

UNITED STATES

POLITICAL REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION PRESENTED TO THE FOUNDING CONFERENCE OF THE BOLSHEVIK LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Boshevik League
of the
United States*

Two decades have gone by with much fanfare and great pronouncements by those who claim to have formed parties of the working class. Two, three many of these so-called anti-revisionist parties exist within one country. This phenomenon is identical in many countries.

In the U.S., where there is one of these parties proclaimed every other day, the proletariat has been recent witness to the magnificent affair five times in the span of five years. These are the Communist Labor Party, The Revolutionary Communist Party, The Communist Party Marxist-Leninist, The Communist Party U.S.A (M-L), and the recently announced Communist Workers Party. All these parties claim to be vanguard parties, leading the spontaneous struggles of the masses, and give reports to the effect that they are overflowing with members. All claims aside, it matters little whether these parties have a few dozen or a hundred members and followers, the social composition of all these parties is the same, petty bourgeoisie and labor aristocrats drawn to the economist or semi-terrorist politics of these cliques.

In all countries, these groups which call themselves pre-parties or Communist parties direct their work towards degrading the idea of a party, towards degrading Marxist-Leninist politics, towards leaving the proletariat without a party and surrendering the working class to the butchery of the bourgeoisie.

This phenomenon of many parties of the petty bourgeoisie and labor aristocrats, has its basis in the ability of the bourgeoisie to bribe a certain strata with the superprofits secured by imperialism.

"Monopoly" said Lenin. "yields superprofits i.e., a surplus of profits that are normal and customary all over the world. The capitalists can devote a part (and not a small one at that!) of these superprofits to bribe their own workers, to create something like an alliance ... between the workers of a given nation and their capitalists against the other countries ..."

The bourgeoisie of an imperialist 'great power' can economically bribe the upper strata of 'its' workers by spending on this a hundred million or so francs a year, for its superprofits most likely amount of about a thousand million" (LCW Vol. 23, page 114-15).

The material result of this bribe is that this strata of workers' interest lies not with proletarian revolution, but in maintaining wage slavery and colonial and semi-colonial plunder of millions of people throughout the world, to enrich further their own bourgeoisie. The menshevik parties propose the conclusion of agreements with the bourgeoisie, when the capitalists are in power. In power, the bourgeoisie is not averse to handing down some "reforms", small concessions across the bargaining table, to individual groups of workers. The bourgeoisie is quite willing to "give in a little" because such agreements are harmful to the working class, while profitable to the bourgeoisie. These agreements do not weaken but in fact strengthen the power of the bourgeoisie, who utilize these concessions to weaken and split the ranks of the proletariat.

The mensheviks strive for more and more concessions, this is why the Bolsheviks consider the mensheviks to be vehicles of bourgeoisie influence on the proletariat, vehicles for the disintegration of the proletarian revolution.

The petty bourgeois leaders of these parties compete over the bribed strata of the proletariat. Implanting their members in the "highly industrialized concentration centers" securing their base with the highly skilled highly paid, totally corrupted strata.

The new "anti-revisionist" parties are nothing more than replicas of the parties of the second international, menshevik, reformist, thoroughly opportunist parties.

On an international scale it is these parties which have formed the international anti-revisionist communist movement. Revisionism has dominated this international since the death of Stalin and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. This international rose to prominence supposedly as anti-revisionist because it opposed "Soviet Social-imperialism." Until recently this international was held together by the *Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement*. The CPC and Mao Zedong were the undisputed leadership of this revisionist dominated international. The *Proposal Concerning the General Line* was a call to unity with revisionism. A centrist cover was given to hide the fact that revisionism had scored a worldwide victory with the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union.

Disagreements on many questions arose amongst the revisionists, in spite of all efforts to further the "unity of the Socialist camp."

The Khrushchevites proposed that they have complete say over the affairs of this international, the Maoists objected, wanting an equal partnership, a deal which they tried to work out for a number of years. In 1963 when *The Proposal* was written the CPC was maneuvering to undermine the influence of the Khrushchevites and prop themselves into complete hegemony over the "socialist camp." Thus the CPC wrote "When only one socialist country existed and when this country was faced with hostility and jeopardized by all the imperialists and reactionaries because it firmly pursued the correct Marxist-Leninist line and policies, the touchstone of proletarian internationalism for every communist party was whether or not it resolutely defended the only socialist country. Now there is a socialist camp consisting of thirteen countries, Albania, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam" (*Proposal concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, FLP Peking, page 10).

Thus according to the Chinese there was one big happy "socialist" family — even though capitalism had been restored in the Soviet Union.

In actuality the split was maturing between the Russian revisionist embarking on the road of a great imperialist power, and the Social nationalism of backward states like China and Albania.

With the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, the aims of the imperialist camp were accomplished i.e., the liquidation of the Socialist Camp and the Socialist World market. The People's Democracies were surrendered to the imperialist world market. Thus, the contradiction between the Socialist camp and the imperialist camp was converted into an inter-imperialist one for redivision of the world. The CPC opposed this redivision as far as it meant the strengthening of the U.S. led bloc, thus it proposed a united front against U.S. imperialism. "The U.S. imperialists have thus placed themselves in opposition to the people of the whole world and have become encircled by them. The international proletariat must and can unite all the forces that can be united, make use of the internal contradictions in the enemy camp and establish the broadest United front against the U.S. imperialists and their lackies" (*Ibid.*, page 12).

The CPC proposed that the "Socialist Camp" with the national liberation movements as the "motive force," become one bloc.

The Russians wanted all of the pie and opposed the social-nationalism of China and Albania with Great Russian Nationalism, and open social-chauvinism.

Thus they warned the Chinese, "ideological and tactical difference must in no circumstances

be used to incite nationalist feelings and prejudices, mistrust and dissension between socialist peoples" (The letter of the CC of the CPSU to the CC of the CPC, March 30, 1963, Proposal Concerning the General Line, FLP, Peking, page 89).

Nationalism was bringing China and Albania closer into an alliance against great Russian Chauvinism; in other words the PLA and CPC objected to the "blackmail" of the Russians to cut aid, cancel agreements and pull out technicians.

The Khrushchevite revisionists were pursuing a policy of peaceful redivision. Being in no position militarily to go to war with the Western Bloc, it pursued the policy of detente. The CPC and the PLA were threatened by the Alliance being struck between the rising Russian imperialist and American imperialism, which included the rehabilitation of Tito by the Khrushchevites.

A realignment of forces, in the so-called "socialist camp," took place and the centers of revisionism were established, one led by the Russians and the other by the Chinese i.e., the Sino-Soviet split: one open social-chauvinist and the other adopting a centrist mask. The 1957 Declaration and the 1960 statements represented the establishment of anti-Leninist norms among the 81 Parties which were enshrined as the norms of the International Communist Movement.

As the Khrushchevites shed their centrist masquerade and openly embarked on the road of open class collaboration with the Western bloc, the nationalists, specifically the PLA and CPC, feared they might lose their "sovereignty." Thus they put out the Russian's dirty line to be aired amongst all "fraternal parties." The Russians withdrew their "aide," and polemics ensued.

The CPC and the PLA utilized the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. to try and bury forever the development of a true Bolshevik international. So-called, "Great Peoples' China, — Great Mao Zedong," became the new center of gravity for the centrists, particularly the PLA who began the active promotion of "Mao Zedong Thought."

"Centrism" recollected Stalin "was a phenomenon that was natural in parties of the Second International of the period before the war. There were rights (the majority), lefts (without quotation marks), and centrists, whose whole policy consisted of embellishing the opportunism of the rights with left phrases and subordinating the lefts to the rights.

What at that time was the policy of the Left, of whom the Bolsheviks constituted the core? It was one of determinedly fighting the Centrists', of fighting for a split with the rights (especially after the outbreak of the imperialist war) and of organizing a new, revolutionary international consisting of genuinely Lefts, genuinely proletarian

elements" ("Industrialization of the Country and the Right Deviation in the CPSU(B)," SCW Vol. 11, page 293).

After Stalin's death the policy was no longer that of the Bolsheviks. Instead the centrists gained the upper hand. Subordinating the lefts to the rights, at first calling for unity with the very ones responsible for the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union. Years later the centrists termed this counter-revolutionary bloody coup a peaceful degeneration of the superstructure and a temporary setback. Stalin said that the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union would mean the darkest day for the international proletariat.

Clear one would think!

The centrists opposed the formation of an international "consisting of genuinely left, genuinely proletarian elements." Instead they called for mutual assistance and non-interference in the affairs of other parties, meaning no open polemics, no debate, in order to hide the deals they had made. Because the centrists have distorted the true meaning of the fight against revisionism, dominating this struggle in order to divert it away from the necessity of a complete rupture, the decisive split with revisionism has not taken place. By opposing themselves to Marxism-Leninism, in spite of all efforts for "unity," this international has been ransacked by crisis and disunity in accordance to two specific revisionist trends.

Firstly, there are the open social-chauvinists. This includes those parties that are open advocates of one or another form of revisionism. These openly call for class collaboration with one or another imperialist bloc. By 1972 CPC concluded its agreements with the Council of Foreign Relations (the Rockefeller and Morgan Group which sets up foreign policy for the U.S. bourgeoisie) and dropped its centrist masquerade, entering the camp of open social-chauvinism, taking with them all those parties who advocated the counter-revolutionary theory of the three worlds.

The open social-chauvinists are calling for imperialist world war for redivision of the world as a way out of the general crisis of imperialism. Amongst these are the Russian led parties who form part of that imperialist bloc. There are also those, the adherents of the social-chauvinist theory of three worlds, who are preaching alliance with the U.S.-led bloc of imperialist powers. These paint China in "socialist" colors. It was these parties who were in the front line with sections of the U.S. bourgeoisie calling for "normalization" of relations between China and the U.S.

According to their social-chauvinist logic, they claimed it necessary for "socialist" China to form an alliance with the U.S. against "soviet hegemonism," the "main threat of war."

They call for a united Europe and beefing up of NATO in order to offset Russian military build-up in Eastern Europe. The social-chauvinists are not waiting for the outbreak of an imperialist

world war to decide which "fatherland" to save. The alliances have been struck. (We do not, nor can we exclude the possibility of changes in alliances on the part of some of these parties, all this would indicate is the working out of a better deal. China for example is already dropping much of the rhetoric about the Russian imperialist, a better deal with the Russians maybe in the working).

An article appeared in the *New York Times* on Nov. 10, 1979, which reports that the CPC has circulated an important document which concludes that the Soviet Party should no longer be viewed as revisionist. According to the report in the *Times* the document says that the Soviet Union is still socialist. The CPC is laying ideological preparation in the event a switch is made. Already there is much evidence that they are throwing the theory of three worlds overboard, a return to the *Proposal Concerning the General Line* which calls for maintaining the "unity" of the so-called "socialist camp" meaning the Russian bloc. It is therefore very possible that the CPC would return to the line of one superpower, the U.S. Then "socialist China," "socialist Russia" and maybe even little "socialist Albania" would reconcile. Because there is a thin line between the social-chauvinists and centrists, there have existed cases where various openly social-chauvinist groups, in the face of China's openly making alliance with U.S. imperialism, have retreated and try to cover-up their social-chauvinism with a centrist cover, e.g. by showing opposition to the theory of three worlds, yet adhering to the policies of Mao and the Gang of Four.

The second trend is centrism. The Centrists claim to be true internationalists. They claim to be opposed to all forms of revisionism, and boast about being the true defenders of Marxism-Leninism. This cheap talk has the aim of overshadowing the fact that the centrists are opposed to a real split with the open social-chauvinists. Today the very centrists who promoted Mao Zedong Thought (e.g. the PLA) or others of this trend who claim to have broken with Mao Zedong, while they admit he is not a "great" Marxist-Leninist, consider it "undialectical," "onesided" and "subjective" to persist that Mao was a revisionist. Thus we have those centrists that consider revisionism in degrees. Some others in this trend openly adhere to Mao Zedong Thought, yet try and mask their opportunism by claiming to oppose the present-day revisionist leaders of China and the theory of three worlds. Open social-chauvinism they might agree is revisionism, but naturally it is beyond the scope of the centrist to consider centrism to be revisionism. Thus according to the centrists when Mao had a Left cover he was a Marxist-Leninist, even if not a "great" one. The PLA of course made sure Mao was embellished in Left sounding phraseology till he was dead and buried.

The centrists categorize revisionism according to nationalist variations e.g. Chinese revisionism, Yugoslav revisionism, Euro-Communism, Russian revisionism, a Revisionist World, etc.

They divert the struggle away from the question of class lines to one of bad elements in power in one country or in a party, etc. By taking it away from line, they are able to choose who to attack when and who to cover up for, until such time that a falling out between them occurs, a little debate is stirred and quieted down according to the norms established by the centrists.

Under the influence of the CPC and PLA, the lefts were instructed to labor from within and overcome the opportunist elements, applying the formula of unity, criticism, transformation. Naturally, the Lefts became subordinated to the rights. The contradictions with opportunism according to the centrists were non-antagonistic, a contradiction 'amongst the people', thus no need for open polemics or drawing of lines of demarcation. The questions of the construction of the Communist Party and proletarian revolution were matters concrete to each specific country argued the centrists, thus there was no need for universal principles nor for revolutionary theory, or for the elaboration of a Party program. The systematic aim of the so-called international anti-revisionist communist movement has been to bury Bolshevism and wipe it off the surface of the earth. But that is as impossible as wiping out the international proletariat.

The centrists have their international club, who is in and out, naturally has nothing to do with principles, it is a matter of maneuvers. The party in hegemony i.e. the PLA, promotes a number of parties through the pages of *Albania Today* or in ATA's. A mutual admiration society is established, "internationalist" rallies are held, delegations to their perspective countries are exchanged.

Albanian literature is widely distributed, Hoxha is highly praised and quoted and any opposition is dealt with severely. It is no different than any other revisionist club. The CPC and the PLA have been playing this game for over two decades. Promoting each other, and stabbing each other in the back. The PLA of course had to promote the CPC with great enthusiasm, despite Mao being an "enigma" to Hoxha. Hoxha's reflections were kept a big secret, while loans and technicians from China flowed to Albania. No doubt the blackmail diary, in two parts, has soothed Hoxha's consciousness. But we doubt he can believe his own lies. Hoxha's reflections on China, are testimony to the norms operating in this so-called anti-revisionist International Communist Movement. Khrushchev was fought through letters, Mao through diaries. There's evidence that documents are doctored by the PLA, to make itself look consistent.

The PLA needs friends of Albania to make itself an attractive commodity to the capitalists, but when these friends begin to question Albania's politics they quickly become unwanted friends. When the matter moves on from questions to polemics against their politics, these unwanted friends become enemies of Albania. The whole thing is void of principles.

Who then is it that is "recognized"?

The very cliques that are thoroughly discredited in their own countries. People of the same unprincipled mold as the PLA. Gangsters, like Hardial Bains the leader of the revisionist Communist Party of Canada (ML). Through Bains, an entire network of phantom parties cloned by Bains, e.g. COUSML, are propped up by the PLA. Friends of Albania, like CPUSA(ML), formerly MLOC who at this very moment is licking the ground for recognition, carry out the centrist clubs dirty work such as the recent activities at the 3rd International Youth festival in Spain, during August, are kept on a string by the PLA; COUSML might prove to be a total embarrassment to the PLA.

Through this game of recognition, and self-admiration fraternities, sabotage of Proletarian Revolution has been carried out by degrading Leninist norms, and preventing the development of genuine Communist Parties.

There's no end to the PLA's bragging as regards its "internationalism." Yet its club is reminiscent of Trotsky's August Bloc, both by its unprincipledness and by its opportunist basis. The PLA like Trotsky was skillful in one thing, in masking its revisionism.

Just like Trotsky, the PLA has organized a bloc of anti-Bolshevik groups and trends directed against Leninism and the Bolshevik Revolution. Hoxha and his club took up a Maoist stand on all fundamental questions. But Hoxha hides his Maoism under the guise of centrism, that is, conciliationism. He claims, he was never a Maoist, that he always knew Mao and the CPC were revisionists. Even his fan club knows this is bold face lie. Twenty years later Hoxha speaks about "enigmas" and reflections, evidence of the agnostic state this centrist finds himself in.

In this sense, Hoxha is more vile and pernicious than the open Maoist, because he is trying to deceive the international proletariat into believing that he was above the revisionism of the CPC, when in fact he and the PLA promoted and entirely supported every decision of the CPC till Mao was long gone and dumped by his own Party.

Hoxha's "internationalism" is more of the same craven opportunism. Lenin described such "Internationalists."

"The nationalists also call themselves 'internationalists' ... and not only do they call themselves, but they fully recognize an international rapprochement, an agreement, a union of people holding their views. The opportunists are not against 'internationalism' they are only in favor of mutual international approval and international agreement of the opportunists" ("Under a Stolen Flag," Collected Works, Vol. 18, page 136, 1930, Edition, International Publishers).

This precisely has been the type of "internationalism" that has existed since the death of Stalin and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. It has been an international of mutual approval and international agreements amongst opportunists.

In order to divert the proletariat from its fight for political power, the opportunists degrade revolutionary theory with the aim of preventing the formation of genuine communist parties.

The party of the proletariat can not be built without revolutionary theory. And not only can it not be built, it can not perform its duties, and role of leader of its class, it cannot be the organizer and leader of the proletarian revolution unless it masters the theory of the advanced class, the Marxist-Leninist theory. Thus revolutionary theory must be placed in its proper place, in the forefront guiding all the activities of the Bolsheviks.

With the degradation of Leninist norms, degeneration of revolutionary theory and Marxist-Leninist politics, the conditions for the rise of social-fascism was established.

The liquidation of democratic debate, the total absence of open polemics, the refusal to air out views in front of all class conscious proletarians created favorable conditions for the rise of social-fascism. The social-fascists launched physical attacks against communist and advanced workers. Public meetings are packed by the social-fascists, carrying bats, clubs and other weapons. Searching before meetings, resembling the frisking carried out by the local police, established from the very beginning an atmosphere of intimidation which made it virtually impossible for intervention to be made at public meetings.

When an intervention was attempted, the minute a quote from the classics was made, heckling and shouting would drown out the speaker. Naturally, potential revolutionaries were driven away from Marxism-Leninism, many were driven into cynicism.

Accusations of agent-provocation are tagged on to innocent victims of slander, while the real agent-provocateurs were comfortably protected by the opportunists. (The political police promotes the revisionist line, as well and better than the opportunists themselves). An atmosphere of paranoia and distrust made it virtually impossible for frank discussion to be carried out. The political police has made full use of the social-fascist groups which provides them a full opportunity to do investigations and carry on physical abuse or black-mail against people.

The question of how to fight the political police, on what bases to expose them, is a question of line. The opportunists have taken this question away from politics diverting the struggle to who said what in back and forth accusations which prove nothing, but which allow social-fascist activity to be carried out under the guise that the opportunists are fighting police agents. But in fact the reality is that the social props and military props have come to terms in order to fight the Bolsheviks. The dangers of social-fascism in the U.S. have reached serious proportions.

One of the foremost representatives of social-fascism in the U.S. has been the WVO, now the Communist Workers Party (CWP). By engaging in direct confrontation with known racist anti-communist murderers like the Klan, WVO provoked the killing of five of its own members.

Such slogans as "Death to the Klan," and provoking the KKK by calling the Klan cowards, were intended effectively to create such a situation which would result in a few martyrs for the "new" party, and headlines in the bourgeois press. It is lowlifes like this that are calling themselves communists.

What does this situation indicate?

This situation is the disgusting result of years of the dominance of revisionism internationally. In order to change the situation a complete rupture is in order. A split from this revisionist dominated movement, and the rallying about the banner of orthodox Leninism, is the immediate question to be taken up by all class conscious proletarians.

"Despite everything", wrote Lenin, "revolutionary Social-Democratic elements exist in many countries To rally these Marxist elements, however small their numbers may be at the onset, to reanimate, in their name, the now forgotten ideals of genuine socialism, and to call upon the workers of all lands to break with the chauvinists and rally about the old banner of Marxism — such is the task of the day" ("Socialism and War," LCW, Vol. 21, page 328).

In order to rally about the banner of Bolshevism, the fight against modern revisionism must be carried out the way that Lenin and Stalin waged it.

This fight must be an organized fight. One which will result in workers of all countries rupturing with the modern revisionists and rallying about the banner of Marxism-Leninism, once again such is the task of the day. The opportunists have directed their work at splitting the class conscious proletarians of all lands, and effectively the revisionists have isolated the genuine revolutionaries. This situation has gone on far enough. In spite of all difficulties, and no matter how long it takes, the unity of the workers of all countries must be achieved through hard and persistent work.

"The unity of the proletariat can be achieved only by the extreme revolutionary party of Marxism, and only by a relentless struggle against all other parties" (History of CPSU(B), International Publishers, page 359).

The Lefts in all countries are faced with the task of building the extreme, revolutionary Party of Marxism-Leninism, i.e., the Party of Lenin and Stalin.

The fight against the Maoists of all shades, these Mensheviks of today, confronts the Bolsheviks with the urgent necessity of organizing the rupture with the opportunists in all spheres.

The Lefts must split, regroup and constitute themselves in groups that take the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin as their model.

In order for this "anti-revisionist" international communist movement to carry out its activity virtually unchallenged, it had to replace Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory with Mao Zedong thought.

The degradation of revolutionary theory had the aim of thoroughly disorienting the movement, and turning potential revolutionaries away from scientific socialism.

"Theory is the experience of the working-class movement in all countries taken in its general aspect. Of course, theory becomes purposeless if it is not connected with revolutionary practice, just as practice gropes in the dark if its path is not illumined by revolutionary theory. But theory can become a tremendous force in the working-class movement if it is built up in indissoluble connection with revolutionary practice; for theory and theory alone, can give the movement confidence, the power of orientation, and an understanding of the inner relation of surrounding events; for it, and it alone, can help practice to realize not only how and in which direction classes are moving at the present time, but also how and in which direction they will move in the near future. None other than Lenin uttered and repeated scores of times the well-known thesis that: "Without a revolution theory there can be no revolutionary movement" (Foundations of Leninism, Stalin p. 22, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1970).

Thus the present-day revisionists, particularly those dressed in leftist sounding phrases, sought to destroy any possibility of the development of a revolutionary movement by denying its revolutionary theory. Rather than the power of orientation which theory alone provides, disorientation through the promotion of phrasemongering and learning by rote, turned potential independent thinkers into slavish worshippers of the CPC and the PLA.

Ignorance was praised, and a whole movement led by blockheads was created, thus, simpletons like Mao and Hoxha were able to control it.

Mao and Hoxha denied the Leninist criteria for judging the working class intelligentsia, the advanced workers. In fact this stratum of workers was systematically isolated through the denial that it exists. The aim of this "international," which in actuality was made up of social-nationalists, was to lower the political consciousness of the working class through catchphrases that were "easy for the workers to understand"! But these dead formulas were intended to prevent any further enrichment of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory.

"The Marxist-Leninist theory is the science of the development of society, the science of the working class movement, the science of the Proletarian Revolution, the science of the building of Communist Society" (History of CPSU(B), Proletarian Publishers, page 355).

Mao Zedong thought is a revisionist theory intended to maintain the capitalist mode of production through distortions of the science of the proletarian revolution.

Without revolutionary theory, the 1957 — 1960 Declarations, as well as the *Proposal Concerning the General Line* and later the social-chauvinist theory of three worlds, could be raised to the level of documents, and theories, "consistent with the principle of Marxism-Leninism," and the rupture with revisionism was diverted for decades.

In the absence of revolutionary theory, eclecticism dominated undisputed. The revisionist works of Mao, Hoxha, Che Guevarra, Fidel, Amilcar Cabrar, Castro, Fanon, Trotsky received wide distribution. The works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin were buried for decades.

In the U.S. as in all countries, to quote from the classics was termed dogmatism by the opportunists who are ferociously opposed to the promotion of "foreign books." Revolutionary intellectuals were attacked, accused of being "armchair revolutionaries" and "library worms." Many were advised to go to the point of production, the more over-time the better to transform; by doing hard and manual labor that would guarantee they not spend too much time studying from books. All learning, had to proceed in "the heat of class struggle"!!! at the tail of the spontaneous movement, and damned be those "ultra-leftists" who want to divert the spontaneous movement towards socialist revolution! sneer the opportunists.

It was not in the interest of the centrist conspirators against proletarian revolution that the inner relations of surrounding events, be understood from the perspective of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory. Especially those relations of surrounding events which led to the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and the disintegration of the socialist camp. Therefore they chose to bury Stalin's last great work, written just months before he died, *Economic Problems of Socialism in U.S.S.R.*, which was a polemic precisely against the modern revisionists who were planning the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. *Economic Problems of Socialism in U.S.S.R.* was an indictment against modern revisionism, one which would have led to a purge of the revisionists in the CPSU, leading to a general cleansing of the ranks internationally.

The degradation of theory was applauded in the U.S. movement, an impotent movement by all standards. American pragmatism deeply imbedded, a disdain for all science widely encouraged, except amongst an elite few. Phrasemongering became very popular in the U.S.¹ The spread of anti-communism proceeds virtually unchallenged.

The proletariat is left without revolutionary leadership. The working class is grabbed at the throat by the bourgeoisie. The aim of the opportunists is to prevent the proletariat from even taking the offensive in the fight against the bourgeois order.

But in order for the Lefts to regroup on the basis of orthodox Leninism, clear and definite lines of demarcation must be drawn against all forms of modern revisionism.

It was none other than Lenin who formulated the basis upon which unity of Marxist-Leninists is achieved.

"Before we can unite, and in order that we may unite, we must first of all firmly and definitely draw the lines of demarcation between the various groups. Otherwise, our unity will be merely fictitious unity, which will conceal the prevailing confusion and prevent its dispersion" (*Declaration of Iskra, LCW, 4:41, Int. Publ.*).

There are many groups internationally who would rather continue along the fictitious path charted out by Mao, i.e., unity — unity — unity, and thus renounce Lenin's criteria. These groups, individuals and circles exhibit a fear of the necessary split with modern revisionism; they betray a conciliatory attitude towards Mao, and the PLA, very evident in the refusal to engage in open polemics before all class conscious proletarians.

The frightening thought of breaking with the centrist politics which has dominated the International Communist Movement since the death of Stalin, leaves these forces mired in a state of total paralysis and complete impotence.

There are those in our country, KCRWC and KCWRCML, who have promised us polemics that never seem to materialize (we are sure this is the case internationally), who would rather things proceed as they have been, "no interference," "no open polemics" i.e., the complete absence of Leninist norms. In this way they can continue insisting that they are the confused victims of modern revisionism rather than abettors of it. We are thus witnessing such philistine excuses in the refusal to air out views publicly as the following: firstly that their political line is not sufficiently developed to engage in open debate in their country or internationally. Secondly, that their groups are not large enough, or "united" enough to engage in open polemics, which at once betrays the factional basis of these groups, the capitulationist tendencies towards a "thousand schools of bourgeoisie thought," to blossom inside their groups, where they are "overcoming opportunism." Stalin warned against this dangerous "overcoming" of opportunism from "within." But to these groups it matters little what Stalin said. This of course is their major problem, the reason for their impoverished political line.

These groups claim to be too weak to demarcate from the opportunist interpretations of world economics and politics. The proletariat must wait, they say, till they 1. develop their political line, 2. grow in numbers, 3. are strong enough to demarcate.

This ridiculous posture makes it quite clear that all these reasons for not debating remain nothing but empty excuses for the refusal to

split with modern revisionism. Instead these people propose to "unite in order to demarcate." This proposition is a renunciation of Leninism and the continued embellishment of Mao and Hoxha.

They would rather "reflect" as Hoxha did for over three decades. While these obviously petty bourgeois circles are getting themselves "together," they allow the sneaking in of the counter-revolutionary insurgence of trotskyism, "questions" of Stalin's orthodoxy are raised for the purpose of maintaining the freedom of criticism against orthodox Leninism. This freedom of criticism is what has characterized the international communist movement for the past three decades.

For the genuine Lefts, there is no "Stalin question," because the genuine Lefts are Stalinists.

The bourgeoisie and their agents, the present day Mensheviks, i.e. Maoists, Centrists, Semi-trotskyites — hate Stalin. This is not shocking. Stalin was the most worthy disciple of Lenin.

Stalin explained where in lies this hatred.

"It is impossible to deny that the mere fact of the existence of a 'bolshevik state' exercised a restraining influence on the dark forces of reaction, thus facilitating the struggle of the oppressed classes for their liberation. This, properly speaking, explains the brutal hatred which the exploiters of all countries feel for the Bolsheviks." (J.V. Stalin, *International Character of the October Revolution*, Marxist Library, Vo. 2, International Publishers, New York)

Yes it is impossible to deny that the source of international opportunism's brutal hatred for Stalin is nothing less than a reflection of the bourgeoisie's brutal hatred for Bolshevism. And this, we think, is crystal clear!

The Lefts must split. To continue being slaves to international opportunism is the worst betrayal to the international proletariat.

The choice is clear. Open polemics, debate, discussion of the fundamental questions of scientific socialism before all class conscious around the banner of Leninism in a complete and absolute rupture with modern revisionism.

For this purpose, the Bolshevik League of the U.S. welcomes the invitation issued by the Bolshevik Union of Canada to participate in the Journal of *International Correspondence*. The proposal for *International Correspondence* draws a clear and definite Leninist line of demarcation with the centrist norms which for decades have kept the Lefts isolated and weak.

The Bolshevik Union of Canada points out a glaring truth, one which should be obvious to everyone. "The lack of open and frank discussion in the international communist movement has contributed to a state of isolation and national parochialism and has allowed the Chinese revisionists and centrists of the PLA to isolate the real communists by promoting various opportunists against them" (*Proposal for a Journal*

of *International Correspondence*).

In the beginning of this article we point out how this "recognition game" has worked in the U.S.

It is the proletarian internationalist responsibility of all genuinely left elements to participate in the international debate in order that we may change this horrendous state of affairs, and show in deed who are the true internationalists.

A forum for this debate is finally available.

The Bolshevik League of the U.S. will participate² in this forum cognizant of the fact that it will criticize and be criticized openly, "so everyone can decide the justness or unjustness of the views of the participants in the debate" (Ibid).

November 1979

1. For a more complete analysis of the U.S. see *Imperialism, Superprofits and the Bribery of the "Anti-Revisionist Communist Movement"* available from The Bolshevik League.

2. The ongoing systematic development of the political line of the Bolshevik League will be elaborated in our monthly political organ *Bolshevik Revolution*, which will be published in two languages, Spanish and English. *Bolshevik Revolution* is made available by writing to Bolshevik League, P.O. Box 1189, Bronx, New York, U.S.A.