

C O N C L U S I O N

Comrades, we are extending this polemic in a spirit of unity-struggle-unity, to move forward the struggle for a Communist Party of the U.S. working class. The RWL is presently dominated by a "Left" opportunist line and so we call on honest comrades inside the organization to struggle to uphold the interests of the class.

There are comrades in the organization we are confident are honest even though the leadership of the organization is, at this point thoroughly bankrupt. But many comrades in the organization are vacillating over this raggedly "Left" line, the basis of much of this vacillation being bourgeois nationalism. We hope that honest cadre will conduct the struggle to root out this "Left" opportunist line, that it be undertaken in a deep and searching way. While the "Left" line and the bourgeois nationalism are both obstacles to building the party, overcoming both of these will be major steps forward to building a multinational communist Party of the U.S. working class, a party able to organize the whole working class for the purpose of overthrowing the bourgeoisie and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

A. Contradictions in the Development of the RWL: Bourgeois Nationalism and The Dominance of the "Left" Line

The emergence of a "Left" trend in the U.S. communist movement is historically conditioned. It is a reaction to the dominant forms of communist deviations in U.S. history, and especially in the last period, led by OL and the RCP.

Recent developments in the U.S. communist movement are in the opposite direction from what Lenin described as the course of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party at the beginning of this century. Lenin explained the turn to economism at that time in this way:

"In our opinion the ground has been prepared for this sad state of affairs by three circumstances. First, in their early activity, Russian Social Democrats restricted themselves merely to do work in propaganda circles. When we took up agitation among the masses we were not always able to restrain ourselves from going to the other extreme. Secondly, in our early activity we often had to struggle for our right to existence against the Narodnaya Volya adherents, who understood by "politics" an activity isolated from the working class movement and who reduced politics purely to conspiratorial struggle. In rejecting this sort of politics, the Social Democrats went to the extreme of pushing politics entirely into the background. Thirdly, working in the isolation of small local workers' circles, the Social Democrats did not devote sufficient attention to the necessity of organizing a revolutionary party which would combine all the activities of the local groups and make it possible to organize the revolutionary work on correct lines. The predominance of isolated work is naturally connected with the predominance of the economic struggle."

Today, in reaction to the economist, spontaneous, nature of much of the prior work done by the communist movement in general led by OL and RCP and including the work done by RWL, RWL has resolutely turned away from the mass struggle and retreated to restricted work in propaganda circles. From an immersion in the spontaneous economic struggles of the masses RWL turned to a view of politics as "an activity isolated from the working class movement," and finally they have turned away from organizing a political party that would "combine all the revolutionary work of the local groups" to the formation of a self contained sect.

As Lenin said of "Leftism": it is a price we pay for the opportunist sins of the working class movement."

RWL's bourgeois nationalism is also a reaction to a more prevalent and dangerous dominant trend: white chauvinism in the working class movement and in the communist movement. More significantly, it is also a reaction to the brutal history of slavery and national oppression that accompanied the development of U.S. capitalism. In both the communist and the working class movement it is white chauvinism which is the main danger, and the main obstacle to unifying the multinational working class and its vanguard.

RWL began as an outgrowth of the Black Liberation Movement, and it included many organizations and individuals who had been in the Pan Africanist wing of the movement. It was developed and led by those elements who turned to M-L. But the original basis of unity was, in the words of the Bolshevik, "unity of advanced elements in opposition to the petty bourgeois nationalists of the BLM, and not the principled unity of communists." (p.65). Thus, when the RWL formed, it was not at all clear about whether it was a communist organization. Since that time the line of the RWL has consistently reflected this conflict between M-L and bourgeois nationalism; but bourgeois nationalism has never been broken with.

The first line struggle was conducted over communism or revolutionary nationalism, but it "took the form of struggle over organizational questions - bureaucratic centralism, federationism and male supremacy in organizational matters" (p.66). In other

words, bourgeois nationalism was not addressed; it was "forgotten" in the course of the struggle that it was the central question. But this question remained unresolved. How could RWL become a communist organization with a strong nationalist current, and with no communist basis of unity. Unity was based on bourgeois nationalism.

Struggles over bourgeois nationalism have been consistently diverted, making it impossible to get to the root of this, and other interrelated deviations. The reaction to this unresolved contradiction was the development of the vulgar proletarianization. This provided a way of identifying with the working class, including white workers, but it substituted the mechanical task of going to the plants for the difficult task of ideological remoulding. It was also a way of consolidating the organization along "Marxists-Leninist" lines, but without focusing on the meticulous theoretical work and ideological struggle needed to achieve such a consolidation. But in liquidating the ideological and theoretical tasks, the vulgar proletarianization line (vpl) served to maintain the organization on the basis of unity it had: bourgeois nationalism. By obscuring this fact from the membership, the vpl made RWL increasingly prone to deviations as it made it less equipped to deal with them. It was in this way a method for "breaking with" the past errors that was not fundamentally different from the original problem facing the organization. Both bourgeois nationalism and the vpl are based on vulgar materialism. And vulgar materialism continues to dominate the organization's methodology and outlook.

A part of the vpl has been the myth of the "proletarian kernel", a metaphysical and idealist essence supposedly embodying the correct class stand and inevitably guiding RWL to its "correct lines." This metaphysical and idealist essence "showed itself... In the course of struggle... (as) our grasp of MLMTT moved from lower to higher levels." (p.69) This underlies RWL's sectarian stand to the rest of the communist movement and the "workerism" of the line of "the role of the advanced in hammering out political line." It explains their development moving from "perceptual to rational" instead of from incorrect to relatively correct, and why RWL wonders how Alkalimet "even got into the organization." It aids in the maintenance of unprincipled unity in organization, unity maintained without Marxist-Leninist criticism/self-criticism. "Black people are a natural people" has mutated to "workers are automatically correct." Both views see ideology growing automatically out of material conditions, either national or class. Thus both views are vulgar materialist.

Throughout this history of ideological confusion, the organization has tailed after a series of other groups in their party building motions: from the RU to the OL to the WVO and now tags to the raggedy line of PRRWO. It has done this without ever putting out an independent line on the major questions facing the movement.

Now, after being plagued for years with right lines, RWL has flipped to the "Left." A frenzied ultra-"Leftism" is now the dominant line, covering as it attempts to break with their right opportunism. This cover has come down in many ways: (1) the sectarian attitude to the Communist movement, all struggle and no unity, calling comrades "bourgeois agents" if they dare to criticize RWL over political differences in reaction to over a year of tailing after the party-building motions of the opportunist wing; (2) growing withdrawal from the mass movement as a way of "breaking" with the vpl; (3) purging cadre who dare to criticize the leadership in reaction to years of following the policy of patient remolding of unrepentant opportunists. As their bankrupt line has increasingly shown itself to be threadbare, the leadership has had to resort to increased bourgeois maneuvering and pragmatic methods to hold the organization together.

We need to briefly look at how this "left" flip took place. The flip developed in RWL after the right opportunists in the communist movement (OL and RCP) had been thoroughly discredited in the revolutionary wing. The lines of demarcation between the revolutionary wing and the right opportunists were clear, at least to those who would look. Placing party building on the proletarian ideological plane, putting theory in the leading role, separated the genuine from sham. But the demarcation had only been clearly drawn on the right. In addition, the organization itself had repudiated and purged the leading advocates of the two right opportunist party building lines from its ranks. The absence of principled community unity, the absence of an overall general line of the organization...and most important, the absence of a firm grasp of the science (the legacy of the vulgar proletarianization line)...left it open to wide political swings. Also, the failure to grasp the essence of party building on the ideological plane meant that the RWL was not able to dig deeply to the basis of its errors, thus leaving it prone to new manifestations of old problems. RWL's right flank was covered, and its basic instability left it wide open on its "left." All of the above set the stage for a "left" flip-flop. PRRWO was waiting in the wings. We now know that there were people in the RWL staunchly upholding a correct Marxist-Leninist line, struggling against the RU/OL party building motions. Many of these comrades put forth the WVO line. At this time we are unclear as to why the "left" trend defeated the correct Marxist-Leninist trend, except that it likely has to do with many of the factors enumerated above. Given that both PRRWO and RWL share a common methodology and outlook (bourgeois nationalism, vulgar and mechanical materialism, a "hustling," get-it-over, fast-talking style which tries to rely on the most retrograde trends among the masses), when PRRWO came into the picture with their sophistry, demagogary, and dogmatic misuse of the science, RWL was swept away. And, thus, bourgeois ideology, in the form of bourgeois nationalism and pragmatism, still remain the ideological core of the RWL despite its apparent transformation into its opposite.

B. CLASS BASIS

The central question in building the party on the ideological plane is the question, "For whom?" This is the question of class stand. In whose interest does a line of action or thinking work? What class interest does it reflect?

RWL's overall line reflects the outlook of the petty bourgeoisie of an oppressed nationality. This stratum stands in opposition to monopoly capital, but does not stand firmly on the side of the proletariat; it has a revolutionary aspect but is not able to stand consistently on the side of the working class. Aside from their self-congratulations about the "relatively good class composition of RWL", the RWL is dominated by the petty bourgeoisie's class outlook. This is characterized by superficiality, one-sidedness, short-sidedness (this is seen in its failure to strategically approach the questions facing the workers' and communist movements), impatience (demonstrated in their refusal to hold principled struggle), and subjectivism. Subjectivism is a major component of this outlook.

Chairman Mao teaches us that subjectivism arises out of two poles. In "Rectify the Party's Style of Work" he says,

"There are two kinds of incomplete knowledge. One is ready-made knowledge found in books and the other is knowledge that is mostly perceptual and partial; both are one-sided. Only an integration of the two can yield knowledge that is sound and relatively complete....

"It follows that to combat subjectivism we must enable people of each of these two types to develop in whichever direction they are deficient and to merge with the other type. Those with book-learning must develop in the direction of practice; it is only in this way that they will stop being content with books and avoid committing dogmatist errors. Those experienced in work must take up the study of theory and must read seriously; only then will they be able to systematize and synthesize their experience and raise it to the level of theory, only then will they not mistake their partial experience for universal truth and not commit empiricist errors. Dogmatism and empiricism alike are subjectivism, each originating from the opposite pole.

"Hence there are two kinds of subjectivism in our Party, dogmatism and empiricism. Each sees only a part and not the whole. If people are not on guard, do not realize that such one-sidedness is a shortcoming and do not strive to overcome it, they are liable to go astray." (SW Vol.3, pp.4-42)

It is precisely this one-sidedness that characterizes the history of RWL. For a long period RWL was dominated by the most vulgar form of the vulgar proletarianization line, i.e. that communist consciousness will emerge spontaneously from being in a plant, a deviation they correctly sum up in the Bolshevik as empiricism. But in the recent flip to the "left", they simply substituted another form of one-sidedness, i.e. dogmatism, for the older deviation of empiricism, although some of the aspects of empiricism are still present, as in their view that ML's unite is not principle because it did not work in their own experience. The dogmatism, however, is by far the dominant aspect of their one-sidedness, and this can be seen in the essential aspect of their line on party building. They seize dogmatically on one word in a quote from Stalin about the party focusing "on itself" taken out of context. Then they rigidly try to squeeze reality to fit their narrow view. In this way RWL makes party-building "our central and only task", and tries to take party-building out of the mass movement, to cut the ties of communists with the masses.

C. PHILOSOPHICAL ROOTS

This rigid dogmatism, is a reflection of a deeper philosophical deviation, mechanical or metaphysical materialism, a deviation that makes RWL unable to see development as the dialectical relationship between two aspects of a contradiction. As WVO defines this,

"Mechanical materialism, though it recognizes that being determines consciousness, does not see the development of a thing as a dialectical process of unity of opposites, does not see the dialectical relations between the two aspects

of a contradiction and the dialectical relation between one contradiction and another. It always absolutizes one aspect (usually the principle aspect) and sees the development of things mechanically.(This) comes out as rigid, undialectical two-stage theory, the epitome of mechanical materialism." (WVO #4, p.115)

This metaphysical materialism underlies not only RWL's inability to see the relationship between the central and secondary tasks, but also blinds it to the process of development of revisionism in cadre and in the party and to the process of development of the party itself. All these are, sooner or later, fatal flaws for a revolutionary organization.

The effect of this view is to fail to see the struggle against bourgeois ideology as a struggle that goes on in all of us all the time, a struggle which none of us can evade if we hope successfully to prevent revisionist degeneration in the party or in ourselves. By not seeing that this struggle goes on in all of us, by imagining that some of us are immune, they metaphorically see communists divided into two camps. Cadre are either correct Marxist-Leninists (their mythical "proletarian kernals") or they are agents of the bourgeoisie: "Bolsheviks" or "Mensheviks". The struggle against revisionism, the long-term strategic task of "study Marxism, criticize revisionism" becomes a struggle against bourgeois agents. The "Bolsheviks" don't make mistakes; they go "from lower to higher". The "Mensheviks", on the other hand, simply go from being hidden agents to being exposed. Errors are explained by external rather than internal causes; RWL was never wrong, it was "taken in". It is this mechanistic/metaphysical materialism that has "bourgeois agents" jumping out of the woodwork at the leadership of the RWL and, evidently, frightening them out of their wits. Listen to this:

"Alright, OL, MLOC, WVO, and all other mensheviks why don't you come out and say it? Say it, Loud! Lenin was ultra-left. (This is after a quote from Lenin where he explains why he polemized to discredit and disorganize the Mensheviks, ed.) He suffered from "Hustlerism". But you can't do that can you, to do that would expose all the more that you are the ones who have split from MLMTT, that you seek to wreck the building of the Party through your attacks on the genuine wing and the advanced. Go ahead! Say out loud, that you want a party of mensheviks and Bolsheviks, that you have ceased to serve the proletariat and are seeking to build the mass movement in order to bargain with the bourgeoisie, to serve your own slimy selfish petty-bourgeois interest.

Yes, comrades. These growing attacks from the mensheviks is a clear sign that they, too, see Bolshevism on the rise. Some coming straight forward on the attack like the OL and WVO; others like MLOC through its guise of "unity", "questions of clarification" and insinuations all have one common purpose - to make us waver, vasculate and conciliate; to get us to go easy on them, hoping to divert us from the correct path and drag us into the swamp, knowing that one day Bolshevik justice will make them pay for their crimes against the proletariat." (Palante, June, 1976, p. 7-8)

This is the effect of having one's line exposed if you assume you are correct; they are obviously being driven to a frenzy.

This mechanical materialism is tied in with, but not identical to the vulgar materialism that we discussed above. Where mechanical materialism cannot answer the question of how processes in the world develop, vulgar materialism cannot answer the question of what the objective world is made of, being or consciousness, and that the relationship is between the two.

This manifests itself, as we have seen, in the identification of the RWL of itself with the correct line based on its "relatively good class composition", the way they view the "role of the advanced in hammering our political line", etc. This is vulgar materialism.

"...one-sidedly hold(s) that a definite social and class base must determine a definite ideology, and in fact negate all the particular processes related to how a certain social and class base gives rise to the development of a certain ideology. They negate internal dynamics of ideology, and replace it with the hollow statement that a certain social being must give rise to a certain social consciousness." (ibid., p.117)

Both mechanical materialism and vulgar materialism, in distorting the development and the make up of ideology confound the task of struggling against revisionism and for a correct line, and so disarm us in the task of building an antirevisionist party. Mechanical materialism sees the struggle against revisionism as a battle between agents of the bourgeoisie and "Bolsheviks". Vulgar materialism sees the correct line growing automatically out of a "relatively good class composition". Neither can grasp how revisionism comes into being and what must be done to prevent it. Neither understands that bourgeois ideology, if not combatted ideologically at every step, will inevitably lead to revisionist decay; nor do they grasp that the struggle against revisionism is what pushed forward the development of the correct line.

Finally, these undialectical "materialisms" inevitably, in trying to explain the basis of a political line, can do no better than to fall into idealism. As Chairman Mao teaches in "On Contradiction", "...metaphysics...is part and parcel of the idealist world outlook...." (SW, Vol.1, p.312). Rather than view an incorrect or a correct line as developing out of the struggle between bourgeois and proletarian ideology, they see them as growing from some idealist essence which exists apart from the struggle between lines. For example, RWL's "proletarian kernel" which periodically "shows itself" in the struggle for RWL's "correct line", is an example of RWL having to fall into idealism in order to explain consciousness whose development, whose process, they can't grasp because their vulgar materialism precludes it. The same is the case in their explanation of bourgeois ideology in our ranks as coming entirely from "petty bourgeois swindlers" and "bourgeois agents" who "consciously try to divert and subvert the movement. They are unable to go beyond the motives of these 'agents' and ask themselves these questions:

"What driving forces in turn stand behind these motives? What are the historical causes which transform themselves into these motives in the brains of the actors? In the realm of history the old materialism becomes untrue to itself because it takes the ideal driving forces which operate there as ultimate causes, instead of investigation of these driving forces. The inconsistency does not lie in the fact that ideal driving forces are recognized but in the investigation not being carried further back behind these into their motive causes." (Engels, Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy, Marx and Engels Selected Works, Vol.3, p.366, as quoted by the WV Journal #4, p.118)

The result is that rather than conduct principled ideological struggle against revisionism, rather than conduct deep Marxist-Leninist criticism and self-criticism, they conduct scare campaigns, witchhunts, shrieking madly about "bourgeois agents" and "Mensheviks in our ranks"; they call for purges without any political basis, except as an afterthought, and to justify it they simply chant that the offender was guilty of "failing to uphold political line as key," with no specific content given to this.

This is the most bankrupt bourgeois methodology, and as Marxism teaches, methodology and world outlook are identical. Thus RWL uses metaphysics and idealism to develop and get over its raggedy line. They resort to a whole bagful of bourgeois tricks and maneuvers to evade principled criticism and struggle. This only reflects the outlook and serves the interests of the bourgeoisie. Conciliating with this corrupt line represents a failure to uphold the interests of the proletariat. RWL's line only reflects the outlook and serves the interests of the bourgeoisie.

This is how RWL builds the party on bourgeois ideology. We call •

on comrades to take up the struggle for the proletariat and its Party and to smash this "left" opportunist trend and uphold the banner of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought.

BUILD THE PARTY ON THE IDEOLOGICAL PLANE, AND GRASP THE KEY LINK OF POLITICAL LINE!

STRUGGLE ON TWO FRONTS: SMASH "LEFT" OPPORTUNISM AND SMASH THE MAIN DANGER ON THE RIGHT!

STRUGGLE AGAINST NATIONAL CHAUVINISM AND BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM AND BUILD THE MULTINATIONAL COMMUNIST PARTY!

DEFEAT CIRCLE SPIRIT: FORWARD TO THE PARTY!