

WHAT ARE "LEFT" AND RIGHT

ERRORS ?

Note: This is a xerox copy of a pamphlet that was written in the spring of 1975 and distributed in mimeographed form in a limited number of copies. The introduction was rewritten in the summer of 1976, and the pamphlet distributed again.

The major weakness of the pamphlet is probably its treatment of Centrism. The pamphlet was written before the question of centrism (e.g. the Guardian's centrism on the nature of the Soviet Union) became a topical one in the movement, and the failure of the pamphlet to adequately take up centrism reflects a lack of depth in the theoretical treatment of deviations. (The pamphlet does mention centrism but only in passing.)

WHAT ARE "LEFT" AND RIGHT ERRORS?

1

A small but vital anti-revisionist communist movement is rapidly developing in the U.S. today. This movement consists of members of party-like organizations, of communist collectives, and of individuals not affiliated with any group. The movement still has several important theoretical and practical tasks to accomplish before the formation of a genuine communist party, but there has been considerable progress towards this goal over the last three years--in theoretical study and struggle, in cooperation among communists of different nationalities, in beginning to link up with the working class, and in establishing organizations functioning under democratic centralism.

The movement as a whole and the party-like organizations in particular have arisen in response to the failures of earlier organizations like the Provisional Organizing Committee (POC) and the Progressive Labor Party (PL) to break with revisionism, specifically the revisionism of the so-called Communist Party U.S.A. (CPUSA). Some of the successors to PL have also fallen by the wayside, such as Venceremos (which collapsed), the Communist League (now called the Communist Labor Party-U.S.N.A.), and the Revolutionary Union (now calling itself the Revolutionary Communist Party). The political lines that CL and RU have put forward are not based on concrete analyses of concrete conditions or on a real understanding of Marxism-Leninism. Accordingly, the new communist movement has exposed and isolated both groups.

In addition to CL and RU, there are other groups which consider themselves to be in the anti-revisionist Marxist-Leninist camp--groups like Workers Viewpoint and the New Voice. But these groups also are consolidated or consolidating around mistaken lines and around approaches which are not Marxist-Leninist. For example, WV's scholastic, sectarian, idealist approach towards combatting revisionism and the New Voice's line on the Black national question, which liquidates the national factor.

The errors and failures of these groups testify to the great difficulty of building a genuine anti-revisionist party in the U.S. And not only in the U.S. In Portugal and other countries we find half a dozen or more organizations claiming to be the genuine upholders of Marxism-Leninism.

One main source of the ideological confusion is the existence of revisionism in the first socialist state, the U.S.S.R., and in revisionist parties (including the CPUSA) throughout the world.

This has brought about a situation of great ideological complexity as all shades of opportunism--from social-democrats, Trotskyists, and revisionist "communists" to anarchists and terrorists--use socialist and communist ideas and phrases to mask their reformist or adventurist counter-revolutionary deeds.

A second source of our ideological difficulty is that we are trying to build an anti-revisionist party in one of the main home bases of the capitalist class and bourgeois ideology. And we are trying to do this among a people known historically for our energy, idealism, practicality, efficiency, and organization, but also known for our lack of interest in theoretical matters, a grave weakness under today's conditions and one which must be overcome if we are to seriously threaten bourgeois rule in the U.S.

The groups which have been trying to overcome these difficulties, that is, the main organized forces in the new communist movement, have included the October League (OL), I Wor Kuen (IWK), the August Twenty-Ninth Movement (ATM), the Guardian newspaper, the Philadelphia Workers Organizing Committee (FWOC), Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization (PRRWO), Congress of Afrikan People (CAP), Revolutionary Workers League (RWL), Bay Area Communist Union (BACU), Workers Congress (WC), Revolutionary Workers Congress (RWC), Marxist-Leninist Organizing Committee (MLOC), and the Revolutionary Bloc--these last four growing out of the recently dissolved Black Workers Congress. There are also strong Marxist-Leninist tendencies within other organizations such as the African Liberation Support Committee (ALSC), Prairie Fire Organizing Committee, and the Revolutionary Communist Party. And then there are the many study groups and communist collectives which also make up the movement. For example, the Communist Workers Group, which has written one of the most incisive, accurate, and detailed polemics to appear in our movement: "Our Tasks on the National Question."

The above forces are far from unified. In fact they are quite divided on many major questions of political line, including the way to build a new party. The October League, for example, has decided to follow in RU's footsteps and found "its own" communist party in 1976, based on its own skimpy analyses of conditions in the U.S. Other forces in the movement have given indications of also wanting to build parties.

But no genuine Marxist-Leninist party can be built until the major ideological and political questions facing the movement are further resolved. We need concrete analyses of the class structure that has developed under U.S. monopoly capital, the nature of the oppression of minorities within the U.S. (the national question), the basis of the oppression of women, the international situation, the trade union question, etc. Further, we need to formulate our program and tactics--our perspective and how we are going to attack work in

each of these areas. And we need a plan to move from our present state to the formation of a Marxist-Leninist party.

Until recently the overwhelming tendency has been for communist groups to put out newspapers and to neglect our theoretical tasks: that is, to sum up practice, make an analysis of conditions, and make these summations generally available. This "tide" of journalism is still very strong. Only a few forces have fought it: IWK, which publishes a theoretical journal; the polemic "Our Tasks on the National Question"; the pamphlet "Class Analysis--U.S. in the 1970's"; and some of the publications of PRFWO and ATM. Martin Nicholas also made a contribution with his series on the restoration of capitalism in the USSR.

Yet in spite of the general absence of concrete analyses on major questions, there has been no lack of polemics among the groups, with accusations of dogmatism, Right opportunism, sectarianism, and economism being frequently hurled. In many cases the charges are accurate and provable, as the superrevolutionary dogmatism of CL's line on the Black national question, RU's organizational sectarianism in the National Interim Committee and elsewhere, and RU's and OL's economist tendencies in trade union work.

Indeed, there has been no shortage of blunders, of gross misapplications of Marxist-Leninist principles in the would-be anti-revisionist movement. We have only to think of PL's "All nationalism is reactionary" of a few years back, CL's "wooden" pseudo-Hegelian dialectics, RU's "nation of a new type," Third Period, and WV's "anti-revisionist premises." The sharp polemics which have attacked these deviations have indicated the rising level of theoretical understanding in the movement.

But with all the charges made there has been a tacit assumption that "everybody" knows what ultra-"left" and Rightist errors are. It seems that many of us independents relatively new to the communist movement--and many inside the larger groups as well--have been stumbling around trying to sort out "dogmatists" from "Right opportunists" without really having studied that much about the history and nature of Right and "Left" errors. Only the Black Workers Congress has printed anything outright on the theoretical bases of the two main kinds of errors. That was in the second issue of the Communist, where they gave a "Definition of Terms," many of which dealt with the question. However, this list was very short, and even according to BWC cadre inadequate as written.

The group which has done the most to apply the idea of "'Left' in form, Right in essence" to the current situation is the October League, with their series on the RU in the Call. OL tries to show how that description fits RU's line, but they assume readers know how to differ-

entiate mistakes that are "Left" in form from ones that are Right in form. This assumption doesn't fit the facts.

The other publication dealing with "'Left' in form, Right in essence" was Carl Davidson's series on Trotsky for the Guardian. This series (now in pamphlet form) is very helpful in understanding Trotskyism, but it also takes knowledge of "Left" and Right errors for granted for the most part and is also somewhat diffuse and incomplete in its assessment of the "Left" and Right aspects of Trotskyism, despite its title ("Left in Form, Right in Essence: A Critique of Contemporary Trotskyism").

Other sections of the movement have generally not used the "'Left' in form, Right in essence" terminology. But it is not just a question of terminology. The phrase "'Left' in form, Right in essence" is used to refer to "Leftism," to ultra-"left" errors. These are different expressions to describe the same phenomena. No, mention of "Left" errors, study of "Left" errors has been downplayed because the majority of groups have put forward the view that Rightism is the main danger in the world and in the U.S. communist movement as well. Thus we have heard a lot about fighting economism, Right opportunism, and revisionism (as if revisionism took only Rightist forms!).

OL and the Guardian have argued that while Rightism is the main danger internationally, ultra-"leftism" is the main danger in the new communist movement. OL has recently modified its position, pointing to what they believe is the rise of a centrist trend (referring to the Guardian) and others). Similarly, ATM and PRRWO have characterized RU (RCP) as Right deviationist, while OL and the Guardian have focussed on RU's "Leftism."

But while applying these branding irons, none of these groups have written very much at all about telling the two kinds of errors apart. Nor have they devoted much effort to analyzing our concrete conditions to provide a standard by which to judge the deviations.

Our movement has a lot of practical experience behind it (acquired though before most of us became Marxist-oriented), but we are very weak theoretically for several historical reasons. Yet knowledge of theory and the development of correct theories about U.S. conditions are essential forerunners to the development of a correct political line. As the Chinese Communist Party, which has more than fifty years of experience, emphasizes: "the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything." (Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China: Documents, p. 17). When the political line put forward is correct, the revolution advances;

when it is incorrect, the revolution suffers setbacks. The Chinese people have learned this basic historical lesson paid for in blood, in the lives of millions of human beings.*

One essential part of arriving at and putting forward a correct line is being able to distinguish what is "Left" from what is Rightist, to know what it means to call something "Leftist" or Right opportunist. (Another essential part is to make concrete analyses--our movement has slighted both tasks.)

It is important to know the history of Rightist and "Leftist" deviations in the communist movement and how communist parties have dealt with these deviations. At bottom "Left" and Right tendencies are rooted in the class struggle and have a basis in the dialectical nature of the world. There are aspects of the two kinds of deviations that are common to specific errors made in specific concrete conditions by specific people. Otherwise, how could there be such agreement among Marxist-Leninists in describing errors as "Left" and Right? We should make it our "business" to know what these common characteristics are and how these deviations have been fought.

iii

Some comrades have argued that, aside from this historical and theoretical understanding of the two kinds of deviations, you can't talk about these errors at all, the errors of our movement, without knowing what the concrete conditions are and what the correct line on an issue is.

I disagree with the thrust of this approach, though there is a valid point at the root of it.

* Some people say, 'We're making the American revolution, we shouldn't quote the Chinese (or Marx or Lenin) so much. America isn't China.' They definitely have a point. We should avoid becoming, in appearance or in actuality, dependents or "flunkeys" of the Chinese or any other party or force. We have the lopsided relationship of the CPUSA to the Soviet party and Comintern as a sufficient bad example. The CPUSA was never able to set its own bearings correctly, though it did do much useful work. But we should never allow considerations of this sort to prevent us from utilizing the invaluable historical lessons the Chinese and others have learned through much struggle and suffering. And on this question in particular, the question of "Left" and Right errors, it is the Chinese comrades who have contributed most to our understanding. Accordingly there will be a lot of quotes from and references to the writings of the Chinese in this paper.

We can and should identify certain lines as deviations, as Rightist or "Leftist" even before we have a sufficiently clear grasp of the concrete conditions to put forward a correct line of our own. For example, the line that there is a "Negro Nation" in the Black Belt South which is a colony "just as Ireland is a colony." CL's line on this question is super-revolutionary, dogmatic, mechanical, ultra-"Left," as is evident from even a little study of the national question or Marxist dialectics.

In other words, it has been correct for the movement to undertake polemics, to try to identify deviations, to isolate wrong tendencies even in the early stages of our knowledge of the concrete conditions in U.S. society. It would have been wrong for the movement to abstain from polemics on the grounds that all the evidence isn't in on, say, the Black Belt South. Such a view is one form of the incorrect line several groups have been running for some time (CL and BWC among them): that our ideological tasks are in the forefront, that therefore we must study, study, study, and then we will come up with correct lines that we can take to the people. The correct line will emerge in the course of theoretical and practical struggles, not from intense closeted study which belittles or excludes concrete investigation and participation in practical struggles.

What is valid in the argument first mentioned, though, is that you can't fully sum up the line of an organization without knowing the concrete conditions, without being well on your way towards a correct line. Once again we touch on a great weakness of our movement, the scarcity of detailed concrete analyses on the major questions.

If we examine Mao, Lenin, and Stalin's handling of deviations during the Russian and Chinese revolutions, we can see that they always analyze a person or group's ideological, political, military, organizational, etc. mistakes against the background of that person or group's wrong views about the nature of the revolution, the stage or period the revolution is in, and the concrete conditions in specific situations. They contrast these views with the correct ones.

In analyzing the errors of our movement we must also gain a deeper understanding of the nature of our revolution and the period we're in. It's not enough to say, "Well, of course, it's a proletarian revolution and we're in the party-building period." For one thing, we need a more concrete class analysis, so that we can give concrete meaning to the easy generalizations about the bourgeoisie, petty-bourgeoisie, and the working class that pass for analysis today. If we don't have clearer lines on these essentials of the "background," we won't know whereabouts on the political spectrum our entire "Left"-Right analysis lies.

In sum, this paper attempts to take a fairly systematic look at what Mao, Lenin, Stalin, the Albanian comrades and others have concluded about "Left" and Right errors, and it contains references from some of the more readily available editions of their works. The paper has been written primarily in the hope that it may be useful to those who are now studying or who want to study "Left" and Right errors in our movement. I feel that this paper (or something like it) has been needed, because our understanding of the errors of our movement has been at a low level and no summation or reference source on the problem of "Left" and Right deviations has been available to help us improve our understanding.

The format in the paper is a question-response one, to lessen the danger of running things together or leaving important aspects out. A summary of conclusions is given after the questions and responses. The content is based as much as possible on the writings of Lenin, Stalin, Mao, other Chinese comrades, and the Albanian comrades, but I may have introduced distortions even in the arrangement of material. I think we have all been finding out--with notable exceptions--how easy it is to make mistakes, to slip into idealism. For Marxism is a science. For these reasons especially criticisms and comments on the paper are welcome.

One final point is that in listing examples of "Left" and Right mistakes, brief mention is made of some errors from the U.S. today. I think this may be useful, even if there isn't space to go into the detail which would be necessary in some cases to justify the characterizations.

Questions and Responses

1. What is an incorrect political line or policy?¹

Any line or policy that is not the correct line.

"History tells us that correct political and military lines do not emerge and develop spontaneously and tranquilly, but only in the course of struggle. These lines must combat 'Left' opportunism on the one hand and Right opportunism on the other."²

2. What kinds of incorrect lines are there?

Basically two, "Left" in form and Right in form.

A line which is "Left" in form is Right in essence, just as an openly Right line is.³

A person or group putting out an incorrect line will not usually stay consistently "Left" or Right. If the source running the bad line doesn't learn Marxism-Leninism over a period of time, both kinds of mistakes will be made.

Liu Shao-chi, for example, is said to have "'struggled desperately' against Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line from the Right, or from the 'Left' in form but Right in essence."⁴

Leon Trotsky, too, was constantly doing flip-flops:

"As is well known, Trotsky played a most despicable role in connection with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk⁵ as well as in the entire history of the Russian revolution and of Soviet construction. He opposed Lenin and Leninism on all the main problems. He denied that the socialist revolution and socialist construction could triumph first in one country. He lacked all principle on the question of revolutionary strategy and tactics, and this manifested itself now in 'Left' adventurism, now in Right capitulationism."⁶

The Trotskyite movement as a whole retains these features,

characteristic of its petty-bourgeois class base:

"The unprincipled vacillations to the 'left' and Right, unity at one time with the extreme Right opportunists and at another with the most extremist and adventurist 'leftist' elements, is also a characteristic feature of the concepts and attitudes of the Trotskyites."⁷

On the other hand, Lin Piao and his line are again and again referred to as ultra-Rightist, even "ultra-Rightist pure and simple."⁸

3. What is a correct line, a genuinely Left (without quotes) line?

As Yu Fan points out in Peking Review, "Marxism holds that one who promotes the development of the objective world according to its inherent laws is Left and revolutionary."⁹ Speaking of the "line that guides our socialist revolution forward from victory to victory," Yu continues, "we are truly Left when we conscientiously carry out Chairman Mao's revolutionary line."

4. What terms are used to describe the main kinds of "Left" and Right errors?

Adventurism, dogmatism, and sectarianism are almost always associated with "Left" tendencies. But there can be Right dogmatism and Right sectarianism.¹⁰

Revisionism, reformism, and tailism are associated with Right tendencies, with errors that are Right in form. Those making these errors frequently try to disguise their Rightism. As the Albanians put it, speaking of the modern social-democrats, "their programs, as a rule, are more leftist than their acts."¹¹

Opportunism may take either Right or "Left" forms, but the

term is more frequently associated with Right errors.

The terms just mentioned need to be used carefully, since some of the current confusion about who or what is Right or "Left" comes from loose use of these words. Some brief definitions follow:

adventurism: "Tremendous leaps" in the sphere of policy (Stalin).¹² "Empty clamour and reckless action." (Mao)¹³ "If we tried to go on the offensive when the masses are not yet awakened, that would be adventurism." (Mao)¹⁴

dogmatism: Stubborn clinging to a set of beliefs, to supposedly eternal principles of Marxism. "It is dogmatism to approach Marxism from a metaphysical point of view and to regard it as something rigid." (Mao)¹⁵

sectarianism: Policy or actions which tend to isolate a group or party from its allies. Based on the view that 'I am the center.'¹⁶

Right errors:

reformism: In this era, working for "corrective" actions without seeing the inability of capitalism to resolve its contradictions. Trying to prop up capitalist society through "realistic" activity, through reforms.¹⁷

revisionism:

"It is revisionism to negate the basic principles of Marxism and to negate its universal truth. Revisionism is one form of bourgeois ideology. The revisionists deny the differences between socialism and capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What they advocate is in fact not the socialist line but the capitalist line."¹⁸

tailism: In What Is To Be Done? Lenin used the term to refer to the Economists, who followed or tailed or bowed to the spontaneity of the working class movement, minimizing the role of theory and organization.¹⁹

Opportunism may be "Left" or Right:

"In the practice of our days too, life confirms great Lenin's conclusion that the roots, the ideological sources of opportunism, both right and left, reside in advocating spontaneity in the revolutionary movement."²⁰

Lenin described opportunism as "sacrificing the basic interests of the working class for some temporary advantage" and "adapting the labor movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie." This refers to the bribery of the "labor aristocrats" with the profits of colonial exploitation: "this stratum of the labor aristocracy or of workers who have become bourgeois, who have become quite petty-bourgeois in their mode of life, in their earnings, and in their outlook . . . they are the real agents of the bourgeoisie in the labor movement, the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class, channels of reformism and chauvinism."²¹

5. Why is it important to be able to distinguish the two kinds of errors?

Suspecting that a line is incorrect, that 'something is wrong,' is not enough. If you serve some hot rolls from the oven and they look all right but no one will eat them, you have to know if they're on the raw side or on the burned side if you want to make the next batch better. Only it's a lot more serious than that.

The Chinese Party suffered disaster before the Long March be-

cause it failed to correct a "Left" line. It believed a line which in reality was "Left" was "Rightist," so in trying to correct the mistakes of that line moved even further "Left."

The Chinese Party considers the Li Li-san line, which in the late 1920's proposed "immediate armed insurrections in all parts of the country," a "Left" adventurist policy. Yet shortly after Li Li-san had been defeated, others criticized Li Li-san's line as "Rightist"! Their views won out for several years, as a result of which the Party lost ninety percent of its members.²²

The need to be able to distinguish genuine Leftism from Rightism of both forms has increased with the growth of revisionism following Khrushchev's "revelations" in 1956. The revisionists have tried to confuse people by clothing their abandonment of Marxism-Leninism in Left terms and calling those who uphold Marxism-Leninism ultra-"Leftists." They further try to conceal their return to capitalist ideology by sometimes criticizing "revisionism" and "Rightism," but when they do so they are only trying to direct attention away from their own errors.

6. What are some examples of "Left" and Right errors?

"Left"

- a. The refusal of the "Lefts" in the Bolshevik party to participate in a reactionary parliamentary body in 1908, a period in which the Russian revolution was in retreat following the defeat of the 1905 revolution.²³
- b. The position of the "Lefts" in the Bolshevik party against compromise (a forced compromise) with Germany in 1918, a period in which

Germany was daily gobbling up more and more Russian territory and the Russian forces could not hope to win militarily.²⁴

c. The refusal of the "Lefts" in Germany to work in reactionary trade unions.²⁵

d. Referring to China in the 1930's (that is, during a protracted bourgeois-democratic revolution), Mao mentions the attempts to economically eliminate the capitalist class and the rich peasants, monopolizing by Communists of the organs of political power, the policy of attacking big cities and denying the role of guerrilla warfare, attacks on Party comrades through the abuse of disciplinary measures, belief that the Kuomintang's fifth "encirclement and suppression" campaign, and the Party's counter-campaign, constituted the decisive battle between counter-revolution and revolution.²⁶

e. In the U.S. recently: Communist League's position on party-building (its dogmatism and sectarianism, especially in the National Continuations Committee); SLA's kidnapping of Patricia Hearst; PL's line on nationalism ("All nationalism is reactionary"); RU's position on trade union work ("Jamming" the unions; building 'pure' independent workers organizations; policy of all struggle, no alliance with reform leaders like Arnold Miller of UMW); RU's position on the Boston crisis (denying racism of some white workers; supporting marches and actions led by white racist forces; call to "Smash Boston Busing Plan"; denial of support to the Black community, both working class and petty-bourgeois); neglect or slighting by BWC and ATM of united front work on the Puerto Rican Solidarity Day committees (definitely in the Bay Area, probably elsewhere as well).

Right

- a. In the Soviet Union, the position of Bukharin and others in the late 1920's that the class struggle would subside, that the rich peasants would peacefully grow into socialism.²⁷
- b. In China, Chen Tu-hsiu's views which stressed cooperation with the Kuomintang and ignored the peasants, which accommodated the proletariat to the bourgeoisie, giving up the Party's leadership of the armed forces, and also of the peasant masses, the urban petty bourgeoisie and middle bourgeoisie.²⁸
- c. In the U.S.A., Earl Browder's revisionism, culminating in the dissolving of the CPUSA in 1944.²⁹
- d. The lines of many of the European parties, from Bernstein to Togliatti to today's leaders, centered around the supposed "electoral road to socialism," the coming to power of socialism without the disintegration of the bourgeois state and military power.³⁰
- e. Many policies of the Socialist Party and the Communist Party in Chile, 1970-1973, during the Popular Unity government under Salvadore Allende, centered on the "electoral road to socialism."³¹
- f. The social-chauvinism (socialism in words, chauvinism in deeds) of Kautsky and other "socialists" of the Second International, especially during the first imperialist world war.³²
- g. The social-imperialism (socialism in words, imperialism in deeds) of Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Kosygin and the Soviet bureaucracy on many questions, including the conscious development of capitalist relations of production, leading to the all-around restoration of capitalism.

The revisionists stress profit (rate of return on investment), interest payments by enterprise to the state, material incentives (including bonuses and profit-sharing), speed-up, labor-management relations, value of commodities sold, etc.³³

h. In the U.S. recently: CPUSA's anti-monopoly coalition strategy of two-stage peaceful revolution; New American Movement's position on building a mass organization, one without ideological unity; Black Panther Party's "electoral road" to power in Oakland; dominant aspect of RU's line on party-building from around 1968 to 1973 (not making party-building the central task; building a united front and not building for a party at all; not developing cadre in Marxism-Leninism; not bringing socialist ideology to the working class); MISO's view that you build a "mass intermediate socialist organization" (a MISO) without development of unity around an ideological line; the views of a number of nationalist groups which have ignored or downplayed the struggle of the working class of all nationalities and held to narrow nationalism; OL's line on Iran, which magnifies Iran's contention with the U.S. and downplays the struggles of the Iranian people against the Shah.

Some sources which take up further examples of both Right and "Left" tendencies are listed in the notes.³⁴

7. How can we recognize an incorrect line?

As Yu Fan notes in Peking Review (Number 42, 1974), "There are objective standards and class criteria for judging what is Left, what is ultra-'Left' and what is Right deviation."

What are these criteria? Yu Fan lists only a few. Following is a list of five basic standards or criteria.

One is whether the analysis of concrete conditions on which the line is based is accurate.

A second is whether the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism have been applied in analyzing the concrete conditions and in formulating the line.

A third criterion is whether the slogans (and other propaganda) put out in accordance with the line are correct or not.

A fourth criterion is how the line works in practice. This means practice among the people, whether or not the line furthers the class struggle, enables the communists to expand the advanced forces, win over the middle, and isolate the die-hards. Mao and Lenin pay particular attention to the effects of the line in the social practice of the class struggle.

A fifth criterion is the class origin of those putting out the line.

These five criteria will be taken up in order in questions 8-12. An additional question (8a) discusses a further aspect of the analysis of conditions: the evaluation of the objective and subjective factors. The use of the five criteria as a group is looked at in question 13.

8. What sorts of mistakes do "Leftists" and Rightists make in "the concrete analysis of concrete conditions"?

As Lenin repeatedly stressed, the "concrete analysis of concrete conditions" is the essence of Marxism.³⁵

In coming to analyze a situation we should be thinking of the problem or problems we're trying to solve:

"What is a problem? A problem is the contradiction in a thing. Where one has an unresolved contradiction, there one has a problem. Since there is a problem, you have to be for one side and against the other, and you have to pose the problem. To pose the problem, you must first make a preliminary investigation and study of the two basic aspects of the problem or contradiction before you can understand the nature of the contradiction. This is the process of discovering the problem."³⁶

Both Right and "Left" errors fail to grasp the two basic aspects in the contradiction in a thing; they commit one-sided mistakes:

"In Lenin's words, they (both "Left" and Right) 'constantly exaggerate, elevate to a one-sided theory, to a one-sided system of tactics, now one and now another "lesson" of this development . . . But real life, real history include these different tendencies, just as life and development in nature include both slow evolution and rapid leaps, breaks in continuity.'"³⁷

Whereas Rightists drag behind in their analyses and are conservative, "Leftists" often (but not always) skip stages in their analyses:

"It often happens, however, that thinking lags behind reality; this is because man's cognition is limited by numerous social conditions. We are opposed to die-hards in the revolutionary ranks whose thinking fails to advance with changing objective circumstances and has manifested itself historically as Right opportunism.

"These people fail to see that the struggle of opposites has already pushed the objective process forward while their knowledge has stopped at the old stage. This is characteristic of the thinking of all die-hards. Their thinking is divorced from social practice, and they cannot march ahead to guide the chariot of society; they simply trail behind, grumbling that it goes too fast and trying to drag it back or turn it in the opposite direction.

"We are also opposed to 'Left' phrase-mongering. The

thinking of 'Leftists' outstrips a given stage of development of the objective process; some regard their fantasies as truth, while others strain to realize in the present an ideal which can only be realized in the future. They alienate themselves from the current practice of the majority of the people and from the realities of the day, and show themselves adventurist in their actions."³⁸

Lenin put it this way, speaking of a situation when the world revolution was strongly on the rise, as it is today:

"Right doctrinairism persisted in recognizing only the old forms, and became utterly bankrupt, for it did not perceive the new content. Left doctrinairism persists in the unconditional repudiation of certain old forms (Lenin has in mind electoral politics, trade unions), failing to see that the new content is forcing its way through all and sundry forms, that it is our duty as Communists to master all forms, to learn how, with maximum rapidity, to supplant one form with another, to substitute one for another, and to adapt our tactics to every such change called forth not by our class, nor by our efforts."³⁹

8a. What kinds of mistakes do "Leftists" and Rightists make in evaluating the objective and subjective factors?

First of all, what do we mean by the terms "subjective" (when it's not used as a criticism) and "objective"?

In Marxist philosophy (which is not "philosophy" in the bourgeois sense), "objective" is used to refer to the real world,^{to} "objective reality," and "subjective" to refer to consciousness, thought.⁴⁰

(In this field, on the question of how we know things (also known as the "theory of knowledge" or epistemology) sense-impressions, experience, practice are at first and predominantly associated with the objective side of things; and concepts, ideas, theories with the subjective side.⁴¹

Genuine knowledge in any field has to be based on the unity of the

subjective and objective factors, on the unity of theory and practice.]

In political and military work, "objective" refers to the given conditions, the situation, including the spontaneous movement of the people⁴² and the forces of the enemy.⁴³ "Subjective" is used to refer to the conscious, organized forces for revolution.⁴⁴

In reference to society as a whole, "objective" is used to refer to the economic base and "subjective" to the superstructure.

So far the words "objective" and "subjective" have been used neutrally, for description, not implying any blame or praise. But the words can also be used in this way. To be call^{ed} "objective" is to be praised. To be called "subjective" is to be criticized. If someone says, 'You thought it was sugar, but it's salt. You made an objective mistake,' he or she means you didn't fully take the objective conditions into account. Marxists refer to such an error as a subjective one; its roots lie in a one-sided, subjective view in which the subjective factor (your idea: sugar) failed to correspond with the objective reality (salt).⁴⁵

Mao points out how in approaching study a person may take a dogmatic or empiricist approach; both are forms of subjectivism:

"There are two kinds of incomplete knowledge, one is ready-made knowledge found in books and the other is knowledge that is mostly perceptual and partial; both are one-sided. Only an integration of the two can yield knowledge that is sound and relatively complete . . .

"It follows that to combat subjectivism we must enable people of each of these two types to develop in whichever direction they are deficient and to merge with the other type. Those with book-learning must develop in the direction of practice; it is only in this way that they will stop being content with books and avoid com-

mitting dogmatist errors. Those experienced in work must take up the study of theory and must read seriously; only then will they be able to systematize and synthesize their experience and raise it to the level of theory, only then will they not mistake their partial experience for universal truth and not commit empiricist errors. Dogmatism and empiricism alike are subjectivism, each originating from an opposite pole."⁴⁶

This does not mean that "theoreticians" will always tend to make "Left" errors when putting forward political lines. Bukharin is an example of a theoretician who made serious Right errors. But it is true that dogmatists generally do tend toward "Left" errors. The same goes, in reverse, for empiricists. Those over-relying on their experience, their practice, tend to make Right, not "Left" errors. To repeat, both are forms of subjectivism.

In connection with the concrete analysis of conditions, an additional criterion is sometimes used: Does the political line or policy rest on an over- or underestimation of some of the subjective or objective factors?

This goes back at least to Lenin, who accused the Economists of "bowing to spontaneity," to overestimating the spontaneous working class movement (in What Is To Be Done?). The other side of Economism was to "belittle socialist ideology," to underrate the conscious element. The Economists underestimated the subjective forces and overestimated an objective factor.

Stalin, Mao and others have also used these criteria. We can see from the examples they give that the criteria must be used with great care.

It is true that frequently "Left" errors stem from underrating the enemy forces (part of the objective conditions) and overrating

the subjective forces, while Right errors tend to make the opposite appraisals.

"There are many instance of setbacks which were due to being terrified of the enemy.

"As against those who underestimated him, some people greatly overestimated him and also greatly underestimated our own strength, as a result of which they adopted an unwarranted policy of retreat and likewise disarmed themselves mentally in the manner of defence. This resulted in the defeat of some guerrilla units, or the failure of certain Red Army campaigns, or the loss of base areas.

"The most striking example of the loss of a base area was that of the Central Base Area in Kiangsi during the fifth counter-campaign against 'encirclement and suppression'. The mistake here arose from a Rightist viewpoint. The leaders feared the enemy as if here were a tiger, set up defences everywhere, fought defensive actions at every step and did not dare to advance to the enemy's rear and attack him there, which would have been to our advantage, or boldly to lure the enemy troops in deep so as to herd them together and annihilate them. As a result, the whole base area was lost and the Red Army had to undertake the Long March of over 12,000 kilometres. However, this kind of mistake was usually preceded by a 'Left' error of underestimating the enemy."⁴⁷

But sometimes "Leftists" overestimate the enemy and Rightists underestimate the enemy. It depends on the concrete conditions.

"What are the characteristics of the openly opportunist Right deviations in our Party? They consist in the fact that they underestimate the strength of our enemies, the capitalists, refuse to see the danger of a re-establishment of capitalism, fail to understand the dynamics of the class struggle under the conditions of proletarian dictatorship, and therefore easily agree to make concessions to capitalism . . .

"And in what does the Left, Trotzkyist, deviation in our country consist? It lies in the fact that the representatives of this deviation over-estimate the forces of our enemies and the strength of capitalism, that they are blind to all save the possibility of a restoration of capitalism, especially blind to the possibility of Socialist construction on its own merits . . ."⁴⁸

These examples indicate that we can't make a blanket statement about these criteria as L. Harry Gould does in his Marxist Glossary, a work reprinted and used by the Communist League group (now the C.L.P.-U.S.N.A.). Gould writes:

"Left Deviation (Left Sectarianism): An over-estimation of the power of the capitalists . . .
 Right Deviation (Right Opportunism): An under-estimation of the power of the capitalists . . ."49

Not only has Gould overreached himself with a false generalization, but also he mistakes the general trend. It is "Left" deviations that more frequently underestimate the enemy, not Right deviations. CL's incredibly dogmatic line is fully in keeping with Gould's and Idealists' approach/his failure to make distinctions.

One reason these criteria are hard to use correctly is that they focus on attitude, on the subjective factor itself. Reliance on the subjective aspects, at the expense of the firmly rooted objective aspects (the concrete conditions, practice) can easily lead to hot air, error.

A second point is that you have to be precise about just what is being estimated. For example, it's true to say, as Foto Cami does, that Rightists generally "overestimate the objective conditions." But you could also say correctly that Rightists generally underestimate the development of objective conditions.

Overall, the criteria are useful ones, and today there are some important international trends relating to these criteria which the Albanians have particularly brought out. These will be taken up in the next question.

9. What kinds of mistakes do Rightists and "Leftists" make in ap-
plying Marxist principles to the analysis of conditions?

A correct line is formulated only as a result of accurately applying the universal truths of Marxism to the concrete conditions of a given country:

"Being Marxists, Communists are internationalists, but we can put Marxism into practice only when it is integrated with the specific characteristics of our country and acquires a definite national form. The great strength of Marxism-Leninism lies precisely in its integration with the concrete revolutionary practice of all countries."⁵⁰

This integration rests first and foremost on the method of class analysis, which is the "fundamental viewpoint of Marxism".⁵¹

"To ensure sound and fruitful work for the communist education of the working people, it (is) necessary to make better use of the method of class analysis, looking at various social phenomena from a class angle. To view phenomena from a class angle means to see them with a political eye, placing above all else the interests of the class of the proletariat, of the people, of socialism, viewing things with the eye of one who seeks to discover the nature of events and viewpoints by defining who benefits from them. This method helps to distinguish the truth even when anti-Marxist, anti-socialist and reactionary viewpoints are cloaked with a pseudo-Marxist phraseology, as the points of view of the modern revisionists are presented."⁵²

Both "Rightists and "Leftists" misuse or misunderstand the method of class analysis. For example, as Mao points out, "the masses in any given place are generally composed of three parts, the relatively active, the intermediate and the relatively backward."⁵³ But the "Lefts" in China around 1930 denied "the existence of a middle camp or third force." Instead, they lay "particular stress on struggle against the rich peasants."⁵⁴ This seems to be typical of "Left" errors--denying the existence of or downplaying

the importance of intermediate strata, middle forces, third forces.

A contrasting example is Lin Piao's "When two sides fight, they become enemies; when two sides live in harmony, they become friends."⁵⁵ Following the no-struggle views of Confucius and revealing his own ultra-Right nature, Lin denied the existence of class struggle under socialism. We can generalize from this example and others and say that Right errors try to blend two opposing classes or sides into one; Rightists tend to view classes and strata as one unified or unifiable mass.

A second important aspect of the integration of the universal truths of Marxism with the concrete conditions involves the uniting of theory and practice. As was mentioned earlier, those who start from book-learning and rely on it are likely to be dogmatists and are likely to make "Left" errors. Those who over-rely on experience, downplaying theory are empiricists and are likely to make Right errors. Both fail to take their opposite into account and so produce distorted theories or views. But their views may very well dovetail at times since, "in spite of their different points of departure, (they) are essentially at one in their mode of thought."⁵⁶ As Mao sums up the relationship between empiricists and dogmatists in the Chinese revolution in its early stages:

"With only limited and fragmentary experience, most empiricists often lacked independent, clear and comprehensive views on questions concerning a situation taken as a whole, and thus generally played second fiddle in their association with doctrinaires; but as the history of our Party proves, there would have been little chance for the rot of doctrinairism to spread throughout the Party, but for the collaboration of empiricism, which,

after the defeat of doctrinairism, became the main obstacle to the development of Marxism-Leninism in the Party. Hence we must overcome both subjectivist doctrinairism and subjectivist empiricism."⁵⁷

The remainder of this response will take a look at some major theoretical distortions of Marxism, in the world communist movement and in the U.S. as well. In approaching these distortions we should not think that those able to cite Marxist classics will therefore be "Left" dogmatists. Marxism has been discarded in what was formerly a large section of the international communist movement, and the revisionists are constantly parading quotes from Marx and Engels, just as their revisionist teacher Kautsky did.

Enver Hoxha, Foto Cami, and other Albanian Marxist-Leninists have noted two international trends in the distortion of Marxist principles: the revisionists on the Right and another grouping on the "Left."

The revisionists are particularly dangerous because they wear the mantle of socialist state power and so sometimes hold to Marxism in words.

"Each (communist) party . . . works out for itself its general line based upon the Marxist-Leninist principles and in conformity with the special features and concrete conditions of its country and time. Even the modern revisionists have these correct Marxist principles on the tip of their tongues, but while they are for independence in words, in reality they want all the other parties to be dependent on them and under their direction; while they are for proletarian internationalism, in words, in reality they strive to prevent the "Marxists from uniting, from upholding a common line" formulated on the basis of a profound, principled, objective Marxist-Leninist class analysis."⁵⁸

But there is no doubt they have also revised Marxist principles themselves:

"Under the false slogans of the 'struggle against dogmatism' and of the 'creative development of Marxism under the new conditions' they actually declared Marxism-Leninism to be outdated, negated its fundamental principles, deprived it of its revolutionary spirit, turned it into a doctrine which is not only harmless but even helpful to the bourgeoisie. The revisionists replaced materialism with idealism, dialectics with metaphysics, accepted the reactionary philosophy of pragmatism. They rejected the class struggle, the socialist revolution and the proletarian dictatorship, and replaced them with bourgeois and opportunist theories of class conciliation, social reform, peaceful transition, and liberal bourgeois democracy. There is no field of Marxist-Leninist theory where the revisionists have not introduced bourgeois social-democratic ideology, which is their spiritual nourishment."⁵⁹

"They (the revisionists) have reduced the entire theory and practice of revolution to reforms within the capitalist order, and are trying to persuade the workers that in our days the boundary between revolution and reform has allegedly been wiped out altogether. They loudly propagate that the working class has the possibility of bringing about radical transformations in the economic basis of capitalism, of occupying important positions, of seizing all power and realizing socialism without violent revolution, without smashing the bourgeois state machine and without establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat."⁶⁰

Overall the revisionists' errors lead them toward reconciliation with social-democratic ideals. This constitutes their Rightist movement: they are abandoning class struggle and making concessions to the capitalists.

The Albanians also identify a "Leftist" deviation that is now widespread:

"Some other ideologists (that is, in addition to the revisionists) from among the ranks of the 'New Left' in Latin America and in Western Europe go even further. They rise against the necessity of introducing socialist consciousness into the working class and the labouring masses; they say that the vanguard role

can also be played by an 'active minority' which emerge as a ferment of revolution, that consciousness and organization are spontaneously acquired in the process of the struggle, they are opposed to the necessity of the Marxist party."⁶¹

This trend includes, to one degree or another, followers of the "foco" guerrilla theory in Latin America, the Baader-Meinhof group in West Germany, the "situationalists" in France in 1968, and in the U.S., Weatherman, the S.L.A., and the Black Liberation Army.

One of the main points the Albanians make is that both Right and "Left" deviations how in the same direction, give support to the enemy in the same way:

While the Rightists more or less openly "overestimate the objective conditions"⁶² and underestimate the subjective forces:

"A characteristic of the present-day revisionists, just as of all the right opportunists, is the philosophy of spontaneity, passivity, of observation that overestimates the objective conditions and waits with folded arms until all the factors of the revolution are ripe. These not only fail to show any concern for preparing the subjective conditions, but, with their betrayal they have caused great ideological and political confusion."

And the Leftists "are characterized by the overestimation and the absolutization of the role of 'subjective activity' in the transformation of reality and by the negation of the role of the objective conditions, of the real possibilities of the situation,"⁶³

Both in fact "stand on a position of advocating spontaneity."⁶⁴
Both downplay the need for theory, programs, for a conscious, organized Marxist-Leninist party. The Rightists do so more or less openly;

the "Leftists" seemingly overestimate the subjective factor, but they conceive of the subjective factor too narrowly and overestimate only an aspect of it: their own subjective activity.

"In the practice of our days too, life confirms great Lenin's conclusion that the roots, the ideological sources of opportunism, both right and left, reside in advocating spontaneity in the revolutionary movement."⁶⁵

10. What kinds of slogans do Rightists and "Leftists" put forward?⁶⁶

As Enver Hoxha has said:

"The various anti-Marxist trends of the Trotskyites and anarchists have been activated as never before. . . . Although they frequently come out with ultra-revolutionary and anti-revisionist slogans, in fact they are playing the revisionists' game, and they are undermining the cause of revolution together."⁶⁷

This is in keeping with Stalin's warning that we shouldn't go by someone's "slogans and resolutions (which cannot be trusted), but by their deeds, by their actions."⁶⁸

Still, we should be aware of slogans and study them, because they are sometimes in fact concentrated expressions of a wrong political line or outlook. Also, as a situation changes, whether local or extensive, the slogans and propaganda of various parties may serve as weathervanes of various "Left" and Right ill winds, so to speak. Lenin develops this theme (without the weathervane image) in Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution. He indicates how the slogan "Revolution" became inadequate as the revolutionary process developed, as more and more forces to the Right of the Bolsheviks took over that slogan. In order to lead the revolution, the Bolsheviks had to put forward a slogan that would express the "very content of the revolution." At that time (1905) it was

"for the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry."⁶⁹

In any given situation, "Left" slogans will appear super-revolutionary, super-militant, because "Leftists" don't pay enough attention to all the concrete conditions and in particular to the readiness (or unreadiness) of the masses to move. They may also neglect the distinction between two kinds of slogans, "basic political slogans that accord with the course of historical development" and "slogans of action for each stage of development and each major turn of events."⁷⁰

The following are some examples of "Left" slogans. In many, their "Leftism" can be seen in their all-or-nothing character.

"Don't give up an inch of territory!"⁷¹ "Merciless blows" in inner-party struggle. "No participation in bourgeois elections!" "No participation in reactionary trade unions!" "For a Soviet Albania!" (in 1941, when the Albanians were trying to unite for a war of national liberation against the Nazis)⁷²

"All nationalism is reactionary!" (PL) "Free the Negro Nation!" (According to CL, the Black Belt South is a colony no different from Puerto Rico, Ireland, etc.) "Workers Power!" (used by the Trotskyites, the Independent Socialists in particular, the slogan takes no account of periods in the revolution, belittles allies of the working class, and implies a unified communist party is not needed) "Out of Southeast Asia Now!" (used by the Trotskyites, the Socialist Workers Party in particular, to combat the views of the Vietnamese themselves, who asked friends to "Support the Seven Points!" in the peace negotiations) "Workers United Will Never Be Defeated!" (not a "Left" slo-

gan as used by some forces, but employed in a "Leftist" way by RU to conceal existing differences in the working class)

Rightists, on the other hand, may downplay use of slogans in comparison with the "Leftists." When Rightists do put slogans forward, they tend to be fuzzy and not oriented toward struggle.

Some examples are "Impeach the Capitalists!" (an example of the CPUSA's electoral road to socialism and also its sense of humor, so-called) "Unity, unity, unity" (honest! This was the CPUSA's "rally cry" at a demonstration by the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression) "A Bi-Centennial Without Colonies" (vague and abstract slogan of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party; "U.S. Out of Puerto Rico" or "Independence for Puerto Rico" would be more to the point) "Detente Can Be Won" (CPUSA slogan on US-USSR relations, based on the view/^{that} imperialism has changed and will submit meekly to its defeat; also, that the USSR is not imperialist) "For a Mass Party of the People" (put forward by various social-democratic forces, such as the National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People) "End War, Racism, Repression" (another CPUSA slogan. Sure, but who's the enemy? How do we fight them? What's the connection?)

Other examples could be given from presidential politics, like "Part of the Way with LBJ" and "Impeach Nixon." Genuine communists shouldn't tail slogans, like the latter, which even the bourgeoisie-- and bourgeois communists (CPUSA) publicize. They should put out their own independent slogans when taking part in work which is essentially reformist, such as impeaching Nixon, and they have to maintain "independence and initiative" while putting the struggle in perspective for those still taken in by the accumulations of more than two hundred years of bourgeois propaganda and nearly 100 years of U.S. imperialist "democracy."

11. What are the characteristic effects in practice of "Left" and Right errors?

This criterion is of the greatest importance, as the Chinese and Albanian comrades stress. The main reason is that practice provides the only true test of the class analysis formulated as a result of applying Marxist-Leninist principles to the concrete conditions. This is the test of class struggle, one of the three branches of social practice from which stem all of our knowledge.

Class struggle in this era focusses on two classes:

"Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of Modern Industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product." 73

It is the "two great classes," the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, which provide us with the basis for distinguishing among Left, "Left," and Right. What is Left really serves the cause of the working class. What is "Left" or Right aids the bourgeoisie.

The existence of middle forces, of allies and reserves of the working class and of the ruling class, complicates class analysis and the formulation of programs, policies, and tactics.

As Mao Tse-tung notes:

"In all mass movements we must make a basic investigation and analysis of the number of active supporters, opponents and neutrals and must not decide problems subjectively and without basis." 74

Corresponding to this view, Mao put forward this principle for work among the people:

"With regard to the alignment of the various classes within the country, our basic policy is to develop

the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and isolate the anti-Communist diehard forces."⁷⁵

Expressed in different words:

"Our tactics are guided by one and the same principle: to make use of contradictions, win over the many, oppose the few, and crush our enemies one by one."⁷⁶

Such a principle involves both struggle and alliance with all possible allies, even if they are "temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable, and conditional," as Lenin put it.⁷⁷

Both Rightists and "Leftists" find this too complicated. For them it's all of nothing:

"These ultra-Left policies were manifestations of the error of 'Left' opportunism, or exactly the reverse of the Right opportunism of Chen Tu-hshu in the latter period of the First Great Revolution. It was all alliance and no struggle in the latter period of the First Great Revolution, and all struggle and no alliance (except with the basic sections of the peasantry) in the latter period of the Agrarian Revolution --truly striking demonstrations of the two extremist policies. Both extremist policies caused great losses to the Party and the revolution.

"Today our Anti-Japanese National United Front policy is neither all alliance and no struggle nor all struggle and no alliance, but combines alliance and struggle."⁷⁸

Both kinds of errors prevent the communists from uniting with the people:

"The reason why such evils as dogmatism, empiricism, commandism,⁷⁹ tailism, sectarianism, bureaucracy and an arrogant attitude of work are definitely harmful and intolerable . . . is that they alienate us from the masses."⁸⁰

"Leftists," hammering away at "struggle above all," tend to isolate the vanguard⁸¹ relatively quickly. They drive the

middle forces to the side of the enemy⁸² and destroy the basis for United Front work. Because the adventurist acts and super-revolutionary slogans and other propaganda of a "Left" policy will generally not be followed by many people, "Leftists" will generally find themselves off in a corner pretty quickly. The reduction in the remaining genuinely Left forces objectively strengthens the hand of the reactionaries, which is the basis for saying that "Leftism" is Right in essence.

Rightists seek unity everywhere, at least outwardly:

"The renegade and traitor Lin Piao preached: 'When two sides fight, they become enemies; when two sides live in harmony, they become friends'; but that was only for the purpose of covering up his life-and-death struggle against the proletariat." ⁸³

Rightists make concessions to the bourgeoisie and give up the leadership of the masses.⁸⁴ They abandon class struggle.

Speaking of the Right deviators in the late 1920's, Stalin said:

"They think that the rural districts can be transferred to the lines of Socialism on the quiet, in the process of drift, without class struggle . . . for they are convinced the kulaks will grow into Socialism . . . The chief evil of Right opportunism is that it breaks away from the Leninist conception of the class struggle and is slipping into the viewpoint of petty-bourgeois liberalism." ⁸⁵

While Rightist errors also isolate the communists from the people, they tend to do this more slowly than "Left" errors, as it may take more time to expose the passivity and absence of leadership in those following Rightist policies. In fact, the party may even increase greatly in membership, as happened in the CPUSA during World War 2 prior to its dissolution by Browder

and also in Indonesia under the Aidit leadership during the period 1951-1959. But, growth or not, Right errors tend to strengthen the hand of the bourgeoisie directly and set back the revolution sooner or later. As in Indonesia and Chile, they can invite a massacre. As in the U.S., they can invite the repressing and crushing of the party (what was left of it after Browder was through). Right errors have the same class effects as "Left" errors--they sabotage the class struggle and strengthen the enemy--only they are openly Right in form, they more or less openly lean toward the capitalists.

12. What are the class origins of incorrect lines?

Certain class origins may and often do produce certain kinds of errors. However, it would be wrong to try to mechanically link up class origin with "Left" or Right errors in every case.

Probably the best short account of the class roots of deviations is Stalin's in his "Sources of Contradictions Within the Party."⁸⁶ Stalin first notes the pressure of bourgeois ideology on the proletariat and its party. He points to three strata in the working class: 1) the main mass of the proletariat, its core, its permanent part; 2) newcomers from the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie, or the intelligentsia, who bring with them their "waverings and vacillations" and are the most likely sources of "anarchist, semi-anarchist, and 'ultra-Left'" groups;⁸⁷ 3) the labor aristocracy, those compromisers with the bourgeoisie who constitute the most favorable soil for "outright reformists and

opportunists."

Stalin quotes Lenin on how "Left" and Right opportunists are simply the reverse side of each other. Their views frequently coincide. Stalin: "If the 'ultra-Lefts' stand for revolution only because they expect the victory of the revolution the very next day, then obviously they must fall into despair and be disillusioned in the revolution if the revolution is delayed, if the revolution is not victorious the very next day."⁸⁸

It is the petty-bourgeoisie which is the primary source of the swings to the "Left" or the Right, a reflection of the uncertain in-between economic status of the petty-bourgeoisie, caught between the working class and the bourgeoisie.⁸⁹ In the "Struggle in the Ching Kang Mountains," Mao gives some striking evidence of this vacillation:

"...in the last twelve months manifestations of opportunism continued to be widespread. On the approach of the enemy, some members, lacking the will to fight, hid in remote hills, which they called 'lying in ambush.' Other members, though very active, resorted to blind insurrection. These were both expressions of petty-bourgeois ideology. . . On the approach of the enemy, either reckless battle or precipitate flight would be proposed. Often both ideas emanated from the same individual in the course of discussions on what military action to take."⁹⁰

Behind the vacillations lies the fundamental tendency of petty-bourgeois ideology:

"As comrade Mao Tse-tung says, 'petty-bourgeois ideology has a conservative character, its influence serves as one of the main sources of opportunism and adventurism in the working class movement.' It is a fact that the petty-bourgeois wave combined with bureaucracy, and the allround

pressure of the bourgeois and revisionist ideology, was one of the main factors that made possible the process of capitalist degeneration in the Soviet Union."91

13. How do we use these criteria in evaluating a line or policy?

There is no formula or system for evaluating a line or policy; there is no mechanical way of combining or manipulating the five criteria taken up. What, then, should be our guide?

As the Albanian comrades put it, in evaluating a political party:

"The only correct criterion is whether or not it (a party) defends and upholds the interests of the working class . . . one should see to whose advantage are the ideology, policy, and all practical activities of this or that party." 92

Does this contradict the use of the five criteria already mentioned? No. Rather, the Albanians are singling out a higher-level criterion. The Chinese comrades have done the same in Peking Review:

"Chairman Mao has incisively pointed out: 'Practice Marxism, and not revisionism; unite and don't split; be open and aboveboard, and don't intrigue and conspire.' This is our criterion for distinguishing the correct line from the erroneous line."93

The Chinese and the Albanian comrades are not contradicting each other--only those hung-up on bourgeois literalism would claim this. Rather, in their own words they are stating vital criteria of a general character which serve as a guide in applying the five criteria (sub-criteria by comparison) looked at in questions 8-12. The five criteria, in turn, allow us to see at a more detailed level whether a political line practices Marxism and upholds the interests of the working class.

Mao's point about being aboveboard is important to keep in mind too:

"In the struggle against deviations, we must give serious attention to opposing double-faced behavior . . . To comply in public but oppose in private, to say yes and mean no, to say nice things to a person's face but play tricks behind his back--these are all forms of double-dealing."⁹⁴

The ultra-Rightist Lin Piao, who claimed to struggle against both "ultra-Left" and Right deviations, was a major recent example of such two-faced behavior.

How, then, should we sum up the five criteria?

One (slogans) is clearly useful but not totally reliable, as people don't always mean what they say. The same could be said of another criterion--class origin. This criterion generally has more validity when applied to a group or party as a whole than when applied to an individual. For example, Marxists have often correctly traced many problems in revolutionary parties to the petty-bourgeois class base which such parties tend to have, especially in their early years. But judgment of an individual based primarily on his or her class background is likely to be inadequate. During periods of revolution revolutionaries who aren't from the working class are striving to put aside the baggage they bring with them from their class; they are trying to remould their outlook; and it is their class stance which is decisive.

The remaining three criteria--analysis of conditions, application of Marxist-Leninist principles, and effect of policies in practice--are very closely connected. Practice is foremost among them.

The concrete analysis of concrete conditions goes together with the application of Marxist principles. While investigating concrete conditions, Marxists don't let their minds go blank but try to apply

the methods and views of dialectical and historical materialism, the accumulated knowledge of history of Marxism-Leninism, in both its theoretical and its practical aspects.

In uniting Marxist principles with the concrete conditions, an analysis is made, and then, flowing from the analyses of the questions facing the revolution, come a program, policies, and tactics. The test of the analyses, and of the political lines based on them, is the class struggle, which involves the "revolutionary practice of millions of people" ("the only yardstick of truth").⁹⁵ In the same vein:

"Policy is the starting point of all the practical actions of a revolutionary party and manifests itself in the process and the end-result of that party's actions. A revolutionary party is carrying out a policy whenever it takes any action. If it is not carrying out a correct policy, it is carrying out a wrong policy; if it is not carrying out a given policy consciously, it is doing so blindly. What we call experience is the process and the end-result of carrying out a policy. Only through the practice of the people, that is through experience, can we verify whether a policy is correct or wrong and determine to what extent it is correct or wrong."⁹⁶

This insistence on practice is in accord with the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge, touched on in the above quote. As brilliantly summarized in Mao's "Where Do Correct Ideas Come From", Marxists hold that knowledge involves perception first and then a leap to rational knowledge. This rational knowledge must then be tested in practice, refined, and again tested in practice. Often many trials and errors are necessary to arrive at correct knowledge: "Practice, knowledge, again practice, and again knowledge," as Mao says in "On Practice."⁹⁷

Then the theories, policies, plans, or measures which are for-

ulated are tested in practice, in work among the people, which includes propaganda work (in which slogans play a role). Just as an individual cannot arrive at correct knowledge without a repetition of the process, without modifying ideas, theories, plans, and programs, neither can a political party or group.

Errors may result from a failure in any of the three areas under discussion (analysis of conditions, application of Marxism-Leninism, and practice), and we must keep all of them in mind. But, while our application of Marxist principles to the analysis of conditions may seem sound, it is the test of these in social practice (particularly, "revolutionary class struggle and revolutionary national struggle") which is decisive. Social practice provides the only real test of a line from the Marxist point of view:

"The knowledge which grasps the laws of the world, must be redirected to the practice of changing the world, must be applied anew in the practice of production, in the practice of revolutionary class struggle and revolutionary national struggle and in the practice of scientific experiment. This is the process of testing and developing theory, the continuation of the whole process of cognition."⁹⁸

Thus, practice is foremost in the Marxist theory of knowledge:

"The Marxist philosophy of dialectical materialism has two outstanding characteristics. One is its class nature: it openly avows that dialectical materialism is in the service of the proletariat. The other is its practicality: it emphasizes the dependence of theory on practice, emphasizes that theory is based on practice and in turn serves practice."^{98a}

While maintaining that practice is the foremost criterion in evaluating a political line or policy, we must not slight the im-

portance of Marxist-Leninist theory. Without knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory we can neither correctly evaluate a political line, nor, as in this period in the U.S., when "practice gropes in the dark (since) its path is not illumined by revolutionary theory,"⁹⁹ formulate comprehensive and correct programs, lines, or tactics. As has often been stated lately, but still not heeded enough:

"The creation and advocacy of revolutionary theory plays the principal and decisive role in those times of which Lenin said, 'Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement.' When a task, no matter which, has to be performed, but there is as yet no guiding line, method, plan or policy, the principal and decisive thing is to decide on a guiding line, method, plan or policy."¹⁰⁰

14. When do "Left" and Right errors occur?

In general, "Left" errors occur when there have been some successes or victories for the revolutionary forces:

"In Combating 'Left' and Right deviations within the Party, we must decide on our policy according to specific circumstances. For example, the army must guard against 'Left' deviations in times of victory and guard against Right deviations in times of defeat or when we are unable to win many battles. In land reform, Right deviations must be combated where the masses have not yet been aroused in earnest and the struggle has not yet unfolded, and 'Left' deviations must be guarded against where the masses have been aroused in earnest and the struggle has already unfolded."¹⁰¹

To become "dizzy with success" breeds "Leftist" mistakes; to be "scared of success" leads to Rightist ones.¹⁰²

For the Chinese, relations with the Kuomintang provided another touchstone for the occurrence of deviations:

"The history of our Party shows that Right deviations are likely to occur in periods when our Party has formed a united front with the Kuomintang and that 'Left' deviations are likely to occur in periods when our Party has broken with the Kuomintang."¹⁰³

Taking a very general view, Stalin says:

"The transition from a period of strife to one of tranquility increases by its very nature the danger of the rightists. If the period of rise brings about revolutionary illusions, thus creating the danger of leftism as the principal menace, the period of tranquility, on the contrary, gives birth to social-democratic reformist illusions, creating the danger of rightism as the main menace."¹⁰⁴

Another guideline is that one kind of error tends to cover for another. Those trying to correct a previous error may overcompensate, overreact, or they may not act sufficiently strongly. 105

"Chairman Mao has constantly taught us: It is imperative to note that one tendency covers another. The opposition to Chen Tu-hsiu's Right opportunism which advocated 'all alliance, no struggle' covered Wang Ming's 'Left' opportunism, which advocated 'all struggle, no alliance.' The rectification of Wang Ming's 'Left' deviation covered Wang Ming's Right deviation. The struggle against Liu Shao-chi's revisionism covered Lin Piao's revisionism." 106

15. Why are wrong lines "Left" and Right instead of, say, Center and Right? How come there are two main kinds of errors instead of three or four?

What should our answers to these questions be in terms of dialectical (and historical) materialism? Taking the second question first, at bottom there are two main kinds of errors because there are only two poles or sides in a contradiction. In society this polarity expresses itself in the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie, the two major contending classes. All other classes must ultimately choose between these two. There is no stable third class for a fundamental third position to adhere to.

This doesn't mean that in any given situation there can't be three, four, or five viewpoints, groups, parties, forces, etc. This is the ridiculous position of CL, which claims there can be no third force (no Third World) in the international situation. 107

Taking their viewpoint to its logical conclusion, only the earth
and
and the sun exist, /it was impossible for the population to expand

beyond Adam and Eve.

It does mean that there are only two basic sides in all processes and things, in all contradictions (and one of these sides or poles is the principal one).

The following remarks of Mao Tse-tung indicate the polarizing outlook of Rightists and "Leftists."

"Two kinds of persons hold views different from ours. Those with a Rightist way of thinking make no distinction between ourselves and the enemy and take the enemy for our own people. They regard as friends the very persons whom the broad masses regard as enemies. Those with a 'Left' way of thinking magnify contradictions between ourselves and the enemy to such an extent that they take certain contradictions among the people for contradictions with the enemy, and regard as counter-revolutionaries persons who are not really counter-revolutionaries. Both these views are wrong."¹⁰⁸

Mao is speaking of contradictions within a socialist society, where the relative strength and alignment of forces are quite different than under capitalism. But the basic method and approach of dialectical and historical materialism don't change under socialism, and it is that basic method and approach that concerns us here.

"Leftists" stand, or tend to stand, with what they believe to be the revolutionary side or pole. They propose all struggle with the other pole, and in the process they tend to put those who are in the middle or even those genuinely on the Left into the camp of the enemy. They want the Left pole or side to be pure, to be uncontaminated by its opposite.¹⁰⁹

Rightists make the opposite error of denying the existence of two poles or sides. They tend to think that everyone is one big happy family, so they accommodate the bour-

geoisie. They make concessions to the enemy and in the process tend to liquidate the Left pole or side. In their eyes there are no real contradictions, so there's no need for struggle. Rightists want unity without struggle.

The answer to the first part of the question (Why are wrong lines "Left" and Right instead of Center and Right or some other pattern?) is closely related to the above.

The two main kinds of wrong lines have a tendency to head

for one pole or the other. All things are in motion (or every "thing" is a process), and all motion, however fast or slow, is in one direction or another relative to certain points. Upholding either "all struggle, no alliance" or "all alliance, no struggle," both "Leftists" and Rightists veer from a correct course (which combines struggle and alliance), directing their energies toward one side or the other.

But the effects of the policies of "Leftists" are of as much service to the other side, to the bourgeoisie, as are those of the Rightists. The "Leftists," with their adventurism, superevolutionary rhetoric, headlong analyses, etc., though seemingly headed toward the genuine Left, are really out of touch with the Left and the middle forces. They are Right in essence, and, as with the Trotskyites, often end up joining forces with the reactionaries.

In reality, neither side is genuinely involved in struggle. The Rightists pretty much openly disavow struggle, as when people say: "Don't be sectarian! We've got to work together." (True,

sectarianism is a huge problem in the new communist movement in the U.S., but this cry is frequently used as an excuse not to struggle.)

The "Leftists" make wild noises and gestures of all sorts and claim to be struggling, but it is mock struggle. In actuality they are not in the arena of struggle either, not contesting the hegemony of the bourgeoisie (to take the situation under capitalism). Though they proclaim they are fighting capitalism, objectively they are serving the enemy. (Objectively, but also consciously sometimes, since pig agents often find the best cover as "Leftists.")

In contrast with both "Leftists" and Rightists, genuine revolutionaries--while certainly not "Centrists"--are truly in the thick of the struggle, combining alliance and struggle. They are guided by "one and the same principle": "to make use of contradictions, win over the many, oppose the few, and crush our enemies one by one."110

16. What is two-line struggle?

"Inner-party struggle between the two lines is a reflection of the class struggle in society. The history of our Party is one of struggle between the two lines. The correct proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao has developed in the course of struggle against erroneous bourgeois reactionary lines of all descriptions. Our Party has waged struggles against the erroneous Right or 'Left' lines of Chen Tu-hsiu, Chu Chiu-pai, Li Li-san and Wang Ming; particularly it has waged repeated, prolonged struggles against the bourgeois reactionary line represented by Liu Shao-chi."111

Two-line struggle is the clash between the bourgeoisie and its forces and the working class and its forces and takes place

in every field, from Lenin's disagreement with Bukharin over what a (drinking) glass is, Stalin's clash with Bukharin and Trotsky over the agrarian and other questions, down to the two-line struggle in the international communist movement today between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism.¹¹²

Summary of Main Points

Incorrect political lines may be "Left" in form, Right in essence; openly Rightist; or vacillate between the two. Adventurism, dogmatism, and sectarianism are associated with ultra-"Leftism," and revisionism, reformism, and tailism with Rightism. Opportunism and subjectivism are associated with both.

Criteria for recognizing incorrect lines have to do with the analysis of concrete conditions, application of Marxist principles, slogans and other propaganda, the effect of the line in practice, and the class origin of those putting the line forward. Of these five criteria practice is foremost, but the analysis of conditions and application of Marxist principles are also of critical importance. Slogans and class origin are also useful, but less reliable. In analyzing conditions, "Left" deviations tend to overestimate the subjective forces or factors and underestimate the objective forces or factors. Right deviations tend to make the opposite mistakes.

There are exceptions to these generalizations, but on the whole "Left" errors can be recognized by:

- 1 In analyzing conditions: Skipping stages, claiming something has gone out of existence when it is still present to a significant degree. Overestimating the subjective factors, underestimating the objective factors.

- 2 In bringing dialectical and historical materialism to bear: In class analysis: belittling middle or third forces. Stressing book-learning, downplaying practice. Holding fast to supposedly eternal "book" truths of Marxism.
- 3 In slogans and other propaganda: Adventurist views and slogans. Super-revolutionary rhetoric.
- 4 In practice among the people: Pitting the working class against all other forces. Words and actions that try to leap ahead of where people are at. Neglect of alliances, treating friends as the enemy. Driving middle forces to the side of the enemy. Rapid isolation of communists.

Overall: "All struggle, no alliance."

Right errors can generally be recognized by:

- 1 In analyzing conditions: Failure to see that conditions have changed. Holding fast to an old, outdated analysis. Underestimating the subjective factors, overestimating the objective factors.
- 2 In bringing dialectical and historical materialism to bear: In class analysis: embracing the enemy and all middle forces. Stressing experience over theory. Revision of fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism. Deliberate or unconscious fuzziness of views.
- 3 In slogans and other propaganda: Non-struggle, vague slogans. "Liberal" rhetoric.
- 4 In practice among the people: Treating the bourgeoisie as being in the same camp as the working class. Tailing the spontaneous movement in words and actions. Loss of independence of communist forces, over-reliance on alliances, treating the enemy as friends. Allowing

bourgeoisie uncontested control of middle forces. Slower isolation of communists.

Overall: "All alliance, no struggle."

Deviations come in basically two forms, ultra-"Left" and Right. Within everything there are opposites in struggle and unity, and "Leftists" and Rightists both err in their understanding of genuine struggle, the genuine unity based on struggle, and the overall relationship between opposites in a process. They fail to draw distinctions properly and gravitate toward one pole or the other, mistaking allies for enemies or enemies for allies.

In revolutionary parties the class base of both "Left" and Right errors and of the vacillations between the two is usually the petty-bourgeoisie.

The correct line develops only through two-line struggle with erroneous views, "Left" and Right.

Notes

- 1 A communist party puts forward lines in many fields. Ideology, politics, economics, Party organization, the military, and culture are some of the most important. In their form, errors of line are "Left" or Right, but the content (the specifics or particularity of the errors) depends on the field, on the subject matter. The ideological and political line is the most important; it's decisive. Of the two, the political line will be focussed on in these questions and responses.
- 2 Mao Tse-tung, Selected Works, Volume I, p. 194. Or SW 1.194, for short.
- 3 For some examples of this terminology, see "Three Major Struggles on China's Philosophical Front," p. 43. This is in pamphlet form. Also, "Report to the Ninth National Congress of the Communist Party of China, pages 23, 24.
- 4 Reprinted in the pamphlet, "Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China," p. 27.
- 5 Lenin briefly discusses the Brest-Litovsk treaty in "Left"-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, Peking edition, pages 22-25.
- 6 In the Chinese polemics in book form, Whence the Differences?, p. 348.
- 7 Agim Popa, "Present-Day Revolutionary Movement and Trotskyism," Albania Today, Number 5, 1972.
- 8 Peking Review, Number 42, Oct. 18, 1974, p. 10.
- 9 Same issue as above, p. 11.
- 10 For Right dogmatism, see Lenin, "Left"-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, Peking edition, pages 110-11. For Right sectarianism, Stalin, "The Right Deviation in the C.P.S.U. (B)," Selected Works, Cardinal Publishers, pages 292-93.
- 11 Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern Revisionism, p. 296.
- 12 Stalin, "Speech at the Plenum of the Moscow Committee and Moscow Control Commission of the C.P.S.U.," Oct. 19, 1928.
- 13 Mao SW 2.318.
- 14 Mao SW 4.243
- 15 Mao, "Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work," p. 19. Not in the Selected Works but is a separate pamphlet. See also Mao SW 1.321-24 and Lenin, What the "Friends of the People" Are, Progress Publishers, pages 167-68.
- 16 Mao SW 1.275, 3.43-49. Also, E.F. Hill, Australia's Revolution: On The Struggle For a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party, p. 84.
- 17 For the reformism of the social-democrats and of the revisionists, see Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern Revisionism, pages 289-316.
- 18 Mao, "Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work," p. 19. In addition to Lenin's works on Kautsky and other revisionists, see also the criticism by the Chinese of the Russians and their followers in Whence the Differences?, in many articles in Peking Review, and in pamphlet form. Also, Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern Revisionism.

- 19 Lenin, What Is To Be Done?, Peking edition, pages 41-53 and throughout the book. See also, Lenin, One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, Progress Publishers, p. 182.
- 20 Foto Cami, "The Objective and Subjective Factors in the Revolution," Albania Today, Jan-Feb 1973. Reprinted by CL. This is a comprehensive and important article.
- 21 Lenin, quoted in the unreliable Marxist Glossary of L. Harry Gould. More on this glossary later. See also Lenin, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, Peking edition, pages 7-10, 125-31, and "Imperialism and the Split in Socialism." Also, Mao SW 1.13-14. For the "vagueness, amorphousness, elusiveness" of opportunism, Lenin, One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, Progress Publishers, p. 200.
- 22 Mao SW 1.249-50
- 23 Lenin, "Left"-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, Peking edition, pages 20-21.
- 24 Lenin, same work as above, pages 22-23.
- 25 Lenin, same work as above, Chapter 6.
- 26 Mao SW 2.441-42. See also SW 4.197, 2.358, and 1.203-04.
- 27 History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course, pages 293-94. See also, Stalin, "The Right Deviation in the C.P.S.U. (B)," Selected Works, Cardinal Publishers.
- 28 Mao SW 4.24, 1.13.
- 29 Mao SW 3.287-88. See also W.Z. Foster's History of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.
- 30 See the Chinese polemics, Whence the Differences?.
- 31 Although they don't take up the question of Rightism and "Leftism," NACLA (North American Congress on Latin America) has some detailed and valuable material available on the Chilean events.
- 32 Lenin, The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, The State and Revolution, and Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism.
- 33 See RU's "How Capitalism Has Been Restored in the Soviet Union and What This Means for the World Struggle" (Red Papers 7). Also, Martin Nicholas' 1975 series in the Guardian. Reprints from Peking Review titled "Soviet Imperialism" and current articles in the magazine. Also, a book very hard to get a copy of, "How the Soviet Revisionists Carry Out All-Round Restoration of Capitalism in the U.S.S.R." published by the Chinese in the late 1960's.
- 34 Some Chinese sources: Mao SW 1.249-51, 2.205-08, 2.290-96, 2.441-42. Peking Review, Number 35, 1971, "Unite the People, Defeat the Enemy: A Study of 'On Policy'." Editorial of three Chinese journals: "Conscientiously Study the History of the Struggle Between the Two Lines," reprinted in the pamphlet edition of Mao's "Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China." The Chinese

polemics, Whence the Differences?, pages 166-67. Peking Review, Number 52, 1971, "Bad Things Turned Into Good Things."

Other sources: History of the C.P.S.U. (B), Short Course, p. 277. Stalin, "Speech at the Plenum of the Moscow Committee and Moscow Control Commission of the C.P.S.U.," Oct. 19, 1928. G. Dimitroff, "The United Front Against War and Fascism," Gamma Publishing Co., pages 28-29. Ho Chi Minh, Selected Writings, pages 180-81 and 242. History of the Party of Labor of Albania, p. 660, 677-80.

- 35 Lenin, "Communism," an article. See also Mao SW 1.195-96 and 251. Also Lenin, What the "Friends of the People" Are, Progress Publishers, pages 166-67.
- 36 Mao SW 3.61.
- 37 Foto Cami, "The Objective and Subjective Factors in the Revolution," Albania Today, Jan-Feb 1973.
- 38 Mao SW 1.306-07. See also SW 4.366-69, 4.228-29, and 1.203-04.
- 39 Lenin, "Left"-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, Peking edition, pages 110-11.
- 40 The most extensive work on this is Lenin's Materialism and Empirio-Criticism.
- 41 Mao, Four Essays in Philosophy, "Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?"
- 42 Foto Cami, "The Objective and Subjective Factors in the Revolution," Albania Today, Jan-Feb 1973. In reprint, pages 1 and 4.
- 43 Mao SW 1.187-91.
- 44 Mao SW 1.128.
- 45 Compare Mao in SW 1.187-91. Also SW 1.215.
- 46 Mao SW 3.41-42. See also 1.296.
47. Mao SW 1.206. See also SW 1.118-19 and Peking Review, Number 50, 1974, pages 6-10; mostly on Lin Piao's pessimism and Rightism in military matters.
- 48 Stalin, "Speech at the Plenum of the Moscow Committee and Moscow Control Commission of the C.P.S.U.," Oct 19, 1928. Also Mao SW 2.228.
- 49 L. Harry Gould, Marxist Glossary, p. 36.
- 50 Mao SW 2.209.
- 51 Mao SW 3.11.
- 52 History of the Party of Labor of Albania, p. 524.
- 53 Mao SW 3.118. See also SW 4.380.
- 54 Mao, "Our Study and the Current Situation--Appendix," p. 60.
- 55 Peking Review, Number 35, Aug. 30, 1974, p. 11.
- 56 Mao, "Our Study and the Current Situation--Appendix," p. 91.
- 57 Same work, pages 91-92.
- 58 Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern Revisionism, pages 229-30.
- 59 Same as above, pages 194-95.
- 60 Enver Hoxha, Report to the 6th Congress of the Party of Labor of Albania, p. 226. See also PLA in Battle with Modern Revisionism, p. 481ff.
- 61 Foto Cami, "The Objective and Subjective Factors in the Revolution," Albania Today, Jan-Feb 1973. In reprint, p. 3.
- 62 Same as above. In reprint, p. 4.
- 63 Same as above.
- 64 Same as above.
- 65 Same article as above. In reprint, p. 5.
- 66 Other propaganda also has to be taken into account in evaluating a line. Because of their shortness and prominence, only slogans are considered here.

- 67 Enver Hoxha, Report on the Activity of the Central Committee of the Party of Labor of Albania, 6th Congress, pages 212-13.
- 68 Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, Peking edition, p. 14.
- 69 Lenin, Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, Peking edition, p. 142.
- 70 Mao SW 1.274.
- 71 Mao SW 1.214.
- 72 History of the Party of Labor of Albania, pages 79-80.
- 73 Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 117. (Moscow)
- 74 Mao SW 4.380. See also SW 3.118.
- 75 Mao SW 2.442.
- 76 Mao SW 2.443-44.
- 77 Lenin, "Left"-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, Peking edition, p. 67.
- 78 Mao SW 2.441-42. See also SW 3.14.
- 79 "Commandism is wrong in any type of work, because in overstepping the level of political consciousness of the masses and violating the principle of voluntary mass action. it reflects the disease of impetuosity." Mao SW 3.266.
- 80 Mao SW 3.265.
- 81 See Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, Peking edition, pages 94-95.
- 82 Mao SW 1.98.
- 83 Peking Review, "The Working Class Rejects the 'Doctrine of the Mean,' Number 35, August 30, 1974, p. 11.
- 84 Mao SW 4.171.
- 85 Stalin, "Political Report of the Central Committee to the 16th Congress of the CPSU, June 27, 1930.
- 86 Stalin, Selected Works, Cardinal Publishers, pages 212-13.
- 87 See also Mao SW 1.221.
- 88 See also, Lenin, "Left"-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder, Peking edition, pages 16-17.
- 89 Mao, "Our Study and the Current Situation--Appendix: Resolutions on Some Questions in the History of Our Party," Peking 1960, pages 97-99.
- 90 Mao SW 1.92-93. See also, "On Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party," SW 1.105-16. Also, SW 1.221 and following.
- 91 Enver Hoxha, Report on the Activity of the Central Committee of the Party of Labor of Albania, 6th Congress, p. 141.
- 92 Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern Revisionism, p. 310.
- 93 Peking Review, Number 42, Oct. 18, 1974, p. 21.
- 94 Mao, SW 2.208.
- 95 Mao SW 2.339-40.
- 96 Mao SW 4.204-05.
- 97 Mao SW 1.308.
- 98 Mao SW 1.304. 98a Mao SW 1.297.
- 99 Mao SW 1.305.
- 100 Mao SW 1.336.

- 101 Mao SW 4.182.
- 102 Mao, "On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation," p. 9.
- 103 Mao SW 4.219.
- 104 Party of Labor of Albania in Battle with Modern Revisionism, quoting Stalin, p. 353.
- 105 Mao, "Our Study and the Current Situation--Appendix," discusses how various "Left" lines directly followed one after another. The basic "Left" perspective, a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of the Chinese revolution, was not overcome by those trying to correct earlier "Left" tendencies.
- 106 "The Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China: Documents," pages 18-19.
- 107 See for example, People's Tribune, May 1974, "International Report."
- 108 Mao, "Four Essays in Philosophy," p. 96. See also SW 4.372-73.
- 109 For "Left" purism see Mao SW 1.164.
- 110 Mao SW 2.444.
- 111 Editorial of three Chinese journals, "Conscientiously Study the History of the Struggle Between the Two Lines," reprinted in Mao Tse-tung, "Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China," p. 22.
- 112 This last is discussed in the Chinese pamphlet, "Long Live the Victory of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat!," p. 19. Methods of conducting two-line struggle are taken up by Mao in SW 3.163-65. Two-line struggle in philosophy is discussed throughout Lenin's Materialism and Empirio-Criticism (page 34 and following in the Peking edition, for example). The history of two-line struggle in the Chinese revolution is also gone into in the "Tenth National Congress . . .: Documents," pages 15-20; in the pamphlet, "Commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Communist Party of China, pages 9-19; and in the "Report to the Ninth National Congress," pages 69-70.