

# EDITORIAL

This issue of *Revolution* has been published late, after a long interval. It should have been published at the beginning of the year, but was postponed so that the internal struggle against the Anti-League Faction could be summed up. Inevitably, following such a two-line struggle, there is much work to do and priorities have to be re-ordered but following this delay *Revolution* will now resume regular publication.

In January of this year the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain expelled Neil Redfern, former Secretary of the Central Committee and Phil Dixon, another Central Committee member, for bourgeois factionalism after they had set up a faction consisting of three individuals. This was an open faction which all three openly boasted about. They were later joined by one other rank and file member.

The forming of the faction in December 1978 was only the culmination of a process of development and exposure in which Redfern has arrogantly refused to approach contradictions between comrades in the spirit of "Unite, Don't Split". Despite mounting criticism on the Central Committee and by the rank and file of the League he dug in his heels and became an incorrigible splittist.

In the course of struggle about the application of the theory of the three worlds to British conditions, Redfern finally came out attacking some basic aspects of the theory itself. In spite of the fact that he constantly claimed to be in favour of a "revolutionary" application of it the Anti-League Faction was finally formed opportunistically by allying with P Dixon who had suddenly come out and attacked the theory of the three worlds as "opportunist"; Dixon has since stated that China is a revisionist and social imperialist state.

Since their expulsion the faction have now launched themselves on the Marxist-Leninist movement under a new signboard. They have made themselves publically known in their first pamphlet under the name "Communist Unity". A fine title for a gang of splitters. But this statement only serves to show their opportunism. They claim to be fighting revisionism, but manage to avoid all mention of the theory of the three worlds, which is one of the major lines of demarcation with revisionism. This is how "principled" their fight is.

Even the name they have chosen exposes their opportunism. They hoped to give the impression in the document that the split was between the two founding organisations of the RCL - the old Communist Federation of Britain (ML), and the Communist Unity Association (ML). They refer a number of times to "the CFB/RCL" in their pamphlet. But this is a calculated lie on their part. The unity achieved at the Founding Congress of the League in 1977 has stood the test of time. Of those in the faction, only two were former members of the CUA. There has been no split along the lines of the founding organisations of the League.

The faction chose to struggle for their political line by attacking democratic centralism - the fighting organisational principle of the proletariat. The reason for this was their petty-bourgeois individualism and arrogance. Why was this? It was because the success of the RCL in winning victories against small group mentality meant that petty-

bourgeois individualism, which is at the root of small group mentality had to come out in a different form - the form of splittism. It was in this way that the ideological influence of the "Gang of Four" appeared in the RCL - in the splittist and anarchistic methods of struggle of the Anti-League faction.

The reason put forward by the faction for attacking democratic centralism was that struggle was being suppressed. Indeed a certain type of struggle was suppressed - splittist and factionalist struggle. In contrast to this proletarian struggle, struggle to reach unity at a higher level in the interests of the working class, including the right of comrades to criticise what they believe to be revisionist errors in the interests of strengthening our fighting capacity, has not been suppressed, and will not be.

In summing up the lessons of the struggle against the faction the League has learnt some valuable lessons. Lenin's classic work *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* proved to be a major guide in drawing these lessons from our experience. This was mainly because the two line struggle was one between Bolshevism and Menshevism. It was a question of pushing ahead with the reconstruction of the revolutionary Communist Party, or going back to the old circles. The faction could not learn the fundamental lesson taught by Lenin many years ago, when he said:

*"In its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon than organisation... the proletariat can become, and inevitably will become an invincible force only when its ideological unification by the principles of Marxism is consolidated by the material unity of an organisation which will weld millions of toilers into an army of the working class..."* (Lenin *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* Beijing Edition PP 279-280)

The faction on the other hand always counterposed politics to organisation insisting that because they opposed key lines and policies of the League they had the right to place themselves above League discipline. A number of examples of this are given in the article on the Faction in this issue.

The faction's standpoint was a throwback to the days of the circles. It is a stand which Lenin exposed many years ago as the class stand of the petty-bourgeois intellectual:

*"It is not the proletariat, but certain intellectuals in our party who lack self-training in the spirit of organisation and discipline, in the spirit of hostility and contempt for anarchist phrasemongering".* (Lenin *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* Beijing Edition pp 245-246)

Again at the RSDLP Congress Lenin showed that the Menshevik attempt to weaken the Party organisationally was just a prelude to the attempt to impose incorrect lines on the Party. This was the case with the faction. The lines of Redfern, later adopted by the faction were put forward increasingly at a time when democratic centralist channels had already been subverted to a certain extent. The faction knew that their lines would be more easily exposed if they fought for them through the correct channels. Hence their constant appeals over the heads of the Central Committee. In the case of the faction, as in the case of the

Mensheviks, "opportunism in programme is naturally connected with opportunism in tactics and opportunism in organisation".

The political line of the faction was indeed a left opportunist one. In future issues of *Revolution* this line will be further exposed. But the most clear exposure of their opportunism was the final reconciliation of opponents and so-called "supporters" of the three worlds theory "All the offended forgot their scores against each other, fell weeping into each others arms, and raised the banner of "revolt against Leninism"." (ibid p269).

The RCL has now spent time in summing up these lessons. The first step was to firmly nail the splittism of the faction. But it is also necessary to strengthen the League and to rectify errors, especially those promoted by the faction, and which led to their period of ascendancy. So it is also necessary to nail left opportunist idealism in ideological and political line. It is through this process that the RCL will emerge stronger and more tempered.

# THE ANTI-LEAGUE FACTION

## its history and main features

In January, the RCL expelled a tiny faction of three members for forming themselves into a faction and attempting to split the organisation. This faction consisted of N Redfern, the former Secretary of the RCL, P Dixon, a member of the Political Committee, and a rank-and-file member. Shortly afterwards, they were joined by a second rank-and-file member.

This grouplet has already exposed itself to the Marxist-Leninist movement through publishing a pamphlet called *Exposure and Defeat of the RCLB's Social Chauvinism is a Major Task in Party Building.* (see *Class Struggle* Vol.3 No.2). This pamphlet is published under the name "Communist Unity".

Throughout this pamphlet, they fail at any time to state clearly their own political stand. Do they support the theory of the three worlds as a new strategic line of the international communist movement? Do they denounce China as revisionist? as an aggressor against Vietnam? or uphold China as a socialist state? Where do they stand? They do not say. Many of the attacks on the RCL in the pamphlet are based on attacks made by one or other of them when they were in the RCL, but opposed by the others. On some they have shifted their position since they were in the RCL. This constant shifting of position by them is not new. As Lenin said, "*You cannot catch an opportunist with a formula.*"

The style of work of the faction is thoroughly opportunist. They sabotaged the proletarian democracy of the RCL in relations between the centre and the districts, and they sabotaged it through making principled struggle on the Central Committee impossible. Later, they attacked the centralism of the RCL. Finally, after a major struggle against Redfern's splittism, P Dixon helped to build a faction as a final attack on the Democratic Centralism of the RCL with the clear intention of splitting the organisation. They failed. They were expelled. It is on the question of Democratic Centralism and all that it entails, including conscientious criticism and self-criticism, and seeking truth from facts that the major line of demarcation was drawn. This in itself was opposed by the faction, who characterise the RCL's emphasis on these correct ideological principles as "the absurd elevation of organisational and petty matters to the position of the highest principle." They metaphysically counterpose basic questions of style of work and the strengthening of Democratic Centralism to "ideological and political line". This is a total failure to grasp that these questions are precisely fundamental questions of "ideological" line, and that they are indispensable to any principled struggle to reach political clarity and unity at a higher level. It is not surprising that their pamphlet shows no sign of greater political clarity on their part.

## REPUDIATING BOURGEOIS FACTIONALISM

The faction was formed in December. In early January they produced a thoroughly splittist document "appealing" to the membership of the RCL. In it they admit that they had been working together. In innocent terms they add that they "did so openly but have been accused of bourgeois factionalism." They had the vain hope, characteristic of their contempt for rank-and-file comrades, that RCL members were too naive to know that the issue of "openness" or "secrecy" was totally irrelevant, and that either way they had flagrantly attacked Democratic Centralism and had indeed established a bourgeois faction. This opportunist mask of injured innocence, like much of their statements was an out-and-out fraud. P Dixon himself stated at a meeting of the Political Committee in December: "My association with comrade Redfern is an open one, and I know it is a factional one." Trotsky's faction in the CPSU(B) was "open". It makes not one bit of difference.

Their tiny clique had been meeting behind closed doors to plan their strategy and tactics for overthrowing the line and leadership of the RCL, rather than working as individuals in their own units and committees. The establishment of such a faction is nothing less than a declaration of causing a split. It is a demonstration that they had thrown out of the window any idea of struggling over a period of time for their line, whilst testing the line of the RCL in practice. Such factionalism has not been tolerated by any other communist organisation. It was not tolerated by the RCL.

The faction complain in their pamphlet that their document was suppressed. It was suppressed for one reason - to uphold the principles of Democratic Centralism. The faction claims that the "real" reason was to suppress political struggle. Yet three weeks later, the Central Committee circulated a criticism of their document and the document itself to the entire rank-and-file!

The faction set itself up as a separate organisation within the RCL. Its utter hypocrisy is apparent when it berates the "bureaucratic centralism" of the RCL for upholding the united face of leading committees, and the principle of allowing those who hold a minority view to "reserve their views" whilst struggling "in an orderly manner." Yet simultaneously, the Anti-League Faction "struggled for unity" among themselves (something they refused to do with the vast majority of RCL comrades) and where they could not agree they adopted the "principle" of the united face of the faction, and avoided criticising each other in the RCL! So, for example, they do not mention the "theory of the three worlds" in either ~~the~~ document they circulated in the RCL, or in their public pamphlet. Why? Because whilst they are indeed united in their opposition to it, N Redfern poses as a solid supporter, whilst P Dixon openly attacks it as revisionist. As P Dixon himself said to the Central Committee at the beginning of December: "many arguments are put which thoroughly refute the theory of the three worlds but which do not make the final break with this opportunist thesis. Such are the arguments of NR. But that does not matter a lot, at least for the time being." Yet the faction attack the RCL for allowing comrades to "reserve their views" when in a minority, instead of expelling them! But the faction will have their unity at all costs, even on the basis of an opportunist compromise.

## THE FACTION WAS THE OUTCOME OF SPLITTIST ATTACKS

The establishment of a faction was itself only the culmination of a vicious splittist campaign waged by N Redfern. It was the result of N Redfern's attempt to change the line of the RCL, not through patient and principled struggle and criticism, but through the means of waging a personal war of extermination against the Chairman of the RCL, and on the basis of demagoguery. Opportunistically he first directed his fire at an individual, when in reality, as the faction only admitted at the very end, he was attacking the Manifesto of the RCL itself. His tactics were to sling more and more mud at an individual. It was a splittist stand from the start. The RCL took a stand that the principled method of struggle was to "nail errors, not comrades". He went on. It reached an extreme form when he denounced the Chairman as a "traitor to the working class". He had no desire to struggle for clarity and unity at a higher level, and thus strengthen the ideological and political line of the RCL.

The first time he brought a major political difference to the Central Committee in June 1978, he proposed that at the next Congress of the RCL the united face of the Central Committee and the Political Committee should be dropped. He kept up this demand through to his expulsion. The Central Committee refused to discuss the form of the next Congress until preparations for it were begun. The real issue was why N Redfern raised it at that time and continued to raise it. It was because he never had any intention of struggling consistently to win the Central Committee to his position, but looked only to making a grand demagogic appeal to the rank-and-file. He denied that principled struggle is the means to reach unity and rejected unity on a higher level as the aim of inner-party struggle. He had no faith in the Central Committee at all.

In December, the faction opportunistically shifted its position again. At that time, once they had made a definite decision to split the organisation, they attacked the concept of having a united face of the Central Committee at all. This was not a principled line of demarcation. They had always claimed to support it before. It was a new line only because it served their immediate aims of splitting the RCL. The united face of the Central Committee exists precisely to ensure that struggle is carried out in a principled manner and to avoid the germs of splittism. The main duty of the Central Committee is to give leadership to the RCL as a whole. Principled struggle should take place on the Central Committee. Once a decision is taken it is taken to the rank-and-file. They have the right to hear the reasons behind the decisions that have been taken, and to struggle with the leading comrade representing the Central Committee. This clarifies their viewpoint. They make criticism upwards to the Central Committee. As they carry out a decision and test them in practice, they make further criticisms showing through experience what was right and what was wrong. It is the task of the Central Committee to sum up these criticisms in a self-critical manner. Always the line is strengthened. Sometimes it is proven quite wrong and the minority position is strengthened. The struggle goes on the Central Committee. The minority on the Central Committee not only have the right but the duty to speak out on the most authoritative committee in the RCL and argue their viewpoint. Through the process of Democratic Centralism, theory becomes even more integrated with

practice. This is true also of general analysis, as the rank-and-file centralise their opinions basing them on what is actually happening in the world. All comrades including leading comrades have some one-sidedness and see only part of the picture. Through the process of Democratic Centralism the organisation becomes more all-sided.

The faction's stand on Democratic Centralism replaces this proletarian stand with a fine-sounding appeal for the rights of the individual. They separate theory and practice and see inner-party struggle as a war to the death between abstract ideas. They show contempt for rank-and-file comrades by crying that the RCL can only be "saved" if N Redfern is allowed to make a personal appeal. No rank-and-file comrade, they think, can come to a "correct understanding" and make criticisms of Central Committee decisions without his individual leadership. Through their organisational "principles" they would encourage leading comrades to try to win "their" local units as their personal mountain strongholds. They would undermine collective Central Committee leadership. They would sabotage patient and conscientious struggle for clarity and unity at a higher level on the Central Committee and replace it with constant demagogic appeals to the rank-and-file. They would reduce the communist organisation to an irrelevant sect permanently consuming itself in internal warfare.

And, as they promised, they would, in fact, sabotage genuine proletarian democracy by expelling all comrades holding a minority position once a decision has been reached, rather than testing the line in practice. That is the reality of ultra-democracy, of bourgeois democracy. As we shall see N Redfern sabotaged proletarian democracy in other ways as well.

N Redfern's splittism took other forms besides unprincipled personal attacks and opportunist switches in his stand on Democratic Centralism. Once he had unleashed his campaign, he threw issue after issue into the melting pot. At every meeting he had changed his mind on half a dozen issues and demanded that they be debated immediately. He mixed up major issues with minor issues and prevented progress on important struggles by raising many new secondary ones. He answered criticisms of his stand on one line, with an attack about another, and used this to reduce the struggle to a struggle between two personalities. This relentless attack inevitably partially paralysed the centre, constantly side-tracked the struggle over the main issues and sowed confusion - as it was meant to do.

Inevitably this led to the demand to struggle in an "orderly manner" to which he again replied that the Political Committee and the Central Committee were trying to "reduce" the struggle to "petty" issues of method of work. Inevitably this led to action against him at the centre. First, in September, he was removed from the position of National Secretary, then he was removed from the Political Committee, when he refused to make a self-criticism for his splittism. But, even then, he was allowed to remain on the Central Committee and put forward his views! He was finally expelled only after he formed a faction. All these steps were supported by the membership of the RCL. Now the faction turn round and attack the RCL for "suppressing political struggle". No! It was N Redfern who suppressed principled political struggle through his splittism, and the Central Committee after experiencing it for some time took steps to suppress splittism whilst still giving N Redfern a

way out. What is more P Dixon who is now part of the faction propagating the lie that N Redfern was silenced because of his political line knows this well because he himself supported the initial disciplinary action against N Redfern at a meeting of the Central Committee in September 1978, as did every other member of the Central Committee. It was only at a Political Committee meeting in November 1978, at the same time as P Dixon came out with an open attack on the theory of the three worlds and on the People's Republic of China that he simultaneously and opportunistically changed his line against splittism.

When the Central Committee, in December, had the gall to unanimously (apart from NR and PD) remove NR from the Political Committee, P Dixon walked out of the meeting with N Redfern in protest. This was the only time that they were unable to put their political line at any meeting of their committees, but it was only their self-enforced absence which prevented them from doing so. Even then P Dixon said, "I uphold the Democratic Centralism of the RCL", and added, "I have not vacillated on the question of Democratic Centralism." He went on: "I am mentally prepared for a protracted struggle." Yet within days, he had formed a faction with N Redfern and a rank-and-file member! The scenario that the faction tried to paint (in its January document "appealing" to the RCL rank-and-file) of the "minority" ie NR and PD being suppressed by the "majority" for "nearly a year" is an out-and-out lie. But, of course, "any means necessary" - including lies - are acceptable in the "struggle against revisionism", and the RCL is dealing with "petty matters" again!

The faction claims in its pamphlet that struggle over political line is not permitted. We have seen what they are really covering up! Political struggle continues in the RCL in an "orderly manner" - how terrible! - at every level. The faction knows that just one example was a document dealing with some aspects of the international class struggle. Both P Dixon and N Redfern took full part in several struggles on the Political Committee over this document. Then they took full part in a struggle at the Central Committee. Then again they struggled on the PC. Finally it went back to the Central Committee in December. They did not take part then - but only because they walked out. All their amendments were even then voted on by the Central Committee. Finally, when it was sent to the full membership for discussion, N Redfern's main amendments were also circulated to enable comrades to draw a clear line of demarcation with his left opportunist distortion of the theory of the three worlds. This is how political struggle is "suppressed" in the RCL!

#### REDFERN'S BUREAUCRATIC LEADERSHIP

In a pathetic attempt to pose as the upholders of "democracy" against "bureaucratic centralism" in order to push what was really ultra-democracy, the faction claimed to the RCL membership in their document: "We stand for a Central Committee which encourages lower levels and the rank-and-file to use their heads...and question Central Committee directives, lines and policies...(and) feel free to voice their opinions." This is rich. No one can disagree with such a fine statement. But coming from N Redfern it only produced a roar of laughter. At the RCL Conference against splittism in March, rank-and-file members, cell leaders, district and branch secretaries got up,

one after the other, to denounce Redfern's activities as Secretary of the Central Committee. They gave example after example of his suppression of criticism and his refusal to make self-criticism. It was precisely N Redfern himself who as Secretary of the Central Committee wielded a sledgehammer against any lower committees who dared to criticise his leadership. It was N Redfern who attacked those who disagreed with him in a manner that suppressed democracy at every level. It was N Redfern who gave arbitrary instruction, who closed his ears when members told him that his demands were not practical, and who flew into a rage and spouted lofty phrases in retaliation, branding them as "revisionist" or "tailist". It was N Redfern's approach that totally divorced theory from practice, and that could not see a distinction between scientific revolutionary optimism and building castles in the air. In reality N Redfern demanded ultra-democracy for himself and bureaucracy for others.

All three matters are precisely fundamental questions of ideological line. From his stand on Democratic Centralism, to his arrogance, to his failure to practice self-criticism to his refusal to seek truth from facts, N Redfern backed by the faction, takes the class stand of the petit-bourgeoisie, whilst hiding behind a cloak of proud phrases.

#### THE IDEALIST METAPHYSICS OF THE FACTION ON PARTY BUILDING - THE RESULT OF DIVORCING THEORY FROM PRACTICE

Redfern was fond of proud phrases. This is one characteristic of the ultra-leftist who commonly mistakes his high-flown ideals for reality. The ultra-leftist relies on idealism as opposed to investigating reality. He prefers separating theory from practice to the struggle to integrate the two.

In total disregard for concrete reality and actual conditions, the faction wildly attacks the party-building strategy of the RCL. This "line" of theirs only started to be put together in their January document to the RCL membership and was added to in their public pamphlet. In particular, their latest addition is their opposition to the RCL's line on the struggle to unite the Marxist-Leninist movement. We have not the space to deal with this here. Instead we shall concentrate on the aspect of the RCL's work of building the party among the masses. This as a question of pace of work and of orientation of work. The two are inseparably related.

#### Practice! Practice! Practice!

Whilst he was Secretary of the Central Committee, N Redfern pushed a line of frantic activism (for others) in the RCL. At the beginning the RCL agreed with this. There was a need to be more active after the long period of internal struggle leading up to the founding of the RCL and the publication of its Manifesto. But N Redfern pushed "practice practice, practice" to such a limit that experience soon started to show the incorrectness of his line. Eventually N Redfern accepted that in fact, theory was still primary over practice, but he accepted it only in the realm of abstract ideas. At that point in summer 1978, the work of the RCL was running into problems. Members were so overworked in direct practice, that in most areas, there was no time to study or prepare for meetings. Firstly, this meant that leads from the Central Committee and from N Redfern were not being carefully studied

and criticised. Democracy was objectively being suppressed. N Redfern's response was a diatribe against the membership. Rather than looking for the cause of the problem, he accused them wholesale of suffering from "employee mentality". Secondly, it meant that comrades' grasp of theory and RCL policy was weakened. Practice began again to grope in the dark. Thirdly, experience was not properly summed up - again weakening the integration of theory and practice. Fourthly, less and less time was spent in working with the most advanced workers and revolutionary intellectuals and thus bringing supporters into membership. The obvious net result was that the development of practical activities was itself held back in the long term. N Redfern's "practice, practice, practice" line was sabotaging practice itself. When N Redfern accepted, with the Central Committee, that the line of "practice is primary" was wrong, and that practice should be guided by theory, he only accepted it in the realm of ideas. His response was ludicrously idealist. He proclaimed that the solution to the problem was to do even more practice, but to do a great deal more "theoretical work" on top. He showed his total inability to integrate theory with practice by refusing to investigate the actual situation by refusing to grasp that there are only 24 hours in a day; and by his inability to see that all aspects of our work need to be correctly and consciously balanced. What elementary facts we have to spell out.

#### Concentrating resources on the industrial working class.

The faction also attacked in their January document, the RCL's policy of concentrating its practical work at the present time on the working class. He demanded that the RCL lead the political struggles of all classes and strata in Britain. What proud revolutionary phrases! The RCL is still a small organisation with scarce resources. It is an immediate practical question to decide where we concentrate these scarce resources. When these elementary points were made, the faction's reply was to avoid the awful reality of the world and say "stop bleating, and get on with it!" The faction's demand that the RCL leads all struggles of all classes and strata betrays another aspect of their idealist outlook. Leadership is based on knowledge of seeking truth from facts; it is based on investigation of the particular contradictions; it is based on grasping the present level of the masses; it is based on learning from the masses. Only those who thoroughly reject the mass line (despite their protestations to the contrary) as the scientific method of leadership can demand that the RCL leads all struggles, even if that leadership was confined only to articles in our political paper *Class Struggle*. No wonder N Redfern could only say "You lead workers by leading them."

#### THE FACTION'S LIES ON RCL "ECONOMISM"

In the same manner the faction attacks the RCL for working "only in individual factories." Of course the RCL does not work in all factories. It could not! The faction goes on with the lie that the RCL is only interested in economic issues. They know that nearly all factory bulletins produced locally by RCL units have not only given a lead (it is another lie that the RCL gives no leadership) in economic struggles, and in the struggle to turn the unions into fighting class organisations but have also carried agitational material on the

oppression of national minorities in Britain; on the nature of the Labour Party, and the British imperialist state; on the struggle in Zimbabwe; on the two superpowers, and the struggle against hegemonism; on Kampuchea; on China's counter-attack against Vietnam's aggression: on Polish workers' struggles and the struggle for workers' trade unions in the USSR; on the Concordat, unemployment, technology etc, etc, etc. "Seeking truth from facts" is certainly not one of the faction's strong points! The factory work of the RCL is precisely carried out with the aim of building communist, not economist cells in the factories in order to ensure that the future party builds deep roots in the only really revolutionary class - the proletariat.

In fact the attack on the industrial work of the RCL is an attack on the general aim of ensuring that the revolutionary Communist Party will be a party organised primarily on factory branches. How the faction has retreated into revisionism. To them the factory is no longer where the workers are brought together in large numbers, where they are actually exploited and where they learn to unite. For them the factories are primarily places where workers have been split up by the bourgeoisie.

These examples ( and there are many more of them) show what a dangerous thing the left idealism of the faction was. Pushed mainly through Redfern's leadership it threatened to spread confusion and demoralisation throughout the RCL. It is certainly not better to be "left" than right.

#### LEARN FROM NEGATIVE EXAMPLES

The faction have given the Marxist-Leninist movement a lesson by negative example. They have rejected Democratic Centralism, the organisational principle of communism through which the proletarian organisation strives to integrate theory with practice, and to strengthen its collective and unified leadership. They have rejected principled and protracted struggle over major questions as the means to reach unity. They have rejected criticism and self-criticism as the indispensable motor that ensures that Democratic Centralism operates correctly. They have rejected the method of thorough investigation and seeking truth from facts. They have rejected the mass line as the scientific method of leadership.

All this they have replaced with a petit-bourgeois concept that truth is grasped in the course of a war to the death between abstract ideas and personalities. In such a stand, Democratic Centralism loses any real purpose and is replaced by a combination of ultra-democracy and bureaucracy. To such people, the task of communists becomes only to take those abstract ideas which have won out in the demagogic battle for supremacy to the working class with the cry of "this is the way - follow me."

This was the essence of the two-line struggle in the RCL. It was over such "petty matters" as style of work and organisational principle. This struggle was directed against splittism and the petit-bourgeois left idealism of the Anti-League Faction. In essence it was a question of whether to build a Bolshevik or a Menshevik organisation.