

ANGOLA: STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM and OPPORTUNISM

GO HAND IN HAND

GENERAL CRISIS OF IMPERIALISM

The second stage of the general crisis of imperialism has meant the sharpening of all of the contradictions of the world. On the one hand, the success of national liberation movements in Vietnam, Cambodia, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, and their rise in Southern Africa, are indicative of the revolutionary direction of world history and the sharpening of contradictions between oppressed and oppressor nations. *The world is experiencing the heightening of the contradictions which have made wars of national liberation and proletarian revolution inevitable since the rise of imperialism in the early 20th century. The victory of these wars reflects clearly that revolution is the main trend in the world today'*

On the other hand, the contradictions between the two imperialist superpowers has also been sharpening, due especially to barbarous aggression of Soviet social-imperialism against other nations, in its competition with the U.S. for world hegemony. Both superpowers, caught in the grip of the general crisis of imperialism are attempting to extend their exploitation and influence over the peoples and nations of the world, and are competing for the upper hand in an inevitable imperialist war. For both the U.S., declining in strength and credibility, and the Soviet Union, which is attempting to bolster its weakened economy and influence, a world imperialist war, re- dividing the world among themselves, is the temporary and only solution of the contradictions which plague them. From the contention of these two superpowers then, particularly from the actions of the Soviet Union, emanates the immediate and growing threat of world war and domestic fascism.

Europe, with its high level of productive forces and capital is the focus of superpower contention. However, the Soviet Union and the U.S. also fight fiercely for control of the nations and states of the Third World, where the natural resources necessary to power a world war are to be found in abundance. No army can march and fight without an adequate supply of raw materials - rubber, iron, minerals, agricultural goods, etc. In this context, the contention of the superpowers over various Third World countries, and Angola in particular, takes on a sinister and vicious significance. Reality confirms that while the revolutionary surge of the worlds' people today determines the course of world history, the factors for both revolution and war are in-



creasing. Any suggestion which in any way belittles the necessity to oppose imperialist war, today belittles the struggle against imperialism itself

UPHOLD PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

Because Angola so clearly reflected the sharpening of all the world contradictions, it presented genuine revolutionary forces with a direct obligation to practice proletarian internationalism - support for the national liberation struggles and opposition to the two superpowers. Our historic task is to unite with the working class and oppressed nationalities world wide to defeat U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

This takes the form of the mobilization of the masses of working people in the U.S. against the two superpowers, against their contention in Angola and the rest of the Third World. Proletarian internationalism most definitely does not mean attacking one imperialist superpower while covering up the bloodstained tracks of the other. Our internationalist duty as communists demands the exposure of both U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism to the people of the world. This exposure is also necessarily bound up with the struggle against opportunism, which protects and "beautifies" imperialist and social-imperialist aggression, while attacking the leading representatives of the international proletariat, the existing dictatorships of the proletariat. The question of Angola requires that Marxist-Leninists and advanced workers be united around an internationalist position on the Angolan civil war (and Soviet social-imperialism) in order to advance toward a new vanguard party. In this way, the contention of the two superpowers

over Angola requires that Marxist-Leninist forces in the U.S. see themselves as an integral part of the international communist movement and to act upon their direct obligation to the international proletariat and the Angolan people.

The opportunist response to the internationalist tasks placed before the communist movement, internationally and in the U.S., has been to completely renounce the Marxist-Leninist duties to the proletariat in favor of support for Soviet social-imperialism.

All over the world Marxist-Leninists have taken different stands on the question of Angola. It is one thing to incorrectly support one of the national liberation movements, it is entirely another thing to openly and blatantly support Soviet social-imperialism in Angola and elsewhere. Because the forces of opportunism and modern revisionism have so heavily focused on the Angolan civil war to mobilize support for Soviet social-imperialism, the Marxist-Leninists and progressive people around the world have a grave responsibility to fight to advance a correct understanding and tactical and strategic line toward Angola.

In short, it was the combined efforts of all three movements in Angola which resulted in victory over the Portuguese colonialists, the Soviet Union is the main instigator of the Angolan civil war, and the savage atrocities committed against the Angolan people since the Portuguese have left are directly a result of the contention between the two superpowers in southern Africa. *The main enemy of the Angolan people are the two superpowers, and particularly today Soviet social-imperialism*

The recent struggle in Angola has vividly demonstrated in every country that the struggle against imperialism must go hand in hand with the struggle against opportunism

In the remainder of this article, we will attempt to sum up the struggle against opportunism that has been waged in the U.S. over the question of Angola

AGAINST OPPORTUNISM ON ANGOLA

In the U.S., the Guardian led the attack on a Marxist-Leninist position on Angola, tailed by the Communist Party U.S.A. (CPUSA), the Communist Labor Party (CLP), the Black Panther Party (BPP) and numerous other forces. Calling the line of the Communist Party of China "class collaborationist" these forces swiftly joined with revisionists and centrists worldwide to mount a vicious and slanderous bourgeois attack on the People's Republic of China for its stand on Angola.

The Guardian which formally upheld the position that the Soviet Union was social-imperialist, could not "tell" whether capitalism had been restored in the Soviet Union. The intervention of the Soviet Union and its Cuban mercenaries, the slaughter of Angolan civilians, the shipment of tons of weaponry as early as March of 1975, suddenly became proletarian internationalism to the Guardian.

The Guardian's support of the Soviet social-imperialist intervention in Angola is justified by a revisionist position. The Guardian states that to expose and attack the imperialist actions of the Soviet bourgeoisie, means to support the actions of our, U.S. bourgeoisie. This is the line of Browder, thinly disguised by a "left" tint. Browder urged that the U.S. proletariat unite with its bourgeoisie in order to oppose the fascist bourgeoisies of Hitlerite Germany and Japan in the 1930s and 40s. The essential similarity between these lines is that they both advocate blocing with one imperialist superpower to oppose another. The correct position is to actively oppose both superpowers in their oppression and exploitation of the world's peoples.

Under the guise of protecting the interests of the Angolan people against U.S. imperialism, the centrists and revisionists in the U.S. actively supported one superpower, the Soviet Union, against the other, the U.S., and one liberation movement above all others. By this action, they betrayed the wisdom of Lenin, Stalin and the international proletariat, which teaches that all national liberation movements are objectively revolutionary if they weaken imperialism, regardless of the composition of their leadership. These movements must be supported by all progressive people. Undoubtedly all three Angolan organizations were the cause of the defeat of Portuguese

colonialism, it was only when these organizations began to unite firmly that the colonial administration was forced to relinquish its control over the Angolan people.

The goal of the revisionist activity was to attempt to isolate the international communist movement, particularly China, and the progressive forces in the U.S. from the masses of working people, with the view of winning the masses over to revisionism and the interests of the bourgeoisie. Some honest forces were sucked into these arguments, and revisionism consolidated its hold over various previously centrist organizations. Sworn "enemies" such as the CLP and various Trotskyist sects exhibited their essential compatibility by working together to hoodwink the proletariat of the U.S.

The objective effect of the revisionist and centrist betrayal has been to further confuse, demoralize and split the U.S. working class and national movements, making bourgeois control over the rising revolutionary movement stronger in the short term. Another result has been the resurgence of opportunist forces within the Black Liberation Movement in the U.S. In a period when the U.S. bourgeoisie is moving rapidly towards fascism and imperialist war as the temporary resolution to its contradictions, these actions and political line are nothing less than direct aid to the U.S. and Soviet Union's bourgeoisies, nothing less than social-fascism and social-imperialism. This was how the revisionist forces, led by the Guardian, took up the immediate tasks

set before the communist movement by the international situation.

IMPERIALISM AND OPPORTUNISM GO HAND IN HAND IN THEIR STRUGGLE TO DEFEAT THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, AND HAND IN HAND THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND OPPORTUNISM MUST BE CARRIED OUT TO THE END.

With this task in mind, the MLOC joined in the work of the Coalition for Angolan Self-Determination (CASD), which was initiated in January 1976 by the Revolutionary Workers League (RWL) and the Fruitvale Law Collective (FLC) on the basis of two principles of unity: 1) Superpowers out of Angola, and 2) Self-determination for the Angolan people.

These two slogans expressed the goals of the coalition which were a) to mobilize the people of the U.S. against the two superpowers, b) to combat

revisionism and centrism on this question and others, and c) to support the just struggles of the Angolan people. In addition to these stated goals, the MLOC saw the coalition playing a positive role in uniting Marxist-Leninists and winning over the advanced, through the struggle in the coalition and through the mass program eventually presented on March 27, 1976.

Participation in the CASD constituted one in a range of efforts of the MLOC to fulfill our internationalist duty. Within the coalition, the MLOC pressed at the outset for the importance of linking the support for the Angolan people with the long range struggle against both Superpowers, and the contention between the Superpowers over Europe, their main battleground. In addition, we encouraged the linking of

(continued on p. 12)

Angola: A Temporary Situation

On November 11 of 1975, five centuries of Portuguese colonial domination of Angola were brought to an end. Inheriting a glorious history of struggle against exploitation, three liberation movements joined forces to seize power from the oppressive Portuguese administration. Up to January, 1975, the forces of National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), the Union of the Peoples of Northern Angola (FNLA), and the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) had maintained their organizational independence and equality in pursuing the dual policy of armed struggle and negotiations with Portugal. In January, the three organizations, each representing a substantial part of the Angolan people, signed the Alvor and Mombassa Agreements. The Alvor Agreement, signed by the three liberation organizations and Portugal, replaced separate agreements previously made between individual organizations and the Portuguese government. It called for an end to hostilities with Portugal in exchange for Portuguese withdrawal from Angola. The Mombassa Agreement, signed in Mombassa, Kenya, was an agreement among the three liberation organizations themselves to make preliminary plans for the projected coalition government to be set up upon withdrawal of the Portuguese administration.

These agreements, along with a previous cease-fire pact, represented a great step toward forging a workable unity between the three liberation organizations, for national reconstruction following the independence date in November of 1975. Further evidence that the three organizations desired and worked to achieve unity was the Nakuru Agreement signed in June of 1975, in which each group pledged to work together to form a transitional coalition government. This agreement also pledged the groups to merge their military forces to carry out the transfer of power from the Portuguese colonialists to the Angolan people.

On the eve of Angolan independence, and only one month after the signing of the Nakuru Agreement, in June of 1975, civil war broke out in Angola. The fighting specifically resulted from a massive influx of Soviet arms, which outnumbered the total of those given by the social-imperialists to Angola during the past 15 year liberation struggle. The hostilities were initiated by the MPLA, the recipient of those arms, against the other two liberation groups, UNITA and FNLA. Quickly it became apparent that the Soviet Union, exploiting the differences between the three organizations, was using one of them to force its way into control of the Angolan people and natural resources. It was advantageous to the social-imperialists that this control could be exerted through the guise of helping a struggling national liberation organization. But bitter experience and history have shown the peoples of the world that in its contention with the United States the Soviet social-imperialists are no ally of the national liberation struggles. Rather, the social-imperialists, like the United States, act to subvert liberation struggles for their own benefit. History again shows this lesson in regard to Angola.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

The present situation in Angola is a temporary one. Great instability prevails, as the Soviet social-imperialists and their Cuban lieutenants jockey for control and domination over the Angolan masses. Politically, the People's Republic of Angola is far from representative of the majority of Angolan people. Within the MPLA itself, disunity and disagreement over the continued Soviet and Cuban military presence has surfaced. The newspaper *O Proletaria Vermelho* (March 15-30, 1976, #32) reported that Rui Ramos, central committee member, politburo member, and long time editor of the political journal of the MPLA, *Victoria Es Certe*, had been arrested

for being "anti-social-imperialist and anti-social-fascist." It reported further that members of the MPLA had been "arrested, silenced and shot" for their "revolutionary, patriotic, anti-imperialist, and anti-social-imperialist" stand. Newspapers internationally confirm that these arrests occurred immediately after Nito Alves, Interior Minister of the People's Republic of Angola, had returned from attending the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Militarily, UNITA has opened a second "anti-colonial front" to drive the Soviet "personnel" and Cuban mercenary troops out of Angola. UNITA regrouped its army into guerilla units in late April, 1976, in order to avoid annihilation by the more sophisticated Soviet weaponry, and has been fighting a people's war, relying on its close contact with the peasantry. It has established a base area in Cuando-Cubango in southern Angola. From this location UNITA has launched attacks against the Soviet and Cuban troops and strategic points such as railways. UNITA also continues to support SWAPO bases in its territory, and still aids the Namibians in their struggle for national liberation.

Politically the penetration of Cuba and the Soviet Union into Angolan affairs has intensified. Cuban troops are not only settling their families in Angola but have been granted Angolan citizenship by the government of the People's Republic of Angola. This does not make them any less than occupation troops, however!

The Soviet Union is not the only imperialist strengthening its economic exploitation of Angola, through uneven trade agreements, joint stock companies, and outright banditry. The People's Republic of Angola has ensured the continued exploitation of Angolan oil by Gulf Oil Company, which has stripped Angola of its oil in the Cabinda enclave for over ten years now. Gulf Oil paid a \$102 million bribe to the People's Republic of Angola government in order to retain

its privilege. Soviet domination of the Angolan economic and political life ensures that it is the Soviet Union which benefits from such degenerate deals.

In the last few weeks, the South African racist regime has begun to test its strength against its liberated neighbors of Zambia and Mozambique. South African planes have recently bombed Mozambican territory, and bombs exploding in Zambian cities have been blamed on South African provocateurs. It is clear that the U.S., through its puppet South Africa, is trying to reassert its control in southern Africa. At the same time, Soviet interference and intrusion into many fronts in southern Africa is increasing, and the general military situation in southern Africa is escalating rapidly.

However, the Portuguese could not overcome Angolan resistance to colonialism for 500 years. The Soviet social-imperialists are wallowing in bourgeois illusion to think that the Angolan people will stop fighting against colonialism and imperialism at this point. The struggle against the social-imperialists and their Cuban allies will continue until every last neo-colonialist is driven from Angolan soil.

At this time, we must continue to build support for all national liberation movements which objectively oppose imperialism and continue to oppose the presence or involvement of either U.S. imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism anywhere on the African continent. Genuine revolutionary forces must greatly intensify the struggle against opportunism regarding Soviet social-imperialism and support for the national liberation movements. The entire multi-national proletariat must be mobilized in support of the African masses, mobilized to fulfill our proletarian internationalist duty.

(For a detailed background on Angola, see "Superpowers out of Angola," MLOC Special Supplement February, 1976, 10¢)



the CASD with preparations for African Liberation Day in May, in order that that day take on a truly internationalist character and mobilize the multinational proletariat. Both suggestions to broaden the coalition met initially with resistance. While the focus of the two Superpowers was taken up, African Liberation Day was ignored and resisted by the minority bloc in the coalition. The result was that in the Bay Area, African Liberation Day was completely dominated by an opportunist political line this year, as in many other parts of the country.

In addition, the MLOC published a four page broadsheet which outlines the history of Angola and the development of its present situation. We obtained and circulated reliable information on the progress of events in Angola, and defended in our work the principled stand of China and Albania on this question. (See "Superpowers Out of Angola", MLOC Supplement February, 1976)

The CASD embodied many valuable lessons on proletarian internationalism and the struggle to unite Marxist-Leninists in the face of an opportunist offensive.

TWO LINE STRUGGLE

The development of the CASD is a history of two-line struggle sharply and constantly waged around almost every issue. In particular the issues of the nature of the international situation and the nature of national liberation movements provoked especially severe struggle between genuine Marxist-Leninist positions and opportunism within the coalition. On these two points and all their subsidiary points, clear lines of demarcation between opportunist and Marxist-Leninist political lines were drawn early in the coalition's history.

The coalition was composed of national and regional Marxist-Leninist organizations, progressive collectives, anti-imperialist mass organizations and groups representative of the oppressed nations and national minorities in the U.S. During the course of the coalition, two established blocs developed, each consistently embodying distinct political positions and class stands. The majority bloc consisted of I Wor Kuen (IWK), October League (OL), Asian Student Union, San Francisco State and Laney College chapters (ASU), Fight Don't Starve (FDS), MLOC and for a time Bay Area Communist Union (BACU) as well as most of the non-affiliated comrades who upheld and defended the line of the international proletariat against all varieties of attack from both internal and external sources. The minority bloc, consisting of Fruitvale Law Collective (FLC), a Marxist-Leninist collective in the Bay Area, Revolutionary Workers League (RWL), Japan Town Collective (JTC), Revolutionary Student Union (RSU), the representative from the African Liberation Support Committee, even though ALSC nationally and locally does not uphold the line put forward in the coalition, and after a certain point BACU, persistently put forward a right opportunist line, which served the interests of the bourgeois-

sie and covered for Soviet social-imperialism. A number of honest forces aligned with the latter position through naivete or subjectivism.

August Twenty-Ninth Movement, (ATM), the last organization to join the coalition, displayed a vacillating position. It voted on every major question with the majority position, and opposed the RWL, their comrades in the Revolutionary Wing. Yet ATM stated that they considered the main forces as the majority opportunists, that is, not in the Revolutionary Wing. Further, ATM in summing up their role in the coalition stated that they had come to the coalition to learn more about the nature of the international situation, and that this accounted for their relatively passive role in the two line struggle. However, ATM had presented their position on the situation in Angola and the world at a public forum over a month prior to the program of the CASD, but made no effort to share this experience with the CASD, or struggle over political line.

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The nature of the international situation, whether war or revolution most characterizes the objective situation, and the direction of history was the issue involving the sharpest struggle as well as the clearest examples of principled and unprincipled methods of struggle and work. This vital topic was debated in every general meeting of the coalition, raised again and again by the minority, despite the continual triumph of the correct Marxist-Leninist line upheld by the majority.

The majority bloc of organizations and individuals waged consistent and sharp struggle for a correct line. This line, which defeated the opportunist view in three votes and countless smaller meetings, is a scientific assessment of the world situation, and our tasks flowing from it. While reaffirming that the over-all motion of history is in favor of revolution and the victory of the oppressed and exploited peoples of the world, this position also stated that the factors for both war and revolution are on the rise. But those holding this view also stated that "owing to the crisis of imperialism, the flames of national revolt have flared up both in the colonies and Europe, and that national sympathies and antipathies have manifested themselves in spite of the

Draconian threats and measures of repression" (Lenin, QUESTIONS OF NATIONAL POLICY AND PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM, p. 158).

From this analysis flowed the majority's position on the nature of national liberation movements. These movements are the leading force against imperialism in the world at this time, their rise is one sign of the sharpening of contradictions between imperialism and the oppressed nations and peoples of the world. The national movements, regardless of the class composition of their leadership, are objectively revolutionary if they are a force in weakening imperialism, in their struggle for liberation. Recognizing that all three Angolan liberation organizations had contributed to the overthrow of Portuguese domination, and the weakening of imperialism and neo-colonialism in Africa, the majority bloc insisted that the coalition not publically criticize any one of them, MPLA, UNITA or FNLA, or choose anyone as the "genuine" liberation movement in Angola. On these points the majority line was identical to that of the Chinese Communist Party.

On both points the minority held an opposing view, although the leader of that bloc, the RWL, has since repudiated the line it held in the coalition. The minority bloc advanced that the majority position was centrist, and generally right opportunist. Their line consistently put forward that they agreed with the majority position concerning the inevitability of revolution in the historical epoch of imperialism. However, they held that in the immediate period, the factors for war and revolution had consolidated into trends, and these two trends were contending.

The organizations of the minority put forward the line that the two "contending trends" of war and revolution were two mutually exclusive parts of a contradiction, which at this point were in a temporary state of equilibrium. Because of this, and the "lagging behind of the subjective factor", allegedly communists "could not determine scientifically which trend was primary at this time". Inevitably, the minority's position on the international situation resulted in their position on the role and nature of national liberation movements, in Angola in particular.

NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS

The minority bloc, principally RWL, put forward on two occasions that national liberation movements are not objectively revolutionary unless they openly espouse socialism, employ certain principles of warfare and are led by the proletariat or a communist party.

The implications of this view are serious. If the national liberation movements are not objectively revolutionary, they must be counter-revolutionary. There is no middle ground on which to stand. *Either the national movements are part of and strengthen the world-socialist revolutionary movement, or they are part of the imperialist reaction against this historic motion.* Very clearly, the national movements not only contribute to but lead the world's revolutionary movements at this time. Any other line, such as the implications of the one put forward by the minority, is totally bankrupt.

The basis of their point of view, was that the minority bloc over-estimated the forces of reaction and could not tell whether revolution or war is the principal trend in the world at this time. Their failure to comprehend the nature of the present era caused them to negate the revolutionary character of many of the present national struggles of the second and third worlds.

In this context, the minority supported putting forward a criticism of the MPLA for having failed to engage in people's war, having not been self-reliant, and for having accepted aid from the Soviet Union and Cuba. To the minority, the coalition had a "right" in its attempt to educate and mobilize the people of the U.S., to criticize the MPLA for non-compliance with certain principles in its internal affairs.

When the RWL later formally repudiated their position on the revolutionary character of the national liberation movements, they continued to press for a criticism of the MPLA. The essence of their line did not change, therefore, and their 'repudiation' was merely a cover for continued opportunism on this question. Against this social-chauvinist position, the majority bloc waged protracted and sharp struggle.

NATURE OF THE EPOCH AT STAKE

Old revisionism attempted to mislead the revolutionary movement of the proletariat by

CUBA: NEO-COLONY OF SOVIET SOCIAL IMPERIALISM

The material basis for Cuban support of Soviet social imperialism and its "commitment of troops" to Angola under Soviet baton is readily understandable when the economic dependence of Cuba on the Soviet Union is brought to light. Unlike other small socialist countries, such as Albania, which pursues a policy of self-reliance, the Cuban economy has always been heavily tied to Soviet strings,

particularly so in the last several years. Today, Cuba is a neo-colony of Soviet social-imperialism.

* The first Soviet "investment" in Cuba was for nickel, which the Soviet social imperialists needed for their armaments industry.

*The Cuban economy developed primarily around sugar in order to meet the Soviet "interna-

tional division of labor", to supply sugar to the USSR and Eastern Europe. Secondly were the needed nickel, coffee and tobacco for revisionist consumption. Castro attacked the line of self-reliance as "dogmatic".

*In 1971, 57.2% of Cuba's imports were from the USSR, who received 35.3% of Cuba's exports, not including figures for Eastern Europe.

attacking Marxism Modern revisionism seeks the same end by attacking Leninism By stating that war and revolution are mutually exclusive parts of a contradiction, that imperialist war is a trend that is or could become primary in determining the development of world history, the minority objectively and independently of its will, revised the fundamental teachings of Lenin on the nature of imperialism. Instead of seeing imperialism as a permanent source of wars and armed aggressions, the minority viewed war as an aspect of imperialism which competes with revolution to determine the course of history. War is the temporary forced resolution of the contradictions facing imperialist powers and between them, contradictions which spring from the same objective conditions as those giving rise to revolution. The elevation of imperialist war to a trend means nothing less than denial of the basic teachings of Lenin on the nature of imperialism, war, and the fundamental contradictions in the world.

This line in essence negated that the basic class contradictions of capitalist society give rise in turn to both war and revolution.

By putting forward that "two trends" are contending, the organizations of the minority discarded an analysis of fundamental class contradictions of imperialism based on materialism, and descended into the depths of idealism.

Further, this idealistic position over-estimated the strength of the bourgeoisie of the imperialist superpowers, and belittled the rising strength of the international proletariat and national liberation movements in two ways. First, the statement that "we cannot know which trend is primary because of the lag in the subjective factor" is a clear abandonment of the Marxist-Leninist duty not only to understand the world, but also to change it. This position relegates the proletariat to supposedly not knowing what is now the trend of the international situation, and in this way stifles the resistance and the development of the subjective factor within the working class movement.

Second was the rationale for stating that war was now a "trend", in contention with revolutionary struggles for "hegemony". This "analysis" is based on the fact that the U.S. and Soviet proletariats are not yet strong enough to prevent

war between the two superpowers by overthrowing their own bourgeoisies. Therefore war is more likely to occur than revolution, and therefore war is a trend contending with revolution said the proponents of this metaphysical line. Lenin and the Bolshevik Party leading the revolutionary struggle of the Russian proletariat were also unable to prevent the Tsarist regime from going to war in 1914. But in 1917, just three years later, they were able to seize state power precisely because of the crisis of the imperialist bourgeoisie that world war represents. The minority position did not see the revolutionary struggle as a process of development reflected in strategy and tactics based on changes in the relations of forces in class struggle. Rather they seized on the momentary appearances of the world situation and working class movements during a short period of time and elevated these appearances to fundamentally negate the revolutionary direction of world history.

THE LINE OF KRUSHCHEVITE REVISIONISM

What does this line represent and on what is it based? It is the line of Krushchevite revisionism, a bourgeois metaphysical and idealist line based on the interests of the imperialists. Philosophically this line begins with the Deborinist theory of equilibrium. This theory places the factors for war and the factors for revolution in "dialectical unity", positing both of these as equal "trends" which at present are holding each other at bay. It does not accept that contradiction in a thing expresses itself throughout its entire history and development, but sees contradictions as only occurring at a certain point in the development of a thing. Thus, re-

volution was the main trend in the world, but now there are two trends, war and revolution, which have recently come into contradiction with one another. Instead of investigating and examining the objective conditions, the metaphysicians who declare this line seize upon two distinct events in the world and counterpose them as poles of a contradiction without seeing if they are indeed the product of the splitting of a single whole into its component parts. The minority justified this opportunist position by stating that Marxist-Leninists "divide one into two". They claim that it is we Marxist-Leninists who divide one into two, instead of remembering that in the real world the development of processes leads to the actual division of things into their opposites, and not that we divide them in our heads. This line in actuality led the minority to combining one into two. An example of this idealism is their fusing of war and revolution into a mechanical unity. A second example is their fusion of the MPLA with Soviet social-imperialism, viewing this association as voluntary instead of understanding the force of imperialism in its push for hegemony.

This pessimistic and conservative view is the expression of the petty bourgeois outlook ultimately reflecting the imperialist bourgeoisie. The petty bourgeoisie has long been the merchant of bourgeois goods, and this case is no different. Seeking to find a niche in the revolution, the opportunism of the petty bourgeoisie manifests itself in voluntarism. Voluntarism is the ideology that something will exist, if only we wish it so. This is the source of the idealist line that Marxist-Leninists can voluntarily "divide one into two", instead of grasping objective contradictions through study of concrete conditions.

Voluntarism reflects the petty bourgeois class basis behind the lines of fusing war and revolution into a contradiction, of fusing the MPLA and Soviet social-imperialism into one whole. Voluntarism profoundly reflects the interests of the petty bourgeoisie as a class, which is not driven to revolution by objective conditions, as is the proletariat, but becomes voluntarily involved in the revolutionary movement for fear of being left behind, for fear of losing its distinction from the proletariat. This is the ideological source which allowed the minority to twist the scientific tenets of Marxism-Leninism to their own use.

The two lines here described developed during the course of the coalition, taking a slightly more expanded form at each meeting. It was the development of the two lines in the coalition that determined the concrete course of the coalition's event. This shows the truth of Chairman Mao's statement that class struggle determines everything.



This is the first part of a two part article, to be continued in the next issue of UNITE'

The next part of this article will take up the line changes of the OL and RWL regarding the international situation, as well as a broader analysis of the roles of different organizations within the coalition. The actions flowing from the opportunist line of the minority will be outlined, and the lessons of the CASD for the communist and proletarian movements summarized.

Death to Apartheid

Since the present racist government of the South African minority regime came to power in 1948, a vast body of legislative enactments has come into existence, designed to give effect to the new policy of apartheid. Hundreds of laws have been passed by the white minority parliament: thousands of regulations, proclamations and

government notices have been issued under those laws.

All these combine to constitute the legal apparatus which regulates the daily lives of more than 4/5 of the population of Azania (South Africa), i.e. the 20.7 million Blacks.

These "Bantu" laws, such as the pass laws, the trespass laws and other laws applying only to the African community are in many ways similar to the Black Codes and Jim Crow laws of the Black Belt South. They control virtually every waking and sleeping movement of the African's life: home, family, movement, work, education, marriage, religion, etc.

The political, military and economic center of the southern African region is the "Republic of South Africa". Azania, the homeland of apartheid, towers like a giant over the African continent. It produces about three-quarters of the entire industrial product of the continent.

The South African apartheid regime is economically, politically and militarily supported by U.S. imperialism and by a number of second world countries like West Germany, France and Britain.

The present wave of repression was sparked by the attempt to further curb the education of the African majority by imposing the Boer language on the African students, who have traditionally used English for their studies. This led to massive protests in the major cities such as Johannesburg.

The latest events in Azania, the murder of over 100 people and the injury of over 1000, are the largest mass scale acts of fascist brutality since the Sharpeville massacre on March 21, 1960. The victories of the national liberation struggles in the last several years have had a profound impact on the struggle in Azania today. Today the Azanian people stand closer to national liberation than ever before and it is the duty of all working people in the United States to support their just struggle.



*The Cuban debt to the USSR approaches \$3-4 billion (U.S.),

which is increasing at about \$350-400 million a year.

*In the 1964-1965 period, Cuba traded 21.5 metric tons of sugar for one Soviet tractor. In 1971 one Soviet tractor required 43.6 metric tons to the Soviet Union.

*Cuba is now approaching a situation where the net incoming "aid" of Soviet social imperialism is equal to or less than the outgoing debt in payment.

*The Soviet investment in Cuba today is about \$4-5 billion (U.S.), considerably more than the height of U.S. investment in Cuba.

*On July 11, 1972, Cuba became part of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), fully integrating itself into the economy of the USSR and Eastern Europe.