

The Workers' Advocate



WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

SPECIAL ISSUE

\$1.00

VOICE OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY OF THE USA

August 10, 1981

Volume 11, Number 9

**The truth
about the relations between the
Marxist-Leninist Party, USA and the
Communist Party of Canada (M-L)**

-Part 2-

The Immediate Ideological Issues Behind the Split

Part Two of the June 16, 1980 Letter
of the CC of the MLP,USA to the CC of CPC(M-L)

The truth about the relations between the Marxist-Leninist Party of the USA and the Communist Party of Canada (M-L)

—Part Two—

In Part One of this series we condemned the leadership of CPC(M-L)'s savage attempts to strangle our Party and their unprincipled wrecking activity. We outlined the anti-Marxist-Leninist theories and ideological concepts that lay behind their savage war on the MLP, USA and its predecessor, the COUSML. We began publishing the relevant correspondence between the two Parties so that the reader could judge for himself the truth that the leadership of CPC(M-L) has done so much to hide.

In Part Two we are publishing the second part of the letter of the CC of the MLP, USA to the CC of the CPC(M-L) of June 16, 1980. This part of the letter elaborates in detail on those revisionist stands of the leadership of CPC(M-L) that were the immediate issues in their war on our Party. It covers the demand of the leadership of CPC(M-L) for a "special relationship" with our Party and their rejection of the Marxist-Leninist norms. It goes in detail into the opposition of the leadership of CPC(M-L) to the struggle against revisionism and opportunism in general and in particular to carrying the struggle against Chinese revisionism through to the end. As well as these immediate issues, the letter also opposes the related factionalist and polycentrist concept of theirs of the existence of two separate but equally legitimate Marxist-Leninist trends in the international Marxist-Leninist movement, one of which being centered on and led by the leadership of CPC(M-L). It also outlines the rightist errors of the panic-stricken New Year's speeches of December 1979 - January 1980 of the leadership of CPC(M-L) that gave their summation of the 1970's and set the orientation for CPC(M-L) for the 1980's.

Since the letter of June 16, 1980 was written, the CC of the MLP, USA has continued its investigation of the line of the leadership of CPC(M-L), focusing on

major questions of the strategy and tactics of the revolution. This study has shown that the characteristic feature of the New Year's speeches was not just rightism in general but in fact was the flaunting of a liquidationist deviation. As well, this study showed that the leadership of CPC(M-L) has been making persistent Maoist errors that they are stubbornly clinging to. Their opposition to the struggle against Chinese revisionism is connected to their defense of their Maoist theses. These questions are outlined in the Introduction to Part One of this series in the June 30, 1981 issue of *The Workers' Advocate* and are set forth in some detail, although without mentioning the name of CPC(M-L), in the series "Against Mao Zedong Thought!" in previous issues of *The Workers' Advocate*.

As well, since the letter of June 16, 1980 was written, there has been further study of the history of the Internationalists. The Internationalists were organizations of the 1960's around which the leadership of CPC(M-L) has created an unwarranted mystique. Investigation has shown that the letter of June 16, 1980 is wrong when, in section VIII-B, it expresses an especially "high valuation of the historical role played by the Internationalists" and similar sentiments. However, this correction simply serves to further underline the correctness of the basic point made in that section, which is a refutation of the leadership of CPC(M-L)'s polycentrist theory on the existence of two different but equally legitimate trends within Marxism-Leninism.

There are also some minor corrections to be made to the Introduction to Part One of this series in *The Workers' Advocate* of June 30, 1981.

The following sentences should be added to the paragraph ending on page 17, column 2, line 15: "But everyone knows that the national bourgeoisie

of an imperialist country like Canada includes the monopoly bourgeoisie and indeed is led by this reactionary big bourgeoisie. The Canadian big bourgeoisie is the strongest and most powerful section of the Canadian national bourgeoisie. Thus, although the theories of the CPC(M-L) leadership about the middle bourgeoisie and the non-monopoly strata of the bourgeoisie are wrong in and of themselves, they have in fact been prettifying the Canadian big bourgeoisie, rabidly imperialist to the core, or major sections of it as 'middle bourgeoisie' or an anti-colonial sort of 'national bourgeoisie.'

The following sentence should be added to page 16, column 2, the sixth line from the bottom: "For the sake of phrasemongering, they sometimes call the revolution a socialist revolution but at the same time they still insist on painting it in anti-colonial colors."

Also, near the same place on the bottom of column 2 on page 16, it is stated that the Special Congress of CPC(M-L) of April 29 - May 9, 1978 did not produce any documents. However, according to *People's Canada Daily News*, the organ of the CC of the CPC(M-L), the Special Congress did adopt a new constitution for CPC(M-L) and discuss "the basic elements of the Political Programme." (*PCDN*, May 15, 1978 and January 22, 1979) The constitution was published in the June 5, 1978 issue of *PCDN* and then republished as amended by the Fourth Plenum of the CC in the January 22, 1979 issue of *PCDN*. Also, starting one year after the Special Congress in the *PCDN* of April 23, 1979, a series of different election programs were published, including the notorious Browderite program of February 15, 1980, but none of them were identified as the official program of CPC(M-L). However all this does not change the conclusion that is drawn in *The Workers' Advocate* that the last regular congress of CPC(M-L), the Third Congress of 1977, is still the currently binding congress. The Special Congress is called "special," and not the "Fourth Congress," in order to stress that it is simply the conclusion of the Third Congress, something like a second sitting of the Third Congress. According to *PCDN*, the constitution and the

"basic elements of the Political Programme" were both dealt with at the Special Congress "on the basis of the Resolutions of the Third Congress" and the "basic elements of the Political Programme" had been widely discussed "since the time of the Third Congress." ("Communique of the Fourth Plenum of the CC of CPC(M-L)," *PCDN*, January 22, 1979) This is also apparent when one examines the constitution itself. For example, it repeats the denunciation of "one-stage revolution" from the Third Congress when, in regard to the relation between anti-imperialist struggle and socialist revolution in Canada, it maintains that it is "ultra-left" to oppose "the step-wise development of the revolution consistent with historical conditions" and condemns "the sophism that the struggle is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie." In the light of the Maoist blunders of the Third Congress, class struggle is a "sophism," but for revolutionary Marxist-Leninists, it is the cornerstone of their activity.

Finally, we take this occasion to reiterate the stand of our Party towards the CPC(M-L) from the Introduction to Part One:

"For our part, we wish no harm to the CPC(M-L). On the contrary, we sincerely hope that the leadership of CPC(M-L) overcomes the Maoist and liquidationist deviations which are proving to be so detrimental to the CPC(M-L) itself. We American Marxist-Leninists have always and will continue to work for the closest fraternal bonds with the Canadian Marxist-Leninists. The MLP,USA continues to stand for true friendship with the CPC(M-L). We hope therefore that the leadership of CPC(M-L) repudiates their hostile war against the MLP,USA.

"In the meantime, no one can deprive our Party of the right to defend its integrity nor should anyone underestimate our determination to do so. As a loyal and militant contingent of the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement, the MLP,USA will continue to exert every effort to strengthen the party of the proletariat in the U.S., to defend the principled unity of the Marxist-Leninist communist parties of the world, and to defend the invincible revolutionary doctrine of Marxism-Leninism."

**Part Two of the Letter of the CC of MLP,USA to the CC of CPC(M-L), June 16, 1980:
Ideological Issues**

CONTENTS

SECTION VIII: More on the "special relationship"	5	X-D: By denouncing the struggle against "one's own" domestic opportunists, you are coming straight out against one of the cornerstones of Marxism-Leninism	40
VIII-A: The leadership of CPC(M-L) is striving to replace the Marxist-Leninist norms with the "special relationship"	5	X-E: No amount of anti-Leninist word-chopping can deny the reality that the new Marxist-Leninist parties have been formed and have matured in the struggle against the modern revisionist betrayal	42
VIII-B: We do not agree with your theory of "two (or more) trends" in the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement	7	X-F: A truly "peculiar" thesis which relegates Lenin's teachings on the struggle against opportunism to the museum of historical antiquity	43
VIII-C: The double standard and the question of equality	11	X-G: Your opposition to the "without and against" slogan is also anti-Leninist	44
VIII-D: On the epithet "peculiar"	14	X-H: Sniveling complaints against the ideological and polemical struggle are alien to Marxism-Leninism	45
VIII-E: The leadership of CPC(M-L) vehemently rejects any and all criticism	14	X-I: The centrist thesis that polemics against revisionism disrupt building "unity"	46
VIII-F: Opposition to the Marxist-Leninist norms on consultation and cooperation	16	X-J: Marxism-Leninism considers that the anti-revisionist struggle is essential and invigorating for the party and the revolution — not a mere unfortunate diversion as you insist	46
VIII-G: A double standard in everything	20		
SECTION IX: Opposition to the struggle against opportunism and revisionism, Chinese revisionism in particular, is the main ideological content of the December 5 letters	22	SECTION XI: An anti-Marxist crusade against ideological struggle and demagogical speculations on the slogan of opposing "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle'"	48
IX-A: The ideological and polemical struggle against Chinese revisionism and the other revisionisms must be intensified and carried through to the end	24	XI-A: Playing with the phrase "two-line struggle" to condemn the struggle against revisionism	48
IX-B: You have condemned our struggle without careful consideration and study, but solely on the basis of anti-Marxist-Leninist generalities against the anti-revisionist struggle	27	XI-B: Your theory of "two (or more) trends in the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement" is close in spirit to Mao's theory of the necessity of two (or more) lines in the party	59
IX-C: Our December 1 letter criticized a number of your theses directed against the struggle against opportunism	29	XI-C: When you condemn the ideological struggle you are renouncing one of the fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism!	50
IX-D: Your letters of December 5 have further confirmed as correct the criticisms raised in our letter of December 1	31	XI-D: The principles involved in the controversy over the term "idealist anti-revisionism"	65
		XI-E: Turning on its head Lenin's fight against the opportunist slogan "freedom of criticism"	67
SECTION X: What you are denouncing as "peculiar" are the well-known orthodox theses of the Marxist-Leninist classics and the advanced positions of contemporary revolutionary Marxism-Leninism	36		
X-A: Denial of the present-day activation of revisionism and opportunism	36		
X-B: Opposition to "highlighting" the struggle against Chinese revisionism	38		
X-C: The struggle against social-chauvinism is international	39		

XI-F: A mutilation of Stalin's correct teachings on the monolithic unity of the party in order to extinguish the class struggle in the party	69	SECTION XIII: Unity-mongering to oppose the struggle against conciliationism and "centrism" in particular	94
XI-G: To profess a purely formal and empty "official optimism" concerning the unity of the Marxist-Leninists is to profess "official optimism" in regard to opportunism	73	SECTION XIV: Panic-stricken speeches which manifest a sharp turn towards rightism	98
XI-H: Your tirades against "campaigns" and "movements" show your addiction to empty phrasemongering	82	XIV-A: A treacherous attack on the Party of Labor of Albania	99
SECTION XII: Under the cover of "unity in one party," pragmatic maneuvering with the opportunist chieftains replaces the principled struggle against opportunism	84	XIV-B: A thief cries "stop thief!"	100
XII-A: More on "unity": The brilliant "tactics" of "we put unity in the forefront, and they expose themselves"	84	XIV-C: It is wrong to inculcate distrust and disrespect for the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement	100
XII-B: The life and death conflict in the United States between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism is replaced by "pro-CPC(M-L)" versus "anti-CPC(M-L)," independent of ideological content	88	XIV-D: You restrict the criticism of Mao Zedong Thought to meaningless generalities and tend to present it as petty-bourgeois ultra-leftism	101
XII-C: Your support for the movement against social-chauvinism was only temporary because it was based on pragmatic considerations	91	XIV-E: An empty self-criticism to obscure and preserve the actual errors and theoretical weaknesses from the past	101
		XIV-F: A continuing crusade against ideological struggle	103
		XIV-G: Negation and ridicule of the essential task of party-building	105
		XIV-H: A sharp turn towards rightism on a series of important political issues	108
		XIV-I: You deny the enigma of China in order to create an aura of your own infallibility	111

Letter of the CC of the Marxist-Leninist Party, USA to the CC of the Communist Party of Canada (M-L)

June 16, 1980

— PART TWO — IDEOLOGICAL ISSUES

SECTION VIII: More on the "special relationship"

In the last section, Section VII, we examined some features of how the "special relationship" has worked in practice. There are definite theories and ideological ideas that lie behind the "special rela-

tionship." In this section, we will examine the ideological basis behind your concept of the "special relationship" between our two Parties.

VIII-A: The leadership of CPC(M-L) is striving to replace the Marxist-Leninist norms with the "special relationship"

To begin with, in your letters of December 5, you advocate that the "special relationship" should replace the usual Marxist-Leninist norms for relations between fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties. For this reason, you write:

"5. You assert: 'The norms and relations between these contingents are regulated by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.' *But what are these 'norms and relations' in concrete terms? ... You are using these phrases for demagogic purposes to mystify your real objectives of disrupting the*

relations between CPC(M-L) and COUSML. *There can be no other reason for this sophistry.*" (p. 2, emphasis added)

We find it astonishing to see a Marxist-Leninist party, such as yours, ridicule and mock at Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism as being allegedly not "concrete." The Marxist-Leninist norms are not only concrete, they are obligatory in the relations between parties inside the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. The upholding of these norms was one of the central points in the fight against both Khrushchevite and Chinese revision-

This issue of *The Workers' Advocate* contains Part Two of the letter of June 16, 1980 in its entirety. Part One of this letter was reproduced in *The Workers' Advocate* of June 30, 1981, which also contains the letters of the CC of the CPC(M-L) of December 5, 1979 and other relevant correspondence.

The above letter is reproduced as in the original. Typo-

graphical errors have been corrected, however, and quotations have been verified with the original sources. All parenthetical and bracketed remarks in the text, including those marked "--ed.," are as in the original, except for those marked "--W.A.," As well, we have removed the names of certain Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations.

ism. But you hold that support for the norms dictated by Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism could have "no other reason" than the "objectives of disrupting the relations between CPC(M-L) and COUSML."

When you ridicule these Marxist-Leninist norms, you are not simply making an empty rhetorical point. On the contrary, you are led to mock at the Marxist-Leninist norms as part of your view that a "special relationship" should govern the norms between our two Parties. You regard the "concrete" norms between our two Parties as being those of the "special relationship," while you have relegated the Marxist-Leninist and proletarian internationalist norms to the realm of mere "phrases." You yourself recognize that your view of the "special relationship" contradicts the Marxist-Leninist norms. That is why you say that raising the issue of the Marxist-Leninist norms can have no other purpose but "[disrupting] the relations," that is, to be more precise, to disrupt the "special relationship."

In the discussions of May 1978 between our two Parties you admitted that your conception of "special relations" was that of relations that "are not part of the international movement." You stressed that such special relations were in your view the actual relations then existing between CPC(M-L) and certain other parties such as ours. You hypocritically talked about wanting to "normalize" this situation. Your representative stated:

"I think you comrades are not understanding this correctly. We need to have normalized relations among the four parties [XXX, Canada, YYY and the U.S. — ed.], relations that are part of those of the international movement and not *special and apart* from it. [i.e., you are stating that presently the relations *are* special and apart from the international movement — ed.] But *these special relations do exist*. You cannot shut your eyes to it. You have to deal with this fact and discuss it a lot. Then we can hold a meeting to resolve these questions. ... [Your representative then went on to briefly discuss this question with respect to the Marxist-Leninists in ZZZ — ed.]" (From our minutes, emphasis added)

But, as we shall see, despite your talk about "normalizing" the relations, in your letters of December 5 you are still stressing that to say that the relations between our Party and the CPC(M-L) are part of the international relations is "intellectualist balderdash." Thus your talk about "normalizing" the relations was just hypocrisy, just an excuse to insist

on your idea that the real relations at the present are the "special relations."

Thus the following passage from your letters of December 5 stresses that, in your view, the relations between our two Parties are not part of the general ties between the parties in the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. You write:

"Joseph Green writes: 'The proletariat is an international class, and its parties in the individual countries are fighting contingents of the one international party of communism, of the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement.' *This is an intellectualist balderdash to cover up the entire history of the fraternal relations between COUSML (and before it, the American Communist Workers Movement) and CPC(M-L) (and before it, the Internationalists) which have been based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. ... This intellectualist hyperbole is dished out for the purposes of insinuating that there is nothing whatsoever between the CPC(M-L) and COUSML, no history and no common struggle, all with the ulterior motive of rewriting this history and disrupting the relations between CPC(M-L) and COUSML.*" (p. 2, emphasis added)

Thus you denounce in the strongest terms the view that our two Parties have fraternal relations because they are both fighting contingents of international communism. You regard this as a denial of the "history" and "common struggle" of our two Parties, as "insinuating that there is nothing whatsoever between the CPC(M-L) and COUSML, no history and no common struggle." This is an extremely negative view towards the glorious fraternal ties between the different contingents of the international Marxist-Leninist movement. This is an extremely negative attitude towards ties based on sharing a common Marxist-Leninist ideology and on representing the interests of the same class, the proletariat. This passage from you shows that you have stopped regarding the relations between our two Parties, our history of struggle in the same trench together, as a manifestation of the ties between two fighting contingents of the international Marxist-Leninist movement. Instead you have replaced this conception with something else. According to you, the real history of relations, its actual significance, lies in something else. In short, you are insisting on some sort of "special relationship" with us, apart from and distinct from the ties in the international Marxist-Leninist movement.

VIII-B: We do not agree with your theory of "two (or more) trends" in the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement

Since the fraternal ties between our two Parties are not in your view supposed to have been part of the general international ties in the international Marxist-Leninist movement, then what are they supposed to have formed part of? You hold that they are part of a separate, special "trend." This brings us to your theory of "two (or more) trends" inside of the international Marxist-Leninist movement. With this theory of several trends, you are not referring to the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist trend versus the various revisionist trends. On the contrary, you are denying the existence of the trend of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and dividing up the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists into several different Marxist-Leninist trends.

Thus in your letter you separate off the "Internationalist Movement" as something distinct from the Marxist-Leninist movement.* You write:

"...this concept that we have advanced that the Internationalist Movement came up as one movement and merged with the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement, with no exception. This is a very important issue." (p. 20)

This is literally all that you say on the issue in your letters of December 5, despite the fact that the question of the "two (or more) trends" in the international Marxist-Leninist movement is one of the crucial ideological questions behind the theory of the "special relationship." Nevertheless, from this passage it is already clear what you mean when you charge us with "covering up the entire history of the fraternal relations" between our two Parties and with "insin-

*The leadership of CPC(M-L) uses the phrase "Internationalist Movement" to denote some or all of those that it considers inside the "trend" grouped around CPC(M-L). Strictly speaking, the name "internationalists" is a reference to three organizations composed mainly of university students and faculty that existed in the 1960's. The first to appear was the (Canadian) Internationalists, which was originally "a completely student and faculty organization founded on March 13th, 1963" (*Mass Line*, Journal of CPC (M-L), March 13, 1971, p. 2, col. 2) at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, Canada. According to a journal founded to implement one of the decisions of the Necessity for Change Conference in London, England of August 1967 organized by the Internationalists, "The Internationalists developed from an 'informal discussion group' in 1963 to a 'centre-left' organization based on opposition to imperialism in 1966, anti-imperialist youth and student movement in August 1967 and Marxist-Leninist youth and student movement in 1968." (*World Revolutionary Youth*, Organ of the Preparatory Committee to organize the "First International Congress of Marxist-Leninist Youth," February 1969, p. 6) In two other countries in the 1960's besides Canada, similar organizations were

uating that there is nothing whatsoever between the CPC(M-L) and the COUSML, no history and no common struggle." You are angry because we consider ourselves as a contingent of international communism, as a part of the Marxist-Leninist trend, and do not agree to any special trend or any special discipline. You are angry because we do not recognize the Internationalists as a special trend inside of the Marxist-Leninist movement. You are trying to use the memory of the Internationalists to justify the "special relationship." You are counterposing the "Internationalist Movement" to the Marxist-Leninist movement. That is why you say that the "Internationalist Movement" had to "merge" with the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. Since it had to merge with it, it follows that the Internationalists were *distinct from* the Marxist-Leninist movement.

Actually, in the above passage you are not direct and straightforward. You hide the fact that you hold that there is presently, and not just in the past, an Internationalist "trend." And the crux of the matter is that you hold that today, at the present, there are several different Marxist-Leninist trends inside the Marxist-Leninist movement. Indeed, you are trying to enforce the discipline of a separate trend upon us with your letters of December 5. In Section VI-S we already showed that you both advocate and take actions on the basis of the concept of several trends in the international Marxist-Leninist movement. We shall come back to this question in a moment. But first we shall finish up some of the questions of history that you have raised in the above passage.

formed. But the (Canadian) Internationalists, on the basis of the activity of its founder in the creation and shaping of the other two organizations, is described in the documents of the Internationalists as the center and inspiration of the entire "Internationalist Movement." By January 1970, all the organizations of the Internationalists had been supplanted by their successors. But the leadership of CPC (M-L) continues to make demagogic use of the phrase "Internationalist Movement" in order to indicate various forces over whom it claims a "special relationship." The fact that this term has more to do with the pretensions of the leadership of CPC(M-L) and their need to find a pleasant-sounding screen for their international factional activities than to any genuine concern for history is shown, among other things, by the fact that the "Internationalist Movement" is supposed to include the Marxist-Leninists in certain countries where the Internationalists never existed. For example, there never was any organization of "internationalists" in the U.S. Hence 10 years after the demise of the Internationalists, the leadership of CPC (M-L) is still trying to build up a mystique around these organizations of the 1960's as one of its justifications for its attempts to build up its own factional "trend." — W.A.

What can it mean to say that "the Internationalist Movement came up as one movement and merged with the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement"? Does it mean that the Internationalists in various countries were separate from and fought against the Marxist-Leninist parties in their countries? Or that they were separate from the Marxist-Leninist parties in their countries and then merged with them? No, neither of these two things is true. The Internationalist organizations in various countries gave rise to the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties. But then does it mean that the Internationalists arose as a movement with an ideology separate from and distinct from Marxism-Leninism and only later adopted the Marxist-Leninist ideology, thus merging with the international Marxist-Leninist movement? If this is what you mean, we also disagree. The only "Internationalist Movement" which we acknowledge any relation to are the Internationalists who were loyal to Marxism-Leninism. Or do you mean that there are many different varieties of Marxism-Leninism, and the Internationalists were one such variety that later merged with a number of others in the international Marxist-Leninist movement? But we don't accept the idea of different varieties of Marxism-Leninism, whether national brands or international cartels. There is only one scientific ideology of Marxism-Leninism, which is an integral revolutionary theory that is valid all over the world.

Thus it is no wonder that you have so far not dared to elaborate your views on the Internationalists as a trend. Put forward consistently, such an idea inevitably leads to the concept of different varieties of Marxism-Leninism or to the concept that this trend is not based on Marxism-Leninism but on something else. You take actions based on your view that the Internationalists are a separate "trend," but you refuse to elaborate this view of yours.

We do not agree with your concept of the Internationalists as a "trend." We supported the Internationalists and we still support their memory because they were Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries. They were loyal to Marxism-Leninism, to revolution and to the international communist movement. We regard any attempt to set the Internationalists apart as distinct from being loyal contingents of the international communist movement as opposition to the real spirit of the Internationalists. And this is the view that we have held ever since we came into contact with the Internationalists, over ten years ago. You demagogically accuse us of "rewriting this history." But it is you who are going against the previously accepted views on this question with your theory of an Internationalist "trend." You yourself admit this indirectly when you write that this idea is a "concept that we [the leadership of CPC(M-L) — ed.] have advanced." You had to advance this concept to us be-

cause it was a new concept, one different from the previously accepted views on this question. At least, one separate from the views that we have always accepted and advocated.

Furthermore, you do not define at all what you mean by the "Internationalist Movement." For example, unlike the situation in certain other countries, there was never in the U.S. any organization by the name of the "Internationalists." The roots of our Party and its predecessors go back deep into the revolutionary mass movements of the 60's and 70's, and these roots are distinct from the Internationalists. Our relationship to the Internationalists comes about on the basis of the unity of the Marxist-Leninists. In May 1969 the Canadian Internationalists organized the Regina Conference, which was the first Conference of North American Marxist-Leninists. As a result of the encouragement and correct orientation given by this conference, the American Communist Workers Movement (Marxist-Leninist), a predecessor of the MLP, USA, was founded by the comrades of the Cleveland Workers Action Committee. The ACWM(M-L) was built and functioned as the single nationwide center for the U.S. Marxist-Leninists. The ACWM(M-L) was eager to learn from the experience of the Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries in Canada because it regarded them as Marxist-Leninists, not as members of some distinct and separate trend. Therefore the ACWM(M-L), the COUSML and the MLP, USA have attentively studied the experience of the Internationalists and the various parties descended from them, supported them against the neo-revisionists, fought side by side with them and cherished them. We have paid special attention to the experience of the CPC(M-L), the first party to be reconstituted on the Marxist-Leninist basis in North America. It is a tribute to the proletarian internationalist spirit of the ACWM(M-L) and COUSML that they united so closely with other fighting contingents of the international communist movement such as the parties descended from the Internationalists to the point that the ACWM(M-L) and COUSML were themselves regarded, and correctly so, as "Internationalists." The MLP, USA has a high valuation of the historical role played by the Internationalists. But it is clear that the relationship between the ACWM(M-L) and COUSML and the parties descended from the Internationalists was based on common adherence to Marxism-Leninism and common dedication to the revolutionary struggle and to the resultant mutual support and cooperation. It was not based in any way on adherence to any trend or ideology or special sectarian principles apart from revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. It was not based on developing some special relationships apart from the international communist movement, but on the ACWM(M-L) and COUSML taking up their role as

contingents of the international communist movement.

But, for that matter, even as regards the parties which are descended from organizations called the "Internationalists," it still has to be defined in what sense these parties can be grouped into an "Internationalist Movement." This is not at all obvious and you refrain from any explanation. The Internationalists were loyal to Marxism-Leninism and to the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement, not to a separate trend or sect. It is against the whole spirit of the Internationalists to counterpose them to the other Marxist-Leninist parties. The unity of the Internationalists of different countries was also a manifestation of unity of the Marxist-Leninists. In this serious question of principle, vague phrases and hints don't suffice. It is not sufficient to refer to the history of relations of the various parties that considered themselves "Internationalists," or to use the phrase "parties that came out of the Internationalists," a phrase which, as we have pointed out above, excludes us. It is necessary to analyze that history deeply and correctly.

Now we will return to the fact that, despite the deceptive words in your letters of December 5, you are advocating that *at the present time* the Internationalists are a separate trend within the Marxist-Leninist movement. In the discussions between the representatives of our two Parties at the time of the 6th Consultative Conference, you put forward the following:

"In practical terms, not political, there are the Marxist-Leninist parties that came out of the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism led by the PLA and those who come out of the Internationalists. There is a question of merging them as one trend. The historical significance of the Internationalists and the work we have done shouldn't be underestimated: 1) common struggle; 2) relations and unity. Should utilize this as a force to develop strong relations in the International Communist Movement. In the present situation, the parties coming from the Internationalists can make a big contribution, utilizing the existing strength in the struggle against revisionism and opportunism. While I [CPC(M-L)'s representative — ed.] was in Albania, I came to the view of the need for a joint statement of the Parties from the Internationalists. I went to XXX and YYY to propose one or two informational meetings to exchange views, particularly regarding the international situation and the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement, and a joint statement of the Parties, ... (continues with further discussion of the joint meeting and joint statement) ..." (From our minutes)

Thus you are putting forward the theory of the existence of different Marxist-Leninist trends in the international Marxist-Leninist movement. Once again we stress that the central point of this thesis of yours is that you are clearly not referring to the question of the Marxist-Leninist trend versus the revisionist trends, but to different Marxist-Leninist trends. You put forward the idea of strengthening the trends as trends as the alleged path of strengthening the international Marxist-Leninist movement. We, on the contrary, think that such a theory of "two (or more) trends" inside the Marxist-Leninist movement is in fact fraught with the danger of unprincipled splits and wild factionalism.

It can also be seen from your description of the trends that you have a great deal of difficulty describing the basic features characterizing the two trends. In order to do so, you counterpose the parties from the Internationalists to those that came up in the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism. Even aside from the historical and factual points that we have raised earlier in this section, this classification is utterly astonishing to us. The Internationalists themselves came up in the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism and supported the struggle of the Party of Labor of Albania. Indeed, it is one of the many repulsive features of this theory of "two (or more) trends" that it places the Internationalists into a separate trend away from the Party of Labor of Albania. But where would we all be without the historic struggles against revisionism waged by the Party of Labor of Albania and without the Party of Labor of Albania's trenchant ideological work! How can one avoid feeling extremely close to the glorious Marxist-Leninist fighters from Albania! We find it a source of great and inexhaustible strength that we are in the same trend as the Party of Labor of Albania, the trend of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. The triumphant advance of the Party of Labor of Albania and the construction of socialism in Albania is a victory for the proletarian trend everywhere, for the trend of Marxism-Leninism, and it is precisely this feeling that should be inculcated in the working class of the whole world. This is the only proletarian internationalist conception of the issue of trends!

You raise the issue, as the basis of the concept of an Internationalist "trend," that there is a history of having developed relations over the years. But if that is taken as the basis of a "trend," then the issue inevitably arises that the other parties too fall into several or many groupings. This is not to mention the tremendous difficulties that would accompany any attempt to divide the international Marxist-Leninist movement on any kind of objective basis into groupings based on historical relations. It is impossible to do so. Nevertheless, it is clear that your theory of "two trends" inevitably becomes a theory of quite a

few trends, if it is elaborated with any consistency. That is why we call it a theory of "two (or more) trends," a theory of "many trends." Once Marxism-Leninism is given up as the common bond uniting the world's Marxist-Leninists, but instead something else is taken as the basis of developing "trends," then many different groupings or "trends" can be brought into existence. Still, you divide the whole movement into two, but that is because you are simply dividing it into "us" versus "them." We do not agree with this attitude towards the other Marxist-Leninist parties of the world. It is not Marxist-Leninist nor proletarian internationalist, but an ugly, corrosive sentiment opposed to the spirit of fighting under the inspiring banner of world Marxism-Leninism.

We are opposed to the idea that the way to consolidate the international Marxist-Leninist movement is to consolidate "trends." We are in favor of the internationalist rallies of Marxist-Leninist parties, of bilateral and multilateral meetings and of the further strengthening of the various forms of cooperation, consultation and joint action between the Marxist-Leninist parties. But the strengthening of the relations is not for the sake of consolidating new "trends" of various sorts, and such an idea of establishing various "trends" will in fact harm the process of developing closer relations. Furthermore, a unified international Marxist-Leninist communist movement cannot be regarded as an alliance or merger of different trends. As far as the issue of "trends" goes, the task is to develop the trend of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism in struggle against the various revisionist and opportunist trends. The relationship of the question of trends to the question of unity was expressed well by Comrade Enver Hoxha when he wrote:

"unity will be re-established in the communist movement and the socialist camp, but it will be re-established by the Marxist-Leninists without revisionists and traitors and in resolute struggle against them." (*Report to the 5th Congress of the PLA* as cited in *The History of the PLA*, Ch. VII, Sec. 2, p. 605)

The same conception of the relation of the issue of trends to the question of unity was stressed by Comrade Agim Popa at the Scientific Sessions in Albania of October 1978. He stated:

"Real unity in the Marxist-Leninist communist movement is possible only on the basis of unwavering loyalty to Marxism-Leninism which shows the proletariat and the peoples the only correct road to their social and national liberation. ... It is precisely deviation from the principles and teachings of Marxism-Leninism that is the main cause of the split in the workers' and communist movement. As in the case of the be-

trayal of Marxism-Leninism by the Second International and that by the Khrushchovite revisionists in the 50's and 60's, the emergence on the scene and crystallization of the present-day Chinese revisionism with its counterrevolutionary theory of 'three worlds' has caused a split in the Marxist-Leninist movement today. ...

"Experience shows that *only on the basis of a merciless struggle against opportunism and revisionism of all hues is it possible to preserve, strengthen and continuously temper sound Marxist-Leninist unity.* ... They [the PLA and the other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties — ed.] have waged and are waging an uncompromising principled struggle against all those who betray Marxism-Leninism and thus split the revolutionary unity, be they Soviet, Yugoslav, Italian, French, Spanish, Chinese or others." ("The Marxist-Leninist Parties — the Leading Force of the Revolutionary Movement Today," *Problems of Current World Development*, Tirana, pp. 103-104, emphasis as in the original)

In your letters of December 5 you try to tone everything down and slur over the issues involved by such things as talking of "the Internationalist Movement" instead of the Internationalist "trend." But this makes no difference. Call it what you will — trends, groupings, movements, headquarters — it makes no difference. The basic fallacy remains: the idea that not Marxism-Leninism but something else is the basis of unity between the Marxist-Leninist parties. There are only two choices. Either: the consolidation of different "trends" in the international Marxist-Leninist movement. Or: the vigorous development of the Marxist-Leninist trend in life-and-death struggle against the opportunist and revisionist trends. Those are the two possible conceptions of the matter.

Your thesis of "two (or more) trends inside the international Marxist-Leninist movement" is a dangerous and fallacious one. And it is closely related to and intertwined with your theory of the "special relationship" between our two Parties. These theories of "special relationship" and "two (or more) trends" explain why you on one hand deny that the fraternal ties between our two Parties are part of the usual fraternal ties between fighting contingents of international communism, while on the other hand you insist that these fraternal ties have great international importance everywhere. In Section VIII-A, we showed how you insisted that to regard our ties as part of the general ties between the parties of international communism was just "intellectualist balderdash to cover up the entire history of the fraternal relations between COUSML...and CPC(M-L)." In

this way, you negated the Marxist-Leninist norms and insisted on a "special relationship" outside these norms. However, at the same time, you also write:

"19. Then yet another shameless and demagogic example of 'American exceptionalism' with which you want to bedazzle us. 'We believe that the cooperation of our Parties in the struggle against imperialism and revisionism has great significance for North America'. You can believe whatever you like because you are hell-bent on provocation, but the genuine and revolutionary cooperation between CPC(M-L) and COUSML has *inestimable significance everywhere for the struggle for revolution and socialism.*... But such is your peculiar analysis and exceptionalism that you want to carve out the proletariat of the United States and the proletariat of Canada and the proletariat of Mexico from the international proletariat and isolate and detach it from the struggle of the international proletariat...all those who wish to smash this cooperation under the pretext of creating a private 'Marxist-Leninist' movement of North America will come to no good end." (p. 7, emphasis added)

You stress the "inestimable significance everywhere" of the "special relationship" between our two Parties because you view this "special relationship" as part of building up a "trend" which should play a big international role. As usual, in trying to defend this idea you fall into contradiction after contradiction and come out with astonishing positions. You bludgeon us with the term "American excep-

VIII-C: The double standard and the question of equality

You have insisted on a double standard in the relations between our two Parties. Part of your theory of "two (or more) trends" is your conception that the leadership of CPC(M-L) has special prerogatives and rights within its "trend." This indeed is central to the "special relationship" between our two Parties which you are fighting so hard for. This is the heart of the "special relationship."

Thus it is not surprising that in your letters of December 5 you openly complain that we have given up the formulation that CPC(M-L) is the leading party in North America. You write:

"...but it is we who are astonished at your 180-degree turn against our Party. From being *the Party which is leading in North America*, CPC (M-L) now 'underestimates the struggle against American opportunism.' What a fraud!" (p. 5, emphasis added)

As we have pointed out in Section VI-E, you are accusing us of a "180-degree turn" because it is you

who are taking a hostile stand against our Party. Let us examine some of your formulations of your "exceptionalist" position of advocating a "special relationship" between our two Parties outside of the scientific Marxist-Leninist norms. You are painting regional cooperation in such ugly colors as a "private 'Marxist-Leninist' movement of North America" and as "peculiar analysis and exceptionalism" — at a time when regional cooperation including regional joint statements and regional multilateral meetings is one of the methods being used to strengthen the ties between the parties in the international Marxist-Leninist movement — while you yourselves are advocating the division of the international Marxist-Leninist movement into different "trends." And the difference between regional cooperation and the division into "trends" can roughly be compared to the difference between having party bodies based on a production and territorial basis and having party bodies based on each having its own ideological platform. Your thesis of "two (or more) trends" inevitably boils down, when put forward consistently, to the idea of the legitimate existence of different varieties of Marxism-Leninism, one for each trend. The fact that you want to create and use a "special relationship" between our two fraternal Parties as a model with "inestimable significance everywhere" in the international Marxist-Leninist movement goes to show how extremely important it is for our Party to insist on its principled stand against the "special relationship" and against the theory of "two (or more) trends" in the international Marxist-Leninist movement.

leading role in North America. For example, in discussions with our delegation to the Third Congress of the CPC(M-L), you put forward the following view in reference to the situation in the U.S.:

"The opportunists are finished...."

"Anyway, CPC(M-L) is on the agenda one way or another. All of the fears of these guys came true. They were scared that the American proletariat will follow CPC(M-L) — now it will come true. For us this is a matter of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism but for them it is a petty thing."

In the same discussion you came back to this point and said:

"In North America there must be very strong unity between the Marxist-Leninists. This will be created on the dead body of American chauvinism."

You elaborated this as follows:

"The key point is American chauvinism is on the way out. It will work this way: anywhere COUSML takes its line they say that this is CPC(M-L)'s line. The question then arises, why don't you follow CPC(M-L)? This is a straightforward question, why are you not following Marxism-Leninism. CPC(M-L) is the party which has consistently advanced Marxism-Leninism. They have to fight this and they are lost, they have already lost." (From minutes of discussions of February 6, 1977)

This is an amazing idea. For the issue that was fought over intensely in the U.S. in 1977 was Marxism-Leninism or "three worlds-ism," it was the fight against social-chauvinism, and it was the fight in defense of socialist Albania. It was not over whether or not to follow CPC(M-L).

In the discussions of January 11-13, 1978, you put forward the idea that "when Albania recognized CPC(M-L), they recognized the whole trend." This is another astonishing statement! This type of statement begins to draw from the theory of "two (or more) trends" the conclusion that the affairs of the international Marxist-Leninist movement will be decided by the relations between the heads of the "trends." Furthermore, you attribute your conception of "two (or more) trends" to the Party of Labor of Albania. But there can be no doubt about the opposition of the PLA to this conception of "trends."

And in the discussions of November 1978, you said the following:

"He [the representative of CPC(M-L) — ed.] spoke about the diminishing role of CPC(M-L), PCDN and NPC in the U.S. Slowly and slowly these things are coming to an end. They played an important role at one time, but now it is COUSML (which is) more and more giving the line and CPC(M-L)'s role must come to an end.

They [the leadership of CPC(M-L) — ed.] (stated that) they know this and they are not unhappy about this."

Far from being happy about giving up a "special relationship" with our Party, you are fighting for it. But the main point about this statement is that it clearly shows that you have given yourself a role in the U.S. outside the proper norms of fraternal relations between parties. That is why you view this role as diminishing with the growth and strengthening of your fraternal party. This speaks volumes about what type of role you are talking about. The role and influence of the international Marxist-Leninist movement in the U.S. grows tremendously, and does not diminish, as its fighting contingent in the U.S., our Party, develops and strengthens itself. Indeed, one could say that the influence of the international Marxist-Leninist movement in any particular country is manifested mainly through the growth and development of its fighting contingent in that country. But you have counterposed your role in the U.S. to the development of the Marxist-Leninist Party in the U.S. This shows that you are talking about a role outside the Marxist-Leninist norms and opposed to the application of the party principle in the U.S. And it is notable that you are still talking about this role in November 1978, over nine years after the formation of the Marxist-Leninist center in the U.S. with the founding of the ACWM(M-L) in May 1969.

We could quote many more statements of yours on this theme. Nevertheless the general drift of your conception is already quite clear. It is clear that you believe that you have special rights with regard to the parties in your "trend," or, in any case, with regard to our Party. That is why you are upset over our dropping the formulation of CPC(M-L) as the leading party in North America.

It is very significant that the current series of problems in our relations did not arise as a dispute over the phrase "leading role of CPC(M-L) in North America." They arose over our defense of the organizational integrity of our Party and our insistence on the necessity to apply the party principle consistently. For irrespective of whether or not we have given the formulation of the "leading role of CPC(M-L) in North America," our view was always that the proper Marxist-Leninist norms should be upheld. Far from going from one extreme to the other, we have shown iron consistency on this issue for the whole period since the start of the current series of problems in our fraternal relations in late 1975. The meeting of March 4, 1978 is a good example of this. You walked out of this meeting and exerted great pressure on us, as we have detailed in Section VII-A-5. But at that time we still upheld the phrase of "the leading role of CPC(M-L) in North America." But in our written speech, which you did not let us

present, we explained that "In order for CPC(M-L) to exercise its leading role, the correct norms of relations must exist between the CPC(M-L) and the COUSML." Thus we only recognized leadership within the Marxist-Leninist norms. But for your part, you walked out of the meeting as soon as you saw that we were bringing up for the agenda the questions of your violations of the norms of relations between fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties.

In order to insist on your special prerogatives and special rights, you have gone against the Marxist-Leninist norms. That is why you ridicule our assertion that the norms and relations between fraternal parties are regulated by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and sarcastically write: "But what are these 'norms and relations' in concrete terms?" (p. 2) Having raised this question, you then refuse to answer it. You raise this question solely to mock the Marxist-Leninist norms as allegedly not "concrete." But in fact these norms are vital for the development of proper relations in the international Marxist-Leninist movement.

Comrade Agim Popa elaborated on these norms at the Scientific Sessions in Albania in October 1978. He wrote:

"Proletarian internationalism today requires that every fraternal party and genuine proletarian revolutionary give full support to the Marxist-Leninist movement in other countries and do everything within their power to strengthen sound militant unity in the Marxist-Leninist communist movement as a whole. *This unity is based on rigorous respect of the principles governing relations among fraternal parties and socialist countries* — principles of independence and complete equality, non-interference in one another's internal affairs, consultation, talks and mutual comradely criticism in working out common views and overcoming differences which might arise, mutual help and fraternal internationalist support. Violation of these principles, attempts to impose the views of one party on others and the use of pressure to force others to submit to its chauvinist dictate, the use of 'aid' as a means of pressure and dictate, divisive activities and brutal interference in the internal affairs of fraternal parties, etc., are all actions which have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism and gravely impair unity." ("The Marxist-Leninist Parties — the Leading Force of the Revolutionary Movement Today," *Problems of Current World Development*, Tirana, 1979, pp. 105-06, emphasis as in the original)

Comrade Popa vigorously denounced the Chinese revisionists for their violations of these norms. Among other things, he pointed out that:

"Many facts, well-known to both the PLA and

the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties prove that for the Chinese leadership, the fundamental criterion for recognizing these parties and establishing relations with them is not adherence to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, but adherence to the Chinese line." (*Ibid.*, p. 106)

These norms not only have great importance in the struggle against Chinese revisionism, but they also played a big role in the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism. Commenting on the publication of the nineteenth volume of Enver Hoxha's works, *Zeri i Popullit* discussed the role of the norms of relations:

"The violation by the Soviet revisionists and other revisionists of the norms regulating the relations between the Marxist-Leninist parties, is seen in the violation by them, from the beginning, of the principle of equality, which is one of the main features distinguishing these relations. The Marxist-Leninist parties are equal in the relations between them. The strict observation of this principle is a condition to ensure their real and unbreakable Marxist-Leninist unity. Being aware of the content and importance of the principle of equality, the Party of Labor of Albania (and) Comrade Enver Hoxha, at the Moscow Meeting and on other occasions, exposed the view and stands of Khrushchovite revisionists who divided the parties into mother and daughter parties, into parties that have the baton and parties that obey blindly to their will, into big parties and small parties, into old parties that as such have privileges and into young parties, into parties that can submit to no principle and norm and into parties that should accept the arbitrariness and chauvinism of the big party, into parties that have the monopoly in the ideological interpretations and into parties that should accept and blindly apply these interpretations, even if they are anti-Marxist." (As quoted by the Albanian Telegraphic Agency and cited in the Norman Bethune Institute edition of *Through the Pages of Volume XIX of the Works of Comrade Enver Hoxha*, Canada, 1976, p. 46)

These norms are quite "concrete." The issue is that you are violating these norms and replacing them with the "special relationship." The "special relationship" is an utter negation of the equality between parties, and in practice it includes the violation of the organizational integrity of our Party and opposition to the application of the party principle in the U.S. By threatening our fraternal relations and taking a hostile stand to our Party on the basis of fighting for a "special relationship," you are judging our Party not on the basis of adherence to Marxism-Leninism, but on whether or not we disagree with you on anything, on whether or not we are

agreed to be part of a special "trend" inside the international Marxist-Leninist movement. In this letter, we detail your violation of numerous of the Marxist-Leninist norms governing relations. It is this violation of the Marxist-Leninist norms that lies

VIII-D: On the epithet "peculiar"

In your letters of December 5 and elsewhere you have taken to denouncing our views as "peculiar." With this epithet, you show that you regard it as wrong in principle for us to ever give any views different from yours. It is not a question of whether these views are right or wrong, based on Marxism-Leninism or not, in accord with the concrete situation or not, but simply that they are "peculiar" as they differ from yours. You seem to feel that this label of "peculiar" is an irrefutable and crushing refutation of us. You do not have to elaborate why this or that thesis of ours is wrong. Horrors! You even have developed whole theories denouncing such elaboration as allegedly being "polemics" or "two-line struggle" or "ideological struggle." All you feel that it is necessary to do is to brand our views "peculiar."

Thus on page 15 you brand the phrase "idealist anti-revisionism" as "peculiar jargon." And on page 22 you write that "U.S. neo-revisionism is the American expression of the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism" is another peculiar theory." On pages 22-23 you denounce our arguments in favor of struggle against the "RCP, USA" as the "peculiar theory of 'weak link'." Indeed, you denounce our struggle against domestic opportunism in the U.S. as both "peculiar" and even a manifestation of "American exceptionalism." You go to the extent of summing up that the problem between our two Parties lies in our coming forward with peculiar theories. You write:

"It is this strong opposition of our Party to the concoction of various peculiar 'theses' and pet 'theories' which has put the damper on this worm to the extent that he is wildly swinging his head in all directions." (p. 23)

In the meetings of early August between our two Parties, you also sounded this theme. You denounced the movement against social-chauvinism as a "peculiar movement" and claimed that it was a "different preoccupation" than the international movement. For example, you raised such issues as whether or not the Party of Labor of Albania has a

VIII-E: The leadership of CPC(M-L) vehemently rejects any and all criticism

Another striking feature of the "special relationship" is that you vehemently oppose any criticism of the leadership of the CPC(M-L). This is clear from your letters of December 5. You justify your entire

at the root of the problems in the practical relations between our two fraternal Parties.

In the rest of Section VIII, we will go into various more particular aspects of your denial of the Marxist-Leninist norms.

movement against social-chauvinism and so forth.

Thus you try to make a pretense that by "peculiar" you mean different from the accepted theories in the international Marxist-Leninist movement. In Section X we shall therefore go through a number of our allegedly "peculiar" theses and compare them with the theses given by Comrade Enver Hoxha, by the Scientific Sessions in Albania of October 1978 and other such sources. We shall see that generally speaking the very theses you denounce as "peculiar" are the ones which are the most orthodox. Your raving about our "peculiar" and "exceptionalist" theories is just demagoguery, emotionalism and a big smoke screen. The bitter truth is that behind this smoke screen of outcries about "peculiar" theses, you are seeking to force us to adopt various theses of yours which either are genuinely and truly "peculiar" or are outright opposed to the orthodox theses of Marxism-Leninism.

Indeed, one cannot help but notice that it is at least a little strange that you are raving on about our "peculiar" theses and about theses allegedly different from those of the international movement, when at the same time you are advocating the division of the genuine Marxist-Leninists into "two (or more) trends." On the one hand you are trying to enforce a "special relationship" with us and to negate the international norms, while on the other you rave against "peculiar" theses. This would be comical if it wasn't such a tragedy. In fact, it is the most disgusting, revolting and repulsive hypocrisy.

Thus all your cries about "peculiar" mean is that certain of our theses are different from yours. Your crushing irony about our "peculiar concoctions" simply means that you refuse to deal seriously with our views and that you prefer to use the method of dictation. With this epithet of "peculiar," you are insisting that we should support your views independently of whether they are correct or not, just because they are your views. The epithet "peculiar" shows the brutal dictation inherent in the "special relationship."

hostile stance against our Party as an allegedly legitimate response to our letter of fraternal criticism of December 1. You call comrades "agent-provocateurs" and "national and social chauvinists" on the

basis that they have criticized or even simply disagreed with you. You accuse us of campaigns to damage the relations between our two Parties on the basis that we have maintained over a period of time our views in the disagreements between the Parties. You demand a split in our leadership and you boycott our Party all because we criticized you. This is not just opposition to criticism, this is all-out war on your part against any criticism of your views.

You explain your stand by stressing that criticism of yourself is incompatible with the maintenance and strengthening of fraternal ties. You write:

"18. Having reduced the relations of our two Parties to this level, you carry on with your demagoguery. 'We stand for strengthening the relations between our two Parties.' Do you really? What does this mean in concrete terms? Is this putrid and foul letter of December 1, 1979, a model example of your windbaggy of your 'stand for strengthening the relations between our two Parties'? With such a stand of 'strengthening,' you do not need any wreckers, splitters or disruptors at all. These 'strengtheners' will amply do the job for you." (p. 7)

According to you, criticism is an activity of "wreckers, splitters or disruptors." Well, we firmly declare that our letter of December 1, 1979 is indeed a good example of proper, principled, constructive and comradely criticism. We, who had good reason to be angry and outraged with your actions, maintained a calm and patient stand. Our letter of December 1 is constructive and fraternal. It takes great pains to develop the analysis of the issue at stake and to seek to explain to you the issues. It is entirely lacking in threats or ultimatums or insults of any kind. All it takes is the briefest comparison of our letter of December 1 and your letters of December 5 to see the wide gulf between fraternal criticism and brutal pressure and dictation.

You also stress your view that criticism of yourself and friendly relations are incompatible by denouncing the fact that we invited you to send delegations to the Preparatory Conference for the Founding of the MLP, USA and to the Founding Congress of the MLP, USA in our letter of November 29, 1979 while we criticized your sale of the English translation of the Palacios book to the "RCP, USA" in our letter of December 1, 1979. You rage against how such things could be done in letters only a few days apart. You denounce this as "the tricks of the entire lying trade" and as having a "forked tongue" (p. 4). But where is the contradiction between the two letters? There is only a contradiction if you believe that criticism is incompatible with fraternal relations, if you believe that our absolute agreement with you, right or wrong so long as it's your views, is essential for fraternal relations. Later, in Section VIII-G, we shall

also see that it is hypocrisy, as you yourself have even denounced us in provocative and brutal ways and invited us to meetings in the very same letter. But this only shows that your opposition to criticism is part of your double standard. You are not opposed to all criticism in our relations. Oh no. You are only opposed to criticism of yourself.

You have gone to the extent that you have developed various theories against criticism. You call criticism of yourself "provocations." You denounced views separate from yours as "peculiar." And you have maintained the view that letters between parties and the elaboration of views concerning the disagreements are "polemics." For example, in our discussions of January 11-13, 1978 you denounced our letters, saying:

"Anyway I [the representative of CPC(M-L) —ed.] told (the COUSML representative) when he was here that we do not accept these letters. They are wrong and their language is not correct. Comrades do not polemicize against each other."

You gave these views repeatedly. Thus in the discussions of early September 1978 you stated:

"We have your letters and views. It seems that what you want is to make a polemic against our leadership...." (Minutes of the discussion of Friday afternoon, September 8, 1978)

It was in these discussions that you refused to speak to our NEC and insisted on speaking to only part of our delegation. You also used the device of denouncing every disagreement with you as a "polemic" in order to justify your opposition to the integrity of our party committees. When our delegation decided that the NC would have to decide on a certain proposal of yours, you withdrew the proposal (which had not been made seriously but on the spur of the moment) and stated:

"Why does everything have to go to your National Committee? You must have some plan. You want to polemicize against our leadership." (September 8, 1978)

This entire theory of criticism as "polemics" is wrong. The Party of Labor of Albania explained the fallaciousness of this theory in the *Letter of the CC of the Party of Labor and the Government of Albania to the CC of the Communist Party and the Government of China (July 29, 1978)*. This letter states:

"Among the Marxist-Leninist norms which regulate relations among communist parties there exists also that of the correct and reciprocal, principled and constructive, criticism of mistakes which are observed in the line and the activity of this or that party. Such a comradely criticism cannot be called polemics, as the Chinese leadership interprets this norm. Polemics, as the word itself indicates, means a state of

ideological and political struggle, it is a state in which non-antagonistic contradictions are transformed into antagonistic contradictions.

"...Whenever it [the PLA — ed.] has seen that the Communist Party of China adopted stands and took actions in opposition to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, in opposition to the interests of socialism and the revolution, it has pointed out the mistakes to, and criticized it in a comradely manner. This is borne out by written documents of our Party and State, which are in your possession. And what has the attitude of the Chinese leadership been? While it welcomed and highly praised the Party of Labor of Albania and the Albanian Government for their support for, and defense of, People's China, the Chinese side never welcomed the correct and principled remarks of our Party. ... Reasoning and acting according to the concepts and logic of a great power, of a great party and a great state, which considers itself an infallible genius, it has demonstrated that it knows no other way apart from dictate and imposition of its views on the others, especially on the smaller parties and states." (pp. 20-22)

"The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China did not reply to the principled

VIII-F: Opposition to the Marxist-Leninist norms on consultation and cooperation

We have already seen in Section VIII-A that you mock and ridicule the norms regulated by Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism for the relations between fraternal parties. You denounce them as not "concrete." As well, in your letters of December 5 you also single out the Marxist-Leninist norms on consultation and cooperation in particular. You write:

"In the final paragraph on page three of his Part Two, Joseph Green again uses demagoguery in the most shameless fashion in order to serve his pragmatic ends. He writes: 'This question of consultation and cooperation is, in our view, one of the most important questions of principles involved in the issue of the selling of the rights to Palacios' book to the 'RCP, USA'. *Why is this one of the most important questions of principle?* It is because this worm has found out through this so-called 'consultation' a 'fact' through which he can wriggle with to nail the CPC(M-L). *There is no other reason whatsoever.*" (p. 13, emphasis added)

And earlier in your letters you denounced as "demagogic nonsense" (p. 6) our assertion that "the building and strengthening of our cooperation require that the problems that emerge be dealt with straight-

and correct letter of our Party. The Chinese leadership never gave our Party any explanation on this question of so great importance. Mao Tsetung limited himself to a verbal statement to the effect that 'we will not reply to your letter because we do not want to stir up polemics'. In our view, which is in keeping with Leninist norms, the exchange of opinions, comradely criticism and each other's enlightenment are normal things between two communist parties. They can by no means be considered polemics." (p. 30)

We hold that you are committing a major error of principle when you oppose criticism as allegedly incompatible with fraternal relations. You have called criticism of your views and actions "polemics" and you have sought to impose the norm that views different from yours are "peculiar." But we think that the experience of the struggles against Chinese and Khrushchovite revisionism proves yet again the burning necessity of upholding the Marxist-Leninist norms on these questions. The truth is that, by opposing principled, fraternal and constructive criticism of yourself, you have violated the equality of our two Parties, imposed a double standard and posed as the leading party of a "trend," disagreement inside the "trend" with its leading party being considered a "provocation."

forwardly, calmly and openly, they must be looked at squarely in the face."

It is a sad thing to see a Marxist-Leninist party such as yours denounce the Marxist-Leninist norms. International cooperation and consultation is one of the most important principles involved in fraternal relations. By denouncing the importance of the norms governing consultation and cooperation you are showing once again that you are fighting to replace the Marxist-Leninist norms with the "special relationship." Indeed, as long as you uphold the "special relationship," as long as you regard any criticism of or disagreement with your views as simply "provocations," "polemics" or manifestations of "national and social chauvinism," then what possible value can you put on "consultation and cooperation"? According to the "special relationship," the issue is that we should simply implement this or that proposal of yours and adopt this or that view of yours, not consult and cooperate with you.

Look at how you describe bilateral discussions between our two Parties! You write:

"This worm pays lip-service to the norms and forms in words because for him these bilateral discussions are 'one of the most important' instruments for his own sinister ends, to pick up

information like a garbage collector which he can then hurl back against the genuine Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary forces." (p. 13, emphasis added)

What a grudge you have against consultation and cooperation! Thus it is not surprising at all that your opposition to the norms governing consultation and cooperation has been one of the important factors creating many problems in and putting many obstacles in the path of our practical relations. This has manifested itself in a number of ways.

One of the key issues is that you have opposed the proper revolutionary formality in our practical relations. In Sections II, VI and VII we have described various features of the methods of discussion you have insisted on in opposition to Marxist-Leninist formality. We have stood for revolutionary formality, for the use of party methods in the relations between the two Parties and in favor of the integrity of the party and of the party committees. For this reason, you have denounced us for years as "formalists." You have done this repeatedly. A typical example comes from the discussion of January 1978. In talking about the problems in our relations, you denounced formality. Our minutes of the discussion contain the following views put forward by you:

"He [the representative of CPC(M-L) — ed.] said that this formality is wrong. That it is now coming up internationally to use this business of non-interference in other parties to develop national and social chauvinism. These things look very innocent at first, but it is here that opportunism will attack."

And you drew the following conclusion:

"He [the representative of CPC(M-L) — ed.] charged that elements [in the leadership of COUSML — ed.] were using this formality to promote social-chauvinism."

Thus you converted the issue of revolutionary formality into the question of the norm of non-interference into the internal affairs of other parties. Very well. But you then denounced this Marxist-Leninist norm and described it as the source from which opportunism will attack the international communist movement. Indeed, you called this Marxist-Leninist norm a source of national and social-chauvinism.

In your letter you denounce us for having a "grocery list mentality." (p. 15 and elsewhere) This is another way you have invented of presenting the norms of consultation and cooperation in an ugly light. With this ugly and rather puzzling name, you defend your practice of holding casual, spur-of-the-moment and offhand discussions by castigating delegates who come prepared to deal with various issues as having a "grocery list mentality." As well, you are using the expression "grocery list mentality" to denounce us for asking you to carry through with

your obligations. You feel free to promise this or that and to propose agreements involving mutual responsibilities. But when we ask you to carry out your commitments or to take responsibility for your acts, you call this a "grocery list mentality." This devastating expression, "grocery list mentality," is another expression of the double standard of the "special relationship," a double standard which gives us all the obligations and gives you the freedom from any responsibility for your words and actions.

One of the most serious ways you oppose the ordinary norms of consultation and cooperation is through not elaborating or writing down your views. In Section VII-B we showed how over years you have failed to elaborate your views in documents and opposed even examining our documents. In this light, it is quite interesting that you try to deny the various theses you have very insistently urged on us over the years against the struggle against the domestic opportunists by saying:

"There is neither official nor unofficial documents of CPC(M-L) which can 'verify' the 'accuracy' of his wild slander and intellectualist hyperbole...." (p. 22)

This makes it clear that you oppose elaborating your ideas in documents not just because certain of these ideas are half-baked and undeveloped, but so that you can deny responsibility for them. This is an ugly, repulsive, unprincipled practice. This is why you have sometimes asked our delegates not to take notes and have conducted discussions in ways that make it difficult to keep good records. That is also why you curse so hard against being what you call "NAILED" to any definite position. It is a major cause of problems in our practical relations.

Nevertheless, the facts are that there is abundant documentation of your theories against the struggle against opportunism. We have our minutes of the discussions, which show you consistently developing such theses. There is your opposition to our struggle against opportunism. There are your public statements denouncing the struggle against opportunism as "two-line struggle." And many other sources. However, we cannot say exactly what "official and unofficial documents of CPC(M-L)" you have. If it is true that these theses of yours are not contained in such documents, then that shows that you are not only violating the Marxist-Leninist norms concerning fraternal relations, but you are also violating the Marxist-Leninist norms concerning the inner-party life of your own Party. Such key theses on the burning questions of the world Marxist-Leninist movement naturally should be thoroughly discussed in the appropriate party committees and elaborated in party documents. To fail to do so means to subject the Party to grave dangers and to flagrantly violate the Marxist-Leninist norms on party-building.

While you are opposed to revolutionary formality, you make an astonishing fetish out of the technicalities of form. Instead of elaborating your views, you have repeatedly used the method of submerging everything in a mass of trivialities over form and trying to trip us up in this Alice in Wonderland maze of form independent of content. This maze of technicalities is used both to oppose and dissolve the actual questions of revolutionary formality and to try to put us in the wrong over our disagreements on various issues without actually taking up the issues involved. It is quite striking that in your letters of December 5 you replace elaborating your views on the key issues at stake by instead raising all sorts of questions about whether or not we agreed to this or that proposal for discussions, whether we did or did not reply in precisely this or that form, and so on and so forth. You even reach the point of denouncing us as a "worm" and as refusing to talk openly to you because — we used a pair of parentheses in our letter to you of December 1! You write:

"And, like the worm he is, he sneaks in a parenthetical comment.... Now why did Joseph Green not bare himself to his 'dear fraternal comrades' and write this comment *without parenthesis*?" (p. 16, emphasis added)

This complaint is the last word in pettifogging sophistry and empty juggling with forms! In Section VI we showed that your picture of our discussions and agreements was a fantasy picture, full of outright lies and incredible distortions. But with these fantasies about form, you try to tie things up in a thousand technical points.

Let us examine an example of your method in action. On page 20 you give your conception of formal and informal discussions. Therefore this passage has some importance in giving your ideological views behind the way you conduct discussions. You write:

"among other things, our representative communicated to them [the representatives of the COUSML in the discussions of early October 1979 — ed.]:

"Thirdly, we think that we should be very vigilant on international developments. We would like to have formal discussions on this question. *Of course, by this, we don't mean these discussions are not formal. For us, formal means that with preparation on very definite topics and informal means just the exchange of views on already known and adopted positions.* We propose, if you like, and whenever you like, whenever it is convenient, to discuss this concept that we have advanced that the Internationalist Movement came up as one movement and merged with the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement, with no

exception. This is a very important issue. ... Further on in this talk, our representative requested: 'You should discuss this question. We have very important views on this matter. At the same time, if I for some reason am not available, then any comrade on the Central Committee can discuss this question with you.'

"CPC(M-L) has received to-date no answer to our formal request to COUSML, except this wild 'off-hand' provocative letter against our Party." (p. 20, emphasis added)

In Section VI-S, we have already shown that it is you who have been evading discussion on the question of your theory of "two (or more) trends" in the international Marxist-Leninist movement. And it has been you who has fought against formal meetings. As well, we neither agree with your account of this "proposal" nor that any "formal request" was made. Even by your own account, it was just another one of your casual, offhand proposals that you make in great numbers. You didn't even bother to put it in writing or to address it to any party committee of our Party or from any party committee of your Party.

But here we are interested in the rationale you give in your letters of December 5 for your alleged "proposal." This will give an example of how you play with forms, pulling norms and forms out of a hat, in order to mystify and oppose genuine revolutionary formality and to avoid dealing with the questions of content. You say that you want "formal discussions." But at the same time you insist that "we don't mean these discussions are not formal." Is it possible to make heads or tails of this? If you said that the discussions of early October were informal and that you wanted formal discussions, then at least one might be able to understand your "proposal." One could agree or disagree with such a proposal, but at least one could understand it. But you both insist that you can't talk in early October because you want "formal discussions" and simultaneously hold that the discussions of early October are indeed "formal." Charming, is it not? This shows that this entire "formal request" was just playing with forms in order to avoid discussion of the question of "two (or more) trends."

Furthermore you define "formal" in the passage we have quoted. You write: "For us, formal means that with preparation on very definite topics." That is, you say that formal discussions are those with preparations and informal discussions are those without preparations. This is rubbish. While preparations on definite topics can be an important, even an essential, part of a successful formal meeting (but also of a successful informal meeting), preparations are not the definition of formality. It is quite possible to have a "prepared" meeting that utterly violates party formality. For example, the composition of the

meeting may be illegitimate, or the meeting may have been convened to circumvent the authority of the appropriate party committees, or the meeting may be conducted informally and so forth. You are raising the issue of "preparation on very definite topics" one-sidedly as the criterion of formality in order to justify your negation of revolutionary formality and various Marxist-Leninist norms, such as your repeated attempts to circumvent the authority of our party committees.

Furthermore, it should be noted that your concern for "preparation on very definite topics" is blatant hypocrisy. You have continually held casual, offhand meetings with our delegations. Even at the formal meeting of delegations of our two Parties of March 4, 1978, you admitted that you were not prepared. Indeed you have even insisted on methods that make preparations rather difficult. For example, you have persisted in and defended the method of sending us urgent requests for a delegation to visit you, without notifying us of what the meeting is for, to say nothing of the subjects that you wish to take up for discussion. But of course your definition of "formal discussions" can serve as a prettification of this practice. For since you were asking for "informal discussions," hence preparations would go against your very definition of such discussions.

But in your passage you are not content to give only one definition of formal and informal discussions, that it depends on whether there are preparations on definite topics. You immediately proceed to give a second and totally different definition. No wonder you are so emphatic in denouncing the very idea of consistency that you curse the very thought of being, to use your own words, "NAILED" to a definite position. You say that "informal means just the exchange of views on already known and adopted positions." This is rather ambiguous. Nevertheless, it is also astonishing. One might think that "already known and adopted positions" were indeed a good subject for formal agreements, joint statements and so forth. But you insist that "already known and adopted positions" are for informal discussions, while presumably not yet adopted positions are for "formal discussions." Since it often happens that formal meetings are used not just for "the exchange of views" but for formal agreements — and indeed you emphasize this by putting "exchange of views" in the definition of "informal discussions" — it follows that your definition would presumably imply that formal discussions and agreements can be concluded on positions not yet adopted by the appropriate party committees. Such a definition clearly serves as a prettification of your practice of trying to circumvent our party committees and violate the organizational integrity of our Party.

For that matter, compare this last definition of

"formal" and "informal" to the discussions of early October 1979. Both Parties had "already known and adopted positions" on the theory of "two (or more) trends." The NC of the COUSML had already discussed this theory and rejected it. You were informed of this and of the reasoning and views of the NC on this question. For example, in the discussions of mid-September 1979 you were informed of our stand on this question, while we already knew as much of your views on this question as you have revealed to us to this day. Hence both sides had "already known and adopted positions." Hence why couldn't there be an "exchange of views on already known and adopted positions"? According to your definition, such an exchange of views not only could occur in an "informal discussion," it was literally your definition of "informal discussion." Yet you insisted that you could only engage in such an exchange of views in a "formal discussion." This blatant contradiction shows once again that your alleged "request" had nothing to do with providing you the opportunity to elaborate your views on "two (or more) trends." These contradictions show the unprincipled character of your quibbles on form. Your definitions of form are as flexible as a rubber band. They are not designed to be taken seriously, but to confuse and to put up a smoke screen.

Thus the only purposes of your concoction of a "formal request" is to hide your actual opposition to formal meetings and to allow you to curse us without ever dealing with the content of the disagreements between the two Parties. You do your best to distract from the issues involved and instead to shout very loudly about nonsensical quibbles. Thus you rave on in your letter after bringing up this alleged "formal request" as follows:

"CPC(M-L) has received to-date no answer to our formal request to COUSML, except this wild 'off-hand' provocative letter against our Party. This further reveals the hypocrisy and demagoguery of this Joseph Green with regard to his preachings on 'discussion and consultation' and 'notification' and 'approval', etc. Joseph Green claims that he speaks 'for the' National Executive Committee of the Central Organization of the U.S. Marxist-Leninists, but how can it be that he does not once mention in his provocative letters the request of CPC(M-L) for 'formal discussions'? If Joseph Green had such 'deep love required to tell the truth', which he hypocritically and demagogically claims to have, then how is it that he does not tell the truth concerning our request for 'formal discussions'? Furthermore, if Joseph Green had such concern about what he asserts to be the 'logical conclusion' of our Party going to bed with the 'three-worlders', then how is [it] that he refused to avail himself

of our request for 'formal discussions' where he could have presented his views and warned his 'dear fraternal comrades' for whom he professes his 'deep communist regards' as to the consequences or so-called 'logical conclusion' of 'the principles you are urging on us' if errors are allowed to grow?" (p. 20)

What nonsense!

What dramatic conclusions you can reach about us on the basis of your concocted "formal request" without bothering to discuss the content of our disagreements! You raise the issue of whether the "Internationalist Movement" can be regarded as a "movement" or "trend" distinct from the international Marxist-Leninist movement. You call this "a very important issue." And then you discuss it in a total of one-half of a sentence. You refuse to discuss it! Instead you waste paper on fantastic complaints about trivialities.

At this point, we would like to recall what actually happened at the discussion of early October. At those discussions you stressed your opposition to the slogan "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists." To back up your opposition to the "without and against" slogan, you also put forward that the international communist movement cannot, by definition, be split. Those discussions also dealt with the question of whether the RCP of Chile should be publicly attacked by name in the press and with certain

VIII-G: A double standard in everything

The double standard and utter hypocrisy pervade the "special relationship" through and through. Here we shall give some final examples of this.

In your letters of December 5 you denounce us up and down as having a "forked tongue" and engaging in "the tricks of the entire lying trade" (p. 4) because the NEC of the COUSML sent you two letters within days of each other, the letter of November 29 inviting delegations of your Party to come to the final conference of the COUSML and to the Founding Congress of the MLP, USA, while the letter of December 1 protests your sale of the English-language edition of the Palacios book to the "RCP, USA." In Section VIII-E we pointed out that there is no contradiction between these letters unless you hold that any criticism of yourself by us is incompatible with the maintenance of fraternal relations. Here we point out that your complaint is utter hypocrisy as you yourself have combined the most brutal provocative denunciations of us and invitations to us for delegations to attend this or that in the very same letter.

For example, consider your letter of September 9, 1977. We have already quoted from this shameful letter in Section VII-A-3. We point out there that this

other matters. The main proposal that you made on discussion was as follows:

"On October 22 we will send you a document.

It is against Mao Zedong Thought and is part of our preparations for the conference against Mao Zedong Thought.*... The document specifically takes up two erroneous concepts:

(1) 'At this time the most important struggle is against Mao Zedong Thought';

(2) 'The basis of unity is in opposition to Mao Zedong Thought.'

These are an indirect answer to you on our opposition to 'without and against'. It will be a theoretical document. If you feel it is useful you should approach us for discussion before the Conference. However, we are very busy from October 24-October 30, but if necessary we can organize to have discussion."

Needless to say, we never received this document, presumably because it was never written. Behind all your denunciation of us for not having accepted your alleged "formal request" for "formal discussion" stands the reality: you never prepared the promised document. And, according to your own account of your proposal, "formal means that with preparation on very definite topics." This is your method in action, your method which you put forward in opposition to the Marxist-Leninist norms on consultation and cooperation.

letter actually taunts the NEC of the COUSML to break relations with you. It threatens the relations between our two fraternal parties, holds that they are so bad that "a meeting of the delegations of the fraternal parties will be of no use whatsoever...." and says that "We had not expected that the situation would deteriorate to this extent." But the next to last paragraph of the letter invites us to the 5th Consultative Conference of the CPC(M-L).

Nevertheless we did not accuse you of having a "forked tongue." We denounced this letter of September 9 to you, but we accepted the invitation to the 5th Consultative Conference.

Another example is your letter of November 5, 1977. We have already discussed this letter in Section VII-A-4. This brutal letter announced that you had decided to return our letters, to receive no further letters from us and not to reply to our letters.

*This conference was never held. COUSML's proposed contribution to it was published in the December 5, 1979 issue of *The Workers' Advocate* under the title "Mao, Browder and Social-Democracy" and later was reissued in pamphlet form. — W.A.

But it again repeats the invitation to attend the 5th Consultative Conference.

But your hypocrisy concerning our letter of invitation to you to attend the Preparatory Conference and the Founding Congress goes further. You also sarcastically denounce our letter of November 29 because "this letter also stresses several times that this 'possibility' of 'get(ting) a remarkable picture' is uniquely available to CPC(M-L) because 'no other organization is being invited' either to this conference or to the congress." But what were your views about who should be invited? In the discussions at the 6th Consultative Conference, you stated:

"(In response to a question) It will be better to have just CPC(M-L) at the Congress. Unless you can have BBB there, then you can have everyone. Without a major party from the continent, it will not be good, it will look like you are developing a faction...."

Our decision to only invite CPC(M-L) may have been right or wrong, but you have no right to find sinister motives in it or wax sarcastic over it. For you urged this idea upon us. Once again, your actions manifest an amazing double standard.

Another example is that you denied that we launched a vigorous polemical struggle against the American opportunists in the latter part of 1976. You call this "the language of this charlatan replete with all the tricks of the lying trade." (p. 22) You write:

"Listen to the language of this charlatan replete with all the tricks of the lying trade: 'First of all, we wish to stress that time has shown that the polemics we launched against the domestic American opportunists were well-chosen and did raise the burning international issues.' However, this worm has simply forgotten in his frantic haste to vilify CPC(M-L) with a devastating political-ideological denunciation [in contrast to your letters of December 5, which no one could accuse of being "political-ideological" in the slightest — ed.] that he has already written and confessed that it is not these elements who 'chose' to 'launch' the 'polemics'! he has already 'recalled' to us earlier, on page four, 'that at the end of 1976 our two organizations agreed, on your suggestion, to a certain tactical co-ordination in the struggle against Chinese revisionism.' What he has written here is inaccurate itself, but this is not the central point here. [The content of the disagreements is never the issue put forward in your letters. For you, the issue is that we disagree with you, not what the disagreement is. Here you write that you disagree with us but can't even hint at what

that disagreement is. — ed.] The point is that Joseph Green forgets to mention that it was 'on your suggestion,' that is, it was our Party which advanced these proposals." (p. 22, emphasis added)

How can it be denied we launched and carried through a glorious, vigorous struggle against the Klonskyites and then extended the polemics to the conciliators and so forth? Oh no, for you, "this is not the central point here." For you, the central point is that allegedly everything which is done is done by your direction.

Consider the founding of the ACWM(M-L) as a result of the inspiration and orientation springing from the First Conference of North American Marxist-Leninists held in Regina, Canada in May 1969. If some American opportunists were to deny that ACWM(M-L) was the Marxist-Leninist center for the U.S. and to call this a "lie" or a "half-truth" or "not the central point" on the grounds that the founding of the ACWM(M-L) was inspired by a conference held in Canada and organized by Canadian Marxist-Leninists, then we would castigate such an opportunist as a chauvinist in the sharpest terms.

But you are giving the exact same argument when you deny that we "launched" polemics on the ground that we cooperated with you in this struggle and accepted various suggestions from you. And you are using this argument for the purpose of creating the opinion that allegedly our Party is incapable of giving leadership to the revolutionary struggle and that it cannot take a single step or avoid the most serious errors without directives from you. Hence it is not enough that we mentioned your suggestions "on page four," and on page five also but we must write and sing praises to it on every page. And hence our Party should dedicate its entire struggle and the results we have achieved to you. For you, the ideological and political issues are "not the central point here." "The point is that...it was our party which advanced these proposals." In short, you have replaced proletarian internationalism with attitudes more suitable to the "special relationship."

But what a fraud your posturing is! Not only is this posturing opposed to proletarian internationalism in theory, it is ludicrous in practice. For you have been fighting tooth and nail against our struggle against the American opportunists and you have been denouncing up and down the movement against social-chauvinism, while at the same time you want to claim all the credit for its successes. This reveals once again the dishonesty and hypocrisy that permeates your whole conception of the "special relationship."

SECTION IX: Opposition to the struggle against opportunism and revisionism, Chinese revisionism in particular, is the main ideological content of the December 5 letters

Your letters of December 5 also present a number of theses directed against the struggle against opportunism and revisionism in general and the struggle against Chinese revisionism in particular. Along with your theory of the "special relationship," your theses in opposition to the struggle against opportunism and revisionism constitute the main ideological content of your letters of December 5.

In your letters you denounce the struggle against opportunism as "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle'" (p. 12 and elsewhere), deny the present-day activation of revisionism and opportunism against the revolution, accuse our Party of "spreading pessimism, gloom and a siege mentality" (p. 3), especially oppose the struggle against the conciliators of social-chauvinism, and so forth. You yourself find "the crux of the matter" in the fierce struggle of our Party against Chinese revisionism. You write, denouncing our letter of December 1, as follows:

"9. Here is *the crux of the matter*: 'The struggle of the Marxist-Leninists against Chinese revisionism, "three-worldism" and so forth requires the closest international cooperation and the most serious and sober estimation.' *This is yet another concoction from your head.* It is not just the 'struggle of the Marxist-Leninists against Chinese revisionism, "three-worldism" and so forth' which 'requires the closest international cooperation and the most serious and sober estimation,' *but it is first and foremost the unity based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism against imperialism, social-imperialism and all reaction and against revisionism and opportunism of all hues and in the defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism and for the triumph of the revolution and socialism.* Your logic is two-faced. Thus, *if you are denounced by our Party for only highlighting 'Chinese revisionism, "three worldism" and so forth,* then, you can, of course, beat your breasts and scream blue murder that all along you really meant the struggle against imperialism, social-imperialism and all reaction and against revisionism and opportunism of all hues. But you do not mean this at all and *you will not be able to squirm and wriggle out of the sentence you have written which we have quoted above.*" (pp. 3-4, emphasis added)

In this passage, you denounce the struggle against Chinese revisionism as "only highlighting Chinese

revisionism, 'three worldism' and so forth." With the blatant dishonesty typical of your letters of December 5, you set up the straw man of "only" highlighting Chinese revisionism or advocating international cooperation *only* for the sake of the struggle against Chinese revisionism. You oppose the struggle against Chinese revisionism by counterposing it to everything under the sun and "first and foremost" to "unity." You vow that "the crux of the matter," hence the reason why you denounce our letter of December 1 and call us "agent-provocateurs," is that we "highlight" the struggle against Chinese revisionism. You are demanding that we tone down or stop altogether this or that aspect of the struggle against Chinese revisionism.

But we fully agree that one of the central issues, an important "crux of the matter," is whether or not to "highlight" the struggle against Chinese revisionism. We are vigorously waging this struggle, while you are floating one thesis after another against this struggle and subordinating this struggle to "unity," that is, to pragmatic considerations of one kind or the other.

A large number of the complaints that you raise against our Party all hinge upon or are related to your opposition to the struggle against revisionism and opportunism. This comes through clearly in such theses as the following:

— Your opposition to the Call of the NC of the COUSML of May 12, 1979 entitled "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists."

— Your opposition to our polemics against the conciliators of social-chauvinism, such as the social-democrats of the MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)" and the "three worlders" of the "RCP,USA." This began with your opposition to our article in the February 10, 1978 issue of *The Workers' Advocate* entitled "How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism."

— Your opposition to the movement against social-chauvinism.

— Your denunciation of the struggle against revisionism and opportunism as "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle'" and as "ideological struggle."

— Your complete underestimation of our principled and consistent struggle against our domestic American opportunists. You sneer that this struggle is "peculiar," "American exceptionalism" and even "beat(ing) not the beast [by which you are referring to the International Commission of the RCP of Chile, not to Mao Zedong Thought or the Chinese revision-

ists — ed.] but only its shadow."

— Your claim that struggle against Chinese revisionism puts one into the company of the centrists. You write that:

"...these centrists are also not only 'opposed' [the pencilled-in quotation marks around the word "opposed" change nothing — ed.] to the 'international trend of Chinese revisionism' but to its 'American' or any other expression, as well. Thus, you are in good company with these centrists." (p. 18)

— Your counterposing of polemics against domestic opportunists to polemics against the international opportunist trends. Also your bizarre counterposing of polemics in general to the elaboration of Marxism-Leninism and to the defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism. And numerous counterpositions, such as counterposing the struggle against opportunism to the other facets of revolutionary work and of party-building.

It is notable that you counterpose the struggle against Chinese revisionism to the question of "unity." You never refer directly to our stand of leading the movement against social-chauvinism and of fighting the conciliators, but repeatedly refer to the question of "unity." Thus you write:

"What is the ulterior motive behind the provocative actions of Joseph Green? *The real motive lurking underneath this perfidious activity is to push his anti-Leninist tactics on the question of building and strengthening the unity amongst the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces in one country and between genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and groups and shield 'American opportunism.'*" (p. 11, emphasis added)

"What has damaged the interests of COUSML and the proletariat in the United States is the anti-Leninist stand of Joseph Green on the question of building the unity of the Marxist-Leninists and his anti-Leninist analysis of American opportunism, as well as his clinging to the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle'." (p. 12, emphasis added)

"...the criticism and repudiation by CPC(M-L) of his tactics on the questions of building the unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists in the USA..." (p. 14, emphasis added)

"...for some time now, Joseph Green has been tearing his hair out because our Party has been opposing his anti-Marxist-Leninist road on the fundamental questions of the unity of the Marxist-Leninists, Party-building and the struggle against opportunism, as well as other, related questions." (p. 24, emphasis added)

Unity with whom? Who are the alleged "genuine Marxist-Leninists" with whom our Party does not wish to unite? You are expressing concern for the

conciliators and "centrists"! You are afraid to say this openly, so you keep beating around the bush. You are counterposing uniting the Marxist-Leninists to polemics, and in particular you are denouncing the struggle against the conciliators as a disruption of the unity of the "genuine Marxist-Leninists." Thus you denounce our article "How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism" of February 1978 as follows:

"What are the facts? Our Party disagreed with the theses emanating from these Joseph Greens and provided comradely criticism and principled line on the question of the building of the unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces in the USA. One of the elements of our comradely criticism was our opposition to the use of peculiar jargon which is not only concocted but also characteristic of typical intellectualism; within this context, *the use of the phrase 'idealist anti-revisionism' was opposed.* Historical facts cannot be denied. ... Thus, exactly in the same manner that as before *propaganda was carried out on the one hand calling for the unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces in the USA while, on the other hand, without exhausting the full possibilities of this opportunity of building the unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists; hidden attacks are launched against others,* today mud is dumped onto our Party from those who are calling themselves our 'dear fraternal comrades' for whom they have the 'deepest communist regards.'" (pp. 15-16, emphasis added)

In this passage you are denouncing the movement against social-chauvinism for *upsetting dreams of "unity" with the conciliators and "centrists."* You even make a direct comparison between unity with the conciliators and unity between our two fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties. And you are so concerned about "the full possibilities of this opportunity of building the unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists" with the social-democrats of the MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)," that you vent great anger at the term "idealist anti-revisionism." You even go to the extreme of denouncing the article "How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism" for disrupting unity even though it did not name any particular group of conciliators. This proves that you are beating around and around the bush when you talk about "peculiar jargon" and "typical intellectualism." Your opposition to the term "idealist anti-revisionism" is based on your views of the possibility of unity with the conciliators such as the social-democrats of the MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)" and of your view on what basis they should be united with. You opposed the term "idealist anti-revisionism" not because it was ineffective "jargon" but for precisely the opposite reason, be-

cause this term struck home. That is why you also haven't shown any enthusiasm for the term "social-democrat" either. In your above passage, you prove that you are counterposing pragmatic maneuvers under the signboard of "unity" to the vigorous development of the movement against social-chauvinism and of the great polemic against Chinese revisionism.

In your letters of December 5, you make a big pretense of being the sternest opponents of "centrism." This is a fraud. Far from your being the staunchest opponents of "centrism," you are floating thesis after thesis against those very things that have proved to be the biggest fiascos and disasters for the conciliators and "centrists" of various shades, namely, the movement against social-chauvinism and the polemic against Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought. You don't even recognize the existence of "centrism" as an issue in the U.S. until fall 1979, over one and a half years after our Party began open polemics against conciliationism as an obstacle in the struggle against Chinese revisionism, and you write about "...this entire centrist trend which unfolded right under his nose across the

IX-A: The ideological and polemical struggle against Chinese revisionism and the other revisionisms must be intensified and carried through to the end

Thus, alongside your insistence on a "special relationship," the other central issue raised in your letters of December 5 is that you are demanding that we tone down or stop altogether this or that aspect of the struggle against revisionism and opportunism, from the movement against social-chauvinism to polemics on the burning ideological and political issues to the principled and consistent struggle against the conciliators and "centrists" of all shades. Thus the questions at stake concern: the carrying through to the end of the struggle against Chinese revisionism; the role of the struggle against revisionism and opportunism in general (including but not restricted to Chinese revisionism) in revolutionary work; the role of polemics in the struggle against revisionism and opportunism; and the analysis of the nature of the conciliators.

Our Party holds that the struggle against revisionism and opportunism must not only be continued, it must be deepened and intensified. The struggle against revisionism and opportunism is one of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, and this teaching of Marxism-Leninism appears especially fresh and new today when the bourgeoisie is activating the opportunists and revisionists in country after country and on a global scale for the struggle against the revolution and Marxism-Leninism. Any illusions that this struggle is a mere side issue or any loosening of the grip against the revisionists and op-

USA this fall [1979!!! — ed.],'' (p. 8, bottom) All your posturing about "centrism" amounts to is denouncing us for not attacking the RCP of Chile by name in the press at your direction in the latter part of 1979. In fact, your letters defend a policy of pragmatic maneuver with certain conciliators or "centrists." That is the meaning of your denunciation of the article "How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism" as allegedly harming the unity of the "genuine Marxist-Leninists." You denounce "hidden attacks" in order to defend your pragmatic maneuvering with the social-democrats of the MLOC "CPUSA(ML)." You also continue in your letters your complete underestimation of our struggle against the American opportunists, including the "centrists." You go to the astonishing extent of defending your sale of rights to the English translation of the Palacios book to the "RCP,USA," denying that any bad consequences flowed from this act, and comparing it to a simple commercial transaction in the book and pamphlet trade.

In the rest of this section and in several following sections we shall go into these questions in more detail.

portunists can only give rise to grave danger for the revolutionary forces. To think that, for example, with the condemnation of Mao Zedong Thought the struggle against Chinese revisionism has come to a successful end, would be a grave mistake. On the contrary, it is essential to use the condemnation of Mao Zedong Thought to deepen and intensify the struggle against Chinese revisionism and to give that struggle a yet deeper ideological content. The question of fighting revisionism is not just the question of repudiating a phrase or of repeating a six-word quotation, as the Chinese revisionists liked to reduce everything to. Fighting Mao Zedong Thought is not just a matter of repeating "down with Mao Zedong Thought," or of just repeating that the Chinese revisionist groups are criminals, but of elaborating Marxism-Leninism and of reexamining every question that has been confused by the Chinese revisionists. And indeed it involves other questions too and in a sense permeates much or all of the other revolutionary work. The question of the struggle against the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism — which includes both open tools of the Hua-Deng clique as well as those groups who fight for the basic stands of Chinese revisionism while professing some disagreement with the Hua-Deng clique — cannot be regarded with complacency, that they are now exposed so we can go to sleep or just call them names, nor can it be separated from the

providing of a deep ideological basis to the struggle against Chinese revisionism. The great setbacks and disasters that Chinese revisionism has faced everywhere for the last few years should not be used as a pretext for complacency, but as a spur to further action. The great scientific works from socialist Albania, the great books by Comrade Enver Hoxha such as *Imperialism and the Revolution*, and *Reflections on China* and *With Stalin*, the Scientific Sessions, should be used to spur on the struggle, not to say that, OK, now everything's settled.

The struggle against revisionism is not something away from the masses, not a matter of some profound thoughts for a handful while the real revolutionary work among the masses is something else. On the contrary. (1) The struggle against revisionism and opportunism is on questions of vital importance for the orientation and direction of the work of revolution. It is a fight both over the general principles of the revolution and over all the concrete problems of the revolutionary movement. It comes up in the formulation and defense of the revolutionary strategy and tactics in the concrete situations facing each party, over the questions of how and what revolutionary mass organizations to build, over the question of how work among the masses is to be conducted, etc. (2) The struggle against revisionism must be taken to the masses. This is part of imbuing the proletariat with Marxism-Leninism, it is part of the party's task of educating the proletariat. As it was put by Comrade Figret Shehu in the Scientific Sessions of October 1978 in Albania: "The historical experience of the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism over the last decades too, fully confirms Lenin's teaching that the only correct Marxist line in the world communist movement is to explain to the proletariat and all the working people the absolute need to break with revisionism and opportunism, to educate the masses through a consistent struggle against those trends, to expose their betrayal of the cause of the proletariat and the peoples and all the infamy of the policy they pursue." ("Broadening and Deepening of the Struggle Against All Currents of Modern Revisionism — An Historical Necessity," *Problems of Current World Development*, Tirana, 1979, p. 68, emphasis added)

The struggle against the revisionists and opportunists necessarily includes the polemical struggle. If someone were to say that they are for struggle, even the allegedly most stern and uncompromising struggle, against revisionism and opportunism — but yet to advocate and practice the toning down or cessation of the polemics or advocate and practice the reduction of polemics to trivialities or side issues devoid of the proper theoretical and political content — then this would be to simply pay lip service to the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the struggle against

opportunism for the sake of emasculating them and undermining them. An example of the type of struggle we must wage can be seen from the example of the Party of Labor of Albania. Without ceasing in the slightest their revolutionary work among the masses and all other fronts of revolutionary work, indeed while constantly strengthening and invigorating the other fronts of work, the PLA has waged a step-by-step, careful, but bold and breathtaking in sweep, ideological and polemical struggle against Chinese revisionism. A partial listing of their recent work includes:

- Comrade Enver Hoxha's *Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA*;
- the editorial "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution";
- the Scientific Sessions of October 1978 "Problems of Current World Development";
- Comrade Enver Hoxha's books *Imperialism and the Revolution*, *Reflections on China*, and *With Stalin*;
- numerous articles in *Albania Today*, many other speeches, pamphlets and books.

This work has had a tremendous effect in fighting Chinese revisionism and has been and is indispensable to the strengthening of the unity of the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. It is essential to make great efforts to study and assimilate these great works. And it is also essential to learn from the PLA the importance of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the necessity of the ideological and theoretical struggle and of polemics.

Comrade Lenin wrote explicitly about the sad results of trying to avoid the polemical struggle or the struggle against opportunism. In the quote below he is referring to the situation within the Swiss Social-Democratic Party, while we are discussing the present-day struggle between the revisionist and opportunist trends and the Marxist-Leninist parties, but the basic point nevertheless remains fully applicable and comes through very clearly. Lenin wrote:

"Nor can we avoid hard struggle within the party...."

"The real choice is this: either the present concealed forms of inner-party struggle, with their demoralizing effect on the masses, or open principled struggle between the internationalist revolutionary trend and the Grütli trend inside and outside the party."

"An 'inner struggle' in which Hermann Greulich attacks the 'ultra-radicals' or the 'hot-heads,' without naming these monsters and without precisely defining their policy, and Grimm publishes articles in the Berner Tagwacht larded with hints and only comprehensible to one out of a hundred readers... — that kind of inner struggle demoralizes the masses,

who see, or guess, that it is a 'quarrel among leaders' and do not understand what it is really about.

"But a struggle in which the Grütli trend within the party — and it is much more important and dangerous than outside the party — will be forced openly to combat the Left, while both trends will everywhere come out with their own independent views and policies, will fight each other on matters of principle allowing the mass of party comrades, and not merely the leaders, to settle fundamental issues — such a struggle is both necessary and useful, for it trains in the masses independence and ability to carry out their epoch-making revolutionary mission." (V.I. Lenin, "Principles Involved in the War Issue," *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 159-60, emphasis as in the original)

Without committing suicide, one can not avoid the polemical struggle, even if one wanted to. The issue is how it will be waged. Either it will be waged on matters of principle and in such a way that it *"trains in the masses independence and ability to carry out their epoch-making revolutionary mission,"* or it will be waged in a way that *"demoralizes the masses."* The theories that oppose the polemical struggle, or advocate polemics devoid of ideological content, or counterpose it to work among the masses or to other revolutionary work, rather than correctly defining the role, scope and methods of the polemical struggle and its proper relations to the other fields of revolutionary struggle, do not prevent the polemical struggle but instead channel it into forms that are demoralizing to the masses.

The movement against social-chauvinism led by our Party was precisely such an invigorating struggle against opportunism as is being referred to by Comrade Lenin in the above quotation. The emergence of the theses of "directing the main blow at Soviet social-imperialism," the propagation of the blatant counter-revolutionary theses of the "three worlds" theory and the deepening degeneration of the Communist Party of China called forth an objective reaction against it in the U.S. This movement against social-chauvinism existed independently of the desires or wishes of our Party. The issue was not whether or not such indignation among the masses against the counter-revolutionary theses of Chinese revisionism would exist or not. The question was that either the motion among the masses would be demoralized, factionalized, trivialized, subverted, liquidated or even turned into its opposite, or else it would be led by the Marxist-Leninists and utilized to *"train in the masses independence and ability to carry out their epoch-making revolutionary mission."* By leading the movement against social-chauvinism, our Party put it onto the correct path of

struggle, gave it a correct orientation, and deepened and broadened it. This movement gave an immense moral prestige to the COUSML and the MLP, USA.

Starting sometime in 1978 you have repeatedly expressed doubt about or denied the existence of the movement against social-chauvinism. You have denounced it as a "peculiar movement" and as allegedly a manifestation of "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'" You seem to believe that it is an invention or concoction of the National Committee of the COUSML. But the movement against social-chauvinism was an objective phenomenon, a powerful revolutionary movement. It is the American component of the great international struggle against Chinese revisionism. Today we have militants of the MLP, USA and entire units who came forward to rally around the COUSML precisely through this movement. It is this struggle against social-chauvinism that has spelled bankruptcy, disaster and utter fiasco for the neo-revisionists. It is not enough that the "three worlders" have revisionist positions for them to suffer fiasco — the struggle against the "three worlders" must be consciously organized and led. It is this struggle against social-chauvinism that has preserved the honor of Marxism-Leninism in the U.S.

The work of our Party in leading the movement against social-chauvinism has also been important for reexamining and clarifying the questions confused by the social-chauvinists and for providing clarification of the political line for revolution in the U.S. It is not enough that the various opportunist groups suffer defeat in and of themselves. The political and ideological basis of the bankrupt groups must be repudiated and the questions of principle put to the fore, so that it is revisionism and not just some group in and of itself that suffers defeat. Our Party gave a broad outlook and orientation to this movement. We oriented this movement to seeing the inseparable connection between neo-revisionism and social-chauvinism. We connected it to political clarification on the burning questions of the American revolution and to the repudiation of Browderite liberal-labor politics. The theoretical work done in conjunction with this movement has been indispensable for the progress of the work on the mass fronts and for the correct general orientation.

The struggle against the conciliators and "centrists" was an integral component of this struggle right from the beginning. It is in the movement against social-chauvinism that all the neo-revisionists saw their doom. Therefore, besides the open Klonskyite social-chauvinists, the Pentagon-socialist advocates of "directing the main blow against Soviet social-imperialism," as well the conciliators of social-chauvinism came out to wage a fierce battle to liquidate the movement against social-chauvinism.

The conciliators wished to preserve the basic neo-revisionist politics, the basic corrupt Browderite liberal-labor politics that underlies and nourishes open social-chauvinism, at the expense of a bow to the left or of giving up one or the other thesis. So the conciliators would even take up this or that thesis of the Marxist-Leninists in order to maintain some credibility among the activists, but always at the same time the conciliators would move heaven and earth to smash the movement against social-chauvinism. For example, the social-democrats of the Barry Weisberg MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)" wished to preserve the basic neo-revisionist politics of the Klonskyites. Therefore they went from being advocates of "three worlds-ism" and most ardent Klonskyites to being vacillating opponents of "three worlds-ism" who, however, openly denounced the movement against social-chauvinism. They advocated everything: that the lines of demarcation had already been settled; counterposing the fight against social-chauvinism and "three worlds-ism" to the fight against Khrushchovite revisionism and the "C" PUSA; counterposing the fight against revisionism in general to the defense and elaboration of Marxism-Leninism; that the basic issue is ultra-leftism, etc. As well, the neo-revisionists and "three worlders" of the "RCP, USA" quickly dropped their short-lived struggle against the open social-chauvinism of the Klonskyites and also did everything possible to smother the struggle over the "three worlds theory." They even went to the point of inventing two allegedly different "three worlds" theories, the allegedly good one of Mao's and the bad one of Deng's. For the leadership of the "RCP, USA" knew that the vigorous development of the movement a-

gainst social-chauvinism and "three worlds-ism" would mean utter fiasco for their defense of Chinese revisionism and their elaboration of Mao Zedong Thought.

Our Party holds that the struggle against the ideology of Chinese revisionism and against the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism has to be continued and carried through to the end. At the same time, the struggle against the other revisionist trends can not be neglected. For example, there can be no complacency about the struggle against modern Soviet revisionism which remains a deadly enemy of the international communist and workers' movement. And among the domestic revisionists in the U.S., there are those who follow Soviet revisionism, "Eurocommunism" and other revisionist trends as well as those who follow Chinese revisionism. Indeed, the movement against social-chauvinism struck not just at the "three worlders," but at the other domestic revisionists too, who are also social-chauvinist through and through. As well, at this time social-democracy is being further activated by the bourgeoisie to use against the workers' movement and the revolution. Social-democratic campaigns are being organized, the labor bureaucracy is being given a deeper tinge of social-democracy and the "three worlders" are on the path of merger with social-democracy. Other revisionists, such as the "C" PUSA and the "CLP, USNA," have long been on the path of merger with social-democracy. Hence our Party holds that it is essential to step up the war on social-democracy, as an essential part of the struggle against revisionism and opportunism.

IX-B: You have condemned our struggle without careful consideration and study, but solely on the basis of anti-Marxist-Leninist generalities against the anti-revisionist struggle

In your letters of December 5 you reiterate your denunciation of our struggle against revisionism and opportunism. But neither in your letters nor in your discussions with us on these questions do you ever stop to examine the actual development of our struggle and the situation which it faces nor do you refer to the extensive literature of our Party elaborating our views and analyzing the situation. Instead at most you pick at this or that phrase or slogan in isolation and try to deduce all sorts of things from it by abstract logic or by quibbling. Or you simply make unsupported declarations. In your letters of December 5, you not only provide no analysis to back up your declaration, but you generally fail to even indicate precisely what it is that you disagree with and what your own views are, even to the extent that you have already done so in previous discussions. You denounce this "stand" of ours or those "tactics" of

ours in the harshest terms without indicating what that "stand" or those "tactics" are. You neither examine our documents nor provide your own analysis of the concrete situation facing our Parties. You have condemned our struggle without making the slightest study of it and solely on the basis of anti-Marxist-Leninist general principles against the anti-revisionist struggle, principles which you put forward as vague hints of ideas and which you leave unelaborated.

Although we hold that even regarding our phrases and slogans in themselves, your comments are wrong, that doesn't excuse you from the necessity to take a serious attitude to the questions which you take up for discussion. Since you are denouncing our struggle, you were bound to examine the situation facing us and to deal with our documents. For example, a whole series of documents exist, starting from

September 1, 1976, on the movement against social-chauvinism. These documents of our Party are a powerful body of literature that extends over years, are consistent in principle, provide an excellent picture of the development of the struggle in the U.S., and broaden and deepen their analysis and correct any errors as the movement develops and as the international struggle develops. A partial listing follows, a listing that is selected from public documents that are available to you and that we have sent to you or internal documents that we have given to you:

— The pamphlet *U.S. Marxist-Leninists, Unite in Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism! Proletarian Revolution in the U.S. Is Our Sacred Internationalist Duty!* — Two Articles on the Path Forward in Party Building. This pamphlet reprinted articles from the March 10, 1977 issue of *The Workers' Advocate*. This pamphlet bears the stamp of the times in which it was written, but at the same time it gave a correct basic program and developed much of the plan for the direction given to the movement against social-chauvinism by the COUSML.

— The Internal Bulletin from the internal conference of late 1977 entitled: "Get Organized for the Revolutionary Upsurge! Build the Party in the Working Class!" This bulletin elaborates our views on party-building and the tasks facing the organization and also goes into the movement against social-chauvinism. Without using the term "centrism" or conciliationism, it in fact develops the analysis of the role of the conciliators "to prevent the Marxist-Leninists from splitting with social-chauvinism, to try to stop this polarization by allegedly 'opposing' the most blatant social-chauvinist slogans while in fact supporting all the main social-chauvinist theses and preparing conditions to totally capitulate to the social-chauvinists in the future." (p. 59)

— The article of February 10, 1978 entitled "How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism." This article reiterates the basic program for the movement against social-chauvinism and also begins the open struggle against the "obstacles in the struggle against social-chauvinism," that is, against "conciliation with opportunism and social-chauvinism." These conciliators might for convenience be called the "centrist" forces. The COUSML had realized the danger posed by these groups right from the start. In 1977 the COUSML used the tactics of intensifying the struggle against social-chauvinism and "three worlds-ism" in order to put the conciliators of social-chauvinism into difficulties. At the start of 1978, the COUSML analyzed that it was time to launch an open struggle against the conciliators or "centrists." "How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism" was the beginning of that attack, as well as continuing the struggle against the direct social-chauvinists and advocates of "directing

the main blow at Soviet social-imperialism."

— The pamphlet of March 1978 entitled *Why Did the 'RCP,USA' Split?* The introduction to this pamphlet sets the struggle against the "RCP,USA" in the context of the movement against social-chauvinism.

— The pamphlet of June 1978 *Reply to the Open Letter of the MLOC*.

— The articles of February 12 and March 29, 1979 entitled "Does the 'RCP,USA' Oppose the Theory of 'Three Worlds'?"

— The series starting in the February 12, 1979 issue of *The Workers' Advocate* entitled "U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism." Part I of this series provides the general program behind this series. Other articles in this series occurred in *The Workers' Advocate* for May 1, 1979; July 1, 1979; October 15, 1979 and December 5, 1979.

— The article of March 29, 1979 entitled "Mao Tsetung and Mao Tsetung Thought Are Anti-Marxist-Leninist and Revisionist."

— The article of March 29, 1979 and the pamphlet of May 1979 entitled "Against Social-Democratic Infiltration of the Marxist-Leninist Movement."

— The Internal Bulletin on the internal conference of March 1979 entitled "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists." It should be noted that you also attended this conference at our invitation. This conference dealt with the history of the struggle to found the party, the plan for the campaign to found the MLP,USA, the condemnation of Mao Zedong Thought, the denunciation of the social-democratic nature of the MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)" and other questions. In this context, it dealt with the movement against social-chauvinism.

— The Call of the NC of the COUSML of May 12, 1979 entitled "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists."

— The articles "Mao Zedong Thought Cannot Dull the Brilliance of the Great October Socialist Revolution" and "To Pursue a United Front with 'Three Worlders' Is Anti-Marxist-Leninist and Tantamount to Betrayal" in the October 15, 1979 issue of *The Workers' Advocate*. These were Parts IV and V of the series "U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism."

— "Against Social-Democratic Infiltration of the Marxist-Leninist Movement, Parts 2 and 3" in the August 15 and December 5, 1979 issues of *The Workers' Advocate*.

— The article "Mao, Browder and Social-Democracy (Mao Zedong and the American ultra-revisionist Browder supported each other and shared a com-

mon platform of social-democracy)" in the December 5, 1979 issue of *The Workers' Advocate*. This was Part VI of the series "U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism."

The above is a partial listing of the works on the movement against social-chauvinism. It excludes a great number of articles denouncing the social-chauvinists and concentrates (without listing all of them) on those articles which give the program, so to speak, for the movement against social-chauvinism

IX-C: Our December 1 letter criticized a number of your theses directed against the struggle against opportunism

In Section III of our letter of December 1 to the NEC of the CPC(M-L), we explained how your sale of the rights of the English translation of the Palacios book to the "RCP,USA" was related to your underestimation of our struggle against the domestic American opportunists. We pointed out that you have been over the last period putting forward a number of theses directed against the struggle against opportunism. We characterized a number of these theses and the evolution of your views concerning the movement against social-chauvinism. In your letters of December 5, you rail against and curse our letter of December 1. But you are unable to show that our letter contains even the slightest inaccuracy. Now we will give a lengthy excerpt concerning your views on the struggle against opportunism from our letter of December 1 and then show how your letters of December 5 verify to a tee the analysis that we have set forth.

The following comes from Section II of our letter of December 1:

"Furthermore, the act of selling the rights to the book by Palacios to the 'RCP,USA' shows an extreme underestimation on the part of the NEC of the CPC(M-L) for the struggle that the COUSML is waging against the American opportunists. The selling of the rights to the book by Palacios to the 'RCP,USA' is related to your wrong assessment of our polemical struggle against the 'RCP,USA.' For some time now you have been taking a hostile attitude to the polemics against the 'RCP,USA,' to the polemics showing that U.S. neo-revisionism is the American expression of the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism, etc. You have not publicly supported them while privately you have constantly opposed them. This has amazed us. Your comments on our work have not been directed towards helping us to carry out the polemical struggle more vigorously, but have been directed towards casting doubt on this struggle. Thus your remarks have not been a motive force

with particular attention paid to the issue of what could be called the "centrist" groups. But you have condemned our struggle without any study of it at all. You have condemned it on the basis of anti-Marxist-Leninist general principles opposed to the Marxist-Leninist principles concerning the struggle against revisionism and opportunism. And so far you have shown yourself unable to even elaborate your own general principles which you leave in the form of vague hints and unworked out and half-baked theses.

for the further development of the struggle, as fraternal criticism should be, but have served as a damper on the struggle. It appears that you underestimate the struggle against the American opportunists. Indeed, over the last period you have floated informally to us and in fact urged upon us insistently, if in an offhand manner, a number of theses directed against the polemical struggle against the opportunists.

"(A) First of all, you began by opposition to the struggle against the forces that might roughly be called 'centrist.' You began to express opposition to our polemics on the occasion of the publishing of the article 'How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism' in *The Workers' Advocate* of February 1978. This article began the open polemical struggle against the 'obstacles in the struggle against social-chauvinism,' that is, against what might be called 'centrism.' You opposed the attack in this article on 'idealist anti-revisionism.' With respect to our pamphlet *Reply to the Open Letter of the MLOC*, you advocated that the only issue on which this miserable sect of 'Klonskyites without Klonsky,' the MLOC, should be openly opposed was on 'vacillation on certain theses of 'three worlds-ism.' According to your view of the time, only open 'three worlds-ism' or direct vacillation should be attacked. Nor did our pamphlet *Why Did the 'RCP,USA' Split?* of March 1978 meet with your approval. Picking out this or that issue, you also opposed it. Under one pretext or other you opposed all the attacks on what might be called the 'centrist' forces.

"(B) From opposition to the struggle against what might be called the 'centrist' forces, you passed over to reconsidering your stand on our struggle against the open social-chauvinists and 'three worlders.' You advocated to us insistently that the issue was that we should not be opposing the local American opportunists in public polemics at all, but dealing with international is-

sues. In your view, these two things were two mutually exclusive categories which you counterposed to each other. This you advocated to us as a matter of principle. On this question you have informally but very sternly floated to us a number of different theses, which however all agree with each other in counterposing the struggle against the domestic opportunists to the question of the international struggle against revisionism; and counterposing the struggle against revisionism to the elaboration of Marxism-Leninism and the defense of its purity.

"It should be recalled that at the end of 1976 our two organizations agreed, on your suggestion, to a certain tactical coordination in the struggle against Chinese revisionism. ...

"Nevertheless, later on you made it into a principle that it is a mistake to deal with the domestic opportunists. Most recently, you have retracted the absolute opposition to such attacks. (Naturally it is impossible in practice to refuse to attack the opportunists over a long period of time — the issue is thus how the opportunists are attacked. There can be good polemics and there can be miserable polemics, but without committing suicide it is not possible to avoid all polemics.) But you still have maintained to us that such attacks should have a certain very restricted role, that they should only expose certain misdeeds of the opportunists, with the idea of the misdeeds of the opportunists or their role apparently regarded rather narrowly. Thus you still counterpose the polemics against the domestic opportunists to articles on international issues and to the elaboration of Marxism-Leninism.

"(C) You have also opposed the slogan 'Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists.' (But you waited until we had gone public with this slogan to oppose it, although we had consulted with you ahead of time.) You have opposed this slogan so vehemently that you have let it get in the way of giving public support to our campaign to found the Marxist-Leninist Party of the USA. You have opposed the slogan by the means of counterposing the struggle against the opportunists to the other work in building the Party. You have gone to the extreme of insisting that the slogan of 'Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists' is in fact in your view a manifestation of Chinese revisionism and the Chinese revisionist type of 'two-line struggle.' It is hard for us to express our sheer astonishment at seeing that our strug-

gle against revisionism is denounced as a manifestation of the ideology of Chinese revisionism. Our denunciation of Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought and of its theory of 'two (or many) headquarters in the party' is not that it fights revisionism too hard, but that it conciliates revisionism and is opposed to the principled struggle against revisionism. The errors and monstrous crimes of the Chinese revisionists did not stem from fighting revisionism too hard or from issuing too many public polemics against Khrushchovite revisionism. The Chinese revisionists did not fail to take a sound Marxist-Leninist stand because they were too busy waging a polemical struggle. On the contrary, the failure of the Chinese to wage a stern, consistent, protracted struggle against the Khrushchovite revisionists, including the open polemical struggle, was and is one of the glaring manifestations of their failure to base themselves on the sound, principled positions of Marxism-Leninism. It was one of the manifestations of their failure to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism. The theory of Mao Zedong of the 'many headquarters in the party' was not a theory to justify fighting too hard against revisionism, but a theory to justify a liberal, conciliatory, social-democratic and nonchalant stand towards the defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, the defense of the monolithic unity of the party, and the stern, unyielding struggle against the modern revisionists.

"All these transcendental principles against the polemical struggle that you have urged us to follow were based on two things:

(a) counterposing one thing to another, the struggle against the domestic opportunists to the struggle on the burning international issues, the polemical struggle to the elaboration of Marxism-Leninism, the struggle against opportunism to the struggle for the building and strengthening of the party, and so forth; and

(b) an underestimation of the struggle against opportunism in the U.S., an underestimation based on general, abstract, high-sounding principles and devoid of a serious, detailed consideration of the struggle here, which is brushed off in an offhand manner.

"It is our view that these principles that you are urging on us would amount to, if taken to their logical conclusion and followed consistently, conciliation. We have expressed this assessment to you previously. We believe that your act of selling the rights of the book by Palacios to the 'RCP, USA' is a verification of the accuracy of our views on the general direction in which the principles you are urging on us can lead, if

taken to their logical conclusion, if errors are allowed to grow."

IX-D: Your letters of December 5 have further confirmed as correct the criticisms raised in our letter of December 1

Your letters of December 5 confirm the analysis we gave in our letter of December 1 concerning your attitude to the struggle against opportunism.

To begin with, your letters of December 5 fully verify your complete underestimation of our struggle against the American opportunists. True, you curse at our letter of December 1 and, among other things, talk of "the villainous accusation that our Party shows an extreme underestimation of the struggle against opportunism in the U.S." (pp. 6, 14, 15, etc.) But your letters of December 5 repeatedly prove that you underestimate this struggle by sneering at it and denouncing it. As we pointed out in Section VI-G, you go to the extreme of sneering that our Party allegedly "do(es) not even recognize 'American opportunism.'" (pp. 6-7, 11, 17, 18, etc.) Is a bigger underestimation of our struggle against the American opportunists possible? We are fighting a fierce battle and you are trying to juggle words to prove that we allegedly don't even "recognize" American opportunism! Your underestimation of our struggle is also seen in your contemptuous and sneering attitude to our very effective work against the tour of Palacios on the platform of the "three worlds" of the "RCP, USA." We have dealt with this in Section VI-C of this letter. Furthermore, you are concocting one thesis after another to denigrate our struggle. You have no respect whatsoever for the protracted, complicated life and death struggle we are waging against American opportunism. You don't study it or make any concrete comments about it or any analysis of the situation facing our Party. Instead you spend your time sneering that this struggle is "American exceptionalism" (pp. 3, 25, etc.), is a "peculiar" concoction, is "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle'" (p. 12) and so forth.

Furthermore, our letter of December 1 is absolutely correct in linking up your sale of the rights to the English translation of the Palacios book to the "RCP, USA" with your underestimation of the struggle against the "RCP, USA." Your notably nonchalant attitude to the sale of the Palacios book, your denial that this sale is of any concern to us, your comparison of this sale to an ordinary commercial transaction, and your refusal to see the major questions of principle underlying your blunder of selling the Palacios book to the "RCP, USA," all testify to an absolutely astonishing lack on your part of any apparent awareness or interest or sense of immediate solidarity for the sharp, bitter, protracted struggle going on against the "RCP, USA."

Now let us pass on to your opposition to the struggle against the conciliators of social-chauvinism, these conciliators being the forces that could roughly be termed "centrist." Here again your letters of December 5 completely verify our letter of December 1. In the introduction to Section IX above we have quoted your letters of December 5 denouncing our article "How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism." You denounce the struggle against the conciliators as a disruption of the possibilities of building the unity of the "genuine Marxist-Leninists." You especially come out against any "hidden attacks" on the social-democratic sect, the MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)," as a failure to take advantage of "the full possibilities of this opportunity of building the unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists." You thus not only opposed attacks on this or that group of conciliators, but also opposed any attacks on the ideology of conciliationism, regarding such opposition to the ideology of conciliationism as "hidden attacks." With your talk about "hidden attacks," you also try to pass over in silence your hostile stand to the open polemics against the MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)," works such as *Reply to the Open Letter of the MLOC* and the pamphlet and series entitled *Against Social-Democratic Infiltration of the Marxist-Leninist Movement*.

Furthermore, your opposition to the polemics against the conciliators included not only a hostile stand to the polemics against the social-democratic MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)" sect, but also a hostile stand against the polemics against the "three worlds" of the "RCP, USA." In your letters of December 5, in the main you try to pass over this in silence. You maintain an absolute silence about your diversionary theses against the pamphlet *Why Did the 'RCP, USA' Split?* You do not even mention them, to say nothing of trying to defend them. As well, you pass over in silence your negative attitude to the other polemics, such as "Does the 'RCP, USA' Oppose the Theory of 'Three Worlds'?" You have negated these polemics to the point that you characterize the "RCP, USA's" position as being that of fighting against the "three worlds" theory. On page 18 you explicitly include the "RCP, USA" in the list you give of centrist groups. But you characterize "centrism" as follows:

"...the entire centrist trend which had already crystallized around the 'defense of 'Mao Zedong Thought'' and the 'contributions' of Mao Zedong, under the mask of their so-called 'op-

position' to Chinese revisionism and the notorious theory of 'three worlds,' the offspring of 'Mao Zedong Thought.'" (p. 4a; except for the word "already," all emphasis is added)

This is an incorrect characterization of "centrism" which, among other things, prettifies the "RCP, USA." The "centrists" are against carrying the struggle against Chinese revisionism through to the end. The "RCP, USA" in particular does not even oppose the "three worlds" theory but is a diehard defender of it. It does not flaunt a "mask" of "so-called 'opposition'" to the "three worlds" theory, but has consistently and doggedly opposed the struggle on the issue of the "three worlds" theory. Under heavy pressure from the struggle against Chinese revisionism, the "RCP, USA" finally put forward the thesis of two different "three worlds" theories, Mao's allegedly good version and Deng's bad version, and insisted that the criticism of Deng's bad version is a minor and even diversionary issue. Finally, you attack the title of the polemical series "U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism." This is your only direct defense of your hostile stand against the polemics against the "RCP, USA." Taken literally, your opposition to the phrase "U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism" means that you are defending the "RCP, USA" from our accusation that it is part of the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism. And indeed, you are putting forward exactly this idea when you write:

"But these centrists are also not only 'opposed' to the 'international trend of Chinese revisionism' but to its 'American' or any other expression, as well." (p. 18)

Thus you prettify the "RCP, USA" as not only not being part of the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism, but of fighting against this opportunist trend. All this fully verifies the analysis given in our letter of December 1 concerning your opposition to the polemics against the conciliators.

Now let us continue on to the fact that you passed over from opposition to the struggle against the conciliators to reconsidering your previous support for our struggle against the open social-chauvinists as well. You took up a hostile stand against the movement against social-chauvinism as a note. This too is verified over and over again in your letters of December 5. Among other things, you write:

"The true facts are that *after the initial attack* against the 'domestic opportunists,' he has today gone off into a tangent and began to connect his peculiar theories 'if in an off-hand manner.' His theory of the so-called 'weakest link' is precisely the latest example of these peculiar

theses. 'U.S. neo-revisionism is the American expression of the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism' is another peculiar theory, and there are many more." (p. 22, bottom, emphasis added)

Thus you verify that you originally supported the struggle against the Klonskyites and then later decided that the movement against social-chauvinism "has today gone off into a tangent." This alleged tangential activity began when we attacked the conciliators. Thus once again you are denouncing the polemics against the MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)" and the "RCP, USA," this time as a "tangent." Thus your passage verified that you denounced the movement against social-chauvinism not during 1977, but only after it started onto the alleged "tangent," sometime in 1978.

But now look at the contradictions you have gotten yourself into. Elsewhere you have denounced the movement against social-chauvinism as being wrong in principle. You call it a "peculiar movement," an expression of "American exceptionalism," and a manifestation of "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'" But clearly if the movement against social-chauvinism was wrong in principle, then it was wrong in 1977 as well as in 1978 and afterwards. After all, "American exceptionalism" and Mao Zedong Thought weren't Marxist-Leninist in 1977 and only go off into a tangent in 1978. And conversely, if the movement against social-chauvinism was correct in 1977, if the "initial attack" was correct, then that movement could not be wrong on the basis of general principles today. What crying contradictions! Thus it is not surprising that you seek to avoid these contradictions by your usual method, that is, by not elaborating your views.

Now let us pass on to the question of your method of arguing in favor of your demand that we tone down or stop altogether this or that aspect of our struggle against opportunism. We have already seen that our letter of December 1 was absolutely correct in pointing out that you completely underestimate our struggle against the American opportunists. As well, in Section IX-B we showed that our letter of December 1 was also correct in pointing out that your denunciation of our struggle is "devoid of a serious, detailed consideration of the struggle here, which is brushed off in an offhand manner."

Thus your letters of December 5 rely on general, abstract, high-sounding principles and vague chitchat, such as throwing about generalities about the "unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists," "tangents," "hidden attacks" and so forth. While this general chitchat type of discussion indicates that you still uphold your various counterpositions, you write in this way to hide your actual theses under vague generalities and platitudes. Thus in your letters of

December 5 you pass over in silence your repeatedly expressed views counterposing polemics to the defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, your various proposals to restrict the polemical struggle in various ways, such as to restrict polemics to internal publications and verbal agitation or to local leaflets or to restrict the denunciation of the opportunists to exposing the local crimes and misdeeds of this or that opportunist, and so forth. You also pass over in silence your counterposition of the struggle against opportunism to the struggle for the building and strengthening of the party. You only refer to these things obliquely, by patting yourself on the back for your theses while maintaining total silence on what they are. For example, you write:

"Now, today, you have become desperate and are driving your head against granite because the peculiar theses which you have been attempting to float around and about have been proven politically and ideologically bankrupt. To stave off his own political extinction, meeting with failure at every pass, this worm has concocted all these lies and slanders to have his 'proof' that the criticism and repudiation by CPC(M-L) of his tactics on the questions of building the unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces in the USA, on the questions relating to the defence of the purity of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and on the questions relating to the founding and building of the Marxist-Leninist Party, USA, is tantamount to 'extreme underestimation of the struggle against opportunism' and so on and so forth." (p. 14, top, emphasis added)

But what this "criticism and repudiation" is, you don't say. This "criticism and repudiation" consisted of a series of anti-Marxist-Leninist counterpositions, as described in our letter of December 1. If your theses were not as we had characterized them in our letter of December 1, then it would have been easy for you to simply expound on them. Your failure to do so is a powerful if indirect verification of the accuracy of our letter of December 1.

Nevertheless, although you try to avoid openly stating many of your theses in your letters of December 5, still your letters of December 5 fully verify that you are using the method of counterposing the veritas that, such as counterposing struggle against the domestic opportunists to struggle on the burning international issues. Your letters of December 5 put forth a whole series of anti-Marxist-Leninist counterpositions.

To begin with, you denounce our struggle against "our own" domestic American opportunists as allegedly "American exceptionalism." This is anti-Marxist-Leninist rubbish. Struggle against "one's

own" domestic opportunists is not only compatible with Marxism-Leninism, but it is an absolute requirement of Marxism-Leninism. Comrade Lenin spoke repeatedly in the most abusive terms of those who try to demonstrate their revolutionary credentials by denouncing the foreign opportunists while remaining quiet about "their own" domestic opportunists. And still today, ardent struggle against "one's own" domestic opportunists is an absolute requirement of the struggle against the international opportunist trends.

But you further develop your counterposition of the struggle against domestic opportunism to the struggle against international revisionism when you denounce the phrase "U.S. neo-revisionism is the American expression of the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism." You do this for the first time that we are aware of in your letters of December 5. On what basis do you denounce this phrase? You write:

"According to what Joseph Green himself admits, he wants the support of our Party for his opposition to the 'American expression of... [this deletion is as in your letter — ed.] Chinese revisionism' which means that he is neither resolutely against Chinese revisionism nor is he against 'domestic opportunism', but content to fight the 'American expression of Chinese revisionism'." (p. 23, top)

In this passage, you counterpose domestic opportunism to international revisionism from two sides and display an aversion to even the words "international opportunist trend," to say nothing of the concept. Thus, according to your letter, to regard certain American opportunists, namely, the neo-revisionists, as being part of the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism is to deny that they are American opportunists. This is a blatant counterposing of the concept of international revisionism to the issue of domestic opportunism. At the same time, you also argue from the other direction that to fight the American exponents of Chinese revisionism is not to fight Chinese revisionism. This is also complete nonsense and just more abstract counterposing of the concepts of domestic and international opportunism. How does the fight against the American component of the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism prevent one from also fighting other components of this trend and from fighting the basic ideological essence of this trend? Our Party has vigorously fought in an all-round way against Chinese revisionism, while it is your press that has gone silent for some time and failed to carry articles denouncing the basic theories of Mao Zedong Thought in detail.

In fact, Chinese revisionism is an international opportunist trend. But in the passage above you strive

as hard as you can to avoid the phrase "international opportunist trend," to the point where you prefer to even misquote us than use this phrase. It is important both theoretically and practically to understand the connection between Chinese revisionism and its manifestations around the world, such as the development of neo-revisionism in the U.S. and in a number of other countries. This is a requirement of Marxist-Leninist theoretical work. Comrade Lenin explained the existence of international opportunist trends and their relation to controversies in individual countries. For example, near the beginning of Chapter I of his classic work *What Is to Be Done?*, he wrote:

"In fact, it is no secret that two trends have taken shape in the present-day international Social-Democracy."*

The footnote by Lenin elaborated this further:

*"*Incidentally, this perhaps is the only occasion in the history of modern Socialism in which controversies between various trends within the socialist movement have grown from national into international controversies; and this, in its own way, is extremely encouraging. Formerly, the disputes between the Lassalleans and the Eisenachers, between the Guesdites and the Possibilists, between the Fabians and the Social-Democrats, and between the Narodnaya-Volya-ites and Social-Democrats, remained purely national disputes, reflected purely national features and proceeded, as it were, on different planes. At the present time (this is quite evident now), the English Fabians, the French Ministerialists, the German Bernsteinians and the Russian critics — all belong to the same family, all extol each other, learn from each other, and together come out against 'dogmatic' Marxism. Perhaps in this first really international battle with socialist opportunism, international revolutionary Social-Democracy will become sufficiently strengthened to put an end to the political reaction that has long reigned in Europe?"*

Thus Comrade Lenin is quite enthusiastic over the fact that the various national disputes have become components, expressions of the struggle of two big international trends, the trends of international revolutionary Social-Democracy (Marxism) and that of socialist opportunism. Since Lenin wrote the above passage, sometime between the autumn of 1901 and February 1902, the international communist movement has seen the struggle of international trends repeated. Today's struggle between revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and the various international currents of modern revisionism is just such a struggle.

Furthermore, to counterpose domestic opportunism to international opportunism and to deny that

U.S. neo-revisionism has anything to do with the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism is, objectively, to help create an ideological basis for pragmatic maneuvering. Once the connection between U.S. neo-revisionism and Chinese revisionism is denied, then anyone can claim to be the fiercest, most uncompromising opponent of Chinese revisionism, while simultaneously engaging in pragmatic maneuvers with any of the groups that form the American component of the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism.

But here we must stress very sharply that you are counterposing the struggle against the domestic opportunists to the struggle against international opportunism for the sake of downplaying both struggles. True, when you put forward this counterposition you try to pose as an adherent of struggle against international revisionism. But you apply all your theories against the polemical struggle against opportunism to any struggle against opportunism. And elsewhere in your letters of December 5 you oppose the struggle against Chinese revisionism as a whole. At that point you put forward a different counterposition, that between Chinese revisionism and "revisionism and opportunism of all hues." And indeed you counterpose the struggle against opportunism and revisionism of all hues to "the struggle against imperialism, social-imperialism and all reaction and against revisionism and opportunism of all hues." You write:

"Thus, if you are denounced by our Party for only highlighting 'Chinese revisionism, 'three worldism' and so forth', then, you can, of course, beat your breasts and scream blue murder that all along you really meant the struggle against imperialism, social-imperialism and all reaction and against revisionism and opportunism of all hues." (p. 4)

Indeed you also go to the extreme of counterposing the struggle against Chinese revisionism to "taking up the historic task of proletarian revolution for solution." You denounce the sentence "The 'three worlders' and the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism are occupying one of the advance posts in the ring of fire" and our talk of the necessity to fight Chinese revisionism by calling these Marxist-Leninist theses:

"...scare-crow tactics to divide the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties from taking up the historic task of proletarian revolution for solution in their own countries and vigorously and resolutely fighting hard against imperialism, social-imperialism and all reaction and against revisionism and opportunism of all hues." (p. 3, bottom)

These quotations show the utterly frivolous nature and complete lack of any serious content in the vari-

ous counterpositions which you use to oppose the struggle against opportunism.

Now let us give one last example of the frivolous nature of your various counterpositions. You write in your letters of December 5:

"Look at the way he concocts in order to present his intellectualist hyperboles: 'For example, in 1979, it has become crystal clear to everyone that both the 'RCP,USA and the Barry Weisberg MLOC/'CPUSA(ML)''...[this deletion is as in your letter — ed.] have their international significance? What is this intellectualist hyperbole presented for? It is presented to 'prove' that they are 'international'... Here is a further self-exposure of Joseph Green's peculiar concoctions. Joseph Green has previously scribbled that the proletariat is an international class. If this is the case, then all Marxist-Leninist parties, organizations and groups are the political and most advanced representatives and vanguard of this international class. The bourgeoisie also is an international class and thus the revisionist parties, organizations and groups are also the social prop of this bourgeoisie and in the service of its counter-revolutionary aims, and thus has (have) 'international significance'. But, according to this green Joe, '...in 1979, it has become crystal clear to everyone that both the 'RCP,USA' and the Barry Weisberg MLOC/'CPUSA(ML)''...have their international significance.'" (p. 23, top)

Thus you argue against considering the concrete role played internationally by the "RCP,USA" and the MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)" social-democratic sect by arguing that everything, every opportunist group, sect or individual, serves the international bourgeoisie and hence has international significance. Then, you turn around and say that since everything has international significance, therefore it is a concoction to say that the "RCP,USA" and the MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)" social-democratic sect do. What a lot of empty juggling with words! What self-satisfied sophistry and empty playing with generalities to avoid dealing with the actual situation!

What was the issue we were raising? At the beginning of Section IV of our letter of December 1, we replied again to your counterposition of fighting the domestic American opportunists against fighting international revisionism. We pointed out the follow-

ing:

(1) "...that time has shown that the polemics we launched against the domestic American opportunists were well chosen and did raise the burning international issues."

And

(2) "This has been verified to the extent that even the groups that we hit at proved to be of significance internationally. For example in 1979 it has become crystal clear to everyone that both the 'RCP,USA' and the Barry Weisberg MLOC/'CPUSA(ML)' social-democratic sect, even when taken just in themselves, have their international significance and that the duty of the COUSML to protect the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement included our duty to sound the alarm against these groups."

How did you reply to this? Consider the first point. You had in the past repeatedly counterposed dealing with the international issues to fighting the domestic opportunist groups. When we pointed out that the fight against the domestic opportunist groups in fact dealt with the burning international issues, you could not say a word. You passed over this question in silence. This proved the utter frivolous nature of all your talk about dealing with the international issues. You displayed no interest in the fight over these international issues at all. And as to the second point, you reply that you are entirely uninterested because you hold that every group has international significance. You displayed no interest at all in the concrete conditions, in that the "RCP,USA's" anti-communist and gangster-like attacks on the great book *Imperialism and the Revolution* and on the heroic Party of Labor of Albania are being reprinted or distributed or hailed in some form or other in India, Scandinavia, France...and elsewhere and by the RCP of Chile. You argue from abstract generalities entirely divorced from the concrete situation. Your counterpositions are frivolous and sophistical arguments devoid of concrete analysis, which you use to downplay and oppose the struggle against opportunism.

Thus the description given in our letter of December 1 concerning your attitude to the struggle against opportunism is strikingly confirmed by your letters of December 5.

SECTION X: What you are denouncing as "peculiar" are the well-known orthodox theses of the Marxist-Leninist classics and the advanced positions of contemporary revolutionary Marxism-Leninism

In Section VIII-D, we begin the discussion of your method of denouncing our views as "peculiar." We showed that you use the epithet "peculiar" as one way of trying to impose a "special relationship" upon our Party. Among the particular features of your use of the epithet "peculiar" are the following: — You use the epithet "peculiar" in order to avoid elaborating your views. If we disagree with you, you believe that it suffices to brand our views "peculiar." You do not discuss our theses seriously, do not develop analysis of the concrete situations facing our Parties nor elaborate the Marxist-Leninist theory.

— With the epithet "peculiar" you express the ideological position that the issue isn't whether our views are correct or incorrect, but simply whether they agree or disagree with your views.

— You posture as if by "peculiar" you meant different from the accepted theories in the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. But behind your smoke screen of outcries about our allegedly "peculiar" theses, you are in fact seeking to force us to adopt various theses of yours which either are genuinely and truly "peculiar" or are outright opposed to the orthodox theses of Marxism-Leninism or both.

X-A: Denial of the present-day activation of revisionism and opportunism

In your letters of December 5 you deny the present-day activation of revisionism and opportunism. You accuse this of being a peculiar thesis and attack this thesis as a manifestation of "siege mentality." You write:

"As far as the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement being 'under tremendous attack from imperialism, revisionism and opportunism', this is nothing new, because 'imperialism, revisionism and opportunism' have always attacked the International Communist Movement right from the period of Lenin to date." (p. 2, emphasis added)

"You are spreading pessimism, gloom and a siege mentality...." (p. 3, top)

"8. Here is pontification of the basest kind: The "three-worlders" and the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism are occupying one of the advance posts in the ring of fire." What does this *reactionary chauvinist lecturing* mean? It means that we should also follow you down your *reactionary freeway* of

In this section, we shall examine a number of theses that you denounce as "peculiar." We shall show that you are denouncing as "peculiar" the accepted theses of the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement or even well-known orthodox theses of Marxism-Leninism. In considering what the accepted theories of present-day revolutionary Marxism-Leninism are, we do not take a consensus or general average of the views prevailing among the Marxist-Leninists, but instead refer to the highest and most profound achievements of contemporary revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. Therefore we shall use as a standard for the accepted theories of present-day revolutionary Marxism-Leninism various works by Comrade Enver Hoxha, such as *Imperialism and the Revolution* and the *Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA*. We shall also make extensive use of the book *Problems of Current World Development*, which consists of the reports submitted to the Scientific Session held in Tirana, Albania on October 2-4, 1978. (We shall refer to this book in this section with the abbreviation "Problems.") As the classics of Marxism-Leninism and the arbiter of Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy, we take the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

American exceptionalism which you have lit up with these concoctions that 'Chinese revisionism ... [is] occupying one of the advance posts in this ring of fire.' ... you are using *scare-crow tactics* to divide [divert? — ed.] the genuine *Marxist-Leninist parties* from taking up the historic task of proletarian revolution for solution in their own countries and vigorously and resolutely fighting hard against imperialism, social-imperialism and all reaction and against revisionism and opportunism of all hues. Your *scare-crow* does not scare anyone. It only makes you feel oh so clever that your head, without any respect whatsoever for the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement... is able to conjure up *these peculiar theses* and float them without any sense of shame...." (p. 3, bottom, emphasis added)

These quotations are revisionist trash to deny the struggle against opportunism. To give these utterly revisionist theses some revolutionary coloring, you cloak them in "official optimism" about opportunism. Oh yes, you are "for" the struggle against opportunism in general, as a part of a flowery plati-

tude. But, you say, don't worry about this struggle, there is "nothing new" to concern oneself about in the sinister work and machinations of the opportunists and revisionists, 'presumably everyone is an old hand at the struggle, everything is fine and under control, and it is "spreading pessimism, gloom and a siege mentality" to talk about the urgency and burning importance of the struggle against revisionism. All this is reminiscent of Khrushchov's taunts against the PLA for their struggle against Yugoslav revisionism, the taunts that this struggle only inflates the importance of the Yugoslavs, reflects narrow nationalism, and so on and so forth.

Furthermore, we see that you do not only attack the struggle against the domestic American opportunists as "American exceptionalism," you attack our talk of the importance of the struggle against Chinese revisionism in general as "reactionary chauvinist lecturing" and "your reactionary freeway of American exceptionalism." This shows the curses you are throwing right and left at the struggle against opportunism. As well, it shows that you trifle with the terms "chauvinism" and "American exceptionalism" and use them simply to indicate that we disagree with you. You use these phrases as almost interchangeable with your use of the word "peculiar." If we disagree with you, this is automatically in your eyes not only "peculiar" but "chauvinism" and a "reactionary freeway of American exceptionalism."

These arguments of yours are diametrically opposed to the theses from the Scientific Sessions held in October of 1978 in Albania. There Fiqret Shehu gave a speech entitled "Broadening and Deepening of the Struggle Against All the Currents of Modern Revisionism — an Historical Necessity." The point is not that there is "nothing new" in the struggle against opportunism, but that the Marxist-Leninist theory, including its teachings on the struggle against opportunism, retain their ever-new and ever-fresh quality. Comrade Fiqret Shehu pointed out the following:

"...Lenin's well-known thesis that *without fighting opportunism, imperialism cannot be fought successfully*, always retains its validity and relevance. Indeed, this thesis assumes *special importance under the present circumstances* when there is no essential difference between revisionism in power and imperialism, between the strategy of the one and that of the other.

"Now, in particular, when the bourgeoisie is making extensive use of such agencies as *social-democracy and revisionism* in its struggle against the cause of the proletariat, the main condition to achieve success in the socialist revolution is the resolute struggle on the part of

the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary parties against any influence of revisionism and opportunism among the ranks of the proletariat and all working people." (*Problems*, p. 68; except for the first emphasis, all emphasis added)

"The activation of present-day revisionism and opportunism is precisely one of these weapons which the bourgeoisie is using in the present situation of the general crisis of capitalism." (*Ibid.*, p. 71, emphasis added)

"In the present situation, all sorts of attacks are being directed against the revolutionary theory of the working class and the great teachers of the proletariat Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin...."

"What accounts for this unprecedented race between the enemies of Marxism-Leninism to attack and fulminate against the proletarian ideology and its founders and elaborators, to slander them in cynical fashion?" (*Ibid.*, p. 75)

"The onslaught which all the enemies of the proletariat have launched against Marxism-Leninism, and their efforts to 'bury' it are not without precedent in history. More than 100 years ago, the Paris Commune was furiously attacked by world reaction." (*Ibid.*, p. 76)

"Two to three decades have gone by since the time when one of the first and most dangerous manifestations of modern revisionism, Titoite revisionism, emerged, and since, with the emergence of Khrushchevite revisionism, revisionism was transformed into a retrogressive trend of world-wide proportions. During this period, it has gone through a process of its formation and evolution until it reached the present stage, when more than ever before, it has become a favourite agency of the bourgeoisie...." (*Ibid.*, p. 44)

"As regards its extension revisionism has now reached a culmination stage. After this, its utter discredit, inevitable defeat and ruin are bound to follow. But these will not come about automatically or spontaneously...." (*Ibid.*, p. 45, emphasis added)

Comrade Ramiz Alia in his "Closing Speech" pointed out:

"Nowadays it is more necessary than ever to maintain our vigilance on the ideological front... It is our task to expose and ward off all these attempts of the enemies, either coming from the Khrushchevite, Titoite, or Eurocommunist revisionists, or when they are the off-

spring of the so-called Mao Tsetung thought." (*Ibid.*, pp. 141-42)

Comrade Enver Hoxha also speaks against the complacency that there is "nothing new" in *Imperialism and the Revolution*. He writes that:

"The revolution has run into rocks and there are more ahead which must be blown up with explosives. Some must be blown up directly, some must be broken down piecemeal, while some others must be outflanked and then given the finishing blow." (Book form, p. 459; *Proletarian Internationalism*, Vol. 1, No. 2, p. 124, col. 2)

You deny these theses on the present-day activation of revisionism, social-democracy and opportunism in order to deny or downplay the struggle against opportunism. You write that there is "nothing new" in this struggle "right from the period of Lenin to date." Thus you counterpose the validity of the Leninist teachings to the question of whether

X-B: Opposition to "highlighting" the struggle against Chinese revisionism

In your letters of December 5, you accuse us of "highlighting" the struggle against Chinese revisionism. Indeed, you yourself claim that "the crux of the matter," that is, the deciding or essential issue, in the differences between our two Parties lies in our "highlighting" of the struggle against Chinese revisionism. (See the introduction to Section IX of our letter for the quotations from your letter on this.)

As well, in the quotations from your letter that we gave just above in Section X-A, in denying the present-day activation of revisionism and opportunism you particularly denied the importance of the struggle against Chinese revisionism. You call this one of our Party's "peculiar" and "American exceptionalist" theses.

But the importance and urgency of the struggle against Chinese revisionism is, however, an accepted thesis of the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. This was stressed at the Scientific Sessions in Albania at which the following was said:

"At present, without overlooking the earlier revisionist trends, the struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties against influences from Chinese revisionism and illusions about the pseudo-Marxist, anti-proletarian, petty-bourgeois, populist, eclectic and pragmatist ideo-theoretical, philosophical-social and political-strategic concepts that it is based on, assumes particular importance." (*Problems*, p. 81)

"In opposition to, and in struggle against, the

there is anything "new" in the world. This counterposition itself is a gross violation of the Leninist teachings and of Marxist-Leninist dialectics. But there is yet more to your phrase that there is "nothing new...right from the period of Lenin to date." You do not mean by this that you accept the Leninist teachings, but the exact opposite. We shall see later on that you advocate that the last split that took place in the international communist movement was that between Leninism and social-democracy back in "the period of Lenin." From this truly and genuinely "peculiar" theory, you go on to elaborate a whole theory of "official optimism" about opportunism. You hold that this question was settled at the time of Lenin and hence that the Leninist teachings concerning the struggle elaborated at the time of the split with social-democracy do not apply anymore. We shall deal with this question further in Sections X-F and X-G.

disruptive stands and actions of the Chinese revisionists, the Marxist-Leninist parties have stepped up their efforts to continuously strengthen the unity and collaboration among themselves and within the framework of the Marxist-Leninist movement as a whole." (*Ibid.*, p. 107)

"The present situations, and especially the emergence of Chinese revisionism call for a deeper Marxist-Leninist criticism of the bourgeois-revisionist theories and preachings." (*Ibid.*, pp. 142-43)

Comrade Enver Hoxha also put this forward in his great book *Imperialism and the Revolution*. He wrote that:

"Now for our Party, as well as for all the Marxist-Leninist parties in the world, the struggle against Chinese revisionism should be given the greatest attention. This is an important question, but this does not mean that while dealing with it, we are permitted to forget [the other trends of revisionism — ed.] (Book form, pp. 459-460; *Proletarian Internationalism*, Vol. 1, No. 2, p. 125, col. 1)

Furthermore, if one examines the great polemic waged by the Party of Labor of Albania, one sees the great importance placed on the struggle against Chinese revisionism. We have listed some of the works from this powerful and breathtaking polemic in Section IX-A.

X-C: The struggle against social-chauvinism is international

You have repeatedly denounced the movement in the U.S. against social-chauvinism as an allegedly "peculiar" movement.

For example, you condemned the struggle against social-chauvinism in the discussions of early September 1978. You said that:

"It is not struggle against social-chauvinism, but defending the International Communist Movement which is correct. You are a contingent of the International Communist Movement and your obligation is to defend it in your country.

"Besides this you develop your ties with the working class. None of the Parties pay much attention to these struggles against the particular groups in their countries. ... We had the idea that you come up against the opportunists and you begin a fight and carry it through. Other Parties have asked us why we do this. It is not right. Today we only do this in certain [local — ed.] areas. This may not even be right."

"Nobody is fighting against 'social-chauvinism'."

At the same time, you also wrote down on paper the typical opportunist sneer against the struggle against opportunism, writing that you had:

"...views on certain lines, especially of writing articles on the theme that 'struggle against social-chauvinism' is the end-all and be-all in the U.S."

However, as usual, you did not elaborate your views.

You repeated this opposition to the movement against social-chauvinism many times. For example, in the discussion of early August 1979 you again reiterated that:

"You are promoting a peculiar movement [the movement against social-chauvinism — ed.] in the U.S. This should not be done."

"Our only disagreement is with this peculiar movement in the U.S. Slogan [i.e., "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists" — ed.] indicates this movement. Our view is that there is something quite suspicious to have a movement in a particular region separate from trials and tribulations of the International Communist Movement."

You claimed that this movement was no good as it was "not the preoccupation of the international com-

munist movement." Setting yourself up as the spokesman for the other parties, you argued that:

"The Party of Labor of Albania never said that they are building the party against social-chauvinism."

"In a number of places parties have been reconstructed — CCC, DDD, etc. Is this the method that was used in these countries?"

You repeat your denunciation of the struggle against social-chauvinism in your letters of December 5. Only you do it in a shamefaced way, not mentioning the phrase "movement" (or struggle) against social-chauvinism, but just repeating your previous denunciations of it without saying what it is that you are denouncing. This is in itself evidence that you are quite aware that there is nothing at all "peculiar" in the movement against social-chauvinism and that you will be subjecting yourself to the danger of appearing absolutely ridiculous or to the danger of too openly coming forward with your theories against the anti-revisionist struggle if you openly denounced the movement against social-chauvinism. You prefer, as usual, to leave certain things to the spoken word and keep them out of writing.

Be that as it may. The facts are that the struggle against social-chauvinism is an international issue. Naturally the form of the great struggle against Chinese revisionism differs in certain respects from one country to another. But not only is the movement against social-chauvinism a legitimate form, not only is the movement in the U.S. against social-chauvinism simply the American component of the great international struggle against Chinese revisionism, but all over the world, in fighting Chinese revisionism the Marxist-Leninists are also fighting the social-chauvinist theories of the Chinese revisionists.

The Scientific Sessions in Albania pointed out:

"At present the true communist parties have set themselves the task of refuting the opportunist thesis of the Chinese revisionists, who call on the proletariat to unite with 'its own' bourgeoisie for the 'defence of the Fatherland' and to make clear to the masses of the proletariat the lesson set out in the 'Manifesto of the Communist Party'...that 'the proletariat of each country must, of course, first settle accounts with its own bourgeoisie.'" (*Problems*, pp. 68-69, emphasis as in the original)

Hence the struggle against social-chauvinism is an important international task.

X-D: By denouncing the struggle against "one's own" domestic opportunists, you are coming straight out against one of the cornerstones of Marxism-Leninism

You have been repeatedly counterposing the struggle against the domestic opportunists to the struggle on the burning international issues. The purpose of this counterposition of yours has been to downplay or negate the struggle against the domestic opportunists. Thus you attack our struggle against "our own" domestic opportunists as "American exceptionalism," "chauvinism," as not "participating in the preoccupations of the International Communist Movement" and so forth.

But in denouncing the struggle against "one's own" domestic opportunists, you are coming straight out against one of the cornerstones of Marxism-Leninism. For example, in the struggle against social-chauvinism, Comrade Lenin was rather abusive against those who don't fight "their own" social-chauvinists, but only those of other countries. In one of his many statements on this subject, Comrade Lenin held this position up to biting ridicule and wrote of it in connection with the denunciation of Kautsky:

"...Kautsky once again swears to be a Marxist in the coming epoch of ultra-imperialism, which may or may not arrive! In short, any number of promises to be a Marxist in another epoch, not now, not under present conditions, not in this epoch! Marxism on credit, Marxism in promises, Marxism tomorrow, a petty-bourgeois, opportunist theory — and not only a theory — of blunting contradictions today. This is something like the internationalism for export which is very popular today with ardent — oh, so ardent! — internationalists and Marxists who sympathise with every manifestation of internationalism — in the enemy camp, anywhere, but not at home, not among their allies: ... In a word, it is one of the 1,001 varieties of hypocrisy." (Collected Works, Vol. 22, p. 107, emphasis, except for "internationalism for export," as in the original)

Elaborating on the same theme, and linking this up with the need to judge parties and revolutionaries on the basis of their deeds, not merely their words, Comrade Stalin wrote:

"Furthermore, history knows not a few Socialists who, foaming at the mouth, called upon the workers' parties of other countries to perform the most revolutionary actions imaginable. But that does not mean that they did not in their own party, or in their own country, shrink from fighting their own opportunists, their own bourgeoisie. Is not this why Lenin taught us to test revolutionary parties, trends and leaders, not by their declarations and resolutions, but by

their deeds?" ("Some Questions Concerning the History of Bolshevism," Works, Vol. 13, p. 99, emphasis as in the original)

Comrade Lenin further elaborated on this question in his book "Left-Wing Communism," *An Infantile Disorder*. Near the beginning of Chapter X, which is entitled "Some Conclusions," Comrade Lenin stresses:

"More. The history of the working-class movement now shows that in all countries it is about to experience (and has already begun to experience) a struggle between communism, which is growing, gaining strength and marching towards victory, and, first and foremost, its own (in each country) 'Menshevism,' i.e., opportunism and social-chauvinism, and, secondly — as a supplement so to say — 'Left-wing' Communism." (Emphasis as in the original)

Comrade Lenin goes on to point out that the struggle against each country's own "Menshevism," i.e., opportunism and social-chauvinism "is proceeding 'in all countries, apparently without a single exception, as a struggle between the Second International (already virtually killed) and the Third International' and that the struggle against 'left-wing' communism can be observed in Germany, Great Britain, Italy, America and France. Comrade Lenin concludes from this that 'the struggle is undoubtedly being waged not only on an international, but even on a world-wide scale.'" How alien to Leninism is the counterposing of the struggle against "one's own" domestic opportunism to the struggle against international opportunism! From the fact that the struggle is proceeding in each country against its own opportunism, Lenin concludes that it is an international, even a worldwide, struggle!

Comrade Lenin then goes on to state:

"But while the working-class movement is everywhere passing through what is actually the same kind of preparatory school for victory over the bourgeoisie, it is in each country achieving this development in its own way. ...

"The whole point now is that the Communists of every country should quite consciously take into account both the main fundamental tasks of the struggle against opportunism and 'Left' doctrinairism and the specific features which this struggle assumes and inevitably must assume in each separate country in conformity with the peculiar features of its economics, politics, culture, national composition (Ireland, etc.), its colonies, religious divisions, and so on and so forth." (emphasis as in the original)

From this Comrade Lenin even draws conclusions about the nature of a truly centralized international leading center. He continues, saying:

"Everywhere we can feel that dissatisfaction with the Second International is spreading and growing, both because of its opportunism and because of its inability, or incapacity, to create a really centralized, a really leading centre that would be capable of directing the international tactics of the revolutionary proletariat in its struggle for a world Soviet republic. We must clearly realize that such a leading centre cannot under any circumstances be built up on stereotyped, mechanically equalized and identical tactical rules of struggle. ... the unity of international tactics of the Communist working-class movement of all countries demands, not the elimination of variety, not the abolition of national differences... but such an application of the fundamental principles of Communism... as will correctly modify these principles in certain particulars, correctly adapt and apply them to national and nation-state differences." (emphasis as in the original)

Comrade Lenin then proceeds to wax enthusiastic over this task. He stressed:

"Investigate, study, seek, divine, grasp that which is peculiarly national, specifically national in the concrete manner in which each country approaches the fulfilment of the single international task, in which it approaches the victory over opportunism and 'Left' doctrinairism within the working-class movement, the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, and the establishment of a Soviet republic and a proletarian dictatorship — such is the main task of the historical period through which all the advanced countries (and not only the advanced countries) are now passing." (emphasis as in the original)

Comrade Lenin identifies this task as "seeking the forms of transition or approach to the proletarian revolution." How Comrade Lenin would have scorned and mocked the arguments of those who today use the epithet "peculiar" in place of thinking, or the advice to turn a blind eye to one's own domestic opportunists allegedly for the sake of taking part in the single international struggle! No wonder! Comrade Lenin bitterly mocked at "internationalism for export"!

The Scientific Sessions dealt with this question also. Instead of counterposing the struggles against domestic and international opportunism, the Scientific Sessions followed the Marxist-Leninist path of defining the relationship between these struggles

and calling for them to be waged simultaneously. Comrade Fiqret Shehu pointed out:

"For this reason the genuine Marxist-Leninist communist parties do not see the struggle of the proletariat against 'its own' bourgeoisie and the struggle to expose revisionism and opportunism in its own country from a narrow angle, as a question confined within the national context, but as part of the struggle to cope with the attacks of the reactionary bourgeoisie in general and modern revisionism as a whole.... However, the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie is initially a national struggle, 'in form if not in substance.' This is precisely why the Marxist-Leninists wage their struggle against all the enemies of the proletariat and the peoples, against modern revisionism, the bourgeoisie, imperialism and socialimperialism, simultaneously, on a national and international scale. In their struggle against the international revisionism of the present day, too, they bear in mind that the same socio-political content manifests itself in one form or another, according to specific national features." ("Broadening and Deepening of the Struggle Against All the Currents of Modern Revisionism — An Historical Necessity," *Problems*, p. 70, second emphasis added)

"These are favourable factors which must be exploited in order to strengthen and intensify the struggle against the revisionism and opportunism of each individual country and against revisionism and opportunism as a whole. This, because without fighting revisionism, such historical tasks as proletarian revolution, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the organization of socialism cannot be carried out, and there can be no genuine freedom and independence for the peoples." (*Ibid.*, p. 73)

And Comrade Agim Pops pointed out:

"However, they [the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties — ed.] have devoted, and deem it essential to devote great attention to the fight against the revisionist parties within their own countries, too, as this is a fight not only over the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism, but also over the concrete problems of the revolutionary movement, over the revolutionary strategy and tactics in the concrete situations of their own countries." ("The Marxist-Leninist Parties — the Leading Force of the Revolutionary Movement Today," *Problems*, p. 81)

X-E: No amount of anti-Leninist word-chopping can deny the reality that the new Marxist-Leninist parties have been formed and have matured in the struggle against the modern revisionist betrayal

As part of your downplaying or negating of the struggle against revisionism and opportunism, you deny that various Marxist-Leninist parties have been born in the struggle against revisionism. According to you, to say that a party is born in the struggle against opportunism means that the party does nothing else but issue polemics and does not have the various other attributes of a true Leninist party. This was one of your arguments against the slogan "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists."

You advocated these views repeatedly. For example, in the discussions of May 1979 you stated:

"You [COUSML — ed.] think that two-line struggle [your term for the polemical struggle or for the movement against social-chauvinism — ed.] will give rise to something, 'anti-social-chauvinist movement.' In 2-3 months we will have views to present to you on this. Eventually, we will see where you end up with these views. We [CPC(M-L) — ed.] used to say to build the party against revisionism. This is wrong. It will take six months to write it, but on the 10th anniversary of the party we will publish a CPC(M-L) history and debunk this. [N.B.: the tenth anniversary of CPC(M-L) has come and gone and neither of the documents mentioned above has been either presented to us or published. — ed.]"

You also reiterated this at the discussions in early August 1979. You stated:

"Our first main question, our objection is to the title [of the Call of the NC of the COUSML, i.e., to the slogan "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists" — ed.]. What does it mean? It is our view that Party's main characteristic is that it is a Leninist Party based on Leninist norms. But this concept is of two-line struggle in the U.S. Marxist-Leninist movement — it is (the idea that the neo-revisionist trend is in the Marxist-Leninist movement) and Party is based on struggle against this neo-revisionist trend."

And you added later on in this discussion, in reference to the struggle against social-chauvinism, the following:

"What struggles you are waging has nothing to do with what is Party. What the Party does, in waging various struggles, is a separate thing (than what the Party is)."

In the discussions of early November 1979 you reiterated this, stating:

"This makes the line of demarcation 'pro-' or 'anti-' this or that. But the issue is defence of Marxism-Leninism. The genuine Marxist-Leninists are united."

But the emergence of various Marxist-Leninist parties from the struggle against revisionism is an accepted thesis of the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. It is also an obvious fact. This was expressed at the Scientific Sessions in Albania. Comrade Nexhmije Hoxha stated in the Opening Speech that:

"With the Marxist-Leninist Parties, we have been and will be united by the struggle against modern revisionism, a struggle in the waves of which these parties were set up, grew and waxed strong...." (*Problems*, p. 8)

Comrade Agim Popa stated:

"In the struggle against Chinese revisionism, too, just as in the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism, new Marxist-Leninist revolutionary parties of the working class will emerge and grow where such parties do not yet exist, or where the existing parties have deviated from the road of Marxism-Leninism and the revolution."

"The formation and tempering of proletarian parties as Leninist-Stalinist parties of the new type is a continuous and many-sided process which takes place in the fire of their ceaseless revolutionary activity." ("The Marxist-Leninist Parties — Leading Force of the Revolutionary Movement Today," *Problems*, p. 79)

Here Comrade Agim Popa both declares that various parties have come from the struggle against revisionism and also immediately refers to the "continuous and many-sided process" of their formation and tempering in the fire of ceaseless revolutionary activity. Hence these two theses cannot be counterposed. As well, it is notable that Comrade Agim Popa explicitly endorses the emergence of new Marxist-Leninist parties from the struggle against Chinese revisionism. Comrade Popa went on to say:

"The new Marxist-Leninist parties were born and grew in the struggle in defence of Marxism-Leninism against the revisionist betrayal." (*Ibid.*, p. 80)

The same view is expressed in the *History of the Party of Labor of Albania*, which stated:

"The creation of the new Marxist-Leninist parties and groups was the result of the process of differentiation which had begun and continued to develop without interruption between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism. This was a natural process of the struggle between two

opposite ideologies which can never live together within a single Marxist-Leninist party, or within the world communist movement in general. Opportunism and revisionism have always been and remain the main splitters of the parties of the working class and of the world workers' and communist movement." (pp. 604-605)

The Marxist-Leninist classics themselves also refer to the formation of various parties and even of Leninism itself in the course of the struggle against opportunism. Comrade Lenin, for example, wrote:

"The Third International actually emerged in 1918, when the long years of struggle against opportunism and social-chauvinism, especially during the war, led to the formation of Communist Parties in a number of countries." ("The Third International and Its Place in History," *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 306)

How utterly alien to Marxism-Leninism is all your scholastic and pettifogging word-chopping which counterposes what a party is to what it does, and counterposes the defense of Marxism-Leninism to the struggle against revisionism and opportunism.

X-F: A truly "peculiar" thesis which relegates Lenin's teachings on the struggle against opportunism to the museum of historical antiquity

A further thesis that you have developed in order to deny the struggle against revisionism and opportunism is that the international communist movement has not been split since the time of Lenin. You apply this concept to the Marxist-Leninist movement of each country too. You hold that both nationally and internationally Marxist-Leninists are automatically united, by definition, and not as a result of the struggle against opportunist elements. This is one of the reasons you give for opposing the slogan "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists," for this slogan is the slogan that calls for the most resolute irreconcilable struggle against, or, to put it another way, for a split with, the social-chauvinists. But you hold that the last split was between social-democracy and Leninism, and that the "without and against" slogan is therefore no longer valid. You use the argument that the last split was between social-democracy and Leninism in order to negate the struggle against revisionism and opportunism.

In the discussions of early August 1979 you said: "Modern revisionism is not a trend which arose from within the movement. Khrushchov tried to smuggle Khrushchovism into the Marxist-Leninist movement. The movement was split at the time of Lenin and not since then."

You elaborated this further as follows:

and so forth, all this word-chopping and obscurantism that is designed to negate the Leninist teachings on the struggle against opportunism!

Indeed, similar lessons apply to the birth and development of Leninism itself. Describing the development of Bolshevism, Comrade Lenin wrote a chapter in his famous work "Left-Wing" Communism, *An Infantile Disorder* entitled:

"In the Struggle Against What Enemies Within the Working-Class Movement Did Bolshevism Grow Up and Become Strong and Steeled?"

Elaborating on the same subject, Comrade Stalin wrote:

"Everyone knows that Leninism was born, grew up and became strong in relentless struggle against opportunism of every brand, including Centrism in the West (Kautsky) and Centrism in our country (Trotsky, etc.). This cannot be denied even by the downright enemies of Bolshevism. It is an axiom." ("Some Questions Concerning the History of Bolshevism," *Works*, Vol. 13, p. 87)

"With the rise of imperialism, there was created a definite stratum. This split the working class movement. It has been split since this time onwards."

"There are two movements. The international working class movement was split by imperialism. The working class movement has been split since that time. [N.B.: But for that matter, the working class movement did not come into existence pure and united. Whatever unity it achieved prior to the rise of imperialism was also the result of fierce struggles by Marx and Engels and the Marxists against opportunism and pre-Marxian socialism and outright capitalist trends, etc. All this by way of aside. — ed.] ... So the split takes place at World War I. You can take any time, but we will say 1919, the formation of the Third International, this consummated the split. The working class movement is split. But the international communist movement is united. The revisionists from Browder on tried to split the unity of the Leninists. The struggle against Browder is struggle against a split. This is why we say revisionists are splitters. It is not true that the Marxist-Leninists are split. It is Khrushchov that split.... Therefore unity exists and this unity is Leninism and is the

communist international. That unity has to be defended. ... The communist movement is always united and fighting all things which are thrown against them. The working class movement on the other hand is split."

This is so nonsensical that in the discussions of early November 1979 you had to defend it with this equivocal pair of statements:

"But what I disagree with is this thesis that revisionism arises from the international movement."

"Of course you can say factually that the revisionists came out of the international movement, if you want to be formalistic."

All this is just "official optimism" to deny the struggle against opportunism. When the call is given to fight the revisionists and opportunists, you moralistically condemn this call as implying that the revisionists and opportunists are Marxist-Leninists, for if they weren't, then why is a call given to clear them out of the Marxist-Leninist movement, for they wouldn't be there in the first place. Thus you turn things on their head and denounce the struggle against revisionism and opportunism as allegedly a manifestation of the belief that the opportunists are Marxist-Leninists. What utter sophistry and demagoguery! You back this up by saying that the last split was between Leninism and social-democracy. Hence you negate the Leninist teachings on the struggle against social-democracy and opportunism and deny

X-G: Your opposition to the "without and against" slogan is also anti-Leninist

You denounce our slogan "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists" as allegedly "peculiar." The reasons you give for this are that this slogan stands for carrying out the movement against social-chauvinism, calls for struggle against "one's own" domestic opportunists, is a call for an irreconcilable struggle, i.e., for a split, with the social-chauvinists, and so forth. We have already dealt with these issues separately in the previous parts of Section X. Your opposition to this slogan is an expression of your negation of the Leninist teachings on the struggle against opportunism and your replacement of them by "official optimism."

For the rest, we will simply point out that this slogan is not at all "peculiar" to our Party. Various forms or variants of the "without and against" slogan were repeatedly put forward by Comrade Lenin as the path forward during the struggle against social-chauvinism in World War I. And the "without and against" slogan was also given by Comrade Enver Hoxha in the struggle against Khrushchevite

their present relevance. You hold that prior to 1919, perhaps, there could be talk of struggle to build the proletarian parties without and against the opportunists. But for the present you replace the Leninist teachings on the struggle against opportunism with the new task of simply defending unity.

In a later section, Section XI-G, we shall deal further with your sophistry on this question and your "official optimism." But for the time being, we simply note that this is an example of where, under the banner of opposing allegedly "peculiar theories," such as the "without and against" slogan, you are seeking to impose on us a genuinely and truly "peculiar" theory. For it is closing one's eyes to the well-known facts to argue that the international communist movement has always been united without any splits since the time of Lenin.

For example, at the Scientific Sessions, Comrade Agim Popa pointed out:

"As in the case of the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the Second International and that by the Khrushchevite revisionists in the 50's and 60's, the emergence on the scene and crystallization of the present-day Chinese revisionism with its counterrevolutionary theory of 'three worlds' has caused a split in the Marxist-Leninist movement today." ("The Marxist-Leninist Parties — The Leading Force of the Revolutionary Movement Today," *Problems of Current World Development*, p. 103)

revisionism. In 1966, at the 5th Congress of the Party of Labor of Albania, Comrade Hoxha stated:

"...unity will be re-established in the communist movement and the socialist camp, but it will be re-established by the Marxist-Leninists without revisionists and traitors and in resolute struggle against them." (*Report to the 5th Congress of the PLA* as cited in *History of the PLA*, p. 605)

The "General Conclusions" at the end of the *History of the PLA* also contains the "without and against" slogan. It states:

"The PLA has also performed a great internationalist duty by carrying on a consistent principled struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism. By means of this struggle it has tried to: ...to re-establish this unity following the split which the Khrushchevite revisionists caused, on a revolutionary basis, without revisionists and traitors and in struggle against them." (pp. 675-76)

X-H: Snivelling complaints against the ideological and polemical struggle are alien to Marxism-Leninism

You have also denied the role of the polemical struggle against opportunism. You have floated thesis after thesis against the polemics; you have repeatedly crusaded against the "ideological struggle" under the pretext of opposing the factionalism of this or that opportunist group; and in practice you have sought to avoid the polemical struggle against revisionism and opportunism as far as possible and to downplay the theoretical and political content of the polemics and to reduce them to side issues and trivialities. You denounce the polemical struggle as "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle'" in order to try to present your denunciation of the polemical struggle as the stand of the international movement. But your theses against the ideological and polemical struggle are in fact your own theses directed against the struggle against opportunism, and these theses stand against the great international struggle of the Marxist-Leninists against the various trends of modern revisionism.

At the 7th Congress of the PLA, Comrade Enver Hoxha stressed the role of the great polemic against modern revisionism. He stated:

"Our Party holds that the continuation and extension of the ideological struggle against revisionism in general, and of Soviet revisionism in particular, the deepening of that great polemic which began after the 1960 Moscow Meeting, constitutes an important and imperative duty for all the Marxist-Leninists, for all true revolutionaries." (*Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA*, p. 226, emphasis as in the original)

Comrade Enver Hoxha thus called for the continuation and extension of the ideological struggle and regarded this ideological struggle as indissolubly linked with the great polemic against the modern revisionists. Later in the same paragraph he states that "The defence of Marxism-Leninism is a question of principle." It is quite clear that Comrade Hoxha does not counterpose the ideological and polemical struggle to "the defence of Marxism-Leninism," but instead wages the ideological and polemical struggle for the defence of Marxism-Leninism.

The *History of the Party of Labor of Albania* also stresses the importance of the ideological and polemical struggle against the modern revisionists. In the passage below it points out the importance of the ideological struggle in ensuring that the struggle against modern revisionism is not diverted into trivialities. It states:

"The open attack launched by the Soviet revisionist leadership against the PLA was not a principled polemic about the fundamental problems of the times over which profound differences had arisen in the international communist

movement. On the contrary, the Khrushchevite group used every method to avoid any discussion on problems of principle, because it was aware of its own weakness in such a discussion. It resorted to slanders and lies continually reported by the revisionist propaganda, to intrigues and plots, diversions and other acts of the most vile sort against the PLA. ... The aim of the revisionists was to isolate and expel the PLA from the international communist movement, to give 'a good lesson' to all who would dare oppose their anti-Marxist course.

"The PLA did not adopt the revisionist position. It was not caught up in trivialities and banalities. It continued its struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism in the ideological sphere, exposing all its anti-Marxist points of view, its inconsistencies, its eclecticism, its swinging from opportunism to adventurism, and its diversionist activity. The articles of 'Zeri i Popullit' against revisionism, translated into several languages and reprinted in pamphlets and broadcast by the radio, served as a powerful and keen-edged weapon in the hands of the Party in its principled struggle in defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism." (pp. 534-35)

The ideological and polemical struggle is closely connected with the raising of the political consciousness of the masses, with the revolutionary education and training of the masses. The struggle against revisionism and opportunism must be brought to the masses and the polemical struggle is a crucial weapon in this. The next quotations we refer to on the importance of the ideological and polemical struggle also point to the necessity to wage this struggle among the masses.

Thus, at the Scientific Sessions, Comrade Fiqet Shehu pointed out:

"The historical experience of the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism over the last decades too, fully confirms Lenin's teaching that the only correct Marxist line in the world communist movement is to explain to the proletariat and all the working people the absolute need to break with revisionism and opportunism, to educate the masses through a consistent struggle against those trends, to expose their betrayal of the cause of the proletariat and the peoples and all the infamy of the policy they pursue." ("Broadening and Deepening of the Struggle Against All Currents of Modern Revisionism — An Historical Necessity," *Problems*, p. 58, emphasis added)

Similarly, in the passage from Comrade Fiqet Shehu that we have already quoted in Section X-C

on fighting social-chauvinism, she talks of making this question clear "to the masses of the proletariat."

Indeed, in opposing the ideological and polemical struggle you are going against the orthodox theses from the Marxist-Leninist classics. In Section IX-A we quoted a vivid passage from Comrade Lenin on the polemical struggle. He pointed out that the struggle against the opportunists could not be avoided, and that "the real choice" was either "concealed forms" of this struggle with their "demoralizing effect on the masses" or an open struggle

"...on matters of principle, allowing the mass of party comrades, and not merely the 'leaders,' to settle fundamental issues — such a

X-I: The centrist thesis that polemics against revisionism disrupt building "unity"

You counterpose the struggle against Chinese revisionism to the question of building the "unity" of the Marxist-Leninists. We showed this in the introduction to Section IX and we shall deal with it further later on. In particular, as part of your denial of the role of the ideological and polemical struggle, you counterpose polemics against revisionism and opportunism to the struggle for "unity." This goes to the extent that you even oppose "hidden attacks" on the conciliators of social-chauvinism, i.e., you even oppose the raising of burning ideological issues without explicitly attacking any particular organization. You defend a policy of pragmatic maneuvers with the conciliators under the signboard of "unity" and simultaneously denounce the movement against social-chauvinism as a "peculiar" movement. Such a policy is a policy of seeking "unity," of engaging in pragmatic maneuvers, on the basis of blunting or liquidating altogether the cutting edge of the polemic against Chinese revisionism.

But your thesis that polemics against revisionism and opportunism are a disruption of "unity" are your own theses and not the accepted views of the

X-J: Marxism-Leninism considers that the anti-revisionist struggle is essential and invigorating for the party and the revolution — not a mere unfortunate diversion as you insist

The whole attitude manifested by your theses towards the movement against social-chauvinism, the struggle against Chinese revisionism, the struggle against "one's own" domestic opportunists, and so forth, in short, your whole attitude towards the struggle against revisionism and opportunism, is wrong. The question is not the way you present it, that the struggle against revisionism is at best a sad necessity, something like taking castor oil, some-

thing that is forced on one and prevents one from dealing with the real issues of revolutionary work and from seeking "unity." The struggle against revisionism and opportunism should not be presented as an unfortunate diversion, something to be hurried through as rapidly as possible, with the opportunists and revisionists simply presented as criminals and police and with the political and ideological questions shoved aside.

struggle is both necessary and useful, for it trains in the masses independence and ability to carry out their epoch-making revolutionary mission."

Here we have the Leninist conception of the struggle against opportunism. How alien to Leninism are sniveling complaints against "ideological struggle" and the denunciation of the struggle against opportunism as a diversion from real work among the masses. The Leninist conception regards the ideological and polemical struggle against the opportunists as "both necessary and useful, for it trains in the masses independence and ability to carry out their epoch-making revolutionary mission."

international Marxist-Leninist movement. At the Scientific Sessions Comrade Agim Popa pointed out:

"Experience shows that *only on the basis of a merciless struggle against opportunism and revisionism of all hues is it possible to preserve, strengthen and continuously temper sound Marxist-Leninist unity.* From this point of view, the 'arguments' of those who want to smother and extinguish the struggle against opportunism and revisionism under the pretext of 'avoiding polemics' and preserving 'unity,' are without foundation; indeed they are centrist, anti-Marxist and fraudulent. The Party of Labour of Albania and the other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties firmly reject such attempts. They have waged and are waging an uncompromising principled struggle against all those who betray Marxism-Leninism and thus split the revolutionary unity, be they Soviet, Yugoslav, Italian, French, Spanish, Chinese or others." ("The Marxist-Leninist Parties — The Leading Force of the Revolutionary Movement Today," *Problems*, p. 104, emphasis as in the original)

On the contrary, the struggle against revisionism and opportunism, when it is a real struggle and not a concoction, when it is based firmly on principles, is a powerful invigorating force. It lends tremendous moral authority to the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties. It sweeps away rust. It helps light the path forward. It helps train and prepare the masses for revolution. It is no accident that the movement against social-chauvinism has had a powerful invigorating effect and led to the founding of the Marxist-Leninist Party of the USA. And it is not for nothing that Comrade Agim Popa pointed out at the Scientific Sessions, as we quoted earlier in Section X-E, that:

"In the struggle against Chinese revisionism, too, just as in the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism, new Marxist-Leninist revolutionary parties of the working class will emerge and grow...." (*Ibid.*, p. 79)

The struggle against revisionism and opportunism is not a "diversion" that will go away to leave us to carry on our revolutionary work in peace and quiet. On the contrary, it is an integral part of revolutionary work. Comrade Lenin stressed:

"It is in the struggle between these two tendencies ['of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists' and 'of the masses' — ed.] that the history of the labour movement will now inevitably develop."

"The fact is that 'bourgeois labour parties,' as a political phenomenon, have already been formed in all the foremost capitalist countries, and that unless a determined and relentless struggle is waged all along the line against these parties — or groups, trends, etc., it is all the same — there can be no question of a struggle against imperialism, or of Marxism, or of a socialist labour movement. ... There is not the slightest reason for thinking that these parties will disappear before the social revolution. On the contrary, the nearer the revolution approaches, the more strongly it flares up and the more sudden and violent the transitions and leaps in its progress, the greater will be the part the struggle of the revolutionary mass stream against the opportunist petty-bourgeois stream will play in the labour movement." ("Imperialism and the Split in Socialism," *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 116, 118-19, emphasis as in the original)

This struggle is not a diversion, but it is essential both for the revolution in general and for the strengthening of the party in particular. It is not for nothing that Comrade Stalin taught that:

"Everyone knows that Leninism was born,

grew up and became strong in relentless struggle against opportunism of every brand...." ("Some Questions Concerning the History of Bolshevism," *Works*, Vol. 13, p. 87)

"The R.C.P.(B.) [Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) — ed.] always developed through contradictions, i.e., in the struggle against non-communist trends, and only in that struggle did it gain strength and forge real cadres." ("A Letter to Comrade Me-rt," *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 46)

Indeed the Leninist conception of the struggle against opportunism is that it is a great regenerating force. Speaking of the struggle against the social-chauvinists in World War I, Lenin held that:

"No matter how hard, in individual instances, the struggle may be against the opportunists, who predominate in many organisations, whatever the specific nature of the purging of the workers' parties of opportunists in individual countries, this process is inevitable and fruitful. Reformist socialism is dying; regenerated socialism will be revolutionary, uncompromising and insurrectionary...." ("Socialism and War," *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, Ch. 1, p. 311)

Hence, it is not for nothing that Comrade Lenin eulogized this struggle and pointed out in his article "Marxism and Revisionism" in 1908 that:

"The fight against the revisionists on these questions resulted in as fruitful a revival of the theoretical thought in international socialism as did Engels's controversy with Dühring twenty years earlier." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 34)

And Comrade Lenin added further on in this article the following magnificent perspective:

"The ideological struggle waged by revolutionary Marxism against revisionism at the end of the nineteenth century is but the prelude to the great revolutionary battles of the proletariat, which is marching forward to the complete victory of its cause despite all the waverings and weaknesses of the petty bourgeoisie." (*Ibid.*, p. 39)

And it was Comrade Lenin who enthusiastically raised this same perspective in his great book *What Is to Be Done?*, namely that:

"Perhaps in this first really international battle with socialist opportunism, international revolutionary Social-Democracy will become sufficiently strengthened to put an end to the political reaction that has long reigned in Europe?" (Note at the beginning of Chapter I)

SECTION XI: An anti-Marxist crusade against ideological struggle and demagogical speculations on the slogan of opposing "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle'"

XI-A: Playing with the phrase "two-line struggle" to condemn the struggle against revisionism

You try to present your opposition to the ideological and polemical struggle against revisionism and opportunism as opposition to Maoism. To do this, you speculate on the slogan of opposing "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'" You identify the ideological and polemical struggle as "two-line struggle" and thus denounce it. With your playing with the term "two-line struggle," you are putting forward in effect the thesis that the problem with the Chinese revisionists was that they fought too hard or polemicalized too much against revisionism. This is absolutely wrong. Far from fighting too hard or polemicalizing too much against opportunism, the Chinese revisionists on the contrary floated one thesis after another in opposition to the struggle against opportunism. For example, the Chinese revisionists advocated that opportunism was a "middle force" to be united with and on this basis they denounced Comrade Stalin. Among other things they opposed the term "social-fascism," opposed the struggle against social-democracy and as well the analysis concerning the struggle against opportunism given in Section III of Comrade Stalin's article "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists" in which the term "main blow" appears. The Chinese revisionists were only forced by circumstances and by their pragmatic calculations to enter into the struggle against the Khrushchovite revisionists; they were not happy with this struggle, found it a terribly heavy burden, vacillated and wavered, and tried repeatedly to end it. By opposing the struggle against revisionism and opportunism under the signboard of opposing "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle,'" you are descending to the level of giving arguments close in spirit to the Chinese revisionists' theses under the signboard of opposing Chinese revisionism. This is a striking example of Marx's remark that: "The antiquated makes an attempt to re-establish and maintain itself within the newly achieved form." (Letter to Bolte, 23 November 1871)

Furthermore your crusade against "two-line struggle" is dishonest and demagogical. You replace serious analysis of the issues involved with shouting a slogan against "two-line struggle." This reminds us of what Comrade Lenin called "Alexinsky methods." Comrade Lenin wrote:

"At the 1907 London Congress the Bolsheviks would dissociate themselves from Alexinsky [then a Bolshevik — ed.] when, in reply to

theoretical arguments, he would pose as an agitator and resort to high-falutin, but entirely irrelevant, phrases against one or another type of exploitation and oppression. 'He's begun his shouting again,' our delegates would say. And the 'shouting' did not do Alexinsky any good.

"There is the same kind of 'shouting' in Kievsky's article. He has no reply to the theoretical questions and arguments expounded in the theses. Instead, he poses as an agitator...." ("A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economics," Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 76)

Sad to say, that is how you argue on the question of "two-line struggle." You refuse to discuss the serious issues involved. Instead you pose as an agitator and shout that some opportunist group or other gives the slogan "ideological struggle." You shout that the Chinese revisionists give the slogan "two-line struggle." Then you rush to the conclusion of condemning the ideological and polemical struggle under the cover of loud shouting that anyone who hesitates to condemn "ideological struggle" and "two-line struggle" is an opportunist, just like this or that group that also gives the slogan "ideological struggle." It is both shocking and repulsive to see a Marxist-Leninist party such as yours descend to the use of such methods. These are Alexinsky methods.

The question of the stand of the Chinese revisionists in the struggle against the Khrushchovite revisionists is a serious one and one completely tied up with the question of "two-line struggle." In analyzing the nature of Mao Zedong Thought and in investigating the questions of the roots and origins of the taking up of the "three worlds" theory by the Chinese Communist Party, one of the crucial issues is the study and reassessment of the whole course of the struggle against modern Khrushchovite revisionism. This reassessment is for the sake of learning how to conduct the struggle against modern revisionism more powerfully, consistently and to greater effect. The path of studying the role of Chinese revisionism with respect to the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism was set forth in the *Letter of the CC of the Party of Labor and the Government of Albania to the CC of the Communist Party and the Government of China (July 29, 1978)*, Part II, and in the monumental two-volume work *Reflections on China*. Our Party set forth this path as a central point in the

study and repudiation of Chinese revisionism at the NC meeting of June 1978 and in the Internal Bulletin of early August 1978. This study reveals the vacillating, wavering and disruptive stands of the Chinese revisionists. These stands of the Chinese leadership in this life and death struggle for the present-day international communist movement impel one to look for the deeper causes of these stands. Among other things these stands destroy the mystique of Mao as the alleged leader of the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism.

The struggle against Chinese revisionism and its ideological basis, Mao Zedong Thought, therefore has as one of its aims to expose and repudiate the Chinese sabotage of the struggle against modern Khrushchovite revisionism and against revisionism and opportunism in general. But you denounce the ideological and polemical struggle against revisionism and opportunism as "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'" This is disgraceful. In our letter of December 1 we expressed our astonishment at this stand of yours. We wrote:

"You have gone to the extreme of insisting that the slogan of 'Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists' is in fact in your view a manifestation of Chinese revisionism and the Chinese revisionist type of 'two-line struggle.' It is hard for us to express our sheer astonishment at seeing that our struggle against revisionism [and the struggle against Chinese revisionism in particular! — ed.] is denounced as a manifestation of the ideology of Chinese revisionism. Our denunciation of Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought and of its theory of 'two (or many) headquarters in the party' is not that it fights revisionism too hard, but that it conciliates revisionism and is opposed to the principled struggle against revisionism. The errors and monstrous crimes of the Chinese revisionists did not stem from fighting revisionism too hard or from issuing too many public polemics against Khrushchovite revisionism. The Chinese revisionists did not fail to take a sound Marxist-Leninist stand because they were too busy waging a polemical struggle. On the contrary, the failure of the Chinese to wage a stern, consistent, protracted struggle against the Khrushchovite revisionists, including the open polemical struggle, was and is one of the glaring manifestations of their failure to base themselves on the sound, principled positions of Marxism-Leninism. It was one of the manifestations of their failure to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism. The theory of Mao Zedong of the 'many headquarters in the party' was not a theory to justify fighting too hard against revisionism,

but a theory to justify a liberal, conciliatory, social-democratic and nonchalant stand towards the defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, the defense of the monolithic unity of the party and the stern, unyielding struggle against the modern revisionists." (p. 5, Section III (c))

In your letters of December 5, you replied to the above passage from our letter of December 1 by denying that the Chinese revisionists had a wavering, conciliatory, reluctant stand vis-a-vis the Khrushchovites. You instead present the Chinese revisionists in effect as staunch fighters against the Khrushchovite revisionists, but from anti-Marxist-Leninist positions. (Of course, it has to be remembered that you regard the waging of the ideological and polemical struggle itself as an anti-Marxist-Leninist position, as the "Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'") You write:

"Look at how this worm poses the question: how the fundamental problem with Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought is 'not that it fights revisionism, but that it conciliates with revisionism....' The fact of the matter is that Chinese revisionism and its ideological base, Mao Zedong Thought, and 'its theory of two (or many) headquarters in the Party' is an anti-Leninist and revisionist trend itself, while this worm is accusing it of 'conciliating with revisionism and is opposed to the principled struggle against revisionism.' Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought are a departure from Marxism-Leninism and between Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought and Marxism-Leninism there is an insurmountable gulf. Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought do fight against Soviet social-imperialism and the Khrushchovite revisionists, but they do so on the basis of anti-Leninism and revisionism and to serve their own pragmatic ends. It is to satisfy your pragmatic ends that you are creating this intellectualist hyperbole." (pp. 17-18, emphasis added)

Here you deny the many shameful facts about the crimes of Chinese conciliationism and wavering stands vis-a-vis the Khrushchovites, their repeated attempts to reestablish unity with the Khrushchovites, their opposition to "the principled struggle against revisionism" and so forth. You deny all these crimes of the Chinese revisionists by the Alexinsky method of shouting this and that slogan against the Chinese revisionists. But you shout these slogans only to end up saying that Chinese revisionism does allegedly fight the Khrushchovites, but "on the basis of anti-Leninism and revisionism and to serve their own pragmatic ends." You thus present the Chinese revisionists as stern and irreplicable foes of

the modern Soviet revisionists, but for their own anti-Marxist-Leninist reasons. What a backhanded compliment of the Chinese revisionists and Mao Zedong Thought!

It is absolutely astonishing to us that you believe that a stern and implacable struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism could be waged from anti-Marxist-Leninist positions. Only the Marxist-Leninists can wage a stern and consistent struggle against revisionism. As Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out in 1966 at the 5th Congress of the PLA:

"...there can be no middle road. ...if the fight against revisionism is not inspired by ideological motives, but only by certain economic and political motives on a national chauvinist basis, it is a mere bluff which is short-lived. Those who uphold this line in their stand toward the renegades from Marxism-Leninism are themselves in danger of slipping, sooner or later, into the positions of the latter...." (*Report to the 5th Congress of the PLA*, cited in the *History of the PLA*, Ch. VII, Sec. 2, pp. 603-04, emphasis added)

The Chinese revisionist stand against the Khrushchovite revisionists was "a mere bluff which is short-lived." They have today openly come out in full revisionist positions and joined openly in the dance of the inter-imperialist (and inter-revisionist) rivalries and alliances.

But before we go on to various aspects of the actual stand of the Chinese revisionists with respect to the Khrushchovite revisionists, there are a few other striking aspects of your passage that deserve comment. For one thing, your passage that we have quoted above is another backhanded defense of centrism and conciliationism. You deny that the Chinese revisionists had wavering, conciliationist, flabby stands with respect to the Khrushchovite revisionists on the basis that Chinese revisionism is anti-Marxist-Leninist. But a conciliationist and wavering stand towards the Khrushchovite revisionists is also anti-Marxist-Leninist. Lenin fought not only the open social-chauvinists, but the Kautskyites, the so-called "center," as well. "There can be no middle road." But you first of all absolutize the concept of conciliationism and shift the issue from whether the Chinese revisionists took a conciliationist stand on the life and death issue of struggle against the Khrushchovite revisionists to whether "the fundamental problem with Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought" is CONCILIATIONISM, with a capital C, capital O, capital N, etc. You then contrast conciliationism to anti-Marxism-Leninism. You convert conciliationism into some type of middle road that is at least partially Marxist-Leninist, that does not have an impassable gulf between itself and Marxism-Leninism, etc. You directly imply this, indeed you stress

this, by insisting that the fact that Chinese revisionism is anti-Marxist-Leninist and that between Chinese revisionism and Marxism-Leninism there is an "insurmountable gulf" means that Chinese revisionism could not have taken a conciliationist stand. This shows your utter confusion on the question of conciliationism and centrism, a confusion which is also manifested in your opposition to our struggle against conciliationism in the struggle against social-chauvinism in the U.S.

It should also be noted that you are accusing us of not holding that Chinese revisionism is anti-Marxist-Leninist simply to create a smoke screen and a diversion. This is part of your Alexinsky methods. You are perfectly aware that our Party unanimously holds that "Mao Zedong and Mao Zedong Thought Are Anti-Marxist-Leninist and Revisionist." The NC of the COUSML already came to this conclusion in February 1979. At an internal conference held in March 1979 and attended by every comrade working under the discipline of the COUSML, this stand was thoroughly discussed and unanimously endorsed. Indeed, you saw this yourself, as at our invitation you sent a delegation (one comrade) to observe this conference. This resolute stand of ours was published in *The Workers' Advocate* of March 1979. And this stand has been further elaborated in a number of articles in *The Workers' Advocate* since then. But instead of dealing with the serious questions of analysis concerning Chinese revisionism, you prefer to use the Alexinsky method of shouting that our Party is allegedly soft on Mao Zedong Thought. What ugly methods you are using! And what disgusting hypocrisy! For the fact is that not only are you opposing our struggle against Chinese revisionism, but your press has fallen quite silent on the burning questions of analysis concerning Mao Zedong Thought and Chinese revisionism since the beginning of 1979. It is one thing to shout slogans denouncing "two-line struggle" as Maoism and quite another to repudiate Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought. Behind your slogans, it is often hard to tell your actual position. For instance, at the time of the internationalist rally for the 6th Consultative Conference of the CPC(M-L), you questioned us concerning our stand on Mao Zedong and Mao Zedong Thought. *The Workers' Advocate* of March 1979 had just appeared. The report from our delegation includes the following:

"We did a background interview for *PCDN* on Mao Tsetung and Mao Tsetung Thought. The Party [the leadership of CPC(M-L) — ed.] was concerned because we have spoken on Mao Tsetung and they have not. Their view is that Mao Tsetung Thought is the official ideology of the Communist Party of China and they speak to this and do not give analysis of the in-

dividual yet, nor his relationship to Mao Tsetung Thought."

And since that time you have not gone deeply into these questions either in discussions with us or in your press. But all these questions are covered up by your Alexinsky-like shouts about Maoism, which you had already started back then.

But now let us return to the question of the stand of the Chinese revisionists in the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism. We shall see that your assertion that the Chinese revisionists did not waver and vacillate and take a conciliationist stand but instead allegedly did fight, albeit from anti-Marxist-Leninist positions, flies in the face of history. For history confirms the Marxist-Leninist teachings that a struggle against revisionism that is not inspired by sound ideological motives is "a mere bluff which is short-lived."

To begin with, the Chinese leadership did not even want to start the polemical struggle against the Khrushchovite revisionists at all. It was the Party of Labor of Albania that began this struggle and bore the burden of it for some time. The *Letter* of July 29, 1978 of the CC of the PLA and the government of Albania documents the conciliationist stand of the Chinese leadership. It points out:

"The Bucharest Meeting and, later, the Conference of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow [of 1960 — ed.] marked the final split between the Marxist-Leninists and Khrushchovite revisionists, and the beginning of the open polemics between them. Whereas our Party initiated and carried on the fight against Khrushchovite revisionism with consistency and resolve, the Chinese leadership wavered and failed to adopt clear-cut anti-Khrushchovite stands. In the initial stage of the fierce polemics between the Party of Labor of Albania and the Khrushchovite revisionists, China was in agreement with Albania, but this only on the surface, because, in reality, as was proved later, it was seeking a reconciliation with the Soviets and the extinction of polemics with them." (p. 25, emphasis added)

"In this manner, when the reconciliation and agreement with the Soviet revisionists, so ardently sought by the Chinese leadership, did not materialize, only then [late 1963 — ed.] the Communist Party of China effectively entered the road of anti-Khrushchovism and agreed to the determined, consistent and principled struggle of the Party of Labor of Albania. This could not fail to rejoice the Party of Labor of Albania and the Albanian people who, single-handed, were for almost three years then facing up to the open frenzied attacks of Khrushchov

and entire modern revisionism." (p. 27, emphasis added)

But the Chinese immediately began to vacillate again, in 1964. In April 1964 they sent Khrushchov a telegram of congratulations on his birthday. Later in 1964 the Chinese leadership began bringing up the question of territorial claims on the Soviet Union. Raising this question did not mean that the Chinese leadership was going to continue the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism, albeit from chauvinist and nationalist positions, as would follow from your view that the Chinese leadership fought although from anti-Leninist positions. On the contrary, having raised this, the Chinese leadership continued its vacillations, maneuvered towards the Titoites and the Romanians, put forward the stand of "the revisionists take the first step, we take the second," tried very hard for reconciliation with the modern Soviet revisionists on the occasion of the downfall of Khrushchov later in 1964, and so forth.

This stand of the Chinese leadership is documented in great detail in *Reflections on China*. Below we quote one of many passages showing that the Chinese leadership did not want to start the polemical struggle against the Khrushchovite revisionists.

"In this document ["On the Ten Major Relationships," April 1956 — ed.] Mao took the initiative, which might have been coordinated with the Khrushchovites, as it was in fact. Khrushchov had informed Mao of his revisionist ideas and about the actions he was to undertake. Mao was in agreement with Khrushchov, a thing which he stated publicly at the Moscow Meeting of 1957, where he praised Khrushchov, attacked Stalin, and approved Khrushchov's liquidation of the 'anti-party group of Molotov and company.' And in this way Mao assisted Khrushchov. ... The 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China was in tune with the Khrushchovites....

"Mao's aim was to help not Khrushchov, but himself, so that China would become the main leader of the communist world and Mao would replace Stalin, whom they thought they had buried. Mao acted quickly to take hegemony.

"Khrushchov for his part wanted to bring Mao Tsetung into line, and under his direction, meanwhile, however, the Party of Labor of Albania intervened by defending Marxism-Leninism and the Communist Party of China. The fire of the polemic was kindled at Bucharest and the Party of Labor of Albania continued it 'with a volley of machine-gun fire' at the Meeting of 81 Parties in Moscow. Mao was for putting out this great fire, was opposed to the polemic. He wanted meetings, wanted social-democratic agreements because he himself was

a social-democrat, an opportunist, a revisionist. But Mao could not extinguish the fire or the polemic, and seeing that he was unable to establish his hegemony, he changed his stand. Mao took a somewhat 'better' anti-Soviet stand, and here he appeared to be in accord with us who were fighting Khrushchovite revisionism consistently. But even at this time he had hopes of rapprochement with the Khrushchovite revisionists. Efforts were made to this end by the Chinese leaders, but we opposed them.

"When Khrushchov fell, Mao's hopes revived. ... This was a fiasco for Mao Tsetung. Then, from the strategy of the fight on the two flanks he turned towards the United States of America." (*Reflections on China*, Vol. II, from near the start of the entry for December 28, 1976, emphasis as in the original)

The Chinese leadership was reluctant to begin the struggle and constantly wavered. Even when they joined the struggle, they continued to waver. They brought forth and acted upon a number of stands directed against this struggle. For example:

— Their theory of "the revisionists take the first step, we take the second." This was a theory to tone down and stop altogether the struggle against the Khrushchovite revisionists.

— Their theory of the "anti-imperialist united front including even the Khrushchovite revisionists."

— Their attempts to reconcile after the downfall of Khrushchov.

— Their maneuvers with and alliances with all sorts of other revisionists allegedly "against" the Soviet revisionists. These revisionists included the Titoites, the Romanians, the Italian revisionists and so forth. Naturally this was also a theory of stopping the principled polemic against modern revisionism.

— Their removing of any ideological content from the struggle against the modern Soviet revisionists.

— Their silence about Nixon's trip to Moscow of 1972.

— China's disdainful and hostile attitude towards the new Marxist-Leninist parties that were born in the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism.

— Even today, the Chinese leadership may, if it suits their pragmatic interests, reverse their alliances and ally with the Soviet social-imperialists against the U.S. imperialists. Or, the Chinese revisionist leadership may take up a position similar to that of the Titoites and openly pelt both U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism with flowers and conciliatorist rhetoric with only the flimsiest pretext of "opposition" to this or that policy.

All these stands of the Chinese revisionists are documented in great detail in *Reflections on China*. They prove that the Chinese revisionists did not fight

the Khrushchovites too hard or put too much stress on the ideological and polemical struggle. On the contrary, the Chinese were forever seeking to extinguish the great polemic against modern revisionism.

You are denying the facts about Chinese conciliationism and wavering stands in the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism in order to present the Chinese revisionist stand as one of exaggeration of the struggle against opportunism, which you call waging "two-line struggle." In fact, the Chinese revisionist theories of "two (or more) lines in the party," "two (or more) headquarters in the party" or of the "proletarian and bourgeois staffs" in the party are all theories of factionalism, theories to justify the eternal existence of factions and hence to deny the Leninist teachings on the party of the new type, to convert the party into a social-democratic conglomerate, and to put a good face on factional strife. These theories are part of the various liberal, social-democratic, factionalist and anarchist theories of Mao Zedong Thought on the organization (or disorganization) and role of the party. The basic idea of these theories is that of the existence of different lines, factions or classes in the party. They are not theories of struggle against revisionism, but liberal, opportunist, social-democratic theories against the struggle against opportunism.

In promoting factionalism, the Chinese revisionists naturally at various times also promoted factional strife. Mao Zedong Thought is rife with theories to justify factional and anarchist methods of inner-party struggle. The Chinese revisionists presented these theories as "two-line struggle" in order to give them an anti-revisionist cover, just as the Chinese revisionists and especially the ultra-revisionists also present fascist suppression as allegedly the true interpretation of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the monolithic nature of the party. But the examination of the Chinese stand in the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism, or of the course of the so-called "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution," or of the results of the application of the factional and anarchist methods elsewhere in the world, all prove that these theories are in essence theories of leniency and conciliation towards the revisionists and opportunists and of disruption of the ranks of the Marxist-Leninists. It is these theories that were the ideological basis for such acts as Mao's reinstatement of the ultra-revisionist, fascist Deng Xiaoping to power after his exposure and disgrace in the "GPCR."

Our Party and its predecessors, from the formation of the ACWM(M-L) in May 1969 to the present, have been built as disciplined fighting organizations with a monolithic unity and a single Marxist-Leninist line. We demanded not just formal adherence to the positions of the Party, but participation in making

decisions, resolute implementation of the decisions, and vigorous participation in the revolutionary struggle. In mid-1974, as part of the successful conclusion of our struggle against the anarcho-syndicalist influence in the COUSML, our Party repudiated anarchist and factionalist methods of waging the inner-party struggle. Our Party repudiated the anarchist organizational practices promoted by the anarcho-syndicalist influence and codified our organizational structure in a fundamental organizational document. In the struggle against Chinese revisionism our Party has right from the start brought to the fore the question of the party concept and the role and organization of the party. In our document of March 1979 entitled "Mao Tsetung and Mao Tsetung Thought Are Anti-Marxist-Leninist and Revisionist," we repudiated Mao's theory of "many headquarters in the party" in the section of "The Leading Role and the Organization of the Party." We wrote:

"Mao Tsetung's factionalism was especially revealed in his theory of the existence of two headquarters in the party, with representatives of these headquarters existing in every body from the central committee and political bureau, right down to every organization at the base. This is a theory of unbridled factionalism and of destroying the party's monolithic unity. It presents itself as a theory to fight revisionism, but actually it is a theory to coexist with revisionism."

You call our views on this question, as on others, "peculiar." But in fact the key documents in the struggle against Chinese revisionism from the Party of Labor of Albania also denounce the Chinese revisionist theories of "two lines" or "two headquarters" in the party as factionalism and not as an exaggeration of the ideological and polemical struggle or of the struggle against revisionism. Indeed, these documents call for the broadening and deepening of the ideological and polemical struggle against modern revisionism. And these documents do not denounce the inner-party class struggle, but instead distinguish between the principled inner-party struggle and the unprincipled inner-party factional strife advocated and practiced by the Chinese revisionists. In brief, these documents give a diametrically opposite view of what the Chinese revisionist theory is than do your preachings about the two-line struggle. We shall now quote some of the key passages from these documents on this question.

Let us begin by examining Comrade Enver Hoxha's *Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA*. Although, because of the year in which it was written, this document could not denounce Mao Zedong Thought by name, it nevertheless opposes many of the basic theses of Mao Zedong Thought. On the question of several lines in the party, Comrade En-

ver Hoxha states:

"Our Party has not allowed and will never allow the existence of factions within its ranks. It has had and has one line only, the Marxist-Leninist line, which it has loyally defended and resolutely implemented." (Ch. III, Sec. 1, p. 80)

But Comrade Enver Hoxha refuses to counterpose the monolithic unity of the party to the vigorous internal life of the party or even to "the struggle of opposites in the ranks of the Party." He incisively points out that the monolithic unity of the party is a "unity of action, a unity of revolutionaries." He writes:

"The unity of the Party is a militant unity, a unity of action, a unity of revolutionaries. The active life of our Party cannot tolerate the existence of such basic organizations with only formal unity, where an atmosphere of 'peace and quiet' and a life of ease prevail, where all are in agreement at meetings but fail to mobilize themselves to carry out the tasks outside and remain unconcerned about this. The genuine and durable unity of the Party of the working class and of each of its organizations is preserved and strengthened constantly only through the struggle of opposites in the ranks of the Party, through debate, principled criticism and self-criticism, by implementing the line of the Party, its decisions and directives, its proletarian principles and norms, to the letter. (Ch. III, Sec. 1, p. 81)

Comrade Hoxha also refuses to confuse factionalism with the struggle between the two roads, and he writes:

"The construction of socialism is a process of stern class struggle between the two roads, the socialist road and the capitalist road, a struggle waged on all fronts, political and economic, ideological and military." (Ch. IV, Sec. 1, p. 108)

Furthermore, instead of counterposing the monolithic unity of the party to the ideological and polemical struggle, Comrade Enver Hoxha stresses the ideological struggle, includes an entire chapter of the *Report*, Chapter IV, entitled "The Struggle of the Party on the Ideological Front," and also calls for the "continuation and extension" of the ideological struggle against modern revisionism and "the deepening of that great polemic." (p. 226)

Now let us examine the Scientific Sessions held in Albania in October 1978. Comrade Agim Popa denounced the Chinese revisionist theories on several lines in the party as follows:

"The Marxist-Leninist parties in various countries have successfully waged a resolute struggle to safeguard the sound ideological, political and organizational unity of their ranks, against

factionalism and splits. They reject those anti-Marxist preachings and practices which justify the existence of two or more lines in the party, and defend, in theory and practice, the view that the party has only one line, the revolutionary line, based on Marxism-Leninism, because only this line leads the proletariat to its triumphant revolution." ("The Marxist-Leninist Parties — The Leading Force of the Revolutionary Movement Today," *Problems of Current World Development*, p. 84)

Comrade Agim Popa then goes on to describe the vigorous internal life of the party, including, within the possibilities allowed by the concrete situations facing the Marxist-Leninist parties, that the parties "have fought and continue to fight for the most effective implementation of democracy in the party" (emphasis as in the original) And we have already, in Section X, quoted extensively from these Scientific Sessions to show that they stood for the continuation and deepening of the struggle against all trends of revisionism.

Comrade Enver Hoxha's brilliant work *Imperialism and the Revolution* also dealt with the question of Mao's theories of several lines in the party. Comrade Hoxha wrote:

"There has been and there is no true Marxist-Leninist unity of thought and action in the Communist Party of China. The strife among factions, which has existed since the founding of the Communist Party of China, has meant that a correct Marxist-Leninist line has not been laid down in this party, and it has not been guided by Marxist-Leninist thought. The various tendencies which manifested themselves among the main leaders of the party were at times leftist, at times right opportunist, sometimes centrist, and going as far as openly anarchist, chauvinist and racist views. ... Mao Tsetung himself has advocated the need for the existence of 'two lines' in the party. According to him, the existence and struggle between two lines is something natural, is a manifestation of the unity of the opposites, is a flexible policy which unites in itself both loyalty to principles and compromise. 'Thus,' he writes, 'we have two hands to deal with a comrade who has made mistakes: one hand to struggle with him and the other to unite with him. The aim of this struggle is to uphold the principles of Marxism, which means being principled; that is one aspect of the problem. The other aspect is to unite with him. The aim of unity is to offer him a way out, to reach a compromise with him.'

"These views are diametrically opposed to the Leninist teachings on the communist party as an organized vanguard detachment which

must have a single line and steel unity of thought and action.

"The class struggle in the ranks of the party, as a reflection of the class struggle going on outside the party, has nothing in common with Mao Tsetung's concepts on the 'two lines in the party.' The party is not an arena of classes and the struggle between antagonistic classes, it is not a gathering of people with contradictory aims. The genuine Marxist-Leninist party is the party of the working class only and bases itself on the interests of this class. This is the decisive factor for the triumph of the revolution and the construction of socialism. Defending the Leninist principles on the party, which do not permit the existence of many lines, of opposing trends in the communist party, J.V. Stalin emphasized:

"...the communist party is the *monolithic* party of the proletariat, and not a party of a bloc of elements of different classes."

"Mao Tsetung, however, conceives the party as a union of classes with contradictory interests, as an organization in which two forces, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the 'proletarian staff' and the 'bourgeois staff,' which must have their representatives from the grassroots to the highest leading organs of the party, confront and struggle against each other. Thus, in 1956, he sought the election of the leaders of right and left factions to the Central Committee, presenting to this end, arguments as naive as they were ridiculous. ... While renouncing principled struggle in the ranks of the party, Mao Tsetung played the game of factions, sought compromise with some of them to counter some others and thus consolidate his own positions." (Book form, pp. 399-401; or *Proletarian Internationalism*, Vol. 1, No. 2, p. 109, col. 1-2)

We have given the above quotation at some length in order to present Comrade Hoxha's idea in its full context and to collect here all the key passages on this question. Comrade Hoxha here repeatedly denounces Mao's concepts on "two lines in the party." In this passage and in *Imperialism and the Revolution* in general Comrade Enver Hoxha does not even use the formula "two-line struggle" in denouncing Mao Zedong Thought, although he does refer to Mao's views on "the existence and struggle between two lines" inside the party. Thus in this passage Comrade Hoxha brings up the question of "struggle between two lines" solely with reference to the fact that the formula of struggle between opposing lines in the party implies the existence of several lines in the party. Comrade Hoxha defends the inner-party struggle and denounces Mao for "renouncing prin-

ciplined struggle in the ranks of the party" and instead playing the game of factions. And clearly Comrade Hoxha does not denounce Mao's theories of the existence of several lines in the party as exaggerating the ideological and polemical struggle. On the contrary, the book *Imperialism and the Revolution* itself is a brilliant example of intensifying and deepening the ideological and polemical struggle against revisionism.

In Comrade Enver Hoxha's monumental work *Reflections on China* there are also many revealing passages on the question of several lines inside the party. We shall quote a few of them. The entry of April 28, 1967 has the following striking passage on the liberalism and social-democratic opportunism in the coexistence of the different lines inside the party. Comrade Hoxha wrote:

"As I see it (and maybe I am wrong, because we are still in the dark about many internal facts of their party), the Chinese comrades have a pronounced dose of liberalism and opportunism in their activities. Naturally, this is very harmful. These tendencies cannot be either new or accidental. The fact that for seventeen years two lines have been observed in their party and have co-existed without a great deal of friction between them (recently, it has been alleged that there was friction, although they seem so adjusted to each other, that they appear to be a single whole), proves the social-democratic opportunism in their line."

"The fact is that the Communist Party of China has gone on for tens of years on end to stating two lines in its ranks. If it proceeds from the principle that two active lines are necessary in the party, then the party cannot be a Marxist-Leninist party. Even within the party a class struggle must be waged, indeed a stern struggle, to totally liquidate the anti-party, anti-Marxist faction as quickly as possible. We have not seen such a struggle in the Communist Party of China, even when some leaders (who have not been alone) have been condemned as factionalists. On the contrary, they have remained not only in the party, but even in the main leadership.

"Even now... we see that some sort of dilletantism, soft-heartedness, slowness to act and liberalism towards anti-party elements opposed to the working class." (The above two quotations are from the *Proletarian Internationalism* edition, Part A, p. 98, col. 1-2, emphasis as in the original.)

The entry of January 22, 1976 also deals with this question. Comrade Hoxha points out that deviations and factions appeared in "the party of Lenin, too,"

but that Lenin acted against them "with clear Marxist ideology and an iron hand." Comrade Hoxha characterizes Mao's factionalism not with the "two-line struggle" formula but with Mao's quotation about a "hundred flowers." Mao's coexistence of factions is thus contrasted to Lenin's struggle on the ideological and organizational fronts against all deviations and factions. Comrade Hoxha writes:

"We see that until Mao came to the leadership of the party, deviations and factions like those of Li Li-san, Wang Ming, etc., etc., appeared in its organization, ideology and practice. Of course, such things occurred in the party of Lenin, too, the enemies attacked the Bolshevik Party from within and from without; but Lenin acted against them with clear Marxist ideology and an iron hand; he tempered the party and gave it the immortal norms which guide and will always guide the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and the revolution in the world correctly.

"I believe that when Mao came to power he established some sort of order, created and led the army and the war, but in the organization of the party and its stands, neither the Leninist basic principles nor the Leninist norms were properly established."

"This party [the Communist Party of China — ed.] grew up with factions and continued with factions, both leftist and rightist."

"Its own leadership says that there are two lines in the Communist Party of China. It accepts their existence and, it seems to me, makes it a condition for the existence of the party, and calls it the class struggle in the party. However, I think that there are not just two lines in this party, but many lines which are clashing with one another for power. The party is chaotic and does not wage a class struggle on sound Marxist-Leninist revolutionary principles, or, to put it better, the party does not wage the class struggle at all, but a struggle of clans goes on within it. The clans are in the party and the state, at the base and in the leadership. All the supporters of factionalists, who have allegedly been condemned, can be found within the party and are operating. All this development has been and is being carried out in the name of Mao, who is being made a taboo, his quotations are learned, but each faction is going about its own business on the quiet. Mao himself permits the 'two flowers,' if not 'a hundred flowers.' 'Let there be two or three factions and let them co-exist,' he says, 'then we shall make a revolution each seven years and

shall see who will triumph. If the rightists win, the leftists will rise and overthrow them.' This is 'the brilliant theory of Mao!!' (Proletarian Internationalism edition, Part C, p. 55, col. 2, and p. 56, col. 2, emphasis as in the original)

In various entries Comrade Hoxha denounced Mao as a centrist for coexisting with the various factions. Thus Comrade Hoxha wrote:

"Mao has always been a centrist, an onlooker, a Marxist-Leninist à l'eau de rose (rose-watered), as the French say." (entry of August 17, 1976, Proletarian Internationalism edition, Part C, p. 72, col. 2, emphasis as in the original)

"Mao Tsetung spoke with revolutionary catchwords about the 'revolution,' the 'class struggle' and other questions of principle, but in practice he was a liberal, a dreamer, a centrist in the direction of the manipulation and balancing of the various currents which existed and intrigued within the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state. With such characteristics, Mao Tsetung was easily influenced by one or the other current; sometimes supported the one, sometimes the other." (entry of October 12, 1976, Proletarian Internationalism edition, Part C, p. 76, col. 2)

"He [Mao — ed.] wrote a good deal about the class struggle, about contradictions, etc., but the class struggle in China, in practice especially, has not been waged sternly and consistently. In this direction, too, Mao proved to be a liberal and a moderate. He permitted rightist revisionist elements to take power and to establish deep roots in the party, the state and everywhere. Mao coexisted with them, simply looked on, and frequently approved them. In the end, he overthrew some leaders of these currents but left their base untouched. His authority, created during the war and after the victory, brought about that the factions 'were defeated,' but the problem was only partly solved and the liberal, moderating situation always continued. Mao Tsetung was a centrist, he kept people of various currents close to him, people who called themselves Marxists but who were not Marxists and who fought on their own line under the umbrella of Mao Tsetung. When they upset the balance, Mao Tsetung intervened and 'put things in order.'

"There was instability in the thoughts and actions of Mao and I think that his interpretation and application of Marxism was done rather in the way the fancy took him." (Ibid., emphasis as in the original)

For the sake of completeness, we note that the question of Mao's theory of several lines in the party is also dealt with in Comrade Ndreçi Plasari's article in the issue #1 of 1978 of *Albania Today*. This article defends the principled inner-party struggle and is entitled "The Class Struggle Within the Party — a Guarantee that the Party Will Always Remain a Revolutionary Party of the Working Class." This article points out that the class struggle inside the party "is not necessarily a struggle between two opposing lines" (p. 13) because the party should be vigilant to prevent the crystallization of the negative phenomena into factional trends and revisionist lines. Thus the article opposes the formula of the "struggle of lines" inside the party solely from the point of view that this formula implies the existence of more than one line in the party. But the party should be vigilant and the inner-party struggle should aim to prevent the existence of factions and lines. The article states that "...objectively, there is a great and continuing danger of the creation of factional trends and anti-Marxist opposition lines in the ranks of the party of the working class. At the same time, ... the emergence and crystallization of these trends and lines is not decreed by fate to be inevitable." (p. 13) Such a thing "emerges and develops only in certain conditions," for example, "when the party of the working class does not wage a correct, determined and consistent class struggle within its ranks all the time." If such a thing should occur, the party should not tolerate the existence of the factions and opposing lines in the slightest.

Thus the article does not identify "two-line struggle" in the party as ideological struggle. On the contrary. Not only does the article defend the inner-party struggle and go into great detail into how it should be waged, but it stresses the role of the ideological struggle. It does not counterpose ideological and organizational measures, but defines the relationship between them. Among the passages on this question are the following:

"The class struggle within the party is, in the first place, an ideological struggle for the Marxist-Leninist purity of its theory, of its general line, and of the communists themselves.

"But it is also a political struggle. The fight against traitors and hostile activity in the party ranks cannot be confined to the ideological field alone. ...

"...this struggle is correct and complete only when it is waged as a combined ideological and political struggle, and is accompanied with the appropriate organizational measures.

"Only through such a struggle can the party work out, preserve and apply a correct Marxist-Leninist line...." (pp. 10-11)

"There is not doubt that, the struggle against anti-party elements, groups and views, like the entire class struggle within the party, is an ideological struggle in the first place. Through this struggle, which has continued even after the smashing of one or the other group, their anti-Marxist views have been exposed and refuted, and profound convictions have been created among the communists and working people about the hostile character of these views which have led the traitors into activity against the party and the socialist order. But the ideological struggle never fully achieves its purpose if it is not accompanied with organizational and political measures." (p. 14)

Furthermore, the article is careful to sharply distinguish between the struggle between the two roads, "between the socialist road and the capitalist road of development, which includes the struggle between the proletarian ideology and the revisionist ideology" (p. 13) and the struggle between opposing lines in the party.

These quotations that we have cited above give an excellent exposition of the Marxist-Leninist critique of Mao's theories of several lines or headquarters inside the party. They show that our views are not "peculiar" at all. On the contrary, it is you who vulgarize the issue to the extreme in order to convert the denunciation of Mao's theories of factionalism into a denunciation of the ideological and polemical struggle as allegedly being "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'" You direct attention away from the issue that the theories of several lines in the party are liberal, opportunist and social-democratic theories of factionalism and of opposition to the Leninist conception of the party of the new type, and instead convert the denunciation of factionalism inside the party into a denunciation of the struggle of the party against revisionism and opportunism. This amounts in essence to identifying factionalism with the struggle against revisionism and opportunism. Thus you denounce the movement against social-chauvinism in the U.S. as allegedly a manifestation of "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'" And you denounce the Leninist slogan "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists" as allegedly "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'" By denouncing the "without and against" slogan, you prove that your shouting and raving against "two-line struggle" has nothing in common with the Marxist-Leninist critique of the Chinese revisionist theories of many lines or headquarters in the party. For the "without and against" slogan is a Leninist slogan which is particularly designed to oppose all the social-democratic theories of the coexistence of opportunism and Marxism-Leninism in one party.

It is a powerful slogan that stresses the need for a party that is both monolithic, a party without social-chauvinists and other opportunists, and that actively fights against the social-chauvinists and other opportunists. It is a dialectical slogan that doesn't counterpose organizational measures (building the party without the social-chauvinists) to ideological and political measures (building the party against the social-chauvinists), but instead calls for a complete struggle, a struggle waged on all fronts.

As we have pointed out earlier in this section, you use quite discreditable means to defend your tirades against "two-line struggle." Instead of elaborating your views, you resort to demagoguery. This is a sign of the weakness of your position. Here we wish to take up another example of your methods. Thus, for example, you write in your letters of December 5:

"Our [the leadership of CPC(M-L)'s — ed.] denunciation of Joseph Green and his intellectual hyperbole including his theory of 'two (or many) headquarters in the Marxist-Leninist Movement in the U.S.'..." (p. 18)

Thus you attribute to us a theory of "two (or many) headquarters in the Marxist-Leninist Movement in the U.S." But this is just another one of your lies. We have never used such a formulation. You think that it is cute to accuse us of having a theory of "two (or many) headquarters in the Marxist-Leninist Movement in the U.S." in order to mock at our denunciation of Mao's theory of "two (or many) headquarters in the party." You do this to create confusion. We have denounced "two (or many) headquarters in the party" so you try to mix everything up by attributing to us the formulation "two (or many) headquarters in the Marxist-Leninist Movement in the U.S." What unprincipled methods you are using.

But when you mock at our denunciation of Mao's theory of "two (or many) headquarters in the party," you are mocking at the struggle against Mao's theories of several lines or headquarters in the party in particular and at the struggle against Chinese revisionism in general. Our Party, as we pointed out earlier in this section and as we described to you in our discussions, has resolutely condemned Mao's idea of several lines or headquarters in the party. In the struggle against Chinese revisionism and in the movement against social-chauvinism, we have placed the question of the party concept in the forefront. We have used the formulation "two (or more) headquarters in the party" as a clear characterization of Mao's theory of several lines in the party. This is a vivid, expressive slogan which brings to the fore the question of Mao's factionalism and opposition to the monolithic unity of the party.

At this point, we shall make a few comments about the formulation of "two-line struggle in the party."

We are opposed to defining the class struggle inside the party as "two-line struggle" because one of the key aims of the inner-party struggle is to prevent the crystallization of a second line in the party. The formulation "two-line struggle" implies the existence of more than one line in the party. Beyond this, we are also continuing our theoretical examination of this term. It appears that formulations about the struggle of opposing lines can more or less appropriately describe certain situations that have arisen inside certain parties at certain times. Presumably this is why Comrade Plasari, in his article in *Albania Today* that we have cited above, says that the class struggle inside the party "is not necessarily a struggle between two opposing lines," i.e., it might be such a struggle under certain circumstances, namely, if the factions or revisionist lines succeed in crystallizing. As well, the struggle between lines might be more or less appropriately used to describe certain struggles between revisionism and opportunism outside the party. It does not appear that terms like "two-line struggle" and struggle between opposing lines can be condemned without qualification as you have done.

Indeed, the Chinese revisionists used the term "two-line struggle" precisely in order to give an apparently militant and anti-revisionist appearance to their liberal, conciliationist and social-democratic practice. The Chinese revisionists tried to cover up their theories of liberal coexistence with opportunism and of factionalism and to give them a thin red coat. It is the task of the repudiation of Chinese revisionism to tear away this deception by the Chinese revisionists. But you fall for it lock, stock and barrel when you identify "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle'" with ideological and polemical struggle and with the struggle against opportunism in general. This goes to the extent that in your letters of December 5 you deny the truth about the wavering, hesitant and conciliationist stand of the Chinese revisionists towards the Khrushchovite revisionists, as we have pointed out earlier in this section. You make great play with the phrase "two-line struggle" because with this phrase you try to equate the Chinese revisionist position with ideological and polemical struggle, something which is not so easy to do if one characterizes Mao's theories on this question as "two lines in the party" or of "two (or more) headquarters in the party." A most natural meaning of "two-line struggle" would be to denote a fight to eliminate the wrong line. However this is not what Mao meant by it. Indeed such a thing would not be in accord with Mao's idealist and metaphysical "dialectics." According to Mao, the opposites in struggle in a contradiction never lead to a qualitative transformation of the entity as a whole, but simply keep changing position with each other eternally. Thus for

him "struggle between opposing lines in the party" was simply a way of describing an eternal balancing of one faction against another, with which faction is dominant and which subordinate capable of changing, but with the existence of factions eternal. Thus in the light of Mao's philosophy, as well as of his practice, it is clear that "two-line struggle" is used by him as the militant-sounding cover for his theories of the necessary and eternal existence of factions. But you denounce Mao's theories of several lines in the party as theories of the exaggeration of the struggle against revisionism and opportunism and not as theories opposed to the struggle against revisionism and opportunism.

Finally, we shall conclude this section with some references from the Marxist-Leninist classics that go against vulgarized conceptions about what Mao's theory of "several lines in the party" is and against vulgarized views about "two-line struggle." These quotations show that the struggle of the Marxist-Leninist trend versus all the revisionist and opportunist trends is not a principle of Maoist revisionism but of Marxism-Leninism, and that the same holds true for the principled inner-party struggle.

You have dismissed the movement against social-chauvinism as a manifestation of "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle'" as it fits the formal pattern of the struggle of two ideologies or trends. But Mao's theory of factionalism is not the theory of struggle of Marxism-Leninism versus the opportunist trends, but of the legitimate and necessary existence of factions of alleged Marxism-Leninism, of the existence of different varieties of alleged Marxism-Leninism. For example, in the article "Socialism and War" of 1915, Comrade Lenin gave a brief description of the history of the Russian party in Chapter IV, entitled "The History of the Split and the Present State of Social-Democracy in Russia." Four of the subsections of this chapter are entitled as follows:

- "The 'Economists' and the Old Iskra (1894-1903)"
- "Menshevism and Bolshevism (1903-1908)"
- "Marxism and Liquidationism (1908-1914)"
- "Marxism and Social-Chauvinism (1914-1915)"

Comrade Lenin concludes this article with the words: "The working class of Russia could not build up its party otherwise than in a resolute, thirty-year struggle against all the varieties of opportunism. The experience of the world war, which has brought about the shameful collapse of European opportunism and has strengthened the alliance of our national-liberals with social-chauvinist liquidationism, still further strengthens our conviction that our Party must continue further along the same consistently revolutionary road."

Clearly, to denounce everything that fits the formal pattern of the struggle of two trends as Maoist revisionism

is a position that has nothing to do with revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and that leads to the negation of the struggle against revisionism and opportunism. For, to repeat a quotation from Lenin that we have cited previously in Section X-J, Leninism teaches that:

"It is in the struggle between these two tendencies ['of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists' and 'of the masses' — ed.] that the history of the labour movement will now inevitably develop." ("Imperialism and the Split in Socialism," *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 116)

You have also dismissed the waging of the inner-party struggle as Maoism. But Mao's theory is that of conciliation and the balancing of factions and of renouncing the principled inner-party struggle. On this struggle, Comrade Stalin pointed out:

"If we take the history of our Party from the moment of its inception in 1903 in the form of the Bolshevik group, and follow its successive stages down to our day, we can say without exaggeration that the history of our Party has been the history of a struggle of contradictions within the Party, the history of the overcoming of these contradictions and of the gradual strengthening of our Party on the basis of overcoming them. Some might think that the Russians are excessively pugnacious, that they love

debating and multiply differences, and that it is because of this that the development of their Party proceeds through the overcoming of inner-Party contradictions. That is not true, comrades. It is not a matter of pugnacity, but of the existence of disagreements based on principle, which arise in the course of the Party's development, in the course of the class struggle of the proletariat. The fact of the matter is that contradictions can be overcome only by means of a struggle for definite principles, for definite aims of the struggle, for definite methods of waging the struggle leading to the desired aim. One can, and should, agree to any compromise with dissenters in the Party on questions of current policy, on questions of a purely practical nature. But if these questions are connected with disagreements based on principle, no compromise, no 'middle' line can save the situation." ("Once More on the Social-Democratic Deviation in Our Party," *Works*, Vol. 9, pp. 3-4)

"Ever since Engels's day the proposition that the development of proletarian parties takes place through the overcoming of internal Party contradictions has been axiomatic." (*Works*, Vol. 13, p. 45)

XI-B: Your theory of "two (or more) trends in the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement" is close in spirit to Mao's theory of the necessity of two (or more) lines in the party

At the same time as you shout on and on allegedly against "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle,'" in fact you are putting forward a concept similar to Mao's idea of several lines in the party. In Section VIII-B we examined your theories of "two (or more) trends in the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement," the two trends being "the Internationalist Movement" and all the other Marxist-Leninist parties. We pointed out that:

"In your letters of December 5 you try to tone everything down and slur over the issues involved by such things as talking of 'the Internationalist Movement' instead of the Internationalist 'trend.' But this makes no difference. Call it what you will — trends, groupings, movements, headquarters — it makes no difference. The basic fallacy remains: the idea that not Marxism-Leninism but something else is the basis of unity between the Marxist-Leninist parties. There are only two choices. Either: the consolidation of different 'trends' in the international Marxist-Leninist movement. Or: the vigorous development of the Marxist-Leninist

trend in life and death struggle against the opportunist and revisionist trends. Those are the two possible conceptions of the matter [i.e., of the question of trends — ed.]."

(emphasis added)

It is clear that the first alternative is in essence similar to or even identical with the ideological basis underlying the theories of Mao on several lines in the party, only applied to the international communist movement instead of the local party. Indeed such a conception is polycentrism. The characteristic feature of polycentrism is not the call for what you term "two-line struggle" or "ideological struggle" among the different "centers." On the contrary, polycentrists may either call for unprincipled coexistence and peace or for equally unprincipled factional strife, or polycentrists may combine these two calls or oscillate between them according to the pragmatic needs of the moment. Polycentrism is marked by its advocacy of the idea of the legitimate existence of different varieties of socialism and by its opposition to the principled struggle against revisionism and opportunism. Only the second alterna-

tive given in the paragraph above is the conception of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism on the question of trends.

But you denounce the second alternative as "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'" At the same time you explicitly put forward the idea of different trends in the international movement. You call for consolidating "the Internationalist Movement," allegedly as a contribution to consolidating the international Marxist-Leninist movement. This conception of yours is unsound theoretically and in practice fraught with the danger of unprincipled splits and wild factionalism. Indeed, your letters of December 5 and your subsequent organization of an international boycott of our Party shows that the danger of unprincipled splits is a very real danger and not just a far-off potential danger. And, of course, each trend must have its own basis. Therefore, as we pointed out in Section VIII-B, your thesis on the different

XI-C: When you condemn the ideological struggle you are renouncing one of the fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism

Part of your crusade against "two-line struggle" is your denunciation of "ideological struggle." You denounce the ideological struggle on the pretext that some opportunist group or other gives the term "ideological struggle" as its slogan. But we by no means agree that any serious political or theoretical questions can be answered by this method. Comrade Lenin expressed himself rather strongly on this point. He wrote the following in reference to Rosa Luxemburg's method of discussing the question of "the right of nations to self-determination and the attitude to be adopted by the socialist proletariat towards this right":

"To a mouse there is no stronger beast than the cat, it is said. To Rosa Luxemburg there is evidently no stronger beast than the 'Fracy.' 'Fracy' is the popular term for the 'Polish Socialist Party,' its so-called revolutionary section, and the Cracow newspaper Naprzod shares the views of that 'section.' Rosa Luxemburg is so blinded by her fight against the nationalism of that 'section' that she loses sight of everything except Naprzod.

"If Naprzod says 'yes,' Rosa Luxemburg considers it her sacred duty to say an immediate 'no,' without stopping to think that by so doing she does not reveal independence of Naprzod, but, on the contrary, her ludicrous dependence on the 'Fracy' and her inability to see things from a viewpoint any deeper and broader than that of the Cracow anthill. Naprzod, of course, is a wretched and by no means Marxist organ

trends "inevitably boils down, when put forward consistently, to the idea of the legitimate existence of different varieties of Marxism-Leninism, one for each trend."

Thus your division of international revolutionary Marxism-Leninism into different trends has much in common with Mao's idea of several lines in the party. This proves once again that your crusade against "two-line struggle" is not a matter of exaggerating the struggle against Chinese revisionism or of excessive zeal in fighting Chinese revisionism. On the contrary, with your demagogical shouting about "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle,'" you are descending to giving these close in spirit to those of the Chinese revisionists concerning the legitimate existence of different varieties of Marxism-Leninism and denigrating the struggle against revisionism and opportunism.

.... ("The Right of Nations to Self-Determination," *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 426)

The question of the role and nature of the ideological struggle and its interrelationships with the other work of the party cannot be answered by mechanically negating the slogan of some opportunist group.

The fact is that ideological or theoretical struggle is one of the three basic forms of the class struggle of the proletariat. This is a fundamental teaching of Marxism-Leninism. For example, in his classic work *What Is to Be Done?*, Comrade Lenin vigorously denounced any underestimation of the importance of the ideological or theoretical form of the class struggle. Thus Section D of Chapter I is entitled "Engels on the Importance of the Theoretical Struggle." Comrade Lenin wrote in that section as follows:

"Let us quote what Engels said in 1874 concerning the significance of theory in the Social-Democratic movement. Engels recognizes not two forms of the great struggle of Social-Democracy (political and economic), as is the fashion among us, but three, placing on a par with the first two the theoretical struggle," (*What Is to Be Done?*, Foreign Language Press, Peking, 1973, pp. 29-30, emphasis as in the original)

Comrade Lenin then proceeded to give a long quotation from Engels which includes the following passage:

"For the first time since the working-class movement has existed, the struggle is being waged in a planned way from its three coordinated and interconnected sides, the theoretical,

the political and the practical-economic (resistance to the capitalists). It is precisely in this, as it were, concentric attack, that the strength and invincibility of the German movement lies." (*Ibid.*, p. 31)

Comrade Enver Hoxha also spoke extensively about the role of the ideological struggle in his *Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA*. One important passage goes as follows:

"Our practice of revolution and socialist construction teaches us that unless it is waged in all its main directions, political, economic and ideological, no class struggle can ever be complete. These three forms of class struggle are intertwined with and complement each other. At given periods, now one or now the other form of class struggle may come to the fore, but in every case it should be waged on all fronts. We should not forget that the enemy, too, wages his struggle in all directions: ideological, economic and political." (Ch. IV, Sec. 1, p. 116)

Of course you have been counterposing theory to the ideological struggle. You have been floating various theses that theory and ideology are one thing, and ideological and theoretical struggle, and especially polemical struggle, another. You have counterposed the elaboration of theory and the defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism on one hand to the ideological and polemical struggle on the other. But such distinctions are pettifogging quibbling and scholasticism. It is impossible to maintain these distinctions in real life for any length of time in any sharp struggle. You are drawing such distinction to pay lip service to the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the importance of the theoretical struggle while in fact weakening, emasculating or opposing these teachings.

Consider the classic works of Comrade Lenin for example. How many of these great works are even in the form of polemic? Consider such books as *What Is to Be Done?*; *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*; *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*; *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*; *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*; *"Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder*; and many more. These clearly show that Marxist-Leninist literature cannot be neatly divided into two mutually exclusive categories, those that are polemics and those that elaborate or advance the Marxist-Leninist theory!

And to return to Section D of Chapter I of *What Is to Be Done?*, it is clear that in this section Comrade Lenin does not put forward any artificial distinction between "ideological struggle" and the elaboration of theory. For example, near the start of this section Comrade Lenin compares two publishers' announce-

ments, one of the journal *Rabocheye Dyelo* and the other of a group of revolutionary Marxists. After showing how the announcement for *Rabocheye Dyelo* is completely silent on the theoretical tasks facing the Marxists, he then writes:

"The other announcement, on the contrary, points first of all to the decreased interest in theory observed in recent years, imperatively demands 'vigilant attention to the theoretical aspect of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat,' and calls for 'ruthless criticism of the Bernsteinian and other antirevolutionary tendencies' in our movement." (p. 27)

Comrade Lenin immediately connects "ruthless criticism" of revisionism with the question of "vigilant attention to the theoretical aspect of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat." Indeed, Comrade Lenin makes the same connection in his famous statement in this section about the need for revolutionary theory. He writes:

"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. Yet, for Russian Social-Democrats the importance of theory is enhanced by three more circumstances.... Under these circumstances, what at first sight appears to be an 'unimportant' mistake may lead to most deplorable consequences, and only shortsighted people can consider factional disputes [here Lenin is referring to the fight between the Marxists and the Economists inside the RSDLP — ed.] and a strict differentiation between shades inopportune or superfluous. The fate of Russian Social-Democracy for many, many years to come may depend on the strengthening of one or other 'shade.'" (*Ibid.*, pp. 28-29)

Indeed, Comrade Lenin directly uses the dread phrase "ideological struggle" later on in the book. He clearly regards "ideological struggle against all opponents of revolutionary Marxism" as part of the theoretical struggle. He wrote:

"The contents of this agreement on principles... make it perfectly clear that we put forward as an absolute condition for unity the most emphatic repudiation of all and every manifestation of opportunism generally, and of Russian opportunism in particular. Paragraph 1 reads: ... [we omit here all the points Lenin listed except one of them — ed.] 'The sphere of Social-Democratic activities includes... ideological struggle against all opponents of revolutionary Marxism'...." (*Ibid.*, Appendix, p. 228, emphasis as in the original)

Hence the theoretical struggle, as one of the three basic forms of the class struggle, is one of the revolutionary tasks facing any Marxist-Leninist party. The ideological struggle is especially pressing at the present time because of the intense battle between revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and the revisionist and opportunist trends. And indeed the great polemic of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists against the modern revisionists has been a major fiasco for the revisionists. To extricate themselves from this major defeat, the revisionists and opportunists adopt various stratagems. Sometimes they oppose the polemic openly, under one pretext or another. They may do this under the guise of calling for "unity" or "unity against the main enemy" and they cry out against the "sectarianism" and "splittism" of the Marxist-Leninists, but a genuine fighting unity can only be achieved without the revisionists and opportunists and in struggle against them. At other times the revisionists call for openly stepping up their fight against Marxism-Leninism. They try to avoid the questions of principle and resort to sophistry and demagoguery on a massive scale. They may either attempt to divert the discussion into side issues and irrelevancies, or they may resort to massive repetition of slanders or seek to submerge everything in sterile, allegedly theoretical discussion in which they bombard one with formulas and quotations which they deprive of their revolutionary essence and distort, deform or even apply in the opposite sense to their real meanings. Indeed, the revisionists combine all these things together. The revisionists make use also of left-sloganeering agencies to caricature the struggle against revisionism and to factionalize it.

The problem therefore arises of how to deal with those opportunists who caricature the ideological and political struggle against revisionism, seek to divert it into channels harmless to the revisionists, and promote a wild factionalism of both the Marxist-Leninist movement and the revolutionary mass movements. There are two possible responses to this problem.

(I) The first possibility is to denounce the opportunist distortions and caricatures of the ideological struggle as sabotage of the ideological struggle in general and of the great polemic against modern revisionism in particular. This is the analysis dictated by revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism teaches that pious wishes or sentimental desires for "unity" do not suffice to establish the unity of the proletariat or of the proletarian party. The only effective path is to build the Marxist-Leninist party without the revisionist and opportunist class traitors and in resolute struggle against them.

(II) The other possibility is to use the factionalist caricatures of the ideological struggle as a pretext to

denounce the ideological and polemical struggle. This is an anti-Marxist-Leninist position. This position has been repeatedly advocated by various revisionists and opportunists. For a Marxist-Leninist party to take this position for any length of time means to expose itself to great danger and to set foot on a slippery inclined plane leading down towards conciliationism.

When you denounce the "ideological struggle" and go on your crusades against "two-line struggle," you are to that extent advocating the second position. In general you have shown great inconsistency and eclecticism on these questions. You have at times simultaneously put forward theses both for and against the ideological struggle, for example, at the time when you were first putting forward slogans against "ideological struggle." This inconsistency has reflected itself in your practice also. And in the last period the inherent logic of your denunciation of "ideological struggle" has manifested itself more and more. You have urged insistently upon us a number of theses in opposition to the struggle against revisionism and opportunism; opposed the struggle we are waging; linked up your denunciation of "ideological struggle" with a crusade against "two-line struggle"; and your own press has shown the effect of your theses in, for example, its silence on the questions concerning Mao Zedong Thought. Your eclecticism and inconsistency, however, are not surprising. Naturally in practice no Marxist-Leninist party can, without committing suicide, stop altogether the ideological and polemical struggle. But your theses against the ideological struggle have definitely resulted in toning it down, removing the ideological content from it, diverting it into less effective forms and even stopping altogether this or that front of the struggle. And insofar as the ideological struggle is toned down, to say nothing of being stopped altogether on this or that front, the revisionists and opportunists are to that extent allowed to continue their dirty work in peace and quiet. Furthermore, at the present time, when the struggle against Mao Zedong Thought and Chinese revisionism has gone to such a profound level and when the Marxist-Leninist principles are being reaffirmed against the distortions fostered by the Chinese and other revisionists, the neglect, denial or taking of a condescending attitude to the ideological and theoretical struggle is especially dangerous. The theoretical struggle is essential to ensure that the proletarian parties are really built up on the firm foundations of Marxism-Leninism.

And it must be stressed that your denunciation of "ideological struggle" is not at all necessary in order to oppose the factionalist activity of those who caricature the ideological struggle. On the contrary, your denunciation of the ideological struggle only

weakens the struggle against the factionalizers. For example, in early 1978 in our pamphlet *How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism*, we took up the question of the factionalization of the mass movement by the neo-revisionists and of the caricature of the ideological struggle by certain social-chauvinists and conciliators. The pamphlet vigorously denounced these activities from the point of view of defending and carrying through the movement against social-chauvinism and the struggle against revisionism and opportunism in general. Thus the pamphlet showed how the factionalization was part of the neo-revisionist war on the party concept, and how the neo-revisionists take up both the positions of Khrushchovite moncentrism and Togliattite polycentrism, depending on the circumstances, in their struggle against the party concept and against the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists. The pamphlet showed not only how the factionalization springs from negation of the party concept, but how it is designed to oppose the struggle against opportunism, pointing out:

"This [the factionalization of the mass movement — ed.] is done allegedly as part of the struggle for principles, but in fact it is done to stop the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism and make it more difficult for the masses to gain political experience. A few years ago, the struggle against opportunism was alleged to break the 'unity of the left,' how it is usually attacked by trying to divide the mass movement into parts where the masses are kept in sterile, germ-free containers free from contamination by Marxism-Leninism. This splitting of the revolutionary masses is a terrible crime against the revolution by the opportunists. As a result, all sorts of bad elements can sneak back into the mass movement." (p. 28 of the pamphlet edition)

And the pamphlet vigorously denounced the idealist caricature of the ideological struggle. It showed how this caricature did not come from exaggeration of the struggle against revisionism and opportunism, but was in essence conciliationism and was based on the carry-over of the methods of the opportunists and social-chauvinists into the movement against opportunism and social-chauvinism.

Furthermore, the question of the caricature and diversion of the ideological struggle by the opportunists is not a new one. In various different forms and variants, it has come up before repeatedly. The principle of carrying through the polemic in opposition to this caricature and not of denouncing the polemic has already been established. We will take an example from the early 1960's and the struggle against modern revisionism. Facing utter disaster in the polemics on principle, the Khrushchovites tried to stop

the polemics while the infamous Italian revisionist Togliatti had another plan for saving revisionism. Comrade Hoxha describes this in his article "Togliatti's Testament, the Crisis of Modern Revisionism and the Struggle of the Marxist-Leninists." Comrade Hoxha pointed out:

"They [the Italian revisionists — ed.] express themselves as firmly opposed to any cessation of the open, public struggle against Marxist-Leninists, even temporarily and for the sake of appearances, because otherwise they cannot carry out their treacherous mission. At the same time, they are telling Khrushchev with this that his demagogic manoeuvres that the 'polemics must be stopped' are completely in vain and deceive no one, that the polemics cannot be stopped either by the revisionists or the 'dogmatists.'"

"In the polemics, with the Marxist-Leninists over major questions of principle, as P. Togliatti himself is forced to admit, the modern revisionists have suffered utter defeat, their demagoguery has failed and they are not in a position to denigrate the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. The polemics of principle is certain disaster for the revisionists, because it is demonstrating openly to the masses of communists and working people the revisionists' flagrant deviation from the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, is bringing to light their real features as renegades.

"Consequently, the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists everywhere are organizing, creating new groups and parties, which are fighting with determination against revisionism in defense of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. P. Togliatti is afraid of this situation and perspective. Therefore, to avoid the complete exposure of revisionism, he demands that the polemics must be shifted from questions of principle and concentrated on discussion of second rate matters, on day-to-day problems." (Enver Hoxha, *Speeches and Articles (1963-1964)*, pp. 274, 275)

What does Comrade Hoxha conclude from Togliatti's attempt to shift the polemics and to convert them into squabbles on second-rate matters? Does he denounce polemics as squabbles and go on a crusade against Togliatti's line of "polemical struggle"? No. On the contrary. To begin with, he denounces Togliatti's scheme not as "ideological struggle" but as ideological coexistence and conciliationism. He writes, continuing the quotation from where we left off:

"What Togliatti means by this is: let everybody stick to his own ideological views and let there be no polemics over these matters of principle;

the communists should not concern themselves about the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism; the process of the creation of new revolutionary groups and parties should be hindered in every way; the revisionist renegades should be left in peace in their activity so that they will have fewer problems and headaches in putting into practice their opportunist line, the line of giving up revolutionary struggle, the line of the liquidation of revolutionary Marxist-Leninists, the line of alliances with the bourgeoisie and imperialism." (*Ibid.*, pp. 275-76)

Comrade Hoxha then calls for the continuation of the polemics. Continuing the quotation, we find:

"But for all the efforts of Togliatti and Co. to divert and quell it, the great polemics which is going on today between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism must never be stopped. This polemics, will cease only when modern revisionism has been totally destroyed. The Marxist-Leninists consider it their lofty internationalist duty to carry this ideological struggle, which has vital importance for the fate of the communist and revolutionary movement, through to the end." (*Ibid.*, p. 276)

Instead of complaining that the revisionists are writing polemics, Comrade Enver Hoxha points out that the intensification of the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism is a great victory for the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists. In the last section of the article, which is entitled "Resolute and Principled Struggle against all Revisionist Trends — A Sacred Duty of Communist Revolutionaries," he writes:

"Togliatti's 'testament' shows clearly that the modern revisionists are determined to carry through to the end the struggle against Marxism-Leninism and all the revolutionary forces of the world. There is no other road for them. The consistent principled struggle of Marxist-Leninists has exposed their revisionist features, now they can no longer act 'under the rose' but are obliged to come out in the open to defend their revisionist positions and fight the Marxist-Leninists actively. This is a great victory achieved, a victory which must be carried deeper by means of the constant strengthening of our struggle against modern revisionism, under whatever disguise or in whatever form it may present itself." (*Ibid.*, pp. 314-15)

Comrade Hoxha then goes on to describe other

victories of the Marxist-Leninists in the struggle against revisionism. He then concludes the article by setting forth a stirring and confident perspective of the struggle:

"These historic victories of Marxism-Leninism will increase and become more thoroughgoing from day to day. The decisive condition and guarantee of this is the principled, uncompromising struggle of all Marxist-Leninist parties and forces against the treacherous aims and activities of the modern revisionists, to bring about their complete and total defeat. Victory in this struggle inevitably belongs to Marxism-Leninism." (*Ibid.*, p. 316)

How different from the Marxist-Leninist conception of the issue of polemics and struggle against revisionism is the feeble whining that the opportunists are engaged in "ideological struggle"! The Marxist-Leninists say: the class enemies are attacking! So, to arms, comrades, to the front lines! The whiners, pacifists and conciliators say: the class enemies are attacking! So let's wring our hands, call for peace and quiet and denounce the horrors of struggle! The Marxist-Leninists say: the revisionists are in such disarray and have suffered such fiasco that even they are forced to admit the impossibility of stopping the ideological struggle! Therefore let us step up the battle and strike them some new blows! *There is no stopping until the utter destruction of modern revisionism!* The whiners shake their heads and suggest that perhaps this whole struggle is one big diversion. After all, aren't there better things to do? But the ideological and polemical struggle cannot be stopped by either side. It is a reflection of the irreconcilable antagonism between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, of the fierce life and death struggle between socialism on one side and imperialism and its lackeys on the other. The revolutionary Marxist-Leninists wage this struggle as one of the decisive parts of the theoretical struggle, which is one of the three great fronts of the class struggle. In denouncing the polemical struggle with the revisionists, you have been led to denounce the entire ideological struggle itself. This shows where your wrong theses on this question are leading. Your denial of the ideological struggle is neither revolutionary nor principled. It is a retreat from the class struggle and a negation of some of the most basic and fundamental tenets of the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism.

XI-D: The principles involved in the controversy over the term "idealist anti-revisionism"

In the introduction to Section IX we began the discussion of the controversy over the term "idealist anti-revisionism." We showed that you are making a big fuss on the question of "unity" and in opposition to the term "idealist anti-revisionism" and the article "How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism" because you are opposed to the struggle against the conciliators and "centrists." You want us to abandon the principled struggle against conciliationism and "centrism" and replace it with pragmatic maneuvers with the conciliators and "centrists" under the signboard of "unity." In this section, we shall continue the discussion of the term "idealist anti-revisionism." Your denunciation of the term "idealist anti-revisionism" is thoroughly intertwined with your crusade against ideological struggle and hysterical sophistry over "the Maoist theory of two-line struggle," so it is appropriate at this point in our letter to return to the controversy over the term "idealist anti-revisionism."

It must be stressed that you have sought to hide the real issues at stake behind your objections to the term "idealist anti-revisionism." Instead of bringing the issues of principle to the fore, you have sought to hide everything behind quibbles, trivialities and absurdities. Thus you call the term "peculiar," which merely means that you disagree with it. Or you rave that the term is "jargon," as if you were simply worried that the term is ineffective. But, as we showed in the introduction to Section IX of this letter, you are opposed to the term "idealist anti-revisionism" not because the term was ineffective, but for the exact opposite reason, that the term struck home. The blow was aimed at and struck home against a certain section of the American conciliators, yet strangely enough the leadership of CPC(M-L) suddenly jumped up and shouted "ouch!" As well, you have denounced the term as not being a well-known international term, but this is both absurd and philistine. It is absurd because the term "idealism" is indeed one of the best-known international terms. It is also absurd as we are not writing articles as an empty show for international consumption, but as part of a serious struggle against the opportunists. Those who want to understand the struggle in the U.S. must seriously study and not simply complain that everything isn't reduced to one or two stereotyped patterns. If you can't understand the term "idealist anti-revisionism," then instead of spouting nonsense you should study the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism in the U.S. and not just rely on a few preconceived ideas or detached incidents. And your objection to the term that it is a new one is also philistine, as the course of the struggle inevitably brings forth new terms, some of which

have only a temporary use while others endure for a shorter or longer period of time. For example, anyone who seriously studies the works of Comrade Lenin finds that the struggle against opportunism in Russia involved many new and particular terms.

With your quibbles and trivialities you are trying to hide the real reasons behind your opposition to the term "idealist anti-revisionism." In fact, the controversy over the term "idealist anti-revisionism" brings up a number of questions of principle. And for Marxist-Leninists, it is the questions of principle that should be put in the forefront.

(A) To begin with, we have denounced various opportunist practices as manifestations of "idealist anti-revisionism," and we thought at one time that you were denouncing the same opportunist practices when you attacked "so-called ideological struggle." By denouncing such opportunist practices as "idealist anti-revisionism," we indicate that we are in favor of the anti-revisionist struggle and of the ideological and polemical struggle, but are opposed to idealist and other distortions or diversions of this struggle. But when you denounce the ideological struggle under the pretext of opposing certain opportunist practices, you are putting forward the opposite view that the problem is that an ideological struggle takes place at all. Hence you are putting forward the view of down with the great polemic against revisionism. Instead of denouncing diversions, distortions or caricatures of the ideological struggle, you are denouncing the ideological struggle itself. These are two opposite views on a cardinal question of principle, namely, the ideological struggle, which is one of the basic fronts of the class struggle. Thus your opposition to the term "idealist anti-revisionism" is, among other things, based on your negation of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the ideological and theoretical struggle. Whether to denounce the ideological-theoretical struggle, or to denounce deviations and distortions of this struggle, this is one of the key questions of principle behind the controversy over the term "idealist anti-revisionism."

(B) Another crucial question of principle concerns the struggle against the conciliators and "centrists." The term "idealist anti-revisionism" was put forward as part of the attack on the conciliators of social-chauvinism. But you opposed the term as a "hidden attack" on the conciliators. Should the conciliationism and "centrism" be opposed in the struggle against social-chauvinism and Chinese revisionism, or should there be pragmatic maneuvers with the conciliators under the signboard of "unity"? Should the "three worlds-ism" of the "RCP, USA" and the social-democracy of the Barry Weis-

berg MLOC/“CPUSA(ML)” sect be opposed or not? We have waged vigorous struggle against “centrism” and conciliationism while you have opposed this struggle. Your opposition to the term “idealist anti-revisionism” is entirely tied up with your opposition to the struggle against conciliationism and “centrism.” The evaluation of the struggle against conciliationism and “centrism” is therefore another key question of principle behind the controversy on the term “idealist anti-revisionism.”

(C) Another important question is that the term “idealist anti-revisionism” stresses that the problem is idealism, and thus calls for the rigorous application of materialism and the materialist dialectics. But you have been putting forward an opposite analysis, that the problem is naive materialism. For example, in various discussions you attacked our views on the ideological and polemical struggle and characterized them as “naive materialism.” In the discussions of May 1978 your representative stated, in regard to your opposition to the pamphlet *Reply to the Open Letter of the MLOC*:

“What worries me is this: by giving them [certain American opportunists — ed.] a specific and distinct character [idealist anti-revisionism — ed.] you weaken the struggle and strengthen their situation. They are part of opportunism and should be hit at in this way. By diverting the struggle to a peculiar trait of theirs [idealist anti-revisionism — ed.] you weaken the struggle. It gives them too much credit. This is the mistake which we always made when we were naive materialists, especially in 1970-71. We would sum up the features of a thing and attack it, giving it a name. *Naive materialism* was important but now we are scientists.” (emphasis added)

Aside from your sophistry that the fight against opportunism is something that strengthens opportunism, the basic thing you raise in the above passage is that the problem is naive materialism and that ideological and polemical struggle against the conciliators is a manifestation allegedly of naive materialism.

It is notable that in your letters of December 5 you characterize our views differently, as “the Maoist theory of ‘two-line struggle.’” Putting your ideas all together, it emerges that you believe that the problem with Maoist philosophy is naive materialism and not idealism. Indeed you put this forward at the internal meeting of your Party on Thursday, November 1, 1979, that replaced the planned conference on Mao Zedong Thought. Addressing the question of whether Mao Zedong Thought was vulgar materialism or idealism, your representative stated:

“You can’t say he [Mao Zedong — ed.] is idealist because he did wage a revolutionary

war. Thus, he is vulgar materialist, not idealist. He has a very definite approach. It is petty bourgeois anarchy. ...” (From the notes taken by our delegate)

True, with regard to Mao Zedong Thought you have stressed the slogan of opposing pragmatism. But you have in essence identified pragmatism not as a variety of idealism, as Marxism-Leninism teaches, but as a variety of materialism, as naive or vulgar materialism. In fact you have attacked materialism under the pretext of repudiating pragmatism. You “defended” the Marxist-Leninist principles from pragmatism by insisting that the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism belonged to a realm above and independent of investigation, facts, observation, etc. You regarded it as necessary to separate theory and practice and to create a transcendental category of truth independent of experience in order to refute pragmatism. Actually, in this way, under the banner of cursing pragmatism, you in fact created a theoretical rationale for pragmatic maneuvering and the implementation of pragmatism under the guise that tactics and practical work occur in a sphere totally detached from the realm of strategy and principles. Thus, for example, without blinking an eye you can and do advocate as a “tactic” pragmatic maneuvering for “unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists” and “unity in one party” with certain opportunists, such as various conciliators, and the cessation of polemics, while insisting that your “strategy” is to totally annihilate these same opportunists. You have tried to cover up your attack on materialism and your separation of theory from practice and of strategy from tactics by frantic confusion-mongering, such as by counterposing historical materialism and the theory of class struggle to the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge.

Thus one of the issues of principle involved in the controversy over the term “idealist anti-revisionism” is over whether to attack idealism as part of the struggle against opportunism. This is related to the question of whether pragmatism is to be denounced as a variety of idealism or as a variety of materialism.

A serious consideration of the term “idealist anti-revisionism” would start from a consideration of the principles at stake, such as the three major questions we have outlined above. Only if there is agreement on the basic questions of principle, do other secondary questions take on any particular importance. Of course your views on the secondary and tertiary questions concerning this term are as wild and unfounded as your views on the major questions of principle. But you are raising such secondary or tertiary issues in an attempt to hide your position on the major questions of principle at stake by raising irrelevant, absurd and quibbling objections to the term.

This is the backhanded way you admit the utter weakness and hollowness of your stand concerning the issues of principle.

XI-E: Turning on its head Lenin’s fight against the opportunist slogan “freedom of criticism”

Now let us return to your crusade against “ideological struggle.” In order to give an allegedly “Leninist” coloring to your denunciation of the ideological struggle, you have tried to present your opposition to the ideological and polemical struggle as opposition to the opportunist slogan of “freedom of criticism.” It is of course well known that Comrade Lenin fought hard against the opportunist slogan of “freedom of criticism.” Therefore by invoking the revolutionary authority and traditions of the Leninist fight against the opportunist slogan of “freedom of criticism,” you are trying to dress up your denial of the role of the ideological and theoretical front of struggle as allegedly “Leninist.”

But Comrade Lenin, in his classic work *What Is to Be Done?*, upheld the ideological, theoretical and polemical struggles against the opportunist followers of the slogan of “freedom of criticism.” “Freedom of criticism” was a slogan to let the revisionists and opportunists live in freedom, freedom from the ideological and polemical struggle of the Marxists. “Freedom of criticism” meant freedom from the ideological struggle against opportunism and the freedom for opportunism to coexist inside the Marxist parties and to corrode them from within. Hence you are slapping yourself in the face when you invoke Comrade Lenin’s withering repudiation of “freedom of criticism,” for this repudiation proves precisely the bankruptcy and anti-Marxist-Leninist nature of your opposition to the ideological and polemical struggle.

Comrade Lenin dealt with the opportunist slogan of “freedom of criticism” in detail in his book *What Is to Be Done?* and in particular in Chapter I entitled “Dogmatism and ‘Freedom of Criticism.’” This classic work of Comrade Lenin’s should be studied to see what the Leninist conception of struggle against opportunism is, and how it is being turned on its head and utterly negated by your crusade against the “Maoist theory of ‘two-line struggle’” and against “ideological struggle.”

Section A of Chapter I is entitled “What Is ‘Freedom of Criticism?’” The “criticism” that is being referred to is not the criticism and self-criticism that goes on all the time in a truly Leninist party. Nor is it the self-critical evaluation by the Leninist party of its work. Nor is it the criticism by the Leninist party of all opportunist and revisionist trends. Nor is it the vigorous discussion by the working masses of the burning issues of the revolution. No. The “criticism” that is being referred to in this slogan is a very

particular “criticism,” it is “bourgeois criticism of all the fundamental ideas of Marxism” (*What Is to Be Done?*, Ch. I, Sec. A) and it is the revisionist trend that took up this “criticism” and “transferred (it) bodily from bourgeois literature to socialist literature” (*Ibid.*). In brief, the “criticism” that is being referred to is opportunism, an opportunism which in those days, like today, liked to present itself as opposition to “dogmatic” Marxism.

Thus Comrade Lenin pointed out who the “critics” he is referring to are:

“In fact, it is no secret that two trends have taken shape in the present-day international Social-Democracy. ... What this ‘new’ trend, which adopts a ‘critical’ attitude towards ‘obsolete dogmatic’ Marxism, represents has with sufficient precision been stated by Bernstein, and demonstrated by Millerand.” (*Ibid.*, emphasis as in the original)

“He who does not deliberately close his eyes cannot fail to see that the new ‘critical’ trend in Socialism is nothing more nor less than a new variety of opportunism. And if we judge people not by the brilliant uniforms they don, not by the high-sounding appellations they give themselves, but by their actions, and by what they actually advocate, it will be clear that ‘freedom of criticism’ means freedom for an opportunistic trend in Social-Democracy, the freedom to convert Social-Democracy into a democratic party of reform, the freedom to introduce bourgeois ideas and bourgeois elements into Socialism.” (*Ibid.*, emphasis as in the original)

Hence “freedom of criticism” meant “freedom for an opportunistic trend.” In order to corrode the socialist movement, the “critics,” i.e., the opportunists, demanded the right to coexist with the Marxists. They demanded freedom from the struggle against opportunism. The “critics” were not in favor of “ideological struggle” between “criticism” and Marxism, but were opposed to that struggle. They wanted the right to corrode socialism without the hindrance of the revolutionary struggle of the Marxists against them. They wanted to have the right to throw mud at Marxism, but the Marxists were not to have the right to reply, for that would be a violation of “freedom of criticism.” The Marxists were to tolerate them and to be silent and not to fight against their ideological poison.

Thus Comrade Lenin denounces the advocates of

"freedom of criticism" not for advocating "ideological struggle" but for advocating the cessation of ideological struggle, for advocating ideological coexistence. He writes:

"Freedom is a grand word, but under the banner of free trade the most predatory wars were conducted; under the banner of free labour, the toilers were robbed. The modern use of the term 'freedom of criticism' contains the same inherent falsehood. Those who are really convinced that they have advanced science would demand, not freedom for the new views to continue side by side with the old, but the substitution of the new views for the old. The cry 'Long live freedom of criticism,' that is heard today, too strongly calls to mind the fable of the empty barrel." (Ibid.)

Comrade Lenin exposes the "inherent falsehood" in the slogan "freedom of criticism" in that it does not demand "substitution of the new views for the old," i.e., a life and death ideological struggle, but instead asks for coexistence.

In Section C of Chapter I entitled "Criticism in Russia," Comrade Lenin pointed out "the connection between, and interdependence of, legal criticism and illegal Economism." (Ibid., Ch. I, Sec. C) He showed that, far from welcoming ideological struggle, the Economists displayed a "fear of publicity." (Ibid.) He pointed to the opposition by the Economists to the discussion of theoretical issues and to ideological strife and wrote:

"This fear of criticism being displayed by the advocates of freedom of criticism cannot be attributed solely to craftiness (although, on occasion, no doubt craftiness has something to do with it: it would be unwise to expose the young and yet frail shoots of the new trend to attacks by opponents). No, the majority of the Economists quite sincerely disapprove (and by the very nature of Economism they must disapprove) of all theoretical controversies, factional disagreements, broad political questions, schemes for organizing revolutionaries, etc. 'Leave all that to the people abroad!' said a fairly consistent Economist to me one day, and thereby he expressed a very widespread (and again a purely trade unionist) view: our work, he said, is in the working-class movement, the workers' organizations, here, in our parts; all the rest are merely the inventions of doctrinaires, an 'exaggeration of the importance of ideology'...." (Ibid.)

Hence far from advocating "ideological struggle," the Economists, as fervent advocates of "freedom of criticism," crusaded against "exaggeration of the importance of ideology." Indeed, there is a striking similarity of spirit between the Economist

complaints about "exaggerating the importance of ideology" and your whining against "ideological struggle."

Comrade Lenin also pointed out a very striking characteristic of the demand to stop the ideological and theoretical struggle. He pointed out 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." (Ibid., Ch. I, Sec. D)

In opposition to this, Comrade Lenin stressed the importance of the theoretical struggle. Section D of Chapter I is entitled "Engels on the Importance of the Theoretical Struggle."

Thus Comrade Lenin calls for theoretical work against the "critics." As to what should be done to oppose "criticism," he states:

"The question now arises: such being the peculiar features of Russian 'criticism' and Russian Bernsteinism, what should have been the task of those who desired to oppose opportunism, in deeds and not merely in words? First of all, they should have made efforts to resume the theoretical work.... Without such work the successful growth of the movement was impossible. Secondly, they should have actively combated legal 'criticism' that was greatly corrupting people's minds. Thirdly, they should have actively opposed confusion and vacillation in the practical movement, exposing and repudiating every conscious or unconscious attempt to degrade our program and tactics." (Ibid., Ch. I, Sec. C)

Thus to wage a real fight against economism and opportunism, not just a verbal paper fight but a fight in deeds, vigorous theoretical work and theoretical struggle are necessary. And this great teaching of Lenin's remains just as fresh and lively as on the day it was written.

We shall end this section with an additional simple observation. Your perversion of the repudiation of "freedom of criticism" from meaning support for the ideological and theoretical struggle to meaning opposition to this struggle reminds us of a rather similar incident described by Comrade Lenin in Section D of Chapter I of *What Is to Be Done?* Comrade Lenin showed how the Economists quoted Marx's statement "Every step of real movement is more important than a dozen programs" in order to justify their opposition to the theoretical struggle. Comrade Lenin exposed that the Economists had turned Comrade Marx's idea on its head. Lenin pointed out:

"Moreover, these words of Marx are taken from his letter on the Gotha Program, 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!" (Ibid., Ch. I, Sec. D, emphasis as in the Original)

It is just the same with your use of the slogan of opposing "freedom of criticism." Comrade Lenin

XI-F: A mutilation of Stalin's correct teachings on the monolithic unity of the party in order to extinguish the class struggle in the party

Another method by which you negate the ideological struggle is by counterposing the ideological struggle to organizational methods in creating and preserving the monolithic unity of the party. You have repeatedly quoted part of the following famous and important passage by Comrade Stalin, but you have misinterpreted it to mean that Comrade Stalin has denounced the inner-party ideological struggle:

"The theory of 'defeating' opportunist elements by ideological struggle within the Party, the theory of 'overcoming' these elements within the confines of a single party, is a rotten and dangerous theory, which... threatens to make the Party a prey to opportunism, threatens to leave the proletariat without a revolutionary party, threatens to deprive the proletariat of its main weapon in the fight against imperialism. ... [Our Party succeeded in achieving internal unity and unexampled cohesion of its ranks primarily because it was able in good time to purge itself of the opportunist pollution, because it was able to rid its ranks of Liquidators and Mensheviks. Proletarian parties develop and become strong by purging themselves of opportunists and reformists, social-imperialists and social-chauvinists, social-patriots and social-pacifists.]" (Foundations of Leninism, near the end of Chapter VIII; the brackets have been added to indicate that you always omit that part when you quote this passage)

Actually, every time you quote this statement you leave off the end, the part about proletarian parties developing and becoming strong through purging the opportunists, that is, through inner-party struggle. You just quote the first sentence. By cutting short this quotation from Comrade Stalin and, more importantly, by the erroneous theses that you have continually heaped to us over the past few years, including those that you have used to justify your opposition to the slogan "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against

stressed the importance of the theoretical struggle, but you are striving — in his name — to belittle the significance of theory. You are turning Comrade Lenin's idea on its head when you use it to denounce ideological struggle, for Comrade Lenin's struggle against "freedom of criticism" was precisely in favor of the theoretical and ideological struggle. You are putting forward anti-Marxist-Leninist ideas under cover of perverting and interpreting in the opposite sense the Leninist slogans.

the Social-Chauvinists," you have shown that you not only negate the importance of the ideological struggle but also the importance of the inner-party struggle in general. Thus you oppose the ideological struggle by in effect advocating the Khrushchovite and social-democratic thesis of "inner-party peace." Thus although you counterpose ideological struggle to organizational measures, we by no means agree that you have the correct conception of the nature of the organizational steps to be taken with respect to party unity or of the distinction between the purging of opportunist elements and the process of rectification of erring comrades. On the contrary, you have given wrong theses on these questions too. We shall deal with the question of "inner-party peace" further at the end of this section. For the time being, however, we shall deal with your counterposition of organizational methods and ideological struggle in ensuring the monolithic unity of the party.

Thus the question arises of how should unity be achieved in the Marxist-Leninist parties and how should their monolithic character be ensured. By ideological means or organizational means? But no, the question cannot be posed in that way. Such a counterposition of the two methods is not proper. The Marxist-Leninist classics stress the proper use of both methods. Thus the famous passage from Comrade Stalin that we have quoted above speaks against relying solely on ideological measures and leaving the party paralyzed and faction-ridden. But this cannot be understood as meaning that one should neglect the ideological struggle or ideological clarification. Comrade Stalin repeatedly emphasized the role of the ideological struggle. In a striking remark, Comrade Stalin stated:

"To expel Brandler [a German type of Browder —ed.] and Thalheimer is an easy matter, but the task of overcoming Brandlerism is a difficult and serious one." ("A Letter to Comrade Me-rt," Works, Vol. 7, p. 46)

This sentence occurs in the midst of a passage that

is full of a number of profound ideas. This passage reads in part as follows:

... To disavow Trotsky and his supporters, we Russian Bolsheviks carried out an intense campaign based on an explanation of principles in support of the foundations of Bolshevism as against the foundations of Trotskyism, although, considering the strength and prestige of the Central Committee of the R.C.P.(B.), we could have dispensed with such a campaign. Was that campaign needed? Certainly it was, for by means of it we educated hundreds of thousands of new Party members (and also people who are not Party members) in the spirit of Bolshevism. It is very sad that our German comrades do not feel it necessary that repressive measures against the opposition should be preceded or supplemented by a wide campaign based on an explanation of principles, and are thus hindering the education of the Party members and Party cadres in the spirit of Bolshevism. To expel Brandler and Thalheimer is an easy matter, but the task of overcoming Brandlerism is a difficult and serious one. In this matter, repressive measures alone can only cause harm; here the soil must be deeply ploughed, minds must be greatly enlightened. The R.C.P.(B.) always developed through contradictions, i.e., in the struggle against non-communist trends, and only in that struggle did it gain strength and forge real cadres. The same path of development through contradictions, through a real, serious and lengthy struggle against non-communist trends, especially against Social-Democratic traditions, Brandlerism, etc., lies before the C.P.G. [Communist Party of Germany — ed.]. But repressive measures alone are not enough in such a struggle."

(Ibid., pp. 45-46, emphasis added)

It is quite significant that Comrade Stalin connects the failure to wage the ideological struggle with failure to understand the role of the inner-party struggle in general. He stresses that a communist party develops "through contradictions, i.e., in the struggle against non-communist trends" and that only in that struggle does it "gain strength and forge real cadres." It is clear that not just for the Communist Party of Germany of 1928 but for our two Marxist-Leninist parties today there is the perspective of development "through contradictions," that is, through "a real, serious and lengthy struggle against non-communist trends," especially against social-democratic, liberal-labor and revisionist traditions.

Comrade Stalin reiterated the importance of the ideological struggle in an article on the situation in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. In part, the relevant passage reads:

"The immediate task is, while combating 'ultra-Left' deviations, resolutely to combat the danger from the Right with the aim of altogether isolating and completely eliminating the Rights. ...

"That, of course, does not mean that all the Rights must necessarily be expelled. Expulsion is not the decisive weapon in the struggle against the Rights. The main thing is to give the Right groups a drubbing, ideologically and morally, in the course of a struggle based on principle and to draw the mass of the Party membership into this struggle. That is one of the chief and most important means of educating the Party in the spirit of Bolshevism. Expulsion must come, if it is really necessary, as a natural result of the ideological rout of the enemy." ("The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia," Works, Vol. 7, p. 66, emphasis added)

Comrade Stalin wrote other articles on the relationship between organizational and ideological measures in the inner-party struggle. His works give model examples of penetrating analysis in deciding when ideological measures should be primary in the inner-party struggle and when it is necessary to organize an extensive organizational purge of opportunist elements. Thus in November 1928 in the fight against the Right deviation in the CPSU(B), he pointed out:

"I think that we must pursue the same course in the fight against the Right deviation. The Right deviation cannot as yet be regarded as something which has taken definite shape and crystallized, although it is gaining ground in the Party. It is only in process of taking shape and crystallizing. Do the Right deviators have a faction? I do not think so. Can it be said that they do not submit to the decisions of our Party? I think we have no grounds yet for accusing them of this. Can it be affirmed that the Right deviators will certainly organise themselves into a faction? I doubt it. Hence the conclusion that our chief method of fighting the Right deviation at this stage should be that of a full-scale ideological struggle. This is all the more correct as there is an opposite tendency among some of the members of our Party — a tendency to begin the fight against the Right deviation not with an ideological struggle, but with organisational penalties. They say bluntly: Give us ten or twenty of these Rights and we'll make mince-meat of them in a trice and so put an end to the Right deviation. I think, comrades, that such sentiments are wrong and dangerous. Precisely in order to avoid being carried away by such sentiments, and in order to put the fight against the Right deviation on correct lines, it must be

said plainly and resolutely that our chief method of fighting the Right deviation at this stage is an ideological struggle." ("Industrialisation of the Country and the Right Deviation in the C.P.S.U.(B.)," Works, Vol. 11, pp. 298-99, emphasis as in the original)

"... Of course, it is easier to remove people from their posts than to conduct a broad and intelligent campaign explaining the Right deviation, the Right danger, and how to combat it. But what is easiest must not be considered the best. Be so good as to organise a broad explanatory campaign against the Right danger, be so good as not to grudge the time for it, and then you will see that the broader and deeper the campaign, the worse it will be for the Right deviation. That is why I think that the central point of our fight against the Right deviation must be an ideological struggle." (Ibid., p. 300)

(Parenthetically, let us note that here Comrade Stalin commits a double heresy according to your mode of thinking. Not only does he call for an ideological struggle, but for the organizing of a "campaign" of ideological struggle, while you have been pontificating about the alleged harmfulness and Maoist nature of both "campaigns" and of "ideological struggle." But we shall speak further about the issue of "campaigns" later on, in Section XI-H.)

Of course it does not follow in the slightest that inner-party ideological struggle must be the only method of struggle nor that it must always be the chief method of struggle. Thus Comrade Stalin stressed that the situation in the Communist Party of Germany in 1928 was different from the situation in the CPSU(B). In Germany the Rights were an arrogant faction who flouted party discipline, organized their own factional group and even had their own press organs. The time had clearly come for the expulsion of the Rights. Comrade Stalin pointed out:

"In opposing the expulsion of the Rights, Humbert-Droz and Serra refer to the resolution of the Sixth Congress [of the Comintern — ed.] which says that Right deviations must be overcome by means of an ideological struggle. That is perfectly true. But these comrades forget that the resolutions of the Sixth Congress by no means limit the struggle of the Communist Parties against the Right danger to measures of an ideological order. While speaking of methods of ideological struggle against deviations from the Leninist line, the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, in its resolution on Bukharin's report, at the same time declared that:

'far from precluding, this presumes the utmost strengthening of iron inner-Party discipline, unqualified subordination of the

minority to the majority, unqualified subordination of the lower bodies, as well as of other Party organisations (groups in parliament, groups in trade unions, the press, etc.) to the leading Party centres."

("The Right Danger in the German Communist Party," Works, Vol. 11, pp. 316-17, emphasis as in the original)

"The 12th point of the twenty-one conditions [for admission to the Comintern, conditions endorsed by the Second Congress of the Comintern — ed.] says that the Party must be 'organised on the most centralised lines,' that within it must 'prevail iron discipline bordering upon military discipline.' You know that the Rights in the German Communist Party refuse to recognize iron discipline, or any discipline whatever, except their own, factional discipline. The question arises, can this scandalous state of affairs be tolerated any longer?" (Ibid., p. 318, emphasis as in the original)

"I learned today from some of the speeches made here that some of the German conciliators plead in their justification the speech I made at the November plenum of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.) [some excerpts from this speech, "Industrialisation of the Country and the Right Deviation in the C.P.S.U.(B.)," have been quoted above — ed.] on the methods of combating the Right elements. As you know, I said in my speech... that at this stage of development of the fight against the Right danger in the C.P.S.U.(B.) the chief method of struggle is the ideological struggle, which does not exclude the application of organisational penalties in individual cases. I based this thesis on the fact that the Rights in the C.P.S.U.(B.) had not yet crystallised, did not yet represent a group or a faction, and had not yet provided a single instance of violation or non-fulfillment of decisions of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.). I stated in my speech that if the Rights were to pass to a factional struggle and begin to violate decisions of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.), they would be treated in the same way as the Trotskyists were treated in 1927. That is clear, one would think. Is it not then stupid to refer to my speech as an argument in favour of the Rights in Germany, where the Rights have already passed to factional methods of struggle and systematically violate decisions of the C.C., C.P.G., or as an argument in favour of the conciliators in Germany, who have not yet broken, and are apparently unwilling to break, with the Right faction? I think that nothing more stupid than such a plea can be imagined. Only people

who have abandoned all logic can fail to understand the vast difference between the position of the Rights in the C.P.S.U.(B.) and the position of the Rights in the C.P.G." (Ibid., pp. 320-21, emphasis as in the original)

Comrade Stalin then continued to go into other factors that have to be taken into consideration when comparing the situations inside the CPSU(B) and the CPG with respect to the problem of the danger from the Right. Thus he pointed out that, unlike the situation in the USSR:

"... In Germany, on the contrary, there is alongside the Communist Party the stronger and fairly firmly organized Social-Democratic Party, which fosters the Right deviation in the German Communist Party and objectively converts this deviation into its agency." (Ibid., p. 322)

As well, Comrade Stalin also points to the fact that "The tradition of struggle against open opportunism" (Ibid.) is not so strong in the CPG as in the CPSU(B). Indeed, the CPG was still "far from having rid itself of Social-Democratic traditions, which foster the Right danger in the C.P.G." (Ibid., p. 323)

Thus Comrade Stalin gives in these articles striking examples of the concrete analysis of the particular situation facing the communist party, an analysis necessary for the determination of the precise methods to be used in the inner-party struggle. Clearly Comrade Stalin's approach differs entirely from the mechanical counterposition of ideological and organizational methods. Instead Comrade Stalin defines the role and relationship of the two methods and the precise ways of implementing them in each particular case. And it is also absolutely clear that to slight the ideological struggle, to say nothing of denigrating, pontificating against or cursing at this struggle, is to cripple the principled inner-party struggle, to harm the growth, development and strengthening of the genuine communist party and to deviate away from the sound positions of Marxism-Leninism.

Now let us return to the point we made near the beginning of this section concerning "inner-party peace." We pointed out that although you appear to counterpose the ideological struggle to organizational methods of inner-party struggle, in fact you are really counterposing inner-party struggle in general to the question of the monolithic nature of the party. Indeed, as the striking quotation from Comrade Stalin about expelling Brandler being easy but overcoming Brandlerism being a difficult and serious matter showed, to neglect the ideological struggle is to fail to comprehend that the proletarian parties develop "through contradictions, i.e., in the struggle against non-communist trends." Slighting of the ideological struggle and of the struggle against opportunism amounts to or is closely related to nega-

tion of the inner-party struggle in general. Thus when you slight, denigrate and often outright negate the ideological struggle, the struggle against opportunism and the inner-party struggle, you are in effect putting forward a concept of the proletarian party developing without contradictions and without any internal class struggle. You are in essence putting forward the theory of "inner-party peace."

But the theory of "inner-party peace" is a social-democratic and revisionist theory. It must be stressed that the advocacy and practice of the theories of "inner-party peace" cannot ensure either genuine unity or a tranquil inner-party life. On the contrary, such theories and practices lead to the destruction of genuine Marxist-Leninist unity and to the replacement of the principled inner-party struggle with factional strife. This is closely related to the similar fact that the advocacy and practice of toning down and denigrating the polemics against opportunism does not thereby solve the problem of how to oppose opportunism. Indeed, in the long run it cannot even stop the polemic, but instead transforms the polemic into forms demoralizing to the masses and disadvantageous to the revolution. As for unity, there can be no solid Marxist-Leninist inner-party unity independent of the class struggle inside and outside the party.

In Section XI-A, in discussing your demagogy about "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle,'" we already gave a number of Marxist-Leninist references on the question of inner-party struggle. We shall not repeat that discussion here. We shall simply end by referring to some important passages from the work of Comrade Stalin that show that the negation of the struggle against opportunism and the inner-party struggle under the pretext of preserving the "unity" of the party is the stock, social-democratic theory. And this social-democratic theory and practice were also taken over by modern Khrushchovite revisionism and defended by speculating on and interpreting in the opposite sense the Leninist teachings on the monolithic and iron unity of the party.

Comrade Stalin stressed the law of the development of the party "through contradictions" and opposed the social-democratic nature of the negation of the inner-party struggle. For example, he elaborates on this in the report entitled "Once More on the Social-Democratic Deviation in Our Party." Subsection I of Section I is entitled "Contradictions of Inner-Party Development." He points out that:

"It follows that the C.P.S.U.(B.) grew and became strong by overcoming inner-Party contradictions.

"It follows that the overcoming of inner-Party disagreements by means of struggle is a law of development of our Party.

"Some may say that this may be a law for the C.P.S.U.(B.), but not for other proletarian parties. That is not true. This law is a law of development for all parties of some size, whether the proletarian Party of the U.S.S.R. or the proletarian parties of the West. Whereas in a small party in a small country it is possible in one way or another to slur over disagreements, covering them up by the prestige of one or several persons, in the case of a big party in a big country development through the overcoming of contradictions is an inevitable element of party growth and consolidation. So it was in the past. So it is today." (Works, Vol. 9, p. 8)

Comrade Stalin then goes on "to refer to the authority of Engels" and gives two collaborating quotations from Comrade Engels. One of them goes: "In the long run the contradictions are never slurred over, but always fought out."

XI-G: To profess a purely formal and empty "official optimism" concerning the unity of the Marxist-Leninists is to profess "official optimism" in regard to opportunism

Another method by which you negate the struggle against opportunism is by professing an entirely formal and empty "official optimism" concerning the unity of the Marxist-Leninists and the danger of opportunism. Thus you denounce the revolutionary struggle necessary to create, temper and preserve unity by counterposing it to the empty and purely formal "optimism" of your thesis that the Marxist-Leninists are always united, everywhere and at all times, simply by definition. You denounce the struggle to isolate and expose the opportunists and revisionists by counterposing this struggle to the fact that opportunism and revisionism are anti-Marxist-Leninist. With your "official optimism" you convert the correct Marxist-Leninist thesis that opportunism and revisionism are anti-Marxist-Leninist from a great mobilizing force and call to struggle against opportunism and revisionism into a pretext for not fighting opportunism and revisionism on the grounds that allegedly the opportunists and revisionists cannot infiltrate the Marxist-Leninist ranks by the very definition of Marxism-Leninism. You especially denounce our slogan "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists." This slogan, which identifies the danger of social-chauvinism and calls for uncompromising struggle against it, violates your "official optimism" that social-chauvinism could have nothing to do with the Marxist-Leninist movement by definition. With empty and sophistical playing with words you try to prove that those who call for the most uncompromising, Leninist struggle against social-chauvinism and for throwing the social-chauvinists out of the movement are really believers that

In the same subsection Comrade Stalin points out that the social-democratic parties, on the contrary, seek to "cover up and conceal" the contradictions and disagreements. He denounces them for not disclosing the contradictions and trying "to overcome them honestly and openly in sight of the mass of the party membership" but instead turning "their conferences and congresses into an empty parade of ostensible well-being." Comrade Stalin pointedly remarks that: "This is one of the reasons for the decline of West-European Social-Democracy, which was once revolutionary, and is now reformist." (Ibid., p. 5) Thus denial of the development of the party "through contradictions," denial of the principled inner-party struggle, is a social-democratic theory which is one of the reasons for the decline and corruption of social-democracy. And the social-democratic theory of "inner-party peace" has been taken up by modern revisionism as well.

there is "something in common" between social-chauvinism and Marxism-Leninism — for why else, you reason, would they find it necessary to give a call to remove the social-chauvinists, opportunists and revisionists from the revolutionary movement in the first place? And behind this allegedly "revolutionary" way of denouncing the struggle against opportunism, you then substitute pragmatic maneuvering under the signboard of "unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists," and "unity in one party" with all those "who claim to be Marxist-Leninists," even though you are quite familiar with what these forces are in reality. Thus your "official optimism" means to put on a false front for official consumption about how excellent the situation in the Marxist-Leninist movement is, how the international communist movement has allegedly never been split since the split decades ago between Leninism and social-democracy, and so forth, exactly in the typical manner of the bureaucrat issuing pompous, soothing and meaningless statements to keep the population calm, while the opportunist poison is allowed to continue to corrode. With your "official optimism" you turn your official statements of high principle about opportunism, as distinct from your practical politics concerning the opportunist groups, into a repetition of empty assurances of ostensible well-being, assiduously covering up and slurring over the actual problems existing in the Marxist-Leninist movement and your actual policies for handling these problems.

It should be stressed that your "official optimism" about the danger of opportunism, an "official optimism" used to negate the struggle against opportunism, is an utterly social-democratic theory and prac-

tice. One of the most harmful and corrupt traditions of social-democracy was precisely their "official optimism" about opportunism. We find it shocking to see you, the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist party, slip into a practice that bears the mark of the flabby, philistine, social-democratic and opportunist spirit that corroded the Second International. Comrade Lenin long ago denounced "official optimism." Comrade Lenin's brilliant and well-loved quotation that "...the fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism" has been repeated thousands upon thousands of times in the world Marxist-Leninist press. It is worthwhile to recall that this quotation comes from a passage where Comrade Lenin is flaying precisely the "official optimism" of the Second International and of the social-democrat Kautsky. Comrade Lenin wrote as follows:

"And so there is created that bond between imperialism and opportunism, which revealed itself first and most clearly in Great Britain, owing to the fact that certain features of imperialist development were observable there much earlier than in other countries. Some writers, L. Martov, for example, are prone to wave aside the connection between imperialism and opportunism in the working-class movement — a particularly glaring fact at the present time — by resorting to 'official optimism' (à la Kautsky and Huysmans) like the following: the cause of the opponents of capitalism would be hopeless if it were progressive capitalism that led to the increase of opportunism, or, if it were the best-paid workers who were inclined towards opportunism, etc. We must have no illusions about 'optimism' of this kind. It is optimism in respect of opportunism; it is optimism which serves to conceal opportunism. As a matter of fact the extraordinary rapidity and the particularly revolting character of the development of opportunism is by no means a guarantee that its victory will be durable: the rapid growth of a painful abscess on a healthy body can only cause it to burst more quickly and thus relieve the body of it. The most dangerous of all in this respect are those who do not wish to understand that the fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism." (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Ch. IX, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 301-302, except for "à la," all of the emphasis is added)

You and Martov give somewhat different reasons for your "official optimism" concerning opportunism. Martov openly gives rightist reasons for his "official optimism" and whitewashes the labor aristocracy and labor bureaucracy. You on the contrary

try to give a more "revolutionary" sounding type of "official optimism." You are willing to call the labor aristocracy and petty bourgeoisie bad names, and you even try to prove your revolutionary credentials by always reiterating that the opportunists are police and criminals. But from this, you conclude that there is no point in seriously repudiating the political, ideological and theoretical views and practices of the opportunists, since after all they are just the ravings of the police. So you end up insisting that the struggle against opportunism is a secondary issue at best and certainly something that should not be "elevate(d)...to the level of theory." (From your speech "The Road of the Party," *PCDN*, April 3, 1980, p. 3, col. 3 and 4) Thus, despite some differences in form between your method of putting forward "official optimism" and that of Martov, it can be seen that your "official optimism" is precisely guilty of the social-democratic position being denounced by Comrade Lenin. The main thing in this regard is the struggle against opportunism. And the whole point of your "official optimism" is to downplay, denigrate and denounce this struggle. But, as Comrade Lenin stressed:

"The most dangerous of all in this respect are those who do not wish to understand that the fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism."

This is the key and decisive issue in the question of "official optimism." And you are precisely guilty of denigrating the connection between the struggle against opportunism and the struggle against imperialism when you denounce ideological struggle, oppose the struggle against opportunism, preach that the struggle against opportunism should not be "taken too far" or elevate(d)...to the level of theory," advocate that the Chinese revisionists were guilty of too much struggle against opportunism or too many polemics, oppose our struggle against opportunism as being allegedly "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle'" and a failure to explore the full possibilities of the unity of the Marxist-Leninists, and so on and so forth.

In Section X-F of this letter we showed that you deny the well-known and obvious facts about the splits in the international communist movement and advocate the bizarre theory that the international communist movement has always been united since the time of the split between Leninism and social-democracy during and after World War I. You have gone to great pains to insist that Khrushchev and the other revisionist renegades allegedly did not arise from within the international communist movement. We dealt with these absurdities of yours in that section. But here we see why you need these theories. They are a component part of your edifice of "offi-

cial optimism." You are aware that if you simply said that the international Marxist movement was never split, that this would be too blatant a denial of Leninism. So you seek to pay lip service to Leninism while in practice relegating his teachings on the struggle against opportunism to the museum of historical antiquities and curiosities. So you concede in effect that the Leninist teachings on the split with the opportunists and on the struggle against opportunism were valid back in the days, many decades ago, of the original split between social-democracy and Leninism. But since then, you say, the international communist movement has never been split and the teachings on the struggle against opportunism must be replaced by simply defending "unity," which you conceive of as something separate and distinct from and opposed to the struggle against opportunism. Similarly, you imply that polemics may have had their role back in the days of the split between social-democracy and Leninism, but today the issue is "the defence of Marxism-Leninism," which you conceive of as something separate and distinct from and opposed to the ideological and polemical struggle. Oh yes, you are willing to concede that the question of splitting with opportunism was a real question and an important task back in Martov's day, at the time of the split between Leninism and social-democracy, and you are even willing to concede that the present-day workers' movement is split, as long as one makes a sharp distinction between the workers' movement and the Marxist-Leninist movement. But when it comes to dealing with the issues in the Marxist-Leninist movement of today, then you relegate the Leninist teachings on the struggle against opportunism to the museum and advocate that the issue was settled once and for all by the split between Leninism and social-democracy decades ago. You may even be willing to use this or that phrase about opposition to opportunism, but you make sure that these phrases remain purely formal and ceremonial by never failing to stress your opposition to ideological struggle, to polemics, to "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle'" and so on and so forth.

Your repudiation of the Leninist teachings on the struggle against opportunism under the pretext of "official optimism" can be seen in your denunciation of the Leninist slogan of building the party without and against the opportunists. Thus you stated, in one of the discussions with us in which you attacked this Leninist slogan, the following:

"You still give the line of two-line struggle. 'Build the [Marxist-Leninist — ed.] Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists.' This is the two lines. Dangerous. We know they [the social-chauvinists — ed.] are not part of the Marxist-Leninist move-

ment. They are a danger to it. You say two-lines: the Marxist-Leninist center and the social-chauvinist center. *The implication is that they [the social-chauvinists — ed.] are part of the Marxist-Leninist movement.*" (from our minutes of the discussions of late May, 1979, emphasis added)

After our delegate protested against this caricature of our views, you went on and said:

"The social-chauvinist center in the U.S. is the presidency [i.e., Carter — ed.]. They want to smuggle social-chauvinism into the Marxist-Leninist movement. Klonsky, the revisionists and the labor aristocracy are their main vehicle." (*Ibid.*)

Here you express the same idea as in the passages from you that we quoted in Section X-F. The bourgeoisie tries to smuggle social-chauvinism into the Marxist-Leninist movement, but it never succeeds, since the last split in the international communist movement was allegedly the split between social-democracy and Leninism decades ago. Therefore you condemn the struggle against the social-chauvinists on the incredible grounds that this struggle allegedly implies "that they [the social-chauvinists — ed.] are part of the Marxist-Leninist movement." It should be noted that you condemn the "without and against" slogan on general principles. You do not discuss any concrete aspect of our struggle or of our analysis. Indeed you simply caricature the "without and against" slogan and introduce talk of two "centers" and so forth, although these are not our formulations.

However, the fact is that the "without and against" slogan is a Leninist slogan. Comrade Lenin pointed out that this slogan (or the basic ideas behind it) is an essential part of any real program of action to deal with the question of opportunism. For example, he wrote:

"The purpose of a real programme of action can be served only by a Marxist programme which gives the masses a full and clear explanation of what has taken place, explains what imperialism is and how it should be combated, declares openly that the collapse of the Second International was brought about by opportunism, and openly calls for a Marxist International to be built up without and against the opportunists. Only a programme that shows that we have faith in ourselves and in Marxism and that we have proclaimed a life-and-death struggle against opportunism will sooner or later win us the sympathy of the genuinely proletarian masses." ("Socialism and War," *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 329, in the section on "The State of Affairs Among the Opposition," emphasis as in the original)

But with your denunciations of the "without and against" slogan, you are denouncing the Marxist "programme of action" as allegedly "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'" As we have seen, you seek to avoid the open appearance of denouncing Leninism by implying that such slogans as "without and against" were historically justifiable at the time, due to the split between Marxism-Leninism and social-democracy, but are obsolete today.

As to your oh so clever argument that the "without and against" slogan implies that the opportunists are part of the Marxist-Leninist movement, the exact same reasoning (or lack of reasoning) can be used to denounce any one of innumerable classical slogans against opportunism. For example, we pointed out at the start of Section XI-F that you have in the last few years repeatedly quoted Comrade Stalin's famous passage about "The theory of 'defeating' opportunist elements by ideological struggle within the Party, the theory of 'overcoming' these elements within the confines of a single party, is a rotten and dangerous theory..." Unfortunately you try to give this quotation the opposite sense intended by Comrade Stalin, because understood correctly this passage is an elaboration of the same idea as that behind the "without and against" slogan. But in any case presumably you believe that at least this passage from the classics is applicable to today's conditions. But this passage ends: "Proletarian parties develop and become strong by purging themselves of opportunists and reformists, social-imperialists and social-chauvinists, social-patriots and social-pacifists." True, you prefer not to quote this sentence, but nevertheless Comrade Stalin wrote it, and moreover it is an important truth. But this sentence is completely equivalent to the "without and against" slogan in its alleged implication that the opportunists are part of the Marxist-Leninist movement. For in order to purge an opportunist, reformist, social-chauvinist or whatever from the party, he must first be in the party. To purge someone from a party means to remove or expel a member of that party from its ranks. This is spelled out explicitly by Stalin in the final section entitled "Conclusion" of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course*, 1939 edition. Stalin pointedly remarks:

"4) The history of the Party further teaches us that unless the Party of the working class wages an uncompromising struggle against the opportunists within its own ranks, unless it smashes the capitulators in its own midst, it cannot preserve unity and discipline within its ranks, it cannot perform its role of organizer and leader of the proletarian revolution, nor its role as the builder of the new, Socialist society.

"The history of the development of the inter-

nal life of our Party is the history of the struggle against the opportunist groups within the Party — the 'Economists,' Mensheviks, Trotskyites, Bukharinites and nationalist deviators — and of the utter defeat of these groups." (emphasis added)

"It may seem to some that the Bolsheviks devoted far too much time to this struggle against the opportunist elements within the Party, that they overrated their importance. But that is altogether wrong."

But of course to call for purging someone from the Marxist-Leninist party or the Marxist-Leninist movement means precisely that one is saying that the individual involved is not a Marxist-Leninist and hence doesn't belong in the party or in the Marxist-Leninist movement. It is only in your topsy-turvy logic, and not in real life, that a call to purge social-chauvinists from the party means an implied recognition that social-chauvinism is, if only partially, Marxist-Leninist. All your objection amounts to is the following: that the struggle against opportunism means to recognize that there is a danger from opportunism, and that recognition violates "official optimism."

Nevertheless you repeat the same stale objection to the struggle against opportunism over and over again in a number of different forms. For example, you have denounced in discussions with us the slogan of "re-establishing unity." Actually, this isn't our formulation, but that made no difference to you. The fact is that you are arguing not against any particular analysis of our Party, but in general against the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the struggle against opportunism. So your representative put forward the following:

"...[you referred to a party in the capitalist part of Europe — ed.] say we must 're-establish unity' of the international communist movement. We oppose this thesis. We disagree. The question of unity has nothing to do with re-establishing. This unity exists. To say re-establish... means we should iron out this difference, means to compromise with revisionism and re-establish unity. Our view of the international communist movement is the opposite. To view this movement as a trend, this is a serious mistake. We used to analyze things this way. This was the influence of Mao Zedong Thought. The defense of Marxist-Leninist principles is not a matter of trends of ideas, defense of ideological theses — it means defending the line in the objective world." (Our minutes of the discussions of early August 1979)

Here you oppose the formulation of "re-establishing unity" in the international communist movement because it violates "official optimism" which holds

that the genuine Marxist-Leninists are always united, unity exists, and so on and so forth. You dragged in, in passing, the name of a particular party, but that party's views and practices are irrelevant to the issue. Just as we do not agree that the Marxist-Leninist teachings on "ideological struggle" can be negated because some opportunist group or other gives "ideological struggle" as a slogan, so here too the phrase "re-establish unity" must be judged in a more serious fashion. And it turns out, of course, that the phrase "re-establish unity" is too general to be either supported or condemned in itself, unless it has further elaboration. If someone or some party wishes to "re-establish unity" with the revisionists or with some section of the revisionists, then such a "re-establishment of unity" is an opportunist and anti-Marxist-Leninist practice. But if the call is to "re-establish unity" without and against the revisionists, then the "re-establishment of unity" has a totally different significance. Thus, Comrade Enver Hoxha gave the stirring call at the Fifth Congress of the Party of Labor of Albania that:

"unity will be re-established in the communist movement and the socialist camp, but it will be re-established by the Marxist-Leninists without revisionists and traitors and in resolute struggle against them." (Cited in the *History of the Party of Labor of Albania*, Ch. VII, Sec. 2, p. 605)

We are enthusiastically in favor of this type of "re-establishment of unity" and against the other type of "re-establishment of unity." But you are simply engaging in empty playing with the words "re-establishment of unity" in order to denounce the struggle against opportunism from an allegedly super-principled and very revolutionary standpoint.

In passing, we should also note that in the passage from you that we have given above, you go to the extent of utterly negating the struggle against opportunism by denying that this struggle should have any ideological content at all. You are sternly opposed to the defense of any Marxist-Leninist "ideas" or "ideological theses" at all! Amazing! This means to either avoid the struggle against opportunism altogether or to reduce it to a meaningless squabble devoid of any ideological content in the slightest.

Furthermore you denounce the thought that Marxism-Leninism could be regarded as a "trend." You try to make this sound very "revolutionary," but it is just sophistry and phrasemongering. The Marxist-Leninist classics have often referred to Marxism as a "trend" or similar such expressions when it was appropriate. Hence with your phrasemongering you are trying to present yourself as more "revolutionary" than the Marxist-Leninist classics. The reason why you have to engage in this chittrade of phras-

mongering is that you are afraid that if you allow talk of the Marxist-Leninist "trend," then you will have to allow talk about the struggle between different trends, and then you will have to recognize the struggle against opportunism and, indeed, even the ideological struggle against opportunism. But you regard the ideological struggle against opportunism as a fate worse than death.

Let us examine an additional passage where you repeat in a slightly different form these same tired-out objections to the struggle against opportunism. In the following short passage you pile on the distortions, slanders and demagogic phrasemongering so thick that it would take pages to sort out these few sentences:

"*En Lutte!* says everyone is in the movement except the Party [CPC(M-L) — ed.]. We agree that we are not part of the opportunist movement. You present the same thesis from the opposite side, i.e., that everyone is part of the movement. This leads to the conclusion that the international movement must purge itself. This plays into the hands of elements who speculate on the international movement. Then you get: re-construct, re-unite, re-etc." (from our minutes of the discussion of October 29, 1979)

Here you repeat once again the same stock slander that to be for struggle against the opportunists means to be for unity with them. This time you serve up this sophistry in a new sauce by saying that our thesis of building the party without and against the opportunists is allegedly the flip side of the thesis that all the opportunists should unite. You identify the following two positions as the same thing: that all the opportunists should unite against the Marxist-Leninists, and that all the Marxist-Leninists should unite against the opportunists. This is equivalent to someone saying that both those fighting arms in hand for liberation and those fighting arms in hand to slaughter and oppress the people are really in the same position, for, don't you see, they both use weapons. Such a complaint can only be made by a pacifist. And indeed, you prove that you are taking a pacifist position in the war between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism in so far as you denounce "ideological struggle" when in the above quotation you identify the war against opportunism waged by the Marxist-Leninists and the war against Marxism-Leninism waged by the opportunists as the same position, though given "from the opposite side."

You then proceed to denounce the conclusion that "the international movement must purge itself." We do not use "purge yourself" as our agitational slogan. But just as in the case of the "re-establishment of unity," this expression must be further elaborated before it can be judged. How can the idea of the international movement purging itself be de-

nounced in general when Comrade Stalin teaches that: "Proletarian parties develop and become strong by purging themselves of" the opportunist elements? Indeed, it is quite true that the international movement is purging itself in the course of the great struggle against modern revisionism. But, you say, this gives rise to such theses as "re-establishing unity," etc. Well, what is so bad about that? It all depends on how one reestablishes unity. We have explained this above.

And there is one last comment that needs to be made on the above passage we have quoted from you. If you are aware that a certain opportunist group is actually preaching unity with everyone, including the right social-democrats, then you are consciously lying when you attribute to this group the position of "ideological struggle." For you yourselves have thus admitted that the actual position of this group is liberalness and social-democratic coexistence. In such a case, if a group that stands for social-democratic liberalness claims to be for "ideological struggle," then the fraud should be exposed. But when you instead denounce such a group for "ideological struggle," you are in effect denouncing the group for not extending its liberalness and coexistence to you, for excluding you from this "movement," which you yourself call the "opportunist movement." Oh yes, you do not fail to add for official consumption that you "agree that we [CPC (M-L) — ed.] are not part of the opportunist movement." But in practice you reject the slogan of building the Marxist-Leninist party without and against the opportunists and instead preach an end to the "ideological struggle." And such preaching means to demand that the policy of liberal coexistence should be extended to you.

Thus we see from your statements that you have over and over again attacked our struggle against opportunism on the topsy-turvy grounds that to call for struggle against opportunism means to "imply" that the opportunists are part of the Marxist-Leninist movement. And you especially object to the call to struggle against opportunism when it is a call for unyielding struggle, for struggle carried through to the end, that is, for struggle conducted along the lines of building the Marxist-Leninist party without and against the opportunists and revisionists. You are opposing the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the proletarian parties developing and growing strong by purging themselves of opportunist elements through the "official optimism" that by definition the proletarian parties do not contain non-proletarian, opportunist elements. Your "official optimism" is a deeply rightist, social-democratic method, but you try to dress it in "revolutionary" colors by posturing with phrasemongering as more "revolutionary" than anyone, even than the Marxist-Leninist classics.

Thus you posture with absurd arguments that Marxism-Leninism can never be called a "trend," that opportunist elements never arise from within the movement (at least, not since the split between social-democracy and Leninism during and after World War I) and so forth. So let us examine again and a little more closely your theories about who is or who isn't in the Marxist-Leninist movement. We shall see in more detail how you use your "official optimism" both to denigrate the struggle against opportunism and to replace it with pragmatic maneuvering under the signboard of "unity of the Marxist-Leninists."

Let us return to your objections to the movement against social-chauvinism in the U.S. You attack this movement, alleging that to struggle against social-chauvinism in order to purge the social-chauvinists from the revolutionary movement means to hold that the social-chauvinists are part of the movement. But the facts are that, at the time of the beginning of the movement against social-chauvinism in 1976, the open social-chauvinists and Klonskyites in particular and the neo-revisionists in general were generally accepted as being part of the Marxist-Leninist movement. Accepted by whom? By the COUSML? Did our predecessor, the COUSML, accept neo-revisionism as being genuinely Marxist-Leninist or anti-revisionist? No, the COUSML didn't. The COUSML never accepted neo-revisionism as Marxism-Leninism and the COUSML declared relentless war upon the social-chauvinists. The COUSML fought to make the neo-revisionists, "three worlders" and social-chauvinists an object of scorn in the eyes of every progressive person. The COUSML fought not just the neo-revisionists, but it also fought neo-revisionism as a trend of thought, as an anti-Marxist-Leninist theory.

Thus the COUSML fought tooth and nail against the social-chauvinists. But it is exactly this fight that you accuse of creating illusions in the social-chauvinists and of implying that they are part of the movement. What a fraud! The fact that the social-chauvinists and neo-revisionists were generally accepted as being part of the Marxist-Leninist movement was not the doing of the COUSML. If the COUSML had closed its eyes to this unfortunate fact, the fact wouldn't go away. Ostriches have never been regarded as the fiercest fighters of the animal kingdom. The most harmful thing in this regard is "official optimism" that closes its eyes to such generally known but unpleasant facts as the presence of opportunists infiltrating into the Marxist-Leninist, revolutionary and working class movements. What creates illusions in the opportunists is the blunting of the struggle. What destroys illusions is the sharpening and intensification of the struggle against opportunism. It is precisely the movement against social-

chauvinism that has destroyed many illusions about social-chauvinism and neo-revisionism, and that has been an utter fiasco for them. It is the scientific and militant stand of the COUSML, which acted to change the situation whereby the social-chauvinists were accepted as part of the Marxist-Leninist movement not by defining the problem away, but by hard struggle, which has destroyed illusions and safeguarded the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the honor of the revolutionary movement.

Thus your holier-than-thou posturing about whether or not the social-chauvinists are in the Marxist-Leninist movement is a big fraud. More, it is utter hypocrisy. For even now you are advocating pragmatic maneuvers with some of the conciliators of social-chauvinism. In your letters of December 5 you denounce our struggle against social-chauvinism, which must of necessity include the stern struggle against the conciliators, as allegedly a failure to exhaust "the full possibilities of this opportunity of building the unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists." (See introduction to Section IX of this letter.) Thus behind your talk about the opportunists not being in the Marxist-Leninist movement stands the reality that you are in favor of pragmatic maneuvers under the signboard of "the unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists" with those who you yourself say are not in the Marxist-Leninist movement!!

Therefore let us take a closer look into your conception of "the Marxist-Leninist movement." You have insisted that there is some question of differences on the issue of the composition of the Marxist-Leninist movement. Very well, there are many different ways to approach a question. However, if you wished to deal with the composition of the Marxist-Leninist movement, you should have taken seriously the issue that you yourself raised. And a serious approach to this question would require, among other things, that you explain clearly what you mean by "the Marxist-Leninist movement," who is in it and how it has developed. But you avoid this like the plague in your discussions with us. Very well, we should go into this anyway.

To begin with, what do you mean by the "Marxist-Leninist movement"? The answer to this question naturally will determine whether or not this or that opportunist is in this movement. Do you mean by "the Marxist-Leninist movement," all those who are genuine Marxist-Leninists and true fighters against revisionism? If so, the neo-revisionists and other opportunists are not part of this movement. Or do you mean all those who are generally accepted as being in the Marxist-Leninist movement? If so, then whether the neo-revisionists or various other opportunists are in the Marxist-Leninist movement depends entirely on the exact state of the Marxist-Leninist movement of the particular country at a particular

time. Or do you mean those activists from the revolutionary mass movement who took part in an objective movement to take up Marxism-Leninism and who came to the realization of the need to fight revisionism? If so, you have never said so. But clearly in this case too the composition of the movement depends entirely on the concrete situation prevailing at a particular time and place. Or do you mean all those "who claim to be Marxist-Leninists"? This movement would include the neo-revisionists and a number of other opportunists. And indeed you have many times given the call that "All individuals who call themselves Marxist-Leninists" or "All those individuals and organizations who claim themselves to be Marxist-Leninists" should join CPC(M-L). See your pamphlet of 1976 entitled *On Unity of Marxist-Leninists*. This is expressed in this pamphlet in numerous places, such as in the article "The General Method of CPC(M-L) for Building the Unity of the Marxist-Leninists in Canada and Quebec." As well, this thesis is expressed in the major speech of your Party assessing the decade of the 1970's, given in Hamilton on December 30, 1979. This speech specifically endorsed the calls of 1974-75 that "those who called themselves Marxist-Leninists" should join the CPC(M-L), the calls that are reproduced in the pamphlet *On Unity of Marxist-Leninists*. (See *PCDN*, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 3) And you yourself admit that those "who call themselves Marxist-Leninists" include certain "revisionists, trotskysts, anarcho-syndicalists and opportunists of various sorts." (*On Unity of Marxist-Leninists*, p. 153 and numerous other pages.)

But if you are willing to appeal for unity to "all those who claim to be Marxist-Leninists," even groups that you do not regard as being in the Marxist-Leninist movement but as groups that are revisionist, trotskyst or opportunist and only "Marxist-Leninist" in words, well then, why bother to waste time and effort arguing about who is or who isn't in the Marxist-Leninist movement. Of what possible value or significance is a "Marxist-Leninist movement" whose extent does not even put a limit on the boundaries of possible Marxist-Leninist unity? Such a "Marxist-Leninist movement" is only an ornament, something to be displayed for ceremonial and official purposes, while in fact you work with a different movement, consisting of all those who are Marxist-Leninist in words.

Just look at the ugly, disgusting hypocrisy behind your mask of "official optimism." You denounce the struggle against social-chauvinism and the slogan "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists" as allegedly "implying" that the social-chauvinists are in the Marxist-Leninist movement. Meanwhile you yourself give appeals that everyone who

"claims" to be a Marxist-Leninist or who "calls himself" a Marxist-Leninist should take part in the "unity of the Marxist-Leninists" and should join the Marxist-Leninist party although it is precisely such an appeal to those who you yourselves call opportunists, revisionists, trotskyists and so forth that is utterly anti-Marxist-Leninist in principle and extremely dangerous in practice and that creates great confusion on what the relation is between opportunism and Marxism-Leninism. Either you are admitting that you are not serious when you call these groups opportunists, revisionists and trotskyites or you are putting forward the position of unity in one party with the opportunists.

Thus your whole facade of "official optimism" is meant to cover up and conceal your actual political practice and policies. Your sophistry and moralisms about the composition of the Marxist-Leninist movement serve not only to provide a "revolutionary"-sounding argument against the struggle against opportunism, but also to conceal that you are willing to call for a "unity of the Marxist-Leninists" with groups that you yourself brand as opportunist and not part of the Marxist-Leninist movement. What a shocking conception of "unity"! The struggle against opportunism is replaced by maneuvers with the opportunists under the signboard of "unity of the Marxist-Leninists." You describe this method of calling for "unity of the Marxist-Leninists" with various opportunists in the pamphlet *On Unity of Marxist-Leninists*. For example, the article "CPC(M-L)'s Consistent Line on the Question of Opposing Opportunism and Building the Unity of the Marxist-Leninists, A PCDN Editorial Comment" starts by raising the following issue:

"Certain comrades and friends of the Party have asked us why, since we consider certain organizations and individuals to be erroneous and go to the extent of pointing out that they are revisionists, trotskyists, anarcho-syndicalists and opportunists of various sorts, does the Party issue the call to unite with them. [Bear in mind that what is being referred to here is unity in a single party — ed.] How can Marxist-Leninists unite with the revisionists, trotskyists, anarcho-syndicalists and opportunists? Certain friends of the Party are puzzled by this. So this editorial is written to explain the Party's view on the question. We will answer the question point by point: 1) The task of building the unity of the Marxist-Leninists; 2) The task of opposing revisionism, trotskyism, anarcho-syndicalism and opportunism." (*Ibid.*, p. 153)

It should be remembered that this article is talking about "unity of the Marxist-Leninists" and the call that all those who "call themselves Marxist-Leninists" should be united into one party, the CPC(M-L).

The article explicitly points out that this call applies to certain organizations and individuals who are "revisionists, trotskyists, anarcho-syndicalists and opportunists of various sorts."

The article does, as promised, take up the question of the task of opposing opportunism. It states:

"For us, to unite the Marxist-Leninists it is absolutely necessary to struggle against revisionism, trotskyism, anarcho-syndicalism and opportunism." (*Ibid.*, p. 155)

The article even talks of "an irreconcilable struggle against these elements," referring to "all those who are pursuing these opportunist political lines irrespective of what they call themselves." But how does the article define this struggle? It clearly and explicitly states the following:

"Certain comrades and friends also raise questions about how the struggle against these opportunist political lines should be waged. In the practical movement, the opportunists are all those who are unwilling to sit together with others and sort out their differences." (*Ibid.*, p. 155)

Thus here the article explains that the task of opposing the opportunist lines is basically a struggle to have everyone, Marxist-Leninist and opportunist, "sit together" to sort out their differences. Opportunism is to be opposed, but opportunism is defined as being "unwilling to sit together." As the article declares:

"Not to join the Party and not to sit together to deal with questions relating to the theory and tactics of Canadian revolution amounts to opportunism." (*Ibid.*, p. 156)

And it should be noted that this view too was endorsed in the major speech of your Party in Hamilton on December 30, 1979. This speech, in discussing the period dealt with in the pamphlet *On Unity of Marxist-Leninists*, upheld as correct that your Party "differentiated between sham Marxist-Leninists and real Marxist-Leninists" on the basis of who joined CPC(M-L). (*PCDN*, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 3, col. 2)

In passing, it should be noted that this article sheds a very interesting light on your opposition to ideological struggle. The article opposes ideological struggle on the grounds that the differing views should all come into the party and be worked out there. And it should not be forgotten that the article is referring to views that differ so significantly on principle that you call them revisionist, trotskyist, anarcho-syndicalist or so forth. The article calls this ideological struggle under "Party discipline," but in fact it is clearly a theory of ideological coexistence in the party. The article states:

"We hold that we should firmly oppose revisionism, trotskyism, anarcho-syndicalism and other opportunist trends, and at the same time

that all Marxist-Leninists should be in one Party where they wage ideological struggle as to what is the correct or incorrect line for the Party. Ideological struggle without Party discipline is to merely engage in the bourgeois pursuit of having endless discussions without reaching any conclusions." (*Ibid.*, p. 156)

Here the struggle of the party against opportunism outside the party is denounced as "ideological struggle without Party discipline." Nowadays you would probably not call for ideological struggle inside the party or for the struggle between correct and incorrect. But this change in formulation simply deepens the error and draws out more clearly the opposition to any ideological struggle at all, inside or outside the party.

Of course at the same time that you are calling for unity with certain groups or individuals that you yourself say are opportunist, you also take care to say that these groups are not in "the Marxist-Leninist movement." You keep referring to them as "Marxist-Leninists," but apparently as Marxist-Leninists who are not in the "Marxist-Leninist movement." Thus the article expresses the hope that MREQ, one of the organizations that is included in the call for unity, "joins the Marxist-Leninist movement":

"We hope that MREQ does overcome its rank opportunism, adopts Marxism-Leninism and joins the Marxist-Leninist movement. Our articles dealing with them are written in this light." (*Ibid.*, p. 157)

Thus the article holds that MREQ was not then in the Marxist-Leninist movement, but might later join it. Thus the article never violates your principle that there are no opportunists in the Marxist-Leninist movement by definition. Never! You simply call for Marxist-Leninist unity with groups that are not in the Marxist-Leninist movement. This is amazing, but it is true.

Thus under the banner of "official optimism" you have in fact developed a whole rationale for justifying pragmatic maneuvers, to say nothing of actual unity, with the opportunists. This rationale replaces the struggle against opportunism with the struggle for the unity of all those "who call themselves Marxist-Leninists." We shall deal further with this in Section XII-A. It should be noted that you have never repudiated the pamphlet *On Unity of Marxist-Leninists*. Since you have published it you have changed certain formulations, such as dropping certain formulations in the pamphlet that refer to the importance of the struggle against revisionism and opportunism, a change which further deepens the basic error, but you follow the same basic theory. This is fully revealed in your crusade against "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle,'" your opposition to

ideological struggle and your denunciation of our struggle against opportunism by counterposing it to "unity of the Marxist-Leninists." And this is completely verified by your endorsement of these theories in your major speech in Hamilton on December 30, 1979, assessing the decade of the 1970's. We have referred to the pamphlet *On Unity of Marxist-Leninists* because it is one of the few places where you have attempted to elaborate your ideas of "unity of the Marxist-Leninists" in some detail and in writing.

Hence you never speak precisely about what you mean by "the Marxist-Leninist movement" because your whole method of "official optimism" is designed to conceal your actual policies concerning the Marxist-Leninist movement. And behind the mask of "official optimism" you denounce the struggle against opportunism and advocate a policy of pragmatic maneuvering under the signboard of "unity." You try to present your "official optimism" as "revolutionary" through extravagant phrasemongering and outrageous sophistry. You attack any presentation of the actual situation in the Marxist-Leninist movement with respect to the danger of opportunism as allegedly a failure to understand that opportunism is anti-Marxist-Leninist, and with the complacent assertion that opportunism cannot infiltrate into or corrode inside the Marxist-Leninist movement by the very definition of the words "opportunism" and "Marxism-Leninism." You oppose with a holier-than-thou air expressions such as "the corrosion of neo-revisionism within the Marxist-Leninist movement." In this way you are in effect posing as more "revolutionary" than the Marxist-Leninist classics themselves, for these classics often spoke about the question of opportunism infiltration. The Marxist-Leninist classics teach how to lay bare the actual situation and contradictions inside the communist movement. Thus far from phrasemongering about the impossibility of opportunists ever arising from within the communist movement or similar such rubbish, Comrade Lenin, who was free from even an ounce of "official optimism," described old-style or Bernsteinian revisionism as follows: "And the second half-century of the existence of Marxism began (in the nineties) with the struggle of a trend hostile to Marxism within Marxism itself." ("Marxism and Revisionism," *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 32, emphasis added. This was written in 1908.) And Lenin went on to add: "Pre-Marxist socialism has been defeated. It is continuing the struggle, no longer on its own independent ground, but on the general ground of Marxism, as revisionism." (*Ibid.*, p. 33, emphasis added) Comrade Lenin did not fear to write this way, because he relied on relentless and unyielding struggle to combat the revisionist danger, while "official optimism" relies on defining the danger out of exist-

ence in order to justify a policy of pragmatic maneuver.

Comrade Stalin also denounced "official optimism"; he flayed the method of concealing the contradictions in the movement as a social-democratic method and connected this to the "middle line" in matters of principle. He wrote:

"How do the Social-Democratic parties of the West exist and develop nowadays? Have they inner-party contradictions, disagreements based on principle? Of course, they have. Do they disclose these contradictions and try to overcome them honestly and openly in sight of the mass of the party membership? No, of course not. It is the practice of the Social-Democrats to cover up and conceal these contradictions and disagreements. It is the practice of the Social-Democrats to turn their conferences and congresses into an empty parade of ostensible well-being, assiduously covering up and slurring over internal disagreements. But nothing can come of this except stuffing people's heads with rubbish and the ideological impoverishment of the party. This is one of the reasons for the decline of West-European Social-Democracy, which was once revolutionary, and is now reformist."

"We, however, cannot live and develop in that way, comrades. The policy of a 'middle' line in matters of principle is not our policy. The policy of a 'middle' line in matters of principle is the policy of decaying and degenerating parties. Such a policy cannot but lead to the conversion of the party into an empty bureau-

XI-H: Your tirades against "campaigns" and "movements" show your addiction to empty phrasemongering

You have also denounced the struggle against opportunism by playing with the words "movement" and "campaign." For example, in the major speech "The Road of the Party," you say that:

"According to Maoism, all that is needed is to start any kind of struggle and then extend this as a 'movement.' For the Maoists, a 'movement' is always parallel to the working class movement, a separate entity and separate from the interests of the proletariat. They never deal with the question of the proletariat as a class, they never deal with the class struggle in a concrete manner, and they do not recognize the dictatorship of the proletariat." (PCDN, April 3, 1980, p. 3, col. 3)

You deduce all these things from the question of "movement." This shows your addiction to empty phrasemongering. And the main target of this tirade against "movement" is to attack the struggle

cratic apparatus, running idle and divorced from the masses of the workers. That path is not our path.

"Our Party's whole past confirms the thesis that the history of our Party is the history of the overcoming of inner-Party contradictions and of the constant strengthening of the ranks of our Party on the basis of overcoming them."

("Once More on the Social-Democratic Deviation in Our Party," Works, Vol. 9, pp. 4-5)

It is quite clear that Comrade Stalin's idea applies fully to the question of the present-day Marxist-Leninist movement. To pretend that everything is fine, to fail to disclose the contradictions and to fail to try to deal with them honestly and openly "in sight of the mass of the party membership," is in fact to introduce a spirit akin to that of social-democracy. It is clear that from such "official optimism" "nothing can come...except stuffing people's heads with rubbish and the ideological impoverishment of the party." In order to rally all genuine Marxist-Leninists around the Marxist-Leninist party, in order to eliminate all opportunism from the Marxist-Leninist movement not by closing our eyes to it but by driving it out, the Marxist-Leninists must wage a vigorous, determined and open fight for Marxist-Leninist principle. The movement against social-chauvinism led by our Party is precisely an example of such a powerful struggle, and the Call of the NC of the COUSML "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists" is precisely an example of a manifesto for such a struggle.

against revisionism and opportunism. Thus you immediately go on to give, as "one salient example," your stock denunciation of ideological struggle in particular and the struggle against opportunism in general. You link this up with denouncing "campaigns." Thus you are denouncing a whole front of the class struggle, the ideological struggle, as something that is allegedly only "parallel to the working class movement, a separate entity and separate from the interests of the proletariat." You are stressing that you hold that the struggle against opportunism "never deal(s) with the question of the proletariat as a class" and "never deal(s) with the class struggle in a concrete manner."

In particular, you have used this denunciation of "campaigns" and "movements" to denounce the powerful and invigorating movement against social-chauvinism led by our Party. What, you cry, it is a "movement" and a "campaign." There is no need

to examine it in detail and/or to even consider the concrete policies and principles underlying our guidance of this struggle. Oh no! It is enough that it is a "movement" and you are able to characterize it as a manifestation of the Maoist line. In discussions with us on October 29, 1979 you put forward this phrasemongering in opposition to the movement against social-chauvinism. And you stated: "We must be consistent Marxist-Leninists, not have campaigns." At the same time, you stated: "As well, you have some specific offensives. But not in such a way as to negate the on-going general defense of Marxism-Leninism." What word-chopping! If a "specific offensive" can be consistent with "the on-going general defence of Marxism-Leninism," then why not a "movement against social-chauvinism" or a "campaign"? Indeed, is the "on-going general defence of Marxism-Leninism" even conceivable without specific polemics, campaigns, movements, programs, and so forth? Your position is that of denouncing meals, but supporting the "on-going general" process of eating. But you went on to make the question of "campaigns" into a major issue and stated: "The whole idea of campaign is erroneous. It involves erroneous assessment of actual motion, of what can be accomplished through such a struggle, of what is the scope of the struggle." How can one discuss "campaigns" in the abstract? With such anti-Marxist-Leninist stupidities you seek to present yourselves as more "revolutionary" than anyone else, even than the Marxist-Leninist classics. Why, you! have gone right down to the root of the issue, to the very idea of "campaigns." True, the Marxist-Leninist classics talk about "campaigns," "movements," "main blows," and so on, but presumably you have advanced science so much further!

Your counterposition of the specific work of the party to its "on-going general" work is utterly nonsensical. Since you are making a general, abstract point about "the whole idea of campaign," we shall discuss this general issue. Let us consider an analogy to the army. After all, military analogies are sometimes made to illustrate certain points about the party, such as when the party is called "the general staff" of the proletariat. In considering the army one sees that it is a model of "on-going general" work. It has a constant, rigid discipline, a discipline which is never so tightly enforced as when the army is in battle. And it has a constantly enforced rigid structure. The army maintains constant maintenance of weapons, constant concern for provisions, a well-developed division of labor and so on and so forth. But what is all this "on-going general" work for? It is to allow the army to be a model of "campaigns," "movements," attacks and retreats, forced marches and sudden change of plans. Indeed, the army is the model for the word "campaign." An army which

tries to fight a war by ruling out all "campaigns" and a party which is afraid of concrete revolutionary actions and "movements" are both absurdities and ripe for ignominious defeat. To denounce "campaigns" and "movements" is an absurd blunder. The science of Marxism-Leninism requires not that, but instead a correct definition of the role and relationship of specific and particular struggles to the "on-going general" work and the formulation of correct policies adapted to the concrete conditions of the revolutionary struggle.

Indeed a correct Marxist-Leninist analysis shows that there are various constant fronts of the work of the party, fronts that are essential and needed at all times. The ideological or theoretical struggle, which is one of the three basic forms of the class struggle, is such a front. Party-building is another. The struggle against opportunism, which is very closely linked with the theoretical struggle, is also such a front of struggle. Work on these fronts should not be done in fits and starts, so that some work is done and then things go to sleep for years until some emergency arises and the rot has already set in. But naturally, however, constant work entails that there will be many campaigns, movements, specific battles, all linked together into a consistent front of work. Each front of work may rise or lower in intensity at times, but it must never be interrupted. Such consistent work is not ensured by your nonsensical sophistry about "campaigns," but by vigilance, by consistent, unflagging efforts. Thus you curse "campaigns" and "movements," but it is you who give a shocking example of advocating work by fits and starts when you assert, in summing up the 1970's, that:

"There is no way that revisionism and opportunism can arise in this country again with the same kind of bluster which they had during the 1974-77 period." (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 3, col. 3)

This assertion is a manifestation of complacency, of neglecting the front of struggle against opportunism and of dealing with it only when there is a crisis, an emergency. It is further deepened when you assert that the party must not "elevate this [the struggle against opportunism — ed.] to the level of theory." (From the major speech of your Party on the tenth anniversary of its founding, the speech entitled "The Road of the Party") This type of complacency ensures work by fits and starts.

Hence your denunciation of "campaigns" and "movements" shows that you are suffering from an addiction to phrasemongering and empty play with words. If you dislike something, then it is a "campaign." If you like it, it is a "specific offensive." Since you are opposed to the struggle against opportunism in general and the movement against social-chauvinism in particular, you call it an example of

the "Maoist" line of "campaigns" and "movements." Meanwhile, you yourself develop your own "movements," such as the "worker-politicians movement." This proves the utterly frivolous nature of your complaints about "movements."

Thus when you make the denunciation of "movements" and "campaigns" a central feature of your denunciation of Maoism, this shows, among other

SECTION XII: Under the cover of "unity in one party," pragmatic maneuvering with the opportunist chieftains replaces the principled struggle against opportunism

XII-A: More on "unity": The brilliant "tactics" of "we put unity in the forefront, and they expose themselves"

It has already become clear in the previous sections of this letter that you negate the struggle against revisionism and opportunism by counterposing it to "unity." In the introduction to Section IX, for example, we showed that you oppose our carrying through of the struggle against Chinese revisionism to the end by characterizing our stand of struggle against opportunism as "anti-Leninist tactics on the question of building and strengthening the unity amongst the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces in one country." In particular you oppose the struggle against the conciliators of social-chauvinism as an alleged failure to exhaust "the full possibilities of this opportunity of building the unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists." In this section we shall examine some more of your views concerning "unity." We shall examine further your statements in which you elaborate your theories denying struggle against opportunism, putting forward the opportunists as "temporary allies," and setting forward the path of pragmatic maneuver with the opportunist chieftains under the cover of "unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists."

In the discussions between our two Parties in late May 1979 you put forward a whole scheme, a strategy and tactics, of replacing the struggle against opportunism with the struggle to unite with the opportunist chieftains. You stated:

"This is the same question of Leninist tactics we don't agree with you on concerning opportunists. You choose frontal attack. Ideologically destroy. *We put unity in the forefront, and they expose themselves.* Now the struggle [which struggle? the struggle to unite in one party with the opportunists? — ed.] is taking place among the masses even." (From our minutes, emphasis added)

Returning to this question, you added:

"Not absolutes, these tactics. [With this you try

things:

- 1) That you have very little serious criticism or analysis of Mao Zedong Thought at all;
- 2) That you are making an absurd counterposition of the particular to the general; and
- 3) That you are still trying to prove that the struggle against opportunism is really a manifestation of Maoism.

to deny the connection between tactics and principles. From the fact that you are calling for unity with diehard opportunists, allegedly no one should draw any conclusion concerning your stand towards the opportunists, because allegedly tactics are one thing, while principles and "absolutes" are another — ed.] You may be right. [But you will call us "anti-Leninist" and "sectarian" for this disagreement anyway and on this basis and because we refuse the "special relationship" you will call for the overthrow of our leadership and break fraternal relations with us. — ed.] *But when opportunists are holding up pretensions of unity, (it is) wrong to have frontal attack.*" (emphasis added)

Our comrade pointed out that far from holding out pretensions of unity, the Weisberg social-democratic MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)" sect had called us the "most anti-Leninist" of all. You replied:

"They can say anything."

With this contemptuous (towards us) and frivolous reply, you showed the complete hollowness of your talk about the "opportunists...holding up pretensions of unity." But there is more to it than that. With this contemptuous reply, you were hiding something. You were concealing the fact that the "pretensions of unity" on the part of certain American conciliators was not towards our Party, whose upright Marxist-Leninist stand against conciliationism was hated by these opportunists and constituted the major roadblock to their schemes, but towards your Party. The Weisberg social-democratic sect of conciliators not only saw that you refused to support our struggle against conciliationism and "centrism," but they also saw that you were willing to have a certain amount of contact with them. This contact was limited, but it sufficed to show them that you were keeping the door open for future pragmatic

maneuvers. (Simultaneously with maintaining this contact and flirtation with the Weisberg social-democratic sect, you also on various occasions denounced Mr. Weisberg to us in terms worse than those that we used in our devastating pamphlet *Against Social-Democratic Infiltration of the Marxist-Leninist Movement*. For we restricted ourselves to what we could prove and document, whereas you are very free with certain serious accusations. But the point is that your theories of "unity" are theories of pragmatic maneuver with the devil himself. So on one hand you denounced Mr. Weisberg and on the other hand you maintained contact with him and flirted, made a number of benevolent, mild and meek assessments of this or that activity of his sect, opposed our polemics against Weisberg's social-democratic sect, and so forth.) Naturally any such maneuvering would be at our expense, at the expense of the genuine Marxist-Leninists in the U.S. and of their principled struggle against opportunism. Therefore you had to evade the question of what "pretensions of unity" you were referring to.

It should be stressed that you did not deny that we were striking at opportunists, and not at good elements. Thus you were opposing "frontal attack," that is, struggle, precisely against opportunism. Indeed, you were opposing it on the basis of general principle. That is, you are throwing away the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the struggle against opportunism and replacing them with a general theory of seeking "unity" with the opportunists. On the pretext of "tactics," you are negating one of the most basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. The general pattern you put forward for dealing with the opportunists is: seek unity with them and then they will "expose themselves." Clearly this means that the opportunists will "expose themselves" if they fail to unite. Thus you, in fact, are putting forward the path of uniting with the opportunists and denouncing them only when they refuse that unity. As for principled struggle against opportunism, you denounce it as a "frontal attack" which allegedly violates creative tactics and you imply it is unnecessary, for the opportunists will "expose themselves."

This shows that to this very day you still uphold the general principles set forth in your pamphlet *On Unity of Marxist-Leninists* of 1976. We quoted from that pamphlet at the end of Section XI-G. We showed that this pamphlet set forward the path of appealing for unity to every individual and organization "who claimed to be Marxist-Leninists," that is, was Marxist-Leninist in words, even though these individuals and organizations were in fact "revisionists, trotskysts, anarcho-syndicalists and opportunists of various sorts." This pamphlet defined struggle against that revisionism, trotskysm, anarcho-syndicalism and opportunism which pretend to be

Marxist-Leninist as being the struggle against the disruption of unity with them, and stated that:

"Certain comrades and friends also raise questions about how the struggle against these opportunist political lines should be waged. In the practical movement, the opportunists are all those who are unwilling to sit together with others and sort out their differences."

"Not to join the Party and not to sit together to deal with questions relating to the theory and tactics of Canadian revolution amounts to opportunism." (*On Unity of Marxist-Leninists*, pp. 155, 156)

This is the same path as you described in late May 1979 as: "We put unity in the forefront, and they [the opportunists — ed.] expose themselves."

And this is the same path as you endorse in your speech assessing the decade of the 1970's, given on December 30, 1979, in Hamilton. Your speech says:

"During this entire period, our Party defended itself. It defended the correct line that there should be only one Party in each country. It called upon the Marxist-Leninists, or those who called themselves Marxist-Leninists, to join the Party and build the Party. *On this basis, [whether or not they joined the CPC(M-L) — ed.] it differentiated between sham Marxist-Leninists and real Marxist-Leninists: those who are real Marxist-Leninists, who are serious, will join the Party and will build it; those who are opposed to this are opportunists and splittists, while Marxist-Leninists are not splittist. [There now — you have solved the whole problem of the unity of the Marxist-Leninists by definition. You have replaced the struggle against the opportunist ideologies and trends that cause splits with defining and redefining the word "Marxist-Leninist." But we follow Marx, who said: "The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it." ("Theses on Feuerbach") — ed.] We pointed out that those who do not want to unite are actually RCMP agents, agents of the secret service, and this has been fully corroborated, [Good grief. Not only did you give the call to unite in one party to those whom you had publicly labelled as "revisionists, trotskysts, anarcho-syndicalists and opportunists of various sorts" (*On Unity of Marxist-Leninists*, p. 153), but also to those whom you had publicly labelled as "actually RCMP agents." And now you say that it is fully corroborated that these people were "actually RCMP agents." But the most dangerous police agent is not the one who refuses to join the party, but the one who will agree to anything, precisely in order to infiltrate*

the party. — ed.] even by the Keable Commission and the McDonald Commission and others — that these people have direct links with the government, with the chiefs of staff of the reactionary bourgeoisie in Canada." (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 3)

In short, you defend the call for unity in one party with all those "who claim to be Marxist-Leninists," even those whom you have labelled as police. This call for "unity in one party" replaces the struggle against the opportunists. You distinguish between "real Marxist-Leninists" and "RCMP agents" on the basis of who joins the CPC(M-L). In this way you define away the struggle against opportunism, for clearly it is not waged against "real Marxist-Leninists" nor can it be entirely identified with the art of combatting the political police. Indeed, all the allegedly militant words about the opportunists being "actually RCMP agents" are simply meant to downgrade the necessity for ideological struggle against opportunism. They are the flip side of "official optimism": i.e., there are allegedly no opportunists in the Marxist-Leninist movement and conversely there is no one but police outside the Marxist-Leninist movement, and hence, you conclude, no serious political ideologies or groupings that have to be dealt with among the opportunists. But your curses against the opportunists as policemen are empty, hollow, hypocritical words, for you continue to bombard these same opportunists with continued appeals for "unity in one party," for an end to the "ideological struggle," and so forth. You curse the opportunists as "actually RCMP agents" to cover over the fact that your theory actually is the opposition of struggle against opportunism. Thus we shall see that "officially" you curse the opportunists as dogs, criminals and police, while behind the scenes you put forward the "tactics" of demanding that we regard them as "temporary allies."

As a side point, but as an important issue in itself, it should be noted that this passage also displays a frivolous attitude to the question of defending the Marxist-Leninist movement from infiltration by the police and other bourgeois agents. From the facts about the relation of the political police and the opportunists, you denigrate the struggle against opportunism instead of finding it a further reason for strengthening the ideological struggle against opportunism. You talk about the presence of political police, but you fail to note that this fully confirms the necessity to replace the abstract, social-democratic scheme of "unity (with the opportunists) in one party" with the orientation of building the Marxist-Leninist party without and against the opportunists. For it is impossible to distinguish between "RCMP agents" and non-agents on the basis of who joins the Party, for the most dangerous agent is the agent pro-

vocateur who will do his best to infiltrate the party. At the same time, since you call for "unity in one party," you must believe that there are honest elements still outside the Party. But in that case it is unprincipled slander and gutter politics to label everyone outside the Party indiscriminately as police agents. This is not just unscrupulous and disgusting, it is degrading the task of fighting the political police and discrediting this fight and turning it into an empty game of name-calling. It is the method of the blackmailer, the method of bourgeois "dirty tricks," to say: do what I want or I will call you police, but agree with me and you are pure as a virgin and a "real Marxist-Leninist" to boot. We are shocked at this frivolous attitude to the essential and constant task of fighting the political police, and we have never accepted this method for use in our work.

From your standpoint of opposing the struggle against opportunism, you therefore denounce this struggle — and our Party, which wages this struggle openly and consistently — as "sectarian." In opposition to this alleged "sectarianism," you put forward the view that the opportunists are "temporary allies." It is shocking to us to see you, the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist party, put forward the same denunciation of the anti-opportunist struggle as is made by the neo-revisionists and the Chinese revisionists. They both call the opportunists "middle forces" and denounce the struggle of the Marxist-Leninists against opportunism as "sectarianism." We have written about this extensively in our series of articles in *The Workers' Advocate* entitled "U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism." Indeed, the Khrushchovite revisionists, social-democrats and other opportunists also denounce the anti-opportunist struggle as "sectarian." When you change the phrase "middle force" to "ally" or even "temporary ally," this is a change of no basic significance.

Thus in the discussions between our two Parties in November 1978, you denounced our struggle against the conciliators of social-chauvinism as "sectarianism." Our minutes of those discussions point out that:

"He [the representative of the CPC(M-L) — ed.] gave views on our tactics with MLOC [now "CPUSA/ML" — ed.]. The Leninist tactics require paying attention to allies, even temporary allies. Certain forces will give the same line as you for a time, insincerely. [Amazing! What an incredible prettification of the social-democracy of the MLOC! You are so eager to engage in pragmatic maneuvers with the conciliators of social-chauvinism that you deny the difference between social-democracy and Marxism-Leninism! You say that this is the "same line." —

ed.] You utilize this. You must pay attention to the objective movement. In his view our tactics are sectarian. He said that on the question of meeting with them we were correct to handle it in the way we did, unlike how the party hurt itself talking to *En Lutte!* [By May 1979 you changed your opinion on this too, and put forward your talks with *En Lutte!* as a model for us — ed.] But we should have continued pursuing the question internally, sending them letters to paralyze them, and arming our comrades to do verbal propaganda to chase them out of our circles. That is, carry on the fight without the published polemics and launch that stage sometime next year. [In short, anything but polemics! [For our principled and hard-hitting polemics put a spoke in the wheel of anyone advocating unprincipled pragmatic maneuvers with the conciliators. — ed.] He pointed out that this is a question of tactics [i.e., don't ask what are the principles underlying this stand of the leadership of CPC(M-L)! — ed.], which is an important question. He expressed enthusiasm that we crush MLOC." (emphasis added)

The completely unprincipled nature of this praise of opportunism as a "temporary ally" is underlined by your criteria for this "temporary ally." It is only that someone call themselves Marxist-Leninist in words. But this means to throw out the consideration of what role these forces actually play in the class struggle. It means to lose faith in the actual revolutionary process, to judge by the shadow and not by the reality, and to be willing to play ball with any element who is willing to phrasemonger a bit (and who has something in his possession that you find useful). It means that you are establishing a meaningless, paper criterion behind which any treachery can be done behind the scenes.

Your theory that one should be guided by whether or not various opportunists "claim to be Marxist-Leninist" is utterly anti-Marxist-Leninist and even a violation of elementary materialism. It is denounced over and over again in the Marxist-Leninist classics. We shall give just two examples of this, but many more could be given. Thus in *What Is to Be Done?* Comrade Lenin says that we should:

"...judge people not by the brilliant uniforms they don, not by the high-sounding appellations they give themselves, but by their actions, and by what they actually advocate...." (Ch. I, Sec. A)

Or again, in the book *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, Lenin sarcastically remarks:

"Let us point out, in passing, that when calling the non-Bolsheviks in Russia, i.e., the Men-

sheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, Socialists, Kautsky was guided by their *appellation*, that is, by a word, and not by the *actual place* they are occupying in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. What an excellent understanding and application of Marxism! But of this more anon." (From the beginning of the chapter "How Kautsky Transformed Marx into an Ordinary Liberal," emphasis as in the original)

You continued this theme in the discussions of December 3, 1978. Here you put forward the theme that the opportunists in general, not just the social-democratic conciliators, are not just a "negative force," but also a "positive force." You stated:

"You probably think the opportunists are a negative force. However, they are also a positive force. They have given unprecedented prestige to China, Marxism-Leninism, etc. All sorts of hardened anti-communists say they are Marxist-Leninist. [To us, this would seem an excellent argument against "putting unity in the forefront" with all those "who claim to be Marxist-Leninists," but you draw the opposite conclusion — ed.] It is a negative force in that it presents difficulties to us. But if we put our difficulties in command, (it) will give rise to factional struggle. We will become a sect. We want to educate the working class, but [But you prefer to let the opportunists "expose themselves" — ed.] when we polemicize against them, they love it. [If this is true, then you should look into the political and ideological content of your polemics — ed.] and take up our line and attack us. We have 400-page books written on the opportunists, but (we) do not publish. You must keep up on their activity."

This truly shocking praise of the opportunists as a "positive force" and as an "ally" is naturally the inevitable accompaniment of your advocating pragmatic maneuvers with the opportunists under the signboard of "unity." You believe that the unity with opportunists can have some pragmatic value for this or that purpose. After all, the opportunists might have some connections, or some numbers, or some influence, etc. Therefore you want to utilize this, so pragmatic maneuvering must replace principled struggle. Oh yes, pragmatic maneuvering doesn't totally exclude polemics under all circumstances. By no means. But it is not for nothing that you insist that your polemics are not ideological struggle. For example, you wrote:

"When we publish our criticism of MREO, it is not for the purpose of waging ideological struggle." (*On Unity of Marxist-Leninists*, p. 136)

Polemics can be waged on a pragmatic basis, either

as part of pragmatic maneuvering (on the theory of give the opportunists a good rap or two so that they agree to be a "temporary ally") or because the pragmatic maneuvering has led to disaster and something must be done. But naturally a polemical struggle against the opportunists which is not inspired by ideological motives, but only by pragmatic concerns, is a mere bluff which in the long run will not stand the test of life.

Our Party stands firmly opposed to all these anti-Marxist-Leninist theories of yours which negate the struggle against opportunism under the signboard of "unity." We are for unity of the Marxist-Leninists and unity of the proletariat under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party, unities which are only achieved in fierce struggle against the imperialists and the opportunists, and against "unity" of Marxist-Leninists with opportunists. We are opposed to pragmatic maneuvering with the chieftains of opportunism under the signboard of "unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists," opposed to the theories that opportunism is a "temporary ally" or "positive force" and opposed to the reduction of polemics and of struggle against opportunism to a pragmatic maneuver, stripped of deep ideological content and consistent motivation, rather than an essential front of the class struggle.

And when our Party opposes your bankrupt theories of opportunism as a "temporary ally," of "unity (with opportunism) in one party" and of pragmatic maneuvers with opportunism, this does not mean that we are opposed to having "temporary allies" or principled maneuvers. Not in the slightest. It no more means that then opposition to the Chinese revisionist theories of opportunism as a "middle force" means opposition to the concept of middle strata and middle forces or the presentation of all non-proletarian forces as one undistinguishable reactionary blob. The point is not to deny "temporary allies," but the point is that you are calling the forces that have come out against the struggle "temporary allies." The point is that you are opposing the struggle against the opportunist roadblocks to the struggle by imposing the scheme of "put unity in the forefront, and they expose themselves." The point is that you are dreaming of pragmatic maneuvers with the chief-

XII-B: The life and death conflict in the United States between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism is replaced by "pro-CPC(M-L)" versus "anti-CPC(M-L)," independent of ideological content

You have also negated the ideological struggle against opportunism in the U.S. not only by counterposing it to "unity" in general, but also in particular by counterposing it to the question of whether or not your leadership is accepted and your experience taken up. In this way, you have denied the struggle of Marxism-Leninism against opportunism in order

to replace it by judging this or that stand simply from the point-of-view of whether it is "pro-CPC(M-L)" or "anti-CPC(M-L)," independently of the ideological content of the stand. In practice this amounts to the demand that the stands of the leadership of CPC(M-L) be followed independently of whether they are right or wrong, but simply because they are the

stands of the leadership of CPC(M-L). It is not Marxist-Leninist for a party in its own country to replace the ideological struggle against opportunism with simply demanding blind obedience on the basis of the prestige of the party. And when you go a step further and negate the ideological struggle against opportunism in the U.S. by replacing it with the demand for adherence to your "trend," then this is a brutal demand for a "special relationship" outside of the Marxist-Leninist norms.

stands of the leadership of CPC(M-L). It is not Marxist-Leninist for a party in its own country to replace the ideological struggle against opportunism with simply demanding blind obedience on the basis of the prestige of the party. And when you go a step further and negate the ideological struggle against opportunism in the U.S. by replacing it with the demand for adherence to your "trend," then this is a brutal demand for a "special relationship" outside of the Marxist-Leninist norms.

Thus in discussing the question of whether or not to hold a meeting commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Internationalists, your representative set forth the following position:

"He [the representative of the leadership of CPC(M-L) — ed.] said...that lately they had noticed that there seemed to be a certain *de-emphasizing of the Internationalists*. He said it was very important not to give up our history. (The delegate from the leadership of COUSML said:) 'But you think there is a trend to de-emphasize.' He said yes, the ideological aspects. For example in the U.S. you do not do propaganda that for years in the U.S. the youth and students were blocked from the advanced experience of the youth and student movement in Canada by national and social-chauvinism. ... It was only when this was broken through, that widespread dissemination of Mao Tse Tung Thought took place and that the opportunists were forced to take up Marxism-Leninism." (Our minutes of the discussions of January 1978, emphasis added)

Thus you are putting forward that the issue in the revolutionary movement in the U.S. was not Marxism-Leninism versus modern revisionism and opportunism, but to take up the "advanced experience" of your trend. You deny the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism and replace it by the issue of whether or not the movement accepted your leadership. In this way you play on the sincere proletarian internationalist sentiments of respect for your Party and try to use them to promote certain anti-Marxist-Leninist pretensions of developing your own "trend."

You present this as a struggle against "national and social-chauvinism." But you define chauvinism as failure to accept your "advanced experience." This type of opposition to "chauvinism" has nothing to do with the struggle against social-chauvinism in the U.S., against the Pentagon-socialist thesis of "directing the main blow against Soviet social-imperialism," against alliance with "one's own" bourgeoisie against the revolution, against the bankrupt positions of Chinese, Khrushchevite and Browderite revisionism and of social-democracy. The struggle against American opportunism is covered up by sim-

ply judging forces by whether they are for or against your leadership.

Thus you described in early 1977 that various forces are following the arch-"three worlder" Klonsky, but allegedly they will turn around and follow you if Klonsky is discredited. You do not consider the question of why these groups are following Klonsky, what this shows about the positions they are in, or why they are part of an opportunist trend but instead reduce the question to simply whether one follows Klonsky or follows you. Thus Klonsky is being "floated internationally," but if he is discredited, everything will be fine and the era of unrestrained pragmatic maneuvering for "unity" will begin. Thus your representative stated:

"OL is the organization being floated internationally. ... I think MLOC and all of these groups will abandon Klonsky. Once he's been smashed internationally, these wavering elements will abandon him.

"Anyway, CPC(M-L) is on the agenda one way or another. All of the fears of these guys will come true. They were scared that the American proletariat will follow CPC(M-L) — now it will come true." (From our minutes of the discussions of February 6, 1977 with our delegation to the Third Congress of the CPC(M-L))

Here you do not consider the history or role of the MLOC and why they took up Klonskyism. And this at a time when MLOC was a real and open social-chauvinist and "three worlder." The MLOC was at this time trying to float, in coordination with the Chinese revisionist propaganda, that the Marxist-Leninists were trotskites. But for you, there is no question of struggle against opportunism and of examining the role of these groups in the actual struggle. Instead the issue is simply to wipe out Klonsky's international reputation and replace it with that of CPC(M-L), and then all these allegedly "wavering elements" will abandon Klonsky and come over to "follow CPC(M-L)."

Naturally history disproved your thesis. For example, it is true that MLOC abandoned support of Klonsky as a person. But MLOC had taken up Klonskyism because neo-revisionism and social-chauvinism fit in with their social-democracy. Abandoning Klonsky, they continued their social-democracy and indeed fought hard to even continue propagating all the positions of Klonsky under the cover of just changing a signboard of a few formulations on the international situation. They stood for "Klonskyism without Klonsky." At the "First Congress" of the MLOC in November 1977, at which they allegedly "opposed" Klonsky and "three worldism," they actually boasted of their Klonskyism without Klonsky and stated:

"Today, the CP(M-L)'s [the Klonskyite "three worlders" — ed.] line on the trade unions tails directly behind what we have pioneered."

(*Class Against Class*, January 1978, p. 34)

Thus the MLOC continued in full opportunist positions, and today still remains an agency for the infiltration of social-democracy in the Marxist-Leninist movement. But blinded to the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism by your wrong theses, you rushed into pragmatic maneuvers under the signboard of "unity" with the social-democratic Weisberg sect, maneuvers undertaken at the expense of our Party. And the sorry results of your "tactics" of pragmatic maneuvers, the fiasco you have suffered, is another proof of the danger of slighting, to say nothing of negating, the struggle against opportunism.

Another example of the way you regarded MLOC, and the Marxist-Leninist movement in the U.S. in general, is seen in the passage from you that we have already quoted above but which deserves being repeated here. You denounced the MLOC as having no principles in discussions with us in November 1977, but on what basis? Your representative stated:

"MLOC has no principles. One day they want to unite, the next day they don't want to get too close. When we looked strong they wanted to unite, when the rightists went on the offensive they retreated, now that Albania looks strong they are acting bolder." (Our minutes)

Thus you disregarded the entire opportunist and wrecking activity of the MLOC in the U.S., disregarded their stand in the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism, disregarded their war on our Party, and reduced everything to whether or not they were willing to come to terms with you. You regarded them solely from the pragmatic angle of whether they could be of use to you.

You further expressed your general outlook that the decisive issue was not the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism but whether or not to follow your "trend," in your comments describing the situation in North America as being a struggle between two chairmen. In the discussions between our two Parties of late January 1977 your representative stated:

"Even in 1960's CPC(M-L) [Presumably this refers to the predecessors of CPC(M-L), as CPC(M-L) was founded in March 1970 — ed.] had the analysis that there were two chairmen in North America, Klonsky and [the chairman of CPC(M-L) — ed.]. These guys think a chairman is elected, this is wrong. The chairman is who actually solves problems, then comes up to be chairman on that basis. Must solve the problem of defeating Klonsky as chairman. Did this in 1960's, they themselves collapsed. Now must

defeat them again." (Our minutes)

Here again the situation is presented not as a struggle of opposing ideologies and political lines, but as a clash of chairmen, of personalities. The question is presented as whom to follow, and not as what path, what road, what ideology to follow. Today you have taken these theories to the logical conclusion when you denounce ideological struggle itself and the struggle against opportunism as "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'"

You describe your struggle for the spread of your "trend" as a struggle against chauvinism. You replace the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism in the U.S. with this struggle against "American chauvinism." Thus in the discussions of February 6, 1977 your representative elaborated on the theme that "The opportunists are finished" and "CPC(M-L) is on the agenda" as follows:

"In North America there must be very strong unity between the Marxist-Leninists. This will be created on the dead body of American chauvinism."

"Klonsky is the last peep, now they are finished. The question will be CPC(M-L). They've done propaganda that the Canadians can do nothing, this will be destroyed."

"The key point is that American chauvinism is on the way out. It will work this way: anywhere COUSML takes it line they will say that this is CPC(M-L) line. The question then arises, why don't you follow CPC(M-L)? This is a straightforward question, why are you not following Marxism-Leninism. CPC(M-L) is the party which has consistently advanced Marxism-Leninism. They have to fight this and they are lost, they have already lost."

Here again you deny the question of the ideological struggle and make it into a question of "why don't you follow CPC(M-L)?" As we pointed out in discussing this passage in Section VIII-C, this is ridiculous. The issue that was fought over intensely in the U.S. Marxist-Leninist movement was Marxism-Leninism or "three worlds-ism," it was the fight against social-chauvinism, it was the fight in defense of socialist Albania. And in this fight the American Marxist-Leninists strengthened and tempered the nucleus of the Party, COUSML. The issue was not whether or not to follow CPC(M-L).

Furthermore you have gone to the extent of in essence presenting the struggle against opportunism as the struggle of domestic versus foreign or, to be more exact, of Canadians versus foreigners. Thus at the Founding Congress of the Communist Youth Union of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) in August 1976 you presented the struggle against opportunism as

basically the struggle against Americans and possibly also against the British. The chairman of your Party presented the issue as follows:

"Every notorious line has come up from the English-speaking world, Britain or the U.S. All our troubles come from down south [i.e., from the U.S. — ed.]. Youth should adopt as a principle that no American should be trusted." (From the minutes from the COUSML delegation at the CYUC(M-L) Founding Congress)

The speech then went on to enumerate various American opportunists. Somewhat later, returning to the point, the speech stated:

"No American should be trusted — this is a matter of principle. Americans should be tested on the basis of social practice. [Only Americans? — ed.] They are emissaries of U.S. imperialism, (of) opportunist lines. If we are not vigilant of Americans then we are not vigilant against U.S. imperialism. The father of a woman in [an organization which is a "left" sloganeering front for Soviet revisionism — W.A.] is head of the counterinsurgency program." (*Ibid.*)

The speech then proceeded to stress that it was referring to all Americans, Marxist-Leninist or not, your fraternal comrades or not, by proceeding to attack the COUSML. The speech then very briefly related a story against the COUSML, which included lies designed to whitewash the role of your Party in the situation described and which also attributed to

XII-C: Your support for the movement against social-chauvinism was only temporary because it was based on pragmatic considerations

We have seen that you have been floating thesis after thesis against the struggle against opportunism in general and against the ideological and polemical struggle in particular. The question therefore arises of why you supported to a certain extent our struggle against the Klonskyite "three worlders" in 1977. As late as January 12, 1978, the NEC of CPC(M-L) wrote to the NEC of COUSML praising the movement against social-chauvinism in strong terms, saying:

"We also take this occasion to congratulate the comrades on the good work they are carrying out on the ideological front against 'C'P (M-L). We consider the movement initiated against the rabid U.S. social chauvinism a valuable and necessary contribution to the entire Marxist-Leninist communist movement."

And in your letters of December 5 you also distinguish between our "initial attack" and our present-day alleged "tangent." (See Section IX-D of our letter)

This was *not* because you only started floating

our Party the acts of certain American opportunist groups. The conclusion of this story was that allegedly COUSML "couldn't 'smell,' tell who was Marxist-Leninist." This was supposed to be because the COUSML was composed of Americans.

What a spirit to inculcate in the communist youth of Canada! What an out-and-out negation of proletarian internationalism! What a provocation against the COUSML delegation that was present to hear these remarks! What a shocking conception of the struggle against opportunism or, to be more precise, rationale for replacing that struggle with the struggle to develop a special "trend" led by your Party inside the international movement.

Thus you hold on very strongly to your thesis that the issue is adherence to your "trend" or not. This shows itself in your letters of December 5, 1979 to us as well. When you attack our Party for not accepting the "special relationship" or the membership in any trend other than the trend of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, you call us "American exceptionalists," chauvinists and so forth. And you attack our struggle against opportunism in the same language. This shows that you are still replacing the norms of Marxism-Leninism and the struggle against opportunism with the struggle against "chauvinism," that is, against non-adherence to your special "trend." Our Party will never agree to these anti-Marxist-Leninist theses of yours, theses which are also a gross and shocking violation of proletarian internationalism.

theses against the anti-opportunist struggle after 1977. On the contrary. You had already been floating these theses for a long time. You published the pamphlet *On Unity of Marxist-Leninists* in 1976 and it contained articles denouncing the ideological struggle from previous years. And right at the beginning of 1977 you went out of your way to denounce the polemical struggle. Right at the start of a year which would witness great victories for the ideological and polemical struggle against social-chauvinism and the "three worlds" theory, your representative stated:

"From its experience in the 1930's the bourgeoisie is highly conscious that so long as there are factional fights the party is paralyzed. This is why the group in Kitchener [a group outside the CPC(M-L) — ed.] is jumping out in the hopes of provoking a factional fight.

"COUSML polemics have the appearance of faction fighting. The opportunists can no longer be defeated with these polemics.

"Even in 1960's CPC(M-L) had analysis that

there were two chairmen in North America, Klonsky and [the chairman of CPC(M-L) — ed.]. ... Must solve the problem of defeating Klonsky as chairman. Did this in 1960's, they themselves collapsed. Now must defeat them again.

"You can no longer defeat these people in the old way. Because they have learned these forms and methods. They cannot really carry them out but they have learned to imitate them and for this reason you can no longer defeat them in the old way." (From our minutes of the discussions of late January 1977)

Thus here you were characterizing the polemical struggle as factional fights and calling for a new way to defeat the opportunists. Nor were you particularly enthusiastic when the special issue of *The Workers Advocate* of March 10, 1977 appeared, the issue that gave the call, "U.S. Marxist-Leninists, Unite in Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism!" You hoped at that time that the Political Resolution of the Third Congress of the CPC(M-L) would suffice to defeat the opportunists in both Canada and the U.S. and possibly elsewhere too. You quite literally regarded that "the Third Congress is the victory of Marxism in Canada" and indeed in North America. And you wanted us to concentrate on studying and distributing the Political Resolution of the Third Congress of the CPC(M-L) and to develop a "movement" on this. (Discussions with our delegation to the Third Congress, March 15-16, 1977)

Thus when you gave a certain support to our struggle against social-chauvinism in 1977, it was despite the fact that in principle you were already against the ideological and polemical struggle against opportunism. And time has further verified that your limited support was based on pragmatic considerations. In essence, you were forced by circumstances to support our struggle. You found our struggle useful to you. Two particular pragmatic considerations stick out: (A) the value of our struggle against Klonsky for your work in forging contacts inside the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement; and (B) the sharpness of the struggle with the followers of Chinese revisionism inside Canada.

(A) To begin with, let us consider the question of your work in strengthening the contacts of your Party with the other parties in the international Marxist-Leninist movement. In this work, you ran across the problem of the influence of Klonsky's "three worlder" party, the OL/"CPML." Klonsky's party was bitterly opposed to your Party and at the same time it had managed to obtain a certain recognition from some parties in the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. For this reason, you supported the struggle against Klonsky's party.

Indeed, it is notable that you constantly discussed the struggle against Klonsky solely from the international angle. You were not interested in the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism in the U.S., but only in the international discrediting of Klonsky.

For example, let us return to that discussion of February 6, 1977 where you talk about CPC(M-L) allegedly being "on the agenda" in the U.S. There you discuss the struggle against opportunism in the U.S. entirely from the international angle. Your representative stated:

"The opportunists are finished, OL and RCP. RCP [that is, the "RCP, USA" — ed.] wanted to be so revolutionary that they couldn't be revisionists like the OL or Marxist-Leninists like COUSML. Anyway RCP has no force; they are not known in Canada. OL is the organization being floated internationally. The Party's [CPC (M-L)'s — ed.] analysis is that Klonsky is a new Browder who wants to build the party as a discussion and education group — Kautsky, Khrushchov, Klonsky, KKK. I think MLOC and all of these groups will abandon Klonsky. Once he's been smashed internationally, these wavering elements will abandon him." (Our minutes)

The entire issue you raise is international recognition. Thus you write off the "RCP, USA," which in reality had far more of an actual organization in the U.S. than OL, on the grounds that "RCP has no force." Clearly this refers to "RCP's" isolation internationally at that time and not to its role in U.S. politics. Besides, you say, "RCP, USA" is allegedly "not known in Canada." Meanwhile you are interested in OL because it is being "floated internationally," and so you are for smashing Klonsky "internationally." You pin great hopes on this, and regard that once this is done the domestic situation will automatically fall in place.

Following the same theme, when you praised our polemics against OL in January 1978 it was from the point of view of its international impact. Your representative stated:

"...COUSML has made an important contribution to the international communist movement in its polemics against OL. The fraternal parties are saying: what kind of 'Marxist-Leninist' group is this to support which is calling on U.S. imperialism to build more B-1 bombers. He said that you have opened up this whole front against social chauvinism and this is an important contribution. They mentioned they liked very much the most recent 'Under a False Flag.'" (From our minutes of the discussions of January 1978)

And similarly, when you denounce our polemics, it

is also from the point of view of what you find useful in your work in the international movement. Naturally, your protestations that this or that is not of interest internationally should be translated to mean that this or that is not of use to you or of interest to you. Thus you insisted that no one "pays attention" to the polemic on MLOC, at a time when the question of MLOC was stirring up a minor international controversy, because you were not interested in fighting MLOC but in promoting some pragmatic maneuvers with MLOC. Thus in the discussions between our two Parties of September 1978, your representative put forward objections to our polemics such as:

"...polemics won't expose MLOC. Nobody internationally pays any attention to these things, it will only cause confusion [If they don't pay attention to the polemics, how can they be confused by them? And it is clear that it is not the fight against the Weisberg social-democratic sect that causes confusion, but that the fight is the only way to clear up the confusion — ed.] ... polemics won't help. When it is time, MLOC will expose itself. [This is a repetition of your basic thesis on pragmatic maneuvers with the opportunists, namely, "...put unity in the forefront, and they expose themselves." This means that you were still interested in "unity" with MLOC. — ed.]" (From our minutes of the discussions of Thursday night, September 7, 1978)

"Nobody is fighting 'social-chauvinism.'" (*Ibid.*)

"You comrades should discuss these questions. It is very important to coordinate your ideological work to the problems of the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. *What is specific to the U.S. should be dealt with internally to consolidate your organization.* Or if it is very important maybe you should deal with it in another way. [Why thank you, kind sirs. How noble of you to allow the possibility that our public press might in very exceptional cases deal with the internal problems of the country we live in. Except that even here you are probably not referring to public polemics, but to verbal agitation outside the organization, letters to groups to "paralyze" them, and so forth. — ed.] (From our minutes of the discussions of Friday afternoon, Sept. 8, 1978, emphasis added)

Thus you finally arrived at the logical conclusion of your theories. Our newspaper should be devoid of material on the struggle against opportunism in the U.S., according to your theses. Such material is, you believe, for *internal* consolidation inside the Party only. While the public press is converted into

something empty, something without a soul and purely for international consumption, a brightly colored ornament without connection to the fierce struggle going on in the U.S., a token to be bartered on the international market.

But in 1977 you were involved in a fierce confrontation with Klonsky's party internationally. Thus you found that our polemics had a certain use for you. Hence you gave them a certain support on that basis. But as your position improved internationally and the danger to you from Klonsky's party faded away, your support for our struggle also faded away.

(B) Another factor in connection with your temporary and limited support for our struggle in 1977 was that the struggle in 1977 against the "three worlders" was fierce. [To be precise, what was fierce was the pressure of the Canadian "three worlders" on CPC(M-L) at that time — W.A.] Here again the immediate necessities of the struggle compelled you to violate your principles against the struggle against opportunism.

Thus in the major speech by your Party in Hamilton, Ontario on December 30, 1979, you identified the years 1974-77 as years when the opportunists had a certain bluster. At the same time, you also indicated that after this period the problem of opportunism could be slighted, in your opinion. Your representative stated:

"The struggle became open in 1974-75."

"However, the entire onslaught of the revisionists and opportunists, all their frauds, and arrogance, actually crashed down around their own heads. ...I pointed out that everything these revisionists and opportunists did during the 1974-77 period actually discredited them, and eliminated them. ... There is no way that revisionism and opportunism can arise in this country again with the same kind of bluster which they had during the 1974-1977 period."

"...during the 1974-77 period, big pressure was exerted from within the Party as well as from outside, that whatever CPC(M-L) says should be consistent with what the Chinese say." (The above three passages are all from *PCDN*, Jan. 3, 1980)

Indeed, you yourself attributed the lack of progress in your maneuvering with the Weisberg social-democratic sect in 1977 as due to the fierce fight with the "three worlders." In the discussions between our two Parties in November 1977 at the time of the 5th Consultative Conference of the CPC(M-L), your representative told us your views as to why Mr. Weisberg came to attend the 5th Consultative Con-

ference after having broken off discussions with CPC (M-L) earlier. For your unprincipled flirting with the Weisberg social-democratic MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)" had gone to the extent that you allowed Mr. Weisberg into the sessions of the 5th Consultative Conference of your Party. Our minutes record the following summation of your views:

"Barry Weisberg had thanked [the chairman of the CPC(M-L) — ed.] for allowing him to participate in the (5th Consultative) Conference. He later said that the conference was very good. He said that he had been away too long, that the break in discussion was MLOC's fault. [The chairman of the CPC(M-L) — ed. pointed out to me [the COUSML delegate — ed.] that this was not exactly the case, that [a representative of the leadership of CPC(M-L) — ed.] had told them (the MLOC) there was no agreement when there was one [at the time of the last previous meeting between MLOC and CPC (M-L) — ed.]. MLOC was to stay the next day to finalize this [the agreement — ed.] but they disappeared. He [the chairman of CPC(M-L) — ed.] summed this up, the fault was ours [CPC (M-L)'s — ed.], but in a more fundamental sense the fault was theirs. ... The discussions had been broken off at the time of the formation of the League. [Canadian Communist League, "three worlders" and Canadian Klonskyites — ed.] Barry Weisberg had actually asked, what will happen to CPC(M-L) when the League is formed? This showed that he had it on his mind that CPC(M-L) would be smashed up. Now he sees the Party is stronger than ever while the League is a joke, and wants to come around again." (From our minutes, emphasis added)

During the period of this fierce struggle in 1977, our Party as always stood firmly beside you without

SECTION XIII: Unity-mongering to oppose the struggle against conciliationism and "centrism" in particular

In your letters of December 5 you phrasemonger a lot about centrism. But the facts are that you have especially opposed the struggle against conciliationism and "centrism." Your theories negating the struggle against opportunism by replacing it with pragmatic maneuvering under the signboard of "unity" have meant maneuvering especially with the conciliators and centrists and the downplaying, obstructing and negating of the struggle against the conciliators and centrists in particular. This is because it is particularly the conciliators and centrists who are covert opportunists who try to hide their opportunism under the signboard of one or two

flinching. And, faced with the fierce attack from opportunism, you found it convenient to give a limited support to our struggle against the Klonskyites and followers of Chinese revisionism in the U.S. But you believed that with 1977 this fierce struggle came to an end, that revisionism and opportunism can in "no way...arise in this country again with the same kind of bluster which they had during the 1974-1977 period." Hence you preferred to resume pragmatic maneuverings with the conciliators of social-chauvinism, and you found our struggle was no longer of use to you but was a downright obstacle frustrating the conclusion of any deal based on pragmatic maneuverings with the opportunists.

Thus your temporary support for our struggle against social-chauvinism did not last. This itself is another proof that if the fight against opportunism is not inspired by ideological motives, but only by certain pragmatic interests of the moment, then it is a mere bluff which is short-lived. And indeed your support for the movement against social-chauvinism in the U.S. proved quite short-lived. With the publication of our article "How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism" in February 1978, you turned against our struggle. From support for the struggle, you turned to sweet dreams of "unity" and deals with the conciliators of social-chauvinism. You proved more than willing to sacrifice the movement against social-chauvinism as part of the price of a deal with the conciliators. And this is abundant proof that your support for our struggle was not inspired by ideological motives, but by pragmatic considerations, for anyone who stood against social-chauvinism on principle would insist on carrying this struggle through to the end and could not but be revolted by the antics of the conciliators and their opposition to the movement against social-chauvinism.

slogans stolen from the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists, slogans which the conciliators distort and try to tear the revolutionary heart out of. Clearly it is the conciliators and centrists who do their best to appear to be Marxist-Leninists in words, while in fact they are dangerous enemies of Marxism-Leninism in practice. Hence it follows that your theories about "putting unity in the forefront" with all those elements that claim in words to be Marxist-Leninists serves to dull the sense of outrage against especially the conciliators and centrists and to present them as "temporary allies" instead of opponents of the struggle.

Throughout this letter we have come repeatedly across the facts concerning your opposition to the struggle against the conciliators of social-chauvinism and the forces that could be called "centrists." You have preferred a policy of maneuver with the conciliators and "centrists" to the policy of struggle. Here we put together in one place a list of some of these facts, most of which have been discussed in more detail previously. These facts include the following:

** Your opposition to the movement against social-chauvinism began with your opposition to our article "How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism" of February 1978, the article that began the public attack on conciliationism as an obstacle in the struggle against social-chauvinism. And what you opposed in this article was precisely the attack on conciliationism in general and idealist anti-revisionism, a variety of conciliationism, in particular.

** You then proceeded to oppose all the polemics on the main conciliators of social-chauvinism. Under one pretext or another, you opposed all the polemics on both the rabid "three worlders" of the "RCP, USA" and on the social-democrats of the MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)."

** You went to the extent of developing a special rationale for opposing the struggle against the conciliators and "centrists." You denounced the struggle against the conciliators as a splitting of the front against "three worlds-ism." Thus in the discussions with you of May 1978 after the memorable Internationalist Rally in Montreal, your representative stated:

"...that their [CPC(M-L)'s — ed.] information was that there was a definite motion in the U.S. developing against the three worlds theory and that to launch this struggle [against idealist anti-revisionism, a variety of conciliationism — ed.] may split this front. And that he [the representative of the leadership of CPC (M-L) — ed.] seriously doubts that the ideas that we are raising are correct [referring to the passages in "How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism" about conciliationism being a roadblock in the struggle against social-chauvinism — ed.]" (From our minutes)

Actually of course motion had been developing against the "three worlds" theory for some time. 1977 had been a year of disaster for the "three world" theorists. In order to thwart the motion against social-chauvinism and "three worlds-ism," there was a further development of conciliationism and "centrism" beginning in the latter part of 1977, a further development that was also a decay. You misjudged the situation entirely, mistook the conciliators for the motion that was developing, and put

forward the hackneyed philistine theory that struggle against the conciliators and covert opportunists means splitting the Marxist-Leninists. In practice, this meant to lose faith in the prospects of the development of the revolutionary upsurge against the social-chauvinists and to abandon the fostering of the healthy new forces coming forward and instead to succumb to the siren songs of a section of the conciliators.

You put forward the theory that one never fights the conciliators directly. You tried to attribute this to another party and your representative stated:

"For example, [you gave the name of a Marxist-Leninist party — ed.] is fighting against Eurocommunism. They know very well that there are elements who oppose Eurocommunism in words but are for it in deeds, but they do not make an issue of this. What they do is to hit very hard against Eurocommunism and persist in this." (From our minutes of the discussions of May 1978)

This is a ridiculous anecdote. You didn't tell us who these conciliators of "Eurocommunism" are who are being referred to, what the situation is in the struggle against them, how strong they are and what danger they pose, or any concrete fact at all. But clearly tactics depend on the time and place, on the concrete circumstances. We ourselves went through a period of putting intense pressure on the conciliators by continually stepping up the attack on the Klonskyite "three worlders" and open social-chauvinists before reaching the point where it was essential to pass over to a direct attack on the conciliators. At the same time, we were quite conscious right from the beginning that a fierce struggle was going on with the conciliators as well as with the open social-chauvinists. But you related this absurd story without time or place or concrete circumstances in order to make a very definite point. The moral of your story was that one allegedly never fights the conciliators.

You therefore advocated attacking only the main official sect of open social-chauvinism. You stated in the same discussion:

"The paralysis of all the opportunists results entirely from the work of COUSML and CPC (M-L) against OL [the Klonskyites — ed.] and CCL [Canadian Klonskyites — ed.] To divert from the main target will give rise to ideological confusion and the strengthening of the enemy." (*Ibid.*)

It should be noted that with this you opposed attacks on the "three worlders" of the "RCP, USA" as well as on the Weisberg social-democratic MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)."

And you have not given up these theories about the struggle against conciliationism and "centrism" splitting the "unity of the genuine Marxist-Lenin-

ists." This is proven by your denunciation in your letters of December 5 of the article "How to Advance the Struggle Against Social-Chauvinism" as an alleged failure to exhaust "the full possibilities of this opportunity of building the unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists." (p. 16)

** You maintained a policy of pragmatic maneuvering with the conciliators and "centrists." You thus maintained a certain contact with the Weisberg social-democratic MLOC/"CPUSA(ML)" sect and judged them not on the basis of their stand in the revolutionary struggle in the U.S. but solely on how much contact they maintained with you at any particular time. You maintained this contact with them and this friendly, mild and benevolent attitude towards them despite their vicious and all-out war against the Marxist-Leninists in the U.S. and despite their vile social-democratic, anti-Marxist-Leninist nature.

Furthermore, you were also willing to at least consider the question of maneuvers with the "RCP, USA." Hence you made the blunder of selling them the rights to your English translation of the Palacios book. To this date you have not admitted that you have violated any principles with this sale but simply complain that you got a bad deal.

** To oppose the struggle against the conciliators means sooner or later to oppose the struggle against the open opportunists. Hence your opposition to the struggle against conciliationism and your replacement of the struggle against the conciliators with maneuvers with them soon led you to denounce the movement against social-chauvinism itself. Thus you started to concoct all sorts of theories against "movements," against attacks on any domestic opportunists at all, even the open social-chauvinists, and so on and so forth. Of course, you dress up your opposition to the movement against social-chauvinism in bright colors and with fancy pseudo-Marxist theories, theories which are a dime a dozen. But objectively, you sold the movement against social-chauvinism in favor of sweet dreams of pragmatic maneuvers under the signboard of "unity" with the conciliators, for it is clear that the price exacted by the conciliators for maneuvers is opposition to the movement against social-chauvinism.

** You advocate that "...this entire centrist trend...unfolded...across the USA this fall [1979 — ed.]" (p. 8) This is ridiculous. Right from the start of the movement against social-chauvinism, conciliationism and "centrism" existed and was a major question. You say that "centrism" arose in fall 1979 in the USA in order to justify your policy of opposing the struggle against conciliationism and "centrism" up until that time. Actually, however, you have continued to this day to oppose our polemical struggle against the "RCP,USA" and to give no

support to our polemics against Mao Zedong Thought and in general to oppose the struggle against conciliationism and "centrism." And it is interesting to us that the first issue of *The Workers' Advocate* that you stopped distributing was the issue of December 5, 1979 that contained the major article "Mao, Browder and Social-Democracy: Mao Zedong and the American ultra-revisionist Browder supported each other and shared a common platform of social-democracy" as a supplement. Nor, as we showed in Section VI-C, did you give any support to our struggle against the tour by Palacios of the U.S. on the platform of the "RCP,USA."

** In your letters of December 5, you identify the question of struggle against "centrism" as being solely the public denunciation of the RCP of Chile by name in the press. This is absurd. It is just another one of your excuses to refrain from the fight against Mao Zedong Thought and the ideological struggle against centrism. Consider your letter to the CC of the RCP of Chile, which you have now published in your organ *PCDN*. This letter not only does not develop the ideological issues at stake, but it repeatedly insists that the ideological differences between your Party and the RCP of Chile on such questions as Mao Zedong Thought are irrelevant and that the only issue is the provocations by the International Commission of the CC of the RCP of Chile against you.

Furthermore, your letter appeals for unity to the CC of the RCP of Chile. So on one hand in your letters of December 5 you ridicule our Party on page 4a for writing that "we are in no hurry to come to a final conclusion on the RCP of Chile," while you yourself then proceed to appeal for unity to this same RCP of Chile! Charming, is it not? You write in your letters of December 5 that the RCP of Chile is part of

"...the entire centrist trend which had *already* crystallized..." (p. 4a, your emphasis)

and that

"...this entire centrist trend...is the creature of imperialism and social-imperialism..." (p. 4a)

and accuse us of not fighting these creatures of imperialism and social-imperialism, and then you yourself publicly and openly appeal for unity with these alleged creatures of imperialism and social-imperialism. And you stress that you hold that the RCP of Chile is "genuinely Marxist-Leninist and stand(s) on revolutionary grounds" through proposing discussions and saying that you oppose discussions with any revisionists and opportunists. You write, right after stressing your proposal for discussions:

"Of course, it is not possible to settle differences with the revisionists and opportunists of

all hues through discussions; *thus, we are always opposed to such discussions. But we firmly believe that parties, organizations and groups which are genuinely Marxist-Leninist and stand on revolutionary grounds can certainly settle their differences through discussions. This is the only correct way to resolve these differences. Thus, we express our enthusiasm for such meetings with you* in order to settle these important matters which we have raised in our letter." (*PCDN*, March 1, 1980, p. 4, col. 4, emphasis added)

Thus, irrespective of whether or not it is correct to polemicize against the RCP of Chile by name in the press at this time — and we have expressed our view on that to you repeatedly — it is clear that polemics against the RCP of Chile such as yours have nothing to do with the ideological struggle against Mao Zedong Thought or "centrism." (All this by the way, is not to speak of the fact that your demand that we attack the RCP of Chile by name as part of your maneuvers was scandalous and disgraceful. As clear from your letter to the RCP of Chile, you wanted to hide the hand that throws the stone so as to pose as a long-suffering saint who abides by all the norms while suffering in silence the Chilean provocations.)

** And finally, you have put forward a number of theories directly prettifying conciliationism and "centrism." Thus we showed near the beginning of Section XI-A of this letter that you denied that the Chinese revisionists adopted conciliatory stands towards Soviet revisionism on the grounds that "Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought are a departure from Marxism-Leninism and between Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought and Marxism-Leninism there is an insurmountable gulf." Thus you denied that conciliationism is "a departure from Marxism-Leninism" and that between conciliationism and Marxism-Leninism there "is an insurmountable gulf." When you deny that Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought could take a conciliatory stand towards modern Soviet revisionism on the grounds that Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought are anti-Marxist-Leninist, you are directly and clearly implying that conciliationism is not anti-Marxist-Leninist.

Furthermore you have denounced the "centrists" as advocates of "ideological struggle." You have denounced the struggle against opportunism as "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle'" and at the same time denounced the "centrists" for "two-line struggle." Thus you have been prettifying the "centrists" as allegedly fighters against revisionism and opportunism, indeed, as those who allegedly exaggerate the ideological struggle, raise it to the level of theory, and so forth. And this is manifested

repeatedly in your letters of December 5.

Thus you write, in denouncing our characterization of U.S. neo-revisionism as the American expression of the international opportunist trend of Chinese revisionism, that:

"But these centrists are also not only 'opposed' [your pencilled-in quotation marks on the word "opposed" change nothing — ed.] to the 'international trend of Chinese revisionism' but to its 'American' or any other expression, as well. Thus, you [here you are referring to our Party and its struggle against opportunism — ed.] are in good company with these centrists." (p. 18)

Here you prettify the "centrists" as opponents of and fighters against both Chinese revisionism and the domestic opportunist followers of Chinese revisionism. According to your prettifications, the "RCP,USA" not only is not Chinese revisionist, but it fights Chinese revisionism and the domestic Klonskyites. According to you, we are in company with the "centrists" when we fight against Chinese revisionism and the domestic opportunists. What an astonishing prettification of "centrism."

Furthermore, earlier on in your letters of December 5, you wrote:

"...the entire centrist trend which had *already* crystallized around the 'defence of 'Mao Zedong Thought'' and the 'contributions' of Mao Zedong under the mask of their so-called 'opposition' to Chinese revisionism' and the notorious theory of 'three worlds'..." (p. 4a, emphasis as in the original)

Here you are more careful to talk of "so-called 'opposition'" and "mask of their so-called 'opposition.'" However, one must compare this passage to your repeated denunciations of the "centrists" for "ideological struggle." Then it is clear that you are putting forward the amazing position and tremendous prettification of "centrism" that it stands for struggle against Chinese revisionism and the "three worlds" theory. Indeed, you are even accusing the "centrists" of exaggerating the struggle against Chinese revisionism and "three worlds-ism." This conception of yours concerning "centrism" is rubbish. It has happened many times that those who were confused about Mao Zedong Thought but who carried on a serious struggle against the "three worlds" theory and were not afraid to seek out the origins of the "three worlds" theory and to carry the struggle against the "three worlds" theory through to the end became clear on the question of Mao Zedong Thought. And conversely, in order to defend Mao Zedong Thought, it is necessary for the "centrists" to betray, blunt, oppose or never begin in the first place the struggle against the "three worlds" theory.

And indeed, in the passage we have quoted from you above you are talking about the "RCP,USA" as part of this "entire centrist trend." But it is downright prettification of the "RCP,USA" to say that it even has a "mask of...so-called 'opposition'" to "the notorious theory of 'three worlds.'" The "RCP,USA" openly supports what they regard as Mao's version of the "three worlds" theory. And the "RCP,USA" has repeatedly and continually stressed its opposition to the question of the "three worlds" theory being considered an important issue. These facts about the "RCP,USA" are no secrets either. We ourselves stressed this stand of the "RCP,USA" on the question of the "three worlds" theory when we wrote the polemical articles "Does the 'RCP,USA' Oppose the Theory of 'Three Worlds'?", Part One and Two, in issues of *The Workers' Advocate* for February 12, 1979 and March 29, 1979.

Thus you have put forward a number of theories that prettify and put in a good light the conciliators and "centrists."

All these facts show that you have slighted, downplayed and sharply negated the struggle against conciliationism and "centrism," just as you have negated the struggle against opportunism in general. Indeed, this is not an accident. For a wrong stand towards the struggle against opportunism and a wrong stand towards the struggle against conciliationism are linked together. Thus Comrade Stalin wrote:

"I am speaking, of course, of a real fight against the Right deviation, not a verbal, paper fight. There are people in our Party who, to soothe their conscience, are quite willing to proclaim a fight against the Right danger in the same way as priests sometimes cry, 'Hallelujah! Hallelujah!' But they will not undertake any practical measures at all to organize the fight against the Right deviation on a firm basis, and to overcome this deviation in actual fact. We call this tendency a conciliatory tendency towards the Right, frankly opportunist, deviation. It is not difficult to understand that the fight against this conciliatory

tendency is an integral part of the general fight against the Right deviation, against the Right danger. For it is impossible to overcome the Right, opportunist deviation without waging a systematic fight against the conciliatory tendency, which takes the opportunists under its wing." ("The Right Danger in the C.P.S.U. (B.)," *Works*, Vol. 11, p. 244, emphasis added except for the first word)

(Since you have made such a big fuss about counterposing "practical measures" to ideological struggle, we will point out that in the struggle against the Right danger at that time Comrade Stalin held that: "...our chief method of fighting the Right deviation at this stage should be that of a full-scale ideological struggle." (*Works*, Vol. 11, p. 299, emphasis as in the original) According to Marxism-Leninism, ideological struggle is a very definite practical measure.)

Here Comrade Stalin is speaking about tendencies and deviations, not trends, but the same general conclusion follows in the case of the hardened opportunist trends of open social-chauvinism, conciliationism and so forth. The fight against conciliationism is an integral part of the general fight against the open social-chauvinists. Here of course we are talking of a real fight against open social-chauvinism, not a verbal, paper fight. The conciliators and all those who only claim in words to be Marxist-Leninists may lift their hands to heaven and cry "Hallelujah!" over this or that formulation, while opposing any practical measures against the social-chauvinists and especially cursing the movement against social-chauvinism. But our Party stood for a real fight and so we have waged a systematic fight against conciliationism. While you have especially opposed our struggle against the conciliators and "centrists" and from that passed on to opposition to our struggle against opportunism as a whole. You have even put forward special theories against fighting "centrism" and conciliationism and these theories are central to your theories of replacing struggle against opportunism with pragmatic maneuvering under the signboard of "unity."

SECTION XIV: Panic-stricken speeches which manifest a sharp turn towards rightism

We have thus reached the end of our discussion of the immediate ideological issues behind your hostile stand towards our Party and your unprincipled splitting activity. However, we wish to take this occasion to inform you that we are seriously concerned about your assessment of the decade of the 1970's. We emphatically disagree with the speeches in which you

have put forward your views on these questions and regard the views expressed in these speeches as both wrong in theory and extremely dangerous in practice.

Your assessment of the decade of the 1970's was put forward in two speeches by the chairman of your Party. The first speech was a major speech at the

"Mass rally held in Hamilton to assess the decade of the 1970s and conclude the celebrations in honour of the centenary of the birth of J.V. Stalin." (*PCDN*, Jan. 3, 1980) This speech not only gave the assessment of your Party concerning the 1970's but also "discussed the work which confronts the Marxist-Leninists in the 1980s." (*Ibid.*, p. 1) It is a major document of your Party. This was followed by the speech in two parts given on December 31-January 1 in Montreal and Toronto. (*PCDN*, Jan. 4 and 5, 1980) These speeches were also major speeches which *PCDN* declared "developed in further detail the analysis presented at the mass rally held in Hamilton on December 30...." (*PCDN*, Jan. 4, 1980, p.1) In these speeches you called for a mass public discussion on these speeches and on the assessment of what was right and wrong in the work of the Party so that this discussion becomes "a matter of household discussion" and takes place "amongst the broadest sections of the masses." (*PCDN*, Jan. 4, 1980) Thus these were major works of your Party setting forth the orientation for the work of your Party in the 1980's.

We disagree with these speeches. We regard them as panic-stricken speeches, panic-stricken in the face of the difficulties facing the work of the Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries in the present conditions. These speeches, and the subsequent development of the same views in *PCDN* throughout the federal election campaign of early 1980, manifested a sharp turn towards rightism. This is especially apparent in *PCDN* during the federal election campaign of early 1980 and reaches a culmination in the extreme rightist program of structural reform set forth in an editorial in big type in the *PCDN* of February 15, 1980 which sets forth a plan of how to bring Canada out of the crisis without the revolution. This was followed by a call to vote for your Party in order to put pressure upon the rich to force some "structural reform" of value to the people. According to the chairman of your Party:

"There is propaganda carried out that to vote for the Marxist-Leninists is a waste because they will not form the government. ... Only a

vote for the Marxist-Leninists is a useful vote. This will put a lot of pressure on the rich and even this can force some structural reform, which is advantageous to the people." (*PCDN*, Feb. 16, 1980, p. 3, col. 4)

As well, these speeches gave up the call for party-building in favor of a call for individual organizing, for the individual comrades finding the line by themselves, simply being more active, and so on and so forth. However, it is our view that this rightism exists alongside of and without negating certain other features such as your longstanding deviation away from Marxism-Leninism towards semi-anarchism. This deviation towards semi-anarchism has long been one of the major theoretical weaknesses of your Party. It is reflected in a certain disdain for the mass movement, in a denunciation of any "partial demands" or momentary interests of the working class other than the seizure of state power, and in a whining denunciation of the real world (whether the mass movements, the necessity to deal with the political and ideological views of the opportunists, or so on) as an alleged diversion. This penchant of yours towards semi-anarchist phrasemongering has proved unable to deal with the serious problems of the revolution and is one of the causes for the astonishing instability in your line and activities, which have taken great zigzags and shifts. Your recent expression of rightist views is a vivid expression of the bankruptcy of the "leftist" pretensions of this tendency towards semi-anarchist phrasemongering. At the same time, it is our view that with your present instability and vacillation of line, sharp zigzags in the future on this or that issue are possible and even likely.

In this section of our letter we will briefly outline some of our disagreements with your speeches assessing the 1970's and giving the orientation for the 1980's. Although the line of the speeches is continued in the subsequent *PCDN*'s during the federal election campaign and in the major speech "The Road of the Party" given on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the founding of the CPC(M-L), for brevity's sake we will concentrate on the December 30 and New Year's speeches.

XIV-A: A treacherous attack on the Party of Labor of Albania

To begin with, your speech treacherously attacks the Party of Labor of Albania and equates the intense interest aroused by the 7th Congress of the PLA with the pressure exerted on your Party in 1974-77 to accept the bankrupt positions of the Chinese revisionists. We are utterly revolted by your sickening attack on the PLA, both because the PLA is in the forefront of the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement and deserves the wholehearted support of all revolutionary Marxist-Leninists every-

where and because it is such a manifestly unjust attack against a party which has extended to you vigorous, warm, fraternal and timely international support. This activity of yours against the PLA reinforces our belief, based on careful analysis of the issues, that the ideological positions that you are seeking to impose on us are also directed against the Marxist-Leninist positions being put forward by the PLA in a series of immortal documents of the international movement. We have denounced this aspect

of your speech already in Section III of this letter, so

XIV-B: A thief cries "stop thief!"

Your speech also vilely attacks our Party as well and accuses it of interfering in the leadership of your Party. With this lying accusation, you are using the trick of the thief who cries "stop thief!" At the same time as you are brutally attempting to split or overthrow our leadership, savagely dictating the ultimatum that you won't even talk to a delegation of a party if it contains this or that member of the NEC, vi-

XIV-C: It is wrong to inculcate distrust and disrespect for the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement

The speeches inculcate unhealthy sentiments in your members on the question of the international significance and international importance of your Party.

Thus you explain away various theoretical weaknesses of your Party and your attitude towards Mao Zedong Thought as simply the result of being allegedly too enthusiastic about the international movement. Your speech declares:

"We had a subjective assessment of the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement. For example, we had a very large heart for the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement." (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 4, emphasis added)

For shame! This is inculcating distrust and disrespect for the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. Where would we all be without the great international struggles against Chinese and Soviet revisionism! But you negate the question of struggle against revisionism and imply that Chinese revisionism was only a problem because you allegedly had too big a heart for the international movement. You compound this by making the backhanded criticism of the PLA that:

"Now, for the first time in the recent history of the International Communist Movement, we see those practical politics coming from Albania. In terms of providing leadership, the Albanians talk all the time about which forces are going in which direction, what they will do, what their motives are, and so on." (Ibid., p. 4, emphasis added)

Here you imply that the problem was that there was no leadership previously. Here you are denying the "practical politics" from the Party of Labor of Albania which was manifested in their guidance of the

we shall not go further into this here.

ciously seeking to strangle our Party and to set up a parallel anti-party network in the U.S., and going all out to either have our Party submit to the "special relationship" with your Party or be destroyed, you are complaining in the press about alleged pressure on your Party. For shame! We have denounced this aspect of your speech already in Section III of this letter, so we shall not go further into this here.

entire struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism and their brilliant analysis of "which forces are going in which direction, what they will do, what their motives are, and so on." This analysis shines through in the documents of the PLA. Comrade Enver Hoxha's monumental work *Reflections on China* reviews the period of the struggle against Khrushchovite and Chinese revisionism and shows the sure footing of the PLA in the midst of very complicated and very difficult situations. But you are, in a sickening, backhanded way, negating the glorious role of the PLA in its fight against modern revisionism. And you are hinting at your opposition to certain ideological stands of the PLA and that your Party's theoretical weaknesses allegedly are due to a lack of leadership in the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. This further verifies that your whole nonsense about having too big a heart is meant to imply that you really knew everything all along, everything was clear to you, you were infallible and the mistakes were all due to noble sentiment for the international movement.

Combined with this, you continue to tend to present the issue of the struggle against opportunism as the struggle of the domestic against the foreign. You present opportunism as something that is imported from the outside into Canada, while inside Canada only the police are opportunists.

The truth is that you have been inculcating unhealthy sentiments in your Party for some time. This is part of the ideological background to your theories of developing a separate "Internationalist trend" based on your Party inside the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. It is the ideological background to the anti-Marxist-Leninist pretensions of your Party to impose a "special relationship" on our Party and elsewhere.

XIV-D: You restrict the criticism of Mao Zedong Thought to meaningless generalities and tend to present it as petty-bourgeois ultra-leftism

Although your speeches make a pretext of self-criticism, a very reluctant and half-hearted self-criticism, on the question of Mao Zedong Thought, you in fact continue the practice of restricting the criticism of Mao Zedong Thought to what is at best a very narrow basis. Thus the speech of December 30 states that:

"...in 1970, the mistake was that the basis of change, development and motion is the contradiction between correct and incorrect..." (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 3)

While in the major speech "The Road of the Party," your Party finds the essence of Maoism in "campaigns" and "movements." (PCDN, April 3, 1980, p. 3, col. 3) What utter nonsense. This is to reduce the question of repudiating Mao Zedong Thought to meaningless generalities. This is to hide the actual concrete issues involved. The truth is that you have never given a serious repudiation of Mao Zedong Thought, whether in terms of the doctrine itself or of its manifestations in your Party.

As a matter of fact, in these speeches and in the Communiqué from the 7th Plenum of the CC of the CPC(M-L) of November 1979 (see the PCDN for Dec. 3, 1979), you tend to present Mao Zedong Thought as in essence petty-bourgeois ultra-leftism. This is a

XIV-E: An empty self-criticism to obscure and preserve the actual errors and theoretical weaknesses from the past

You also give the view in these speeches that:

"This young organization, at the historical juncture in 1970 [the first year of existence of the CPC(M-L) — ed.] was inspired by 'Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.' We must admit openly that it was more 'Mao Zedong Thought' than Marxism-Leninism. And as the days and weeks and months and years passed by, it became more Marxism-Leninism than 'Mao Zedong Thought,' to the extent that in 1978, we toppled 'Mao Zedong Thought' altogether." (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 2)

We are astonished to see such a categorical and sweeping formulation used to characterize your history. We do not agree with this. One cannot detach the beginning of the CPC(M-L) and the Regina Conference, which you are also discussing in the passage from which we have taken the above quotation, from the great movement against modern revisionism nor from the fervent Marxist-Leninist convictions of the revolutionaries of those times. To tar all this as being allegedly more Maoist than Marxist-Leninist is wrong. At the same time, such a sweeping formulation has the purpose of actually obscur-

ing and covering over the actual errors and theoretical weaknesses of the past and of preserving them. It is the most artful and devious type of opposition to genuine self-criticism and to a real discussion of the issues involved. And it ends up with boasting about your alleged infallibility, that "...in 1978, we toppled 'Mao Zedong Thought' altogether." What a lie! It was the PLA that "toppled 'Mao Zedong Thought' altogether" while at the end of 1978 you merely gave up the formulation "Mao Zedong Thought." Indeed, in March 1979 you were still insisting to us that you hadn't taken a stand yet on Mao Zedong, but were only denouncing Mao Zedong Thought as it was the official philosophy of the Communist Party of China. (We pointed this out in more detail on page 50 in Section XI-A.) And as we pointed out in the last section, you still have not given a serious critique of Mao Zedong Thought.

As well, in smearing the past as more Maoist than Marxist-Leninist, you are also characterizing the Regina Conference, which was the first Conference of North American Marxist-Leninists. Thus you are in fact passing judgement on the U.S. as well as on Canada, on the ACWM(M-L) (a predecessor of the

COUSML and the MLP, USA) as well as the CPC (M-L). As usual, you do so without even consulting us. So we take this opportunity to tell you that we do not agree with this method of characterizing the Regina Conference and do not accept its relevance to the ACWM(M-L) of that time. Our views on the early history of our Party with respect to Mao Zedong Thought and on the ACWM(M-L) were presented at our internal conference of March 1979 entitled "Build the Marxist-Leninist Party Without the Social-Chauvinists and Against the Social-Chauvinists" which you sent a delegation to, a delegation which appeared excited and pleased by our historical presentation. We are still working on these historical questions, as the views presented at the internal conference of March 1979 were preliminary views. Nevertheless, we reject such sweeping statements as "more Maoist than Marxist-Leninist." We will instead continue to follow the path from the internal conference of March 1979 of seriously looking into the accomplishments and errors of the times.

It must be stressed that your sweeping characterizations serve to hide the fact that you are not actually looking seriously into history. Your presentation of the history of your own Party suffers from remarkable errors, inconsistencies and half-truths, that are contradicted by your own published documents. Consider for example the question of "new methods." The speeches claim that this line was dropped by the Second Congress of your Party. For example, in the speech of December 30, it says that your Party "...came to their senses [on the question of 'new methods' — ed.] within one-and-a-half years after the adoption of this programme [the Political Report of April 1970 — ed.]." (*Ibid.*, p. 2, col. 2)

In "The Road of the Party," it says that the "new methods" were repudiated at the Second Congress of CPC(M-L) of 1973. It states:

"Thus, for our Party, while adoption of Marxism-Leninism and 'Mao Zedong Thought' was a justifiable mistake, it was not justified to take the road of 'new method'. This entire line of 'new method' was finally defeated by the convening of the Second Congress of the Party in March 1973." (*PCDN*, April 2, 1980, p. 3, col. 4)

This is nonsense. The "new method" was explicitly endorsed, to the point of quoting the relevant section from the Political Report of the First Congress of 1970, at the Third Congress of CPC(M-L) of 1977. This can be found in your pamphlet *The Political Resolution of the Third Congress of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist)*, February 6-March 13, 1977. It is in point number 25 on pages 49-50. For that matter, it is endorsed in the Political Report from the Second Congress also. Chapter 3 of

Part Four is entitled "Study Historical Experience." It stresses the study of the "important documents of CPC(M-L)," which includes the Political Report from the First Congress. In regard to this it explicitly endorses that the Party comrades must "never forget" such things as that "the revolutionary method of work developed in the struggle against the revisionist methods of work...."

Our objections to the empty character of your denunciation of "new methods" and of your former theses on methods of work and our refusal to condemn the past in sweeping terms does not mean that we defend the erroneous theses from your Party's past. On the contrary. We object to your empty phrasemongering about such things because, among other things, it is an attempt to obscure the actual weaknesses and to impose mistaken views on the present movement by means of one-sided demagogical phrasemongering about the past. Take for example the question of "new methods." In the past you described these "new methods" as the repudiation of revisionism. Thus at the Third Congress of the CPC(M-L) you stated:

"The rejection of 'the old methods of work prior to May 1968, as moribund, and as being a shackle to the revolutionary struggle,' to the Party, meant the necessity of opposing revisionism... and the necessity of opposing the influence of revisionism and social-democracy in the working class movement." (*Political Resolution of the Third Congress*, p. 50)

The Resolution talked about the necessity for "a sharp ideological struggle against revisionism." Now you say that actually the question of "new methods" meant that "the Leninist methods were also wrong." (*PCDN*, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 2) This is a most serious admission. Hence it should be dealt with seriously. Specifically which teachings of Leninism were rejected by your leadership? What relation did the idea of "new methods" have to your views at the First Congress of your Party and later on such questions as the line towards the working class movement, the attitude towards trade union forms, towards "partial demands" and so forth, what did it mean concerning your attitude to soviets and why did you put forth "revolutionary committees"? And indeed, even apart from the relationship of these questions to "new methods," these questions are mainly important in themselves. It is clear that a certain tendency towards semi-anarchism is apparent in the political discussion of the First Congress of your Party and in various of the Party's later stands. Furthermore, it is also serious that insofar as various Leninist forms and methods were rejected, this was in the main done behind the back of the membership, which believed it was endorsing the rejection of revisionist methods and was not told honestly of

the attitude of the leadership towards certain questions of Leninism. But you cover over these questions through saying that everything is solved by repudiating the phrase "new methods." This is the same position as you were in at the First Congress, only turned inside out. There a determined attempt was made to present as much as possible of the political line as flowing from the question of methods of work, including questions that had nothing to do with methods of work, and today you are trying to present everything as being solved by rejecting the "new methods of work." For example, you describe a certain shallow and anti-Marxist-Leninist conception of the revolution and attribute it to "new methods":

"It [the Political Report of the First Congress of CPC(M-L) — ed.] says we have developed new methods of work, called the mass democratic method of work. [It is typical of the entirely non-serious nature of this type of "self-criticism" that in this speech you surprisingly identify "the mass democratic method" with "new methods," but already a few months later in "The Road of the Party" you change your mind and support "the mass democratic method" against the "new methods." Naturally you give no explanation at all of these zigzags. — ed.] through which we...do propaganda, disseminate 'Marxism - Leninism - Mao Zedong Thought,' and then, in the process of change, development and motion, we will defend the right to carry out propaganda and agitation by force of arms which will give rise to people's defence committees [actually you called them "revolutionary committees" in 1970; the "people's defence committees" of one sort or other, such as the Canadian People's Defence Committee (Citizens and Residents), are much more recent — ed.] which will be armed, and before long, we will have armed civil war all across

Canada. All this comes from the analysis that there is a contradiction between the correct and incorrect method of work." (*PCDN*, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 2)

If anything is clear, it is that this whole scheme of revolution does not follow from the question of the contradiction between correct and incorrect methods of work, but involves very definite political and theoretical stands towards a number of burning questions of revolution, such as the role of the working class movement, the method of organizing in the mass movements, the role of armed struggle, and so on and so forth. You are covering up your actual theories by continuing to hide under the question of the "new methods." What it all ends up with is that you do not repudiate the deviation towards semi-anarchism but instead use the big fuss about "new methods" and "the contradiction between correct and incorrect" to find another way of denouncing the ideological struggle against revisionism. Look how bad this struggle is, you say, it leads to the analysis that there is a contradiction between the correct, Marxism-Leninism, and the incorrect, revisionism. Hence it leads to all these other sins, the "new methods" and so on and so forth. What rot!

The complete emptiness of all your talk about how you were more Maoist than Marxist-Leninist and your alleged self-criticism on "new methods" is shown by the fact that at the same time, in the same speech, you insist that the only reason you didn't know that Mao Zedong was not Marxist was because you had too big a heart for the international movement. But if you were really more Maoist than Marxist-Leninist at your formation, then this and not your "big heart" would be at the root of your support for Mao Zedong Thought. These crying contradictions in your speeches show your complete lack of any serious critique of Mao Zedong Thought and any serious presentation of your own history.

XIV-F: A continuing crusade against ideological struggle

These speeches are notable also for their vehemence in denouncing the struggle against opportunism. These speeches throw themselves upon the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the struggle against opportunism and rip at them with the insatiable appetite for blood of a pack of wolves. With these speeches, the leadership of the CPC(M-L) continues its frenzied crusade against the ideological struggle. The general method used in these speeches to denounce the ideological struggle, which is one of the constant and indispensable fronts of the class struggle, is to pass judgement on the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the ideological struggle on the basis of

the practice of certain opportunist groups which actually practice coexistence with social-democracy and opportunism. Then the "ideological struggle" is denounced by ascribing to it all the sins of these opportunist groups. The basic pretext for this crude maneuver and sleight of hand, this infamous conjuring trick, is that one or the other of these groups uses the phrase "ideological struggle." But of course, among those opportunists who, to use your words, "claim to be Marxist-Leninists," the phrase "ideological struggle" is used — for failure to use it would brand these groups as out-and-out enemies of the most basic Marxist-Leninist teachings. As long as

these groups "claim to be Marxist-Leninist," a number of them will "claim" to be waging the ideological struggle.

Earlier in this letter we have gone into great detail on your anti-Marxist-Leninist views opposing the ideological struggle and the struggle against opportunism, so there is no need to repeat that analysis here. It will suffice to point to certain particular features of the way these speeches denigrate the struggle against opportunism.

To begin with, as these speeches sum up the 1970's and give the orientation for the 1980's, naturally they also give your assessment of the prospects and orientation for the struggle against opportunism. And these speeches give the orientation of utter complacency and of an end to the struggle against opportunism. Thus the speech of December 30, 1979 states:

"...everything these revisionist and opportunists did during the 1974-77 period actually discredited them, and eliminated them [Really now, this is too much! You claim that the opportunists are "eliminated"! — ed.]... There is no way that revisionism and opportunism can arise in this country again with the same kind of bluster which they had during the 1974-77 period." (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 3)

This, however, should not be taken to mean that you at least supported struggle against opportunism in 1974-77. You denounce the struggle in that period too. Thus the New Year's speeches declare:

"... 'In Struggle' tells the proletariat to organize debates and to engage in 'ideological struggle' in the International Marxist-Leninist Communist Movement, just like they organized in Canada in the mid-1970's." (PCDN, Jan. 4, 1980, p. 3, col. 2, bottom, emphasis added)

You are dreaming of a decade free of ideological struggle and denouncing that struggle which did take place in the 1970's.

You go to the extent of denouncing the ideological struggle on the grounds that theory (analysis) isn't that important. Thus the speech of December 30, 1979 states:

"...the opportunists are debating over what is Marxism-Leninism and what is opportunism.

"The Marxist-Leninist tactics, the Marxist-Leninist tradition, the Marxist-Leninist style of work — all show that it is not necessary to have correct analysis all the time — the issue is where one stands, first and foremost: On the side of revolution and socialism or on the side of imperialism and all reaction? Secondly, once a mistake is made, it must be eliminated [Without having the correct analysis to know that something is a mistake, how is the mistake supposed to be eliminated? — ed.]. One must not

talk about it in the manner the Maoists did — that one must have two-line struggle to eliminate opportunism [Here it is! Instead of denouncing the Maoist theories of the necessity of more than one line in the Party as theories of coexistence with opportunism, you are denouncing the Maoists for allegedly wanting to eliminate opportunism! — ed.]. (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 3, emphasis added)

Thus this speech openly comes out against the importance of theory. Millions upon millions of revolutionaries, honest sincere revolutionaries who engaged in marvels of heroism and shed their blood against imperialism and all reaction, have seen their dreams go up in smoke because they did not have the correct analysis, the correct Marxist-Leninist theory, to guide their struggle. Comrade Lenin explicitly points out: "Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement." (*What Is to Be Done?*, Ch. I, Sec. D) But you are defending your theoretical weaknesses by shrugging your shoulders and saying, well, what is so necessary about analysis anyway. So you have come full circle, from the slogan "Action with analysis" to the slogan "Action without analysis (but with a correct stand)." In former days, you talked of starting from relatively correct analysis and developing to more correct analysis in the course of the revolutionary struggle, but today your struggle against the struggle against opportunism has inevitably led you to denigrate the role of theory. You sarcastically sneer at debates "over what is Marxism-Leninism and what is opportunism." Ordinary mortals would believe that the outcome of the debate in the revolutionary movement over the correct theory is of crucial importance for the revolutionary movement, and that opportunism is distinguished not by its taking part in this debate but by what it advocates. But you have put forward some magical, superhuman theory whereby mistakes are rectified without needing the correct analysis and whereby discussions and debates on matters of theory are ruled out. In short, you are not only putting forward the insistent demand for the end to all polemics with revisionism and opportunism, you are denigrating the role of theory altogether.

It should also be pointed out that you go to such pains to denounce the contradiction between the correct and the incorrect in order to denounce the struggle against opportunism (which of course can be regarded as a manifestation of struggle between correct and incorrect, or of the struggle between opposites) as allegedly Maoist. Instead of discussing the actual concrete situation in the struggle against opportunism, you want to take everything into the dizzying heights of the utmost abstract philosophizing. This, by the way, is the same way that Mao de-

nounces the idea of the monolithic unity of the party, by alleging that ideas of purity and unity violate dialectics. You instead denounce the struggle of opposites on the pretext of supporting monolithic unity. This is Maoism turned inside out. You agree with Maoism in believing that the struggle of opposites and dialectical development is incompatible with the idea of monolithic unity. Mao, however, denounces monolithic unity on the plea of supporting the struggle of opposites, while you denounce dialectics on the plea of supporting monolithic unity. Both Mao and you therefore deny Marxist-Leninist dialectics such as Comrade Stalin's teaching that:

"The dialectical method therefore holds the process of development from the lower to the higher takes place not as a harmonious unfolding of phenomena, but as a disclosure of the contradictions inherent in things and phenomena, as a 'struggle' of opposite tendencies which operate on the basis of these contradictions." (*Dialectical and Historical Materialism*)

Stalin goes on to quote Lenin that "Development is the 'struggle' of opposites." (Lenin, "On the Question of Dialectics," *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 360) And Stalin teaches that these laws of dialectics apply to the development of the internal life of the party too, and we have earlier in this letter quoted from the section "Contradictions of Inner-Party Development" in "Once More on the Social-Democratic Deviation in Our Party" and other works of Stalin concerning these issues. Both Mao and you manifest your opposition to these teachings by your philo-

XIV-G: Negation and ridicule of the essential task of party-building

Your speeches also negate the task of party-building, ridicule the norms of the party as bureaucratic rules and regulations, and emphasize individualist, rather than collective, party methods of organizing. This is an extremely serious error in setting the orientation for the 1980's. Party-building is one of the essential prerequisites for the successful conclusion of all the other revolutionary work of the party. Party-building must not be carried out in fits and starts, but as one of the constant fronts of work of the party. But the speeches not only neglect party-building, they openly slight it and ridicule it and instead put forward the line of "individual organizers."

To begin with, you counterpose party-building to the political presence of the Party among the masses. The speech of December 30, 1979 states:

"The fact is that after 10 years we are not talking about establishing some branches of the Party or some influence of the Party, or establishing some newspaper somewhere, or carrying some activities in terms of strengthening

sophical arguments against the struggle against opportunism. Mao imposes a formal pattern of the repeated transformation of one opposite into the other and back in order to deny development, qualitative transformation, revolution, etc. Thus he converts the doctrine of the struggle of opposites into teachings on the eternal coexistence of opposites, and he replaces the struggle against opportunism with his theories of coexistence with opportunism. Meanwhile you deny directly dialectics and the struggle of opposites in order to deny the struggle against opportunism. In effect, you are opposing the Maoist negation of Marxist-Leninist dialectics by replacing it by the Khrushchovite negation of dialectics, namely, "unity" through "inner-party peace."

Your opposition to ideological struggle in general is related to your opposition to carrying the struggle against Chinese revisionism through to the end. And we regard this as a very serious question. Your charges against ideological struggle are related to your lack of any serious critique of Mao Zedong Thought. It means that you are not seriously reexamining the work and theoretical basis of the Party in the light of the struggle against Chinese revisionism, despite the fact that you phrase-monger about how the Party was at one time more Maoist than Marxist-Leninist, but instead are continuing to hide and cover up the theoretical weaknesses of the Party and to preserve them. The repudiation of Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought is a major test for our Parties, and how this test is handled will affect the work of the Party for years to come.

our Party internally, etc. Today, we are talking about the political presence of the Party in the class and amongst the broad masses of the people." (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 2, top) Thus you denigrate party-building as an activity of the past as opposed to the alleged new panorama opening before the Party. You counterpose the organizational strengthening of the Party and the work for the Party to the work among the masses. And indeed it is true that in this speech and the New Year's speeches you have dropped all your talk about bolshevizing the Party, dropped the talk about strengthening the basic organizations and simply demand more activity from the comrades as individuals.

Indeed the speeches denounce party-building as the allegedly Maoist line of "getting organized." The speech of December 30, 1979 stresses:

"Today, some of the secretaries come to us and say: we are getting organized. Amazing situation. Their words have been in existence for a

long time, and they are getting organized! How come you are not leading, we tell them. You have been organized for a long time! Those who say that they are getting organized are advancing a reactionary line. It is an anti-Party line — a Maoist line." (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 3, col. 4)

How can the phrase "getting organized" be denounced as an anti-party line, a Maoist line? If someone or other uses generalities like "we are getting organized" to avoid giving a concrete answer to what the actual activities of their basic organization are, then this is drowning real work in empty words and should be opposed. But this is not what is at stake here. This is your typical method of reducing everything to meaningless generalities — but behind this denunciation of the generality of "getting organized" stands an impatience with party-building. This impatience goes to the extent that it is regarded as "amazing" that party-building continues after the units are first set up. (Actually, given the dance of the organizational forms we have seen put forward in your documents and described in discussions with us, we are not so sure that your basic Party units can be regarded as such stable and long-established entities. However, you are the most qualified to judge on this question. In any case, in our view party-building goes on in long-established units as well as new ones.) And to cloak this impatience under the cover of opposition to Maoism is incredible, seeing that it is precisely the lack of serious attention to party-building that is one of the characteristic features of Mao Zedong Thought.

The speech of December 30, 1979 goes on to ridicule the norms of the party and its organizational structure. Under the pretext of criticizing someone or other's erroneous conception, it speaks in the most derogatory terms of organization. Thus it states:

"There are various people within and around our Party who think that a Marxist-Leninist Party is a huge bureaucratic organization, like Charlie's Angels. A Communist Party is not like that: any Charlies in the Party must be overthrown. They are not Marxist-Leninists — there is nothing whatsoever in common between bureaucracy and liberalism and Marxism-Leninism. Rules and regulations and organization do not mean that we should have a bureaucracy. The basic units must themselves be aroused and inspired and they should take measures themselves. But in various places they are waiting to receive directives from somebody. A member of a Communist Party cannot be somebody who sits back and orders some angels to run around." (*Ibid.*, p. 3, col. 3)

We can hardly avoid noticing that this is the same

type language that you used in denouncing our insistence on preserving the organizational integrity of our Party committees. Because our delegates upheld the authority of our Party committees, you denounced them as "Charlie's angels" in your letters of December 5. In this passage, on the pretext of criticizing bureaucracy, you are denouncing the party's norms. If your Party has a problem of bureaucracy, and this you are the most qualified to judge, then such a problem requires serious steps. If the rules and regulations are not correct, then this requires attention by the CC. But instead you do not call for a reexamination of these rules or other steps regarding bureaucracy, but simply call for a cavalier attitude towards the party's norms. You do not call for establishing correct norms and rules and regulations, but for disregarding the norms.

The speech of December 30 contemptuously states:

"Marxist-Leninists use organization as a force in their own favour, not as a thing to paralyze themselves, to entangle themselves in so many rules and regulations that their hands and feet are tied in knots." (*Ibid.*, p. 3, col. 4)

This is straightforward ridicule of the norms of the party. It is to say that there are those who can regard the organization as "a force in their own favour" and avoid being "entangled" in the norms, which will only apply to others. We must admit that you have given us many examples of your use of organization "as a force in (your) own favour" and the avoidance of getting "entangled" in the norms in your repeated violation of the Marxist-Leninist norms in your relations with us and your attempt to impose a double standard in which all the obligations are imposed on us and you are free of any responsibilities.

This individualist negation of the party with respect to the party's norms is also extended to the sphere of the party's line. The speech of December 30, 1979 states:

"We must be what Lenin describes as a tribune of the people. How can a person be a tribune of the people, a Marxist-Leninist, if the person cannot, on his own account, come to the correct line in the course of practice?" (*Ibid.*, p. 3, col. 4, emphasis added)

This is astonishing. It is not the Marxist-Leninist concept of fostering initiative and the ability to find one's bearing independently in the cadre on the basis of implementing (and taking part in formulating) the common line of the party. No, this is the exact opposite concept, because it puts the existence of the common line of the party itself into doubt. The "line" is described not as the line of the party, but as a matter for individuals to find and implement on their own. And indeed, this is emphasized by the fact that this quotation occurs just before the pas-

sage that says that individual comrades should "use organization as a force in their own favour."

Hence this passage negates the party. On the one hand, the passage negates the basic organizations. It sets the individual comrades against the collective life in the basic organization. But it is the strengthening of the basic organization that plays a very crucial role in the carrying out of the work in the masses, in the analysis of the local situation, in providing stability to the work of the individual comrades and preventing one-sidedness, in encouraging the initiative of the comrades, and so forth. On the other hand, this passage also manifests an amazing conception of the central apparatus as well. Questions of the national line cannot be decided locally (this does not mean that the local organizations should not be intimately involved in the discussion of line, but that no individual local organization can usurp the role of the national organization) to say nothing of being decided by individual comrades. The party must have its uniform national line that guides the local organizing. How can the various individuals have their own "line" which they each implement on such questions of vital importance to the local organizing which you have been raising as questions on which national mass organizations should be built, the present strategy and tactics in the work in the reactionary trade unions, whether the factory committees should be party bodies or non-party bodies, and so on. The very existence of the party is bound up with its maintenance of a correct, common line.

Furthermore, this passage about each individual finding "the correct line" on their own irresistibly brings to mind another issue. This is that you answer the question of line not by setting forth a definite line as the line of the Party, but by telling each individual that they are no good if they can't find the line themselves. This brings to mind that in the same speech you denounce "some of the secretaries" for allegedly saying they are "getting organized," and the speech replies "How come you are not leading...?" One is tempted to ask: how come you, the leadership, are not "leading"? Why don't the speeches give definite views and assessments rather than simply denouncing the rank and file for not having these views and assessments? Oh yes, the speeches do in effect give a definite orientation, an orientation to which we are opposed. But even this orientation has to be dragged out of the speeches, which rely more on creating a mood than on definite precise analysis and which are full of eclectic and contradictory assertions. A typical example occurs when you describe the discussion inside your Party. The speech of December 30, 1979 declares:

"The on-going discussion in the Party since January 1979 — first at the Consultative Conference of the local secretaries in the third week

of 1979, then again during the May 22 elections, and again in July, in September and November, culminating in the statement of the Seventh Plenum of the Central Committee of CPC(M-L), has all concentrated on this point, that the comrades must carry a practical programme based on realistic assessment. The Marxist-Leninists must be Marxist-Leninist politicians in a practical sense. They must advance the cause of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people in their areas." (*Ibid.*, p. 3, col. 2, emphasis added)

In short, after a year of intense discussion, all you sum up in the speech of orientation for the 1980's is that there is a necessity of having "a practical programme based on realistic assessment." This presumably is the opposite of "getting organized." And that's all. But what this program is and what are the general conclusions and assessments, about this you say nothing. But this is to talk for the sake of saying nothing. Or less than nothing, for the implication that this is the first time that your Party has dealt with having "a practical programme based on realistic assessment" is not true. Right from the moment of its birth your Party always stressed the slogans about the necessity for the Party units to be built in the thick of the revolutionary mass movement, to lead actual struggles, to have a conscious analysis of the situation and so on. Indeed the slogan "Action with analysis" precedes the founding of the CPC (M-L). But instead of giving any assessment about what a "practical programme based on realistic assessment" would be in today's conditions, you denounce the rank-and-file comrades for not coming to "the correct line" on their own while you yourself just talk in vague generalities.

The individualism inherent in these speeches is further reiterated by your somewhat backhanded endorsement of the possibility of organizing the Party on the basis of following an individual rather than a definite line. Thus in the New Year's speeches it states:

"The point is that this organization [the basic organization — ed.] inspires the sincere communists; it is a great power and we have made a very big advance on this question. We are not organizing on the basis of following one individual as was done in 1971. At that time, for a period of one-and-a-half years or so, we had to pass a resolution stipulating that if anyone wanted to join the Party, they had to agree to support Herdial Bains, because the central organization was very weak at that time and the line was being pushed that there was no leadership. [This reasoning is incomprehensible. You would think that the conclusion from the weakness of the central organization and the neces-

sity to fight the view that there was no leadership would be to strengthen the central organization. But instead the conclusion is drawn that the party should be organized on the basis of "following one individual" — that is, to agree to the view that there was no leadership. — ed.] But today, there is none of this. We have our Party; we have the highest bodies of the Party — the National Congress, the Central Committee, regional bodies and basic organizations. [This is still incomprehensible. In the main, these bodies existed in 1971 also. For that matter, how could a resolution to support an individual replace these bodies? — ed.] (PCDN, Jan. 5, 1980, p. 3, col. 1, emphasis added)

You pretend that the stage of "following one individual" is described as a historical phenomena, a stage of work which has been passed and outgrown. But in fact this method of "following one individual" is being endorsed. It is not criticized, it is not even described as an unfortunate historical necessity due to special and unusual circumstances, but is supported as entirely natural and necessary. In "The Road of the Party" it claims that your Party defeated "the thesis that, 'under certain conditions, Party leadership is not necessary'" by the First Congress of CPC(M-L) in May 1971. (See PCDN, April 2, 1980, p. 3, col. 4) But you were just slapping yourself in the face, for the speech of December 30 openly defends replacing Party leadership with "following one individual under certain conditions.

Indeed, while allegedly giving "following one individual" as an outgrown stage of the Party, in fact the speech sets this method up as something generally acceptable under broad conditions. This is clear from the reason given for the "following (of) one individual," namely the weakness of the central organization. This cannot be regarded as a special and unusual circumstance, for it is very common, if not essentially universal, for all parties to have to go through a process of strengthening the central organization and forging a real leadership. And indeed party committees at all levels of the party also generally have to go through a process of tempering. This is a difficult, complex and protracted process. To justify the method of "following one individual" on this basis means to make the method of "following one individual" into an essential stage necessary

XIV-H: A sharp turn towards rightism on a series of important political issues

These speeches also manifest a sharp turn towards rightism not only in denigrating party-building in favor of individualist concepts about organizing, but also in terms of various political issues. We shall outline a few of the areas of this rightism in this section.

sometime in the life of almost every party organization. By this method of justifying "following one individual," the speeches make clear that they are not criticizing this method, but accepting it as a normal and useful method, that might be resorted to again without blinking an eye if the necessity arose. Furthermore, since this passage occurs in the context of speeches putting forward individualist methods in general, it in effect sets forth a model for an acceptable method in the work in the localities.

It is notable that the passage about "following one individual" occurs right after a section of the speech that is rather unusual in that it briefly praises the role of the "basic organization." As if trying to make up for or cover up for the blatant individualism elsewhere in the speeches, the passage raises that the comrades should work "within the general line of the Party." What happened to the demand that each comrade "on his own account, come to the correct line in the course of practice"? What happened to the song and dance about "Charlie's angels" and the bureaucracy of having party norms? But wait, this praise of "basic organization" is immediately followed by the passage on the organization of the whole Party on the basis of "following one individual," a passage which is in its own way the most direct setting forth of the idea of rampant individualism and opposition to the allegedly Maoist line of "getting organized." This is a typical manifestation of the eclectic and contradictory nature of the way that these speeches present analysis. If these speeches talked of the basic organization, and didn't in the very same breath contradict themselves and praise individualism, then they would be providing a better orientation towards the party principle. But in fact these speeches stress individualism, and then throw out some platitudes to smooth things over. This is "the middle line" in questions of principle. But we judge these speeches not by the platitudes but by the main direction of and orientation given by these speeches. We regard the platitudes as the homage that vice pays to virtue. If you weren't yourself aware that the orientation being given by these speeches was anti-Marxist-Leninist on a number of fundamental issues, you wouldn't have to interrupt the exposition with disclaimers every so often.

To begin with, these speeches speculate on the correct Marxist-Leninist theses about the individuality of the Marxist-Leninist party of each country and the individuality of each country itself. The speeches distort these theses and instead engage in an ugly display of a bourgeois sort of "Canadian-

ness." A striking example of this is your deprecation of the immigrants and stress on the issue of being Canadian-born. Thus in the New Year's speeches it stresses:

"The candidates of our Party are the sons and daughters of the proletariat of Canada, and this scares the bourgeoisie; this is a fact. *They are not the sons and daughters of the proletariat in some other country* [This is shocking. You are repudiating the immigrants on the plea of the anti-immigrant hysteria of the reactionaries. What happened to proletarian internationalism? — ed.] as the reactionaries try to make believe. All their nonsense that our Party is largely comprised of immigrants will be blown to bits. *Ninety-five percent or more of the candidates were actually born in Canada*, and this fact they don't want to recognize. Our Party came out of the revolutionary movement of the Canadian people [How low are you going to go? Isn't it a fact that immigrants are part of the Canadian people and play an important role in "the revolutionary movement of the Canadian people"? — ed.]; it was established by the Canadian Marxist-Leninists, and the spokesmen of the Party are also Canadian. The reactionary bourgeoisie and their servants want to suggest that there are some foreign agitators who have a chip on their shoulders and are causing trouble. These are not the facts. [And so, to refute them, you repudiate the immigrants! This is not fighting the reactionaries but getting down on one's knees before the reactionary propaganda. — ed.]" (PCDN, Jan. 4, 1980, p. 3, col. 4, emphasis added)

This is disgusting. It is a violation of proletarian internationalism. It is a violation of the duty of the Marxist-Leninist parties to champion the class interests of the entire proletariat, which includes fighting for the interests of the disadvantaged sections, and not to pride itself on representing only the "respectable" ones. It is particularly shocking in a country like Canada, which like the U.S. is a land composed of immigrants and their descendants with the exception of the native peoples who are themselves especially downtrodden, oppressed and disenfranchised. You even try to present your Party as more Canadian-born than the Canadian people by bandying about figures like 95% of your candidates were born in Canada. This playing with bourgeois "Canadian-ness" is neither revolutionary nor honorable.

Another manifestation of this playing with "Canadian-ness" is apparent in the way the speech of December 30, 1979 elaborates on the issue of "Albanian-style government." Strictly speaking, it is not incorrect to define the type of government as a "Marxist-Leninist style of government." But you do

not then point out that the Albanian government is a brilliant example and a shining model of Marxist-Leninist government, but instead seek to disassociate yourselves from the "Albanian style of government." You manifest extreme anxiety over the *Toronto Sun* attributing the desire for "Albanian-style government" to your Party. The speech stresses:

"A couple of days ago, a reactionary journalist asked me whether we will have an Albanian style of government. I said no, we will have a Marxist-Leninist style of government.

"Nonetheless, the *Toronto Sun* quotes me as advocating an Albanian-style government. The issue of style, the issue of whether a Party is genuinely nationalist [! — ed.], democratic, independent, etc. is fundamental when assessing whether the Party is really internationalist, is really for revolution and socialism, or not." (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 4)

So you disassociated yourself from the "Albanian-style government" on the basis of the "issue of style." This can mean one of two things: 1) you are opposed to the style of the Albanian government and believe that you have a better style; or 2) that you are putting forward the path of separate roads to socialism in each country. The question of "independence" is irrelevant here, as the issue was the "style" of government not its dependence on other countries. And the "Albanian style of government" is a style of the most rigorous defense of its independence and sovereignty combined with the most enthusiastic adherence to proletarian internationalism.

But you go further. The passage we have quoted above goes on immediately to stress the issue of fighting opportunism as a question of the domestic versus the foreign. It continues as follows:

"Is this not the experience of our Party, of the Internationalists before it, that all kinds of trends were floated within our country by the opportunists from the U.S. such as the red bandits of the Rudi Deutsche [By the way, he was from Germany, not the U.S. — ed.] type, and that charlatans from various countries came here to float this or that trend. What did we say about these trends? We said that we could not accept any of them. Glory to the Internationalists and to CPC(M-L) for standing on their own two feet as Canadian Marxist-Leninists." (*Ibid.*)

Because this passage comes in the paragraph explaining why you are disassociating yourselves from an "Albanian style of government," it hints that you have a disagreement with the PLA. But aside from that, it presents the whole issue of the fight against opportunism as a fight against immi-

grants. Both Marxism-Leninism and opportunism are international trends. Marxism-Leninism was itself first developed outside Canada and then brought into Canada as an immigrant, so to speak. It is anti-Marxist-Leninist to present the struggle against opportunism as a struggle of the Canadians against the foreigners.

A particularly revolting feature of this emphasis on "Canadian-ness" which proves its bourgeois character is the double standard that is involved. In regard to our Party, you forget all about the question of "style" of being "independent" and insist on a "special relationship." You have lectured against our insistence on the proper Marxist-Leninist norms of relations and our upholding of our organizational integrity as allegedly "formalism," "centrism," "American exceptionalism," a violation of proletarian internationalism, and so on ad nauseam. But when it comes to your own Party, you suddenly go to the other extreme and even take up a bourgeois "Canadian-ness." You have now even gone to the extent of repudiating immigrants. We take this occasion to express our contempt for these crude and brutal violations of proletarian internationalism.

Besides the bourgeois "Canadian-ness," the speech of December 30, 1979 also revels in the work in the reactionary mass organizations as if it had found a whole new world. Marxist-Leninists work in such organizations as part of the work of the party, and in fact your Party has worked in these organizations from the day of its birth. But your speech creates wrong impressions about the prospects of this work and in fact goes to the extent of calling the reactionary trade unions "organizations of the workers" as opposed to "organizations of the bourgeoisie." For some reason or other, the speech deduces the necessity to work in these organizations from "the Canadian mentality," which is mainly described as "still hav(ing) illusions about bourgeois democracy," although the work in such organizations is a general principle of Marxism-Leninism and not caused by special Canadian conditions. The speech states:

"This [the "Canadian mentality" and the "bourgeois-democratic illusions" — ed.] means our comrades must educate the proletariat by leading it in acquiring its own experience, which means that we must work through trade unions, through student councils, through social organizations, cultural organizations, etc.

"I am not talking about working through the organizations of the bourgeoisie, but we must make our presence felt in the organizations of the workers." (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 3, col. 3) Here the proletariat "acquiring its own experience" is identified with work in non-revolutionary and even reactionary mass organizations, which is

only one aspect of the proletariat gaining its own experience. Furthermore, all these organizations are called "organizations of the workers." Neglecting such absurdities as calling student councils "organizations of the workers," this also marks an amazing change of attitude to the trade unions. The reactionary trade unions are composed of workers (and a certain stratum of bureaucrats), but this is not the only criterion for a workers' organization. Proletarian trade unions and trade union forms cannot be confused with the reactionary, counter-revolutionary and often downright fascist trade unions. At one time you had a different attitude to the reactionary trade unions and even stressed that they were integrated into the state apparatus. But now this speech presents another zigzag. As is typical with your zigzags, you do not explain the reason for your change in views but simply allow several different views to coexist together eclectically.

Similarly, the electoral front is presented as a new front of work, as if your Party had not been engaged in serious work on the electoral front for years. For example, your work in the 1972 federal election campaign is assessed in the Political Report to the Second Congress of the CPC(M-L). But instead great expectations were created concerning the election and such things as the plan to distribute nearly 5.5 million copies of the election program. As a result a certain euphoria was created about this alleged new world which had been found. In summing up the results of the election campaign, the chairman of your Party pointed out the following:

"Because this euphoria was created, an advance [in the federal election campaign of early 1980 — ed.] did not take place in terms of the increased support amongst the workers and the broad masses of the people."

"...because the comrades did not pay serious attention to linking themselves with the broad masses of the people, a breakthrough was not made in the election." (PCDN, "Comrade Bains Addresses a Meeting of Party Activists in Toronto to Sum Up the Election Results," February 25, 1980, p. 2, col. 5, 6, emphasis added)

However we disagree on the cause of the euphoria. The speech gives certain reasons, but we believe that the cause for it should be sought in the assessment and orientation given for the 1980's in the speech of December 30, 1979 and the New Year's speeches and elsewhere. Indeed, in the passages we have cited from the summation of the elections, it is revealed that there were thoughts that this election would bring a "breakthrough." As we pointed out in Section XIV-D, the Communiqué from the 7th Plenum of the CC of the CPC(M-L) even went to

the extreme of denouncing the parliamentary cretinists for not making use of electoral possibilities. It is clear that the euphoria was a reflection of the assessment concerning how to make a "breakthrough" in the elections. This idea of the imminent breakthrough is part and parcel of the whole tone of the orientation of the 1980's, which writes off the work of the Party in the 1970's and paints new prospects allegedly available with a turn to the right.

These speeches also give a series of other rightist views. On the question of illegal methods of organizing, they state that your Party will use them "if this is necessary." (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 4, col. 4) Well, are they necessary or have you put off their use into some indefinite time in the future? As well, you continue and deepen your longstanding error concerning the "middle strata" by which you mean certain sections of the "middle bourgeoisie" or "non-monopoly bourgeoisie" or what you formerly called the "national bourgeoisie." We shall deal with this serious error, which is blatantly anti-Marxist-Leninist theoretically and very dangerous in practice, in the future. For now we note that you are wrong both in your assessment of the role of the middle bourgeoisie in the socialist revolution and also in your idea of how the proletariat rallies its actual allies around itself.

The rightist views from these speeches grew and "flowered" during the federal election campaign of your Party in early 1980. For example, on the question of war, you gave the view of boycotting war, for the workers to reply to the threat of war by "not participat(ing) in the war-oriented economic sector, that is, in those factories and mines which are directly being used in these war preparations." (PCDN, Feb. 2, 1980, p. 2, col. 2) The organization of the workers in the war industries and their involvement in struggle is an important front for a Marxist-Leninist party, but this is quite a different thing from encouraging illusions that war can be stopped by depriving the war industries of workers. And as well you put forward as a central issue that the Canadian people should not permit any foreign troops on their soil. This restricts the issue to the struggle against the imperialist bourgeoisie outside Canada, the imperialist bourgeoisie of other countries. And you make this appeal at a time when Canada is already under the jackboot of U.S. impe-

rialism and the Canadian bourgeoisie is thoroughly enmeshed with the U.S. and Western imperialist bourgeoisie. Perhaps if such a call were an immediate agitational appeal in a struggle against certain definite troops in certain particular situations, it could be understood, but at the present it is a dangerous slogan as Canada could be involved in a war on the side of U.S. imperialism in which the Canadian people are suppressed by Canadian and not U.S. troops and in which the call is given to fight the threatening Soviet troops.

In many ways this rightism reaches a high point with the election program in the February 15 issue of PCDN. This program undertakes to out-promise the bourgeois parties in terms of how to end the crisis independent of the development of the socialist revolution. It gives no call at all to the mass struggle of the masses on the economic and political fronts. The only exception is on the issue of war preparations, where it calls on the people "to oppose all imperialist blocs and powers" and not to side with "one bloc or the other," that is, it calls for struggle against the imperialist bourgeoisie outside Canada. The election program thus undertakes to promise how to get Canada out of the all-round crisis without mass struggle and revolution. It gives a series of economic panaceas and schemes and it creates the illusion that the structure of the Canadian economy can be reshaped and the "financial oligarchs" expropriated through voting in the Marxist-Leninist Party of Canada. The program calls for "guarantee (ing) the right to self-determination and secession for the nation of Quebec, ...protect(ing) the rights of the Acadians and eliminat(ing) regional disparities and restor(ing) the hereditary rights of the Native people" and "defend(ing) the sovereignty of Canada and the democratic liberties and freedoms of the people" by "proclaim(ing) a new constitution." The program is absolutely silent about the measures that would be necessary as a prerequisite for any serious assault on monopoly capitalism. It is a program without the revolution whatsoever and without socialism too, although at one point it does insist that some enterprises should "be run on a socialist basis." How enterprises can be run on a socialist basis in a presumably non-socialist state is never explained. Volumes could be written about the utter rightism of this program.

XIV-I: You deny the enigma of China in order to create an aura of your own infallibility

In the speech of December 30, 1979, you also denounce the concept of the "enigma of China." The speech states:

"This was the mistake on the assessment of Mao Zedong and 'Mao Zedong Thought.' When we say it was a mistake, it is not for the

reason that some people are now suggesting, that Mao Zedong and China were not very well known to us. When Comrade Enver Hoxha talks about this he is saying something entirely different to what these people are suggesting. As far as our Party is concerned, we, with

open eyes, knowing that Teng Xiaoping and others were revisionist, knowing that they were counter-revolutionaries aligning with all kinds of reactionary forces on the world scale, said that Mao Zedong was a Marxist-Leninist, while these others were not." (PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 3-4, emphasis as in the original)

"But, for no reason whatsoever, [oh come now, was it just blind chance? — ed.] they [articles in PCDN of September 1977 — ed.] say that Mao Zedong also supports these correct positions, that Mao Zedong is also a Leninist." (Ibid., col. 4)

Here you hypocritically state that you agree with what Comrade Enver Hoxha says about the "enigma of China," but not with what some unspecified other people are saying. But you never explain exactly what conception of "enigma of China" you allegedly agree with, and how it differs from the conception of the "enigma of China" that you are denouncing. In fact, there was a time when you were somewhat more honest on this question. In the discussions between our two Parties of late May 1979, your representative disagreed openly with the view of the PLA, said that the PLA and our Party had the same view on this question, and stated that the leadership of your Party couldn't understand why Albania sees an enigma. In later discussions, however, you began to resort to brutal hypocrisy. You stated a purely hypocritical agreement with the PLA's talk about an "enigma of China," but said that this concept only could be used by the PLA, and that it couldn't be talked about in the U.S. or Canada or presumably anywhere outside Albania. This of course is absurd. The questions of the enigma of China and of the forms and methods used by the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party to create this enigma, including the withholding of essential information on the Party, state, and economy, the keeping of all theoretical literature in a state of confusion, the vacillating and zigzagging policies of the Chinese leadership, the hiding of the line behind the constant interpretation and reinterpretation of stereotyped propaganda formulae or of six-word quotations from Mao Zedong, the arbitrary attribution of every crime or of anything that isn't convenient to the "second or bourgeois headquarters" in the Party, and so forth, are objective phenomena. It is not a question of who analyzes China, but of what the Chinese leadership itself did. The evaluation of the "enigma of China," just like the evaluation of Mao Zedong Thought itself, cannot differ from country to country. If you disagree with the concept of "the enigma of China," you of course have the right to set forward your views concerning the analysis of Chinese revisionism on this question as well as in general. This you don't

do. But when you fight against the conception of "the enigma of China" while posing as the greatest defenders of the views of the PLA on this question, when you attack unspecified defenders of the concept of the "enigma of China" and accuse them of disagreeing, not just with you, but with the PLA, this is not only hypocrisy, it is downright treachery. It means that you are waging an unprincipled war not just against our Party and its Marxist-Leninist positions on the "enigma of China" and the analysis of Chinese revisionism, but also against certain ideological positions of the PLA.

In opposing the concept of the "enigma of China," you try to create the impression that to say there was an "enigma" is simply to make an excuse for oneself. What a philistine conception! You do not regard the concept of the "enigma of China" as a serious indictment of the Chinese leadership. Nor do you analyze this concept in itself. Instead you regard this concept from the purely pragmatic angle of what use this or that person might make of it in this or that situation. But it is clear that the question of the errors or weakness of this or that party in respect to Chinese revisionism and the question of the anti-Marxist-Leninist forms and methods used by the Chinese leadership to create a big mystery concerning the stand of the Chinese Communist Party are distinct and separate questions, although with a certain relationship. And furthermore, our Party readily accepted the analysis of the "enigma of China" because it corresponded with our experience in trying to analyze the Chinese positions during the study we undertook on Mao Zedong Thought. You on the other hand claim that there is no enigma, that everything is clear to you, but at the same time you don't have a serious analysis of Mao Zedong Thought. Indeed you have simply reduced the question of repudiating Mao Zedong to such meaningless generalities about "campaigns" and "movements" and the contradiction between correct and incorrect that the question of the analysis of the actual stands and theories of Chinese revisionism is obscured.

Hence, while you pretend humility and present your negation of the concept of "the enigma of China" as a sign of modesty, the slightest examination of your stand on this question shows that it is part of your claim to infallibility. You posture as the most self-critical and soul-searching on the issue of Mao Zedong Thought. But in fact you are cultivating an aura of infallibility around your Party and its history and presenting things as if your Party was always right, was always the most advanced of all parties and that it was only dragged down into serious errors by its big "heart" for the international movement. You claim that for you there was no "enigma," you saw everything clearly concerning the Communist Party of China, were clear on every-

thing, but simply "for no reason" made a mistake in thinking that Mao was Marxist-Leninist and the others weren't. This assertion of yours that you attributed Marxist-Leninist positions to Mao "for no reason" is a powerful proof of your attempt to present yourself as all-knowing. It vividly shows that you are negating the concept of "enigma of China" not in order to avoid explaining away your mistakes and weaknesses, but precisely to gloss over the issues at stake.

Your thesis that you supported Mao "for no reason" also conflicts with the public documents of your Party. Consider the Political Resolution of the Third Congress of the CPC(M-L) of 1977. The first point of this resolution praised Mao Zedong very highly, stating that this "revolutionary authority was of the same caliber as the authority of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin" and pointing explicitly to a number of theories and alleged contributions of Mao, such as "fortifying the countryside to encircle the cities," and so forth. If you were clear on all the matters of the theory of Chinese revisionism, then why did you endorse these theories? It is clear that you are denouncing the concept of "the enigma of China" not as a sign of humility and still less in order to probe more deeply into the errors of Chinese revisionism, but precisely in order to gloss over and obscure the theoretical weaknesses in your Party and to reduce the repudiation of Mao Zedong Thought to vague generalities and platitudes.

Your presentation of yourself as infallible continues to the point that you say that to have opposed Mao Zedong Thought in 1968-1970 would have put one in the same camp as the class enemy. The New Year's speeches state:

"We re-organized the Internationalists in 1968 on the basis of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Some people look back and say that it was very strange that we re-established the Internationalists, and later the Party, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. The most petty-minded liberal elements, who don't want to do any work for the Party are coming around to say that the Party should do more self-criticism on this question...."

"The fact of the matter is that if you relive the 1968-1970 period, you find that to take up a position against China at that time, against Mao Zedong and against 'Mao Zedong Thought', would have placed you in the reactionary camp, in the real sense of the word — not just that some people would characterize you as a reactionary, but your activities would be in the service of the bourgeoisie." (PCDN, Jan. 5, 1980, p. 2, col. 4)

Here you defend that your Party was absolutely right

to defend and propagate Mao Zedong Thought, for otherwise its activities "would be in the service of the bourgeoisie." Since you cannot deny that your Party supported the formulation Mao Zedong Thought and was confused about various theories, you defend the infallibility of your leadership by saying that this was absolutely necessary for the period 1968-1970 in order to be opposed to the bourgeoisie. What shameless glossing over of mistakes and weaknesses! What utter rot! This passage from your assessment of the 1970's is utter sophistry, for it confuses the question of denouncing China and Mao Zedong in that period with the question of taking up Mao Zedong Thought. To have refused to take up Mao Zedong Thought in that period would have been a good thing that would have been helpful to the progress of the revolution, not something in service of the bourgeoisie. For example, the Sixth Congress of the PLA in 1971, while vigorously supporting China and Mao Zedong, put forward its views in positive form on a number of issues that were being confused by Mao Zedong Thought and presented the correct theses and also refused to take up Mao Zedong Thought as the banner of the Party. The whole point of your confusing these two separate things — the defense of China and the taking up of Mao Zedong Thought — is to justify your positions of the time.

You continue to present yourself as infallible in the speech "The Road of the Party." There you present the leadership of your Party as "infallible" and any mistakes as "justifiable mistakes" (in the PCDN version of the speech) or "understandable mistakes" (in the pamphlet version) which "could not be otherwise." You stress this repeatedly. For example, "The Road of the Party" states:

"There are mistakes which were justifiable mistakes, taking into account the actual historical conditions of the period in a concrete manner. The founding of the Party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and 'Mao Zedong Thought' in 1970 was such a justifiable mistake for the period. It could not be otherwise. But our Party, in its life and activity of 10 years, never looked at this mistake with smug complacency and never tailed behind events. [Oh no, you just insist in March 1980 that this mistake was "justifiable" and that "it could not be otherwise." But there is no "smug complacency." Never! — ed.]...." (PCDN, April 2, 1980, p. 3, col. 3, emphasis added)

"Thus, for our Party, while adoption of Marxism-Leninism and 'Mao Zedong Thought' was a justifiable mistake, it was not justified to take the road of 'new method.' This entire line of 'new method' was finally defeated by the

convening of the Second Congress of the Party in March 1973. [The "new method" was supported by the Second Congress and explicitly reendorsed at the Third Congress of the CPC (M-L) in 1977, as we have pointed out in Section XIV-E of this letter. — ed.]" (*Ibid.*, col. 4)

"During the period of 1970-1973, that is, the period between the First and Second Congresses, the Party made serious mistakes in terms of its tactics under the influence of 'Mao Zedong Thought.' [Here you are trying to claim that everything was rectified by the Second Congress. As we have seen in the case of "new methods," this is not true. You are constantly trying to minimize and downplay the issue of the repudiation of Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought and present the leadership of your Party as having dealt with the matter long ago. — ed.] *It could not be otherwise.*" (PCDN, April 3, 1980, p. 3, col. 4, emphasis added)

Indeed, you go to the extent of blaming your errors and theoretical weaknesses on the international movement and so forth. Thus, "The Road of the Party" states:

"And this [the adoption by your Party of Mao Zedong Thought — ed.] was right during the period when our Party was founded, was extremely inexperienced and lacked the vigorous sympathy and support of the genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties, which our Party enjoys today." (PCDN, April 2, 1980, p. 3, col. 3, emphasis added)

Thus in the passage above you blame the adoption of Mao Zedong Thought on lack of contact with the Marxist-Leninist parties, while in the passage from this same speech which we quote below you blame it on the views of these same parties among other factors:

"At that time, when *the climate internationally and nationally* was that 'Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought' was the highest development, such a mistake was justifiable." (*Ibid.*, col. 4, emphasis added)

Both these passages agree however in blaming the error on someone else. And this last passage is absolutely astonishing: it is the theory that it is "justifiable" to float with every breeze, both internationally and nationally. So much for your assertion that you "never tailed behind events"!

All this reveals the complete hypocrisy behind your alleged self-criticism that "We must admit openly that it [the CPC(M-L) at the time of its founding in 1970 — ed.] was more (inspired by) 'Mao Zedong Thought' than Marxism-Leninism." (The speech of Dec. 30, 1979, PCDN, Jan. 3, 1980, p. 2, col. 2) On one hand you make such a sweeping statement, on the other hand you maintain that you were always clear on the issues involved and that you attributed Marxist-Leninist positions to Mao "for no reason whatsoever." With your sweeping statements and vague meaningless generalities you are actually opposing the serious consideration of the history of your Party and the development of the repudiation of Mao Zedong Thought. Instead of seriously analyzing the accomplishments and weaknesses of your Party, you are glossing over the theoretical weaknesses and instead squirming this way and that to prove that your leadership is infallible, that its mistakes were "justifiable" and that things "could not be otherwise." You are opposing the concept of the "enigma of China" precisely in order to replace it with the concept of the infallibility of your Party and to oppose the further repudiation of Mao Zedong Thought and Chinese revisionism under the pretext that everything is clear.

* * * *

This brings us to the conclusion of our letter. We have carefully and painstakingly assessed the situation in detail. And we have thoroughly and all-sidedly analyzed the immediate ideological issues involved. It is our sincere desire that the leadership of your Party considers carefully and reflects seriously upon the extremely important issues our letter has raised. We are confident that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) will summon the necessary courage to soberly face the present grave situation which has been created between our two Parties and for which it alone bears the full responsibility. Our Marxist-Leninist Parties are fearless and do not shy from their duty because above all else they are loyal to the proletariat and to the immortal teachings of Marxism-Leninism.

Communist regards,

Central Committee
Marxist-Leninist Party of the USA