

In Defense of Marxist Principles

As for their response to our strong condemnation of the coordinated factionalist attempt within organizations close to New Labor Press, *The Worker*, and other groupings who have published statements by proxy through the website Red Library, have decried the entire scheme as an “invention” of ours and a “phantom plot”. New Labor Press has never made a statement like the one found in “On Renegades and Revolutionaries” before, even amidst polemics and line struggles with other organizations, and the only reason we have broken with precedence to make such an immediate organizational statement is based on the damning reports and evidence we received. For the time being then, we respect the internal prerogative of the organizations involved to produce their own public statements and reports on their own timeline and according to their own needs. In this present text then we will instead concern ourselves with polemicizing and exposing the errors and revisions of our ideology contained within the broader common ideological-political line of groups and websites like *The Worker*, the Central Group of the CR-CPUSA, and organizations which support and uphold their line.

For the purposes of this we want to quickly establish some brief definitions and terminology. Within this polemic we will refer to this common ideological-political line, and its errors, as the **Daltonite left-opportunist line**. We identify this line, which has its first origins within the positions of the once dominant leadership faction of the former Red Guards Austin, as “left-opportunist” for two reasons. First, the line can be identified as a “left-” rather than rightist error because it generally presents as “left in form, right in essence” as many ultra-left lines have throughout the history of the International Communist Movement, and even manifests many of the metaphysical idealist errors that ultra-left trends like the Otzovists/God Builders and Lin-Biaoists had historically. Secondly, it can be categorized as “opportunist” because, following Lenin’s formulation that “an opportunist will readily put his name to any formula and as readily abandon it, because opportunism means precisely a lack of definite and firm principles”, US revolutionaries have seen how this particular faction has embraced a seemingly endless series of differing and contradictory positions month after month, year after year, based on short-term interests rather than long-term stable principles. The specific major errors which constitute this left-opportunist line currently, and how it manifests in our current context, we will outline below.

On Principles of Leadership

One of the most consistent, but also difficult to deal with, errors of the Daltonite left-opportunist line is its idealism, metaphysics, and fundamental disconnect from the basic facts of reality. Among other things, one of the main ways this manifests in the current line struggle is the inaccurate version of events, and of the objective conditions of the US and subjective conditions (and recent history) of our revolutionary movement, that the Daltonite line bases its positions on. It is thus necessary to begin our response by bringing this line struggle out of the realm of ideal fantasy and into reality.

The Daltonite worldview is simple. In the Central Group CR-CPUSA's self-criticism they write:

“In March of 2021 the Maoist movement and adjacent activist networks suffered a major split, the results of which have been disastrous on one hand and on the other offer a special opportunity to train communists, to teach the class and the masses.

[...]

The third consequence is the comrades and activists caught in the middle, who have lost clear direction, suffered demoralization or come to regard politics with apathy. Formerly active elements have lost their connection to the masses or politically surrendered. This is a situation harmful to the class, the masses as well as those individuals who have not been able to hold firm or find their bearings and have sunken into private life.

[...]

The Committee to Reconstitute the Communist Party of the USA exists, and it will exist until its tasks are fulfilled. We have no doubts that self-criticism belongs to aspect of winning and not losing. We have raised a glorious red flag, emblazoned with the hammer and sickle and we will never lower it.

This generalized self-criticism is intended to deepen discussion on the principal weaknesses and is not intended to focus on individual errors. It is an opening shot, not a closed book. At the current moment of this writing, it is only the Committee to Reconstitute the Communist Party which has issued self-criticism for activity of the first stage of the Maoist movement beginning in 2014 and which persists today entering a second stage. It is by the example of the Committee that the best sons and daughters of the class who are linked to other nuclei can take up the mantle of Bolshevik self-criticism and contribute greatly to our shared march forward, to reconstitution, peoples war, socialism, and the continuation of the socialist revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, for Communism—our unalterable goal, forever luminous, in which we all enter or no one will.”

In their polemic against NLP *The Worker* speaks of “concrete conditions of liquidationism which have robbed [US revolutionaries] of leadership”, and extrapolates on how NLP is not worthy of the tasks of “communist” leadership in their eyes. An outline of some of the features of how this “robbing of leadership” has manifested, as well as how they characterize their own leadership and calls to action can be found in their “Statement on the Political Degenerate Right Liquidators”:

“A less obvious way the liquidators gain success through dispersal of forces is encouraging demoralization, allowing the errors made in political work to totally discredit the entirety of the work. This pessimistic and capitulationist demoralization must not be allowed to fester; on the contrary, revolutionaries must stick to their post, remain connected to the

masses, and deepen their contact. It is in the interests of liquidation for all fronts to collapse, for the connections between the masses and the revolutionaries to wither, and for the revolutionaries to be separated from one another with leadership prevented from arising. The idea that working towards unity requires abandonment of political and mass work is a liquidationist notion.

Be warned that liquidation further sells itself as putting tasks before and at the expense of the principle task: the reconstitution of the Communist Party, which is today expressed in the struggle to unite under Maoism. The Worker as the advanced agent of the Daily Worker is committed to serving the reconstitution of the Communist Party as an organ of revolutionary working class expression, one which serves the goal of unity under Maoism, combating dispersal, revisionism and liquidation. We call on all those who stand for reconstitution to deepen the struggle to unite under Maoism”

And finally in their document “Three Principles Related to the Question of the Party” they write about how from their perspective:

“Sadly some comrades refuse to do these things, likely in the name of preserving a sham oppositional and factional-based “unity,” their own sticky mess, and in this refusal they drag their feet in the march for reconstitution, afraid to struggle for unity and afraid to be attacked by the snitches if they denounce them. It is easier for them to spread distrust among those who uphold Maoism and extend sympathetic-validation to the anti-communists.”

The world presented by those who uphold the Daltonite line is thus deceptively straightforward. According to them in the US there prevails a subjective situation in which there is a large mass of inactive and disillusioned former revolutionaries who have “sunken into private life”, a disconnected and scattered “new generation of young revolutionaries” desperate for leadership but lacking it, and a few isolated “snotty” “nuclei” like NLP who are, opportunistically depending on the rhetorical point being made, either “communists in formation” or “[not] involved in any clandestine Party-like structure and we make no insinuation. Such involvement requires more expertise than they have yet to manage”. Worse still, according to them the fundamental problem persists that these scattered revolutionary nuclei have been “separated” from and “robbed” of their rightful “leadership”. Luckily then, the “advanced agent of the Daily Worker” and the Central Group of CR-CPUSA are both here to re-assert leadership “by example” and salvage the situation.

This line was expressed most succinctly in a document produced from some of the factionalists involved in the plot we covered in our previous statement: “By [the liquidators] persuading the scattered revolutionary elements in the United States that the attempt to construct a proletarian headquarters represented by CR-CPUSA had fully ceased to exist, they made it less likely that the CR-CPUSA could recover from the bend in the road created by their splitting activities and re-establish unity amongst these revolutionary elements in the U.S”.

Immediately problems begin to emerge in this idealist, metaphysical narrative. To begin with very basic surface-level facts about their statements are wrong. The “attempted split” occurred in March 2022, not 2021. Despite basing their entire “open letter” on this premise, the majority of the signatories of the statement “Center Palestine by Centering Revolution” are not student or youth organizations and neither is the author of the statement, OBRSG, whose text we criticized. New Labor Press is not a “communist rudiment”, it is an open theoretical publication devoted to the labor question. The claim that the CG-CRCPUSA is the only group to have self-criticized for the 2014-2022 period is a particularly cynical lie, considering the vast wave of criticism and self-criticism from *every* level and side over the last three years that objectively exists whether or not one agrees with their content, some of which *were formerly hosted on the site that now hosts this document claiming they don’t exist*. (One need only compare the current RedLibrary page on the US Maoist movement to the archive.org version from last August to verify this.) As Mao says, even principally incorrect criticisms can have a kernel of truth and useful elements, and the attempt to obfuscate and erase recent history rather than address it betrays a bigger problem.

In this sense, we begin to see how this line is predicated on an objectively false version of reality regarding the CR-CPUSA and the current movement to reconstitute the Communist Party USA, a false reality which is opportunistically used to advance an incorrect bourgeois conception of leadership which has plagued the Daltonite left-opportunist line since its inception.

What occurred in the Fall 2021-Spring 2022 sequence was not a clear “split” between two headquarters with the majority caught in the middle as the Daltonites would claim, nor a full liquidation as the Right Liquidationist Line would claim, but rather a fragmentation in which a former center was shattered and dispersed. There is actually a direct parallel to this in our movement’s recent history, ironically involving the original iteration of the left-opportunists but in reverse, when under Daltonite leadership the collective Red Guards Austin led a liquidationist attack on the first attempted national Maoist party embryo, the New Communist Party (Liaison Committee), under the slogan “we will not integrate into a burning house” and “bombard the headquarters”. In their attempt to destroy the NCP-LC, in reality the Daltonites only succeeded in its fragmentation, with one center separated into multiple competing centers, some of which persist to this day (like MCU).

The fundamental facts are this: by Fall 2021 (months prior to the March 2022 right-liquidationist plot) quite literally every single campaign, generated organism, or structure of the CR-CPUSA was either moribund or already outright liquidated. In an immense, unconscionable, and unprecedented failure of the line and leadership, before the liquidation attempt was even made, Tribune of the People, its support committees, the United Neighborhood Defense Front, Struggle Sessions, the Popular Womens Movement, its labor work, its police brutality work, and the actual structures of the CR were all in a state of disintegration or free fall. Identifying this correctly as a direct result of the internal revisionist errors of the Daltonite leadership on all three levels (ideological, political and organizational), much of that leadership was either already replaced or in the process of being replaced, and the CR and its network put on rectification footing, when a Right Liquidationist Line emerged and through a new opportunist “bombard the headquarters” campaign, took advantage of the crisis to use a mix of wrecker

and police tactics to successfully fragment and splinter the CR and wreck any attempt to rectify it, similar to the years earlier campaign against the NCP-LC. This attempt to fully liquidate the work was unsuccessful however, and despite the disorganization produced by the CR's prolonged internal crisis of 2021-2022 and dramatic fragmentation, the majority of revolutionaries in the US were never demoralized and inactive for a prolonged period of time (much less remain demoralized and inactive contemporaneously) as the left-opportunists falsely assert.

This objective version of events (the concrete rejection of Daltonite leadership and material fragmentation of the center that occurred throughout the 2021-2022 sequence, even prior to the March 2022 right liquidationist headquarters emerging), while never outright acknowledged by the Daltonites, is vital to establish because by denying this fact the Daltonites try to conceal another crucial fact that fundamentally undermines their entire positions and exposes the base factionalism and metaphysics that underlie their line. The fact is that since the 2022 fragmentation new leaders have been stepping up in the course of the class struggle in the US and they are not only struggling for the re-organization of revolutionaries nationally, but have made significant progress in this regard. If this was not the case, there would be no basis for the frenzied attacks on the leadership of organizations like NLP or RSU coordinated by the Daltonites. That is, the picture painted of a generally inactive and demoralized US revolutionary movement without leadership is plainly false, a vision that could only confuse observers external to the national movement or the small few who largely by choice remain isolated locally or are terminally online. It is a reality which is even seemingly tacitly recognized by the Daltonite positions themselves by their contradictory line that the CR-CPUSA “*exists, and it will exist until its tasks are fulfilled*” (a more metaphysical formulation could not even be imagined), but it is for some reason necessary to demarcate the author of their document as the “Central Group” of the CR-CPUSA rather than just the “CR-CPUSA”.

This inconvenient truth is further belayed by omission: why does *The Worker* never mention the names of the organizations under whose leadership the revolutionaries they address in their texts already fall under? An entire “Open Letter” is devoted to the Revolutionary Student Union, Revolutionary Study Group, and Revolutionary Maoist Coalition, as the signatories of the OBRSG article, and yet in spite of a very specific dedication to these organizations somehow in the entire lengthy letter they are not mentioned by name once! The only time the Revolutionary Study Groups are ever mentioned is in a polemic of one of their Austin chapter's works, a polemic which is particularly illustrative insofar as they make the decision to “call the author [of the text they criticize] Comrade Krix for our purposes here” without explanation, an incredibly obscure and idiotic reference to ancient Red Guards Austin-era personal conflicts that demonstrates the Daltonites' inability to follow through on even the most basic of their supposed “self-criticisms” like the unprincipled substitution of line struggle with personal attacks. The only time after months of innuendo about the “leaderless” “the students” and “youth” the RSU is mentioned is in response to our statement, in which we mentioned them specifically, and the only time the RMC is mentioned is in passing in *The Worker's* polemic against NLP.

Yet, despite the fact that these organizations are never mentioned by name, their presence can be found all over Daltonite texts in the form of opportunistic innuendo and lying by omission. Who exactly is

being referred to when *The Worker* writes “we must ask why some who proclaim ‘long live the International Communist League’ here in the USA have either made excuses for the liquidationists or have conveniently ignored them to avoid taking a principled position”? Whose “*sham oppositional and factional-based ‘unity’, their own sticky mess*” is being criticized and polemically referenced? Why does *The Worker* invent that the NLP has played a role in struggling with RMC over their incorrect conception of a “revolutionary mass organization” transforming into a party when it was the Charlotte RSG chapter who led that process and whose works on the topic *The Masses* [publicly published](#)? And who are all these nameless “nuclei” and “groups”, and “communists-in-information” that populate the pages of various Daltonite documents? Much is written about the “students” and “new generation of young revolutionaries”, but why are they presented as formless and organization-less when they objectively belong to a concrete national organization (the RSU) and have largely embraced the leadership of another revolutionary formation (the RSGs)?

The reason for all this cloak-and-dagger rhetoric is once again simple: to acknowledge that there is not only actually-existing alternative leadership in various sectors nationally, but one which has carried out and accomplished many of the tasks of re-organization *The Worker* foolhardily pretends have not already been done, would undermine the anti-Marxist and factional basis on which they have organized their “line struggle”. Whether the left-opportunists agree or unite with this leadership or not, through the work done by the RSU, RSGs, and NLP in their respective sectors, the US revolutionary movement is larger and more active now than it has ever been, even when compared to the revolutionary collectives or CR period during which consistent revolutionary work was always limited to a handful of cities in a country of hundreds of major metropolitan areas. This present work has its problems, its errors, its deficiencies, but to ignore it, or opportunistically dance around it, is the epitome of liberalism and opportunism.

It is easy to cheaply dismiss the work organizations like the above have done in their sectors in a simplistic isolated way, as they do by negating our work as “militant economism”, but it is much more difficult for the Daltonites to address the broader phenomenon of the revolutionary movement’s re-organization without undermining the metaphysical distortions which underlie their political line. Thus they are forced to invent splits, demoralization, and inactivity where there are none, attempt to counterpose organizations which communicate and work together (as they attempt to do with their “Open Letter”), and obfuscate the actual work leading organizations like New Labor Press, the Revolutionary Study Group and Revolutionary Student Union have done and replace it with their own idealist posturing. If new leadership has emerged and become recognized by many revolutionaries nationally, if it has already begun to re-organize and made slow, steady and substantial progress in its tasks (including forging unity under our ideology!), has begun a process of demarcation with revisionism and rightism (where are *The Worker*’s polemics against MCU and the OCR?), then the lack of substance of the Daltonite line regarding leadership becomes clear. Thus they are forced to invent a nameless leaderless “youth” and pretend somehow their seemingly non-existent work among the proletariat and our own is even comparable.

Leadership is fundamental to Marxism, proletarian leadership in particular, and through examining the

facts we can see how the Daltonite line presented in their texts represents a clear deviation and revision of this most fundamental Marxist principle. It was Lenin who famously outlined in Letter to a Comrade how:

“The whole art of running a secret organisation should consist in making use of everything possible, in ‘giving everyone something to do,’ at the same time retaining leadership of the whole movement, not by virtue of having the power, of course, but by virtue of authority, energy, greater experience, greater versatility, and greater talent. This remark is made to meet the possible and usual objection that strict centralisation may all too easily ruin the movement if the centre happens to include an incapable person invested with tremendous power. This is, of course, possible, but it cannot be obviated by the elective principle and decentralisation, the application of which is absolutely impermissible to any wide degree and even altogether detrimental to revolutionary work carried on under an autocracy. Nor can any rules provide means against this; such means can be provided only by measures of ‘comradely influence,’ beginning with the resolutions of each and every subgroup, followed up by their appeals to the C.O. and the C.C., and ending (if the worst comes to the worst) with the removal of the persons in authority who are absolutely incapable.”

Gonzalo and the PCP expanded on these principles with their theory of Great Leadership, and his Interview Chairman Gonzalo describes how:

“In our Party, revolution, and people’s war, the proletariat has brought forth a group of top leaders, by a combination of necessity and historical chance, in Engels’s words. It is necessity that generates top leaders and a Great Leader, but just who that will be is determined by chance, by a set of specific conditions that come together at a particular place and time. In this way, in our case too, a Great Leadership has been generated. This was first acknowledged in the Party at the Expanded National Conference of 1979. But this question involves another basic question that can’t be overlooked and needs to be emphasized: there is no Great Leadership that does not base itself on a body of thought, no matter what its level of development may be. The reason that a certain person has come to speak as the Great Leader of the Party and the revolution, as the resolutions state, has to do with necessity and historical chance and, obviously, with Gonzalo Thought. None of us knows what the revolution and the Party will call on us to do, and when a specific task arises the only thing to do is assume the responsibility.

We have been acting in accordance with Lenin’s view, which is correct. The cult of personality is a revisionist formulation. Lenin had warned us of the problem of the rejection of top leaders just as he emphasized the need for our class, the Party, and the revolution to promote our own leaders, and more than that, top leaders and Great Leadership. There’s a difference here that is worth emphasizing. A leader is someone who occupies a certain position, whereas a top leader and Leadership, as we understand it, represent the acknowledgment of Party and revolutionary authority acquired and proven in the course of

arduous struggle—those who in theory and practice have shown they are capable of leading and guiding us toward victory and the attainment of the ideals of our class.”

Thus we can see how, unlike the bourgeois conception of leadership which is based principally on title, charisma, office, personal fiat, etc. in Marxism the great tasks and posts of leadership are afforded by way of the needs of collective proletarian struggle to those who “by virtue of authority, energy, greater experience, greater versatility, and greater talent” **retain and prove** that leadership and “who in theory and practice have shown they are capable of leading and guiding us toward victory and the attainment of the ideals of our class.”

Herein lies the problem for the Daltonites which they cannot avoid no matter how hard they try. The type of proletarian leadership they claim is, unlike bourgeois leadership, not a post-modern act of self-identification, nor is it something that can be simply proclaimed or bequeathed through titles and posts. There must be a concrete historical, practical, and theoretical basis, a long trail of victories and successes, of principled struggle under diverse conditions, acknowledged by the class and its conscious element which confirms or denies leadership. What do the various Daltonite groupings have to offer in this regard? On the basis of what victorious “theory and practice” are they the “Central Group” and why is *The Worker* the “advanced agent of the Daily Worker”, an impressive feat which was somehow already achieved in their first founding declaration¹? Is it based on the Daltonites’ essential and undeniable role in the fragmentation and undermining of the last two national Maoist party initiatives, their history of almost every ideological, political, and organizational error and deviation imaginable, and their both materially negligible and politically factionalist role in the current stage of re-organization? Clearly not, so instead material reality is replaced with metaphysics, basic facts and events are obfuscated, and a false bourgeois conception of leadership is edified in order to split and confuse revolutionaries rather than unite and organize. The Daltonite line claims their leadership, like a pure platonic essence, “exists and it will exist” until they decide it doesn’t, no matter their failures, incompetence, and inability to retain or prove that leadership.

On a more actively pernicious level, this idealist distortion of proletarian leadership is used to flip the current process of national unity-struggle-unity process on its head. Instead of a line struggle for unity based on principles, which seeks higher and higher ideological-political-organizational unity through struggle, the higher unity is already *a priori* presumed, and the process of struggle to reach that unity becomes a simple administrative formality. The proletarian principle of two line struggle is then transformed into a bourgeois factionalist *fait accompli*: if in conditions of dispersal and fragmentation, *The Worker* is on the basis of metaphysical auto-proclamation already the “advanced agent of the Daily Worker” and the author of their “self-criticism” already the “Central Group of the CRCPUA”, if they begin from the basis of an unchanging, undialectical, and static concept of leadership where once they were national leaders they are always national leaders no matter their failures, their inability to prove or retain leadership, their organizational recall, their incompetence, their lack of authority, their lack of mass support, etc., then the entire process becomes a farce, a revisionist reversal of our principles.

¹<https://theworker.news/2023/05/01/declaration-of-the-editorial-board-of-the-worker/>

It is for this reason that the Daltonite left-opportunist line relies on a persistent and systematic distortion of basic facts and reality. Once the basic facts are made clear, and their metaphysics are made self-evident, the emptiness of their sloganeering and writings becomes painfully apparent. They write:

“Transformation and development take place in the political life of class struggle and the struggle for unity, never in isolation from it. This is a Marxist principle based on the law of contradiction; attempts to reverse it are acts of revisionism. Unity is possible only on two conditions: 1) the desire for unity, and 2) a struggle for unity. Nothing else. Stop adding conditions, there are not any others.

There are those who would set false, liberal, and anti-Marxist preconditions for unity such as the complete withdrawal from politics for those who have made mistakes or even been accused of making mistakes. This is a sleight of hand that shuts down the necessary two-line struggle.”

Unfortunately for the Daltonites, Marxist principles exist as a coherent whole, and cannot be cherry-picked and highlighted in isolation from one another. Revolutionaries unite with all those who **can** be united with, “can” being the operative word. No given individual or group is guaranteed or entitled to a place in any revolutionary process, much less a seemingly permanent place in leadership in that process. Leaders who in theory and practice demonstrate profound incompetence and a pattern of revisionism, who have harmed rather than strengthened our movement, are not owed an endless process of internal organizational rectification as if to them revolutionary work is some kind of hobby or affinity group to which they have an inalienable bourgeois right. This is not a “false, liberal, and anti-Marxist precondition” but a basic principle of discipline, quality, and control anyone should be able to recognize.

In summary then, we see how in order to “re-assert” their leadership nationally the Daltonites use idealist metaphysics and opportunism to reverse on their head vital Marxist principles regarding leadership and unity-struggle-unity. Rather than proceed from objective reality like materialists, they pick and choose facts as they see fit, obscuring certain facts and changing or manipulating others, in order to create a narrative that suits their short-term needs. Not only are their past failures and errors profound, but their conduct and “line” in this current struggle demonstrates the paper thin quality of their supposed self-proclaimed “transformation”. As we explain in the following sections, these opportunist deviations extend even further to the principles of our ideology and the process of party reconstitution itself, in ways that damage and limit the current process of national unity-struggle-unity serving reconstitution.

On Principles of Class and Social Analysis

As Mao explained in *On Practice*, our sole “criterion of truth” is social practice, especially class struggle. We are partisans of a particular class, the proletariat, and in this way our theory and practice

must not only serve the interests of that class, but also must be products of the perspective and struggle of that class if they are to be considered actually Marxist. Marxism's class perspective and its materialist outlook are linked at the hip and form an immovable part of its approach to philosophy, political economy, and scientific socialism.

The Daltonite left-opportunist line represents a deviation from these elementary principles on both counts. Firstly, they represent a metaphysical deviation insofar as they fail to correctly comprehend the material realities of our country and the "external world", instead inventing or perverting reality opportunistically as suits their subjective interests. Secondly, they represent a petty-bourgeois deviation insofar as they fail to consistently apply a class criteria in their analysis and synthesis, instead writing from a perspective that downplays, ignores, or outright negates class criteria when it comes to essential questions like the labor question, the question of the student movement, or the women question. Their positions on the labor question, and their de facto labor line, are especially illustrative insofar as they demonstrate both the Daltonites ignorance regarding the actual state of the workers' movement in our country, and their inability to apply the most elementary of Marxist principles, the principles of class, correctly or consistently.

The revolutionaries which produced New Labor Press have been organizing line struggle for proletarian leadership in the labor movement since before its consummation as a public theoretical organ. Through the investigation, experience in class struggle, and collective social practice of ourselves and those we work with we have reached the view that the state unions do not represent the proletariat, they represent the imperialist bourgeoisie. Hence the NLP and its fraternal organizations criticize the state unions from two different perspectives. The first is from the standpoint of the economic demands of the trade unionist struggle. This is also referred to as the standpoint of bourgeois trade unionism as outlined by Lenin, a perspective which *The Worker* explicitly rejected in their appeal to us for "unity". This is the struggle for immediate demands within the confines of wage labor under conditions of a bourgeois dictatorship. The state unions are notorious for enforcing layoffs, speedups, pay cuts, "flex" scheduling, and so on, and naturally, every principled trade unionist (communist and otherwise) rejects state unionism on the basis of this negation of the economic struggle (which even the so-called "business unions" of the pre-NLRA period were able to conduct on bourgeois trade unionist terms).

The second is from the standpoint of the proletarian dictatorship, the conquest of political power and the political interests of the proletariat within the labor movement. The state unions are crucial in channeling the energy of the workers back into the Democratic and Republican parties and are the most organized and powerful agents of the bourgeois state (politically and organizationally) within the US labor movement. Through the institutions of the modern US welfare system and the US two-party bourgeois democratic model, the state unions are directly integrated into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and US imperialism, relying on these structures for their legitimacy and survival. Naturally, every revolutionary rejects this. Thus it is the mission of the New Labor Press to develop correct theoretical positions on the labor question, begin to outline a revolutionary path within the labor movement, and help in the forging of new trade union leadership capable of organizing outside the state union channels (and utilizing them correctly when unavoidable) in order to win the economic demands of the masses as well as prepare the workers for the new tasks involved in overthrowing the

dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie and organizing socialist production. Furthermore, the development of new trade union leadership is part of the struggle to reconstitute the Communist Party, which is needed to lead the trade unions, and not simply exist as an organized faction within the anti-worker state unions as the revisionist CPUSA does.

Not so for *The Worker*! In the eyes of *The Worker*, this is not line struggle nor contributing to reconstituting the Communist Party—it is simply “bickering over the question of labor tactics”!² In the eyes of *The Worker*, the question of whether the unions will be a means for the imperialist bourgeoisie to press-gang the workers into ever-worsening conditions or a powerful tool for improving day-to-day conditions and organizing socialist production is “militant economism”. The empirically wrong claim from *The Worker* that “the bourgeois unions are not part of the state apparatus” (see the NLP’s “[Political Economy of the American Labor Movement](#)”) leads to their objectively incorrect line on reconstituting the Communist Party and completely invalidates any pretense to unity with the NLP that *The Worker* may hypocritically display. In actual fact, this constitutes a rejection of line struggle on their part, since they call for us to “unite under Maoism” through explicitly downplaying and liberally skipping over two completely opposite positions on the labor question, one based in reality and the other based in petty bourgeois fantasy. Furthermore, this and other positions demonstrate an inability to grasp class criteria, class position, and other fundamentals of Marxism, like dialectical and historical materialism.

For example, in the petty bourgeois fantasy of *The Worker*, the NLRB was a concession granted to the workers and not direct state intervention in the labor movement against the interests of the workers. There is this article³ which touts the NLRB’s “rules that protect employee’s speech while exercising their organizing rights, lauded at the time of implementation by the Teamsters as a big win for labor”. And in case that was too ambiguous: “In 1935, the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) was passed, *protecting workers from the influence of company politics in the union and helping to maintain the independence of the workers in their organizations.*”⁴ In the petty bourgeois fantasy of *The Worker*, “The strike is almost universally successful historically.” In the very same article in which the NLRB is praised, it is claimed, “In the present, the labor union represents the interests of the bourgeoisie by mediating and ensuring that productive relations are maintained.” That is the labor line of *The Worker*. They tack left ideologically by condemning labor unions across the board for representing “the interests of the bourgeoisie”, but in actual fact they copy the extreme right of the labor movement by praising the NLRA and downplaying the political differences between class collaborationist unions and class conscious ones (left in form, right in essence). This is the same line that led *The Worker* to publish an article falsely equating Teamsters Mobilize, a revisionist electoralist faction of Teamsters for a Democratic Union, with New Day at UPS, the publication of actual class-conscious shop-floor trade

²<https://theworker.news/2024/07/04/a-critique-of-new-labor-press-the-principal-task-of-revolutionaries-in-the-usa-is-reconstituting-the-communist-party-expressed-in-the-current-task-of-uniting-under-maoism/>

³[\[https://theworker.news/2024/06/15/monopoly-backed-judges-strike-legal-blows-against-workers-rights/\]](https://theworker.news/2024/06/15/monopoly-backed-judges-strike-legal-blows-against-workers-rights/)

⁴[\[https://theworker.news/2024/07/18/the-workers-must-work-to-destroy-the-labor-aristocracy-historical-perspectives-on-the-2024-neaso-strike/\]](https://theworker.news/2024/07/18/the-workers-must-work-to-destroy-the-labor-aristocracy-historical-perspectives-on-the-2024-neaso-strike/)

union organizers at UPS, as “another rank-and-file organization of UPS Teamsters”.⁵ It is the line of *neither* trade union organizing *nor* party organizing—the same line criticized as Avakianism by the NLP in “[False Theories False Leaders: MCU in the Labor Movement](#)”. It goes without saying that such a line has nothing to do with organizing or leading the process of reconstituting the CPUSA or leading the trade union struggle, that this line is only a cover for factional fighting in the labor movement over the sops offered by the state union bureaucracy.

Falsely equating New Day at UPS and Teamsters Mobilize is a sign that *The Worker* does not understand the elementary difference between organizing a faction inside a reactionary state bureaucracy and organizing workers who happen to be in the legal custody of said organization, and does not grasp the contradiction between reformism and revolution as it actually manifests when organizing workers. This is what Stalin said about the prospects of communist organizing in the labor movement in 1928:

“From the fact that we must work within the reformist trade unions — provided only that they are mass organisations — it does not at all follow that we must confine our mass work to work within the reformist trade unions, that we must become slaves of the standards and demands of those unions. If the reformist leadership is identifying itself with capitalism (see the resolutions of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern and the Fourth Congress of the Profintern), while the working class is waging a struggle against capitalism, can it be affirmed that the struggle of the working class, led by the Communist Party, can avoid breaking to some extent the existing reformist framework of the trade unions? Obviously, this cannot be affirmed without landing into opportunism. Therefore, a situation is quite conceivable in which it may be necessary to create parallel mass associations of the working class, against the will of the trade-union bosses who have sold themselves to the capitalists. We already have such a situation in America.” [The Right Danger in the German Communist Party, emphasis added]

This is important because this was written *before* the NLRA or corporatist Nazi Germany, before the colossal expansion of trade union capitalism and its incorporation into the state in the form of 501(c) organizations, at a time when ties between the unions and top union officials and the bourgeois parties and state were much rarer and less formal, and ties between the workers and their trade unions were much stronger (with the obvious exception of fascist Italy). Even back then, it was necessary to break with the existing framework of the trade unions and “create parallel mass associations of the working class”. After a hundred years of near-total unwavering obedience to the American imperialist bourgeoisie on the part of the existing trade unions, and the reduction of the trade unions’ popularity among the masses to an absolute minimum, people *still* dispute or add unnecessary qualifications to this line! Nor do these same “comrades” recognize the absolute importance of a correct understanding of the Labor Question as a defining point of demarcation between reformism and revolution in theory and practice, as Stalin, Lenin, and all great Marxist leaders did.

The material basis for the continued line struggle over this is found in the vast petty-bourgeoisie and labor aristocracy in the United States. Lenin wrote in *Imperialism and the Split in Socialism* that, “The important thing is that, economically, the desertion of a stratum of the labour aristocracy to the

⁵[\[https://theworker.news/2023/09/15/teamsters-vote-in-new-contract-praised-as-historic-win-by-leadership-sell-out-by-rank-and-file/ \]](https://theworker.news/2023/09/15/teamsters-vote-in-new-contract-praised-as-historic-win-by-leadership-sell-out-by-rank-and-file/)

bourgeoisie has matured and become an accomplished fact; and this economic fact, this shift in class relations, will find political form, in one shape or another, without any particular ‘difficulty’. On the economic basis referred to above, the political institutions of modern capitalism—press, parliament associations, congresses etc.—have created political privileges and *sops for the respectful, meek, reformist and patriotic office employees and workers*, corresponding to the economic privileges and sops. Lucrative and soft jobs in the government or on the war industries committees, in parliament and on diverse committees, on the editorial staffs of ‘respectable’, legally published newspapers or *on the management councils of no less respectable and ‘bourgeois law-abiding’ trade unions—this is the bait* by which the imperialist bourgeoisie attracts and rewards the representatives and supporters of the ‘bourgeois labour parties’.” [emphasis added]

It must be noted that while *The Worker* put forward the slogan of “The Workers Must Work to Destroy the Labor Aristocracy”, they put this forward only as the rallying cry of the lower and mid-level bureaucrats against the executives. This is demonstrated in their writing on the NEA Staff Organization’s (NEASO) strike.⁶ The NEASO is an organization for defending the rights of the middle-level NEA bureaucrats against the NEA membership and the NEA executives. This is undeniable evidence both of *The Worker*’s petty bourgeois editorial line and their continued inability to grasp reality, to correctly differentiate a trade union from a guild or professional association (much less a state-produced bargaining unit). For decades, the NEA has worked with reactionaries of all stripes to worsen the conditions of educators and students. *The Worker* says, “Opportunism exists in the current labor movement of the United States. It manifests itself primarily as the labor aristocracy but finds its roots in the very ideology taught by the unions themselves. In the present day, the labor unions are living on the imperialist superprofits of the United States economy. [...] The labor aristocracy stands in an effort to preserve the bourgeoisie, preserve imperialism, and ultimately preserve the capitalist monopoly on the world. [...] The work of any and all labor aristocrats is rendered impossible without the existence of these [NEASO, DSA, AFL-CIO] internal staffing unions.” Straightforward, one would think. Yet when one section of the labor aristocracy and bureaucracy, the NEASO, goes on strike, *The Worker* says, “The NEASO is correct to criticize the NEA for refusing to ‘uphold union values;’ ... The NEASO strike is justified, but the situation demands a correct and materialist analysis of the class character of the NEA and all other ‘yellow’ unions, which are staffed by the lieutenants of the organized labor movement, again doing the political work of the bourgeoisie.” Which is it—is the NEASO strike a strike of labor bureaucrats seeking a better deal for themselves from imperialism, or is it a justified uprising against the higher-level lieutenants of the establishment labor movement? One wonders how the NLP is supposed to unite with people who cannot take a clear stance on such a basic issue as the class nature of the NEASO strike: can there be unity in the labor movement with people who are unable to apply class criteria in their “analysis”?

The Worker is equally unprincipled and petty bourgeois regarding the line struggle in the student movement. But it bears mentioning why the NLP even bothered to comment on the student movement. The student and youth movement, when organized correctly, has historically played a key auxiliary role not just for the revolutionary movement broadly, but the labor movement in particular. This can be seen

⁶ [<https://theworker.news/2024/07/18/the-workers-must-work-to-destroy-the-labor-aristocracy-historical-perspectives-on-the-2024-neaso-strike/>]]

specifically in the history of youth departmental work within the revolutionary labor movement in this country, and the ways the youth and student movement were combined with the labor movement through work within the education sector. For example, one of our ideas is that there should be a shared quarterly or trimesterly magazine that could include contributors from among the students, educators, and support staff. Such a publication would be important in tying together the exploitation and oppression of all three and could include such topics as imperialist propaganda in the curriculum, finance capitalism and landlordism of the university system, administrative spending/corruption, discrimination against national and religious minority and LGBT students, Republican and Democrat attacks on education, NEA and AFT sabotage of teachers' demands, so on and so forth, and furthermore, that such a publication could serve to unite the education sector and the youth movement behind a set of demands for improving the conditions across the board after decades of backsliding. We bring this up to make clear that our struggle for principles in the theoretical struggle is connected to our practical work, that the struggle over principles does not exist in the platonic realm of ideas isolated from history and work as the Daltonites metaphysically assert.

It was with *these historical principles of the relationship between the youth and workers movement* in mind that the NLP undertook criticism of a specific political line put forward by certain organizations. (This line was expressed in the statement "Center Revolution by Centering Palestine" which was written by the Oakland-Berkeley Revolutionary Study Group and signed by the Revolutionary Maoist Coalition, Revolutionary Student Union, and Revolutionary Study Group.) Contained within this piece were formulations that contained elements of the line of student vanguardism and the revisionist method that denies or obfuscates the existence of class differentiation among the students. (Theories which have existed in this country for decades and actually played a significant role in sabotaging party reconstitution.) Obviously *anyone rejecting in principle class differentiation among the students (or anyone who in principle rejects class politics) cannot be said to represent the proletariat in the student movement*, and consequently cannot be considered a revolutionary element. On the other hand, if revisionist or incorrect positions are the product of amateurism and "unscientific planning", as our piece says, and groups struggle to unite with this criticism and carry out their organizing on the basis of criticizing the bourgeois and petty bourgeois leaders of the student movement, then they can be said to be revolutionary in deed and not just in words. In an environment of prevailing theoretical poverty, the struggle over these principles must be open and honest, must be clear and firm, not unclear and opportunist, which we can observe on the side of the Daltonites.

The Worker criticized the signatories of "Center Palestine by Centering Revolution" for describing the genocide of Palestinians as a "policy" and for using the words "center" and "gaze", which are associated with postmodernism. The students were explicitly told, "You comrades do not need to leave your universities and enter the drudgery of our factories and job-sites to gain class consciousness, nor to become proletarian revolutionaries." ⁷ In classic opportunist fashion they contradict this outright and meander to-and-fro between lines: saying one moment "Of course we are in full agreement with the NLP comrades that students as such or university students in particular are not any sort of vanguard"

⁷ [<https://theworker.news/2024/07/07/open-letter-to-the-signatories-of-the-statement-center-palestine-by-centering-revolution/>] [<https://theworker.news/2024/07/04/a-critique-of-new-labor-press-the-principal-task-of-revolutionaries-in-the-usa-is-reconstituting-the-communist-party-expressed-in-the-current-task-of-uniting-under-maoism/>]

and another “Such labeling [student vanguardism as a revisionist idea] does more to repel the young comrades and to consolidate rather than correct their mistaken ideas.” This is how *actual* opportunists and sectarians write polemics: they avoid clearly and unambiguously labeling ideas as right or wrong, and criticize the people who are correct (in this case, by their own admission, the NLP) for subjective reasons. In this case the subjective reason is that by clearly and unambiguously stating their errors, the NLP might offend some students and drive them further down the road of revisionism. Not only is this the definition of condescending and pessimistic, but for those who doubled down on their errors rather than struggling for unity this would only further demonstrate the NLP’s point on the vacillating and not-yet-defined class nature of students. Another example: “Liquidationism does in fact hide behind the political line of the Revolutionary Maoist Coalition in the form of their arguments that put national ‘mass organizations’ before the question of reconstitution. This is a major mistaken idea, which NLP have led struggles to correct; we only insist that they correct their methods of struggle...” *The Worker* has to play this idiotic game of hide-and-seek because they are *afraid* to admit that someone other than them was correct, but *plainly expressing their own views* would completely expose them as sectarians disinterested in class politics. The opportunism and idealism of the Daltonites becomes even more obvious here considering that we never actually engaged the RMC in direct line struggle over the question they claim we have, yet somehow the NLP’s “methods of struggle” are wrong. The NLP is criticized for “methods of struggle” that exist solely in the mind of the author. Perhaps we should simply slander the RMC as “immature” and “infantile” as *The Worker* does to the NLP?

The student movement, like the labor movement, is not a monolith. There is no magical barrier preventing bourgeois agents from entering it, and in actual fact, the *default world outlook of the students is bourgeois*. The adage that the ruling ideas of any epoch are the ideas of the ruling class is even more true in the university system, which is responsible in part for propagating those ideas. As for the class nature of students in theory: “The students would not be what they are if their political grouping did not correspond to the political grouping of society as a whole—‘correspond’ not in the sense of the student groups and the social groups being absolutely proportionate in strength and numbers, but in the sense of *the necessary and inevitable existence among the students of the same groups as in society*. And Russian society as a whole, with its (relatively) embryonic development of class antagonisms, its political virginity, and the crushed and downtrodden condition of the vast, overwhelming majority of the population under the rule of police despotism, is characterised by precisely these six groups, namely: reactionaries, indifferents, uplifters [progressives], liberals, Socialist-Revolutionaries and Social-Democrats.” [Lenin, *The Tasks of the Revolutionary Youth*]

Basing our line on materialist analysis of the student movement, the students could roughly be divided into the following categories over the war in Palestine: Zionists (aka pro-Israel one-staters), pro-Palestine one-staters, two-staters (aka conciliators with Zionism), “pro-international law” type liberals, and indifferents. The issue with the original OBRSG article was that it went out of its way *not* to differentiate between these groups, instead making sweeping incorrect claims regarding the protests (which were mainly led by conciliators and liberals) and the role of the students in the class struggle. *The Worker*, instead of simply agreeing with our correct criticism, decided to opportunistically demonstrate its “real leadership” and criticized the original statement for its language while *defending the statement’s lack of class analysis*, haughtily asking the NLP, “Where and in what world do the students at universities stop being part of the proletarian movement?” This is another expression of

their petty bourgeois editorial line. The students are active, they are rising up against the university administration and even confronting law enforcement in skirmishes, therefore they must be “part of the proletarian movement” regardless of class criteria and the actual politics of the people leading.

The Daltonites fall into another similar metaphysical error regarding the women’s movement as well. Regarding the existence of women, the division of women into cis and trans, and the existence of non-binary people, it is clear *The Worker* continues to be vexed by these facts. In their polemic against “comrade Krix”, *The Worker* says: “Female is a biological condition, not a social condition (as womanhood is).” Womanhood as a “social condition”—this does not differ from the postmodernist line on gender. In case there was any ambiguity, “Woman as a combination of factors, biological, economic, and social, with social being the principle (i.e. the determinant historical factor) is lost on Krix. [...] If *woman is a social product* as Marxism has always held, then this product is *the result of complex and changing social relations of and inflicted upon the female sex*.”

The rhetorical flourish by which Marxism is turned into postmodernism is this: the Marxist tautology that people, including women, are socially produced, is subtly substituted for the postmodernist claim that women are not a natural phenomenon at all but a social one. This position has also been used by the Daltonites to deduce that trans men and women or nonbinary people (or homosexuality in the case of the RCP) are socially produced by imperialism—a position identical to the reactionary concept of social degeneracy⁸. Marxism has always separated the existence of women from their social position, which is the only correct materialist thinking. (For instance, Eleanor Marx: “The position of women rests, as everything in our complex modern society rests, on an economic basis.” And furthermore, “The reason of this is again the economic position of dependency upon man. Women, once more like the labourers, have been expropriated as to their rights as human beings, just as the labourers were expropriated as to their rights as producers.”) The Daltonites wrongly equate the existence of women with their social position in class society. If *The Worker*’s formula that women are the product of social relations forced upon females is accepted, then it logically follows that women would cease to exist following the abolition of those social relations and an end to systematic force against females. It would also follow that trans women don’t exist, as these would presumably be categorized as males and womanhood is something “inflicted upon the female sex”. And, so that there can be no doubt as to where this reactionary line of thinking leads, one need only recall the spurious claim from *Struggle Sessions* that, “the ideology that underlies non-binary identification is rooted in idealism and reactionary postmodernism.”

This is postmodernist ideology that does not differentiate between natural phenomena (the division of humanity by reproductive functions typical of mammals and the natural existence of people outside this norm, whether it be homosexuality, intersex conditions, transgender-ness, etc—none of these phenomena are specific to human society) and social phenomena (the exploitation of reproductive labor and the oppression of women and queer people characteristic of class society and imperialism in particular as reaction all along the line). As Stalin said in *Anarchism or Socialism*, “Don't you really

⁸ [<https://web.archive.org/web/20210713005730/https://struggle-sessions.com/2021/07/12/letter-to-the-editor-class-struggle-or-sexual-liberation/>]

know that physiological phenomena, such as eating, for example, differ fundamentally from sociological phenomena, such as the economic conditions of men, for example? [...] Is it conceivable that *that which does not change* [in our case – the sexual physiology of humans] can determine *that which is constantly changing* [the position of women and queer people in class society]?” This is an ongoing theoretical problem going back decades that is able to persist because of the extreme backwardness of the sciences. Gender and sexuality has been poorly studied because of the biases of the bourgeois scientific institutions, and this lack of understanding is seized on by reactionaries to defend misogyny or attribute diversity in gender and sex to imperialism. At the same time, breakthroughs in science (such as the mass production of hormones, in vitro fertilization, automation of domestic labor, etc) are seized on by the petty bourgeoisie as opportunities to dispute the leading role of working women in the women’s movement and even deny the economic exploitation of women and queer people to reduce their struggle to that of formal equality in the bounds of bourgeois democracy. *The Worker* represents an attempt to eclectically combine these two deviations, claiming women are a “social product” of imperialism but selectively condemning transgender or nonbinary people (a line which is also applied opportunistically or hidden depending on the given moment) on the grounds that they represent an ideological concession to imperialism. In short, just nonsense.

However, this subjectivist type of thinking is not unique to this group. The draft programme of the Revolutionary Union decades ago claimed, “Prostitution, drug addiction, *homosexuality and other practices which bourgeois society breeds and the bourgeoisie promotes to degrade and enslave the masses of people*, will be abolished.” Abolition of homosexuality, or abolition of womanhood, is a petty bourgeois fantasy. (Not to mention the questionable theory equating prostitution, a type of exploitation, with drug addiction, a disease, and with homosexuality, a type of sexual intercourse.) The idealists cannot understand how developments in biology and reproductive technology have altered our understanding of women—which was wrongly equated with female reproductive functions when virtually all of the most important Marxist texts on women and the class struggle were written—and subsequently cannot understand the difference between the idealist conception of women’s liberation and the materialist conception of it. Described succinctly by Lenin: “*The real emancipation of women*, real communism, will begin only where and when an all-out struggle begins (led by the proletariat wielding the state power) against this petty housekeeping, or rather when its *wholesale transformation into a large-scale socialist economy begins*.” [A Great Beginning] And elsewhere, “The working women’s movement has for its objective the fight for the *economic and social, and not merely formal, equality of woman*. The main task is to draw the women into socially productive labour, extricate them from ‘domestic slavery’, free them of their stultifying and humiliating resignation to the perpetual and exclusive atmosphere of the kitchen and nursery.” [On International Women’s Day] There is not a word in the Marxist canon about the distinction between men and women disappearing under communism, or about women being a class in their own right (as is implied by *The Worker*’s particular use of the phrase “social product”). Women acquire importance insofar as their place within political economy (as laborers for example), and usually, they are a specially downtrodden section of the proletariat and lower petty-bourgeoisie. (Often due to formal or implied exclusion from certain institutions, such as legal bans on voting or owning property or discrimination in employment, facts which bring women as a whole closer to the proletariat and create a rich basis for the leadership of working women over the whole women’s movement.)

Communist theory is supposed to demonstrate how women, and poor and proletarian women in particular, can only be fully liberated by the forcible overthrow of the imperialist bourgeoisie, and subsequently build up socialist enterprises that serve as the material basis for ending the spontaneous exploitation of women and use the proletarian state to eliminate reactionary remnants. Metaphysical ruminations on what the essence of womanhood is or why women exist, which are typical of idealist petty bourgeois factions, are nothing more than a veiled renunciation of the demands of working women. It is worth noting that, while the Daltonite revisionist clique puts on a public performance of a left line on womanhood, in practice one of the key errors they committed, were criticized for, and mishandled to such an extent that it helped produce the 2021-2022 leadership crisis and Right Liquidationist Line was blatant misogyny, including holding a struggle session against a woman for trying to leave her partner (alluded to in the phrase “the conception of ‘struggle sessions’ based mainly on one’s personal life and personal problems” in “Our Main Weaknesses in the Three Fields”), delegating reproductive labor to women cadre and women’s organizations, and expecting trans women to look a certain way.

On that note, the only mention of the issue in the (CG) CRCPUSA’s “self-criticism” is the following: “This is evidenced in the fact that all the erroneous political lines that were assumed to have been overcome: the national line, the so-called ‘gender line,’ the line of charity and disconnected study, Avakianite definitions and revisionism, were not defeated and in fact came right back after the split. This shows that the political line of the left was not carried out to strengthen unity but only accomplished superficial dominance.” And “Evictions are coming, layoffs are coming, attack the enemy head on. Women must be mobilized as a force for proletarian revolution, attack the enemy head on. Workers at the point of production must be reached, do nothing and allow the enemy to pillage.” One wonders what “the so-called gender line” was—was the Struggle Sessions position that nonbinary identification is reactionary postmodernism correct or incorrect and partially defeated by “the left”? But the real issue of the Struggle Sessions article was the premise that gender is an ideological or social phenomenon anyway, so even if the Struggle Sessions position is being criticized here it still isn’t a full admission of the problem. And furthermore, none of the practical problems of organizing women under the CR are addressed at all, thus making this document utterly pointless from the standpoint of the women and queer proletarians.

It is on the basis of these fundamental errors of Marxist philosophy and political economy that the left-opportunists then attempt to edify and provide us with a vision of the “party” and “party reconstitution”.

On Principles of Party Reconstitution

For all their bluster about the “party”, reconstitution, the “principles” of these concepts, etc., it is truly astounding how little real content and analysis the writings of the left-opportunists actually have on the topic. In particular it is remarkable how little is defined in their writings on reconstitution, especially as

they pertain to our actual material conditions and context (the United States), and how consistently vague and rigidly formulaic their prescriptions regarding reconstitution are. This is in turn worsened by the high degree of formalism and opportunistic changing of positions and formulations found generally within their works that makes it hard to nail down what exactly they are even saying or proposing.

For example, the formula found in the very title of their polemic against is: “the principal task of revolutionaries in the USA is reconstituting the Communist Party, expressed in the current task of uniting under Maoism.” But what does that mean? What does “reconstitution” mean in a US context, and what does “uniting under Maoism” mean?

These are not empty rhetorical questions, but actual problems worth pondering. The original slogan of reconstitution that Chairman Gonzalo and Peruvian revolutionaries waved was “Let us take Mariategui and reconstitute his party”, because even though the original Communist Party of Peru had devolved into revisionism, there was still a path to revolution and reconstitution for the Peruvian masses established through Mariategui’s thought. This gave their reconstitution process real concrete meaning, as Gonzalo and the PCP describe in *To Understand Mariategui* and *Let Us Take Mariategui and Reconstitute His Party*. It concretely defined their reconstitution process as it related to the land or peasant question, the question of colonialism and semi-colonialism in Peru, the question of the indigenous Peruvians, the need for a revolutionary peasant-worker alliance, etc. and would be defined and developed further by Gonzalo by theoretical elaboration on the question of bureaucratic capitalism, the institution of the latifundio, the theory of people’s war as applied to Peruvian conditions, etc.

The United States does not have a defined path to reconstitution like the Communist Party of Peru had with Mariategui even prior to Gonzalo’s historic leadership. We have no single great revolutionary leader, no pre-existing revolutionary thought domestically to look to to show us the path to reconstitution and revolution in our context. Even identifying a useful reference point or relative peak of our movement is complicated by the fact that the left line never had firm control of the Communist Party USA even prior to the 1944 liquidation, as its top leadership was always composed of an alternating cascade of different rightists and revisionists, whether they be Lovestonites, Fosterites or Browderites. For example, while we at NLP would probably categorize the CPUSA during the Third Period (1928-1932) as our movement’s relative highest historical peak, most of the main achievements of that period were due to the direct intervention of the Communist International rather than due to any correct historic leadership in the CPUSA itself.

So when the Daltonites write about “reconstitution”, how do they relate universal theories of scientific socialism (party construction, constitution/reconstitution, etc.) to a US context? What is the definite path to reconstitution they lay out in US conditions? The short answer is they don’t, but rather provide us with a few bits, pieces and massive holes, scattered around different articles and polemics. Much of what they provide is copied directly from different historical and current international formulations, but those original applications of our ideology to US conditions they do provide are insightful insofar as illuminate to us the faulty grasp of Marxism that is at the root of these errors.

In one article they write that “the reconstitution effort must take place in the center of the concrete class struggles and not on their margins, specifically the places where proletarians are exploited, in the factories and warehouses, to consolidate around itself a core of class conscious workers who can be forged in struggle in order to carry out mass work”, that “labor struggles are the principal site of struggle for communists fighting for reconstitution and socialist revolution”, but in their criticism of us they write “the principle task is not bickering over the question of labor tactics but the reconstitution of the Communist Party” and “the trade union question is not fundamental in the strategic sense.” We wonder what Gonzalo would have said if told the agrarian question in Peru “is not fundamental in the strategic sense” and defining a revolutionary position on it was “distracting” from the process of reconstitution?

In one article they write: “The current stage of revolution in the US is the stage of reconstitution. Today this is characterized and specified as rectification, patient ideological struggle, and allowing revolutionary practice to speak. In this way, the leadership of the proletariat can emerge, consolidate, and become recognized⁹” but then elsewhere write “The principal task all through the stage of reconstitution, the task which guides all the other tasks, is the reconstitution of the Communist Party. We understand this as expressed now in two tasks: unite under Maoism and go to the deepest and most profound masses, the hardcore of the proletariat mainly¹⁰.”

They then define this task to “unite under Maoism” variably as 1) “the struggle for unity under Maoism means standing against liquidation and is the principle struggle of the communists; no other struggles must take place before this one”¹¹, 2) a struggle over the “points of demarcation” taken from the International Communist League’s founding statement, 3) an internal struggle within revolutionary circles who “desire a unified revolutionary movement steeled in Maoism, and therefore they must first struggle against their amateurism, factionalism, and lack of confidence in struggle and begin talking seriously to those with whom they disagree¹²”, 4) the use of a newspaper (“the advanced agent of the resumption of The Daily Worker”) to “to link up the best and most revolutionary circles with the most revolutionary and class conscious workers, forging and consolidating ideological unity¹³”, and 5) the struggle over “1) defining the type of revolution which must be accomplished in imperialist countries like the US as the socialist revolution, explicitly winning support around the socialist revolution; 2) defining the stage in which this revolution proceeds, specifically the stage of reconstituting the Communist Party of the USA; and 3) considering the level of development in this stage on the basis of the subjective and objective conditions, this is to specify that the relative dispersal of forces, the level of class consciousness among the workers and the crisis of imperialism all amount to highlighting the necessity of uniting under Maoism, which will define the coming years.”

⁹<https://theworker.news/2023/06/01/fundamentals-of-communist-work-in-the-current-conditions/>

¹⁰<https://theworker.news/2024/01/02/unite-under-maoism-boycott-the-2024-elections/>

¹¹<https://theworker.news/2024/07/04/a-critique-of-new-labor-press-the-principal-task-of-revolutionaries-in-the-usa-is-reconstituting-the-communist-party-expressed-in-the-current-task-of-uniting-under-maoism/>

¹²<https://theworker.news/2024/07/10/three-principles-related-to-the-question-of-the-party/>

¹³<https://theworker.news/2024/05/01/one-year-of-the-worker/>

This jumbled list of formulas and contradictions speaks for itself. It does not provide clarification, but only serves to further confuse and disorganize the present line struggle serving reconstitution. The fundamental problem underlying this all is that the Daltonites, being idealists, don't understand their own country. They don't have the basic grasp of materialism, in particular the concept of class, necessary to understand their own circumstances, and are thus incapable of formulating correct and effective principles, lines and strategies serving the process of reconstitution.

Regarding the array of revolutionary forces in our society they write: "If we are to look at the stage of revolution in the US we conclude that the main force and leading force is the working class, and that its reserve forces are the students and intellectuals¹⁴." Again, what does this even mean, and on what basis is such a claim being made? Which students? Which intellectuals? Which segments of the working class? Why, using what class criteria? And also, once again, we have to look elsewhere to find answers to *some* of these questions (their lack of basic material analysis of the students remains unaddressed throughout their texts).

Their longest article that serves an analysis of US society is entitled "Fundamentals of Communist Work in the Current Conditions". In it we find the following contradiction regarding this "reserve force" of intellectual workers: "Workers who do not create any value, those who work for Non Government Organizations [!], intellectual workers and so on, are not proletarians but as workers can find common ground and be united behind proletarian leadership" while at the same time "The imperialist ruling class is the principal target of the socialist revolution, it is the true enemy of all other classes but nonetheless it converts some into its staunch allies, or handy tools in moments of crisis to secure its rule. This sector is often composed of intellectual laborers, academics, managers, expert professionals, religious officials, small-scale capitalists, the police apparatus, and agents of the old state, for example in the form of electioneering for one imperialist administrator or another". So the intellectual workers are one of two key reserve forces of the proletarian revolution, but are also "staunch allies" of the imperialist ruling class? In this same vein, their description of NGO workers as a key potential ally of the proletariat would be almost unbelievable if it wasn't real: who do they think the "intellectual laborers, academics, managers, expert professionals", "electioneers" and "agents of the old state" are? Are they blissfully unaware of fifty years of bourgeois governance in this country, where since the 1970s the administration and reach of the imperialist state has been modified and expanded through the vast domestic and international NGO-complex?

When looking into what they mean by "working class" we run into another related problem. While there is an identification of the working-class being composed of various strata, and there being segments of society who are key allies of the "hardcore proletariat" ("immigrants", "Black people", certain "small-scale exploiters"), etc. what the seasoned Marxist will notice immediately is that the level of analysis has glaring absences. There is no discussion of the national question (both on the mainland US or its overseas territories), no discussion of the semi-proletariat/urban or rural poor and

¹⁴<https://theworker.news/2024/05/20/an-activists-asks-how-can-student-occupations-help-us-win-our-demands/>

their respective movements, no discussion of the women's movement, no discussion of major US institutions and structures like the two-party system, the legacy of settler-colonialism in the reservation system, etc. and no analysis of the labor question outside of the acknowledgment of the existence of a US labor aristocracy.

The closest we get to a discussion of the national question is a section on the specific oppression and importance of "Black people", in which the discussion remains limited to the struggle against racial oppression and white chauvinism. Do the Daltonites recognize or not recognize the Black Belt thesis established by the Communist International's Sixth Congress? Do they uphold the Chicano national thesis? What is their view on the question of the various indigenous peoples, or the US's external colonies like Puerto Rico, American Samoa or Guam? If they do not believe the national question is valid in a US context and or in relation to any of these peoples, is it because they feel these groups are better understood as national minorities, or do they feel that theses like that put forward by the Communist International were incorrect to begin with? Their deliberate silence on these topics when attempting to provide a comprehensive analysis of US conditions, having once taken concrete stands on these questions years prior, is another demonstration of how they refuse and negate the process of line struggle in practice, no matter how much they use the term in their sloganeering.

Party reconstitution, people's war, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, essential processes of scientific socialism like these cannot be applied in the abstract but must instead be defined in relation to the particular material problems and questions which affect a given particular national context. The labor question and the national question have been the two fundamental theoretical-practical questions that flow from our particular national conditions around which much of the last century of US party work and revolutionary practice has revolved. The idea that the theory and process of party reconstitution can be defined and applied in our US context while either negating or ignoring taking a correct stand on these questions would be laughable if it wasn't what the Daltonites are actively doing. They remove the centrality of the masses and a concrete application of our universal ideology to a particular national context from the process of reconstitution. It is the position of worshiping and codifying our theoretical poverty, of constructing "principles" that enshrine idealism and metaphysics and disorganize rather than organize the national line struggle and process serving the reconstitution of the Communist Party USA. And this is without even beginning to get into their confusions and errors of understanding regarding the theory and practice of the Party itself.

Even just in their brief and vacuous writings on the subject, the left-opportunists cannot help but import their idealist and petty-bourgeois deviations into definitions and formulations of what it means to be a "Communist" and "professional revolutionary" in our current context. On the subject of what it means to be a "Communist" in the US they write: "A Communist is he or she who accepts the revolutionary program of the Communist Party and belongs to the Party as a militant, or in the case of the USA, one who accepts and carries out the reconstitution of the Party as a supporter of a definite revolutionary organization." And on defining the work and essence of "professional revolutionaries" in our context they have recently raised the slogan and formulation of being an "outside agitator":

“Please let the outside agitators, the professional activists, the influential militant arrive and begin their enthusiastic and necessary work—we are waiting! And when they come, trained not outside but from among our best in these very struggles today, let us embrace them warmly and let us recognize them as professional revolutionaries!

[...]

If you would like to become an outside agitator, contact *The Worker* to learn how you can get involved.”

Elsewhere *The Worker*, in its “Three Principles Related to the Question of the Party”, puts forward an individualistic and subjective conception of party unity instead of an objective materialist one. *The Worker* says, “Organizational control over individuals’ lives is a communist position that fundamentally violates the old-liberal concept of the free-individual.” *The Worker* talks only about “ideological requirements to calling oneself a communist”, everywhere there are subjective criteria concerning party members but not a word about what organizing work is needed to reconstitute the Communist Party. In their view, there are subjective requirements that an individual either accepts or rejects, and on that basis, they may or may not be a “Communist” capable of contributing to party organizing.

From the above quotation about control, one would think *The Worker* at least holds some respect for party discipline. On the contrary, this is what *The Worker* has to say about discipline: “There are those who would set false, liberal, and anti-Marxist preconditions for unity such as the complete withdrawal from politics for those who have made mistakes or even been accused of making mistakes.” In the backwards outlook of *The Worker*, forcibly ejecting serial incompetents and misbehavers from revolutionary work is “liberal”. And so that there can be no mistaking their rejection of discipline, they clarify that this applies, “No matter the error made, this theory [of expelling people for mistakes] is unacceptable. It is a liquidationist theory meant to sweep class struggle and two-line struggle under the rug. First, it denies a desire for unity, second it avoids the struggle on this basis. The fact is that there have always been right opportunists and there always will be; they hide and seek to remain hidden by separating the left.”

Thus, we can clearly see how in terms of “principles related to the question of the party” we are presented by the Daltonites with a typical mix of Menshevism and petty-bourgeois fantasy. Firstly, it should be noted how little a role the actual work and tasks of “professional revolutionaries” seems to play in the left-opportunists’ formulations. Here even being a capital-C “Communist” is transformed into subjectivist metaphysics: so much for the “best sons and daughters of the class”, according to the Daltonites anyone who is a “supporter” of a “revolutionary organization” in the US and “who accepts and carries out” their abstract undefined process of party reconstitution is now magically a “Communist”. Notice how, once again, the basic principle of class criteria and class stand is notably absent. This petty-bourgeois Menshevik perversion of the Leninist concept of the “professional revolutionary” should come as no surprise however, as having an empty idealist conceptualization of

party reconstitution will naturally lead to a similarly empty and metaphysical conceptualization of the leaders and “professional revolutionaries” who carry out that process.

Stalin wrote in *Foundations of Leninism* that, “The Party as the organised detachment of the working class. The Party is not only the advanced detachment of the working class. If it desires really to direct the struggle of the class it must at the same time be the organised detachment of its class.” And furthermore, “But the Party cannot be only an advanced detachment. It must at the same time be a detachment of the class, part of the class, closely bound up with it by all the fibres of its being. [...] But the Party would cease to be a party if this distinction developed into a gap, if the Party turned in on itself and became divorced from the non-Party masses. The Party cannot lead the class if it is not connected with the non-Party masses, if there is no bond between the Party and the non-Party masses, if these masses do not accept its leadership, if the Party enjoys no moral and political credit among the masses.”

This is an actual materialist formulation of Party work. According to the materialist outlook, there are certain organizations needed to establish and maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat, and concrete tasks to perform in building up these organizations. Furthermore, there are individuals who objectively are or are not capable of performing these tasks. The highest organization that guides all the rest is the Communist Party, and individuals accept the discipline and leadership of the Party because it is objectively in their class interest to do so. The Party acts as the conscious leading force and a concrete force multiplier for the proletarians and not as another capitalist exerting “organizational control” over them. (Even if the petty-bourgeoisie sees it this way.)

Thus on the struggle to reconstitute the party, we see the petty bourgeois slogan of telling unqualified “Communists” (supporters of revolutionary organizations) and “outside agitators” to “unite under” an abstract “Maoism” un-applied to US condition versus the Marxist theory of the party as an organized system of working-class organizations which dialectically stems from and leads the class through concrete theoretical and practical work and is composed only of those individuals who are recognized and proven to be capable of carrying out those tasks. It is the difference between subjectivist criteria based on dedication to “ideology” and materialist criteria based on political-organizational work in service to the proletariat defined in relation to major questions of domestic class struggle.

Regarding principles of the work of the party, it has already been pointed out that *The Worker* pursues a petty bourgeois idealist line in the labor and student movements. They actively promote the NLRB as a supposed safeguard in the labor movement and are seemingly unable or unwilling to correctly apply basic principles of class criteria in their work and analysis. Our ideology tells us one key point of party work is to bring the spontaneous and limited battles of the masses, and our class in particular, in line with the conquest of political power (the dictatorship of the proletariat) through organizing. An organ such as *The Worker* which cannot tell the difference between the proletariat, the petty bourgeoisie, and the imperialist bourgeoisie in the labor movement thus distorts the very principle of class which underlies scientific socialism and the theory and practice of the party.

But maybe they are helping to organize line struggle among Maoist organizers? Also no. They reject the “sectarianism” and “bickering” of the New Labor Press and they reject the struggle for proletarian leadership in the student movement. The sole aim of their “line struggle” is now to opportunistically

attack already-existing national leadership and replace it with their own, through unprincipled posturing from afar, once their original slogan of “allowing revolutionary practice to speak” so that “the leadership of the proletariat can emerge, consolidate, and become recognized” backfired when others became recognized as leaders instead of them¹⁵.

The Party isn't a bunch of “outside agitators” or “supporters of definite revolutionary organizations” united around subjective criteria. According to Lenin, “The Party is the sum-total of its organisations linked together in a single whole. The Party is the organisation of the working class divided into a long chain of all kinds of local and special, central and general organisations.” [*How Vera Zasulich Demolishes Liquidationism*] The work and organization of revolutionaries in the line of the trade unions, producer cooperatives (especially collective farms), consumer cooperatives (including debtor associations, student unions, and tenant unions) is a matter of life and death for the Communist Party. These aren't issues that can be metaphysically separated from the process of reconstitution or line struggle or put off until some unspecified date pending “unity under Maoism” (processes which must occur within class struggle and not outside of or counterposed to it). Failure to carry out line struggle in these organizations, or failure to lead in the building of these organizations, is itself liquidationism. It is unthinkable that there can be a socialist economy without mass organizations of these types organized behind the vanguard party of the proletariat, especially if the masses are organized in direct subordination to a dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie like in the established trade unions. True, *The Worker* rails against liquidationism in their publication, they freely throw around accusations of Party or non-Party organizing at other Maoists, but what is the significance of these statements when they turn the struggle against liquidationism into a factionalist struggle in defense of their revisionist leadership?

The 12th point of the 21 conditions for adherence to the Comintern said that the party must be “organised in as centralist a manner as possible,” that there must be “iron discipline.” It goes without saying that if somebody can be politically active in the party (or pre-party for the US) or a revolutionary organization “no matter the error made”, there cannot be iron discipline. Furthermore, this is a revisionist distortion of line struggle. Line struggle does not mean that two lines can be allowed to coexist in perpetuity, that the people persistently carrying out ultra-left or right opportunist lines or failing to carry out the correct line must be permitted to continue in their post “no matter the error”. That is the theory of “two combines into one” criticized as bourgeois philosophy during the Cultural Revolution. The point of line struggle is not the revisionist theory of peaceful coexistence applied to the Party but that “the big fish swallows the little fish”, that the Left imposes itself on the Right. Again from *Foundations of Leninism*: “The achievement and maintenance of the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible without a party which is strong by reason of its solidarity and iron discipline. But *iron discipline in the Party is inconceivable without unity of will, without complete and absolute unity of action on the part of all members of the Party*. This does not mean, of course, that the possibility of conflicts of opinion within the Party is thereby precluded. On the contrary, iron discipline does not preclude but presupposes criticism and conflict of opinion within the Party. Least of all does it mean that discipline must be ‘blind.’ On the contrary, iron discipline does not preclude but presupposes

¹⁵<https://theworker.news/2023/06/01/fundamentals-of-communist-work-in-the-current-conditions/>

conscious and voluntary submission, for *only conscious discipline can be truly iron discipline*. But after a conflict of opinion has been closed, after criticism has been exhausted and a decision has been arrived at, unity of will and *unity of action of all Party members are the necessary conditions without which neither Party unity nor iron discipline in the Party is conceivable.*”

Thus concerning the question of discipline, we see *The Worker* demanding unity with people “no matter the error” to establish “organizational control over individuals’ lives” versus the Marxist theory of iron discipline in the Party logically following from conscious subjection to a political line that serves a single class through correct leadership within class struggle and two-line struggle. (And negatively reinforced by threat of expulsion in case of active wrecking or demotion in case of incompetence.)

Finally, perhaps most dangerously, in the entire way they have presented and carried themselves in this “line struggle” the Daltonites reverse and undermine the basic division of open and closed work at the heart of scientific socialism. By playing fast and loose with their internal definitions and external labeling of others with terms like “Communist”, “communist-in-formation” and “professional revolutionary”, what is supposed to be a principally closed process (like party reconstitution) is transformed into an open process. Topics which can and should be struggled over publicly, like theoretical positions on major national questions are glossed over or left ill-defined, while topics that should not be discussed in the open or on the internet, like the current policies of the bodies of secret organizations, as in the CG’s self-criticism, or identifications of who is and is not a “Communist” or “professional revolutionary” are obscenely paraded out for the sake of opportunist posturing. In what world should a supposedly open publication like *The Worker* ask for strangers on the internet to “reach out” if they are interested in becoming a “professional revolutionary” or “militant”? In what petty-bourgeois fantasy-land is it correct for a supposedly closed organization to leak internal documents to random isolated internet publications like Red Library “for public release”? It is simply absurd, a negation of basic security principles for the purpose of winning over and impressing elements who are amateurish enough to not recognize the rank opportunism of it all.

This tactic of baiting and posturing over closed work in the open is damaging and the same error which in part directly lead to the last two major liquidationist campaigns detailed in the first section. We condemn the practice and re-iterate our stance that will not fall into the trap of engaging with this dirty police-like perversion of what open two line struggle should look like, no matter how much the Daltonites or others persist in it. It is a line which lends itself to the Avakianite practice of constructing “intermediate organizations” which are neither sectoral mass organizations nor Communist organizations. It is a deviation which haunts the US petty-bourgeois left and dangerously combines closed and open work. For example, we might look at the correct example of sectoral work represented by our Peruvian comrades and their organizations like the Centro de Autoeducacion Obrera Jose Carlos Mariategui. An open worker’s organization focused on creating theoretical analysis and political works on the labor question, in central defining documents of their’s from the 1970s like “The Current Political Situation and the Tasks of the Proletariat” they spend most of their time focusing on the problem of “corporatist unionism” and the need to correctly apply class criteria and “the principle of class struggle”, and almost never mention the Communist Party, much less party reconstitution.

Perhaps the Peruvian comrades of the 1970s themselves were “militant economists”, or perhaps instead they understood the distinction between open sectoral mass work and closed work.

Thus the Daltonite left-opportunist line represents a distortion and undermining of our principles regarding the Party on five key counts. First, they turn party reconstitution into a metaphysical slogan divorced from the particular realities and questions of our class and our national context as they actual exist. Second, they separate the Party from the masses, creating a vision of “Communists” and “party principles” which are elaborated and produced outside of the class and without using class criteria. Third, they embrace petty-bourgeois Menshevism, opening up the ranks of “professional revolutionaries” and “Communists” to anyone as long as they “support” a “definite revolutionary organization” and “accept and carry out” the vague and subjectively defined process of “party reconstitution” mentioned in the first error, fourthly they create a theoretical justification for their continued opportunism by negating the Leninist concept of “iron discipline” within the party and distorting it into a petty-bourgeois individualist mess, and fifthly they incorporate Avakianite deviations regarding the blending of open and closed work into the present struggle for reconstitution.

The NLP upholds the theoretical principle that tasks related to party organizing must be based within and not outside of the questions which plague the proletariat in the class struggle and on strict observance of the underground party principle. One wonders why *The Worker* even bothered to email us about unity when they reject the importance of the labor question and the struggle for the masses’ demands within the bounds of wage slavery, the basis of our organizing, and distort the fundamentals of the Communist Party so openly. The precise path of the proletarian dictatorship in our context, the political line the leaders must follow, the proposed strategy and demonstrated practice of bringing the masses into the work of building up their organizations on the basis of their own demands, these fundamental questions of party reconstitution are covered up with hypocritical talk about “uniting under Maoism”, “line struggle”, and “ideology” placed outside of the context of class struggle rather than within it. It is a postmodernist theory of party reconstitution that hinges on self-proclaiming the party into existence, on the principle that if you repeat a lie or distortion enough times it becomes true and correct.

Conclusion

The current state of Maoism in the US is extremely backward, even relative to other countries which lack a reconstituted Communist Party, owing to a combination of factors. The material influence of US imperialism as the world’s premier hegemon in bribing organizers, the effects of a large and diverse labor aristocratic and “middle” strata, and the active co-optation and repressing organizing efforts are immense. However, the internal contradiction is primary: as Maoists are able to establish cohesion among themselves and carry out their organizing among the masses, the proletariat marches further down the road to reconstituting their Party. Factions like the Daltonites play a role typical of petty-bourgeois sects throughout the history of the ICM insofar as they interrupt and disrupt this process, they deliberately obscure their own ideas and misrepresent other people’s, and are evidently willing to

sink to the level of revising basic principles of two-line struggle itself and replacing them with ultra-left factionalism and metaphysical posturing.

Before anything else, in any line struggle there is a need to affirm and impose material reality, to base our arguments and positions on the real conditions and facts of our context and history. Marxist principles do not exist in the abstract, in Plato's land of pure ideals and essence, but rather are always dialectically linked to their application to and correspondence with actual existing material phenomena, events, and persons. Our entire theory of knowledge, theory and practice hinges upon this most fundamental principle of materialism. As Gonzalo said of understanding Mariategui's thought and path:

We must base ourselves on facts, start from the class position of Mariategui, start from his Marxist-Leninist ideology and one must also start, therefore, from his dialectical materialist method. Whoever does not focus on Mariategui with those three viewpoints indicated above, cannot understand his thought and will twist it in many cases in good faith or in the majority of cases, like the feathery hacks, in very bad faith.

While the Daltonite left-opportunists have boisterously raised the banner of-line struggle (strangely enough, seemingly only against our publication), they have twisted this line struggle in "very bad faith" and have failed to demonstrate or provide evidence of a grasp of these basic viewpoints (facts, class criteria, and our ideology, in particular our dialectical materialist method). Instead, they present to us metaphysical reversals of concepts at the heart of our revolutionary process, particularly leadership, theoretical elaboration, and party reconstitution. In this sense, the Daltonite line does not represent a coherent theoretical position or organizing contribution to line struggle but rather its opposite. It represents the codification of our domestic theoretical poverty, amateurism, opportunism, and ignorance, an attempt to construct a shambolic disorganized theory and line out of these harmful elements.

To conclude, we might compare the Daltonites proposed basis for "line struggle" with a document that actually demonstrates a good and correct application of Marxist principles as they relate to line struggle and party reconstitution. The 2022 document [Unity Among Communists: Struggling For the Party and For the Communist International of a New Type](#), authored by the Colombian organization Proletarian Power, correctly identifies the need for unity and breaking with the splittist "sect spirit" as all true revolutionaries do. However, in structuring the line struggle for unity, one will immediately note how the principles the Colombian comrades elaborate are not abstract or metaphysical, but are applications of "our scientific ideology" to their specific national context. They are principles that, like Gonzalo highlighted from Mariategui's works on "Peruvian reality", correspond closely to the real problems of revolution and class struggle in Colombia like armed revisionism, corporatism, national liberation, the Agrarian Question, etc. This is the sort of analysis and work we need here in the US, not more metaphysics and opportunism masquerading as politics.

It is through the task of this sort of analysis and theoretical work that organizations like NLP humbly serve the broader process of party reconstitution nationally, and it is through the recognition and unity forged through that work that we have won any leadership at all. NLP exists to investigate and analyze

the “US reality” of state unionism and the labor question in our national context, from the perspective of our scientific ideology and the principle task for revolutionaries in our context (party reconstitution), but it does not pretend to be that which it is not (a closed pseudo-vanguard organization). We find no need to posture as that which we are not, nor distort the principles of our ideology and facts of our movement in order to better present ourselves as “leaders”. We hope this document serves to organize rather than confuse the current line struggle, and that it serves as an educational tool as to what actually constitutes principles of line struggle and reconstitution in our context, and what does not.