

THE COLLAPSE
OF THE OPPORTUNIST
INTERNATIONAL

*The Bolshevik League
of the United States*

Recent events in Valencia, Spain (of which we speak later) have given conclusive evidence to what has long been suspected: that international opportunism is in deep political crisis and owing to this crisis has adopted the tactics of social-fascism — the violent suppression of criticism of the *line* of international opportunism. This fact has grave implications for the struggle against opportunism and the attempt to rally the Lefts, internationally, to the banner of Leninism. A serious approach to this question must examine 1) where did the tactics of social-fascism spring from? 2) what gives it strength? and 3) how is social-fascism to be combatted?

It would be sheer fallacy for one to conclude that the origins of these social-fascist tactics are to be found merely in the conditions existing in recent years. This shallow approach to the question would negate the fundamental fact that opportunism, principally in the form of centrism, has dominated the "international communist movement" since the death of Stalin and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. Further, it would be a mistake to even equate the domination of opportunism internationally with the existence of a communist movement. With the death of Stalin and the violent overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the *only*, socialist country the world has ever known, opportunism was unleashed on a scale previously undreamt of. The restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union merged the many varieties of existing opportunism (and

increased its number and the variety of its shades) into one torrent of anti-socialist, anti-communist propaganda. This victory of international opportunism could only occur with the assistance and in alliance with, international finance capital, with imperialism. The victory of opportunism did not occur *within* Leninism, but *against* Leninism. To forget, for one moment, this absolute truth, is to perpetuate the idea that within Leninism is contained the seeds of opportunism. This idea is entirely anti-Leninist and constitutes the main propaganda weapon in the hands of the bourgeoisie in its battle to further enslave the proletariat to bourgeois liberal labor policy.

This victory of international opportunism was achieved violently — through the forceful suppression of opposition to opportunism — through the tactics of social-fascism. An examination of the events surrounding the removal from their posts (and subsequent disappearance) of a great number of leaders of the Soviet and other communist parties — *leaders who were defenders of Stalin and Bolshevism* — will bear this out. The origins of the present tactics of social-fascism, therefore, are not to be found in recent years; rather they are to be found in the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and the subsequent victory of opportunism on a world scale.

Hand in hand with the victory of opportunism internationally, and indispensable to its growth, came the renunciation of Leninist norms of relations between parties, embodied in the infamous 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations. These declarations, signed by eighty-one parties, buried the previously existing Leninist norms of criticism and self-criticism under a mound of dirt known as "fraternal relations." The gist of the matter was to consolidate all of the shades of international opportunism under one banner, to attempt to ensure the impossibility of the rise of Bolshevism through the official renunciation of Leninism. With the complete unanimity expressed in Moscow, in 1957 and 1960 the temporary victory of opportunism was assured.

Soon, however, rifts in the alliance of the opportunist international began. The Moscow leaders demanded complete adherence to their line and economic subordination to their imperialist designs. The rift became a breach when the Chinese leaders demanded the right to develop capitalism in accord to their own bourgeois national interests. It is this fact, and this alone, that enables one to understand the splits and re-splits that have occurred within international opportunism. It is the existence of opportunism *in state power* that characterizes the opportunist international. It is the interests of these bourgeois states, which, given the law of uneven development of capitalism, sets them at loggerheads to one another, and determines the *political* differences that arise among them. In the Soviet Union, China and Albania — to mention only the most prominent "socialist" countries — the bourgeoisie rules under the guise of socialism.

With the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union the world socialist market (of which China

and Albania were members) was surrendered to world capitalism. This was with the blessing and assistance of the social-nationalist leaders of both China (Mao Zedong) and Albania (Enver Hoxha). Try as they did to conceal from the world proletariat the bourgeoisie character of their economies, the present crisis of imperialism has brought this fact out in bold relief. Both Albania and China are thoroughly dependent on the export of capital from imperialist great powers. Both are racked with unemployment (as many as twenty million in China!), both are actively advertising the availability of their natural resources to the imperialist world market, Albania's per capita income is nearing \$400, both are in serious economic straits. In a word, both are governed by the economic laws of capitalism and not of socialism.

Politically, neither is able to conceal any longer the bourgeois nationalist line that is in state power. The theory of "three worlds" to which the Chinese Communist Party is committed is blatant in its collaboration with imperialism and opposition to proletarian revolution. E. Hoxha's recently published diary, *Reflections on China*, is truly a reflection of opportunism all along the line. The shameless attempt on the part of Hoxha to shield with a diary his long standing approval of the line of Mao Zedong in every aspect of political and economic life should be sufficient proof of the bourgeois dealings this social-nationalist has undertaken for forty years.

The international working class must be reminded at every occasion that neither Mao nor Hoxha advanced the slightest opposition to the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. That neither uttered a word in protest at the Twentieth Party Congress of the Soviet Party, when the immortal work of Lenin's greatest disciple, J.V. Stalin, was viciously attacked by the agent of world finance capital, N. Krushchev.

Hence our first question, viz., from where did the present tactics of social-fascism employed by the international opportunists arise? is answered by an examination of the significance of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and the surrender of the world socialist market to the clutches of world capitalism. On a number of occasions, Stalin spoke of the terrible danger that would befall the *international proletariat* if the restoration of capitalism (for which international imperialism in alliance with Trotskyism was plotting) in the Soviet Union was not prevented. Stalin spoke not merely of the economic dangers, but also, and principally of the *political* dangers that this blackest day would signal. It stands to reason that given the fact that the Soviet Union was not only the bulwark of international socialism economically (and the organization of the world socialist market with the Soviet Union at the head bears this out) but also, the bulwark of communism politically, that restoration would mean the end of the *political* fortress of socialism from which the world-wide proletarian revolution gained its strength. To have abetted this crime of restoration, for which Mao and Hoxha are guilty, is to have abetted

world capitalism in its struggle to tear from the proletariat its socialist fatherland, and hence the base of world socialist revolution.

Thus, both the CPC and PLA, who rose together against the Soviet Union, against Stalin, and against the political and economic base of the world socialist revolution are principals in the victory achieved by international opportunism over the working class movement.

Hence, to answer the second question, viz., where does international opportunism find its strength?, the examination must necessarily lead to the existence in power of various social-nationalist bourgeois parties. International opportunism, through its various state powers, and allied from the beginning with world capitalism, had tremendous means at its disposal to consolidate its victory. International opportunism controlled the international "communist" press, through the Tirana and Peking publishing houses. With vast amounts of capital gained in the exploitation of their proletariat and peasantry, these bases of social-national opportunism financed the organization of various groups in other countries (e.g., the bankrolling of the Revolutionary Union in the U.S. by the CPC, for which concrete evidence has been unearthed).

With the assistance of the bourgeoisie (certainly its most "enlightened" sections) in the capitalist countries, these opportunist groups were given every forum from which to express their programmes of reform, while every embryonic murmur of Bolshevism was ruthlessly persecuted and crushed. Mao's Red Book (which was more read than red!) became a favorite with the petty bourgeoisie, as the works of Lenin and Stalin virtually disappeared in the vaults and archives of Moscow, Tirana and Peking — all these are facts. Anyone who denies the undeniable link between the opportunists in state power and the spread of opportunism internationally must be blinded by the striving to assist the bourgeoisie in the spread of anti-communism.

A similar situation existed after the outbreak of the First World War and the turn to the shelter of the bourgeoisie by Kautsky, Plekhanov and others. Lenin chronicled the worth of these opportunists to the bourgeoisie when he said in response to the question, wherein lies the strength of opportunism?

"It is because behind Sudekum are the bourgeoisie, the government, and the General Staff of a Great Power. These support Sudekum's policy in a thousand ways, whereas his opponents' policy is frustrated by every means including prison and the firing squad. Sudekum's voice reaches the public in millions of copies of bourgeois newspapers (as do the voices of Vandervelde, Sembat, and Plekhanov), whereas the voices of his opponents cannot be heard in the legal press because of the military censorship!" ("The Collapse of the Second International," LCW 21:247, Moscow, 1974)

Does not the voice of Mao (and even Hoxha) reach the public in millions of copies? But enough!

The events in Spain which we mentioned in the beginning must now receive our attention, for it strikingly portrays the damage done by the international opportunists in the sphere of international relations.

The recently concluded "Third International Youth Camp" held in Valencia, Spain, marked another chapter in the disgraceful annals of the relations existing within the so-called International Communist Movement. This event represented in detailed expression the complete absence of Marxist-Leninist norms among a section of those labelling themselves Marxist-Leninist. The result of this Camp was a communique, signed by eleven parties or organizations, alleging "agent provocateur" activity on the part of other parties and organizations, allegations made to stifle criticism. This is the only conclusion that can be drawn by a thinking person, certainly by any who consider themselves Marxist-Leninist. The baselessness of the charges, the complete lack of evidence corroborating them (and none has been brought forth) and the utter lack of principle exhibited by the eleven signees give ample reason to draw from this sordid affair the conclusion that an attempt was made to *forcefully* stifle debate and discussion on questions vital to International Communism. This, and only this, interpretation stands up to the scrutiny required by Marxism-Leninism. It has long been the practice of opportunism to abdicate political debate in favor of charges of "provocateur" activity, precisely (and only precisely!) against those with whom they disagree for whatever reason.

Centrism is a political trend of bourgeois thought (and clearly of bourgeois relations) which has cunningly concealed its true programme, its true politics, behind the label of "Marxism-Leninism." Centrism disdains to reveal its views, while Communism disdains to conceal its views. Stalin referred to the characteristic fact that centrism seeks to bury differences, while attempting to reconcile Marxism to opportunism. The Youth Camp Communique signed by the eleven parties and organizations clearly sought to bury differences that had arisen among the attending groups. Further, it mentioned not a single word of the political positions advanced by those labelled "provocateurs" and in fact shed absolutely no light on the questions around which the beginnings of debate had been attempted.

To evoke the title Marxist-Leninist requires more than mere bestowal of such a title by its bearer. It requires, if one is a true communist, and not simply a petty bourgeois philistine, the adherence to the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. And the strictest adherence, at that. But, one must ask; "Where in these teachings have these people who have paraded as Marxist-Leninists found any such writings that would compel them to act in such a philistine, bourgeois, and social-fascist manner?" Obviously they have not found any sources in

the works of Marxism-Leninism that could compel to resort to such activity. Only the worst scoundrel could so lightly trample on Communist principles and in exchange substitute social-fascist activity. The source of the utter betrayal of Marxist-Leninist norms by these scoundrels is in fact the *opposition* to Marxism-Leninism, and the *centrist opposition* in particular. One cannot forget with what rabid hatred Kautsky (father of centrism) attacked Lenin and the Bolsheviks with slanders of "provocateur," etc. One would be foolhardy to forget that Trotsky was for many years a foremost representative of centrism and life-long opponent of Marxism-Leninism. Are the activities and slanders carried out by Kautsky and Trotsky any different than those pursued by the centrists of the "International Youth Camp" Communique? Not at all. The aim is to prohibit debate, whether "peacefully" or through forceful means — in either case it remains nothing less than the undemocratic and unprincipled maneuver of social-fascism.

In order to shed light on the difference between principles guiding true Marxist-Leninists and the lack of them guiding their opponents, we must review the history (though briefly) of the norms of international relations of Marxism-Leninism.

I. Marx, Engels and the First International Working Men's Association

Since Marx and Engels founded scientific socialism, the matter of international norms governing the relations between various parties and organizations has been a serious problem among the class conscious workers. Marx took it upon himself, first in the Communist League (whose *Manifesto* is the classic of the foundation of Communism), and later in the First International Working Men's Association, to elaborate the theory and demonstrate the practice of principled norms among the proletarian parties.

To formulate the matter from the scientific standpoint, i.e. from the standpoint of the relations between classes in modern society, one must demarcate between the proletarian and bourgeois positions on the question of relations between parties and organizations internationally. It is widely known that the "norms" of bourgeois parties are characterized by unprincipled relations between one another — that they lie, slander and accuse each other of various maneuvers unceasingly. This is true not only of the "official" bourgeois parties, but of the "unofficial," or "socialist" (now "Marxist-Leninist") parties as well. At the same time, they seek to stifle any opposition (from within or without) of their favoured policies. Debate remains confined within clearly set limits, and any voice raised outside these "accepted" limits is ruthlessly silenced. That is the norm among bourgeois parties, of whatever title.

The proletarian parties, on the other hand, were nurtured under the tutelage of Marx and Engels to employ fundamentally different norms.

They were raised to debate, to discuss, to criticize and to do so in an atmosphere free of intimidation and abuse. And precisely because to the class conscious workers socialism is a serious conviction, debate and polemics must be insisted upon, criticism and self-criticism demanded. This was the central theme of Marx and Engels on International norms. No one was above reproach, no one eternally free of criticism. And the nine-year history of the First International Working Men's Association bears this out more clearly than we can. This first International Communist organization itself demanded the strictest adherence to the norms of debate and discussion. Marx and Engels were staunch opponents of sweet (or bittersweet!) phrases designed to lull one to sleep for the impending attack under cover of darkness.

Polemics, debate, discussion — this characterized the relations between proletarians of Marx and Engels time.

II. Lenin, the Collapse of the Second International and the Birth of the Third International

Engels took to directing the Second International at its founding in 1889. Under Engels and Kautsky's (when Kautsky was still a Marxist) guidance the Second International prepared the groundwork necessary for the passing from the "peaceful" period of preparation of the proletariat for revolutionary action to the period of onslaught against capital. The Second International has a definite place in Communist History in this regard but after Engels' death lost all prestige and authority when, during and just before the First Imperialist World War, Kautsky and other renegades departed completely from revolutionary Marxism and adapted themselves and the policies of the International to the bourgeoisie. Pursuing a union with the outright social-chauvinist agents of the bourgeoisie, Kautsky and Co. deserted not only Marxist politics, but Marxist norms as well. Intrigue and unfounded slanders occupied the writings and speeches of the centrist Kautsky on the question of the revolutionary Marxist parties (and the Bolshevik Party of Lenin, principally).

As a result of departing from revolutionary Marxism in politics, departure from Marxist to bourgeois relations in the international arena ensued. There cannot be one without the other.

It fell to Lenin and the Bolsheviks to demarcate from the politics and activities of the degenerate Second International and to chart the path for the re-establishment of revolutionary Marxist norms in international relations. The pursuit of open polemics and debate was of the greatest importance to Lenin. His works *Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, *How the Spark was Nearly Extinguished*, *The Collapse of the Second International*, and many others demonstrated with great clarity his abhorrence of silences on matters of principles. The series of writings on the mistakes of Rosa Luxemburgers (*Critical Remarks on the National Ques-*

tion, etc.) show with what dispassionate precision he criticized the mistakes of comrades deviating from the Marxist path. Lenin was an advocate of open debate, of criticism and self-criticism of one's mistakes, and the honest recitification of errors. He was an opponent of silence, of slander, of unfounded charges, and intrigue.

Lenin directed the Communists to debate openly and in a principled manner not out of any petty bourgeois sense of morality, for this was entirely alien to him; he demanded it in order that one be able to judge how deep are the disagreements, how real the unity, and how great the conviction. Toy forms of democracy were a favorite enemy of Lenin; while principle and honesty in politics were the epitome of his life and work. This legacy he left Stalin to carry forth in the Third International.

III. Stalin, Opponent of Intrigue and Defender of Leninist Norms

After Lenin's death, the task not only of directing the construction of socialism in the young Soviet Republic, but also of defending Leninist norms in the Comintern (Third International) fell to Lenin's immensely capable comrade-in-arms Stalin. The norms of international relations between parties of the proletariat had already been tested in the course of seven decades, but they were to receive perhaps their greatest test in the years of the Comintern. The Dictatorship of the proletariat in USSR was under constant attack with salvos launched almost daily from the pens of the opportunists and from the guns and explosives of the Trotskyite spies. In a time of such grave peril, it is a task of true brilliance and generalship to be able, not only to preserve, but also to expand the norms of Marxism-Leninism in international relations. Ruthless and calculated struggle against all forms of opportunism, the painstaking correction of deviations within the Bolshevik Party and Comintern, and all the while exhibiting the greatest principle in relations — such was the work of Stalin. Leninist norms flow from Leninist politics. This cannot be denied and it fell to Stalin, the truest Leninist politician, to defend these norms to the end.

Did Stalin dream of haranguing the world with talk of 'one single Marxist-Leninist line...'? Of course not! Only a philistine dreamer can talk so cheaply. Stalin outlined the existence of two lines in the Bolshevik Party, the line of the Party and the line of an opportunist bloc. Not merely did he outline the existence of another line than that of the Party, but he fought against it with all the strength and means at his disposal. Is this to say that Stalin did not fight for one monolithic line within the party? Of course not. It was precisely because he did fight for the one line of Leninism within the party, precisely because he was the greatest defender of the one Leninist line, that he waged a ruthless struggle against all anti-Leninist lines and blocs. Did Stalin dismiss opportunism with a wave of the hand? Of course not. This would be disgraceful

for a Leninist. The type of activity that is carried on in the international communist movement today is a disgrace. It is shameful that under the stolen banner of Leninist norms are grouped parties and organizations (such as the eleven Communique signees) who seek to drag this banner through the mud with their unfounded and unprincipled charges.

Such, in brief, is the history of the birth and development of the Leninist norms governing the relations among true communists. The disgraceful state of present relations stems from the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and the "official" renunciation of Leninism in Moscow in 1957 and 1960.

IV. The Renunciation of Leninism: the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations

This is not the place to discuss the utterly disastrous and tragic consequences of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, an occurrence that would signal, according to Stalin, the blackest day in the struggle of the international proletariat (take note, all who sigh about "temporary setbacks," "tactical defeat," etc.).

But what must be said is that with the darkening of the clouds over the heads of the proletarians, certain charlatans came forth to capitalize (yes, capitalize!) on this blackest of days.

Grovelling before the dictates of Krushchev and Co., every existing, "official" communist or workers (?) party, without exception was a partner to the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Declarations which marked the renunciation of Leninist norms in international relations, and the institution of unprincipled, philistine social-nationalist maneuvering on the part of all of the signees. "Fraternal relations" substituted for criticism and self-criticism. "Non-interference in the internal affairs of fraternal parties" substituted for open debate and polemics. And slavish worship of revisionism and the bourgeoisie was substituted for class struggle against them. One must comprehend the significance of these revisions of major importance if one is to comprehend the present horrifying state of affairs in international relations.

The Leninist theses of judging parties not by their high sounding phrases but by their deeds is well known among not only the Communists, but the opportunists themselves. For this reason the opportunists are sometimes hard pressed to conceal their deeds behind revolutionary phrases, and when this occurs they are not averse to actually bringing words into correspondence with their unprincipled deeds. Such are the words of the Moscow Declarations.

It does not require genius to see that the existence of practiced Leninist norms in international relations is of great danger to opportunism. Norms based on principle greatly hamper the sabotage of the proletarian revolution, to which all opportunism is committed. The schemes of international opportunism, (whether social-chauvinist or centrist, it matters little) are served by the stifling of debate, the "conspiracy of

silence" to which Lenin, in his time was so opposed. It is a question of training and educating the class conscious workers with the ability to recognize and hence, drive from the workers' ranks, open or concealed class enemies. It is a matter of the firmest principle that Marxism-Leninism carry on this training and education for without its success the achievement of power by the proletariat is a pious wish.

Is it defensible to assert that the signing and carrying out of the Moscow Declarations represented a conspiracy on the part of international opportunism? We think it most definitely is. Who among the signees of these declarations has raised a voice (after sufficient time to "find" a "lost" head) against them? The answer is obvious. We need only look at perhaps the most flagrant violation of Leninist norms communism has known as illustration of our allegations.

The Communist Party of China and the Party of Labor of Albania were both co-signers (co-conspirators?) to the Moscow Declarations. They have both been "exemplary" in carrying them forth. Their "fraternal" relations over the past eighteen to twenty years must then be of some significance in this matter.

Everyone recognizes that with the so-called Sino Soviet split the CPC and PLA played the major roles in the leadership of the "anti-revisionist communist movement" internationally. And it is no secret that with the break in relations between China and Albania two trends of opportunism have once again come to plague the communist movement. That China and those who support its "three worlds theory" have openly lined up in the U.S. — led bloc of imperialism, is by now no great revelation. But that Albania and all who support its "two superpowers" theory have more covertly lined up in the Russian — led bloc of imperialism is a great revelation. It is significant precisely because it is a number of PLA — cloned parties who signed the Youth Camp Communique, and significant secondly, because it was the PLA who since 1935 (according to Hoxha*) knew that Mao Zedong was an opportunist and yet conspired to hide this fact from the proletariat, who suffered (and continues to suffer) great pains at the hands of Mao's "thought."

Far from applauding Hoxha and the PLA for their belated exposé of Mao, we condemn them as the social-nationalist conspirators they have (belatedly) proven to be. Yes, Hoxha "reflects" on Mao's revisionism, but he conceals his own sympathy for all of the Maoist policies and ideas that proved so beneficial in the fifteen or so years of Chinese export of capital to backward Albania. The CPC-PLA relations are an example of the banality and defense of opportunist norms that have resulted since the Moscow Declarations.

*See Enver Hoxha, *Reflections on China*, for a crude and blockhead attempt to disengage what has been engaged for twenty years, viz, CPC and PLA conspiracy to bring the proletariat under the wing of social-nationalism.

The tactics of the proponents of the theory of "three worlds" and the self-proclaimed "opponents" of this theory have now merged. This is not surprising when one considers the perilous position in which the bourgeois social-nationalists in China and Albania find themselves, and the increasing difficulty they have in portraying their countries as "socialist." The activities of their counterparts in other countries (the pro-"three worldists" and the pro-"two superpowers" adherents) represent the actions of rats swimming towards a sinking ship.

Anyone who is capable of serious thought will be able to verify the relationship between the political crisis affecting the social-nationalist parties in state power and the emergence of social-fascist tactics on the part of their defenders in order to conceal the bourgeois nature of these "socialist" countries. This is the essence of the matter. To fail to understand the significance of this relationship is to fail to understand the significance of "fraternal relations" among the opportunists. Opportunism internationally has been nurtured since the death of Stalin, by revisionism in state power. The existence of a number of so-called proletarian parties in each imperialist country is directly related to the revisionist parties in state power and their need to secure support for their policies and alliances. There are no countries free from the imperialist blocs, no countries outside the struggle for redivision of the world that drives the great powers towards war — and certainly the alliance of China and the U.S., Albania and Russia, require an explanation (and a great deal of sophistry) in the eyes of the class conscious proletarians. Albania, China and the bourgeois governments of the imperialist great powers to which they are respectively allied desire the continued portrayal of these two countries as socialist, in order to deceive the workers with bourgeois social-nationalism.

Advocacy of class collaboration; abandonment of the idea of socialist revolution and revolutionary methods of struggle; renunciation of the class viewpoint and the class struggle, for fear of alienating the "broad masses," the "progressive peoples" (meaning the petty bourgeoisie and bourgeois nationalists); advocacy of social-pacifism or instigation of war; renunciation of Leninist norms and the crushing of criticism and debate — such, undoubtedly, are the political foundations of social-nationalism.

One can well understand why the opportunists are so fearful of exposure of their political line, of the deception they pass off as socialism and communism, and why they engage in the social-fascist quelling of any opposition. The collapse of the international communist movement is a fact — it has been replaced with an international association of opportunism. This fact has been proved through the polemics and is confirmed by the Youth Camp affair. Attempts by the centrists to cover up this collapse represent the further maneuvers of opportunism — the further striving to subordinate the Lefts within their opportunist "International."

It is time that the Lefts in each country deliver a resolute rebuff to the centrists. It is time to come out against social-fascism and the social-nationalism that nurtures and harbors it.

The Bolsheviks must pay heed to Lenin's words:

"The social-nationalists do not call themselves, and do not admit to being, social-nationalists. They are lending, and are compelled to lend, every effort to hide behind a pseudonym, to throw dust in the eyes of the working masses, to cover up the traces of their links with opportunism, to conceal their betrayal, i.e., their having gone over in fact to the side of the bourgeoisie, and their alliance with the governments and the General Staffs. Grounding themselves on this alliance, and in control of all the important positions, the social-nationalists are, more than anybody else, clamouring for "unity" between the Social-Democratic parties and levelling the accusation of splitting tendencies, against all these who are opposed to opportunism" ("The Collapse of Platonic Internationalism," LCW 21:195, Progress Publishers, Moscow 1974 edition).

It remains for us to answer the question of how to combat this social-fascist trend. Clearly the Bolsheviks must not combat them through falling prey to the provocation they exhibit. To do this would only play into their hands. To do this would reflect a failure to understand the balance of forces and the alliance of the social-fascists with the bourgeoisie.

To combat social-fascism, other, more mundane, but infinitely more revolutionary methods are required. Within the Bolshevik and Left press there must appear frequent and biting exposures of the activities of the social-fascists, the line of international opportunism and its various trends — the Bolshevik and Left press must further the exposure of the links between the social-fascist parties and groups in the various countries and the social-nationalist parties in state power that have raised and nurtured them. We must expose the alliance of these parties and groups with their "own" bourgeoisie, their General Staffs, and their political police. We must denounce the activities of opportunism, of all shades, within the workers movement, and among the movements of the oppressed nations, colonies and semi-colonies.

We must in all of this, not forget our pressing duty to construct truly revolutionary Bolshevik Parties in each country, Parties able to rally the vanguard of the proletariat to their banner, the banner of Leninism. It is a long and bitter struggle that lies before us — one that requires the utmost in perseverance and attentiveness to detail — one that requires the firmest adherence to Leninism.

We wish to express our sincerest support for the proposal by the Bolshevik Union of Canada for the publishing of an international journal of correspondence, a forum in which the voice against international opportunism will increasingly be heard. To break the grip of opportunism it is

required to breach the wall of silence, the absence of Leninist norms that characterize the opportunist international. Let us be clear, we cannot confine ourselves to demanding the institution of Leninist norms, we must go beyond the point of demanding this, to the actual defense of Leninist norms in deeds. This is the service that *International Correspondence* performs. It is for this that we raise our pens.

Post Script:

One of the eleven signees of the "Youth Camp Communique" is an American opportunist party the Communist Party, USA(M-L). The truest expression of internationalism is the struggle to overthrow the bourgeois order in ones' "own" country and by so doing, give the greatest assistance to the revolution world-wide. A precondition for this struggle for state power by the proletariat is the defeat of opportunism in the working class movement in each country. Therefore, we must pay particular care to the defeat of the CPUSA(M-L) within the American workers movement a task to which we are duty committed. Hence, in the pages of our monthly periodical, *Bolshevik Revolution*, we will concentrate our attack on opportunism further in regard to CPUSA(M-L); however, we saw little to be gained from a separation of this party's activities at the "Youth Camp" from that of all others, and for reasons of length and deadline did not give a detailed examination of this party.

Written for
International Correspondence