

Capitalist Roaders Still on the Capitalist Road

ONCE AGAIN ON THE OCTOBER LEAGUE

In November 1975, the October League (OL) published their first party building call (Marxist-Leninists Unite to Build the New Party! The Call, 11/75, pp. 12-13). In March 1976 The WVO criticized the petty bourgeois indefiniteness and revisionist danger of this call (Slipping and Sliding: October League, The Most Dangerous Revisionist Trend in the Communist Movement and Their Call for the Party. Workers Viewpoint newspaper, 3/76, Supplement. Reprinted in WV Journal #4, 5/76, Vol. 2, No. 2)

Last May, the OL held their May Unity Meeting, where they and the Organizing Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Party redrafted the party building call and re-issued it (Marxist-Leninists Unite! The Call, 7/5/76, Vol. 5, No. 10, Supplement). Here we continue the criticism of the OL's slipping and sliding, their new orthodox image and their road to a revisionist party.

OL and Party-Building

THE MAIN DANGER IN THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Anybody who has followed the October League (OL) knows that for more than four years they have been saying that ultra-"leftism" has been the main danger in the anti-revisionist communist movement, and that the Revolutionary Union/Revolutionary Communist Party has been one of the most important, if not the most important, representatives of this ultra-"leftism."

Back in 1972, they wrote: "While the principal danger in the general peoples' movement is posed by the right opportunist CPUSA, within the young communist forces the main danger is ultra-'leftism'." (Unity Statement, OL, May 1972)

This was the basis of the OL's work for several years and the whole content of their criticism of the RU. But that didn't keep the line from doing an about-face in a few months and so quietly that almost nobody would notice.

In their November party building call, they said: "While yesterday the 'left' danger might have appeared strongest within our ranks, today the rightist influences are re-emerging on the scene." (The Call, 11/75, p. 12)

Just two months later, this became: "The greater obstacle on the road of party building today is put up by right-opportunist forces, especially 'centrism'." (The Call, 1/76)

Until finally, in their May party building call, they hardly mention "ultra-'leftism'" anymore! They open with this statement on the origins of the communist movement: "The present Marxist-Leninist movement was born in struggle against modern revisionism."

"To date, our growth and development has been dependent on this struggle" (the OL means the struggle against the modern revisionism of the "C"PSU and "C"PUSA) "and has brought us to the point where we have achieved greater unity and clarity than ever before." (Marxist-Leninists Unite! pp 1, 2)

And the reasons for this supposed 180-degree flip on the main danger?

"In the last several years, important ideological struggles have done much to isolate and discredit 'left' opportunism in our movement, while our growth and development has brought us recently into much more direct and sharper conflict with the revisionist CPUSA. In addition, a consolidated 'centrist' trend has emerged in our movement and is actively spreading the line of conciliation to revisionism, and social-imperialism under the 'cloak' of Marxism-Leninism. Finally, our movement has begun to increase its

work of mass agitation -- particularly in beginning to give communist leadership to the developing mass upsurge against the conditions of the capitalist crisis." (Marxist-Leninists Unite!, p. 2)

The first reason that OL gives is a condition that can strengthen right opportunism. The struggle against "left" opportunism can help strengthen the right, for as the Communist Party of China says, one tendency covers another. But this doesn't explain at all the class and ideological basis of right opportunism, which are the real roots of the problem.

In fact, when the OL was saying that ultra-"leftism" was the main danger, they used this "one tendency covers another" argument to go just the opposite way! They said ultra-"leftism" was strong because it is a reaction to the revisionist "C"PUSA! They also tried to make a class analysis of "left" deviations, saying that they were based in the student and petty bourgeois origins of the communist movement:

"In part, this leftism today stems from a reaction to the rightism of the revisionist party. In part, it reflects the social base" (the OL means the student, intellectual class basis) "of the communist movement at the present time." (Party Building in the U.S., OL, spring 1973, p. 8)

So we see that the OL will twist an argument any way they like, any way it will serve their purposes at the moment. Yesterday, "left" opportunism supposedly got stronger because we were fighting the right. Today, right opportunism is supposed to be getting stronger because we've been fighting the "left," even though at the very same time, "our growth and development has brought us recently into much more direct and sharper conflict with the revisionist CPUSA". Try to understand that one!

And what's happened to their analysis of the petty bourgeois class basis of these deviations? Has the class basis of the communist movement's deviations changed drastically in the last 3 years? The OL hasn't even tried to patch up this hole. They've just tried to hope we'll forget about it altogether.

The OL's second reason, the emergence of a centrist trend, is an important manifestation of the danger of right opportunism. But this too doesn't explain the class and ideological roots of the deviation. The OL knows that centrism has emerged, but doesn't care to know why.

As a matter of fact, the OL doesn't know when the centrism emerged, either. The centrism of groups like the Guardian has been around for a long time. It is nothing new! The Guardian, which today has degenerated into revisionism, never clearly and consistently supported the Communist Party of China and Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought. They never had a clear stand against Soviet social-imperialism or the revisionist "C"PUSA.

Ideologically, the Guardian never made it out of the eclectic period of the spontaneous movements of the 1960s, supporting anything that came along and looked to them like a "progressive," "anti-imperialist," "people's" movement. They once said they supported Mao Tse-tung Thought but they also support Fidel Castro, Guevara and even Brezhnev. They once said they supported the anti-revisionist communist movement, but they also support

the Trotskyites, the revisionist "C"PUSA and even gay liberation. And so on. The Guardian played these opportunist tricks for years.

And for years, the OL and Guardian had identical positions on all the burning questions that split the communist movement. They had total unity on their uncritical support for trade union misleaders like Arnold Miller and Cesar Chavez, together they supported bourgeois tricks like the forced busing plan in Boston and the Equal Rights Amendment; together they opposed party building as the principal task and upheld building the mass movement. During all these struggles, the OL and Guardian clung tightly to each other, showing no differences of principle.

The OL started struggling openly against the Guardian only a little over a year ago, when the Guardian was already nose-deep in the revisionist slime. By that time, the rest of the communist movement was ready to let the Guardian go altogether, for they were openly supporting the revisionist "Communist" Party of Portugal and the "C"PUSA here at home, and openly criticizing the revolutionary line of the CPC.

Yet the OL wants to tell us that this centrism emerged only recently, and this is supposed to be a reason why right opportunism has become the main danger only today! But this cannot be the case, since the Call's petty bourgeois line today was "transferred bodily" from the Guardian. As Lenin put it, it was not surprising that legal Marxism was bodily transferred from bourgeois literature to socialist literature. He said that, that

"there is a personal as well as ideological connection between all these forms of opportunism is an undoubted fact. It is sufficient to mention the name of the leaders of the Economists, A. Martynov, who subsequently became a Menshevik and is now a liquidator. ("The Ideological Struggle in the Working Class Movement," LCW, Vol. 20. Also in Against Revisionism, p. 275)

History certainly repeats itself on this question. Many present editors of the Call were writers for the notorious Guardian. They were "bodily transferred" from the legal Marxist Guardian to the "socialist literature" of the Call.

Is it any accident then that their "best" positions on the trade union question, women's question (except the international situation) etc., and their ideological tendencies, were all identical?

Now, are we supposed to seriously believe that the revisionist Guardian is sham and therefore the "socialist" Call is genuine?

The OL's third reason, the communist movement's increased agitation and mass work, is also a condition that can strengthen right opportunism. In the Russian communist movement, Lenin noted that the transition from propaganda circles to agitation and mass work in the late 1890s helped strengthen economist and right opportunist deviations.

Today the OL has started parroting the correct slogan that "propaganda is the chief form of activity" in the period of party building. This is another one of their giant-size flip-flops in the May party building call, because more than two years ago they were already hailing the transition from propaganda circles

Inside: OL's "2 ASPECTS THEORY of the STATE"

WV Supplement

to mass agitation and mass work as one of the biggest steps forward in building the party.

In 1974, they reprinted this big attack on "ultra-'left'" communist propaganda and the study of Marxist theory in party building, which was written by Carl Davidson for the Guardian: "An important achievement of the new communist movement in the past several years has been its transition from student-oriented propaganda circles to agitational work in the mass movements.

"The transition has been uneven and is far from complete. Yet every step taken toward integrating Marxism-Leninism with the struggles of the working class and oppressed nationalities is both a blow against the bourgeoisie and a concrete contribution to the building of a new communist party." (The Call, 4/74, p. 13)

Propaganda to win over the advanced is our chief form of activity through the whole first step of party building, the step of consolidating and training the vanguard, the cadre core that will lead the masses to revolution. Through this first step, communist propaganda is the main way to train and educate this vanguard. And through this whole first step, right deviations from this task, the tendency to underestimate the consciousness of the advanced, sink to trade unionism, lower the level of our propaganda, and not grasp tightly the necessary, immediate and universal preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat are the main danger.

Yet here again, the OL tries to cover over everything they've been saying for the past several years, and wants to tell us that this right danger of downgrading communist propaganda has only popped up recently!

So on all counts, the OL gives us a lot of jive but no real analysis of the danger of right opportunism. They never get at the deep class and ideological roots of right opportunism in imperialist countries, which is the only way to explain why this is a long-term danger in our movement.

Instead, they give us a lot of slipping and sliding. They have to cover up their own history, they flip-flop to new positions without explanation or self-criticism, they use old ideas to argue the opposite way today, and they invent the "recent" emergence of right opportunist dangers that have actually existed all along.

But this rotten maneuvering is nothing new to the OL. They've done it before, and today they have to spread it to all other important questions for the sake of their new orthodox look.

IS THE RCP RIGHT OR "LEFT" OPPORTUNIST?

The OL has all along been tailing RU's practice, practice, practice line and building the party by building the mass movement. And all along they have adopted the posture of having differences with the RU.

For years now, the OL has criticized the right opportunist RU/RCP for its supposed "ultra-'leftism'". The OL has called them "sectarian," "splittist," "dominating" (mark that!), "petty bourgeois 'leftists'", and so on.

In 1974, the OL even claimed that the struggle against the RU's opportunism was setting the main ideological basis for the new party: "It is largely in struggle to understand and oppose this erroneous line that the ideological foundations for a new communist party are being laid." (Revolutionary Union: Opportunism In A "Super-Revolutionary" Disguise, OL, 12/74, p. 18)

In their November party building call, they said again: "While this 'left' deviation could be found in all of the young communist organizations, it gained leadership and consolidated itself most notably in two -- the Communist League (now the so-called 'Communist Labor Party') and the Revolutionary Union (now the so-called 'Revolutionary Communist Party')." (The Call, 11/75, p. 12)

But now, just 6 months later, the OL has turned all this around to say that the RCP is right opportunist!

"While in the past RCP upheld the ultra-'left' pose of 'jamming' the trade unions, the rightist and economist essence of the RCP's line has always been evident with their economist 'workers' papers. The RCP's line that the primary task of communists has always been to build the mass movement (except for the brief period of their party formation) is further evidence of this right opportunism." (Marxist-Leninists Unite!, p. 2)

The OL tries to cover up this whole maneuver by playing with the word "essence." We know we've always called the RU "ultra-'left'" in the past, the OL tells us, but they were always right "in essence." So why can't we get away with calling them right opportunist today?

All errors, whether right or "left" in form, are always right in essence! Everybody knows this. The point is that the OL used to say the RU was "left" opportunist, and today they are saying the RU is right opportunist! And to cover their asses on this 180-degree turn, they are trying to pass off this latest flip-flop onto the communist movement by playing word games with the "essence"!

What is different about the RCP today? To us, the right opportunist RU of 1972-75 looks like the same right opportunist RCP today. If the OL thinks the RCP has gone through some big changes, let them try to show it.

Actually, the RCP hasn't changed at all. It's the OL who has flip-flopped. For more than three years, the OL was wrong about the RU/RCP. For more than three years, the OL fought the right opportunist RU from their own right opportunist stance.

OL ON PARTY BUILDING AND THE IMPORTANCE OF MARXIST THEORY

The OL should be the last ones to criticize the RCP for right opportunism. Knowing the OL's history, their criticism that the RU concentrated on building the mass movement is downright ridiculous.

We want to remind the OL of an important statement on party building that their chairman, Mike Klonsky, made in 1973. Speaking on how to fight the main danger of "ultra-'leftism'" and build the anti-revisionist communist party, Klonsky said:

"So the question for us is, how can we fight against this ultra-'leftism'...? Well, the main thing at this time is not to abandon the mass struggle to build the anti-imperialist united front and to develop those close ties with the masses, to integrate ourselves in mass struggle." (The Call, 6/73)

So who were the right opportunists who wanted to build the party out of united front, who replaced party building with building the mass movement?

Every honest comrade in the OL, the Organizing Committee and the U.S. communist movement should know this statement of Klonsky's and Carl Davidson's article on party building and mass work. We've printed them before and we're printing them again because it's essential to criticize and repudiate these opportunist lines. These were no accidents, individual deviations or slips in the heat of polemics. The OL upheld and repeated these opportunist lines thousands of times in their press, and even more important, they carried these lines into practice. These were the OL's real party building lines for more than three years; these were the lines that made the OL an "independent" trend in party building.

It's especially important to criticize and repudiate this opportunism because now the OL is trying to cover over it all, digging up their old pamphlets where they once talked about the importance of party building and studying Marxist theory, and trying to pass themselves off as "consistent" defenders of party building!

For more than 20 years since the complete degeneration of the old "C" PUSA in

the 1950s, the U.S. working class has been fighting to build its vanguard, the genuine communist party. For more than three years, the OL helped to drag back this heroic struggle. For more than three years, the OL misled their own cadres and a section of the communist movement down the wrong track and into the right opportunist rut. This is the tremendous damage that the OL's opportunist lines have done to the U.S. workers and the communist movement!

By flip-flopping today on all these fundamental questions of principle, the OL is admitting this damage they've done to the communist movement. They're admitting it underhandedly, but not openly and honestly, because they've done absolutely no self-criticism or repudiation of this opportunism, but are trying to hush it up and prettify it. This rotten approach can only strengthen the opportunism and raise it to higher levels. And this is exactly what's happening.

This is nothing short of capitalist methodology. What the OL is trying to do is declare bankruptcy and wipe away all former debts -- like a sinking capitalist business -- and start anew. "All debts are no longer mine," says Klonsky, the unrepentant capitalist roader who refuses to mend his ways. They've been wiped away forever, as if they never existed.

The OL's Menshevik Autonomist Organizational Line

FIGHT FOR THE HEGEMONY OF THE CORRECT LINE

Party spirit or circle spirit? This struggle on organizational line in party building has come up sharply in the fight against both the right and the "left" opportunists today.

The "left" opportunist Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization (PRRWO) and the Revolutionary Workers League (RWL) started their split with us on this organizational question, charging the WVO with "organizational hegemonism", "theory of mergers", seeing ourselves as the "leading circle", and so on. Both the PRRWO and the October League (OL) fought the big, bad Revolutionary Union (RU) with this accusation of "hegemonism" in 1974, and today the OL is running into the same charges from some other quarters in the communist movement.

For Marxist-Leninists, the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything. Absolutely everything.

Objectively, in every line struggle there is always a relatively incorrect line and a relatively correct line. One line that is most correct always exists, the line that most accurately reflects objective reality and will serve the proletariat's class struggle best. This most correct line exists whether millions of workers or only a small circle of people recognize that line and unite around it.

Communists have the duty to fight for the one line that they think is most correct. We are definitely for the hegemony of the correct ideological and political line and for the defeat of all incorrect views. This is elementary for communists.

On the other side, opportunist and revisionist lines also strive for hegemony. Line struggle in the communist movement reflects the sharp class struggle in society, where there is no middle ground. Either the bourgeois line or the proletarian line wins out, just as either the capitalist class or the working class exercises its dictatorship over the other. That's why it's ridiculous and wrong to fight a line on the grounds that it's striving for hegemony. We fight opportunist lines because they're wrong and they serve the bourgeoisie. We expect them to strive for hegemony and we have no illusions about it.

Anyone who does not believe that there is one most correct line in every line struggle, who does not fight to the end for the hegemony of the correct line, or who opposes a line on the grounds that it is striving for hegemony, is not a communist at all but a petty bourgeois liberal. All these views lead to the bankrupt, bourgeois democratic view that "there are

many correct views", "everybody is equally correct", and the bourgeois striving for "freedom of criticism" that Lenin condemned. They all weaken the proletariat's class struggle against the bourgeoisie.

"... 'freedom of criticism' means freedom for an opportunistic trend in Social-Democracy [Communism], the freedom to convert Social-Democracy into a democratic party of reform, the freedom to introduce bourgeois ideas and bourgeois elements into Socialism.

"Those who are really convinced that they have advanced science would demand, not freedom for the new views to continue side by side with the old, but the substitution of the new views for the old." (Lenin, What Is To Be Done?, 1902. Collected Works, Vol. 5. Peking edition, pp. 9-10)

PRRWO/RWL and the August Twenty Ninth Movement (ATM) threw exactly this kind of petty bourgeois democratic mud at us. According to them, qualitative line differences existed only between the revolutionary and opportunist wings in the communist movement. But within the revolutionary wing, there was no overall most correct line. Each organization had aspects of correctness and incorrectness. But none was most correct.

The way they saw it, dialectics apparently didn't apply within the revolutionary wing! There was no principal aspect or secondary aspect in the correctness or incorrectness of each organization's struggle with the others. There was no struggle of opposites, just the happily balanced correct and incorrect aspects of all the organizations' lines.

And because the WVO denied all this and claimed that we have the overall most correct line in the communist movement, they flung their charges of "hegemonism" and "sectarianism" against us. Under their new slogan of "no most correct line", PRRWO/RWL and ATM have dug up the rotten petty bourgeois demand for "equality, equality" and "freedom of criticism" for everybody.

When they were the "underdogs" in appealing to petty bourgeois retrograde trends, the OL threw these same charges of "hegemonism" against the RU. Today, they are receiving the same treatment from other "anti-hegemonists". The OL answers these charges in exactly the same petty bourgeois spirit as PRRWO/RWL and ATM, by denying any such evil ideas: "To those who would accuse OL of practicing 'organizational hegemonism' in this matter, we can only say: 'Take part in the work and judge for yourselves.' Anyone who has worked with the October League know this (accusation of hegemonism) 'is false.'" (The Call, 4/76, p. 12)

Instead of a clear Marxist-Leninist view of this important question of organizational principle, the OL gives us their friendly, liberal invitation to come inside and check them out!

LINE AND ORGANIZATION

Because the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything, organizational unity or disunity between communists, merger or split, must follow from our unity or disunity on our ideological and political line. Once we have reached unity on this line, communists must unite organizationally, subordinating all petty interests to this goal, whether they are old circle ties, national ties, personal friendships, and so on. On the same basis of the ideological and political line, we must split organizationally if we have sharp differences, again subordinating all the same petty ties to this goal. This principle of basing our organizational relations on our unity or differences on line should be obvious for communists. It applies to all relations between communists, whether between individuals, or an organization's recruitment of an individual, or the merging of collectives or democratic centralist organizations, and so on. But to practice this principle consistently is another thing.

The WVO exists as a separate democratic centralist organization only because we grew out of fighting opportunist organizations that we could not unite with, and because we think we have the overall

most correct line in the communist movement. If we saw another organization with a more correct or the same line, we would certainly liquidate the WVO for the sake of the higher unity, in what Lenin called the "slaughter of organizations" for the greater whole.

But this is exactly what the PRRWO/RWL call "hegemonistic"! Well, PRRWO/RWL, what holds your organizations together? If it isn't your unity around what you think is the most correct line in the communist movement today, then it must be those bourgeois circle ties, national ties and personal friendships. If you think we're "hegemonists", it only shows that you're the worst bunch of circle hustlers around.

CENTRALISM OR AUTONOMISM, AND THE OL'S "TEMPORARY LEADING BODY"

The OL's November party building call schemed for the formation of their party without a program, without a congress and without a central committee and democratic centralism. For a full year, this party would have been guided by nothing but some "temporary leading body":

After this discussion we propose that the new party be established around a temporary leading body which can survey the organizational forces represented in the party, establish democratic centralism and prepare us for our first Party Congress, to be held within a year of our founding." (The Call, 11/75, p. 13)

In March this year, the OL had to drop this bankrupt scheme, admitting that it would have increased federationism in their ranks:

"The Central Committee decided to omit this 'temporary leading body' and instead to call for the founding congress of the party to be held later this year.

"The weaknesses of the 'temporary leading body' idea were: first, the 'temporary leadership' would not have the full authority that it could have if elected by a congress, and this would open the door to federationist weaknesses and undermine centralist unity. Secondly, under 'temporary leadership' the party would be without a program to guide the struggle for up to a year until the first congress. Third, the unification process would be based solely on unity from above, not also on unity from below." (The Call, 3/76, p. 11)

Yet today, they're trying to write off this giant blunder as a little error that they caught just in time, "before the damage caused by the error got out of hand." (Class Struggle, Spring-Summer 1976, #4-5, p. 18)

As we will show, the error is already way out of hand, and it is not being corrected but is deepening.

The OL's call to form the party without a program, congress or central committee and democratic centralism, was no small slip. It was their pure autonomist, petty bourgeois spirit. Their scheme for a "temporary leading body", a sort of Marxist-Leninist steering committee, fully exposes their lowest common denominator appeal which runs through their whole organizational line.

Because the proletariat is a class with a single interest, we are always for the greatest degree of centralism in organization and discipline around the correct ideological and political line. We are for enforcing the iron discipline of the whole party under the leadership. We are for restricting "democracy" and autonomism under the power of the center. In democratic centralism, proletarian democracy must be under centralized guidance and centralism is built on the foundation of proletarian democracy; the only correct relation between centralism and democracy is to put centralism first and for higher centralism:

"The Communist Party not only needs democracy but needs centralization even more." (Mao, "Rectify the Party's Style of Work," 1942. Selected Works, Vol. III)

Once Again on OL

In a communist party, the center is the national Congress and the Central Committee that it elects. What does the OL think it means to say:

"The whole Party must observe unified discipline: the individual is subordinate to the organization, the minority is subordinate to the majority, the lower level is subordinate to the higher level, and the entire Party is subordinate to the Central Committee." ("The Constitution of the Communist Party of China")

The OL's scheme to build their party without any formal center, and even without a political program, was a wide-open invitation for factionalizing, for refusal to submit to organizational discipline and for setting up independent kingdoms under the "temporary" leadership. This franchise system is how the monopoly capitalists build up their enterprises, but it's no way to run a genuine communist party.

Petty bourgeois radicals constantly come out "on principle" against centralism, bureaucracy and formalism. It makes sense. The intellectual or the capitalist thinks that everything he has achieved has been through his own individual talent, individual skill, money and connections. That's why organization discipline and centralism to him are "humiliating", they rob his "individuality" and turn him "dull gray".

But the individual worker who stands up alone against the boss, loses automatically. The individual worker has no money, power or connections. But united in the millions through organization, the working class cannot be stopped. As Lenin said:

In its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but organization. Disunited by the rule of anarchic competition in the bourgeois world, ground down by forced labour for capital, constantly thrust back to the 'lower depths' of utter destitution, savagery, and degeneration, the proletariat can, and inevitably will, become an invincible force only through its ideological unification on the principles of Marxism being reinforced by the material unity of organization, which welds millions of toilers into an army of the working class." (One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, 1904, Lenin Collected Works, Vol. 7, p. 412)

That's why the working class never fears organization or centralism, but upholds them tightly by class instinct. Democratic centralism, which puts centralism first, is the world outlook and the only scientific principle of the proletariat on organization. The working class learns the value of organization from its factory training and its whole experience in the class struggle:

"For the factory, which seems only a bogey to some, represents that highest form of capitalist cooperation which has united and disciplined the proletariat, taught it to organize, and placed it at the head of all the other sections of the toiling and exploited population. And Marxism, the ideology of the proletariat trained by capitalism, has been and is teaching unstable intellectuals to distinguish between the factory as a means of exploitation (discipline based on fear of starvation) and the factory as a means of organization (discipline based on collective work united by the conditions of a technically highly developed form of production). The discipline and organization which come so hard to the bourgeois intellectual are very easily acquired by the proletariat just because of this factory 'schooling'. Mortal fear of this school and utter failure to understand its importance as an organizing factor are characteristic of the ways of thinking which reflect the petty-bourgeois mode of life and which give rise to the species of anarchism that the German Social-Democrats call Edelanarchismus, that is, the anarchism of the 'noble' gentleman, or aristocratic anarchism, as I would call it. This aristocratic

WV Supplement

tic anarchism is particularly characteristic of the Russian nihilist. He thinks of the Party organization as a monstrous 'factory'; he regards the subordination of the part to the whole and of the minority to the majority as 'serfdom'...; division of labour under the direction of a centre evokes from him a tragicomic outcry against transforming people into 'cogs and wheels'...; mention of the organizational Rules of the Party calls forth a contemptuous grimace and the disdainful remark (intended for the 'formalists') that one could very well dispense with Rules altogether." (One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, Lenin Collected Works, Vol. 7, p. 388)

Well, who else is the OL feeding with their "temporary leading body" scheme, except the petty bourgeois radicals and intellectuals who refuse to submit to real democratic centralism? The OL has come out with a 100% autonomist organizational line and exposed their "take it or leave it" attitude to democratic centralism, and still they dare to call this a little mistake, which they've caught in good time! It is clear that, rather than a "little slip," the OL's call for the "greatest possible democracy" was a reflection of their thinking, their ideas, stamped with the brand of a particular class--the petty bourgeoisie.

The OL's take-it-or-leave-it approach to the party program, Congress and Central Committee is nothing but bourgeois pragmatism. In China, one of the favorite sayings of the capitalist-roader Teng Hsiao-ping was: "White cat, black cat. Any cat that catches mice is a good cat." He meant that whether China was socialist or capitalist didn't matter. To him any way that achieved production and "results" was the good way. This is how Teng Hsiao-ping used bourgeois pragmatism to argue underhandedly for the restoration of capitalism in China.

The OL might as well chant behind Teng Hsiao-ping: "'Temporary leading body' or 'Central Committee'. Any leading body that gets the party built is a good leading body."

"ONE GROUP, ONE VOTE" APPEALS TO PETTY-BOURGEOIS EQUALITY --

"The organizing committee is composed of one representative from each group participating in the unity efforts, regardless of size... Organizations and collectives may be represented in the O.C. upon agreement with this statement and principles of unity. Once accepted by the committee, any groups joining the party-building efforts will have a seat on the O.C." ("Marxist-Leninists Unite", The Call, 7/5/76)

Although the OL attempts to give the impression of having changed its line and orientation towards party building from that of a Menshevik bottom-up approach, to a Leninist top-down approach, it is impossible.

The OL's thoroughly Menshevik, bottom-up approach to party building cannot be obscured by the Organizing Committee: one vote, one representative-form. We are not opposed to a representative Organizing Committee in principle, but must always get to the content that the form clothes, and see how the form serves, enhances, or retards the content.

The OL's party building approach, as we have summed up before, represents a lowest common denominator approach, a call to retrograde tendencies. The OL's principles of unity demarcate no one, liquidates all the polemics and struggles that have gone down and rich syntheses, rich political lines and programmatic elements that we have developed. After eight years of the new communist movement in the U.S., these seven principles of unity are a step backwards, as they represent a level of unity of ML in the eclectic period from the mid-60's to 1972. On the basis of these current eight

principles of unity, the OL "unity trend" should have called for the party before 1972. This is why OL's present call and the seven principles of unity represent a call to any and everyone. The RCP, MLOC, IWK, WC, etc. and many marsh elements could unite with the principles of unity of this Organizing Committee.

Since this is the period in which political line is key (the program being the concentrated expression of such) the absence of demarcation being drawn around lines on busing, E.R.A., the international situation, fascism and reformism, etc. represents the worst opportunism, and an attempt to lower the level of unity. It is the concrete struggle over political line that has served to further crystallize definite trends in this period. The OL, rather than putting forward its line as the leading line, representative of this trend, and struggling openly and above board for its hegemony and as the basis for their party, hides it. This reveals their petty bourgeois Menshevism, spinelessness, and indefiniteness characteristic of this "unity trend." The forging of "the great whole" must be a result of the slaughter of circles and circle spirit, to the hegemony of the correct line. This is a most ruthless struggle that must be taken head-on. This is a matter of proletarian principle. In the period of the formation of the Party, circle spirit is the main danger. This is as Lenin summed up:

"The importance of many of them [circles], which are now forgotten, was exaggerated, but in their time they wanted through struggle to assert their right to existence. ("Preface to Collection of Twelve Years," Against Revisionism, p. 102)

But does the OL take this struggle head on, as a matter of principle? No! They make all kinds of statements about how "they are not hegemonic," they are nice guys, and make appeals to full democracy, and fullest "possible" democracy, etc. consequently capitulating to this circle outlook, and expressing their own ultra-democratic, autonomist outlook on party affairs.

This is the context in which OL's line of one-representative -one-vote must be seen. The Organizing Committee was created in the RSDLP after Lenin and Iskra carried out a ruthless war against the circles, drawing sharp lines of demarcation, and therefore the Organizing Committee represented proletarian democracy after the hegemony of the correct line was achieved (the defeat of economism, expressed programmatically). But OL's Organizing Committee clothes its appeal to "all-comers," "all students," "all free-lancers," and feeds retrograde, petty bourgeois circle interests. Since no real line of demarcation has been drawn (except against crude eclecticism), then everybody can have a vote, regardless of line, past history, or practice, and therefore can protect their circle's interest.

The one-group-one-vote approach is top-down in words only, but bottom-up in deeds. The OL, rather than call on groups to liquidate themselves based on unity with the line of the leading representatives of this "unity" trend, instead attempts to reconcile certain groups, institutions, persons and bodies. As Lenin stated:

"In the very first words of his resolution Trotsky expressed the full spirit of the worst kind of conciliation, 'conciliation' in inverted commas, of a sectarian and philistine conciliation, which deals with the 'given persons' and not the given line of policy, the given spirit, the given ideological and political content of party work.

"It is in this that the enormous difference lies between real party-

ism, which consists in purging the Party of liquidationism and otzovism, and the 'conciliation' of Trotsky and Co., which actually renders the most faithful service to the liquidators and otzovists, and is therefore an evil that is all the more dangerous to the Party the more cunningly, artfully and rhetorically it cloaks itself with professedly pro-Party, professedly anti-factional declamations." ("Notes of a Publicist," Against Liquidationism, p. 76)

This is a bourgeois parliamentarist, not proletarian democratic outlook. This parliamentarism permeates the OL party building approach. Is it any wonder that, given this approach, a number of "recent, new, just-began-studying-ML" type collectives have joined the Organizing Committee, with full rights to vote? Is it any wonder that many of these collectives just happen to have OL cadre in them? Of course not; the whole parliamentary approach breeds bourgeois maneuvering. Instead of open and above board struggle for the hegemony of OL's line, the OL creates collectives, keeps out others, in order to ensure that its line will be dominant through bogus votes on the Organizing Committee. The OL is playing the same game as the bourgeoisie -- bourgeois democracy for all out front, while hidden is democracy for the bourgeoisie (the OL).

This is what a bottom-up, parliamentary approach to party building will lead to - the worst opportunism and appeals to retrograde petty bourgeois democratic instincts. Lenin wrote:

"The chief thing is to 'reconcile' persons and groups. If they do not agree on carrying out a common policy, that policy must be interpreted in such a way as to be acceptable to all. Live and let live. This is philistine 'conciliation,' which inevitably leads to sectarian diplomacy. To 'stop up' the sources of disagreement, to keep silent about them, to "adjust" 'conflicts' at all costs, to neutralise the conflicting trends - it is to this that the main attention of such 'conciliation' is directed." (Ibid, p. 77)

This is the main content of the one-group-one-vote line of the OL's Organizing Committee. This is the essence of the OL's party building, "unity trend" line!

TOP-DOWN OR BOTTOM-UP PARTY BUILDING AND THE LEADING CIRCLE

As for the OL's statement that their former scheme "would be based solely on unity from above", we don't think that's the problem at all! Whatever would hold such a sham party together would be unity down below, and certainly not the strength and authority of the "temporary" leadership.

The OL's "anti-hegemonic", "anti-bureaucratic" and "anti-centralist" line is the epitome of what Lenin called the bottom-up approach to party building, which upholds the democracy, autonomy and independence of all groups and individuals.

To uphold centralism before democracy, or "democracy under centralized guidance" (Mao, "On Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party", 1929, Selected Works, Vol. I), is the top-down approach. In the period of circles before the party's formation, this top is inevitably one of the circles, the leading circle.

The most popular catchword being thrown around today by both the right and "left" opportunists is the accusation that so-and-so is trying to become a leading circle. This charge comes in a package deal with "hegemonism". PRRWO/RWL have thrown them both against the WVO and the OL. The OL liberals, of course, deny being any such thing.

We uphold the approach of building a leading circle to unite the communist movement and advanced workers around the most correct ideological and political line. That circle must not only have the most correct line, but must also demonstrate revolutionary consistency in fighting opportunism and be able to unite Marxist-Leninists and win advanced workers to communism.

This approach is diametrically opposed to PRRWO/RWL's view that "no organization has the overall most correct line", and the Marxist-Leninist Organizing Committee's (MLOC) world of formal equality, where "everyone stands abreast".

The sharp difference of principle between these two views is, top-down or bottom-up? Proletarian centralism or petty bourgeois autonomism?

The WVO has always held that we have the most correct ideological and political line in the communist movement, and this has been the sole basis for our existence as a separate organization. We also knew that we were not yet the practical center for the communist movement, uniting Marxist-Leninists and winning the advanced to communism.

We do hold that, having become a definite consistent ideological and political trend based on building the party on the proletarian ideological plane and waging an open fight on two fronts against both right and "left" opportunism, the WVO should strive today to become the leading circle. We lay this out openly for everyone to see, and to criticize if it's incorrect.

PRRWO/RWL think this is "hegemonic" and "sectarian". The OL agrees? We expected you to agree, for you both have identical, petty bourgeois autonomist organizational lines, Menshevism and "left" inside-out Menshevism.

Now check this out:

"Bureaucracy versus democracy is in fact centralism versus autonomism; it is the organizational principle of revolutionary Social-Democracy /communism/ as opposed to the organizational principle of opportunist Social-Democracy. The latter strives to proceed from the bottom upward, and, therefore, wherever possible and as far as possible, upholds autonomism and 'democracy', carried (by the over-zealous) to the point of anarchism. The former strives to proceed from the top downward, and upholds an extension of the rights and powers of the centre in relation to the parts. In the period of disunity and separate circles, this top from which revolutionary Social-Democracy strove to proceed organizationally was inevitably one of the circles, the one enjoying most influence by virtue of its activity and its revolutionary consistency (in our case, the Iskra organization)." (One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, Lenin Collected Works, Vol. 7, p. 394)

There they are. Bureaucracy versus democracy, centralism versus autonomism, top-down versus bottom-up, leading circle versus absolute equality--these are the diametrically opposed approaches of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung thought and opportunism.

CENTRALISM OR THE "FULLEST POSSIBLE DEMOCRACY"?

In the very same anti-centralist circle spirit as their "temporary leading body", the OL promised "full democracy for all members" in their November party building call. We criticized this revisionist line which nowhere mentioned the need for greater centralism, which upholds the petty bourgeois "independence" and "freedom" of individuals against centralism.

Now the OL has changed this to "fullest possible democracy". This "possible" doesn't change the content of the OL's promise at all, because they have still evaded the essential question: which serves which, centralism or democracy?

How much democracy is "possible"? We think just about anything is "possible" for the OL and other pragmatists, but Marxism holds that "freedom consists in knowledge of necessity and transformation of the objective world" (Peking Review #30, July 23 1976, p. 11).

Here the necessity is the demands of the class struggle on the proletariat's organization. Stalin said time and again that the proletarian party is not a debating club, but a militant fighting organization that has to wage the fiercest and most revolutionary class struggle in history. The need to wage this all-out class war against capitalism calls for the greatest centralism and organization, and puts the limit on democracy. Recognition of this necessity opens the door for us to uphold staunchly the value of centralism.

Any way we come at the problem, we run into the same question of principle, the correct relationship between centralism and democracy. By trying to cover themselves with a pragmatic "possible", the OL has jacked up their opportunism on organizational line another notch, but they haven't got around that question at all.

The OL's Bourgeois Democratic Illusions

THE OL'S NEW LOOK ON REFORMISM

In the past, the OL saw the "progressive sections of the union leaders" as "direct reserves" of the proletariat, calling on communists to "unite with the progressive section of the labor leadership against the reactionaries" to "push the unions to the left." This was the liberal reformist theoretical basis for the OL's complete unity in practice with Arnold Miller of the United Mine Workers, Cesar Chavez of the United Farm Workers, and every other liberal misleader who came along. We've criticized this liberal line many times (WV Journal, May 1975, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 12-14, 39-44)

Today, the OL does this so-called self-criticism for their liberal reformism:

"The line of 'pushing the unions to the left' mistakenly underestimated the great danger of the liberal reformists (who appeared to be part of the 'left') in the trade unions. This erroneous line called for a 'united front against the fascist union leaders.' It abandoned a scientific understanding of reformism and revisionism as the main ideological props of the imperialists inside the workers' movement. It mistakenly saw the main contradiction in the trade unions as being between the 'fascists' and the 'anti-fascists'...today the trade union leadership as a whole, including Meany as well as Sadlowski, are reformists.

"...the main enemy of the workers in the trade unions is the reformist and revisionist union leaders. It is these opportunists who have the greatest hold on the workers ideologically and organizationally.

"As the danger of fascism and open terror attacks on the unions increases, it will be these opportunists who leave the working class disarmed...this whole bureaucracy, and the labor aristocracy on which it is based, stands as the enemy of the working class." (Call, Aug. 2, 1976, p. 7)

But this was never a deviation on trade union work alone. The OL's line of hooking up with reformists as "direct reserves" in the fight against fascism was the concentrated expression of the OL's petty bourgeois liberal conception of bourgeois democracy and fascism. The OL has always seen reformists, even ruling class reformists, as shaky but real allies of the proletariat. This goes to the heart of the OL's whole conception of monopoly capitalist rule, and has turned up on every burning question of strategy and tactics.

Once Again on OL

From the same angle, the OL issued the slogan "Stem The Fascist Tide!" during Watergate, claiming that this tide came only from Nixon and his backers, while the liberal Congress was supposedly part of the counter-tide. The OL called on the working class to pressure the ruling class liberals to impeach Nixon, and exposed Congress only for its "paralysis" and "refusal to act"!! The OL was completely blind to the fact that their hero Senator Sam Ervin bitterly fought the Civil Rights movement, while others like Rodino and Kennedy were at the very same time sponsoring their notorious Bill to deport immigrant workers!

The OL's conception of ruling class fascists and anti-fascists, their support for the one against the other, their use of Watergate to expose only one part of the ruling class and actually help build up illusions in the others, all exposed the OL's own deep illusions in the bourgeois democratic system. It exposed their typical mentality, which sees every incremental step to the "left" as a step closer to revolution.

Look at other political issues today, and we see that this same revisionist mentality still lives on. (see our polemics with OL's line of Capital Punishment in this issue).

UNITED FRONT STRATEGY OR TACTIC?

The OL's belief that the united front is a strategy for revolution and not a tactic is a fundamental theoretical basis for their liberal reformist practice. This comes out clearly in their work with the militant misleaders in the mass movements. The OL has never understood the strategic conception of aiming the direction of the main blow against the social props to expose and isolate them, and the revolutionary tactic of "supporting" militant misleaders like a "rope supports a hanged man."

Since to the OL, every inch to the "left" is an inch closer to revolution, every reformist misleader and politician they can hook up with on a day-to-day, issue-basis in their united front work, is automatically a "direct reserve." This temporary, issue-based unity is the strategy guiding their work.

For the OL, Afro-American misleaders like Jesse Jackson or Hosea Williams are "opportunist at times," "but they are not opportunist when they are serving the people" ("On Building the Party of the U.S. Working Class..." RU, 1974, p. 30). This view that the misleaders are opportunist if they oppose us, but are not opportunist if they unite with us the next day, shows that the OL doesn't understand class analysis, the determining of friends from enemies, and does not warn the masses ahead of time and expose the misleaders before, during, and after each struggle. The OL is captive to the misleaders' daily maneuvers, doomed to tail their every twist and turn.

Lenin called the opportunists in the workers' movement "better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeoisie itself," and the more militant they are, the more deceptive and dangerous they are to the proletariat.

Communists must ruthlessly expose these misleaders and smash their influence among the masses. Without this work, no proletarian revolution can be successful. This is a Leninist strategic conception of aiming the direction of the main blow against the social props, especially in advanced capitalist countries where the material basis for opportunism is fertile and under certain conditions of twists and turns of events.

WV Supplement

In these times when all the old opportunist faces are getting more and more exposed, it's the fresh militant misleaders who are most dangerous. These new faces still have a grip on the masses.

Communists have to work with these militant misleaders who still have mass influence, to smash them and in the process educate and win the masses to our side. This is a necessary preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat in advanced capitalist countries.

The OL is changing their line only now on Arnold Miller and Cesar Chavez, when the UMW and UFW rank and file have already seen through them on their own. The vast majority of rank-and-file miners already hate Miller from their own experience because he sold out their contract in late 1974 and since then has been actively suppressing and sabotaging every rank-and-file strike motion! For the past year, the miners have been wild-cattling by the tens of thousands, against both the Miller and pro-Boyle union misleadership! The majority of farmworkers are also seeing through Chavez from their own experience, because he agrees to the ruling class's deportations of immigrant workers, and because he has given up both their right to strike and their use of the secondary boycott through his support for the Agricultural Labor Relations Act!

The OL inevitably tails the mass of middle and even many backward workers. In explaining the tactic of "uniting with misleaders to expose them" or "supporting them like a rope supports a hanged man," we exposed the OL's tailism:

Communists must be clear on both points: first, that we support him; second, that we support him with a noose. We ourselves must have no illusions about the misleader's nature; as communists, we must see through him long beforehand. We support him only for the education of the masses, because the masses do not have Marxist-Leninist theory but learn mainly through their own experience in politics. We do not support him for our own education!

But this is just what the OL did. For the OL, Miller's, and other similar misleadership role was an open question, something not yet settled. And since they themselves did not know the answers, how could they educate and lead the masses? So in the meantime, as long as the question was still open (!), they demanded that all communists give full, unconditional support for Miller. (WV Journal, May 1975, Vol. 2, No. 1, p. 43)

For the OL, the long-term strategic interests of the proletariat are subordinate to the OL's day-to-day maneuvering in the united front. For them, strategy is subordinate to tactics; strategy is the sum of their short term alliances.

This is why the OL builds up a whole array of mini-united fronts, hoping they will add up to a strategy. For them, their strategic "United Front Against Imperialism" is the sum total of their strategic "Black United Front," "Black Women's United Front," "Multi-national Women's United Front."

But tactics must be subordinate to strategy! Who are our friends and who are our enemies cannot be determined by who we can or cannot ally

with from one day to the next, but must come from our strategic conception of the role of each class, oppressed nationality, and stratum in the socialist revolution. Only this strategic conception can guide our day-to-day united front work.

For example, only if we have a class analysis of the labor aristocracy, a strategic conception of misleaders as the social props of the ruling class and the direction of main blow, can we predict their class behavior beforehand, and expose them before, during, and after. Only then can we be ahead of the masses to lead them. Otherwise, we will be doomed like the OL to tailist maneuvering in the name of the "united front strategy."

"The movement is everything, the ultimate aim is nothing" -- this catchphrase of Bernstein's expresses the substance of revisionism better than many long disquisitions. To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chopping and changing of petty politics, to forget the primary interests of the proletariat and the basic features of the whole capitalist system, of all capitalist evolution, to sacrifice these primary interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment -- such is the policy of revisionism." (Lenin, Marxism and Revisionism. 1908, LCW, Vol. 13. Also in Against Revisionism, p. 116)

The OL's determination of the composition of the united front from case to case, adapting themselves to the events of the day (e.g. busing and the recent anti-apartheid demonstration without putting the fight against the 2 superpowers as a basis of unity); and their historically incorrect analysis of the role of militant labor aristocracy (a basic feature of the whole monopoly capitalist system) is to forget the primary class interests of the proletariat. This is the policy of the OL. This is the policy of revisionism.

THE OL's "LESSER OF TWO EVILS"

The pivotal issue where the OL has not even tried to change their view of reformists and the bourgeoisie's subterfuges is the Boston busing struggle. This is how the OL criticized the liberal supporters of forced busing, in response to the WVO's polemics with them:

"...the liberals in the final analysis capitulate inevitably to the fascists.

"The phony stand of the liberals like Garrity and Kennedy is increasingly being exposed before the people. Kennedy, while making a few speeches on behalf of the busing program, has only been using the program as a way of building his political base, using unprotected Black children as cannon fodder in the process. The liberal politicians and judges cannot be relied on to stand up to the fascists and ultimately will side with them. Garrity's approval of the white boycott 'tutorial program' is another clear example of this fact." (Class Struggle, Summer 1975, No. 2, pp. 88-89)

Here is an entire class view of social-reformism. To the OL, even ruling class liberal supporters of busing are allies of the proletariat in the struggle against fascists. The only problem with them is their "phony stand". To the OL, the liberals work in the right direction, but they just don't go far enough. They "capitulate inevitably," they "cannot be relied on to stand up to the fascists and ultimately will side with them."

To Marxist-Leninists, in this period reformism works as fascism's twin pole, actively feeding its growth by chaining the proletariat to the bourgeoisie and crippling the workers at every step. But to the OL, the liberals are the "lesser evil," a better choice than the fascists.

Whether it's stated or not, this belief that the liberals are the "lesser of two evils" lies behind every line that supports the forced busing plan. This belief fully crystallizes the petty bourgeois revisionist conception of fascism and bourgeois democracy, in which the liberals are genuine opponents of the fascists.

The OL's belief that the liberals work in the right direction, but just don't go far enough, isn't a Marxist-Leninist criticism at all. It's a reformist criticism of the reformists, the criticism of petty bourgeois radicals who think they're to the "left" of reformism but who are still riddled with bourgeois democratic illusions.

To Marxist-Leninists, liberalism or reformism are an integral part of capitalist rule. Reformism is the carrot of the carrot-and-stick tactics of bourgeois rule, which Chairman Mao called the reactionary dual tactics of the ruling class.

Like the OL, the British Fabians, who were the original reformists and direct forerunners of the revisionist Bernstein, also believed in this "quantitative" difference between reformism and Marxism. Engels criticized the Fabians:

"This socialism of theirs is then presented as an extreme but inevitable consequence of bourgeois liberalism; hence their tactics, not of decisively opposing the Liberals as adversaries but of pushing them on towards socialist conclusions and therefore of intriguig with them, of permeating liberalism with socialism... They do not of course realise that in doing this they are either lied to and themselves deceived or else are lying about socialism." (Quoted by Lenin, Preface To The Sarge Correspondence. 1907. LCW, Vol. 12. Against Revisionism, p. 77)

The OL still tries to claim that they all along had "a generally sound approach to the labor work." The only reason they can see for their liberal reformism is that they were "combating the 'leftist' line of skipping over work in the trade unions!" (The Call, 8/2/76, p. 7) The OL says nothing about the pattern of their deviations on all major political questions, and the bourgeois class and ideological basis of them.

From their total support for militant misleaders and their subordination of strategy to tactics in their united front "strategy," to their alliance with liberal ruling class politicians against fascists, the OL shows a clear pattern of reformism. This consistent repetition of political deviations reveals the bourgeois ideological root underneath, their deep faith in bourgeois democracy.

Without disclosing and repudiating all the political manifestations of their reformism and the bourgeois ideological root that they spring from, and without rectifying these deviations in practice, these same deviations will inevitably rise up again and again, in new forms and on new issues, and the OL will continue deserting from the proletariat to the ruling class!

Be Bold in Making Criticism, Self-Criticism to Build the Party on the Proletarian Ideological Plane

HOW THE OL DOES SELF-CRITICISM

Beat back and cornered, the OL has had to mutate, amend and flip-flop on practically every burning issue of principle in the communist movement today. Now we can start to sum up the stinking opportunism behind the OL's new orthodox image.

The list of the OL's amendments and about-faces is long!

Before, they upheld building the mass movement and the united front. Now they say party building has always been our central task.

Once Again on OL

Before, they said ultra-'leftism' was the main danger in the communist movement. Now they say right opportunism is the main danger.

Before, they always said the RU/RCP was the biggest representative of ultra-'leftism.' Now they claim the RCP is right opportunist.

Before, they glorified mass work as the biggest step forward in party building, and ranted and raved against any stress on theory as "dogmatism" and "hippy radicalism." Now they claim they have always upheld the study of Marxist theory.

Before, they claimed agitation to integrate with the masses was most important. Today they say propaganda is our chief form of activity.

Before, they saw every reformist as a real friend and direct reserve of the proletariat. Now they have to admit that reformists are the worst misleaders of the people.

Before, they promised all members "full democracy." Now they have altered this to the "fullest possible democracy."

Before, they said communists have to "unite with the progressive section of the labor leadership" and "push the unions to the left." Now they say we have to drive all the union misleaders out and win the unions to communist leadership.

Before, they didn't think their party would need a political program, Congress or Central Committee for its first year. Now they have added all these.

Before, they tried to evade saying whether the united front is a strategy or tactic. Now they have come out and said it's a strategy.

Before, they did not include Mao Tse-tung Thought as the theoretical basis of the party. Now they have added this.

Before, they said revolution is the main trend. Now they say that both factors of revolution and world war are rising.

And the list goes on and on.

Every one of these blunders is an important question of principle. If the OL leadership really took these so-called self-criticisms seriously, they would have to repudiate themselves along with the whole ideological, political and theoretical foundation of the OL up to date.

The OL is still clinging to their bourgeois line on forced busing plans, community control, the ERA, the Shah of Iran, etc. Through their rotten methodology, they are still desperately clinging to their ideological foundations of pragmatism, illusions in bourgeois democracy, fake self-criticism and slanders against the WVO and other genuine Marxist-Leninists.

Nowhere has the OL ever done a thorough self-criticism for a single one of their blunders. Nowhere have they ever looked for the pattern of their deviations, the class and ideological basis of them and the method of rectification.

Only their "temporary leading body" and "push the trade unions to the left" were such big, clumsy blunders that they were forced to call attention to them publicly. In most cases, they have not even honestly pointed out their errors, not to mention thoroughly exposing and rectifying their roots. They have tried to get over by just making the changes silently, hoping that nobody will notice, and by using strings of fake arguments and sophistry to cover up their rotten opportunist history.

IT'S A FAMILY AFFAIR

This is the OL's real guiding line on open self-criticism. Instead of honestly advancing self-criticism and "opening wide" to criticism from the communist movement and the masses, the OL tries to smother their errors under the bedsheets, behind closed doors.

Real Marxist-Leninists are not afraid of making mistakes, and openly disclosing their errors to the masses. Marxism holds that making mistakes is absolute and being correct is relative. This is because we all have bourgeois ideology that constantly sets us off course, and as Lenin put it, because reality is always more complex, varied and rich than the understanding of even the most advanced representatives of the most advanced classes.

That's why an error is usually not as dangerous as a dishonest, bourgeois refusal to admit and correct the error. We will constantly make mistakes, but as long as we honestly work to correct them, we will steadily improve and advance towards Marxism. But with a corrupt, rotten outlook, even the smallest mistakes are bound to grow into opportunism and revisionism.

"Not he is wise who makes no mistakes. There are no such men nor can there be. He is wise who makes not very serious mistakes and who knows how to correct them easily and quickly.

"The attitude of a political party towards its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it in practice fulfils its obligation towards its class and the toiling masses. Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analysing the conditions which led up to it, and thoroughly discussing the means of correcting it -- that is the earmark of a serious party; that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the class, and then the masses." (Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder. 1920.. Peking Edition, pp 21, 50-51)

Without submitting ourselves to this process that Lenin demanded of all communists, we can't possibly advance. Without admitting the mistake, disclosing the reasons and conditions for it and finding the method of rectification, there can be no real repudiation.

The OL doesn't try to understand and practice any of this. That's why they think they can get away with just mentioning their errors, or even worse, with covering over and silencing them. But as Lenin once said, nothing comes free in politics. If you let a mistake slide by today, you'll have to pay for it in the future ten times over. The OL doesn't understand the class content of correcting mistakes and that the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything. They think it's all a game. They haven't grasped that these mistakes can cost millions of proletarians their lives.

Certainly not all mistakes have equally deep class and ideological roots. Some errors may come mainly from inexperience in a new situation, especially complicated conditions, or rooted more in external causes.

But when somebody repeats the same kind of mistake over and over again, to show a pattern, then that is not a slip or a mere tendency, but a bourgeois trend that has to be ruthlessly dug up and repudiated.

When the OL made a petty bourgeois autonomist deviation with their "temporary leading body," then repeated the exact same kind of mistake with their "anti-hegemonism," repeated it again with their promise of "full democracy" and "fullest possible democracy," and again with their bottom-up approach to party building, then that is no slip that they "corrected in good time" as they tried to claim. That is a petty bourgeois autonomist trend that the OL either has to thoroughly disclose and root out, or else thoroughly degenerate themselves.

When the OL for three years made the right opportunist error of building the mass movement and the united front as their central task instead of building the genuine communist party, fought ultra-'leftism' and the RCP's so-called ultra-'leftism' as the main danger, glorified agitation and mass work against

communist propaganda and study of Marxist theory, and gave full support to Arnold Miller and the Shah of Iran, then that is also no slip but a solid right opportunist bourgeois democratic trend that the OL again has to thoroughly root out or turn revisionist.

When the OL amends and mutates all these crucial questions, then they are admitting their right opportunism in their own small-capitalist, money-under-the-table way. But, we repeat, without honestly repudiating and criticizing and changing in practice their opportunism, on every question, that opportunism is bound to repeat itself over and over, and the OL will continue to desert to the camp of the bourgeoisie.

Why? Because the bourgeois trend the OL represents has deep class and ideological roots, and as Lenin said about opportunism in Russia, it "is not an accident, nor evil design, stupidity or error on the part of some individual, but the inevitable result of the action of these objective causes, and the superstructure of the entire labour movement in present-day Russia, which is inseparable from the basis." (Notes of a Publicist. 1910. Collected Works, Vol. 16. Also in Against Liquidationism, p. 79.)

"Conscientiously study Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and criticize revisionism" is the first criterion for membership in the Communist Party of China. The OL doesn't understand that we have to apply this to all practice and thinking, including our own.

"Study Marxism and criticize revisionism" contains the truths that all of us have both Marxism and bourgeois garbage in our thinking and that Marxism develops in struggle against revisionism. This slogan grasps the dialectics of truth and falsehood, Marxism and revisionism, and is the most advanced understanding of how to combat and prevent revisionism.

"Truth develops through debate between different views. The same method can be adopted with regard to whatever is poisonous and anti-Marxist, because Marxism will develop in the struggle against it. This is development through the struggle of opposites, development conforming to dialectics.

"There can be no differentiation without contrast. There can be no development without differentiation and struggle. Truth develops through its struggle against falsehood. This is how Marxism develops. Marxism develops in the struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology, and it is only through struggle that it can develop." (Mao, Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work. 1957. Selected Readings, pp 494-95)

"Study Marxism and criticize revisionism" are two inseparable aspects of a contradiction. If we remain modest and vigilant, and study Marxism and criticize our own bourgeois thinking in the course of practice, we can steadily advance. But to drop either one of these is to open the door wide to revisionism.

This is what all opportunists and revisionists do. They all come together to try to kill the dialectics of studying Marxism and criticizing revisionism. They all get arrogant, conceited, refuse to admit their mistakes, refuse to do self-criticism, and therefore guarantee their own degeneration.

When Bob Avakian, Chairman of the RCP, boasts that they "must not and will not go revisionist" (Revolution, 10/75, p. 11), when PRRWO/RWL claim that Marxism and bourgeois ideology don't coexist in their thinking, and when the OL liberals just try to slide by without saying anything about their errors, they are all trying to kill the dialectics of Marxism and revisionism, and as long as they stick with it, they are all guaranteeing their own degeneration.

OL ORGANIZING COMMITTEE...

Our attitude towards criticism and self-criticism is a class question, and reflects a bourgeois or proletarian class stand. All opportunists refuse to do self-criticism because they put themselves, their careers and their circles above the revolution and the people.

To really do criticism and self-criticism requires the communist spirit of serving the people:

"If we have shortcomings, we are not afraid to have them pointed out and criticized, because we serve the people. Anyone, no matter who, may point out our shortcomings. If he is right, we will correct them. If what he proposes will benefit the people, we will act upon it. ...If, in the interests of the people, we persist in doing what is right and correct what is wrong, our ranks will surely thrive." (Mao, *Serve the People*, 1944. Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 177)

That's why the style of practicing criticism and self-criticism is one of the three great traditions of the CPC, along with the style of integrating theory and practice and maintaining close ties with the masses. That's why to "conscientiously study Marxism and criticize revisionism" and "be bold in making criticism and self-criticism" (Constitution of the Communist Party of China, Chapter II, Article 3) are a must for all communists, and are fundamental in building the party on the proletarian ideological plane.

The CPC also requires that Party members must "be able at uniting with the great majority, including those who have wrongly opposed them but are sincerely correcting their mistakes; however, special vigilance must be maintained against careerists, conspirators and double-dealers so as to prevent such bad elements from usurping the leadership of the Party and the state at any level and guarantee that the leadership of the Party and the state always remains in the hands of Marxist revolutionaries." (*Ibid.*)

On this basis, we oppose PRRWO/RWL's absurd, wholesale witch-hunt purges, which are nothing but their "left" opportunist politics extended to organizational matters and methods of struggle. There's nothing scary about these purges. They are nothing but the typically "left" opportunist method of "ruthless struggle and merciless blows" that Chairman Mao fought long ago. In China, the "left" opportunist Wang Ming resorted to this method to suppress those who opposed this "left" opportunism, seeing himself as an imperial emperor above line and above criticism, and demanding blind personal loyalty.

We've always held that the vast majority of the OL's cadres are honest revolutionaries. But going along with the opportunist line and the opportunist method of refusing to do self-criticism and repudiate errors, they are sure to end up as opportunist as their careerist and double-dealing leadership.

That's why the renegade Klonsky and the other careerists and opportunists in the OL leadership must be purged if the OL, as an organization, is to change its course.

What we can't go along with is the OL's rotten bourgeois methodology, for "Marxism holds that world outlook and methodology are identical" (*Great Benefits Derive from a Good Analysis*, Peking Review, 12/14/73. Reprinted in *WV*, 9/74, Vol. I, No. 2)

Communist politics is not a fashion show where there's a new look every season. To about-face and mutate, to treat self-criticism like a family affair, to divert criticism by pointing at the official revisionists, to change political line like a capitalist politician who hopes nobody will remember what he's done over the past 4 years, or like

bourgeois lawyers who "enter amendments" and "reword clauses" without changing the bourgeois content at all -- this is not communist politics but capitalist politicking. It is bourgeois political swindling and double-dealing!

This stinking methodology is the growth and maturing of revisionism. And this is the whole story of the October League.

What is the Marsh?

The principal tactical differences in the present-day labour movement of Europe and America reduce themselves to a struggle against two big trends that are departing from Marxism, which has in fact become the dominant theory in this movement. These two trends are revisionism (opportunism, reformism) and anarchism (anarcho-syndicalism, anarcho-socialism). (Lenin, *Differences in the European Labour Movement*, LCW, vol. 10. Against Revisionism, p. 124)

The mass movements of the 1960's were the rebellion of the most conscious sectors of society, basically the students and oppressed nationalities. These were the "fire at the treetops" that swept the country for a decade. The Freedom Rides, the Free Speech Movement, the anti-war and Black Liberation movements, the G.I. and women's struggles covered the country, coupled with the national movements directly linked to worker and community struggles, such as DRUM and HRUM.

Like the historic May Fourth Movement in China in 1919, these movements brought a whole new wave of revolutionary struggle and thinking to the U.S. and raised tremendously the class consciousness of the majority of the U.S. people. These movements brought thousands of devoted fighters to the front, and it's no accident that the bulk of our anti-revisionist communist movement came out of them.

But these mass movements drew in many petty bourgeois and intellectual elements, who have not adopted the Marxist world outlook and have bred very heavy, petty bourgeois opportunist trends at every step. This

DEATH PENALTY: STATE EXPOSES THEIR

The death penalty under bourgeois rule requires a clear understanding of the nature of the capitalist state and its effects on the working class and oppressed nationalities.

In early July, the Supreme Court made a ruling which supposedly restored the death penalty. But the Supreme Court isn't really "restoring" the death penalty because it was never abolished to begin with. In 1972, it had only said that the then-existing death penalty laws were "unconstitutionally" applied because the death penalty was imposed arbitrarily and capriciously -- without a consistent pattern -- and that there was clear evidence it was biased in application against oppressed nationalities.

The 1972 decision had come after an upsurge in the revolutionary national movements, when national oppression and racial discrimination were clearly exposed and challenged. This step is an example of the classical zigzags of bourgeois tactics: give some "concessions" during the revolutionary upsurge of the masses, and then take them back after the upsurge subsides.

But we know that the movements of oppressed nationalities and students in the '60s have given way to the movement of the multinational working class. The strength of the working class movement lies in its fusion with the communist movement, and that's what the bourgeoisie fear the most and are trying to do everything they can to prevent.

The death penalty is one way they are trying to threaten and intimidate us from overthrowing bourgeois rule and smashing its state apparatus. Capitalist law in general and the death penalty in particular are there just to defend the capitalist class' interests, to protect their property and to defend their exploitation of the working class and all the toiling masses.

The bourgeoisie are imposing the death penalty in this period because bourgeois democracy is increasingly being exposed for the sham that it is. So they must

try to convince the masses that the law is more "fair" now, is more "just" and "rational" than ever before. They are trying to tell us that the death sentence is now being administered "in equality."

A main thrust of this latest move by the bourgeoisie is their attempt to obscure the class nature of law and class character of crime. In emphasizing how "concerned" they are with administering the capitalist law "justly," they are trying desperately to cover their tracks, which are increasingly being revealed through the masses' own experience.

OL's Deeply Entrenched Faith in Bourgeois Democracy

This is exactly what the October League (OL) liberals don't understand. Their article on capital punishment (*The Call*, July 12, 1976), while correctly mentioning the racist nature of law, made no mention of the capitalist class nature of the legal system.

The OL liberals were clearly "shocked" about the news that the bourgeoisie is "restoring" the death penalty. *The Call* revealed to us: "The restoration (sic) of the death penalty is a sharp reminder that we live in a bloody dictatorship of the big capitalists."

For the suburban liberals who are sheltered from class exploitation and class struggle, it was indeed "a sharp reminder" that they are still "live(ing) in a bloody dictatorship of the big capitalists"! But for the working class and the oppressed nationalities, it is day to day reality, it is certainly no "sharp reminder" that we are still "live(ing) in a bloody dictatorship of the big capitalists"!:

The OL has organized a campaign to study Lenin's *State and Revolution*. But it is clear that the OL has not grasped the first thing about Lenin's teachings

... EXPRESSWAY TO THE MARSH

petty bourgeois social basis is the reason why these opportunist trends have not been accidental, but inevitable.

Lenin taught over and over that the workers' movement and every real mass revolutionary movement will always attract and absorb some petty bourgeois "fellow travellers." These fellow travellers may play progressive or revolutionary roles at some point in the struggle, but later on, under the new demands of new situations, they start to hold the movement back. If they cannot change, they eventually turn reactionary and have to be thrown overboard. The forward motion of history sorts them out from the proletarian trend.

The line struggle within the Communist Party or the communist movement inevitably reflects this struggle between the proletarian and petty bourgeois and labor aristocrat, the revolutionary and the opportunist, the advanced and retrograde trends. In the eight years of our anti-revisionist communist movement, the struggle of these trends has so far carved out three definite periods, where each time the petty bourgeois fellow travellers got sorted out from the proletarian trend as it surges ahead.

Though they are drawn from all different classes, students as a whole are a petty bourgeois stratum. Even those from good working class backgrounds adopt the bourgeois or petty bourgeois outlook at school.

The spontaneous national movements were overwhelmingly made up of workers and working people. But here too there were significant petty bourgeois sections. And the various nationalist theories that inspired and guided them, which were overwhelmingly revolutionary in practice, were not the proletarian theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought.

THE FIRST PERIOD: MID-1960'S TO 1972: DEFEAT OF ECLECTIC THEORIES

When the mass movements of the 1960's were flowing furiously, there was no communist vanguard to meet and lead them, and bring them to Marxism-Leninism.

The old Communist Party, USA, had turned thoroughly revisionist in the mid-1950's. The two major attempts to rebuild the party that broke out of

the "C" PUSA, the Provisional Organizing Committee (POC) and the Progressive Labor Party (PLP) had also already degenerated or were going down fast.

Without a communist vanguard to inject Marxism-Leninism into these movements, all kinds of revolutionary or seemingly revolutionary theories took hold. Besides the rising trend of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought, the theories of Nkrumah, Fanon, Guevara, Castro, "student-as-vanguard," "lumpen-as-vanguard," the Weathermen, and so on, all caught on. Some of these were revisionist and reactionary from the jump, such as Marcuse's "new working class" theory that held that almost everybody, even managers, were part of the working class, or the white skin privilege line that held that the white U.S. workers are bribed and are the direction of main blow.

The Marxist-Leninist trend had to develop from the advanced elements of these movements. The Revolutionary

(CONTINUED ON P. S11)

OL's "2 ASPECTS THEORY" OF THE ILLUSIONS OF BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY

on the state. Without any self-criticism or repudiation of their stand in the July 12 article, the OL in the following weekly Call attempted to give a class analysis to the death penalty to cover their asses. But their thinking is still hopelessly within the framework of bourgeois legality:

"Lenin once wrote that the capitalists rely on two main instruments of rule: the hangman and the priest. The 'priest' is reformism, bourgeois liberalism [mark that! Bourgeois liberalism, as if there is proletarian liberalism], legalism, parliamentarism -- the 'legal process.' The court's decision is a confession [mark that!] on the part of the ruling class that the 'legal' forms of rule are losing their grip over the people. The decision is a sign of weakness, of failing legitimacy." [mark that -- the "legitimacy" of bourgeois law!!!]

Comrades, what kind of nonsense is this, if it's not liberal crap?! As we pointed out earlier, the bourgeoisie, by appearing to "administer" the death sentence more "fairly," is strengthening the "legal system" in an attempt to shore up its ever nearer dying rule. The death penalty is being "restored" to perfect the bourgeois legal system, to enforce bourgeois class rule over the proletariat. This is at the same time to perfect their "hangman and priest" approach as an integral capitalist legal system.

Here, according to the OL, the death penalty is not part of legalism!! The decision to "restore" the death sentence, as far as the OL is concerned, is an example of the bourgeoisie resorting to the "hangman" approach (they do take it literally, don't they?)

while non-death sentences under the same legal system represent reformism of the "priest" variety. This includes life sentences, we assume. And the decision to "resort" to the death sentence is a "failing legitimacy"!! While we oppose the death penalty, we see prisons are

also part of the "hangman" approach.

Laws are different from morals in that laws are enforced by the state apparatus. OL would like us to believe that the "priest" approach is legalism, parliamentarism, as if legalism is soft, and not enforced by force. But enforcement of law is by force and is the hangman's approach. In advanced capitalist bourgeois democracies, law incorporates reform (such as minimum wage laws, Social Security, etc.) as well as repression. But every worker knows that the legalism of the bourgeoisie is law and is enforced by the bourgeoisie by force. The OL's disbelief that "legalism" incorporates the hangman and their insistence that legalism is the "priest" is precisely their own belief in legalism, their own belief in the "legitimacy" of law!!! And they dare to drag in Lenin to justify their line!

Comrades, this is no mere slip, but a continuing reflection of the OL's petty bourgeois democratic world outlook.

The OL would have us believe that not only is there the "legitimacy" of law, but there is the "legal" and "extra-legal" way the bourgeoisie act in suppressing the toiling masses, i.e., "whether it uses violence against its own citizens in the legal form, via the death penalty, or in the extra-legal form, by shooting strikers, demonstrators, etc., in the street.."

Capitalist law is a direct reflection of capitalist economic relations in society. It expresses the will of the ruling class and serves bourgeois property relations and the political power of the capitalist state. Judges are representatives of the capitalist class. They use money as the basic standard and "legal" criteria to judge. All this is elementary. But the OL would have us believe that there are "legal" and "illegal", "legitimate" and "illegitimate" ways that the capitalists use to suppress the working class.

From the class stand of the bourgeois-

ie, acts that protect their class interests are all "legal", e.g. shooting of striking workers and demonstrators, or locking us out, are all legal as far as they are concerned, and they can always figure out ways to make them legal -- by bourgeois sophistry and even writing new laws.

From the proletariat's standpoint, all these things are illegal. The very existence of the capitalist class is illegal. And one class can exist only by overthrowing the other. There is no third path. Only those like the OL, who are not clear on their stand and viewpoint and keeps changing them, can speak of "legal" and "extra-legal" ways of bourgeois rule!!

Whether or not the death penalty is used at any moment, the ruling class always rules by force and deception. The bourgeoisie talk about law and order, but they have never been hung up on bourgeois legality as the OL has in defending their own interests. They have hardly restricted themselves to "legal" violence in dealing with the resistance of the working class and oppressed national minorities. The death penalty has not been carried out "legally" since 1967, but Fred Hampton, George Jackson, Native Americans at Wounded Knee, and countless workers in mines and mills are dead--all "legally" from the bourgeoisie's stand and point of view. About these countless deaths, the OL doesn't need to be "sharply reminded."

In the OL liberals' best tradition, they demand the bourgeois state help them out. The OL states,

"We absolutely oppose the death penalty when used by the capitalist state against the workers and minorities. We demand that the capitalist state apply the death penalty instead to those who are guilty of lynching and arson and bomb murders against Afro-Americans and other minorities, crimes which are again becoming frequent in the present crisis." (July 19 Call)

Is this any different from the OL's

CONTINUED ON PAGE 10

WV Supplement DEATH PENALTY

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 9

reactionary demand for federal troops in Boston, "to support and defend the Black students in Boston"?

After a year and a half to reflect on this question, Sherman Miller still has the audacity to write in "Revolutionary Wing or Anti-Party Bloc" (Class Struggle #4):

"What do you do when a fascist lynch mob is attacking Blacks? Do you promote armed self-defense as the basic strategic line, while at the same time tactically taking advantage of contradictions in the enemy camp by demanding that the police break up the fascist gangs and provide effective legal protection?"

We ask the OL, again -- "What effective legal protection was 'provided' at Carson Beach in Boston, when the police drove the people into the ocean, ran over someone with a motorcycle, and generally ran amuck?"

We agree with the Comintern that:

The demand for equal rights in our sense of the word, means not only demanding the same rights for the Negroes, as the whites have in the United States at the present time, but also demanding that the Negroes should be granted all rights and other advantages which we demand for the corresponding oppressed classes of whites (workers and other oilers). Thus in our sense of the word, the demand for equal rights means a continuous work of abolishment of all forms of economic and political oppression of the Negroes, as well as their social exclusion, the insults perpetrated against them and their segregation. This is to be obtained by constant struggle by the white and black workers for effective legal protection of the Negroes in all fields, as well as actual enforcement of their equality and the combating of every expression of Negrophobia. One of the Communist slogans is: Death for Negro lynching!

Taking advantage of contradictions in the enemy camp doesn't necessarily mean siding with and relying on one "side" of the bourgeoisie! But the OL consistently follows this line of uniting with the "liberals" against the "fascists" in the bourgeoisie. Where is the "contradiction" between the fascist gangs and the police? Where did the police have contradictions with the fascist gangs at Carson Beach in Boston?

In fact, it wasn't a mere question of contradictions between the police and fascists. The question was the OL's role in uniting with the NAACP in leading the Afro-American masses into a trap to get slaughtered. And they claimed "Freedom Struggle Erupts in Boston!"

Raising this argument one-and-a-half years later, the OL hopes the people have forgotten their position that the demand for troops was posed as an act over and beyond the question of "protection" -- that it was posed that the Afro-American masses must "learn from their own experience" that the police and Federal troops are not on their side -- a "demand" they raised without prior exposure that the troops would fire on the masses. This was nothing but a wretched, bloody liberal argument at the expense of the lives of the masses!

The question is: how to fight for our minimum program in a revolutionary way and not in a reformist way. OL betrays their liberal essence, not by putting forth these demands, but by their reliance on the police (revealing their deep-seated faith in bourgeois democracy) and hitting the fascist gangs as the main target and letting the bourgeois state off the hook as the main target.

Since the OL has brought forth the Comintern to try to hide behind, we would like to include the particular section which they conveniently forgot to quote,

and thus use the CI to properly guide our work and expose opportunism:

"The slogan of equal rights for Negroes without a relentless struggle in practice against all manifestations of Negrophobia on the part of the American bourgeoisie can be nothing but a deceptive liberal gesture of a sly slave owner or his agent. This slogan is in fact repeated by 'socialist' and many other bourgeois politicians and philanthropists, who want to get publicity for themselves by appealing to the 'sense of justice' of the American bourgeoisie in the individual treatment of Negroes, and thereby sidetrack attention from the one effective struggle against the shameful system of 'white superiority:' from the class struggle against the American bourgeoisie." (Comintern Resolution on the Black National Question)

Comrades, what the OL does is exactly what the renegade Kautsky does: takes from Marxism what is acceptable to the liberals, to the bourgeoisie, and discards and passes over all that in Marxism which is unacceptable to the bourgeoisie. What can be more acceptable to the bourgeoisie than the OL relying on it to enforce its own laws?

And by demanding that the bourgeoisie exercise its death penalty on Calley, Hitler, etc., what contradictions in the enemy camp are you making use of in this instance, OL? The "liberal" and "fascist" sectors of the bourgeoisie again? (The Call, 8/2/76)

No, it's a reflection of your intrinsic petty bourgeois faith in bourgeois democracy that slips out on every question. This jive about "basic strategic line" is a cover for your petty bourgeois moralism. The OL called on the federal troops in Boston because it was their view that the communist movement at that time could not provide protection to the Boston school children. Consequently they took the path of least resistance and called on the state. As petty bourgeois liberals, you were morally outraged and sank to promoting bourgeois democratic illusions about the state. You tailed the petty bourgeois democratic misleaders of the national movement. The stress, strain and "horrors" of class struggle shocked your petty bourgeois liberalism, and your faith in bourgeois democracy jumped out. You called on the bourgeoisie to defend the interests of the proletariat and oppressed nationalities.

This is no different from your demand that the bourgeoisie apply its death penalty to crimes that "morally" outrage you. The task of communists is to stand firm, expose the class interests and nature of the crimes committed by the running dogs, Calley and Eichmann and point to the bourgeoisie as the target. Yet the OL resorts to petty bourgeois moralizing and demands that the state partially use an instrument that the proletariat and oppressed nationalities want to take away from them completely. In fact, what the OL is doing amounts to granting the bourgeoisie partial usage of the death penalty, when we know that the law cannot be applied partially. This objectively reflects a belief that the state apparatus can be used in an above class manner! This is the revisionist theory on the "dual" nature of the state.

This is where the petty bourgeois democratic world outlook and line on two wings (reactionary/liberal) of the bourgeoisie lead. These bourgeois democratic illusions of the OL would lead to serious losses and setbacks in the proletariat's struggle for state power, that we currently see on a smaller scale, as in Carson Beach.

And there is another historical example that we must cite to demonstrate the grave consequences of such a bankrupt line. This was the experience of

the Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI) which suffered grave setbacks because of bourgeois democratic illusions concerning the state. Over a million people were massacred by the reactionary Suharto clique in Indonesia.

"The experience of the PKI provides us with the lesson that by criticizing the modern revisionism of the CPSU leadership alone, it does not mean that the PKI itself will automatically be free from errors of Right opportunism, the same as what the modern revisionists are doing.

"It is a fact that the PKI, while criticizing the modern revisionism of the CPSU leadership, also made revisionist mistakes itself, because it had revised Marxist-Leninist teachings on class struggle, state and revolution.

"The climax of the deviation from Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state climaxed by the Party leadership was the formulation of the theory of the two aspects in the state power of the Republic of Indonesia. /emphasis in original/

"The state power of the Republic, viewed as contradiction, is a contradiction between two opposing aspects. This first aspect is the aspect which represents the interests of the people (manifested by the progressive stands and policies of President Sukarno that are supported by the PKI and other groups of the people). The second aspect is the aspect that represents the enemies of the people (manifested by the stands and policies of the right-wing forces and die-hards).

"The two aspect theory obviously is an opportunist or revisionist deviation, because it denies the Marxist-Leninist teaching that the state is an organ of the rule of a definite class which cannot be reconciled with its antipode (the class opposite to it). (Lenin, State and Revolution)

"The Party leadership declared that the two aspect theory was completely different from the theory of structural reform of the leadership of the revisionist Italian Communist Party... However the fact is, theoretically on the basis of practical realities, there is no difference between the two theories. Both have for their starting point the peaceful road to socialism. Both dream of a gradual change in the internal balance of forces in the state power. Both reject the road of revolution and both are revisionist in character."

We have quoted these excerpts from the "Self-criticism of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the PKI," Indonesian Tribune, Jan. 1967, Vol. I, No. 3 (Tirana, PRA), to point out clearly that the OL's line on capital punishment, Boston, etc. objectively is a line of "theory of two aspects of the state power," and flows from their bourgeois democratic illusions and "reactionary/liberal" sectors analysis of the U.S. bourgeoisie. OL's line already has done serious harm to the communist and mass movements. If persisted in, and not exposed, it will do greater harm in the future.

Comrades, over and over again we have asked ourselves, "Are we picking on the OL?" Our summation is NO! There is a repeated pattern -- independent of the OL's will -- that reflects itself on every question, no matter how hard they attempt to cover it up with a new "left" orthodox image. It is a result of their thoroughly petty bourgeois liberal world outlook and intrinsic faith in bourgeois democracy, with its effective legal protection."

RCP's Populist Deviation

There is another deviation today on this and related questions, and that is the populist approach of the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP) on this issue, which

CONTINUED ON PAGE 11

Union played the leading role in this. They helped defend and support the Black Panther Party against the PLP's Trotskyite and chauvinist attacks. The RU played a vanguard role in bringing advanced elements from the student and national movements to accept the leading role of the working class, to start accepting the proletarian class stand, and Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought.

In this first period, in which some general standpoints of MLMTTT were reaffirmed - the necessity for armed struggle, the necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat, the leading role of China and Albania, the leading role of the working class, the contributions of Stalin - the principal focus of struggle and the key link in moving the entire process forward was the recognition of the leading role of the working class and the necessity to adopt the stand and outlook of the proletariat.

THE SECOND PERIOD - 1972-1975: DEFEAT THE PRAGMATIST LINE OF BELITTILING THE ROLE OF MARXIST THEORY AND PARTY BUILDING

During the second period in the communist movement, the mass movements dropped into an ebb. The fire at the treetops burned low by 1971 and 1972. Many of the less devoted elements who were drawn in during the "exciting" and "glorious" days of the 1960's fell away, generally leaving the best elements from the past flow to take up the new tasks.

The task in this period was to sum up the rich lessons and questions raised in practice by the past movements, using the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought. The fighters from those movements faced scores of burning questions. The Marxist class analysis of the U.S., the strategy and tactics for proletarian revolution, the Marxist View of the national question, the women's question, the international situation, party building, and the importance of theory, and so on, all demanded answers.

For our communist movement, coming fresh out of the practical struggles with little or absolutely no theoretical training, the key link to solving all the burning questions was to accept the

importance of the role of Marxist theory in the principal task of party building. Training in the fundamentals of that theory, its stand, viewpoint and method was a pre-condition to solving correctly all the other burning questions of class analysis, strategy and tactics, and party building itself. That's why a correct grasp of the role of Marxist theory was the key link to advancing the whole chain and ending the second period.

The importance of theory is itself an aspect of Marxist teaching, its teaching on the theory of knowledge (a question belonging to the philosophical domain of Marxism) that had to be applied to the struggle against concrete deviations (pragmatism) in the U.S. Lenin warned: "In our opinion, the absence of theory deprives a revolutionary trend of the right to existence and inevitably condemns it, sooner or later, to political bankruptcy." (China Reconstructs, Jan. 1976).

The application of this teaching in our movement led to a struggle between Marxism and American pragmatism and empiricism. This battle, and the connected battle to accept party building as the principal task, were the main content of the second period. As we formulated it then, party building was our principal task, and the role of Marxist theory was the most important of our four components of party building, which also included waging open polemics, recruiting advanced workers, and uniting with other Marxist-Leninist organizations on the basis of unity on common line.

Here the RU played a backward opportunist role. The RU had led in ending the first period by reaffirming some standpoints of MLMTTT against the crude existing eclecticism. While fighting petty bourgeois eclecticism, the RU carried it to the other petty bourgeois extreme, and became like the Russian Narodniks - petty bourgeois elements who cried "going to the masses" as a solution to everything.

But in the second period, the RU was the main representative of this pragmatic, blind, practice-practice-practice line, which we struggled out mainly over the role of theory and accepting party building as the principal task. The RU action freaks constantly downgraded the impor-

and rapes. In fact the monopoly capitalists will use cases like Charles Manson and William Calley as excuses to whip up people's support for the death penalty. But we would have no regrets about killing these low forms of life.

Due to the putrefaction of capitalism, besides the inhuman crimes committed by the capitalists against all working men and women, there are also crimes committed against the toiling masses by the lumpen and the Mafia gangs. The basis for petty crimes under capitalism is the capitalist ownership of means of production and the relations of production. They are bred by underemployment, unemployment, lack of social service, deteriorating schools, etc. Many of the downtrodden masses are forced into petty crimes against the oppressed masses themselves in order to survive. This contradiction is promoted into the principal one by the bourgeoisie, and used to try to divert our attention away from the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

Under the capitalist system, stealing a loaf of bread is a crime, but the capitalists' theft of a workingman's life -- long hard years of sweat and blood -- is not. The bourgeoisie manipulates genuine working class sentiment against such crimes and tries to make it look like the law works to protect the working class from these criminals. The bourgeoisie tries to shield the real class content of their own crimes.

But the working class and the oppressed nationalities in the absence of the science of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, do not always know and understand that. Under these conditions, bourgeois and opportunist demagogues of all sorts are able to deceive the masses. The misleaders ranging from the KKK and other fascist vigilante groups,

Once Again on OL

tance of party building and the role of theory and historical experience, instead advancing the slogan: "Build the struggle, consciousness, and revolutionary unity of the working class and its leadership in the anti-imperialist united front." They glorified the narrow direct experience of the young communist movement, going so far as to claim that the Party program would be "fleshed out of the experience that has been accumulated in the last period." They slandered anyone who upheld the importance of theory as "dogmatists," completely ignoring the much larger danger of American pragmatism and empiricism.

The RU's pragmatic line dominated the communist movement through most of this period. In a few of their early pamphlets in 1972-3, the OL mentioned that party building was their central task and that theory was principal over practice. But under a few early knocks from the RU, the OL quickly buckled under and as we know, they became wholehearted defenders of building the united front, the mass movement, and practice-practice-practice. Through this whole period, the OL tailed as closely as they could behind the RU's "popular" pragmatic line. They had plenty of company. The I Wor Kuen (IWK) and the Guardian newspaper stuck with them loyally, playing the same retrograde role. The Black Workers Congress (BWC) and the Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization (PRRW) also swung to this pragmatist line for a while. The RU's opportunist line developed nationally into the dominant leading line when they initiated the National Liason Committee, composed of the RU, the BWC, PRRWO, and IWK.

Many organizations and groups around the country waged struggle against the RU's dominant incorrect line. One was the Asian Study Group, a forerunner of the WVO, which at first fought the RU over the role of theory. At the time, we could only wage the struggle locally, and because we didn't yet understand the value of open polemics we didn't do it publically. As a result, the struggle was unsuccessful, in that it did not defeat the opportunist line of the RU at that time. But other collectives and organizations were beginning to

to Percy Sutton and the Amsterdam News, are all mobilizing the petty bourgeoisie and some working class elements to "fight crime" by joining auxiliary arms of the police and the bourgeoisie, and aiding the bourgeoisie to maintain "law and order", and keeping an eye on the vanguard of the working class -- communists. Meanwhile, these all serve to prop up the dying bourgeois democratic illusions among the masses.

Under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie we oppose the death penalty in general, because the bourgeoisie will always try to turn it around to use against the working class and its allies. But we are not against the death penalty in general.

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, when the genuine Communist Party is providing leadership and is in control of state power, the death penalty will serve a revolutionary purpose. It will be correct to execute counterrevolutionaries who try to subvert the consolidation of socialism and resurrect capitalism.

Engels once said that force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with the new. In destroying capitalism, smashing its state apparatus for the dictatorship of the proletariat, there will be class enemies and diehard elements who bend to block the proletariat's forward motion. They should and will be eliminated by proletarian law, the will of the proletariat and the authority of the revolutionary movement under the leadership of its party, during and after the proletarian revolution.

It is only under the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism that we will turn a bad thing -- the death penalty -- into a good thing to serve the proletariat and its allies and all mankind in the bright future ahead.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 10

... DEATH PENALTY

breeds chauvinism among the masses. In the name of having working class sentiment, the RCP plays at and appeals to the worst instincts of the working class. This way the RCP also helps to blur the class content of the legal system and the laws. To maintain their populist stand, the RCP also did not mention the especially racist character of laws and the judicial system under capitalism. Of the 611 prisoners on death row, 335 of them are members of oppressed nationalities or national minorities.

The RCP is doing the same thing today. In order to ride on the "working class horse"--as the RCP describes it--by hook or by crook, they use vulgar populism to try to get in with the spontaneous working class movement.

In their article on the death penalty in The Worker (July issue), they say: "Some of them [prisoners on death row] are guilty of truly terrible crimes and at least under capitalism won't change." The RCP populists gloss over the difference in class nature between class crime and petty crime, both resulting from the decay of capitalism. They never draw a distinction between proletarian kernels and backward views that can be used to build the base for fascism.

The pragmatism of the RCP led them to use the catchword "terrible" for all crimes, trying to get over the quickest and easiest way possible on the question of the death penalty (as they do on all other questions). Not providing any Marxist-Leninist analysis is to allow bourgeois ideas to flourish and take hold. And this is exactly what the RCP is practicing.

"Terrible crimes" are those committed against the people, such as mass murders

WV Supplement

raise the same kind of differences with the RU. In 1973, the NLC broke up, and BWC and PRRWO started an open struggle against the RU's right opportunism.

There were "left" swings from the RU's right line, as again, one tendency covered another. One of the most dangerous happened in the summer of 1974, when the BWC, PRRWO, as well as the ATM and others, swung into the "Communist" League's ("C" L) Trotskyite party building motion, their National Continuations Committee (NCC). The WVO struggled fiercely against the BWC, PRRWO on their "C" L motion. Later, due to such struggles and internal struggles in the organizations, they pulled out of the NCC.

But Marxism develops in the course of struggle. There developed in the U.S. communist movement in 1974 a revolutionary theory trend, that emerged in the struggle primarily against the RU, but also against the OL and the IWK,

as well as the "Communist" League. This revolutionary theory trend was composed of the PRRWO, August Twenty Ninth Movement (ATM), BWC, WVO, and numerous other collectives and individuals that attempted to uphold the leading role of MLMTTT and the central task of party building. It was largely due to the exposure and defeat of the line of the RU by this theory trend that saved and kept many honest comrades from being sucked up into the RU motion. This revolutionary theory trend was united on the leading role of theory, the necessity for Bolshevik criticism, self-criticism and repudiation, and submitting their lines to open polemics. There were differences and deviations in this theory trend, most notably the dogmatist deviation of PRRWO, but it was a revolutionary theory trend vis-a-vis the right opportunist line of the RU/OL.

In 1975, the revolutionary and opportunist wings crystallized, demarcated by the revolutionary theory trend. The line uniting the revolutionary wing was based principally on the acceptance of the leading role of theory and the principal task of party building, propaganda as chief form of activity, factory nuclei as the basic unit of communist organization, necessity to get down to the ideological roots and nationally specific forms of revisionism, focus on winning the advanced workers, a ML analysis of periods, key link, advanced worker, etc. The opportunist wing of the RU, OL, IWK, and the Guardian had consolidated around their pragmatism and right opportunism. By then, the revolutionary wing of WVO, PRRWO, RWL, and ATM had drawn an absolute line against this opportunist wing.

Differences, of course, remained in the revolutionary wing. The WVO continued to struggle openly against the PRRWO's "left" opportunist tendencies on the advanced worker, united front tactics, as well as the character of the party. The Menshevik line on organization and these questions, dealt with in WVJ #4, May 1976, are the main differences over which the revolutionary wing later broke up.

The opportunist wing continued their degeneration. Under pressure of the sharp criticism of their right line, the RU raised up party building as the central task "for the brief period ahead," raising it only to liquidate it with the formation of the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP) in Oct. 1975. As always, the OL is following as closely behind the RCP as they can, with their own party building push. The Guardian finally turned totally revisionist when they openly supported Soviet Social-Imperialism and its Cuban mercenary troops in Angola. The IWK, as always, is still in the same muck.

THE THIRD PERIOD - BEGINNING 1975: POLITICAL LINE IS THE KEY LINK

The second period was a time to consolidate the anti-revisionist movement on the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought and sum up the rich practical lessons from the 1960's movements. The task was to use the "respite" of the short ebb period to train theoretically our almost completely untrained new forces, and prepare for the great demands of future upsurges.

Since 1974, the multi-national working class upsurge has started. The fire at the treetops has burned down to the tree trunks, and the U.S. working class is on the move. Both internationally

and at home, this is a period of two contending trends. Internationally, the factors for both world war and revolution are on the rise, and at home, the same goes for the factors of fascism and proletarian revolution, whether world war will give rise to revolution, or revolution will prevent world war.

The sharpening of all the fundamental contradictions in the world today is bringing out rich lessons in all spheres of social life. And with our theoretical orientation firmly set by our preparations in struggling with the right opportunists during the second period, we are able to take up these new tasks.

Political line is the key link in this period. Line itself is in the realm of the ideological superstructure, "the more or less clear expression of struggles of social classes." (Engels, Preface to the Third German Edition of Karl Marx's 18th Brumaire, International Publishers).

Political line is the one sphere of ideology that deals with those questions most closely linked to state power, such as the state, strategy and tactics, class analysis, the workers', national, and women's movements, bourgeois democracy and fascism, world war and revolution. Our thinking or ideology also includes other spheres less directly linked to state power, but still based on the class struggle, such as lines on military, cultural, religious, economic, and organizational questions.

We aim the development of our political line straight at the development of the political program for the formation of our party, and preparation for proletarian revolution in the U.S. Political line is the key link to end the third period and form the party to continue preparations for achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat.

THE OL'S KEY LINK AND ECLECTIC TRICKS

A couple of years ago, the OL held that political line was key link to party building: "Political line has become decisive in the development of a new party." (RU: Opportunism in a "Super-Revolutionary" Disguise, OL, Dec. 1974, p. 18).

Yet in their Aug. 1975 "Constitution of the October League" pamphlet, they write: "The basic ideological foundations for the new party have been laid. But the organizational question remains and has now become the principal one awaiting resolution before a new party can be founded." (Introduction) (emphasis added) Similarly, at their Third Congress in 1975, they claimed that organization was now the key. The Congress decided: "...that 1) party-building has become a question of immediacy 2) that the OL should begin to accelerate its efforts towards the 'organizational formation' of a new party, and 3) that the present period calls for a shift in our party building work to emphasis on the organizational forging of the party itself." (Call, Aug. 1975, p. 11)

This didn't stop the OL from backtracking to political line months later: "It is true that in this period, the most decisive factor in party building is political line." (Call, Dec. 1975, p. 13)

By this time, the OL's "key link" had a lot of ragged ends that they tried to tie up. In answering those who say political line is the key link today, the OL came up with this clumsy and vulgar piece of sophistry and eclecticism:

To those who agree with the primacy of political line in party building, we must also ask, what about political line on the organizational question? (Call, Dec. 1975, p. 13) Very smart!!

The question is what sphere of the line struggle in the communist movement today is the key to developing all the others? Is it the political line, or organizational line, or military, or some other sphere?

And now the OL sticks their head in and answers: It's the political line on organizational questions! Well, OL, as long as you're dealing with the "political line on organizational questions," why don't you also explain to us the "political line on ideological questions," and the "political line on military questions," or "political line on economic questions," or the "political line on philosophical questions," etc.

Here, the OL is reducing the term "political line" to its common usage,

meaning "class struggle" and not its precise, scientific meaning used by our teachers in its various different spheres (see, for example, Lenin's Marxism and Revisionism). Class struggle takes place in all line struggles, in all spheres. To say class struggle in lines in the organizational sphere is the key is the same as saying that lines in the organizational sphere are the key.

This stupid trick of the OL is nothing but fast-talking-eclecticism, which opportunists and revisionists have always used to fool the masses. Eclecticism doesn't look for the real connection and contradiction between phenomena, the principal contradiction and the principal aspect. Dialectics looks for the connection between phenomena, but by finding the real connection and principal contradiction that actually exists between them, not by just seeing everything thrown together or by using fake arguments and sophistry to tie them up.

Recently in China, Chairman Mao put out three directives for the country's development. They are to study Marxism and combat and prevent revisionism, to strengthen unity and stability, and to develop the national economy. He explained that the class struggle is the key link to developing all of them.

The capitalist-roader Teng Hsiao-ping claimed that all three directives, taken together, are the key link. In this way, he tried to raise production and unity and stability and liquidate the class struggle. It was a sly way of undermining the proletarian dictatorship and preparing to restore capitalism.

The OL uses exactly the same kind of eclecticism to try to fool the U.S. communist movement when they claim that "political line on organizational questions" is the key link to the development of the entire communist movement. It's nothing but double-dealing to smuggle "organization is key," devoid of political line, into their sham party building motion.

There is absolutely no difference between this dirty trick and Teng Hsiao-ping's. This is the methodology of all sophists, the time-honored methodology and world outlook of all political swindlers.

THE OL BEGINS THEIR "LEFT" FEINT IN 1975

Last March, we already called out the new "left" aspects that had been creeping into the OL's line for the past year or so. We called this the OL's "left" feint to build their party.

It started with the OL's 1975 New Year's Editorial statement, where they announced that "the next year will be a decisive one in the establishment of a new communist party." (Call, Jan. 1975) Then they started dusting off some of their old pamphlets where they had once talked about the central task of party building and the importance of theory. In their November party building call, the OL boasted that they had always been "consistent and clear" on the importance of party building:

From its very beginnings to the present time, this movement has viewed party building as central among its many tasks. The October League, for one, has been consistent and clear in its stand on party building against those who tried (and still try) to liquidate this task from the 'left' or the right... (Call, Nov. 1975, p. 12)

It was then that the OL, who had been saying for years that "ultra-'leftism'" was the main danger, started to sniff a new "right danger" in the wind. In November, they wrote:

While yesterday the 'left' danger might have appeared strongest within our ranks, today the rightist influences are re-emerging on the scene. (Call, Nov. 1975)

And two months later, on New Year's, they announced:

The greater obstacle on the road of party building today is put up by right opportunist forces, especially "centrism". (Call, Jan. 1976)

This centrism of the Guardian was another important part of the OL's "left" feint. But the Guardian is no longer in the communist movement. To most of the communist movement, by 1975, the Guardian was already stinking bad from the revisionist scum they were mixing with, including the "C" PUSA, the revisionist Puerto Rican Socialist Party and

the "C"P of Portugal. It was only then, after years of the tightest possible unity with the Guardian on line, that the OL started to realize they were picking up the same bad smell. In 1975, after a long honeymoon, the OL tried to take over the Guardian. But the consolidated social-democrats there resisted. Only then did the OL come out with their "two lines" in the Guardian, as if revisionist lines were not there before. Only after that did they attack the Guardian's centrism as a decoy to draw attention away from their own rightism (again, as if it wasn't there before; the Guardian's line on the Soviet Union was there all along).

The OL's "left" feint broadened out more on International Women's Day 1975, in New York City, where the OL came up with their new "principle" called "no united action with revisionists." Like thieves, the OL stole this slogan from the CPC and distorted it to fit their own opportunist purposes.

The CPC had raised this slogan during the struggle against modern revisionism in the mid-1960's to make clear that real communists must not tail, but must break with Soviet Social-Imperialist collaboration with U.S. imperialism to sell-out the national liberation struggle in Vietnam. On these questions of ideological and political line, we must draw firm and definite lines of demarcation with the revisionists.

But the OL twisted this slogan to mean that communists cannot work "in principle" in any mass coalitions or organizations where there are revisionists. This "left" phrasemongering goes against another Leninist teaching. That teaching shows us that, while maintaining our own independence and initiative by holding our Marxist-Leninist principles, communists must work wherever the masses are to be found, even in the most reactionary mass organizations, where there are revisionists, and trade union misleaders and police agents who are misleading the masses. Communists must go there, precisely to expose the revisionists and misleaders in front of the masses, and win the masses to our side. This is another Leninist principle that the CPC has always upheld.

The OL distorted the meaning of the CPC slogan to try to justify their maneuvering at IWD 1975. The OL "broke" away from the main N.Y. IWD coalition, where there were "C"P revisionists, but also genuine, honest masses. The real task of communists was to go into that coalition, expose and smash the revisionists and all opportunists to win the honest masses to our side. But the OL went off to form their own "pure", "anti-imperialist" coalition. (See also WV Journal #4, pp. 24-28)

This capitalist politicking, which the OL carried out under a mass of "left" phrasemongering about "breaking" with revisionism, had absolutely nothing to do with communist principles. The OL "broke" to form their own coalition because they were starting to rally their forces to form their new party. The N.Y. IWD was an important part of their campaign. They summed up their separate rally:

Through events such as this, a new communist party is emerging, its forces gathering strength and its foundations being laid...
(Call, April 1975, p. 12)

This was the OL's "left" feint, so they can testify to the world that they "oppose" official revisionist "C"PUSA, to prove that the OL was "genuine." In the same way, they pointed at the Guardian's centrism to convince others that the OL is indeed "left."

But their actions speak louder than their words. And OL's rightist action is known throughout the country. They called on the state to protect the children of oppressed nationalities in Boston and helped mislead the masses into racist and police traps in Carson Beach.

And talking about "no united action with revisionists," in their Gary Tyler campaign, the OL unites with the A. Phillip Randolph Institute, a most notorious organization of bourgeois agents, for sabotaging the Afro-American and other national movements.

And where was the OL's so-called principle of "no united action" on October 27, 1974, when the OL worked in the Puerto Rican Solidarity Day Committee along with the revisionist "C"PUSA and PSP? It was correct for communists to enter that coalition to smash the revisionists' influence and win the advanced elements and the masses to our

side, as the WVO did. But the OL entered the Committee and united with the revisionists on political line, for they absolutely refused to criticize the PSP's revisionist slogan for a "Bicentennial Without Colonies," until they were pressured to do so after the rally. This again shows the OL is unscrupulous in principles.

In 1975, the new "left" make-up only covered a few spots; now, it has covered almost the whole face, to a whole range of questions that we have dealt with here. This is what makes up the OL's new look, their new orthodox image.

THE EXTREME TAILISM OF THE OL'S NEW ORTHODOX IMAGE

Having taken a look at the three periods in the communist movement, we can put the OL's orthodox image in the right context.

From 1973 to 1975, the OL abandoned party building as the central task, abandoned the importance of theory, and carried out in both their writing and practice an extreme right opportunist line. The OL's openly right line continued straight to the end of the second period.

For the OL to start picking up party building, theory, etc. only now, in late 1975 and in 1976, is nothing but extreme opportunist tailism! Why? Because the battle, the struggle over party building as the principal task and the importance of theory has already been won. Those were the main struggles in the second period, which is in the main over.

The second period ended with no help from the OL, who tailed as usual and drifted along the stream of the RU's dominant pragmatist line throughout. That period ended because

the revolutionary theory trend dared to go against the tide and fought that dominant line, including the OL's, and exposed it!

If nothing else, the behavior of all the opportunists in the communist movement proves this. Two years ago, all these opportunists, including the OL, slandered anybody who upheld the principal task of party building as "dogmatists" and "sectarians," even charging that "WVO is all theory and no practice," or that "WVO exaggerates the role of theory." Today, "everybody" is for party building. Today, all these things are downright "popular" and, in fact, have turned into a fad. This is true of the OL, the IWK, the Marxist-Leninist Organizing Committee (MLOC). Even the revisionist Guardian is now calling for party building and the importance of theory.

Lenin had this to say about these Menshevik vultures who pick and eat on the carcass of the old, dead period:

The basic mistake made by those who now criticize What Is To Be Done? is to treat the pamphlet apart from its connection with the concrete historical situation of a definite, and now long past, period in the development of our Party. This mistake was strikingly demonstrated, for instance, by Parvus (not to mention numerous Mensheviks) who, many years after the pamphlet appeared, wrote about its incorrect or exaggerated ideas on the subject of an organization of professional revolutionaries.

Today, these statements look ridiculous, as if their authors want to dismiss a whole period in the development of our Party, to dismiss gains which, in their time, had to be fought for, but which have long ago been consolidated and have served their purpose. ("Preface to the Collection Twelve Years," Vol. 13. Also in Against Revisionism, p. 98)

Did the WVO "exaggerate" the importance of the study of Marxist theory? Yes, we did and we are proud that we did. As Lenin said, "That victory would have been impossible if this idea had not been pushed to the forefront (emphasis in original) at the time, if we had not 'exaggerated' so as to drive it home to people who were trying to prevent it from being realized... And now, when the fight for this organization has long been won, when the seed has ripened, and the harvest gathered, people come along and tell us: 'You exaggerated the idea of an organization of professional revolutionaries!' Is this not ridiculous?" (Ibid, p. 98-9)

We call the OL, IWK, and other right opportunists vultures, because that's what they are, appealing to the backward and primitive instincts of comrades

Once Again on OL

in the communist movement, smothering the revolutionary will and energy of the masses. They are vultures, because these opportunists are still on the opportunist road; despite some mutations and self-cultivational "self-criticism," they cannot help but to pull the communist movement off the correct track, cannot help but to pull the communist movement back from the third period, cannot help but to liquidate the party program in the name of writing one.

Historical experience merits attention. We have seen how the RU liquidated theory and the party through their "brief period ahead" line, when they proclaimed their two principles; party building is the principal task, theory is now the principal task in the brief period ahead. The OL, liberals, Klonskyites cannot help but to repeat this. All opportunists, determined by their class nature, inevitably jump out and will take their predecessors' road.

It was inevitable that opportunism would now take on the form and cloak itself in theory and orthodoxy. It is a testament to the defeat of the right opportunists and the victory of the revolutionary theory trend. This is the dialectics of our movement.

And the second half-century of the existence of Marxism began (in the nineties) with the struggle of a trend hostile to Marxism within Marxism itself... Pre-Marxist socialism has been defeated. It is continuing the struggle, no longer on its own independent ground, but on the general ground of Marxism, as revisionism.

(Marxism and Revisionism, p. 111-112, Against Revisionism)

This is the dialectics of our movement. This right opportunist trend continues the struggle, now under the cloak of theory, the cloak of orthodoxy. This again reaffirms the necessity to get down with the ideological and political content of nationally specific forms of revisionism, because none of the opportunists today dare come out openly for the "three peacefuls" or against theory, but are hostile to genuine MLMTTT nevertheless.

Take the IWK. Through their whole history, the IWK has tailed after every dominant line in the movement, whatever was "popular" at the time. Here we'll just give one example. Crude forms of narrow nationalism, such as theories of an all-Asian communist party, or all-Black communist party, etc., were thoroughly routed years ago. Yet the IWK did not come out openly for multi-national communist work until Jan. 1976! (IWK Journal #3, Jan. 1976, p. 26).

Struggle against the RU's pragmatist line started in 1972. Three years later, in May 1975, the IWK for the first time "criticized" the RU's economism, worship of spontaneity, and belittling of theory. Four years later, in 1976, they "concluded" in their profound "theoretical" slogans, "Make the Struggle for Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought Central in Party Building," "Party Building is a Question of the Conscious Realm." At the same time, these tailists of the tail-end have the audacity to criticize the WVO for "ossifying" and "killing" theory!

MLOC is another example, who smuggles their opportunism in under a "bright red," "orthodox" flag. The MLOC is a Jimmy Carter in the communist movement, a happy face that's unscarred and is the "least disgusting" of the opportunists, who now wants to be in the party building "theoretical" bandwagon. MLOC doesn't take positions on hardly any burning, current issues. They criticize the WVO, the OL, and the RU on the Boston bus issue, without having their own position on the forced bus plan. They write "Draft Theses" on the Women's Question, and then explain that they don't have a position on the Equal Rights Amendment, one of the most important issues and a real test of a Marxist-Leninist position in the women's movement today. But one line that they do have, of course, is...they uphold party building and theory in general!

It is not "difficult" to profess to uphold party building and theory today. It doesn't take any kind of "daring" to "go against the tide" of the blind practice trend. Neither the OL, IWK, MLOC or any other opportunists are going to run into any opposition on these settled questions.

WV Supplement

THE OL ALWAYS LIQUIDATES THE REAL KEY LINK

But how does the OL size-up on the real key link today, the key link of political line aimed at developing a party program? The OL announced their party building drive in Jan. 1975. And as we know, until March 1976 they were planning on building a party without a political program!!

At their May Unity Meeting, they redrafted their party building call, and according to their own schedule:

A draft program will be written prior to the second unity meeting. The next unity meeting will be held within three months, after which the draft will be published and widely circulated during the period immediately preceding the congress. (Call, June 14, 1976, p. 7)

So the OL is drafting their whole party program in three months, even though they didn't consider a program necessary at all until March!! Then the draft program will be debated publicly for no more than a few more months, for the OL has promised they will form their party in 1976!

That is what we call "raising the program to liquidate it"! That is what we call the continuation and deepening of the OL's original blunder of not even seeing the need for a program at all.

The party program contains the basic line of the party, its final aim and immediate demands. It is the crystallization of the ideological and political unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists, serving as our common guide to action. It must be based firmly on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought, applying its stand, viewpoint and method to the concrete conditions of the U.S.; and summing up the class struggle of the U.S. and international proletariat.

The program of the genuine anti-revisionist party must be the line of demarcation with all opportunist, revisionist and social-democratic parties and trends, a basis to unite the genuine and draw out the sham. The eight years of our communist movement have been propelled forward by the two-line struggle between Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse-tung Thought and opportunism during each period. Each time the opportunist line has suffered defeat, the opportunists have cloaked themselves in higher and more deceptive forms of opportunism. But dialectics also dictates that the revolutionary line gets more advanced each time. Therefore the program must be a product of the two-line struggle and must crystallize the most advanced lines that can cut through the different shades and forms of revisionism, opportunism, and masked, "orthodox" revisionism.

This is the role of a real vanguard. But the OL's eight principles of unity for calling the party and their liquidation of the party program shows the role of the rearguard, asking the communist movement to forget all the two-line struggles before.

The political program can only be the result of all our work in developing our political line in this, the third period, just as our ability to take up political line as the key link today is based on all our theoretical preparation and application to the concrete conditions in the U.S., throughout the entire second period, from 1972-75.

The key link is the link that we have to grasp to move the whole chain forward. Throughout this whole period, we have to concentrate on developing the political lines of the future program in all our day-to-day practical work and polemics, and particularly in all our communist propaganda.

After being exposed in the second period, the RU raised up party building and theory "for the brief period ahead" to liquidate them. In exactly the same way, after being thoroughly exposed in today's third period, the OL has

raised political line and program for an even briefer period, to liquidate them!

To sum up. From 1972-75, the OL tailed the dominant pragmatist line of the RU. Today, when that line has been defeated, the OL and all other opportunists are showing up to claim "victory" on party building and the role of theory. But that is no longer the crucial question today. In both periods, the OL liquidated and is still liquidating the real key link, and attempts to block all real efforts to build the genuine Communist Party.

To desert from one camp to another, to drag at the tail at every step, to liquidate what will really move the whole struggle forward, thus smothering the proletariat's class struggle -- that is the essence of all opportunism and revisionism. That is the essence of the October League.

KLONSKYISM -- KHRUSHOV OF THE U.S. COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Lenin said:

The very same social and political content of modern international opportunism reveals itself in a variety of ways according to national peculiarities. In one country the opportunists have long ago come out under a separate flag; in another, they have ignored theory and in fact pursued the policy of the Radical Socialists; in a third, some members of the revolutionary Party have deserted to the camp of opportunism and strive to achieve their aims, not in open struggle for principles and for new tactics, but by gradual, imperceptible, and if one may so put it, unpunishable corruption of their party; in a fourth country, similar deserters employ the same methods in the gloom of political slavery, and with a completely original combination of "legal" and "illegal" activity, etc. To talk of freedom of criticism and of Bernsteinism as a condition for uniting the Russian Social-Democrats and not to explain how Russian Bernsteinism has manifested itself and what particular fruits it has born amounts to talking with the aim of saying nothing. (What Is To Be Done?, p. 360, LCW, Vol. 5) (emphasis in original)

Who was Bernstein? None other than the chief representative of international opportunism at that time. But Lenin says, let's talk about our Russian Bernstein's -- how Bernsteinism reflects itself in its nationally specific form, or we are talking without saying anything.

Modern revisionism is the main danger in the international communist movement. Who was its main international representative? Khrushov! But to talk about Khrushov revisionism without talking about how it manifests itself in the U.S. communist movement, amounts to talking without saying anything. Talking loud and saying nothing.

Klonsky revisionism is the Khrushov revisionism in our movement, the OL Klonskyism. The WVO over the years has pointed out how this representative of modern revisionism in our movement has ignored theory and strove not to achieve their aims in open polemics, but by gradual, imperceptible, and unpunishable corruption. The modern revisionists in our movement would not dare come out under a separate flag against the CPC, which is why we must grasp their nationally specific form, for the ideological and political content is the same -- desertion to the camp of the bourgeoisie. OL Klonskyism does not openly call for organizational unity with social-democracy, but instead poisons itself with the marsh elements through its "Call for Unity." The OL, as representatives of the left spectrum of social-democracy in the U.S., manifests:

The trend to get closer to join with social democrats, the whole treacherous line of action of the modern revisionists... (The PLA in Battle with Modern Revisionism, p. 285)

The OL Klonskyism does not openly call for what the PLA sums up as the "Liquidation of Communist Parties - the Goal of the Modern Revisionists", but instead its line objectively denies:

the radical distinction between the communist party and so-called workers parties permeated with the ideology of other classes, which, therefore, cannot fully represent the true present and future interests of the working class, means, in fact, to place the communist party on a level with non-proletarian parties, to deny that there is only one scientific socialism which clearly determines the historic role of the working class, the tactics, the strategy, which enables it to carry out its mission, and to admit the possibility of a reformist way to socialism placed on a level with the revolutionary way. (Ibid, p. 327)

This is OL Klonskyism. The nationally specific representatives of modern revisionism in the U.S. movement.

This is why, no matter how orthodox the form becomes, the ideological and political content will remain the same. No matter how much they attempt to fool us with these latest self-criticisms, "experiences on studying the State and Revolution," "changes" in the approach to party building, etc. the petty bourgeois democratic line inevitably comes out. This is a trend, which has deep historical, ideological, social, and class bases. Individuals may be won away, but the trend itself will not disappear. The capitalist roader is still on the capitalist road. Klonskyism represents double-dealing, and unrepentant opportunism - the Khrushov in our movement. This is independent of our will. If we were to compromise with it, it would open the floodgates, and drown our nascent, genuine communist movement.

HOW THE OL PIMPS OFF THE REVOLUTIONARY WING AND ITS DISINTEGRATION

The disintegration of the Revolutionary Wing, and the degeneration of PRRWO/RWL into "left" opportunist Trotskyite sects, was the best thing that OL thought ever happened to them. They have put a lot of work into making the Revolutionary Wing look like an unprincipled alliance that formed in opposition to the OL. (Class Struggle #4, Revolutionary Wing or Anti-Party Bloc?) The OL can then hide behind the "left" opportunism of PRRWO/RWL, the same as PRRWO/RWL hides behind the OL's right opportunism.

The OL is correct that the Revolutionary Wing was formed "in opposition" to them -- just as there was the revisionist Second International, Lenin had to form the Third International; just as there emerges modern revisionism, we must build the genuine Marxist-Leninist movement.

The Revolutionary Wing was a concrete product of the second period whose main content was over the leading role of theory, the central task of party building, open polemics, criticism-self-criticism, etc. On this basis the revolutionary theory trend drew an absolute line against the main representatives of right opportunism, the OL/RCP. The unity of the Revolutionary Wing was even higher and more concrete as was shown earlier, which deepened the line of demarcation with right opportunism in our movement.

The OL doesn't say a word about this line struggle, which was the key link of the second period and the principal basis of the revolutionary wing's unity. They seize and play on other differences that did exist and were bound to exist. By lifting the Revolutionary Wing out of its concrete context of the conditions, time and place, by ignoring that it was a product of the second period, the OL tries to paint it as an "anti-OL bloc." A neat trick!

All the OL can do is complain, saying, "The Revolutionary Wing writes a lot of polemics against us! They must be an anti-OL bloc!" The OL is com-

pletely unable to grasp the concrete conditions, the character, and key link of each period in our movement's growth, the struggle between the revolutionary and opportunist forces that inevitably produce unity between some and splits between others.

With exactly the same trick of lifting the Revolutionary Wing out of its concrete context, the OL gives us their vulgar, philistine explanation of the break-up of the Revolutionary Wing.

Why did the Revolutionary Wing break up?

It broke up because, in essence, there was a bunch of petty bourgeois democratic fellow-travellers in the revolutionary wing, who had to get sorted out from the genuine Marxist-Leninists. These were not right opportunist fellow travellers like the OL and RCP, but the "left" opportunist, dogmatist and narrow nationalist fellow travellers of the PRRWO/RWL.

These "left" opportunist fellow travellers were sorted out on the basis of the new conditions and new demands of the third period.

The "left" opportunist tendencies had already showed up in the second period, when the BWC, PRRWO and ATM had swung into the "C" L's party building motion, and in many struggles that followed over advanced worker, factory nuclei, key link, united front, etc. But in the second period, the struggle between genuine Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought and these "left" opportunist deviations remained skirmishes. They were not resolved.

In other words, in the "pro-theory, pro-party building" trend, there were already these "left" opportunist deviations. But in the context of fighting the dominant pragmatist line in the second period, the differences within the "pro-theory" trend could not come out fully and be resolved.

These differences came out when the line struggle deepened to the question of building the party on the proletarian ideological plane, and grasping the key link of political line. Then the deviations in the course of struggle became a full-blown, theoretically justified trend.

When the PRRWO/RWL finally had to answer how we will build the party on the proletarian ideological plane, they exposed themselves completely. By saying that Marxism and bourgeois ideology don't co-exist in their thinking, they proved that they could not grasp the meaning and practice of "study Marxism, criticize revisionism." By hanging onto their favorite phrase, "the root of all opportunism is bowing to spontaneity," which they distorted, they proved that they could not criticize the concrete ideological content, the nationally specific forms of revisionism. By saying that all comrades who came out of S.D.S. were "bound to degenerate" because they are "white and petty bourgeois," they exposed their narrow nationalism and mechanical materialism. From the first question to the last, PRRWO/RWL proved that they couldn't get beyond the phrase: "We want a Bolshevik Party, comrades, not a Menshevik Party!"

In the sphere of political line, the PRRWO/RWL showed that they could not apply the stand, viewpoint, and method of Marxist theory to solve the concrete political questions of the U.S. revolution. In defining the advanced worker, all they could do was recite Lenin's 1899 definition in his article "Retrograde Trends," but could not apply his method to the conditions in the U.S. On factory nuclei, they could only read off isolated passages from Comintern documents, again completely missing the essence and the factory nuclei's relation to mass work, trade unions and other mass organizations. On the united front tactics, they could not go beyond "left" phrasemongering about exposing the labor aristocracy. On the danger of world war and fascism, they proved they were still stuck in the 1960's, when revolution was the main trend in the world.

In the sphere of organization, they proved that they were a bunch of circle kings and queens, who held the autonomy and independence of their little forts above the proletariat's class interests.

The opportunist PRRWO/RWL proved that they are just what we call them, a bunch of fast-talking hustlers!

In China, many elements who were bourgeois democrats fought in the new democratic stage of the revolution, and even joined the Communist Party. But as the revolution has advanced through the socialist stage since 1949, these bourgeois democrats started to oppose the socialist revolution's advance and turned reactionary, exposing themselves one by one as capitalist roaders. Teng Hsiao-ping was one of these bourgeois democrats who jumped out as a capitalist roader.

The Young Lords Party, the forerunner of the PRRWO, played a leading role in the national movements of the first period. The same is true of comrades in the WVO and the RWL and other organizations. But petty bourgeois fellow-travellers inevitably sneaked into the ranks. Many petty bourgeois democratic fellow-travellers sneaked past the first period by claiming to accept the vanguard role of the proletariat. They sneaked through the second period in the fight against the RU's pragmatism, during the lull of the mass movements.

But the third period stopped them cold. The rise of the multi-national workers' movement with the rich lessons in this period when all the fundamental contradictions in the world are sharpening, are the broad objective basis that have forced out PRRWO/RWL's narrow nationalism and dogmatism, their all-round "left" opportunism.

This is why the revolutionary wing split. It was inevitable because it had class and ideological roots. On the broad objective basis of the motion from the fire at the treetops to the fire at the tree trunks, the "left" opportunist fellow travellers who had leached on years ago, got sorted out in the third period. Their opportunism on the organizational question was the floodgate that unleashed the more domineering, more theoretical "left" opportunist line.

This is why the Revolutionary Wing broke up, and not because, as the OL thinks, PRRWO's leadership has nasty tempers or because the unity of the wing was philistinely based on opposition to the OL.

The whole trick of the OL is to lift each struggle in the Communist movement out of its concrete context, in painting things the way they like things to be.

They try to paint the former Revolutionary Wing as having no line except being "anti-OL", to ignore the character and entire content gained in the second period and forgetting that the wing was the product of struggle against right opportunism in that period.

They attempt to show that the struggle between the WVO and the opportunists in PRRWO/RWL as infights between opportunists, rather than being an inevitable struggle between Marxist-Leninists and opportunists.

And they are trying to make themselves look orthodox today by covering their dirty retrograde role they played in the second period, and are still playing today.

One of the fundamental teachings of Marxism is that the truth is always concrete, never abstract. But nowhere does the OL ever try to analyze the class and historical motions that lead to ideological and political unity at one point, and splits later on. Nowhere have they ever analyzed the concrete circumstances of each battle to explain the trends in the communist movement. The OL's method depends on blurring over those concrete circumstances, in other words, on blurring over the truth.

Lenin wrote:

In each of these stages the circumstances of the struggle and the immediate object of the attack are materially different; each stage is, as it were, a separate battle in one general military campaign. Our struggle cannot be understood at

Once Again on OL

all unless the concrete circumstances of each battle are studied. But once that is done, we see clearly that development does indeed proceed dialectically, by way of contradictions...

But the great Hegelian dialectics which Marxism made its own, having first turned it right side up, must never be confused with the vulgar trick of justifying the zigzags of politicians who swing over from the revolutionary to the opportunist wing of the Party, with the vulgar habit of lumping together particular statements, and particular developmental factors, belonging to different stages of a single process. Genuine dialectics does not justify the errors of individuals, but studies the inevitable turns, proving that they were inevitable by a detailed study of the process of development in all its concreteness. One of the basic principles of dialectics is that there is no such thing as abstract truth, truth is always concrete... (One Step Forward, Two Steps Back. 1904)

Everything the OL says about the formation and break-up of the Revolutionary Wing amounts to the vulgar trick of justifying their own zigzags, the vulgar habit of lumping together particular developmental factors belonging to different stages of our movement's advance, and justifications for their right opportunism ("anti-OL bloc" versus the "unity trend of OL"), to paint themselves as "orthodox."

Lenin once remarked that eagles at times fly lower than the hen. But the hen can never fly higher than the eagle. The OL's "unity trend", OL's proud declaration that "we never had a split" is nothing but their character as hens, incapable of flying high, seeing far and leading the working class struggles. Our split, our disunity, our sorting out of the opportunists within our ranks, is a thousand times more true to the proletariat, a thousand times more faithful to the course of communism, than the philistine "peace," "reasonableness", "unity trend" of the OL liberals. This, the "good intentioned" OL liberal opportunists can never understand or swallow.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE WVO AND THE OL

We've summed up that the broad social basis of the OL is the petty bourgeois liberal and revisionist stratum from the 1960's movements.

The OL is the left wing of this marsh, and its representatives in the communist movement. Most of these backward trends never made it past the first period. They are not in the communist movement, and they are what make up the present-day petty bourgeois marsh.

The thoroughly liberal white skin privilege trend is an example. In the name of fighting white chauvinism, these liberal reformists fall into every ruling class scheme, weeping on the open arm of every good-intentioned, pro-integrationist imperialist politician, who they see as friends of the people, and they aim the "direction of the main blow" against white workers! These petty bourgeois elements, many of whom are white, have always been more concerned for their "guilt feelings" and fighting "white skin privilege," than with fighting the bourgeoisie for the proletarian revolution.

In the communist movement, under a ML cover, the OL represents the very same theories, trends of thought, and mentality of this stratum, with their support for the Boston busing plan, super-seniority, community control plans, and the E.R.A.

The Guardian is another example. The Guardian managed to sneak into the second period because they claimed to uphold Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought. But as Angola fully proved, they were "unrepentant revisionists" who tried to reverse the verdict.

The OL criticizes the thoroughly petty bourgeois spirit of the Guardian newspaper's masthead: "Independent Radical

Once Again on OL

Newsweekly." But as we've seen, the OL practices this very same petty bourgeois, autonomist "independent radical" line on organization.

In criticizing the OL's November party building call, we summed up the class basis of their deviations (from WV Journal #4, May 1976, pp. 154-155)

"Who gains by leaving Mao Tse-tung Thought out of a party building 'call'? What kind of party promises its members 'full democracy'? Who gains from principles of unity that are either so wrong or so broad that they prevent the drawing of any clear lines of demarcation? What class has total faith in bourgeois democracy and tries to build its line and party on a pragmatic lack of any definite line and organizational principles?

"This is the ideological 'profile' of the OL. And it is the distinctive profile of the petty bourgeoisie, with its ideology of bourgeois democracy and pragmatism, its politics of reformism and liberalism and its 'democratic' looseness in organization. And the OL's party building call is the concentrated 'summing up' of all this opportunism. It's a concentrated expression of this petty bourgeois retrograde trend in the communist movement. So there has been no 'ideological leap'! The only 'leap' has been OL's qualitatively improved skill in feinting left and right - to look ML.

"The 'call' is nothing but a dinner bell for all the worst retrograde trends in the communist movement today. And there's plenty of fertile ground for it to grow on. This is the danger of its broad appeal to petty bourgeois indefiniteness. There are plenty of downright revisionists in our movement who will not accept Mao Tsetung Thought, but who claim to accept Marxism-Leninism, intellectuals who will never accept democratic centralism but who will go for 'full democracy', petty bourgeois radicals who do not know the difference between the socialist and democratic struggles, and liberals and nationalists who will not accept real proletarian internationalism but who will support 'black businesses' and the Shah of Iran. This is the breadth of the OL's 'appeal'. This is the mud that they're laying their party foundations on.

"The overwhelming majority of the OL's cadres are honest Marxists. But if they accept these party 'foundations', they're sure to sink into this mud.

"The bulk of our anti-revisionist communist movement came out of the 'fire at the treetops' in the 1960's, the movements of the most conscious sectors of society, of the minorities, students, women, anti-war movement, etc. A weakness we still carry is that even with the many excellent fighters who came out of these struggles and our beginning roots in the working class, the movement still doesn't have the solidity of deep ties with advanced workers or the working masses. The heavy proportion of intellectuals and other petty bourgeois elements from the 60's movements is the social basis for opportunism in our movement.

"In building the party, communists must forge an all-round opposition to this opportunism. But how can the OL fight this with its soupy 'call'?

Just the opposite, the OL is trying to build on these retrograde trends. The OL objectively represents the left wing of this petty bourgeois layer in the communist movement. They are the left wing of social democracy."

In the Russian communist movement, after the failure of the 1905 revolution, petty bourgeois trends consolidated in both the Menshevik and Bolshevik wings.

The Liquidators appeared among the Mensheviks, who held a completely reformist line and pushed for all legal work, a purely legal party in Russia, a line

that was liquidating the party. The Liquidators dominated the Menshevik wing.

There was also a "left" opportunist petty bourgeois trend among the Bolsheviks, called the Otzovists ("Boycottists"). They were against all legal work and any work for reforms, and they were for boycotting the Russian Duma (parliament). Lenin called them "Mensheviks inside-out" because although their politics took a different form from the Mensheviks and professed to fight both the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, in essence they upheld the same anti-Marxist theories as the Mensheviks. This "left" opportunist trend flared up briefly among the Bolsheviks, who quickly exposed and iced it out of their ranks.

Lenin explains:

"No sizable section of a mass workers' party could, by the nature of things, avoid during a time of bourgeois revolution taking on a certain number of 'fellow-travellers' of diverse shadings. This is inevitable even in the most highly developed capitalist countries, after the completion of a bourgeois revolution, for the proletariat is ever in contact with the most varied sections of the petty bourgeoisie and is constantly being recruited and replenished from them. There is nothing abnormal or terrible in this, if the proletarian party is able thoroughly to absorb these foreign bodies, to control and not be controlled by them, and is able to see in good time that some of these elements really are foreign bodies, and that in certain conditions one must clearly and openly dissociate oneself from them. In this respect the difference between the two wings of the R.S.D.L.P. is that the Mensheviks turned out to be in thrall to the liquidators (i.e., the 'fellow-travellers')... while in the case of the Bolsheviks the liquidationist elements -- the otzovists and god-builders -- proved to be a small minority from the outset, were rendered harmless from the outset, and were ultimately pushed aside." ("The Liquidation of Liquidationism," Collected Works, v.15.)

What is the difference between the WVO and the OL?

The WVO called the shots and took initiative in making a clean break with our 'otzovists,' the "left" opportunist PRRWO/RWL. This is contrary to the otzovist claim that they purged us.

We left their "no correct line" sham party building attempt first. Then they purged us from the publicly known formation, the Revolutionary Wing. In our Journal #4, May, 1976, we explained the basis for our split to the whole communist movement, and the class and ideological roots of "left" opportunism, as well as deviations and errors we committed.

We predicted that PRRWO/RWL would chart out the otzovist path, step by step blow by blow, on their path toward rapid degeneration. The open split began in February, 1976, and today they are already politically dead. Dialectics is a two-edged knife. Fighting the correct line of the WVO line by line, PRRWO/RWL degenerated visibly month by month. Their newspaper, Palante, shows that today they have absolutely no line or principles left, nothing but their frantic witch-hunt "purges" for "bourgeois agents in their ranks." They have and will have no more influence in the communist, workers', or national movements.

Their back is broken. We pushed them aside.

On the other side, our sum-up of the OL's amendments, mutations and flip-flops shows that whatever genuine Marxist-Leninists are fighting inside the OL and their Organizaing Committee did not manage to get an honest repudiation of a single right opportunist line. The only change is that the OL's opportunism is now several notches higher than before.

Comrades, OL's deviation is no accident, no evil designs of individuals. It is based on concrete fertile material and ideological basis for revisionism in the U.S.. Their pragmatism, liberal chauvinism, petty bourgeois democratic illusions on the state, their spinelessness, fear of struggle, are all based on objective conditions.

Lenin said:

"These objective conditions are rooted in the specific features of the present period of bourgeois development in Russia, the period of bourgeois counter-revolution and attempts by the autocracy to remodel itself on the pattern of a bourgeois monarchy. These objective conditions simultaneously give rise to inseparably interconnected changes in the character of the working-class movement, in the composition, type and features of the Social-Democratic vanguard, as well as changes in the ideological and political tasks of the Social-Democratic movement. Hence the bourgeois influence over the proletariat that gives rise to liquidationism (=semi-liberalism, which likes to consider itself part of Social-Democracy) and otzovism (=semi-anarchism, which likes to consider itself part of Social-Democracy) is not an accident, nor evil design, stupidity or error on the part of some individual, but the inevitable result of the action of these objective causes, and the superstructure of the entire labor movement in present-day Russia, which is inseparable from the 'basis.'" ("Notes of a Publicist," Collected Works, v.16. in Against Liquidationism, p.79.)

Comrades, because these objective conditions are independent of our will, the OL, by not repudiating this basis along with its manifestations (they are in fact still justifying them with ever-higher "theoretical" dressing), will be bound to repeat them, bound to deepen them, bound to elevate them into political, organizational, and military line, bound to elevate them into a full-blown revisionist system of views.

Comrades,

"From this point of view, unity is inseparable from its ideological foundation, it can grow only on the basis of an ideological rapprochement, it is connected with the appearance, development and growth of such deviations as liquidationism and otzovism, not by the accidental connection between particular polemical statements of this or that literary controversy, but by an internal, indissoluble link such as that which binds cause and effect." (Lenin, same source as above, p.80.)

Unity with the OL today would mean unleashing the floodgate of opportunism to drown the nascent communist movement in the U.S.

The OL will continue to go to the right on principle, just like Potresov and Dan. Lenin wrote,

"A Russian proverb says: make a certain person pray and he will do it with such a zeal that he will bang his forehead against the ground! Plekhanov might have said: make the Potresovs and Dans go to the right for the sake of a maneuver and they will go to the right on Principle." ("Notes of a Publicist," as above, p. 256)

In China, the CPC says that the capitalist-roaders are still taking the capitalist road. They use that slogan to raise the people's vigilance against the maneuvers of the revisionists, who always swear they'll stick with Marxism, and whose revisionism gets slicker and slimier every day.

We warn the U.S. communist movement that the right opportunist OL is still taking the right opportunist road. Our sum-up of their lack of self-criticism shows that they are farther down that road than ever before.

The difference between the WVO and the OL is that we broke with our petty bourgeois fellow-travelers and pushed them aside, tremendously deepening our own line and strengthening our organization in the process.

The OL is completely dominated by their fellow-travelers from the marsh. The marsh controls them.

This is why the OL will continue to slide into the petty bourgeois marsh, and why the WVO will continue to grow stronger and more correct, tempered in struggle against the fiery heat of the right and the deep-freeze of the "left."