

IV

SOME HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT IN PARTY-BUILDING.

In *Ludwig Fuerback*, Engels wrote, "If we are able to prove the correctness of our conception of a natural process by making it ourselves, bringing it into being out of its conditions and using it for our own purposes into the bargain, then there is an end of the Kantian 'thing in itself'."

Expounding his materialist conception of history, Karl Marx wrote, "Just as little as we judge an individual by what he thinks of himself, just so little can we appraise such a revolutionary epoch in accordance with its own consciousness of itself."

The honest working class reader is no doubt concerned at this point to get some deeper grasp of the Party-building process. If it is improper, from the Marxist-Leninist point of view, to learn merely the *letter* of Marxism by *worshipping* certain particular writings of the principal Marxist-Leninist theoreticians, is there any better method for learning about the party building process? Of course there is. This better method is to study the historical experience of the working class movement in building genuine Marxist-Leninist parties. For as Comrade Stalin taught us, "Theory is the experience of the working class movement in all countries taken in its general aspect." (*Foundations*)

This chapter then deals with the experience of the working class movement in several countries where Communist Parties were established and flourished, at least for a long period and which proved in practice to be capable of leading the toiling masses in powerful and successful revolutionary struggles against imperialism. And it deals with the experience of the working class movement in our own country in the one essentially successful effort to build a Communist Party in the USA (though this Party never reached the quality in its vanguard leadership of the class and the masses that the other parties examined were able to achieve).

Because the "new communist movement" has an idealist conception of history, these groups quote individual works by individual authors to establish one or another "condition" in regard to their particular Party-building group, rather than making a serious examination of the historical experience of the international proletariat in building genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties. In sharing our understanding of the historical process of party building in Russia, China, Albania and in the USA, we are confident that the generalizations gleaned from this rich experience of the international working class movement will prove to be in conformity with our "theory"

of party building and will be sufficient to expose and dispose of, at least ideologically, the bankrupt anti-Marxist "theory" of party building projected by the "new communist movement" on the basis of its idealist conception of history.

In Chapter II, we discussed how the "new communist movement" applies its idealist conception of history to the question of Party building. Briefly, these petty bourgeois see the party building process as essentially a *subjective* process; they see the question of building the Party as essentially a question of *subjective* will. According to the ideologues of the "new communist movement" all that is required to build a Leninist Party is a "magical" (i.e. metaphysical or mechanical) application of Lenin's "ideas" expressed in *What Is To Be Done?*, and perhaps in *A Retrograde Trend in Russian Social-Democracy* (written even earlier than *What Is To Be Done?* in 1899 and never published till long after the October Revolution and apparently after Lenin's death) to whatever concrete material circumstances we find ourselves in.

With this in mind, let's examine the actual process by which the Communist Party of the United States, Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik), Communist Party of China, and finally, the Party of Labor of Albania were formed, tested and steeled.

A. The Formation of the CPUSA:

In the authoritative work, *History of the CPUSA* by William Z. Foster, he begins by discussing "Early American Class Struggles (1793-1848)" followed by a discussion of "Pioneer Marxists in the United States 1848-1860". It is not until chapter XII "The Formation of the CP 1919-1921" and then Chapter XIX "Building the Party of the New Type 1919-1929" that Foster brings us to that point which the "new communist movement" deludes itself that we can achieve today merely by assimilating some "advanced ideas." In the other seventeen chapters leading up to "Building the Party of a New Type" are described the tremendous *spontaneous* struggles of the working class and the toiling masses against various forms of oppression as well as the ideological and organizational struggles waged by the various kinds and qualities of Marxists from 1848 to 1919-29, as well as the objective role played by these Marxists in the spontaneous struggles of the toiling peoples and working class of the USA.

The forces who made up the left wing of the Socialist Party and became the main force in the creation and consolidation of the (eventual) CPUSA, were active in the IWW and in all strikes and organizing campaigns. The SP's trade union influence grew phenomenally from the founding of the SP in 1901 to 1904, doubling the dues paying membership to 20,768.

Foster states,

'In consequence of its many activities in the sharp class struggle of the

period, the Party grew rapidly in numbers and influence. By 1912, the high-water mark achieved by the S.P., the Party had some 120,000 members. Pennsylvania was the banner state, with 12,000. The party had a powerful base in the trade unions. There was also strong organization among the western farmers...At this time supporting the S.P. were the following A.F. of L. unions: Brewery, Hat and Cap Makers, Ladies Garment Workers, Bakery, Fur, Machinists, Tailors, and Western Federation of Miners. There were also large Socialist contingents among the leadership of the Coal Miners, Flint Glass, Painters, Carpenters, Brick, Electrical, Printers, Cigarmakers, and other unions. The Socialists likewise led many local and state councils of the A.F. of L. and they were generally a rapidly growing force in the unions.

"The Party had considerable election success. In 1910 Emil Seide was elected mayor of Milwaukee, and six months later Victor Berger was elected as the first Socialist in Congress from the same district. The Party in this period elected 56 mayors in Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Montana, and New England, as well as 300 councilmen. In 1912 some 1,039 dues-paying Party members were holding elected offices. The presidential campaign of 1912, with Debs and Seidel as the candidates, resulted in a big advance for the Party—the vote 897,011, being the highest polled by the party up to that time.

"The S.P. also built up a strong press. In 1912 the Party had 323 periodicals. Among these were five English and eight non-English dailies; 262 English and 36 non-English weeklies; and 10 English and two non-English monthlies." (pp. 112-13)

With the experienced, steeled, and tested cadre from the left wing of the SP, the new CPUSA (after the merger of the original two separate CP's) could carry on and lead positive anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist struggle.

This is why when the "Communist Party" was formed in 1919, it could claim a membership of 58,000 while it estimated that the Communist Labor Party formed at the same time had 10,000 members. Foster points out that, "The programs of the two parties were essentially the same. Their strengths and weaknesses were those of the Left Wing Manifesto, [of the S.P.]". (p. 172) Foster continues:

"That is, they developed a basically correct Marxist-Leninist position on such general questions as the state, imperialism, the war, and proletarian dictatorship: but they failed in applying Marxist-Leninist principles to the concrete American situation. In the latter respect, they largely remained clamped in the traditional sectarianism and 'leftism.'

"Thus, on the trade union question, dualism expressed itself in both parties.

"The C.L.P. did not mention the Negro question at all, and the C.P. outlined the incorrect, but generally-held opinion in the word-for-word De Leonite formula that 'The racial expression of the Negro is simply expres-

sion of his economic bondage and oppression, each intensifying the other. This complicates the Negro Problem, but does not alter its proletarian character.'

"Both parties proposed to have nothing to do with partial, immediate political demands.

"The political basis of the 'leftism' that prevailed in both parties was a wrong estimate of the general political situation in the United States. The tacit assumption of both parties was that the country was approaching a revolutionary crisis.

"Much of Europe then was in a revolutionary situation. Moreover, the revolution in Germany, had it not been betrayed by the Social-Democrats, could have spread widely, thereby directly affecting the United States. It was therefore quite correct for the American Communist Parties to have a general Socialist perspective. Their mistake was in conceiving this in an altogether too immediate sense and in a mechanical fashion. They failed to make a clear distinction between a Europe devastated by the war and the scene of active revolutionary struggle, and a capitalist America enriched by the war and by no means ready for socialism. This faulty analysis contributed directly to the young Communist Parties' underestimation and neglect of the daily struggles of the workers for partial demands. Raising the slogan of Soviets for the United States was a serious political error, indicating the political immaturity of the Party." (pp., 172, 173, 174)

(Shades of the "program" of the "new communist movement" in the US (north) today!)

Yet with all the erroneous "political line" that these two CP's shared in common, Foster was able to conclude *correctly* that, "The two conventions, between them laid the organizational and political foundations for the eventual Communist Party of the United States." (p. 174)

This was because of two principal factors: 1) The existence of the Comintern's and especially Lenin's outstanding political leadership of the international proletarian movement. And both the new CP's declared for affiliation to the Communist International. 2) The composition of the two CP's really represented most of the best, most advanced, dedicated and self-sacrificing members of the US working class who had been tried and tested in countless class and mass struggles for years in the S.P., IWW, Socialist Labor Party and many other class and mass organizations involved in the "spontaneous movement."

These are the two basic reasons why, with all their theoretical confusion and sectarianism, nevertheless, the new CP was able to win perhaps a few thousand IWW members to the CP banner and the first pioneer *Black* communists. were won to the Party.*

*Furthermore, by correctly dealing with the "Negro Question" as a national question by 1930, (again with the help of the Comintern, by this time under Comrade Stalin's leadership), over 1300 new Black members of the CP could be recruited in that one year.

These two reasons also explain why much of the syndicalist Trade Union Educational League (T.U.E.L.), which included a considerable group of active and experienced trade unionists led by Foster himself, were able to be brought into the CP after Lenin had led the Red International of Labor Unions in the repudiation of dual unionism under the impetus of Lenin's *Left Wing Communism*.

This experience of the US working class in Party building then, indicates that all the rhetoric of the "new communist movement" stating that "political line is key", or "organization is key," "in this period", etc. cannot substitute for positive, anti-imperialist, anti-monopolist, and anti-fascist *mass activities* led by the vanguard elements even while there is no Party and no Comintern. For just as it is true for the class and the masses, so it is true of the vanguard elements that they must learn largely through *their own experience* of the necessity for the proletarian revolution and on this basis the means for accomplishing this great task.

A genuine Party of the new type was built in the USA in spite of the tremendous theoretical weaknesses of the Party (which weaknesses in the Party's early days, bore a remarkable resemblance to the "left" and sectarian errors of the *present* "new communist movement") precisely because the Party members were in *practice* the vanguard of the working class and the toiling masses of the USA in that period.

B. The Formation of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party:

Earlier we quoted Mao Tsetung's *Reform Our Study* which points to the *History of the CPSU(B)* as "the best synthesis and summing-up of the world communist movement of the past hundred years, a model of the integration of theory and practice..." etc.

Does the *History of the CPSU (B)* begin with a discussion of the Party building circles and groups, as the "new communist movement" with its idealist conception of the Party building process might lead us to expect? No. Quite the contrary. Chapter One "The Struggle for the Creation of a Social Democratic Labour Party in Russia 1883-1901", begins with a section entitled, "Abolition of Serfdom and the Development of Industrial Capitalism in Russia. Rise of the Modern Industrial Proletariat. First Steps of the Working Class Movement." In this section we are told that,

"The working class of Russia began to awaken already in the seventies, and especially in the eighties, and started a struggle against the capitalists. Exceedingly hard was the lot of the workers in Tsarist Russia. In the eighties the working day in the mills and factories was not less than 12½ hours, and in the textile industry reached 14 to 15 hours. The exploitation of female and child labour was widely resorted to." (p. 6)

The first Russian workers *organization*, says the *History*, was the South Russian Workers Union formed in Odessa in 1875. And in 1878 the Northern Union of Russian Workers was formed in St. Petersburg. The *History* continues,

"The program of the Union stated that its aims and objects were similar to those of the Social-Democratic labour parties of the West. The ultimate aim of the Union was to bring about a Socialist revolution—'the overthrow of the existing political and economic system, as an extremely unjust system.' Obnorsky, one of the founders of the Union, had lived abroad for some time and had there acquainted himself with the activities of the Marxist Social-Democratic parties and of the First International which was directed by Marx. This circumstance left its impress on the program of the Northern Union of Russian Workers. The immediate aim of the Union was to win political liberty and political rights for the people (freedom of speech, press, assembly, etc.). The immediate demands also included a reduction of the working day." (p. 7)

Hence, almost from its very inception the organized (but spontaneous) labour movement already possessed some "consciousness" and some advanced political demands. (Cadre of the "new communist movement" note: all this prior to the founding of the first Marxist circles in Russia!)

The *History* concludes this first section by pointing out that,

"The Morozov and other strikes taught the workers that a great deal could be gained by organized struggle. The working-class movement began to produce capable leaders and organizers who staunchly championed the interests of the working class. *At the same time, on the basis of the growth of the working-class movement and under the influence of the working-class movement of Western Europe, the first Marxist organizations began to arise in Russia.*" (p. 8, our emphasis)

Hence the *History* tells us that the first Marxist organizations in Russia "began to arise" on the basis of the growth of the Russian *working class movement* and under the influence of the *working class movement* of western Europe. According to the *History*, then, *spontaneity bred consciousness!!* and not vice versa, as the "new communist movement" would lead us to believe.

The first Russian Marxist group, "The Emancipation of Labour", was formed in Geneva, Switzerland in 1883 and was led by Plekhanov who had been forced into exile by the Tsarist regime. Yet the *History* points out,

"In the decade of 1884-94 the Social-Democratic movement still existed in the form of small separate groups and circles which had no connections, or very scant connections, with the mass working-class movement. Like an infant still unborn but already developing in its mother's womb, the Social-

Democratic movement, as Lenin wrote, was in the 'process of foetal development'.

"Neither the 'Emancipation of Labour' group nor the Marxist circles of that period had yet any practical connections with the working class movement." (p. 15)

Today the "new communist movement" jabbars endlessly about "fusion" of socialist consciousness with the working class movement. All their talk of this "fusion" is so *abstract* that it seems to be a task that only a magic formula, or the "Holy Word" from "Above" can accomplish. Yet it was Lenin who in 1895 united all the Marxist circles in St. Petersburg into the "League of Struggle For the Emancipation of the Working Class" and put before the League, "the task of forming closer connections with the mass working-class movement and of giving it political leadership." (p. 16) How did Lenin propose to accomplish this task?

"'Lenin proposed to pass from the *propaganda* of Marxism among the few politically advanced workers who gathered in the propaganda circles to political *agitation* among the broad masses of the working class on the issues of the day.'" (p. 16-17, their emphasis)

The *History* tells us further that,

"The nineties were a period of industrial boom. The number of workers was increasing. The working-class movement was gaining strength. In the period of 1895-99, according to incomplete data, not less than 221,000 workers took part in strikes. The working-class movement was becoming an important force in the political life of the country." (p. 17)

Thus, the objectively existing ("spontaneous") movement of the class was surging forward. The *History* proceeds to explain that,

"Under Lenin's guidance, the St. Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class was the first body in Russia that began to *unite Socialism with the working-class movement*." (p. 17, their emphasis)

Because of the mysticism which the "new communist movement" associates with this process of "fusion", because the "new communist movement" substitutes *con*-fusion for the process of fusion, we will quote in detail the materialist explanation offered by the *History* for "fusion":

"When a strike broke out in some factory, the League of Struggle, which through the members of its circles was kept well posted on the state of affairs in the factories, immediately responded by issuing leaflets and Socialist proclamations. These leaflets exposed the oppression of the workers by the manufacturers, explained how the workers should fight for their interests, and set forth the workers' demands. The leaflets told

the plain truth about the ulcers of capitalism, the poverty of the workers, their intolerably hard working day of 12-14 hours, and their utter lack of rights. They also put forward appropriate political demands. With the collaboration of the worker Babushkin, Lenin at the end of 1894 wrote the first agitational leaflet of this kind and an appeal to the workers of the Semyannikov Works in St. Petersburg who were on strike." (p. 17)

Here is Lenin, "stooping" so "low" (i.e. from the heights of the "ideological plane" from which the "new communist movement" looks down upon the "real world") collaborating with the *worker(!)* Babushkin in writing the first socialist *agitational leaflet* in early 1894, in a *pre-party* period (when the task "most assuredly" must have been Party-building)! Yes, this is the very Lenin who our modern so-called "*Leninists*", the "new communist movement", have tried to turn into an anti-practical (armchair) "theoretician"; the very same Lenin who (when *it* served the cause of opportunism and capitalism) was condemned by Plekhanov for being a "practical" worker, for being anti-theoretical!

But the *History* continues,

"In the autumn of 1895 Lenin wrote a leaflet for the men and women strikers of the Thornton Mills. These mills belonged to English owners who were making millions in profits out of them. The working day in these mills exceeded 14 hours, while the wages of a weaver were about 7 rubles per month. The workers won the strike. In a short space of time the League of Struggle printed dozens of such leaflets and appeals to the workers of various factories. Every leaflet greatly helped to stiffen the spirit of the workers. *They saw that the Socialists were helping and defending them.*" (p. 17-18, our emphasis)

The practical leadership role exercised by the Revolutionary Marxists in St. Petersburg, centered around Lenin, culminated when,

"In the summer of 1896 a strike of 30,000 textile workers, led by the League of Struggle, took place in St. Petersburg. The chief demand was for shorter hours. This strike forced the tsarist government to pass, on June 2, 1897, a law limiting the working day to 11½ hours. Prior to this the working day was not limited in any way." (p. 18)

Herein lies the reason for the conclusion drawn by the *History* that,

"The St. Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class was the rudiment of a revolutionary proletarian party in Russia." (p. 25)

This section reveals the "magical" means by which socialist consciousness is "fused" with the spontaneous movement. How abstract and mysterious, must this revelation be for the philosophical idealists of the "new communist movement"! But how *concrete and realizable* is this task for the honest working class

vanguard elements as they develop pre-party organizations and then the Party organization armed with a *materialist* conception of history!

The *History* tells us of the tremendous significance for the working class movement of Russia of the activities of the St. Petersburg League described above.

"The St. Petersburg League of Struggle gave a powerful impetus to the amalgamation of the workers' circles in other cities and regions of Russia into similar leagues. In the middle of the nineties Marxist organizations arose in Transcaucasia. In 1894 a Workers' Union was formed in Moscow. Toward the end of the nineties a Social Democratic Union was formed in Siberia. In the nineties Marxist groups arose in Ivanovo-Voznesensk, Yaroslavl and Kostroma and subsequently merged to form the Northern Union of the Social-Democratic Party. In the second half of the nineties Social Democratic groups and unions were formed in Rostov-on-Don, Ekaterinoslav, Kiev, Nikolayev, Tula, Samara, Kazan, Orekhovo-Zuyevo and other cities." (p. 18)

In March 1898, the 1st Congress of the RSDLP was held. It was composed of the Leagues of Struggle from St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, and Ekaterinoslav, and the Bund. The main significance of this first attempt to unite and form a Social Democratic Party was the formal declaration of its existence. As the *History* explains,

"But although the First Congress had been held, in reality no Marxist Social-Democratic Party was as yet formed in Russia. The congress did not succeed in uniting the separate Marxist circles and organizations and welding them together organizationally. There was still no common line of action in the work of the local organizations, nor was there a party program, party rules or a single leading centre." (p. 22)

This is why, when Lenin and other members of the St. Petersburg League returned from Siberian exile, (as the *History* continues),

"Lenin conceived the idea of founding a big illegal Marxist newspaper on an all-Russian scale. The numerous small Marxist circles and organizations which already existed in Russia were not yet linked up. At a moment when in the words of Comrade Stalin, 'amateurishness and the parochial outlook of the circles were corroding the Party from top to bottom, when ideological confusion was the characteristic feature of the internal life of the party', the creation of an illegal newspaper on an all-Russian scale was the chief task of the Russian revolutionary Marxists. Only such a newspaper could link up the disunited Marxist organizations and prepare the way for the creation of a real party." (page 24)

Eventually from abroad Lenin was able to organize the production of *Iskra* and its transport and circulation within Russia.

Chapter Two of the *History*, "Formation of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party...1901-1904" begins *not* with a Party congress or Party building focus, but again (as in Chapter One) with

the objectively developing ("spontaneous") movement of the working class and the masses of Russia. As the *History* points out,

"The rising tide of the working-class movement and the obvious proximity of revolution demanded a united and centralized party of the working class which would be capable of leading the revolutionary movement." (p. 31)

In this objective situation, the "Economists" tried "to justify on theoretical grounds the lack of organizational cohesion and the ideological confusion within the Party..." (p.31) To meet the objective needs of the working class and mass movement of Russia, Lenin wrote *What Is To Be Done?** which, among other things the *History* points out, "Brought out the great importance of theory, of consciousness and of the Party as a revolutionizing and guiding force of the spontaneous *working class movement*." (p. 38)

The *History* also points out that "one of the most important things that *Iskra* did was to draft a program for the Party...a matter of prime importance." (p.38) The importance of the formulation of this *program* prior to the Second Congress of the RSDLP is buried by the "haloed" treatment given to *What Is To Be Done?* by the "new communist movement". Yet the *History* points out,

"During the drafting of the program serious differences arose on the editorial board of *Iskra* between Lenin, on the one hand, and Plekhanov and other members of the board, on the other. These differences and disputes almost led to a complete rupture between Lenin and Plekhanov. But matters did not come to a head at that time. Lenin secured the inclusion in the draft program of a most important clause on the dictatorship of the proletariat and of a clear statement on the leading role of the working class in the revolution.

"It was Lenin, too, who drew up the whole agrarian section of the program. Already at that time Lenin was in favour of the nationalization of the land, but he considered it necessary in the first stage of the struggle to put forward the demand for the return to the peasants of the *otrezki*, that is, those portions of the land which had been cut off the peasants' land by the landlords at the time of 'emancipation' of the peasants. Plekhanov was opposed to the demand for the nationalization of the land.

"The disputes between Lenin and Plekhanov *over the Party program* to some extent determined the future differences between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. (p. 38-39, our emphasis)

**What Is To Be Done?* is already discussed at length in this pamphlet. Suffice it to acknowledge here that the *History* briefly but uncritically repeats the theoretical weakness on the question of where does socialist ideology come from that appears in *What Is To Be Done?*.

The principal factors that went into the creation of a "real party", as the Iskraists and then the Bolsheviks called it, the main conditions for the creation of this "real party" in Russia, were:

1) The union or fusion of the working class movement with Socialist consciousness based on the widespread recognition in the working class movement of the beneficial vanguard role of the Socialists in the working class movement. All of this was based largely on the tremendous breadth and depth of militant activity of the Russian working class and masses in this period as well as the tremendous work concentrated in the day to day struggle by the Socialists.

2) The widespread recognition in the Marxist or Socialist movement of the importance of vanguard theory and organization to the spontaneous mass movement. This was largely accomplished by Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?*

3) The development of *Iskra*, the "All-Russian" newspaper, the establishment of which, to Lenin, would represent "the first step in the building of the Party." In addition, based on the ideological and organizational experience of *Iskra* at the head of the Revolutionary Movement in Russia, the formulation of a generally correct program for the Party, "...a brief, scientifically formulated statement of the aims and objects of the struggle of the working class." (p.38)

C. The Founding of the Chinese Communist Party (1921):

Just as Foster in the *History of the CPUSA* and Stalin and the Central Committee of the CPSU (B) in *The History of the CPSU(B)* started with a discussion of the objective historical development of the toiling masses and the working class in the USA and the USSR respectively, so too does Hu Chiao-mu* begin in like fashion. Hu opens the *Thirty Years of the CPC* with the following:

"The Communist Party of China came into being as a result of the synthesis of the Chinese working-class movement with the science of Marxism-Leninism. It was no accident that the Party was founded in 1921. It took place after World War I, the October Socialist Revolution in Russia, and the

*Unfortunately, no history of the CPC authorized by its Central Committee, such as the *History of the CPSU(B)* used above or the *History of the Party of Labor of Albania* which will be used in the next section has yet been produced. Nevertheless, *Thirty Years of the CPC* by Hu Chiao-mu written in 1951, had gone through four editions and at least one revised English translation when published by the Foreign Languages Press in Peking in 1959. This is an indication of a certain authoritative character of the book until at least a decade after the victorious Chinese Revolution of 1949. We rely primarily on this text as well as a section of *On New Democracy* by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, for the following discussion.

patriotic May 4 Movement of the Chinese people, which began on May 4, 1919, against the imperialist Treaty of Versailles and against imperialism and feudalism in general.

"During World War I China's feeble industries made relatively rapid strides, and at the same time the Chinese working class grew numerically and the scale of its struggles developed. Following the victory of the October Revolution in Russia, the influence of Marxism-Leninism permeated China's revolutionary intellectual circles. The May 4 Movement helped to bring about the synthesis of the Chinese working-class movement with Marxism-Leninism, thereby preparing for the founding of the Party. A year after the May 4 Movement, communist groups were formed in such major cities as Shanghai, Peking, Hankow, Changsha, Canton, Tsinan and Hangchow." (p.2)

Hu proceeds to go into the history of China in the period from 1840 till WWI, the period in which "The penetration of foreign capitalism caused China's feudal economy to disintegrate and stimulated the growth of Chinese capitalism." (p. 3) From the discussion of these concrete historical developments, Hu concludes that "...the basic demands of the Chinese people were to free themselves from imperialist and feudal oppression and to achieve national independence, democracy and freedom." (p. 4) Hu proceeds to explain that,

"From the time of the Opium War to the eve of the May 4 Movement, the Chinese people waged many struggles against imperialism and feudalism. One of the most significant of these struggles was the peasants' revolutionary war of 1851-64, which broke out ten years after the Opium War and gave birth to the "Taiping Heavenly Kingdom." The other was the bourgeois revolution of 1911 which took place ten years before the Communist Party of China was founded." (p. 4-5)

Hu explains that these struggles failed because while "The Chinese bourgeoisie was feeble, fearing imperialism and feudalism on the one hand and the workers and peasants on the other,"

"...The peasantry, though very numerous and determined in struggling against these two oppressors, were nevertheless incapable of leading the revolution to victory, because, being limited by their old and backward methods of production, they could not see the perspectives of the struggle." (p.5)

Hence,

"Although small in number (about three million), the Chinese working class differed from the peasantry in that it represented the new productive forces. It also differed from the bourgeoisie in that it possessed a resolute will to fight because it was a victim of the triple oppression of imperialism, feudalism and capitalism." (p. 5)

The May 4 Movement of 1919 is considered by both Mao Tse-tung and Hu to be "the turning point at which the Chinese revolu-

tion was transformed from a democratic revolution of the old type into one of a new type." (p. 6, Hu)

Mao explains why:

"The May 4th Movement was an anti-imperialist as well as an anti-feudal movement. Its outstanding historical significance is to be seen in a feature which was absent from the Revolution of 1911, namely, its thorough and uncompromising opposition to imperialism as well as to feudalism. The May 4th Movement possessed this quality because capitalism had developed a step further in China and because new hopes had arisen for the liberation of the Chinese nation as China's revolutionary intellectuals saw the collapse of three great imperialist powers, Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary, and the weakening of two others, Britain and France, while the Russian proletariat had established a socialist state and the German, Hungarian and Italian proletariat had risen in revolution. The May 4th Movement came into being at the call of the world revolution, of the Russian Revolution and of Lenin. It was part of the world proletarian revolution of the time. Although the Communist Party had not yet come into existence, there were already large numbers of intellectuals who approved of the Russian Revolution and had the rudiments of communist ideology. In the beginning the May 4th Movement was the revolutionary movement of a united front of three sections of people—communist intellectuals, revolutionary petty-bourgeois intellectuals and bourgeois intellectuals (the last forming the right wing of the movement). Its shortcoming was that it was confined to the intellectuals and that the workers and peasants did not join in. But as soon as it developed into the June 3rd Movement, not only the intellectuals but the mass of the proletariat, the petty bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie joined in, and it became a nation-wide revolutionary movement." (Vol II, Mao, p. 373-4)

It is particularly noteworthy for our purposes to point out that in the course of this movement, according to Hu,

"The workers in Shanghai, Tangshan and Changhsintien called a political strike, for the first time in Chinese history, as their part in the nation-wide anti-imperialist struggle." (p. 5)

The "Faithful" of the "new communist movement" will protest—"but this is *impossible*: how can workers in their spontaneous movement call a *political strike*?"

Nevertheless, Hu goes on,

"The rise of the Chinese working class as a political force served as an impetus to China's Left-wing intellectuals in the May 4 Movement, who made up their minds to carry on revolutionary activity among the workers." (p.6)

And Mao tells us that, "Both in ideology and in the matter of cadres, the May 4 Movement paved the way for the founding of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921..." (p. 374, Vol II)

This first Congress of the CPC included twelve delegates elected by the communist groups that had been formed after the May 4

Movement, and a representative of the Comintern was present there. The Congress not only founded the Party but also adopted its first Constitution and elected its central organs.

What then can we conclude from the experience of the formation of the CPC?

1) Given the anti-feudal, agrarian, and anti-imperialist character of the Chinese revolution demanded by the interests not only of the Chinese national bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie, and peasantry but also by the Chinese proletariat under the objective circumstances that existed then, it is not surprising that the young, relatively tiny proletariat of China would be moved into the political struggle by the movement of the petty bourgeois students.

2) Yet these same facts expose the bankruptcy of the proposition put forth by the "new communist movement"—that students "*in general*" have played an outstanding role in the struggle against capital and that "*therefore*" the privileged petty bourgeois university students in the chief imperialist (oppressor) nation in the world have the same revolutionary capacity as the Chinese students possessed in oppressed, occupied and enslaved China of 1919, that these US petty bourgeois students and intellectuals have the *same* capacity to inspire the US proletariat today and to move it into action against monopoly capital. As Lenin pointed out, "...that distinction between oppressing and oppressed nations...is the *essence* of imperialism and is fraudulently evaded by the social-patriots..." (p. 68 *The Right of Nations to Self Determination*)

3) Clearly, according to both Mao and Hu, the spontaneous movement of the Chinese masses in the May 4th Movement was the internal material development which led to the formation of the CPC. Apparently, in China as in Russia, *spontaneity bred consciousness!*

4) Contrary to the proposition of "self-reliance" so decisively fought for by the US "new communist movement" and its leaders in the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" in China, the CPC itself was clearly aided in its formation by the victorious October Revolution in Russia as well as by the Comintern which had a representative at the founding Congress of the CPC.

5) To repeat what Hu Chiao-mu said in opening his book:

"It was no accident that the Party was founded in 1921. It took place after WW I, the October Socialist Revolution in Russia, and the patriotic May 4 Movement of the Chinese people, which began on May 4, 1919, against the imperialist Treaty of Versailles and against imperialism and feudalism in general." (p. 2)

These tremendous currents stirred the Chinese masses to wage a titanic struggle against imperialism and feudalism, in the course of which they created the Communist Party of China.

D. The Founding of the Albanian Communist Party (1929-1941):

The Central Committee of the Party of Labor of Albania, following the great example of the C.C. of the CPSU (B), authorized the writing and publication of a history of its Party, *The History of the Party of Labor of Albania*. Hence we and the rest of the international proletariat have the great benefit of the rich experience of this heroic section of the international proletariat, the Albanian working class. Since the Albanian CP was founded many years after the historic accomplishments of the October Revolution and the "Party of Lenin" had become clear to the whole world, it is not surprising that, in spite of the extremely different objective conditions of Albania in the 30's and 40's and the USA in the 70's some fundamental problems which the Albanian Party experienced in struggling to be born (based on a fetish being made out of past success) are very similar to problems which now plague the genuine communists in the USA trying to help build a CP here. Such problems include 1) sectarianism and 2) bookishness; both manifested in a reluctance to participate in the struggle of the class and the masses.

The authoritative *History of the PLA* begins its first chapter, "The Struggle to Found the Albanian Communist Party (1929-1941)" with a section entitled "The Beginnings of the Workers' Movement. The Growth of the Democratic and Anti-Imperialist Movement During the First Quarter of the Twentieth Century". Just as in the *History of the CPSU (B)* (and the other works discussed), the *History of the PLA* begins with the objective historical conditions in Albania, including the history of the spontaneous movement of the Albanian masses and then the Albanian working class against oppression. For these material conditions form the starting point for the historical materialist approach to the Party building process.

Among the high points of the Albanian people's struggles in this period were the anti-imperialist National Congress of Lushnja and the battle of Vlora which ended with the expulsion of the Italian imperialists. These occurred in direct response to the Soviet decision based on the Leninist anti-imperialist policy to make known to Albania and the world the secret April 1915 London Treaty in which Albania was scheduled to be divided among Italy, Serbia, Montenegro and Greece.

While the Albanian working class was still relatively weak and undeveloped in this period, "In March, 1923, thousands of city people and peasants demanded 'Bread' for the people, and the poor peasants demanded *land*." This led in June 1924 to victory of the bourgeois democratic revolution led by Fan Noli.

Yet before the year was out Fan Noli's bourgeois democratic regime was over-thrown by Zog's dictatorship of the landlords and

the reactionary bourgeoisie. Zog ruled Albania for the next 15 years. This semi-Feudal regime was completely tied to imperialism as can be seen from the fact that all the armed forces were trained and led by agents of foreign imperialism! In addition, for equal work, the Albanian worker was paid less than the Italian workers employed with him *in Albania!*

In the period 1925-27, several workers' organizations and strikes rose up from among the Albanian working class. And in 1928 the first communist cell was set up by the *workers (!)* in Korca. As the *History of the PLA* points out,

"The movement of the democratic forces, the enlivenment of the workers' movement and the general dissatisfaction of the people toward the regime had at last created the necessary background for an organized communist movement."(p. 27)

("New communist movement" cadre: please note how the PLA sees that *spontaneity breeds consciousness!*)

In June, 1929, the Communist Group of Korca was formed and within a short time included cells with 40 members. This group represented the first revolutionary political organization of the Albanian working class. But while it took only initial steps, its formation coincided with the developing economic crisis of world capitalism and "the workers movement of strikes in defense of their rights assumed wider proportions."

With the advice of Comrade Dimitroff and the Comintern, the Albanian Communist Group in the Soviet Union set up a communist fraction within the Committee for National Liberation, the anti-imperialist N.L.F. organization that had been set up after the defeat of Fan Noli's bourgeois democratic government by the Zog reactionaries in 1924. Following the Constitution of the Albanian Communist Group in the Soviet Union which put forth as the primary task of the group to develop concrete revolutionary work within Albania, the outstanding leader, Ali Kalmendi, among others, came back into Albania in 1930 and established connections with the Korca Communist Group. But the Korca group "was locked in its own shell". However the capitalist economic crisis sparked the Albanian workers to struggle against capital. Consequently, in Sept. 1933 the "Puna" ("labor") Association was formed in Korca and was led by its communist fraction.

Interestingly, this Puna Association under conditions of semi-feudal oppression, not only included construction workers but also "master builders". It had not only a legal existence as a non-political mutual aid society, but also under the leadership of the communists had a semi-legal side in which it put forth and practiced its real program. And the real program called not only for revolutionary defense of the workers rights, but also for struggle "against Zog's regime and for freedom and democracy!"

Based on their initial success the Korca communists initiated the formation in 1934 of trade unions made up of shoemakers, tailors, motor vehicle drivers, etc. But even within the Korca communist Group, the Trotskyites (reminiscent of the practice of our "new communist movement") hindered the extension of communist influence among the masses by projecting a theory that communists should not participate in mass struggle but "should shut themselves up in their cells and engage only in theoretical education". (p. 33) Nevertheless, during 1934-1935 new communist organizations, detached from the struggle of the Albanian toilers, were set up in a number of cities and towns throughout Albania.

In 1935, in response to Zog's capitulation to Italian fascist domination, a coalition of national bourgeois, peasant, and communist forces, including a number of army officers, organized an armed uprising to overthrow Zog. The communist participants, though they carried it through to the end, did not lead the movement nor did they develop a clear cut program for the uprising. Nevertheless, as Ali Kalmendi wrote, in spite of the limitations and the defeat of the uprising, it was "the ordeal by fire and touchstone" for the Albanian communists.

In fact the Fier uprising shook up the Zog regime to the point where in October 1935 Zog appointed a new "liberal" government with promises of reform to try to contain the rising mass struggle. But as the *History of the PLA* states, "the very limited freedoms it proclaimed were used by the communists to extend their organizing of the working class and to spread their influence among the broad masses of people." (p. 40-41) In the same month, a Puna Association was formed in the most important work place in Albania (with 1600 Albanian workers)* the Italian Oil Company operation in Kucova (now Stalin-city). By November, the government had recognized this Association in its "economic", "bread and butter" functions, but this did not divert this "Puna" from becoming a revolutionary anti-Zog and anti-fascist workers' organization.

When the Italian company tried to make the workers work on Albanian Independence Day on November 28, 1935, the "Puna" organized a powerful demonstration against the Italian fascists. This was followed in December by an increase in the communist-led workers organizations in Korca. This set the stage for the communists to become the vanguard not only of the workers movement but of the peoples' anti-Zog movement.

On February 21, 1936 the Korca "demonstration for bread" was the first popular anti-Zog mass action organized and led by the communists. It was brutally suppressed, yet inspired the

*Relative to the current US population, the 1600 workers would be equivalent to 320,000 workers!

masses of people in other districts to action. Hunger demonstrations broke out throughout the country.

During this mass upsurge the Korca communist group recognized the need to develop communist work in the other districts, but, for the most part was unable to do so. (Meanwhile, Ali Kalmendi had been deported by Zog.) At the same time, the new Shkodra Communist Group which did extend to many districts, "lacked a sure, defined, political line, a clear cut organizational form, sound discipline and secrecy among its ranks. The cells which in general were made up of three members *engaged mainly in their own theoretical studies.*" (p. 47, our emphasis) With the fertile conditions for decisive mass struggle, there was no Communist Party to lead the struggle to victory and prospects were not good for a Communist Party to be born soon.

Ali Kalmendi delivered a key report at a meeting of Albanian communist activists abroad held in Moscow at the initiative of the Comintern. Its purpose was to analyze the situation in the Albanian communist movement and its tasks, in light of the directives of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern where Comrade Dimitroff had projected the tactical line of the world-wide "united front against fascism." Following Kalmendi's recommendations and with Comintern approval, it was decided that "a clandestine organization of a democratic and anti-fascist character was to be set up in Albania under the leadership of a Central Committee composed of communists and patriotic nationalists." (p. 51) The political platform of the new organization would be the same as the communist minimum program, the struggle in defense of *national* rights and in defense of the *democratic* rights of the people!

Now we come to the point that will most startle and upset the "new communist movement":

"With regard to the communist organizations, the Comintern proceeded from the fact that the old cells were detached from the masses and shut in their own shell and, as such, they were incapable of carrying out the new line. Therefore, they and their leading forums should be temporarily dissolved and reorganized on a party basis after having established sound foundations among the masses by working through the legally authorized associations. Contacts among communists should be personal. The functions of the communist organizing centre should be exercised by the communist nucleus of the Central Committee pending the formation of the party." (p. 52)

Thus the Comintern and the Albanian communist activists abroad took the approach of creating the embryo of a mass anti-fascist popular front (actually anti-imperialist united front or NLF) organization *prior* to the formation of a CP to lead it!! And they "added insult to injury" (from the standpoint of the "new communist movement") by calling for the *dissolution* of those "Party building circles and groups" that then existed in Albania, *all in*

order to bring the communists into active participation in the national and class struggles against fascism and imperialism. (Hadn't the Comintern read *What Is To Be Done*?!!!?)

The Korca communist group was the only group to put this into practice. (Ali Kalmendi was never to return to Albania to carry out these tasks, because of illness leading to his death in France in early 1939). In March 1938 the Korca group dissolved its cells; and in June in the municipal elections and in elections to the county councils, etc., the list of candidates presented by the democratic bloc including progressive bourgeois elements was presented by the communists. "The democratic bloc won 86% of the votes, against the list sponsored by the capitalist group of the 'General Electric Company' in the June election in Korca." There were similar successes in the several other cities where the Korca group put forth a democratic bloc of candidates.

The Korca group resorted to direct action as well. "In 1938, the communists engaged in street fighting with the members of the 'Fascist Committee' operating in Albania" and frustrated the effort to organize Albanian youth on Italian Fascist lines.

In the ideological and practical sphere the Korca group had a generally correct line in conformity with the resolutions of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern. Meanwhile the leaders of the Shkodra group, while not *directly* opposing the fight for a "democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-fascist order," tried to direct the main forces to a fight for "proletarian socialist democracy" and projected the establishment of a "socialist federation in the Balkans." Nevertheless, in the struggle that developed between the two groups in the organizational field *both* took on unprincipled characteristics.

When Italian fascism made the decision to occupy Albania directly, the Albanian people in righteous indignation went into the streets in massive, organized demonstrations organized by the communists. And the Soviet Union was the only country to voice its protest at this act of fascist aggression. In addition to fascist troops [there was] "the influx of tens of thousands of Italian colonists (workers, farmers, specialists, teachers, entrepreneurs, merchants, employees, etc.) These, together with the occupation troops, made up the force which aimed, 'inter alia', at the complete colonization and fascistization of the country." (p. 65) Under the Italian fascist boot, the Albanian handicraftsmen experienced general ruin, the impoverishment of the masses of peasantry deepened, the discrimination in favor of Italian workers at the expense of the Albanian workers became even more blatant. Workers' strikes under Italian occupation now took on a pronounced anti-fascist political character; school youth resisted the fascists in various ways, etc.

The militancy of the masses made clear the need for united

communist leadership. Negotiations among the leaders of the groups took place, but broke down. Yet as the *History of the PLA* explains, the material conditions, the spontaneous movement of the masses, and the participation of the rank and file communists in the leadership of the practical struggles of the masses created the basis for the development of a united party.

'While the negotiations among the leaders of the communist groups dragged along for months, the popular anti-fascist movement was growing all over the country. The communists stood at the head of this movement. After the occupation of the country, a radical change had taken place in their understanding. *The rank and file members of the communist groups were becoming more and more aware that unity could not be achieved through sterile talks among chiefs but through a common struggle against the fascist invaders.* This gradually pushed the political and ideological differences into the background. The authority and influence of the chiefs upon the rank and file of the groups had declined. On their own initiative, the communists threw themselves into struggle against the foreign occupiers and became agitators for the liberation war. On Flag Day, November 28, 1939, they led anti-fascist mass demonstrations in the principal cities of the country. The demonstrations were conducted under the slogans: "Long live free Albania", "Liberty or death". The communists were the inspirers and leaders of the anti-fascist movement of the workers and the school youth." (p. 70, our emphasis)

The *History of the PLA* then quotes Comrade Hoxha's "Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Albania" at its First Congress.

'At war and at grips with the invaders and Quislings, united for a single purpose: the liberation of the country from the invaders, the sound communists at the grass roots of the various groups were forging links with one another in blood, forgetting their squabbles and feuds, crystallizing out a correct communist line, and demanding union into a single party as a 'conditio sine qua non' for organizing and guiding the war of liberation." (p. 71)

On this healthy basis, the Korca group finally broke out of its localism and, among other things, sent Enver Hoxha to organize a branch in Tirana.

The Albanian peoples struggle against fascism continued to deepen. In spring, 1941, freedom fighters led by Myslim Peza began to wage armed struggle against the fascist invaders. This sparked desertions from the fascist army by Albanian conscripts who fled into the mountains and began to wage anti-fascist armed struggle themselves. Recognizing the importance of this "spontaneous movement", Hoxha and his comrades sought to link up the communists with the freedom fighters. Hoxha and Peza agreed on the (communist) proposal for communists to join the armed force and give the fighters organization and political consciousness. With this, the communists began to mobilize the armed

struggle throughout the country. They now intensified the use of mass, democratic agitational leaflets, at first in the cities and then in the rural areas.

The Tirana branch of the Korca Communist Group under the leadership of Comrade Hoxha had carried out much class and national struggle among the communists and patriotic nationalists, and on this basis had solid connections with them.

Around the Tirana branch, which gradually became "the real organizing center for the entire communist and anti-fascist movement in Albania," dedicated communist activists of the *other* communist groupings including those of the Shkodra Communist Group were united. Precisely on the basis of the vanguard revolutionary leadership which the Tirana Branch of the Korca group was providing to the mass struggle in practice, the communist unity which developed around this branch "constituted the basis of the coming communist party." (p. 86)

With the direct involvement of the Soviet Union in the war against fascism, the leaders of the Shkodra group could not prevent their rank and file from taking up the anti-fascist national struggle in Albania. Hence, the Shkodra group moved closer to the political line of the Korca group, and new, more massive, anti-fascist political demonstrations were mounted in October and November, 1941.

As the *History of the PLA* points out,

"The anti-fascist war waged by the communists of the various groups shook the very foundations of the sectarianism and of the group spirit, which had prevailed up to that time." (p. 85)

Hence, it was in the crucible of the revolutionary struggle of the masses that the dogmas of the communist groups were tested; the policies of the groups were tested not by their slogans and resolutions but by their *deeds*. *It was on this real material basis of the communists' experience in the movement of the working class and the toiling masses that a real Communist Party was established in Albania.*

Noteworthy in this connection is the fact that a stipulation of the founding meeting was that "none of the former principal leaders ... of the groups would be elected to leadership." This meeting thus broke decisively with the "old" method which had proven thoroughly *bankrupt* for uniting the groups and establishing a CP, namely, the "negotiations of the leaders" method. The meeting recognized that it was not the "ideologically advanced" leaders who had created the conditions for unity, but the rank and file communist leaders of the mass anti-fascist struggle, those communists in interaction with the Albanian masses. And the future of the Party was largely placed in their hands.

The Meeting of the Communist Groups was held in secrecy in

Tirana, November 8 - 14, 1941 and was attended by 15 people including Enver Hoxha. In this historic meeting the "theory of cadres" was polemicized against sharply "as defeatist and opportunist, for it isolated the communists from the masses, kept them as a sect trailing behind the masses, and would finally lead to the dissolution of the party." (p. 88)

The *History of the PLA* continues,

"A basic problem which the meeting took up for discussion and placed on the order of the day was that of linking the Party with the masses. It was persistently demanded that the malady of groupism should be wiped out without fail." (p. 90-91)

Immediately after the founding of the Party, the Provisional Central Committee addressed itself to the entire Albanian people, declaring: "Everyone unite in the war FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION AGAINST THE FASCIST INVADERS." As the *History of the PLA* points out,

"Never before had any political group or organization in Albania ever carried out such widespread and militant propaganda and agitation with such sound ideological content, *so clear and down to earth*, as the propaganda and agitation the Communist Party of Albania began to carry out with the masses of workers, peasants, intellectuals, youth, women and soldiers. Through this untiring work, the Party elucidated its general line, explained the international and internal situation, popularized the Soviet Union and the heroic war of the Red Army, denounced fascism, the Italian invaders, the Hitlerite aggressors and the traitors to the Albanian people." (p. 103, our emphasis)

So, the CP of Albania was born and began to prepare for the armed uprising of the National Liberation Army backed by the National Liberation Front, all under the Party's leadership. This would lead to the establishment of the Peoples Republic of Albania, an Albania free of foreign domination and on the road of socialist development.

What, then, are some of the basic lessons forged by the Albanian communists and working class in their struggle to found a CP?

1) Contrary to the "new communist movement" proposition concerning party building, that the main obstacle to party building was, is, and always will be the right opportunist danger of belittling the role of the conscious element, the Albanian experience demonstrated that the main obstacle to party building *there* was the left opportunist error of sectarianism, groupism and one-sided emphasis on vanguard study divorced from the struggle of the masses, combined with the infantile "left" error of adventurism manifested in premature, "advanced" slogans about "Albanian Soviets," under objective conditions demanding a multi-class popular front against the foreign fascist occupation of Albania.

2) Contrary to the proposition of the "new communist movement" concerning party building, that it is a matter of formulating a correct "political line" and "organizational line" divorced from the struggle of the masses; the Albanian experience demonstrated the necessity for the communists to submerge themselves in the class and national struggles of the working class and the masses, *precisely* in order to establish a principled basis for political and organizational unity of the communist vanguard. *Unity of action* laid the material conditions for political and organizational unity of the Albanian communists.

3) Contrary to the "new communist movement" proposition based on its idealist conception of history that party building requires the "negotiations of the leaders of the communist groups" as the method for achieving unity, i.e. basing ourselves on "the good wishes of 'great individuals'", as Comrade Stalin described it; the Albanian experience demonstrated that communist unity was achieved there only when the "negotiations of leaders" method was *rejected*, and only when the unity meeting was based on the experience of the rank and file communists in their role as leaders of the class and the masses in *their* concrete struggles against capital, i.e. based, as Stalin put it, "on the laws of development of society, and on the study of these laws," i.e. based on a materialist conception of history.

4) Contrary to the proposition of the "new communist movement" that "their" group (and groups like theirs) inevitably are the embryo of the new Communist Party in the USA, the Albanian experience demonstrated that (with the leadership of no less an authoritative body than the Comintern itself) the path of *dissolving the communist groups and submerging their members* (as vanguard elements) *in mass work rather than in "vanguard" work such as "theoretical study", preparation for unity meetings of the leaders etc.* was the path which not only advanced the Albanian mass and class struggles in the immediate situation, but also proved a real aid in breaking through the sectarian isolation of the "vanguard groups" from the masses, and thus helped pave the way for the establishment of the Party in the long run! (What will our poor "new communist movement" do with this fact?!?)

5) All of the above experience of the Albanian communists was made possible by the objective conditions which existed not only in Albania but internationally. Certainly the direct occupation of Albania by Italian fascism and the direct involvement of the USSR in the war *against* fascism both played a large role in the way the Albanian Communist Party was able to be formed. The rise of fascism and the ability of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International to provide leadership to the international proletariat and the toiling peoples of the world in their struggle against fascism largely conditioned the developments in Albania. And the Comintern's struggle was directed against the

"self-satisfied sectarianism" and "dogmatism" of the communists in much of the world at that time which hindered *unity of action* of *all* sections of the working class in the struggle against fascism. As Comrade Dimitroff, outstanding communist leader of the world-wide struggle against fascism, put it at the 7th World Congress of the Comintern:

"We are *enemies of all cut-and-dried schemes*. We want to take into account the concrete situation at each moment, in each place, and not act according to a *fixed, stereotyped form* anywhere and everywhere, not to forget that in *varying* circumstances the position of the communists cannot be *identical*.

"We want soberly to take into account all stages in the development of the class struggle and in the growth of the class consciousness of the masses themselves, to be able to locate and solve at each stage the *concrete* problems of the revolutionary movement corresponding to this stage....

"We want to draw increasingly wide masses into the revolutionary class struggle and lead them to the proletarian revolution *proceeding from their vital interests and needs as the starting point, and their own experience as the basis.*" (p. 79, Dimitroff's emphasis)

"Revolutionary theory is the generalised, *summarised experience* of the revolutionary movement. Communists must carefully utilise in their countries not only the experience of the past but also the experience of the present struggle of other detachments of the international workers' movement. However, correct utilisation of experience does not by any means denote *mechanical transposition* of ready-made forms and methods of struggle from one set of conditions to another, from one country to another, as so often happens in our parties. Bare imitation, simple copying of methods and forms of work, even of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in countries where capitalism is still supreme, may with the best of intentions result in harm rather than good, as has so often actually been the case. It is precisely from the experience of the Russian Bolsheviks that we must learn to apply effectively, to the specific conditions of life in each country, the *single international line*: in the struggle against capitalism we must learn to pitilessly cast aside, pillory and hold up to general ridicule all *phrase-mongering, use of hackneyed formulas, pedantry and dogmatism*.

"It is necessary to learn, comrades, to learn always, at every step, in the course of the struggle, at liberty and in jail. To learn and to fight, to fight and to learn." (p. 111, Dimitroff's emphasis)

Comrade Dimitroff said,

"We want our parties in the capitalist countries to come out and act as *real political parties of the working class*, to become in actual fact a *political factor* in the life of their countries, to pursue at all times an *active Bolshevik mass policy* and not confine themselves to *propaganda and criticism, and bare appeals to struggle for a proletarian dictatorship.*" (p. 79, Dimitroff's emphasis)

Hence, the Comintern's valuable guidance to the Communist groups in Albania was based on the lessons learned from the experience of the international proletariat as well as on an understanding of the concrete conditions then facing the Albanian working class and masses and the Albanian communist movement.

This materialist conception of history, reflecting respect for the role of the laboring people and especially of the working class as the makers of history, we believe, is the essential ingredient with which the Albanian Party and the other genuine communist parties discussed in this chapter were able to be born and to blossom as the organization of the very best elements in their working class capable of leading the class and the masses to great victories over international capital.

* * * * *

Thus far we have established the following:

1) The materialist conception of history is a cornerstone of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, 2) the "new communist movement's" idealist conception of history is in fundamental opposition to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, 3) armed with an idealist conception of history, the "new communist movement" constitutes a serious obstacle to the ongoing practical activity of the proletariat and to the building of a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party in the USA today, 4) in their effort to transform Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?* into a justification for their idealist conception of history, the "new communist movement" betrays Leninism and the proletarian revolutionary cause, and 5) the histories of the genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties discussed above render absolutely bankrupt the idealist conception of the party building process that the "new communist movement" puts forth.

Since the "new communist movement" claims to be Marxist-Leninist, the question arises—why is its theory and practice on the question of Party-building etc. so consistently anti-Marxist-Leninist?