

DETROIT REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT RECORDS

BOX 13 OF 16

FOLDER 4

CL PUBLICATIONS FACTORS
ON THE REVOLUTION

THE OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE FACTORS IN THE REVOLUTION

The correct Marxist understanding
and application of factors in the socialist
revolution and socialist construction.
The connection between the laws of history
and revolutionary initiative.
The role of the vanguard party in the
revolutionary movement.

PUBLISHED BY THE
COMMUNIST LEAGUE



ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEMS OF REVOLUTIONARY THEORY AND PRACTICE IS THE CORRECT DIALECTICAL-MATERIALIST UNDERSTANDING AND APPLICATION OF THE ROLE OF THE OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE FACTORS IN THE REVOLUTION AND SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION.

This problem is very complex. It includes the relationship between matter and the ideal, between social being and social consciousness, the base and the superstructure, the economy and politics, theory and practice, the spontaneous movement and conscious and organized activity, etc.

Absolutizing one or the other side, in theory, leads either to vulgar materialism, to economism and the advocating of spontaneity or to idealism, subjectivism and voluntarism; while in politics it leads either to opportunism, reformism and revisionism or to adventurism, dogmatism and sectarianism. Viewed from this angle, this is a cardinal problem of vital importance for the victory of the revolution and socialism, a demarcation line dividing the materialists from the idealists, the Marxist-Leninists from the opportunists of every hue.

Marx and the historic merit of Lenin

Discovering the materialistic understanding of history Marx for the first time also correctly solved the relationship between matter and consciousness, the objective and subjective factors in the development of human society. With this great discovery he dealt a lethal blow not only to idealism in social life, but also to vulgar materialism. "The weapon of criticism", he wrote, "certainly cannot replace criticism by means of weapons, material force must be overthrown by the same means of material force; but theory, too, becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses" (*Marx and Engels, Works, vol. 1, p. 406, Russian edit.*).

Marx and Engels lived at a time when the tasks laid down by the development of the labour movement and the elaboration of its ideology dictated the necessity, in the first place, of rejecting idealism, of arguing the fundamental materialist thesis that it is the conditions of the material life of society, it is the

mode of production, which is the decisive force determining the entire physiognomy and development of society, including the birth and development of social ideas and theories. Engels wrote, "Marx and I are ourselves partly to blame for the fact that the younger people sometimes lay more stress on the economic side than is due to it. We had to emphasise the main principle vis-à-vis our adversaries, who denied it, and we had not always the time, the place or the opportunity to allow the other elements involved in the interaction to come into their rights." (*F. Engels, Letter to J. Bloch, September 21-22, 1890.*)

In the last years of his life Engels, in a series of letters, returned to this problem and strove to stress the active role of the subjective factor, of various ideas, parties and institutions, of the superstructure in general, criticizing vulgar materialism and economism. He pointed out, "The economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure... also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their form." (*F. Engels, Letter to J. Bloch, September 21-22, 1890.*)

But the evil against which Engels rose could not be averted. Opportunism, which was based precisely on vulgar materialism and economism, seized the second International. The theory of the "productive forces" and Bernstein's infamous slogan of "the movement everything, the aim nothing" became the basis of all the opportunist theories of the revisionists of that time which caused great damage to the working class revolutionary movement. What could not be done by Marx and Engels in their time, was done in the new historical conditions by Lenin. Imperialism, Lenin pointed out, is the "epoch when, according to the general admission of the Marxists, the objective conditions have already ripened for the destruction of capitalism..." (*Complete works, vol. 26, p. 119; Russian edit.*). Under these circumstances special importance was assumed by the role of the subjective factor which was elaborated by Lenin in an allround manner. In his work "What is to be done" and in many other works he scientifically argued the necessity and importance of the theory and party of the working class, forcefully stressing the thesis that without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement

and that the role of vanguard can be played only by a party which is guided by the vanguard theory. Lenin elaborated the role of the subjective factor in fierce struggle against the ideological opponents of Marxism, who saw the development of society as a peaceful and spontaneous-evolutionary process which occurred without the intervention of man; who said that socialism would be established gradually, by itself as an inevitable result of economic development, without the class struggle, without the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, without the leadership of the Marxist party. The historic merit of the exposure and destruction of the opportunism of the traitorous second International belongs to Lenin. For the first time in the history of Marxist thought Lenin discovered the ideological roots of opportunism, which reside precisely in advocating economism and spontaneity in the revolutionary movement of the working class. Lenin also waged a resolute struggle against the subjectivism and voluntarism of the Narodnik-petty bourgeois, anarcho-syndicalist ideologists, Trotskiysts and "left" opportunists who in fact negated the role and importance of the objective conditions and based everything on the will and consciousness of man.

In the present-day conditions the role of the objective and subjective factors has again emerged as a great and current problem, in that in theory and practice there are great distortions that harm the revolutionary movement. "Today", comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out at the 6th Congress of the PLA, there has been a revival of the various theories which preach spontaneity in the revolutionary movement, which hold the role of the conscious factor in contempt, which negate the role of theory and of the party of the proletariat.

The modern revisionists, led by the Soviet revisionists, just as their predecessors - the opportunists of the second International, have in fact slipped into the theory of the productive forces, into economism and reformism. They seek to prove that present-day capitalism is being integrated into socialism, that the working class can embark on the road of socialism even within the framework of the bourgeois order, that the transition to socialism can be made by means of reforms, through a peaceful road and through

evolution, that the struggle for socialism can also be led by non-proletarian classes and parties, that socialism can also be built on the basis of other «socialist» ideologies which are not Marxist-Leninist ideologies, etc.

Some other ideologists from among the ranks of the «New Left» in Latin America and in Western Europe go even further. They rise against the necessity of introducing socialist consciousness into the working class and the labouring masses; they say that the vanguard role can also be played by an «active minority» which emerge as a ferment of revolution, that consciousness and organization are spontaneously acquired in the process of the struggle, they are opposed to the necessity of the Marxist party, to its leading role and to its being built on the Leninist principles. In order to justify these anti-Marxist positions, their partisans are striving to prove that Lenin distorted the Marxist concept of the relationship between socialist consciousness and the spontaneous movement, between the party and the masses; that he in no way complemented Marx's doctrine about the party, but created a theory of his own, which is allegedly not found in the works of Marx, but is in opposition to them. In the final analysis, Lenin's doctrine, they say, may be correct and necessary for the backward countries, but it is entirely unsuited to the present-day conditions of the advanced capitalist countries where the distance between the vanguard and the class has been and is being greatly shortened and where the class is in a position to acquire socialist consciousness by itself.

All this confusion places the necessity of intensive struggle to defend the Marxist-Leninist principles from the distortions of the various revisionists and opportunists on the agenda even today. As comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out at the 6th Congress of the PLA, «The situation is such that the practical movement of the masses has advanced and continues to advance, while the subjective factor, consciousness, organization and their direction, in many countries has remained behind, and does not meet the tasks of the times». This is related, above all, to the cut and out betrayal by the modern revisionists, which disorientated the ranks of the revolution ideologically and politically, and left the working class and the labouring masses

in many countries unarmed, without a revolutionary leadership. This vacuum is being filled and will continue to be filled with the creation and strengthening of the new Marxist-Leninist parties, which have the historic task of liberating the masses from opportunism and reformism and of leading them in the revolution.

Historic laws and revolutionary initiative

Analyzing the present situation in the world, comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out at the 6th Congress of the PLA that not only is this situation developing in favour of the revolution, but also, that revolution is becoming the general aspiration of the peoples, that the road of the development of present-day human society is opened and determined by revolution.

This conclusion, derives from the scientific analysis of the present-day reality in the world, from the very contradictions of the capitalist and imperialist system, which irrevocably lead the working class and the labouring masses towards the revolution as the sole road to eliminate oppression and exploitation, to transform the world on the new socialist and communist basis. Capitalism creates all the material premises and the social force capable of carrying out the proletarian revolution, but without the role of the conscious factor there can be no radical transformation. «Capitalism itself», Lenin pointed out, «creates its own grave-digger, itself creates the elements of a new system, yet, at the same time, without a «leap» these individual elements change nothing in the general state of affairs and do not affect the rule of capital» (V.I. Lenin, *Complete Works*, vol. 16 «Differences in the European Labour Movement», p. 348).

The reformists and modern revisionists, with their anti-Marxist «theories», are striving to prove that present-day capitalism can be transformed into socialism by a peaceful road, by means of reforms, by extending bourgeois democracy and its institutions, by gradually occupying important economic and political positions in order to later seize the whole power and ensure the tran-

sition to socialism. The philosophical basis of these theories is economic vulgar materialism which denies or underestimates the role of the subjective factor in history, the role of the class struggle and of the Marxist-Leninist party, which confuses the objective with the spontaneous, while from the methodological viewpoint they are a negation of dialectics and its replacement with simple evolution. The political essence of these theories is the fight against the Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the preaching of the integration of capitalism into socialism. In order to make their reformist theories more convincing the Soviet and other revisionists badly distort even the notion of the revolutionary situation as the essential objective condition for the victory of the revolutionary situation is not created as a result of the sharpening of the social economic and political contradictions to the critical point, and it is not accompanied by the impetuous outburst of popular hatred. The working class, they say, can gradually extend the place d'armes of its offensive against the power of the monopolies by gradually removing them from key economic and political positions. In these circumstances, according to them, the revolutionary situation can assume the form of a chain of partial crises, reciprocally connected, extended in time and comparatively independent, where each of them leads to the occupation of specific positions, and taken together, they give us the revolution.

Thus, the modern revisionists see the revolution as a simple evolutionary process, as the totality of reforms. According to them, the demarcation line between the revolution and reforms has disappeared. In the present-day conditions, they say, democratic transformations and «structural» reforms are becoming stages on the road towards socialism, forms of the approach towards and transition to socialism.

While the modern revisionists, as right opportunists, hold to the issues of the day, to small economic demands, to the reforms and aims of the bourgeoisie and for their sake sacrifice the ultimate aim, deny the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, some «left» elements deny the necessity of the «back work» of the struggle for the econ-

mic, social and political demands of the working people, of legal work and of work in the organizations of the masses, they ignore the stages of the revolution, oppose various alliances, they are partisans of the immediate revolution, of the struggle for the seizure of state power and the establishment of socialism at one stroke.

It is clear that one of the most characteristic features of the opportunists of all hues is the ignoring of the distinctions between evolution and revolution, between reforms and the qualitative leap, between the struggle for democracy and independence and the struggle for socialism, between the struggle for immediate day to day demands and the struggle for the fundamental objectives. The establishment of a correct relationship between these two aspects of the revolutionary process as well as distinguishing the Marxist-Leninists from the reformists and modern revisionists also distinguishes them from the left opportunists. The ideological roots of these two currents reside precisely in the unilateral treatment of the revolutionary process. In Lenin's words, they "constantly exaggerate, elevate to a one-sided theory, to a one-sided system of tactics, now one and now another "lesson" of this development... But real life, real history include these different tendencies, just as life and development in nature include both slow evolution and rapid leaps, breaks in continuity" (*Lenin, Complete works, vol. 16, p. 349, "Differences in the European Labour Movement"*).

A characteristic of the present-day revisionists, just as of all the right opportunists, is the philosophy of spontaneity, passivity, of observation that overestimates the objective conditions and waits with folded arms until all the factors of the revolution are ripe. These not only fail to show any concern for preparing the subjective conditions, but, with their betrayal they have caused great ideological and political confusion. Even when revolutionary situations arise they do their utmost to curb the revolutionary movement of the masses, they prevent them from dealing the decisive blow to the ruling classes. Under the pretext of the lack of "objective conditions" and of the danger of adventurism, they act as servants of the bourgeoisie and are opposed to any revolutionary initiative and activity of the masses which brings the revolution closer and speeds it up.

On this question, too, the Marxist-Leninists fight in two directions as well as fighting against the modern revisionists, they also fight against the viewpoints of those representatives of "left" trends who are characterized by the overestimation and the absolutization of the role of "subjective activity" in the transformation of reality and by the negation of the role of the objective conditions, of the real possibilities of the situation. These "left" trends see the will of the revolutionaries for action, their determination to throw themselves in to struggle irrespective of the conditions and situation, as the only determining factor. According to them, even if a revolutionary situation does not exist it can and must be artificially created by the "vigorous actions" of a militant group consisting of several armed, brave and resolute men. In fact this is a kind of theory of heroes, which denies the role of the masses of the people as the creators of history. A revolutionary is a man of action, he does not wait with folded arms for the "great day" of the revolution, but continually works for its preparation. The direction and forms of his activity must always respond to the objective conditions, to the actual situation. No transformation whatsoever which is not ripe both in objective reality and in the consciousness of the masses can be carried out. The tasks laid down can be solved successfully only when they meet the requirements of the historical development of each country and the level of the consciousness and organization of the masses. Otherwise, the revolutionary vanguard breaks from the masses and falls into adventurism.

Revolutions, the 6th Congress of the PLA stressed, are ripened by the situation itself while their triumph or defeat depends on the situation of the subjective factor. But this factor cannot be represented by only one group of men, however conscious and determined they may be concerning the revolution, indeed not even by the party alone. For this it is indispensable for the majority of the workers to understand the necessity for a turning point and to be prepared to throw themselves en masse into revolutionary actions, for the Communist party to have ensured great support from the working class and the labouring masses, for the other sections of the working people, even when they do not give the party direct support for its entire line, to support it in certain sectors of the struggle.

The subjective factor, comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out at the 6th Congress, is not prepared only through the actions of a "locus" of guerillas, nor only through agitation and propaganda. For this, as Lenin and life itself teach us, it is indispensable for the masses to become convinced through their own practical experience".

Revolutionary movement and the party

The preaching of spontaneity, as the ideology of opportunism in the labour movement, is spearheaded, in the first place, against the necessity of the Marxist-Leninist theory and party. The modern revisionists are spreading the illusion that in capitalism especially in the developed industrial countries, socialist consciousness springs from the spontaneous movement itself, that the push towards socialism comes spontaneously from the development of the productive forces and from the change of the ratio of forces in the world to the detriment of imperialism, that in these conditions all sorts of parties and organizations, from the liberal-bourgeois and social-democratic parties to the national liberation fronts and the trade unions in the service of the bourgeoisie, can become the bearers of the ideals of socialism and the leaders of the socialist transformation of society.

In fact, some representatives of the "leftist" forces irrespective of their subjective aims and objectives, also stand on a position of advocating spontaneity. They negate the necessity of theory, scientific consciousness, they rise against Lenin's thesis that without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement, they deny the role of the vanguard armed with the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism, they oppose the necessity of working out clear political programmes, scientific strategy and tactics. According to them the important thing is to start and carry out the revolution; while the question of who leads it: the Marxist-Leninist party or other

litical forces, is of no importance. The revolutions, they say, are led by revolutionaries whether they adhere to the party or not, there are no mathematical equations equating the vanguard with the Marxist-Leninist party, the guerrilla is the party in embryo, the people's army will be the nucleus of the party and not vice versa, etc., etc. In the practice of our days too, life confirms great Lenin's conclusion that the roots, the ideological sources of opportunism, both right and left, reside in advocating spontaneity in the revolutionary movement.

In his report delivered at the 6th Congress of the PLA, comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out that it has already been historically proved that without its party, the working class, no matter what the conditions in which it lives and acts, does not become conscious by itself. That which transforms the working class from a class in itself into a class for itself is the party. Of course, a certain level of revolutionary, socialist consciousness does emerge from the objective conditions themselves or from the revolutionary struggle itself, but this is only a very low level; it is, as Lenin has called it, a trade-union consciousness. The high level of socialist conscience is not formed spontaneously, but by the Marxist-Leninist science and this is first mastered by the most advanced part of the class, which organizes itself into the proletarian party and then educates the entire class with it, clarifying the revolutionary aims and objectives, indicating the correct road for their attainment and leading it in its historic struggle.

The party is not only indispensable for introducing socialist consciousness into the working class and the labouring masses, for enlightening the various detachments of the spontaneous movement of the masses and for coordinating their actions, but to it belongs the leading role in the revolutionary movement, it is the theoretical, political and practical leading staff of the revolution in all its fields - political, ideological, economic and military. To deny the leading role of the party means to leave the working class unarmed before the bourgeoisie and reaction. History has provided no example whatsoever to show that the proletarian revolution can win and socialism be built without the communist party of the working class, without its leading role, let alone in opposition to the com-

munists. It can happen that, where the communist parties are weak or have slipped into revisionist and reformism, the lead of the revolution is taken by other political forces, but in this case we have to do with democratic or national liberation revolutions, which can be transformed into socialist proletarian revolutions only if the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party place themselves at their head.

To play its educative, organizing, mobilizing and guiding role the party cannot be just any sort of party. The role of the revolutionary vanguard of the working class can be played only by that party which is guided by the vanguard theory of the proletariat and which is built on the basis of the organizational principles of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin has the historic merit not only of having shown the proletariat that for its triumph it is indispensable for it to reinforce its unity of ideas on the basis of the Marxist ideology, with the material unity of organization which makes compact the millions of working people in the army of the working class (Complete works, vol. 8 p. 404), but also of having elaborated the organizational foundations of the building of the revolutionary party of the working class. In words, the Khrushchovite type revisionists uphold the Leninist norms and principles of party building, but in deeds, they have violated them, they have deprived them of their revolutionary content, they have bastardized them and caused them to degenerate into revisionist norms and they use them for their counter-revolutionary aims. Under the anti-Marxist slogans of «the party of the entire people» and the «mass party» they have liquidated the class character of the proletarian party, they have opened the doors to every opportunist, career-seeker and bourgeois intellectual; they have wiped out the distinction between the party and the working class and the masses.

The revisionist parties, as parties of social reform within the capitalist order, are organized in such a way that they are suited only to legal existence and activity within bourgeois legality. Just as Kautsky and company, the present-day revisionists, too, cannot imagine the party other than as a legal party. Even those few revisionist parties which in some countries, for historical reasons, are still

illegal, are seeking in every way to be part of bourgeois legality and to make common cause with the bourgeoisie. In contradiction to these practices, Lenin stressed that only that working class party is worthy of its name which, when the necessity arises, is capable of passing into a state of illegality of combining legal work with illegal activity. Without complementing legal organization and activity with the creation of illegal bases, with illegal organization and activity, true revolutionary work cannot be done, the working class and the labouring masses cannot be prepared for the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Liberalism and legalism are the two most important organizational sources of revisionist degeneration and two fundamental features of the revisionist parties. They derive from the revisionist line, strategy and tactics of the «peaceful road». Departure from the ideological principles of Marxism-Leninism cannot fail to lead also to departure from the organizational principles of the building of the Marxist-Leninist party. Life has confirmed that the parties which slip into liberalism and legalism either degenerate into bourgeois parties of the social-democrat type, as is the case with the present-day revisionist parties, or suffer terrible disillusionment which costs the revolutionary movement dearly, as was the case of the communist party of Indonesia.

Some of the present-day revisionists in Italy, France and elsewhere go even further. They seek to prove that the Leninist norms and principles of party building have lost their value in our day; that they can still have value only for the backward countries, while for the developed capitalist and socialist countries they must be replaced with new norms and principles. They openly say that it is a question «not of some partial corrections of the Leninist model of the party, but of a radical change of the model itself», that «the problem must be totally re-examined and a new system of organizational principles must be determined».

They particularly attack the fundamental principle of party building - democratic centralism, which they see as the source of all evils, of bureaucracy and the degeneration of the party. They stand for a disintegrated party, without discipline

and unity of thought and action, for the complete freedom of factions and opposite lines, they conceive of the party as an inn with two doors, as a talking shop and they consider this as the climax of democracy.

Centralism and democracy are two principles forming a single unity. On their basis are formed and tempered the unity of thought and action of the party which can play its leading role in the entire revolutionary activity. Centralism without democracy is transformed into a bureaucratic centralism which places the leadership above and in opposition to the party and the class, whereas democracy without centralism is transformed into dissolution, anarchy and confusion. The evil does not reside in the principle of democratic centralism itself, but in counterposing centralism and democracy. In life, contradictions emerge between these two aspects, but the whole point is to know how to overcome them, and to implement the principle of democratic centralism in compliance with the conditions in which the party acts, illegal, legal or semi-legal, in capitalism or socialism, with the stages of the development of the revolution and of the party

itself. The forms of realizing and combining centralism and democracy change, and they cannot fail to change, but the principle of democratic centralism always remains a basic and inviolable principle of the building of the revolutionary party of the working class.

Today, when the revisionist parties have departed once and for all from the position of Marxism-Leninism in all fields - ideological and political, economic and military, cultural and organisational, the Marxist-Leninist parties are the bearers of the proletarian ideology, of the revolution and socialism. Although still young in many countries, they are genuine revolutionary parties which have set themselves the aim of realizing the historic mission of the working class. Pursuing a correct strategy and tactics, closely linking themselves with the broad masses of the people and strengthening and tempering the unity of the thought and action of their ranks in struggle against any right or left opportunist influence, they will assuredly fulfill the present-day historic demand - the creation of the subjective factor indispensable for the revolutionary transformation of objective reality.

LITERATURE

The following publications
are available from the CL:

	<u>Donation</u>
Negro National	
Colonial Question	\$1.00
Dialectics of the	
Development of the	
Communist League	\$.50
Lenin and Stalin on the	
Party	\$.50
The Proletariat (theore-	
tical journal of the	
Communist League)	\$1.00

For more information about
the Communist League or
People's Tribune write:

P.O. BOX 3774
MERCHANDISE MART
CHICAGO, ILL 60654
