxism.

The second stratum is composed of those proletarians who have recently emerged from non-proletarian classes; from the peasantry petty bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. This stratum, having just emerged from non-proletarian classes, has brought into the proletarian class its old habits and customs, its wavering and vacillation. This stratum represents the most favorable soil for all sorts of anarchist, semi-anarchist and "ultra-Left" groupings.

Finally, there is a third stratum. This is the aristocracy of labour, the upper stratum of the working class, the most secure in its conditions compared with the other sections of the proletariat; it strives to compromise with the bourgeoisie; its predominating mood is to adapt itself to the mighty of the earth and to be "respectable". This stratum represents the most favourable soil for avowed reformists and opportunists.

In spite of their apparent difference on the surface, the last two strata of the working class represent a more or less common milieu which fosters opportunism: frank and avowed opportunism when the mood of the aristocracy of labour prevails, and the concealed

opportunism of "Left" phrases when the need of that stratum of the working class prevails which has not completely cut itself off from the petty-bourgeois contacts. There is nothing surprising in the fact that avowed opportunism very frequently coincides with "ultra-Left" moods. Lenin has said more than once that the "ultra-Left" opposition is the reverse side of the Right wing, Menshevik, avowedly opportunist opposition, and this is absolutely correct. If the "ultra-Left" stands for revolution because it expects the immediate victory of the revolution, then naturally, it must fall into despair, it must become disappointed in revolution if a hitch takes place and the revolution is not immediately victorious.

Naturally, at every turn in the development of the class struggle, on every occasion that the struggle becomes more acute and difficult, the difference of views, the difference in the habits and moods of the various strata of the proletariat must tell in the forms of differences in the Party, and the pressure of the bourgeoisie and its ideology upon the Party must inevitably cause these differences to become more acute and to find an outlet in the form of a struggle within the proletarian party.

These are the sources of the inherent contradictions and differences within the Party.

Is it possible to avoid these contradictions and disagreements? No, it is not. To imagine that it is possible to avoid these contradictions means to deceive oneself. Engels was right when he said that it is impossible to gloss over the contradictions within the Party for any length of time, that these contradictions are solved by struggle.

This does not mean that the Party should be converted into a debating society. On the contrary, the Party of the proletariat is, and must remain, a fighting organization of the proletariat. I merely wish to say that we must not shut our eyes to differences within the party if these differences are over questions of principle. I want to say that only by fighting for principle can the proletarian Party withstand the pressure and influence of the bourgeoisie. Only by overcoming internal Party contradictions can we guarantee the soundness and strength of the Party.

1926

The Communist, (New York), August, 1937, pp. 773-776, Joseph Stalin