During the last period which was marked by mass upheavals of the people, we were witnessing mass movements of the people: movements which were generally spontaneous and without the benefit of a Black political party shaped by tested advanced fighters, rooted in the masses, whose political ideology, style of work, and expertise could provide direction and leadership.

During this period, however, serious advanced fighters are struggling throughout the U.S. to build political parties capable of providing long-term theoretical and practical leadership for our struggle against U.S. imperialism.

This, then, is a major and fundamental difference in mass movements and Party-type formations we ought to be constantly and consciously aware of:

A genuine Party-type formation will always be guided by long-term strategic interests, and all its tactical work will be guided by strategic interests. On the other hand, mass movements are characterized by short-term or tactical interests and are often spontaneous occurrences. Mass movements, such as the Civil Rights Movement and the Black Power Movement, are often victimized by a tendency to raise tactical objectives to the level of strategic objectives, thereby often becoming slaves of the urgency of the moment, which can, among other things, lead to ultra-leftist and adventurist acts.

Clearly then, during this period of intensive party building, our comrade brother, and his party, are incorrect in assuming the impossibility of confronting our imperialist enemy in the day-to-day defense and struggles of our people as necessary tactics for realizing the strategic objectives of our struggle for political independence, and self-determination through self-liberation.

Not only is this an objective right-opportunistic posture—a posture and tendency characterized by avoiding immediate struggle in the ostensible interest of long-range goals; a posture which objectively unites us with rightest politics in that it denies the value and necessity of struggle—it is also incorrect as a tactic for party building. For genuine liberation, or revolutionary, or vanguard parties, must be built in the heat of struggle. They must be formed, tested and steeled in actual combat with our class enemy and national oppressor—combat which is determined by our actual capabilities, concrete time and place, and our tactical and strategical objectives.

An attempt to build a party otherwise—in the sterility of classroom situations, or the false security of closet politics—not only dooms our efforts to the mere creation of cults and sects, but also provides us with politically fragile formations which must necessarily fold and disintegrate from its first serious contest with our class enemy and national oppressor.

Now that we have made a distinction between mass movements generally, and party-type formations doing mass work, it may serve us to distinguish working with spontaneous mass movements (which means they are mass movements which do not project or are not born of an attempt to realize long-term or strategic aims) from working with mass movements which project and which are born out of an attempt to realize strategic aims.

(So this statement does not appear contradictory, I would like to make this point: for advanced fighters, socialist-revolutionaries, African Internationalists, etc., all mass movements are tactical vehicles, tied to long-range strategic aims beyond the objectives of a mass movement. Therefore, when we talk about the spontaneous or tactical or short-term character of "some" mass movements, we are speaking of their character as opposed to, or in comparison with, the character of other mass movements.

Mass movements may be distinguished, one from the other, by the fact that some mass movements may project strategical objectives unto themselves; that is to say, objectives which are realizable within the limited context and capabilities of mass

Black schools have always been victims of a lack of materials and small classrooms.

movements, while others, which we define as spontaneous or short-term, may not do so, and may project only immediate objectives which are directed at the symptoms of deep social maladies.)

As an example, we may imagine the potential for a mass movement developing around the integration of schools. Such a movement may be honest in its intent. It would be born out of the frustrations of our people in acquiring a decent education and in response to the slavish philosophy of Integrationism which presently dominates our community.

Such a movement would approach the question of education superficially and based on a perceptual observation, one which shows the inadequacy of "Black" education as opposed to "white" education. Such a movement would not understand the relationship of the post-World War II expanded productive capacity of U.S. industry and the subsequent demand for "integration" as the best method for preparing Black workers for entry into the labor market. Such a movement would not understand that education in any society serves the dual purpose of providing the minimum necessary information and training prerequisite for efficient production, and as the ideological underpinning required by a society.

Ignorance concerning the aims and purposes of education would obscure the self-defeating character of a mass movement promoting "integration" and would leave the movement struggling against the symptoms