

DEFEAT OL'S (MENSHEVIK - LIBERAL) CALL FOR THE PARTY

INTRODUCTION

"Profound changes have taken place in the international situation since the 29th Session of the United Nations General Assembly. A serious capitalist economic crisis plagues most parts of the world. All the basic contradictions in the world are further sharpening. The trend of revolution by the people of the world is actively developing. The Asian, African and Latin American peoples have advanced valiantly and won a series of significant victories in their struggle against colonialism, imperialism and hegemonism. On the other hand the contention between the two superpowers for world hegemony has become more and more intense. The whole world is in greater turbulence and unrest. Rhetoric about detente cannot cover up the stark reality. The danger of war is visibly growing."

(p.1 Speech by Chiao Kuan-hua, at the Plenary Meeting of the 30th UN General Assembly)

"We hope that the people of all countries will heighten their vigilance and get prepared against the growing danger of a new world war. It is better to be prepared than unprepared. Without preparations one will suffer. The superpowers look strong but are inwardly weak and very isolated. The more evils they do, the more thoroughly they will reveal their true features, and the stronger the resistance of the people of the world will become. At present, the factors for both revolution and war are increasing on a world scale. Whether war gives rise to revolution or revolution prevents war, in either case the international situation will develop in a direction favourable to the people. And the future of the world will be bright."

(p. 9, Ibid)

Comrades and Friends,

It is in this light that we must view the current struggle inside the communist movement in the U.S. For as Marxist-Leninists we understand that the intensification of class struggle is not something that occurs just in the international arena, or in the general domestic arena; in fact we clearly grasp the fact that class struggle in the communist movement is a reflection of the international struggle between two classes, two lines and two roads.

Also, we understand that our greatest duty as proletarian internationalists in this superpower is to overthrow "our own" bourgeoisie, to make proletarian revolution. And how is it that we fulfill this great historic mission? We believe that our central task is Party building. Comrade Stalin taught that we must:

"locate at any given moment the particular link in the chain of processes which if grasped, will enable us to keep hold of the whole chain and to prepare the conditions for achieving strategic success.

"The point here is to single out from all the tasks confronting the party the particular immediate task, the fulfillment of which constitutes the central point, and the accomplishment of which insures the successful fulfillment of other immediate tasks." (Stalin, Foundations of Leninism)

Comrades, we believe that the formation of a genuine Bolshevik Party is the central task in the process of the U.S. revolution at this time, and tonight we will be polemicizing against the Menshevik line on party building. Our main focus will be on the OL "Call to the Menshevik Party." We have unity with the comrades from PRRWO on the fundamentally incorrect "Anti-Theoretical Revisionist Premises" of the WVO and the OL's right opportunist line on Party Building.

These two organizations, despite all their apparent differences, have unity on the line of "how not to build a Bolshevik Party." True, each of them will in the not too distant future, declare themselves a party, or the only correct organization in the communist movement, but as we hope to make clear tonight, these will be Menshevik parties composed of liberals and anarchistic intellectuals of the 2nd International type.

Before beginning our presentation, we would like to use the telescope that Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought provides us with to foretell what the basic line of defense to these polemics will be. First, the WVO and OL have unity on left dogmatism being the main danger in the genuine wing of the Communist Movement. We think the following quote from the great teacher Lenin makes clear our position.

"Dogmatism, doctrinarism, ossification of the Party - the inevitable retribution that follows violent strait-lacing of thought - these are the enemies against which

the knightly champions of 'freedom of criticism' in the Rabocheye Dyelo rise up in arms. We are very glad that this question has been placed on the order of the day..."



"Thus we see that high-sounding phrases against the ossification of thought, etc., conceal unconcern for and impotence in the development of theoretical thought. The case of the Russian Social-Democrats very strikingly illustrates the phenomenon observed in the whole of Europe (and long ago also noted by the German Marxists) that the celebrated freedom of criticism does not imply the substitution of one theory for another, but freedom from all integral and considered theory; it implies eclecticism and lack of principle. Those who have the slightest acquaintance with the actual state of our movement cannot but see that the wide spread of Marxism was accompanied by a certain lowering of the theoretical level. Quite a number of people with very little, and even a total lack of theoretical training joined the movement because of its practical significance and its practical successes. We can judge from that how tactless the Rabocheye Dyelo is when, with an air of triumph, it quotes Marx's statement: 'Every step of real movement is more important than a dozen programmes.' To repeat these words in a period of theoretical chaos is like wishing mourners at a funeral 'many happy returns of the day.'

(our emphasis) Moreover, these words of Marx are taken from his letter on the Gotha Programme, in which he sharply condemns eclecticism in the formulation of principles; 'If you must unite,' Marx wrote to the Party leaders, 'then enter into agreements to satisfy the practical aims of the movement, but do not allow any bargaining over principles, do not make 'concessions' in questions of theory.' This was Marx's idea, and yet there are people among us who strive in his name - to belittle the significance of theory. Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. This thought cannot be insisted upon too strongly at a time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism goes hand in hand with an infatuation for the narrowest forms of practical activity." (Lenin, What Is To Be Done)

Comrades, we've also been and will be called splitters and neo-Trotskyites by these organizations. Tonight, we will make clear who it is who revises the Marxist-Leninist principles on the Proletarian Party, who fundamentally revises Stalin's teachings on strategy and tactics, replacing them with "anti-imperialism" and the United Front Against Imperialism. The comrades from PRRWO will point out who reduces Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought to the "premises of the premises," just as Zinoviev tried to reduce Leninism to a correct line on the agrarian question. After these presentations, we think that it will be clear that it is the

Revolutionary Wing that is practicing marxism, forging deeper and stronger unities in the heat of class struggle against opportunism, especially against these Menshevik lines on Party building, that it is the Revolutionary Wing that tonight is being open and aboveboard, eager to carry out principled struggle. And it will also be clear who is practicing revisionism, revising Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought, and who see every split of the genuine from the sham as a terrible and frightening thing - and who will intrigue and conspire to avoid exposure.

The OL's call to the party does not represent as they say a "call on the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces in the U.S. to unite and build a new Communist Party", but in fact represents a call to the confused, the unclear, the opportunists, and to every striker, to build an unprincipled Menshevik Party, thereby further consolidating the retrograde trend that the OL currently represents.

In exposing the outright opportunist call to the party, we should be perfectly clear that the opportunist character of the call, reflects the opportunist character of the OL itself. There can be no wall drawn between the two, between the "Call to the Party" and the OL.

The OL's "Call to the Menshevik Party" reveals a number of features that can be summed up as nothing short of Menshevism, opportunism in matter of politics, opportunism in matters of organization and opportunism in ideological content.

Opportunism in Matters of Organization

The Call to the Menshevik Party, although putting forward the principle of unity as the approach to uniting Marxist-Leninists. It is a newspaper approach that sees organization as the key link which OL attempts to cover up in a half hearted way with their sham principles of unity. This organizational line belittles struggle as the prerequisite to ideological and political unity concentrated in a maximum and minimum program based on Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought and cemented by democratic centralist rules of organization. What does the call to the Menshevik Party put forward?

"It is the position of the OL that Marxist-Leninists should unite around these principles not as a final statement of full program of the party but as a minimal basis for unity at the present time...after this discussion (in which flexibility of tactics will be utilized in discussing the minimal principles) we propose 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. A newspaper of the Leninist type should be established under the central leadership which would appoint the editorial board... the work around the paper would serve as the main way for the units (cells) to put forward our political line and program... The paper should serve as the nerve center and until the first congress act as the focal point for ideological struggle (based on practice) to determine how national and international events are analyzed and what theoretical works are published."

Comrades, what is this but backwards opportunist Menshevism! First, the OL proposes that we unite around vague, incorrect principles of unity. Second, establish a chump central committee (establish democratic centralism?); third, thru struggle in the newspaper develop the political line, concentrated in a program.

Lenin was very clear on this question - the necessity to inject the program in the process of drawing lines of demarcation in the struggle for ideological unity, because it is only through political line, concentrated in the program, that differences reveal themselves the sharpest, and the genuine is separated from the sham, and a congress, as the highest body of the party can be held to establish the iron discipline of democratic centralism.

But the OL, because it is attempting to build a lowest common denominator Menshevik Party, first attempts to unite people behind the principles of unities, set up a rump central committee and democratic centralism without a congress, then develop the political line and program and call a congress, a year later. Meanwhile, every striker in this Menshevik party will be running around worshipping the spontaneous movement, building the fight back with no political line or program, which Lenin said was necessary to give scope and orientation to our propaganda and agitation. This is outright Menshevism - conciliationist, centrism - and not the road to building a genuine Bolshevik party, firmly united around program and cemented by the iron discipline, unity of will and action that flows from democratic centralism. But the OL, because it represents the interests of the declassed petty bourgeoisie and anarchist intellectuals and unstable elements, and attempts to appeal to every striker, professor, vacillating and unstable element, puts forward under the section on party organization that: "...It (the party) must practice democratic centralism with one center and full democracy for

all members..." Comrades, centralism restricts democracy. Full democracy (to do whatever you want - your own thing) is the outlook and aspiration of the alienated petty bourgeoisie. The proletariat demands and understands the dialectical relationship between centralism and democracy. There can be no freedom without discipline, nor democracy without centralism. In order to have democracy, centralism is necessary. Chairman Mao says: "...We need democracy, but we need centralism even more..." Engels said freedom is the recognition of necessity (which Chairman Mao enriched with the view that "...freedom is not only the recognition but also the transformation of necessity...").

The bourgeois and the anarchist intellectual promotes a metaphysical view of freedom as equaling free will, with no restrictions, no centralism.

In One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, Lenin wrote:

"Martov's formulation ostensibly defends the interests of the broad strata of the proletariat, but in fact it serves the interests of the bourgeois intellectuals who fight proletarian discipline and organization. No one will undertake to deny that it is precisely its individualism and incapacity for discipline and organization that in general distinguishes the intellectual as a separate stratum of modern capitalist society."

Comrades, when you undertake to build a lowest common denominator Menshevik Party you inevitably have to lower the level of discipline. We ask "who is the OL appealing to but the non-proletarian elements, with its promise of full democracy?" The proletariat recognizes that in order to make proletarian revolution democracy is necessary in the Bolshevik party, but centralism is needed even more. This is the difference between Bolshevism and Menshevism. To the Menshevik, the Party is a debating club. To the Bolshevik the Party and its organizational principles are an instrument for carrying proletarian revolution through to the end.

Comrades, we think that the essence of the Menshevik method of party building is to build a party from below, not a Leninist method of building the party from above. Building the party from above demands principled ideological struggle to reach the highest level of unity around program - the formation of a leading center by the Congress and then direction to all other parties from the Bolshevik center. Genuine democratic centralism flows from unity around the correct line. The opportunist OL instead attempts to build its party in the opposite manner - unite people around a minimal level of unity, with no program (clear line), establish democratic centralism, then develop line. What is this but an opportunist attempt by the OL to sneak its opportunist line into the "Menshevik" Party through the back door? The whole process is a cover for ensuring the minimal disagreement with OL's line in the formative stages of this Menshevik formation, and reflects a philistine attitude towards struggle, that has characterized the OL since its inception. Build the party from above - this is a Bolshevik principle.

Opportunism in Matters of Politics

We think that we could go on all night, drawing out the opportunist character of their call to the Menshevik Party, but because of time, we would just like to speak to a few of the most revealing points in this section.

In the introductory section of The Call as well as in the sections outlining why the conditions exist for the party, the OL makes a number of opportunist errors, besides the conscious attempt to be vague and unclear throughout all sections of the Call. First, the OL states that party building has always been viewed as the central task by this movement (which movement?). Obviously, this is an attempt to raise up plausibly that the OL has always held that party building has been the central task, to distinguish them from the RU. But what this statement reveals is their ahistorical, metaphysical analysis that the OL has of the development of the communist movement in the U.S. The OL liquidates the fierce struggle waged by the genuine Marxist-Leninists against the attempts to place party building as a secondary task and as a byproduct of tailing the spontaneous movement as well as the struggle over what type of party, and for whom. The OL does not raise this because it in fact tailed the RU in practice. In the Party Building Forum sponsored by the Guardian in 1973, Klonsky, speaking to the question of what road to building the party, said,

"We've got to expose opportunism. We've got to expose revisionists... We can't stand on the side lines of the mass struggle and attack them. That's why it's so important that this new rising communist movement is beginning to sink its roots in the mass struggle of the people... this is essential. We cannot wait until after there is a party to do this work. Or what kind of party are we going to build?..."

"We will end up building a little clique that's isolated from the masses, that doesn't understand the sentiments and aspirations of the people. That's not the way we intend to do things. This ultra leftist view, that abandons the mass struggle today for some high idealism, some ideals about a communist party..."

6 DEFEAT OL cont. from pg. 4

This is the opportunist line of the OL that has to be defeated. In raising the left - the OL attempted to cover its right line of tailing the mass movement as the central task. It is precisely in struggling against this line that the genuine are now forging with honor the highest form of organization of the proletariat, and raise high the ideals of this most precious instrument of the proletariat - the Bolshevik Party. Only a Menshevik, a party builder from below would slander the party of the proletariat with such language as that used by the Renegade Klonsky.

Second, the OL distorts the development of the communist movement with an unscientific analysis of periods. They see periods essentially as "...going from little organizations to big organizations..." which is less than simplistic. The significant ideological struggles they point out were characterized by victories over Trotskyism, anarchism, syndicalism, revisionism and the main danger of ultra-leftism, which set the basis for this ideological leap that was made and the conditions that make the formation of the party possible now. This is no analysis and amounts to nothing but phrase mongering. This "ideological leap" is certainly not reflected in their principles of unity which anyone who even claims to be in the anti-revisionist movement can unite with, nor in their Menshevik approach to Party Building. The OL even fails to draw a line with the CLP - a Trotskyite organization - and says the CLP is within the Communist Movement.

As another condition that has laid the basis for the party formation, the OL states that ultra-leftism had to be checked, as it would merge with modern revisionism. All deviations from Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought, unless checked, will merge with modern revisionism (witness the OL and the WC). The central question is whether they are checked by exposing their ideological and political deviations, and uncovering their social basis. Checking them does not mean - as the OL thinks - simply repeating general formulas and passing this off as ideological struggle. It is the ideological and political exposure of revisionism in its nationally specific form in the course of 2 line struggle - drawing lines of demarcation that lays the ground for the formation of the party. The empty phrases of the OL are no substitute for struggle to hammer out political line. The OL's ranting about "ultra-leftism" covers its right line and practice; its ranting about "no united action with the revisionists" is a cover for the OL's left feint, in a false attempt to look and sound like genuine communists.

After all this ideological leaping the OL claims to have caused by its ruthless struggle against opportunism, why is it not reflected in the principles of unity around which their party is to be formed? Because the OL's principles of unity mainly reflect its own development (or rather degeneration) and not the development of the communist movement which has divided into two - the genuine and the sham. The principles of unity represent the retrograde trend in the communist movement. Because the OL has in fact belittled theory, tailed the spontaneous movement, failed to draw sharp lines of demarcation, but conciliated with opportunism, ran from principled polemics (has seen them as something to defend yourself with (respond when attacked) as opposed to seeing the necessity of waging ideological and political struggle, drawing lines of demarcation, and educating and tempering the genuine communists in the struggle against the sham, it has degenerated and could not rise above the level of only restating the general truths of Marxism and quoting a few formulas they have learned by heart. The process of raising Party Building to the ideological plane has been carried out by the genuine in struggle against the opportunism of the sham (who sought to hold back and retard the movement from gaining clarity on what kind of a party and for whom). From the very beginning the OL has shown a disdain for drawing lines of demarcation, a disdain for ideological definiteness - leading to a line of all unity, conciliationism, and lack of grasp of the fact that Marxism develops in the course of struggle; truth emerges in the struggle against falsehood.

Again, at that Guardian Forum, attended by RU, BWC, PRRWO, Guardian and OL, the renegade Klonsky put forward the basic line of how to fight "ultra-leftism" as mainly by not abandoning the mass struggle to build the united front. He said:

"...We've got to unite the communist forces and we've got to combat everything that stands in the way of unity, whether it be on the level of divisive rumor spreading and gossip which the police and revisionists use to their advantage - the approach of always putting differences first or looking for differences as the main thing. We have to see that within every communist party there is a sharp struggle. We've got to build unity and we've got to fight for unity...So we're very confident that unity can be built. We've seen a spirit among all groups represented here today. This has encouraged us a great deal. If we all stick together and take a principled stand in a very short time we'll be able to forge a Communist Party..." (our emphasis)

Here the OL reveals its spineless, liberal, all unity attitude toward Party building that has led straight to Menshevism. Lenin, in the preface to the Collection of Twelve Years wrote:

"The old and in many respects outdated polemic with Struve is important as an introductory example. One that shows the practical and political value of irreconcilable theoretical polemics. Revolutionary Social Democrats have been accused times without number of an excessive penchant for such polemics with the Economists, the Bernsteinists and the Mensheviks. Today too their accusations are being bandied about by the conciliators inside the Social Democratic Party and the sympathizing semi-socialists outside it."

And in The Declaration of the Editorial Board of Iskra, Lenin wrote:

"As we have said, the ideological unity of Russian Social Democrats still has to be created, and to this end it is in our opinion, necessary to have an open and all-embracing discussion of the fundamental questions of principle and tactics raised by the present day economists, Bernsteinites and critics. Before we can unite, and in order that we may unite, we must first of all draw firm and definite lines of demarcation. Otherwise our unity will be purely fictitious, it will conceal the prevailing confusion and hinder its radical elimination...open polemics conducted in full view of all Russian Social Democrats and class conscious workers are necessary and desirable in order to clarify the depths of existing conditions in order to afford discussion of disputed questions from all angles, in order to combat the extremes into which representatives, not only of various views, but even of various localities, or various specialities of the revolutionary movement inevitably fall. Indeed as stated above, we regard one of the drawbacks of the present-day movement to be the absence of open polemics between avowedly differing views, the effort to conceal differences or fundamental questions."

Now comrades, does not the renegade Klonsky of 1973 sound like the philistine liberal who sees differences as a bad thing to be covered up, who sees struggle and splits always as a bad thing, and that the road forward is to all stick together. And has not the OL failed its responsibility to engage in open polemics, denied the educational value of them to the Communist Movement and in fact used polemics only to defend its raggedy line when attacked, and in fact responded with a slanderous method and guilt by association tactics. And does not the OL of today still represent this bourgeois liberal trend with its Call to the Party, by stating "...We must move towards unity with great speed and oppose endlessly redefining our differences and eternally drawing even further lines of demarcation - outside the organization structure of the Party..." Comrades, how can these people have the audacity to say this when this Party has no program - but only vague incorrect principles of unity! This is out and out Menshevism. Even the bankrupt RU put forward a draft program in its rush to form its Menshevik Party. But the frenzied, petty-bourgeois madness of the OL, trying to scare others into this Menshevik formation by raising up the danger of war and fascism, refuses to even put forward a program. This is an affront to even the most backward elements. And the OL has the audacity to say that this is not "a-get-rich-quick-scheme."

This line of the OL comes out clearer in other places in the Call as they equate weaknesses in the course of sharp ideological struggle with splits, and strength with quantitative growth, and then claim that they have passed the test and proceed to beat their breasts for never having a split. Every genuine Bolshevik knows that splits are also good things as they separate the Mensheviks from the Bolsheviks and reflect the truth of one dividing into two. Of course the OL has never had a split, as only firmness and ideological definiteness based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought provides the basis to draw lines of demarcation and purge our ranks.

The actual content of the principles of unity themselves reflect the opportunism of the OL's call to the Party - they reflect no ideological leap - and consciously attempt to demarcate no one. The Call to the Menshevik Party omits any reference to Mao Tse Tung Thought nor does it even mention a Bolshevik Party. Neither does it sum up the national question as a class question nor does it uphold the necessity to support the revolutionary struggles of peoples against their own reactionary ruling classes. It does not claim factory nuclei as the basic form of organization of the party. Again we think this reflects the outright opportunism of the OL's Call to the Menshevik Party and the OL, as it attempts to suck up loose and unclear elements - an attempt to not keep anyone away, but scare everyone in. Other than this the principles of unity are very general, and in content contain very little. We think that this allows the OL to be, as they say, "flexible in tactics" in discussion over these principles, which in the final analysis amounts to flexibility over principles. The principles of unity do reveal most clearly the OL's line on strategy, that we will go into deeper, later on.

In the last section of the Call to the Menshevik Party Communists Unite, the opportunism of the OL grows visibly sharper, as they attempt to distinguish their bankrupt scheme from the RCP and the CLP. In the main the OL stresses

three main points: (1) they are not isolated and weak; (2) their style of work is different; (3) their stance on support for Third World peoples.

We think none of these are ideological demarcation, but an attempt by the OL to slide in an appeal for communists emerging out of the national movements to join their ranks. This is linked to their line that presently national forms of Marxist-Leninist organizations are a step backwards because the communist movement is no longer a "white" movement. We think that this is a continuation of the OL's policy and line of conciliation toward Marxist-Leninists emerging primarily out of the national movement and reflects the flip side of the outright blatant chauvinism that has characterized other formations - like the RU - and in essence the same content only in a covert liberal, conciliationist form.

Style of work, like political line arises from basic ideological stance; an incorrect ideological stance can manifest itself in a variety of opposing styles of work. In the absence of establishing ideological and political differences between them and the RCP and the CLP, the OL's claim to style of work (which is "patient and principled") is fundamentally incorrect.

In addition, our experience and the experience of other comrades has proven that their view of "patient and principled" in fact means that they are willing to conciliate, that they want to show they are nice people and conduct criticism and polemics behind closed doors; anything except ideological struggle. Not holding up the principle of multi-national communist forms of organizations in all periods, but only in a period when the Communist Movement cannot be called white, illustrates this conciliationist, popularity contest the OL has been playing in the Communist Movement. Comrades this is Menshevism, Menshevism, Menshevism - of the American type, opportunism in ideological content.

Comrades, we think that at the root of the organizational and political Menshevism of the OL and its Call to the Menshevik Party are three main general ideological deviations: pragmatism, reformism, and liberalism - whose philosophical root is empiricist method of thinking.

Maneuvering, doing whatever works best for the OL, elevating truth to the success of the OL, worshipping their own narrow experience, hustling other people into its sham Menshevik Party, we think reflects the pragmatic outlook of the OL. Raising the struggle for reforms to the level of final aims, and not as by-products of the revolutionary struggle reflect the reformist, bourgeois democratic outlook of the OL.

"To a reformist, reforms are everything, while revolutionary work is something incidental, something just to talk about, mere eyewash. That is why, with reformist tactics under the conditions of bourgeois rule, reforms are inevitably transformed into an instrument for strengthening their rule, an instrument for disintegrating the revolution. To a revolutionary, on the contrary, the main thing is revolutionary work and not reforms; to him reforms are a by-product of the revolution." (Foundations of Leninism, J. Stalin, p. 98, FLP)

At its basis this reformist outlook is metaphysical. It does not see that society and all forms of matter develop through quantitative steps and qualitative leaps. It sees things statically and therefore starts with the view that capitalism is permanent - that bourgeois rule will last for ever. This outlook is contained in the OL's line particularly on strategy and tactics. They replace proletarian revolution with "anti-imperialist" struggle. On the question of busing in Boston, the OL sees the sham reform of busing as everything and the revolution as nothing. In short, the OL is creating an entire system of views that revise the fundamental doctrine of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought - the class struggle - and in its place they substitute petty bourgeois reformism. These views reflect the class position of the petty bourgeoisie in monopoly capitalist society. They want in the worst way to live like the bourgeoisie, but at the same time are being crushed by the monopoly capitalists. Caught in this dilemma, the petty bourgeoisie struggles to maintain the world essentially as it is (with minor reforms). This reformism of the petty bourgeoisie is at the base of the OL's Call to form a Menshevik Party. They wish to capture leadership in the revolutionary struggle in order to contain it - hold it back.

Conciliating to all in order to maintain sham unity, not engaging in principled polemics, is a manifestation of liberalism. In sum, we think the OL will form its anti-imperialist Party - but, our response is - Stop clutching at us for we have two views on unity.

"In order to build the Party, it is not enough to be able to shout "Unity!" it is necessary, in addition, to have some sort of political programme, a programme of political action. The bloc of liquidators, of Trotsky, the Vperyodists, the Poles, Bolshevik Party members, Paris Mensheviks, etc., etc., was foredoomed to a scandalous downfall because it was built on a lack of principles, on hypocrisy and empty phrases. It wouldn't be a bad thing if these siphers finally got down to solving

for themselves the most complex and difficult question: Whom do they want unity with? If it is with the liquidators, then why not say so without grimacing; if they are against uniting with the liquidators, then what sort of unity are they sighing for?" (Liquidators Against the Party, May 8, 1912)

Now we would like to briefly look more closely at the OL's view of strategy and tactics, our initial thinking on a Marxist-Leninist view of strategy and tactics and show how the OL blatantly revises Marxist-Leninist principles on this question.

The bankrupt Menshevik line of the OL on party building and their view of strategy and tactics are a clear example of nationally specific forms of revisionism in the U.S.

We must identify these erroneous lines and their representatives, expose them and drive them from our midst.



Lenin said:

"To talk of freedom of criticism and of Bernsteinism as a condition...amounts to talking with the aim of saying nothing."

Comrades, today in our revolutionary movement it is not enough to criticize revisionism internationally or just the CP-USA. We must link their counter revolutionary line to its representatives in our midsts.

The different raggedy lines and tendencies we made a break with in the late 60's and early 70's have slipped into our movement and now hide under the signboard of Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought.

They are constantly seeking to divert our march toward revolution into the swamp of reform. They are daily, hourly trying to distort Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought, turning the Bolshevik party into a reform party - a Menshevik party of the social democratic type.

The OL and the RU have been the leading representatives of revisionism within the U.S. Anti-Revisionist Communist Movement. The OL, in the "Call to the Party" reduces the aim of socialism to an anti-imperialist struggle. We quote from the "Call to the Party."

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is our strategic objective. This objective is based upon the leading role of the working class within the anti-imperialist struggle..."(our emphasis)

It is clear that the OL is twisting Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought to fit their petty bourgeois view of revolution. The dictatorship of the proletariat is not a strategic objective - it is an instrument of the proletariat led by its vanguard party. Our aim is socialism and the struggle is for socialist revolution not anti-imperialist struggle. This replacement of socialism and the struggle for socialist revolution with anti-imperialism runs throughout the OL's work.

They have replaced Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics, which is based on a scientific analysis of the historical period, mode of production and assessment of class forces with a muddled petty bourgeois analysis which transposes the democratic content of the first stage of a two stage revolution onto the one stage revolution in the U.S. They therefore propagate anti-imperialism as a third ideology.

"Strategy is the determination of the direction of the main blow of the proletariat at a given stage of the revolution, the elaboration of a corresponding plan for the disposition of the revolutionary forces (main and secondary reserves), the fight to carry out this plan throughout the given stage of the revolution." (Stalin, Foundations of Leninism)

DEFEAT O.L. cont. from pg. 7

The aim, main blow, target and reserves are strategic concepts - scientific terms. It is significant that the OL does not use either them or corresponding terms but instead loosely talks about the core of the united front and replaces the struggle for socialism with anti-imperialism. Instead of a plan for the disposition of class forces, they put forward that we should build the Black united front, the womens' united front, very similar to the RU five spearheads of struggle. To them, revolution is simply a collection of little united fronts under the signboard of unite all that can be united.

By replacing socialism and the struggle for it with "anti-imperialist struggle" and turning the science of strategy and tactics into an eclectic mish mash, the OL seeks to turn the wheel of history backward and transpose the conditions of Third World countries onto the US single stage revolution. They are trying to struggle for new democracy in a stage where only proletarian revolution will resolve the contradictions in US society. This is not semi-feudal China. This is the U.S. A single stage proletarian revolution is our aim. These strivings are manifestations of the frenzied petty bourgeoisie, being ground under by the monopoly capitalists.

The direction of the main blow refers to those strata and representatives which must be isolated in order for revolutionary struggle to fully develop. In this country the revisionists, the poverty pimps, the trade union bureaucrats and the labor aristocracy are all props of bourgeois rule which must be exposed and isolated. They are petty bourgeois reformers.

The reserves are forces which stand outside the proletariat but can be used strategically in a manner favorable to the revolution. There are direct and indirect reserves. How does the OL distort strategy and tactics to divert our struggle from its revolutionary aims?



There is a fundamental difference between a two stage and a one stage revolution. In a two stage revolution, the first stage - as in China and Russia - has a democratic content while the second stage has clear socialist content. Therefore in the first stage the reserves-strategic allies - of the proletariat are determined by their class relationship to the content of the revolution which is anti-imperialist and democratic. In China, the reserves of the proletariat were the poor and middle peasantry. In the second stage of the Chinese revolution, the content of the revolution was socialist. Therefore the reserves of the proletariat were the poor peasantry.

The reserves shift according to what kind of revolution is necessary.

What kind of revolution are the petty bourgeois revolutionaries of the OL talking about?

It is clear, that in the U.S. it must be a single stage socialist revolution. This is objective necessity. The struggle for proletarian revolution has a democratic content, which the minimum program focuses on - housing, quality education, against national oppression - but these struggles do not make up a separate stage and are fused to the struggle for socialism. These struggles cannot be consistently "anti-imperialist" unless they are given conscious direction and linked to the struggle for socialism. They cannot be suspended in Communist Youth Organizations and Intermediate Workers Organizations at some middle level.

When the OL substitutes anti-imperialist struggle for proletarian revolution, they are trying to slip a second anti-imperialist democratic stage into our one stage revolution (in through the back door).

Therefore the reserves of the proletariat are determined not on the basis of their class outlook toward socialism but on whether they fight around democratic issues. This is one

of the reasons why the OL has run around for the past several years shouting about fascism. To them fascism is the most anti-democratic thing they can imagine and therefore anyone who seemingly fights this must be an ally. This determination of allies, based on the democratic content of an invented second stage in the U.S. revolution allows the petty bourgeois OL to say in their unity statement - "...intellectuals and middle classes are reserves of the proletariat..." instead of seeing the petty bourgeoisie as a class whose instability must be neutralized.

Comrades, this is revisionism.

It is revising of Marxist-Leninist principles under the signboard of Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought.

How did "anti-imperialist" as a third ideology and a nationally specific form of revisionism develop inside our movement? What class forces carried it in and perpetuate it today? Whose interest does it represent?

"Anti-imperialism" as a concept, grew in the U.S. on the fertile soil of the struggles of the oppressed nationalities, workers, students and petty bourgeoisie for democratic rights, against war and for revolution. Petty bourgeois theorists took the term from the national liberation struggles and used it to refer to the content of these struggles in the U.S. Many people said, "Since these struggles are objectively in opposition to the monopoly capitalists, they are anti-imperialist."

Later, the RU took this formulation, because of its popular acceptance, and called it the strategy for revolution on the basis of their five spearheads. This formulation was not based on the aim of socialism nor on a scientific analysis of class forces. It is a view which promotes every fighter for democratic rights - regardless of class interests and severed from the final aim as a revolutionary.

Comrades, this is not Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought. This is the view of the petty bourgeoisie. This unscientific view was taken over wholesale by the Menshevik liberals in the OL. They just, as Bernstein and Millerand before them, demand that "...Social democracy must change from a party of social revolution into a democratic party of social reforms. Bernstein has surrounded this political demand with a whole batter of well attuned 'new' arguments and reasonings..." (Lenin, What Is To Be Done) Our modern day Bernsteins have promoted an entire system of views, altering Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought, denying the existence of the main blow, changing the aim of the revolution to "anti-imperialist struggle." This is revisionism.

The OL denies the existence of the main blow. They tail behind E. Mays at GM Fremont, Arnold Miller and the NAACP's sham reform schemes in Boston. Instead of seeing that these are forces to be isolated, smashed, they view them in fact as stable allies - in the fight against fascism and for democratic rights. Comrades, we are struggling for proletarian revolution and not against fascism. The OL represents reformism in its purest form.

The nationally specific form "anti-imperialism" has many consequences for our revolutionary struggle. It is closely tied to the OL's lack of view of the advanced worker, their attempt to build a Menshevik party, the fight back, the Black united front and the Black womens' united front to name a few. Their deviation from Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought is in essence the same as the RUS'. We do not have the time to run all of the aspects in this presentation - but we will be coming forward with a pamphlet on anti-imperialism and strategy and tactics.

The OL's Menshevik view of revolution leads them to say that the target of the revolution, who is going to be expropriated, is only the monopoly capitalists and not the bourgeoisie as a whole. It allows them to say that we may have a coalition government and not the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Both the OL and RU see anti-imperialism as a middle ground between the stand of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat - as some type of third ideology. They do not strive to bring Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought to the working class and even formulate retrograde definitions of the advanced or don't bother to really speak to this question.

On Advanced Worker

Advanced workers are the life and blood of the Party, the best elements produced by our class, the proletariat. These elements are the target of our agitation and propaganda in this period, those who, when armed with Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse Tung Thought, can change the character of the workers movement from spontaneous to conscious. Winning these advanced to communism is one of our two main tactics of party building. Analyzing an organization's attitude toward these "diamonds of the class" is a good method for helping to distinguish the genuine from the sham. We view the advanced as independent leaders, who have practically demonstrated their desire and commitment for fundamental change, leaders who study, study, study a wide range of materials in an effort to find answers to the problems facing

