

## **In Practice the "RCP" Ends Up Giving the Same Political Line As the OL Social-Chauvinists: Iran, "Zaire", Ethiopia, Fascist Anti-Busing Movement**

One example of this is the issue of the Shah of Iran. The Shah of Iran is a bloodstained puppet of U. S. imperialism. He not only oppresses and butchers the people of his own country in the most barbaric fashion, but he also, on behalf of U.S. imperialism, sends troops into other countries to oppress them also, such as into Oman to suppress the revolutionary movement there. The RCP gave the facade of a big, militant criticism of OL on the issue of OL's support for the Shah of Iran, how the OL was capitulating, blah, blah, blah. But at the end of all this, it turns out that at the present time the RCP asserts that the Shah of Iran does in fact fight U.S. imperialism, and actually asks for the American proletariat to support the Shah of Iran to the extent that he allegedly fights U.S. imperialism. The RCP says: "But for the U.S. proletariat to support, for instance, the Shah of Iran to the extent that, as a member of OPEC, Iran struggles against imperialist plunder, does not mean putting such support above support for the revolutionary struggles of the Iranian people to defeat imperialism and overthrow the Shah." (Revolution, July 1977, "On the Three Worlds and the International Situation", p. 18, column 2) So at the same time that the RCP puts up its big propaganda front about how it supports the Iranian people's struggle and how it opposes OL's social-chauvinist stand in support of the Shah of Iran, it turns out that the RCP creates illusions about the role of the Shah of Iran and ends up giving the same social-chauvinist line that the Shah of Iran does fight U.S. imperialism to a certain "extent".

A similar example concerns the issue of the traitor Mōbutu in the Congo-Kinshasa ("Zaire"). When a band of former Katangese mercenaries, egged on by the Cuban-MPLA- Soviet neo-

colonial regime in Angola, invaded the U.S. imperialist neo-colony of the Congo-K, the social-chauvinists jumped up and down, saying that the main question was to oppose the Soviet Union and to support Mobutu. In this way the social-chauvinists support the vast U.S. colonial empire against both "theft" by the Soviet social-imperialists and against true liberation by, for example, the revolutionary forces in the Congo-K led by the Marxist Revolutionary Party of the Congo-K. This is undoubtedly an example of what the comrade referred to earlier when he pointed out that the social-chauvinists say the main threat to the "independence" of such countries is the Soviet Union, negating the fact that these countries aren't independent to start with, but are simply neo-colonies. And the RCP came directly out in chorus with the social-chauvinists in supporting Mobutu. The May issue of Revolution carried a front page article entitled "Soviet Backed Mercenaries Invade Zaire". This article "militantly" declares that Mobutu is not only "pro-U.S." but even "the main pro-U.S. black government in Africa", that "Mobutu has been a servant of U.S. imperialism and the people of Zaire will undoubtedly overthrow their oppressors" and that "The U.S. is also trying to shore up the Zaire government against the invaders, not out of any concern for Zaire's independence but rather for the \$1 billion in U.S. investments and U.S. imperialism's more general interests in Zaire." Thus RCP holds that both the Mobutu government and the invaders are servants of imperialism. But according to this article you should decide which servant of imperialism gives the best situation for the country! Naturally the RCP thinks that when all is said and done the situation would really deteriorate if the Soviet servants win, so from this point of view they support Mobutu and "their own" U.S. imperialists against the invader. Of course, this is only because they are very concerned for revolution in the Congo-K, and they even say so: "If such an armed invasion succeeds in imposing a new regime, the conditions for revolution will not be advanced, but set back." The RCP even uses the exact same sophistry of the OL of trying to turn Comrade Stalin into a social-chauvinist. The RCP concludes its article with the following passage, which could have been copied from OL's "dialectician" Eileen Klehr: "The lesson of all this reaffirms the Marxist position summed up by Stalin in appraising the maneuvers of the imperialists in the oppressed countries

half a century ago. These situations, he said, have to be seen 'from the point of view of the actual results, as shown by the general balance sheet of the struggle against imperialism, that is to say, 'not in isolation, but on a world scale'.'

"The Soviets are on the move in Africa, trying to use the armed liberation struggles as an opening for their own intervention, and as Angola proved, the meddling of the USSR, like the meddling of the U.S. (suddenly the U.S. is no longer "meddling" in the Congo-K, just the Soviet Union -- ed.) brings only setbacks for the revolutionary struggle. In the context of the situation in Africa as a whole and the imperialists' aims there, the invasion of Zaire is a dangerous threat to the overall struggle and a dangerous precedent for more of the same. The trampling on the independence of countries which have long been victimized by imperialism (the "independence" of the Congo-K is only being trampled on by the Soviet Union, according to RCP -- ed.) is a foul crime no matter what banner it is cloaked in.

"From the point of view of the situation within Zaire itself, if the current reactionary regime is replaced by another pro-imperialist regime whose power is established through force of invasion, this too would be a setback in the conditions for the revolutionary struggle in Zaire, a struggle which is sure to end in the overthrow of all of imperialism's servants, including the present regime.

"From this point of view -- from the question of whether it actually advances or goes against the struggle of the people of Zaire, Africa and the whole world against the imperialist system and the two superpowers who head it up, this invasion of Zaire is completely reactionary and must be opposed." This stand by the RCP really flustered the OL, which had to try very hard to concoct some difference with RCP on the question of Mobutu. All the OL could say is that the RCP doesn't explain clearly enough why it takes the social-chauvinist position! The Call wrote: "Trying to cover themselves, they (the RCP, expressing itself by way of an article in The Veteran -- ed.) tack on a remark that 'this little war must end with one side or the other as the victor', and that therefore it would be better if the mercenaries were defeated. But with their distorted logic, portraying the struggle simply as a fight between the superpow-

ers, they cannot explain why it would be better." (The Call, "RCP Tells People of Zaire 'Don't Fight'", June 20, 1977, p. 12, column 4). Thus there is no actual difference of political line between the RCP and the OL on this question. Both support U.S. imperialist aggression on the plea of opposing an allegedly even worse Soviet social-imperialist aggression.

Another example concerns Ethiopia. All sorts of groups have suddenly become excited about the Ethiopian question... just as soon as they could use this to emphasize the question of Soviet domination. Until recently the social-chauvinists had little interest in the Ethiopian revolution. After all, the fascist Derg is a "third world government" and thus part of the "main force" moving forward world history -- and the Derg itself was more than happy to go along with such a farce and made all sorts of demagogical "anti-imperialist" pronouncements. But as soon as the Derg expelled some U.S. imperialist personnel and Cuban troops started to come in, the social-chauvinists certainly became interested in the Ethiopian revolution because they could say that this was part of directing the "main blow" at the Soviet social-imperialists. The RCP had been interested in subverting the Ethiopian revolution for some time. But the RCP too began to use the Soviet aggression in Ethiopia to whitewash U.S. imperialist aggression in Ethiopia. The RCP says that U.S. imperialism was thrown out by the Derg when it expelled some U.S. imperialist personnel and U.S. bases. Therefore they say that U.S. imperialism is still contending for Ethiopia but only through such forces as the Ethiopian Democratic Union. They completely negate the fact that the U.S. imperialists have strong positions in the Ethiopian state-machine as well as in the economy, and the Derg simply expelled a few personnel and did not dismantle the state-machine or transform the economy. So U.S. imperialism still has its grasp on Ethiopia, and not just through the Ethiopian Democratic Union. Thus the RCP puts all the crimes of the Derg on the back of the Soviet New Tsars. While the Soviet Union does indeed deserve denunciation for backing the Derg, the RCP whitewashes U.S. imperialism's crimes in Ethiopia and its support of the Derg's crimes against the people.

Another example is the RCP's stand on the fascist anti-busing movement. The OL and RCP have different forms of the same line of opposition to the movement against racial discrimination and violent repression. At the end of a long period of debate, both settled down to the view that the question was that each individual busing plan had to be examined on its own merits. What incredible wisdom! The RCP wrote in a reply to a letter that: "We also agree that one has to look at the particularities of each busing plan to see whether it is good or bad..." (Revolution, April, 1977, p. 6, col. 2) Thus the RCP made the issue into "whether or not we support busing in a particular case" (same article, p. 6, col. 3) while shamefacedly denying that it is doing so. The RCP way of not making busing itself into the issue is to promote slogans like "Smash the Boston Busing Plan!" and more recently "Plan Should Be Upheld Reaction Erupts Over Chicago Busing" (Revolution, October, 1977, p. 2) Revolution explains this as follows: "But we have also said that the issue is not busing in itself and stressed that the particularities of each busing plan have to be analyzed, because in some cases busing can and should be supported". (Revolution, October, 1977, p. 17, col. 1) In brief, "busing in itself" isn't the issue -- the individual busing plans are. The OL was hard pressed to explain how this differed from their own position. In the April 11, 1977 issue of The Call they whine that "... they (the RCP -- ed.) now call for an 'examination' of each plan to see if it is real or not. But while it is important to expose fraudulent busing schemes as The Call has done around 'one-way' busing in Milwaukee and rural Alabama, this 'examination' is the totality of RCP's program for integration. (Remember that OL believes that integration is revisionist, which is why they use what they consider the "ironical" expression of "program for integration" -- ed.) The slogan 'examine each plan' (The Call has just pointed out one sentence earlier that it follows this same slogan in practice -- ed.) is hardly a rallying point for the fight against school segregation".

What does this position of examining each plan on its own merits hide?

1) Both the RCP and the OL oppose active resistance to fascism and deny that the main task of the progressive people is to smash the fascist anti-busing movement and the issue is not

"busing", nor is it to devise better "concrete, positive demands" (Revolution, April, 1977, p.6, col.3), but the issue is the racial discrimination and violent repression that is organized by the state apparatus against the Afro-American people. Both the RCP and OL are so mired in the neo-revisionist reformism and parliamentary cretinism that they make the question of whether the plans are good or bad the main issue. The OL has such faith in the allegedly "democratic" U.S. imperialists that it even makes the issue whether the plans are "real" or "fraudulent", while the RCP is dreaming of better "concrete, positive demands" and of "quality education".

2) In this way both the RCP and the OL present the U.S. state apparatus, including courts, government and police, as having two aspects, a pro-people aspect and an anti-people aspect. Each busing plan is to be examined to see whether it is pro-people or anti-people or, in OL's classic words, "real" or "fraudulent". This is the most vulgar form of bourgeois democratic illusion and revisionist reformism. In fact the U.S. government is seeking to organize fascist mass movements against the oppressed nationalities as the cutting edge of growing fascism. In order for the U.S. state apparatus to organize a fascist anti-busing movement, the open fascists have to collaborate with the concealed fascists, called liberals, and present some busing plans. These plans are presented in a mutilated and distorted fashion in order to mobilize sentiment against integration. Naturally any democrat, to say nothing of communist, is in support of any integration that may occur because of the busing plans. But any such integration that does occur is against the will of the state apparatus, which is systematically increasing segregation and the oppression of the nationalities. It is the masses, not the criminal fascist U.S. "authorities", who are enthusiastic for integration. It is down-right political deception on behalf of the state to present the matter as if the government had any other aim but increased racist and fascist attacks on the people.

3) Both the OL and the RCP deny that the fascist anti-busing movement is state-organized. The RCP is so blind and has such love for action without analysis that it missed the fascist nature of the anti-busing movement and actually helped the government to organize it in Boston and some other places. The RCP jumped into bed with the fascists and complained that the

Klan was "bogarting (hogging -- ed.) the leadership". Meanwhile the OL, not to be outdone, took fright at the sight of the fascist mass movement in Boston and called on its mentor, the U.S. federal government, to disperse the fascists -- thus helping to give a democratic facade to the U.S. government's repressive armed apparatus and propagating the suicidal tactics of telling the Afro-American people to look to "federal protection" (The Call, Nov. 1974, p.12, col.1) as a savior against the racist attacks organized by that very same state. The Call admitted that "The role of the cops has been mainly (only mainly ???-- ed.) to suppress the efforts of the Black community to defend itself and to occupy the community while nothing is done to protect it." Thus the debate between the RCP and the OL boiled down to: who could best suppress the movement against racial discrimination and violent repression -- the unofficial, irregular thugs of the fascist anti-busing movement or the armed, uniformed, "liberal" thugs of the state's official apparatus of terror and repression.

4) It should be pointed out that the self-righteous OL vacillates on whether or not busing violates OL's version of the "right to self-determination" of the Afro-American people. Both in theory and shamefacedly in practice, the OL holds the line that "integration is revisionist". In OL's articles on the Boston busing plan, they echoed the Wallaceite and segregationist cries of the open fascists with talk of "forced busing", "integrationist schemes" and racist dribble like "They (the liberals -- ed.) have continually added fuel to the racist fire by saying that only by rubbing elbows with white kids can Black and other minority kids learn". (The Call, same reference as above) To give this racist rot about "rubbing elbows" a "democratic" tinge, the OL reverses the verdict against "separate but equal" and adds the most amazing lawyer's double-talk about "Their whole integrationist scheme is based upon white supremacist assumptions about education". Thus, OL denounced the liberals in order to hide OL's endorsement of the "liberal" Ford Foundation schemes of "community control". OL is against "integrationist schemes" in order to promote segregationist schemes under the guise of the "right to self-determination". So, all OL's demagoguery aside, the OL differed with the fascist anti-busing movement only on the question of method, not on the ultimate goal. In fact both OL and the RCP deny or are embar-

rassed by the strong democratic sentiment of the masses, which includes enthusiasm for integration.

5) The RCP sets the question of school integration up against the question of "quality education" and cut-backs in education. This is the view of a case-hardened capitalist bookkeeper, blinded by routine, who balances the expenditures needed for "busing", against the expenditures needed for interest payments to the blood-sucking banks, etc., ... mindful that he must keep within the limits imposed by the capitalist authorities in order to maximize profits for the capitalists and shift the burden of the economic crisis onto the backs of the oppressed masses. This is the exact same imperialist economism as the OL exhibits, only the OL also sets "integration" against "community control". The OL denounced the Chicago busing plan in a front page headline "Chicago: Fighting Racist Schemes to Divide and Rule" (The Call, September 12, 1977). The OL sets the struggle against cut-backs against the struggle against racial discrimination as follows: "The crisis in education goes hand-in-hand with school segregation, (here OL is referring to the busing plan -- ed.) which leads to whites fighting Blacks and parents fighting parents, rather than a joint and unified struggle for quality housing and education". This is the exact same argument, in even about the same words, as the RU used to support the fascist anti-busing movement in Boston.

Just as the U.S. state needs both "liberals" and open reactionaries to float the fascist anti-busing movement, so the positions of the RCP and the OL on this issue are simply two sides of the same coin, minted by the state. On this issue, the OL tends to hide its segregationism by inclining to the imperialist liberals and concealed fascists, while the RCP is mesmerized by the "militancy" of the open fascists. This difference, however, is itself often reversed both on this and on other questions where the OL inclines to the open fascists and chauvinists and the RCP prefers the liberals. The basic political line of the two organizations is the same -- opposition to active resistance to fascism, opposition to the mass revolutionary struggle against the state-organized fascist and racist movement and opposition to the struggle against racial discrimination and violent repression, an opposition hidden behind the concoction of sectarian or even reactionary demands which are to be imposed on and counterposed to the mass movement.

These shameful social-chauvinist positions of the RCP show the sham nature of the RCP's struggle against social-chauvinism. Nevertheless it should be born in mind that some people may not see clearly through RCP's facade, through the RCP's pages and pages of intellectualism, and they may have the impression that the RCP does oppose social-chauvinism. This false impression that the RCP does oppose social-chauvinism has to be taken very seriously tactically,...

## How the "RCP" Lays the Ideological Basis for OL Social-Chauvinism

Now let us go into the RCP lines that give the ideological grounds for social-chauvinism. And there are a number of them.

The first point which should be taken very seriously is that the RCP is against the struggle against opportunism, even in theory as well as in practice. By this means they are preparing the grounds for uniting in the future with the social-chauvinists under the hoax of allegedly uniting all who can be united against the main enemy. This is openly expressed by them in their attack on Comrade Stalin's wise teachings on the question of the "main blow" (See Revolution, Feb. 1977, "OL Bloodies Own Nose With Its 'Main Blow'"). You can find these teachings in, for example, Stalin's classic Marxist-Leninist work, The Foundations of Leninism. These teachings are the direct opposite of OL's social-chauvinist ravings about "directing the main blow at Soviet social-imperialism" and in fact show the necessity of directing the "main blow" at the OL social-chauvinists and all types of revisionism, social-democracy and opportunism. Comrade Stalin's teachings on directing the main blow at the opportunists are equivalent to Comrade Lenin's teachings that "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 a humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism." (Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, Ch. X). Comrade Stalin's teachings on the "main blow" are equivalent to Comrade Lenin's statement at the Second Congress of the Com-