

Some Questions Pertaining to the Connection Between the “CPUSA” and “CPC” and the “New Left”

The struggle against the social-chauvinist theory of the “three worlds” provided the basis for a systematic, ongoing analysis of the history of revisionism in the U.S., up until now covered up by the destructive influence of Chinese revisionism, which found cuddled under its wing Foster, Progressive Labor Party (PLP), Revolutionary Union (RU) and “Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist)” (“CP(ML)”), as well as “Communist Labor Party” (“CLP”), the “Revolutionary Wing”, “Marxist-Leninist Organizing Committee” (“MLOC”) and “Central Organization of U.S. Marxist-Leninists” (“COUSML”). Thus an understanding of the trends internationally has begun.

The treachery of the “Communist Party of China” (“CPC”) has had no limits in its disgraceful history. In 1963, the “CPC” wrote a letter to the “CPUSA”, who had long since been a renegade, revisionist party. The “CPC” addressed them on a comradely basis, criticizing the CPUSA for its attacks on the “CPC”. This was at the time of the policy of the “United Front Against Imperialism”, designed to effect a reconciliation with Russian imperialism. What follows are some excerpts from the letter— “On January 9 of this year, the CPUSA issued a statement publicly attacking the Communist Party of China. Certain comrades of the CPUSA have also made a number of other attacks on the Chinese Communist Party in recent months.” They continue— “The position of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people on the Caribbean crisis was very clear. We supported the five just demands of the Cuban Revolutionary Government, we were against putting any faith in Kennedy’s sham ‘guarantee’, and we were against imposing ‘international inspection’ on Cuba. From the outset we directed the spearhead of our struggle against U.S. imperialism, which was committing aggression against Cuba. We neither advocated the sending of missiles to Cuba, nor obstructed the withdrawal of so-called offen-

sive weapons. We opposed adventurism, and we also opposed capitulationism.” (A Comment on the Statement of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. ,1963, pg. 1)

This was an all-out cover-up of Russian imperialism’s role in the Cuban missile crisis, a cover-up of the inter-imperialist contradictions as manifested in the struggle for the re-division of the world. Thus, while professing to be against U.S. imperialism, this opportunist stance served to cover both “great” imperialist powers, and in particular, Krushchevite revisionism. This is clearly shown in how the “CPC” covers up that the “CPUSA” was Krushchevite revisionist through and through. The “CPC” instead wiggled around and said— “This action is a reflection of their completely wrong understanding of the U.S. imperialism and their completely incorrect class stand.” (Ibid., p. 2)

That the “CPUSA” was an appendage of the bourgeoisie was a surprise to no one but the “CPC.” In fact, it was a long established fact. Browderite revisionism had been combatted as an international revisionist trend, while Foster, though assuming a centrist mask, had by 1949, introduced a program for peaceful transition, which remains the unchanged line of the “CPUSA” to this day. But the Chinese revisionists could “forget” this. The Chinese revisionists were not in the least bit prompted into struggle with the “CPUSA” due to the attacks on Marxism-Leninism, or its refusal to carry out the directives of the Comintern, which characterizes much, if not all, of the history of the “CPUSA”. They were not prompted by the attacks on Stalin unleashed at the 20th Congress of the “CPSU”, which the “CPUSA” fully endorsed in 1956. Oh no, the Chinese “Communist” Party “criticized” the “CPUSA” only because it “publicly attacked the CPC .”

The “CPC” was hopeful that other centrists would come to power in the “CPUSA,” so they had this to say of the centrist Foster: “The Chinese Communists and the Chinese people and the Communists and people of the United States are fighting on the same front against U.S. imperialism. We highly esteemed Comrade William Z. Foster, builder of the CPUSA and outstanding leader of the U.S. proletariat. We have not forgotten that the U.S. Communists represented by him warmly supported us Chinese people in the difficult years of our revolution and laid the foundation for friendship between the Chinese and the U.S. Parties and between the Chinese and American peoples. U.S. Communists are now being savagely persecuted by the U.S. government; we have great sympathy for them in their difficult position. In a statement issued a year ago, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party condemned the U.S. government for its outrageous persecution of the U.S. Communists. The Chinese people also launched a mass movement in support of the U.S. Communist Party. But, for reasons beyond us, the leaders of the CPUSA did not think it worthwhile to inform its members and the people of the United States of the support given to the U.S. Party by the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people.” (Ibid., p. 15-16)

Here we have it—the “CPUSA” was part of China’s “broad united front.” It was defended by the “CPC” who called out mass support for the revisionists in

the U.S. those who had long ago betrayed the proletariat, who had long since been collaborating with the bourgeoisie.

But because the “CPUSA” chose to remain loyal to its revisionist headquarters in the Kremlin, because it had been trained in Krushchevite revisionism by Browder and Foster and refused to be led out of the social-imperialist camp by the “support” the Chinese revisionists had offered them, the “CPC” was then forced to dump them, in pursuit of loyal agents for Chinese revisionist interests in the USA. They stumbled several times—PLP, RU, but now they have the most loyal of all previous lackies, the “CPML”, the recognized “party”. But just in case the Chinese revisionists decide to sponsor someone else, (if the “CPML” fails at any juncture to serve their interests as the “CPC” sees fit—), the League of Revolutionary Struggle, Marxist-Leninist (LRS,M-L) or Workers Viewpoint are future possibilities, as seen in the shifts so characteristic of the “CPC’s” unprincipled blocking and realiances. The “Gotten Together League”—“LRS-ML” is still certainly hopeful, as witnessed in how it has not gone into the “party”, giving only critical support for “CPML”. There is such an abundant marsh in the U.S. the “CPC” can take their pick.

The “Communist” Party of China gave leadership to the petty bourgeois movement in the U.S. The results have been the full-scale development of social-chauvinism in the U.S. and all countries where China’s franchised agents exist.

The inconsistent stance in the fight to defend the orthodoxy of Marxism-Leninism, the hesitation on the part of the genuine Lefts in the U.S., gave Chinese revisionism an open hand to promote “new conditions”, “another world”, “a new era”. Instead of Marxism-Leninism, “Mao Zedong Thought” served as the basis to draw lines of demarcation and obscured wherein lay the real differences.

This section will trace the relationship between Chinese revisionism and the development of the “new left”, in particular revealing its role in sabotaging the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat in the U.S. Through its franchised agents, PLP, RU, “CPML”, “COUSML” and “MLOC”, the work of the counter-revolution has been carried out. In their own names and yellow bellied traditions these organizations have spread “Mao Zedong Thought” and the revisionist theory of “three worlds”, or conciliation with it, which has served to derail proletarian revolution in the U.S. thereby strengthening U.S. imperialism temporarily, together with all the imperialist bourgeoisie in every capitalist country. It was a hidden alliance which is now hidden no more.

How conveniently the Chinese revisionists utilize their demagoguery to make all sorts of deals with imperialism, covered up, of course, as “a way” to bring the “second world” closer to the “third world”. As truth reveals, they assist

all the imperialists in furthering the plunder of the colonies and semi-colonies, for which they are competing, while giving a hand to the bourgeoisie to tighten its control, exploitation, and oppression of the proletariat and oppressed masses within the capitalist countries.

Of course the "CPC" could not have been as successful in sabotaging proletarian revolution, had it not had the wholehearted support of those petty-bourgeois "lefties" who moved on from the "CPUSA" to form "new Left" groups. Many of them were centrists, masking their social chauvinism with left-sounding phraseology and talk of internationalism, collaborating with the "CPC", who also took a centrist "anti-imperialist" mask internationally. Many of those "veteran cadres" entered the student, national, womens' and anti-war movements of the 60's and partook actively in them, motivating the "new" leaders who would prove themselves to be perfect careerist material for the old guard to work with. The national movements became a favorite stomping ground. The just struggle against national oppression was seeing the continued rise of protest amongst the nationally oppressed. But here too, due to the absence of a Marxist-Leninist vanguard Party, and nothing in terms of a core of professional revolutionaries to lay the ground work for the Partys' founding, these struggles remained spontaneous and at the mercy of bourgeois and petty bourgeois nationalists, who seized hegemony over them in pursuit of reformist gains.

National forms of organizations were promoted or created, ranging from out-right right wing groups to civil rights and "leftist" types, e.g., the Black Panther Party, Young Lords Party, Brown Berets.*

As new tunes to old revisionist songs were being written, RU challenged OL, where Klonsky was now nesting, for complete hegemony over the national movements. In fact William Hinton, a "closed cadre" of RU, wrote: "Where such a party does not yet exist, as in America, revolutionary students should help build one by joining, supporting, and helping to bring together such genuine revolutionary sprouts as the Black Workers' Congress, the League of Revolutionary Black Workers, the Young Lords Party, and the Revolutionary Union. In addition there are local and regional groups not yet linked to any national organization that study and apply Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought seriously and strive to unite all forces that can be united against the main enemy. These too may be called genuine revolutionary sprouts. They form part of the base from which a national working class revolutionary party may eventually be built." (*Turning Point In China*, p. 109)

With the petty bourgeoisie in leadership, economism, reformism, vulgar materialism, right opportunism, petty bourgeois nationalism flourished by leaps and bounds. The RU spread the liquidationist line—"Build the revolutionary unity and consciousness of the working class", while Party building became something for the distant future. The OL, characterized by its historic spine-

* These organizations were either terroristically eliminated or destroyed due to opportunist leadership, based in the petty bourgeoisie-lumpen alliance.

lessness, a centrist characteristic, raised that Party Building was the central task only to liquidate it further, by "criticizing" itself later, saying that this was an "Ultra-leftist" view. In line OL was even more of a third worldist sect than their hegemonic opponents in the RU.

And so a hegemonic struggle over who would bring the "majority of oppressed nationality cadres" into their future "party" ensue—the likes of which was a warning to all advanced workers to stay clear away from these "anti-revisionists".

The RU and OL continued to insist on rebuilding "national forms" of organizations, based on applying the theory of "three worlds", "third world as the motive force" bankruptcy, calling for an organization for each nationality, "third world" coalitions, Black workers the vanguard one day, the next day Chicano workers, etc. Wherever the petty bourgeoisie desired to adore the spontaneous movement, here they claimed was the vanguard. The theory of "three worlds" served as the greatest obstacle in the way to the forming of a center for the organized activity of Party Building. Meanwhile, one Hardial Bains, the "chairman" of the "Communist Party of Canada (ML)" had found one Nelson Peery of the "Communist League" (also a vet of the "CPUSA") in the U.S. Through the alliance which the American "Communist" Workers Movement (now "Central Organization of U.S. "Marxist-Leninists") historically had with Hardial Bains, as a member of Bains "International", a call was made for a conference of "North American Marxist-Leninists".* The call for the "Conference of North American Marxist-Leninists" was on the one hand repulsed by the class conscious proletarians, whom the "Communist League" (CL) and "American Communist Workers Movement" ("ACWM-COUSML") had failed to attract, due to their thoroughly demagogic phrasemongering and extreme doctrinarism. On the other hand, these groups served to strengthen the three worldist revisionists of the RU and OL in the U.S., who attacked these groups for "ultra-leftism" providing them with a mask to present themselves as internationalists opposed to social-chauvinism. The genuine Marxist-Leninists responded by aiming the fire at the RU and OL, and in so doing, taking up a defense of Marxism-Leninism which would serve to also draw lines of demarcation with "COUSML" and "CL", as we shall show. The RU became the frontline advocates of the revisionist line, OL shadowing as usual, also taking on a centrist posture. Liquidationsim through and through of the Party, of the National Question, of proletarian revolution, found RU frenziedly realizing that it was losing ground, exposed in the struggle for the defense of the purity of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. They raised the bogeyman of "ultra-leftism", mounting attack upon attack against the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces. OL came to the aid of RU by (1) staying out of the polemics, and (2) concluding that the "left" had become the main danger.

* This part of history, the threat which Bains' "CPC-ML" and the "COUSML" group in the U.S. represent in the international communist movement, posing as "anti-third worldist", warrants a specific detailed study. See—the section on Contemporary Movement, later in this article.

And so they united— RU and OL in the fight against Marxism-Leninism and against the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces. The difference between the two all along, as history proves with its stubborn insistence of revealing the truth, amounted to a race for who would be recognized as the “party” and franchised agents of Chinese revisionism, with exclusive rights to spread revisionism in the U.S.

As we pointed out earlier, RU had seized hegemony over a sizable section of the petty bourgeois movement by 1972. OL’s form of the liquidationist line was expressed slightly differently than RU’s though in essence the same line reveals itself. Straight out of Klonsky’s mouth we are told: “For such a Party, practicing the *mass line* [our emphasis-ed.] is the method of mobilization of the revolutionary forces. That is, it must go to the masses, take their ideas and concentrate them, then go back to the masses, persevere in the ideas and carry them through.” (“Unity Statement,” OL, 1972)

As comrades will note, no distinction is made between advanced, intermediate, and backward workers; “masses” in general, “workers” in general, “people” in general, is a convenient trick which all revisionists utilize to cover the alliance which they have struck with their own bourgeoisie, as comrade Lenin long ago exposed. OL also makes it clear that it had no intention of raising the class consciousness, the political consciousness, of the proletariat from that of “a class in itself,” to that of a “class for itself”, which is done by the Party of the proletariat. In the first period of Party building this is secured by winning the vanguard, the advanced workers, to the side of communism. OL also makes clear that it possessed such disdain for Marxist-Leninist theory, that it would not interject scientific socialism but instead develop the “mass line” [sic] as the method to mobilize the “revolutionary forces”. RU came out saying that “advanced workers were those who enjoyed the confidence of the workers even if they were anti-communist”, a feeble attempt to hide their own anti-communism. OL came out with the “mass line”, even if it’s anti-Communist!! Thus trying to render RU more profound. Both had the the same social-basis, the same revisionist stench. Their differences? Only big-organization politics separated the two. Another example:

“While the principal danger in the general people’s movement [here we go again with the “people” in *general*-ed.], is posed by right opportunism” [note this gem] “within the young communist forces the main danger is ultra-leftism.” (Ibid.)

Why this unmitigated sophistry? Consistently, RU and OL covered (and as “CPML” and “RCP” continue to cover) the social basis of opportunism and revisionism in the U.S. They took on a centrist mask of paying lip service to “right opportunism as the main danger,” while their so-called polemics were launched at “ultra-Leftism”. They completely negated the Marxist-Leninist line that revisionism is an international phenomenon, and never took on any fight, not even an inconsistent one, against the actual manifestations of right opportunism in the U.S. movement. Did OL attempt to give an analysis to its distortion of the actual situation? As to their bankrupt analysis on the main

danger, let’s see— “Due to the inexperience and still shallow roots among the *basic sections* [our emphasis-ed.] of the working class, the danger of a purist view towards the mass struggle and negation of the united front pose an important obstacle.” (Ibid.)

They of course meant to cover up the reformist approach to the mass struggle, the worship of spontaneity, the economism, which characterized those years, precisely the ones they are supposedly analysing. What could you expect from SDS-ers, who could only apply the university campus approach, and were being so “sincerely” and “honestly” frightened that the “purist” view, in the fight for the purity of Marxism-Leninism, in the fight to weld the Party out of the class conscious proletarians and purify the ranks in the struggle against opportunism, would, as it has, render them useless.

Of course, this little neat package, so very hostile to “purity” was intended to cover up liquidationism, in the traditions of Browder and Foster—in unity with the RU—as mandated by the Chinese revisionists. “A manifestation of this ultra-leftist influence is the view of ‘building the Party first, then later engaging in the mass struggle’”. (Ibid.)

The problem of course was liquidationism, that trend which has stood as the obstacle to building the Party at all, let alone “first”. These attacks on Leninism have not stopped in the least; in fact, an intensification of the attacks is everywhere manifest.

Stalin’s work, “The Party Before and After Taking Power” gives direction to the Communists all over the world. In the first period of Party building, the Party must concentrate on itself, on its own preservation. He outlines the absolute necessity of welding a center, a core of professional revolutionaries. He outlines the chief form of activity, propaganda, and for what purpose. But the RU and OL could have none of this— they were *against* “purity”, against revolutionary theory, against propaganda, against the advanced workers, against building the Party of a *new* type. “Practice”, they said, “common practice”, they argued, “mass practice”, they cried, is the basis of “unity”.

So what kept them from uniting? Every *Peking Review*, became a tally sheet of who was leading the race, who was getting more letters printed, more messages received and recognized, more trips to China. William Hinton, who was a “closed” cadre of RU, succeeded at first in providing a link between the RU and the Chinese revisionists. But OL never gave up. They leached, and begged, and parroted everything the Chinese revisionists ordered them to parrot. And so, they continued to bicker over who was betraying the revolution more furiously, who had succeeded in spreading the “united front against imperialism” fallacy more broadly, and whose united front was the broadest. They continued to bicker over who had chanted and spread “Mao Zedong Thought” and Lin Piao-ism more widely, who had the greatest number of “third world” cadres and the greatest amount of ragsheets, who had the biggest coalitions or fightback committees, who had recorded more “national campaigns” like “Throw the Bum Out” (RU), “Dump the Bum” (OL), “Jobs or Income Now” or “Make the Capitalists Pay”.

Both RU and OL have been equally treacherous; both display unbounded opportunism; both are identical replicas of the corpse of the "CPUSA" and the Second International; both bragged about how their leaders were "Red Diaper Babies", the vets of the "CPUSA", both can trace their origins in the petty bourgeois student movement of the most elite campuses in the U.S., such as Columbia, Harvard, and Berkeley; both had a base of support within every organization in the centrist trend—Black Workers Congress, Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization, August 29th Movement (ATM), I Wor Kuen (IWK).

Their hegemonic contradictions were reflected within each and every organization in which they had secured a base of support, where "Mao Zedong Thought" permeated. All united to unleash a counter-revolutionary offensive against Marxism-Leninism and the genuine Communists who took up the struggle to defend its orthodoxy against distortions. In the struggle to draw lines of demarcation, the defenders of Leninism inevitably had to come into a confrontation with Chinese revisionism, "Mao Zedong Thought" and the rotten theory of the "three worlds".

The hegemonic aspirations of the franchised agents of the Chinese variant of modern revisionism in the U.S. served to muddle up matters, diverting the struggle away from the thorough exposure of modern revisionism. This created a chaotic situation that for 5 years, (1972-1977), saw the rise of factional infighting, and the spread of disillusionment designed to halt the struggle for the Party, and proletarian revolution in the U.S. The factional infighting which gripped every group saw the total destruction of Black Workers Congress, riddled from top to bottom with revisionists of every shade (end of 1974), and a split in PRRWO, (end of 1975—beginning of 1976). PRRWO then became the focal point of attack by every revisionist "third world" sect, who labelled it as "ultra-leftist," while in fact right opportunism characterized the line of PRRWO upholder of the "three worlds" theory. They did this to assist the third worldist and provocateurs internal to PRRWO who were being exposed. The consolidation of a pact between ATM and IWK now merged in the "League for Revolutionary Struggle-ML" and "CPML" left "RCP" with little influential power over the petty bourgeoisie. The "RCP" had been established on factional infighting from the beginning, and lost out in its hegemonic fight with OL, for recognition from the Chinese revisionists.

Now "CPML", proceeded to make its alliance and open collaboration with U.S. Imperialism, since its revisionist bosses of the "CPC" had entered into open collaboration with U.S. imperialism. Prior to 1972 and Nixon's visit to China, united fronts with the Soviet revisionists' representatives in the U.S., such as with the "CPUSA" and the Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP) through "coalitions" and "united fronts against imperialism", had been the policy of OL and RU, as it was then the policy of the "CPC" with Soviet Social-imperialism. Now the alliance, as dictated by the Chinese revisionists, was to be between the "peoples of the world" against "Soviet social-imperialism", i.e. the line of the "main enemy."

The treachery of "two line struggle" and the "unity trend" was actively promoted in opposition to drawing lines of demarcation by those doing the bidding for Chinese revisionism, first by PLP, later by RU, OL, and the rest of the open social-chauvinists and, in a camouflaged way, by "COUSML" and "MLOC". Both resulted in every group that professed to be Marxist-Leninist having two lines, neither one Leninist. This served to undermine the struggle for the one Marxist-Leninist line in opposition to modern revisionism. Thus, the influence of "Mao Zedong Thought" lingered on, serving in effect to sabotage the important polemics going on in 1974, for the defense of Leninism against liquidationism of the Party. The Leninist line had to be defended against the revisionist lines being propagated by OL—RU, primarily, although certainly not exclusively, on the National Question, the Woman Question, Party Building, Strategy and Tactics, and all questions centering around Party Program, in order to carry out proletarian revolution in the U.S. for socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The lines of demarcation were being drawn but inconsistently against economism, against the worship of spontaneity. By 1974, a split had taken place which left RU and OL nakedly defending revisionism and opportunism, while a fight for the Marxist-Leninist line that Party building was the central task was attempting to assert itself.

However, without a struggle against "Mao Zedong Thought" and the "three worlds" theory, this fight remained superficial, and the lines of demarcation were incomplete, which resulted in deviation and further manifestations of liquidationism.

By way of illustration we quote from passages of *In the U.S. Pregnant With Revisionism*, PRRWO publication in 1974, after the split with RU:

"Yes, we agree that Party Building must be done through active participation in the class struggle, bringing scientific socialism to the working class, etc., but ideological struggle and drawing lines of demarcation is a pre-requisite in the building of the Party. The RU sees Party Building only through the United Front Against Imperialism."

This line was defended by the lefts. The struggle to draw lines of demarcation as a pre-requisite to building the Party was and remains the line of conduct for all class conscious proletarians in opposition to the calls for "unity" with social-chauvinism being made by the centrists. However, the adoption of an opportunist line, peddled by the "Communist" Party of China—"United Front Against Imperialism" hindered a clear cut stance, and undermined the unmasking of the true meaning of the revisionist two-stage revolution line propagated by the RU and OL. The "united front against imperialism strategy" applied to the U.S. This was a new version of the "CPUSA's" revisionist trash of "anti-monopoly coalition", now being peddled by "COUSML."

"Unite the many to defeat the few" became the justification to unite with all and any reactionary regime. Included in the "many" at first was the Russian imperialists; now, as is so evident, U.S. imperialism is in the "united front."

The revisionists in the U.S. were given respite to spread attacks and distortions, aimed at discrediting Marxism-Leninism, counterposing revolutionary theory, Marxism-Leninism, with "Mao Zedong Thought". One-stage revolution which has as its immediate aim the smashing of the bourgeois state, expropriation of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of socialism, was counterposed to a "united front" with the enemies of proletarian revolution, with the enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. Party Building was liquidated, counterposed with "anti-imperialist" coalitions, workers' organizations, and prattle about building the Party in the "heat of class struggle." This was in opposition to the Leninist norms of building the Party composed of advanced workers, firmly founded on Marxist-Leninist theory, which will therefore pursue one single Marxist-Leninist line. The Party must be modeled after the Bolshevik Party which alone can lead the proletariat and all working people in crushing the resistance of the bourgeoisie, by smashing the bourgeois state through armed insurrection and at one sweep expropriating the bourgeoisie, establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and thereby ending the exploitation of man by man. This is the road to socialism, the way out of the general crisis of imperialism, the only way out of the horrors of war, in all capitalist countries. Instead, alliances and blocs were being sought and developed. "Unite the many to defeat the few" was smuggled in by the franchised agents of Chinese revisionism, as a way to cover the open alliance with imperialism.

The social chauvinist sects in the U.S. have struck an open bond with their own bourgeoisie. Today this open alliance is propagated and shown by the bourgeoisie itself. For example, Dan Burstein, editor of *The Call*, wrote an editorial for the *New York Times* on November 21, 1978, as the first "American" to Kampuchea, which indicates active participation of the "CP-ML" in U.S. policy-making, which is now an established fact. This is a logical step for this social chauvinist clique, which has been so instrumental in spreading large scale ideological confusion and attacks on Marxism-Leninism, promoting an alliance between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and defending their own bourgeoisie's super exploitation of the colonies and semi-colonies.

By way of defending orthodox Marxism-Leninism in a struggle against internal enemies, the class conscious proletarians came into a battle against the theory of "three worlds". By relying on Leninism, the U.S. Marxist-Leninists were set on the correct path, and firmer and more definite lines of demarcation were drawn. Confusion gave way to clarity, and Marxism-Leninism is striking death blows at the eclecticism which has resulted from the propagation and influence of "Mao Zedong Thought".

In the past, the fight against opportunism was not taken to its logical conclusion—the need for a split. In fact all the opportunists claimed that splits were harmful and called on all the wavering and vacillating elements to beware of the

"splitters" who were labelled "ultra-leftists" The ideological struggle against social chauvinism did not result in a rupture, due to the dominance of opportunism not only in the U.S. but internationally.

Rather than a fundamental split taking place, the "movement" was re-shuffled, so to speak and new alliances were established. With the failure to expose the social chauvinists and centrists all along the line, with the failure to unmask the most authoritative ideologues, opportunism was passed over in silence.* The "CPML" has a long history of centrism and its social chauvinism is now open. As we mentioned earlier "CPML" proved that it could outslit "RCP" and it did get the franchise from the "CPC", to be their representative agents in the U.S. Klonsky is an opportunist maneuverer from way back.

However, as the "CPC" was stripping off all its internationalist pretexts, as it moved to closer collaboration with U.S. imperialism, "CPML" could maneuver no longer under the centrist mask. Those opportunists that RU dragged with it were too discredited, e.g. Danny Brown, to be able to make a comeback as "mass leaders". "CPML" however, was now on the "rise" with a number of ex—"CPUSA" members, Klonsky, and hidden scabs from BWC and PRRWO. It thus built itself an apparatus with *connections* in a number of the "mass movement", i.e., sections of the petty bourgeoisie and labor aristocracy.

In opposition to both RU and OL, yet another opportunist formation developed in the so-called "Revolutionary Wing." This centrist formation was a hotbed of opportunist cliques. BWC had been splintered into 5 opportunist groups—Workers Congress (WC), Revolutionary Workers Congress (RWC), Marxist-Leninist Organizing Committee (MLOC), Bay Area Communist Union (BACU), and the Revolutionary Bloc (RB). This marked the end of Black Workers Congress. The "Revolutionary Wing" was composed of what remained of the faction ridden PRRWO, the raving nationalists of ATM, WVO and Revolutionary Workers League (RWL), suddenly emerging from the "secret cells".

The history of this "wing" of opportunism is disgustingly typical of what has developed in this soil of reaction, U.S. Imperialism. All these opportunist groups claimed to be against RU and OL. All claimed to hold that Party building was the central task; all claimed propaganda to be the chief form of activity; and all vowed to work towards winning the advanced workers to communism. WVO from its inception was the most openly economist, openly calling for the freedom of criticism through its "anti-revisionist theoretical premises," remembered in the polemics against it as the "anti-theoretical revisionist premises."

* RU—exposed as openly social chauvinist, implemented its line of Party building for a brief period, rushed to its "party congress" formed RCP and immediately went with all it had to the working class where it failed miserably. The aim of seizing hegemony over the proletariat directly in the labour movement collapsed. Internal squabbling between different factions—reflective of the factions and crisis in the "CPC"—matured to an antagonistic level and the RCP split up into RCP (Avakian) and the Revolutionary Workers Headquarters (Bergman and Jarvis.)

WVO denied the very existence of advanced workers and had copied to the last detail RU's liquidationist tactics. RU called for intermediate organizations, WVO called for Ad hoc committees. WVO was openly pushing for "united front from above" work with the labor bureaucrats, and evaded the National Question by saying it had no position.

Through its work of sabotage in the African Liberation Support Committee (ALSC) it was able to seize control of ALSC and hide behind it as it did with all its front organizations. RWL and WVO had the closest relationship of all the organizations in the so-called "Revolutionary Wing".

The two had a similar history. Both were mainly based in the student movement and both were formed as "secret cell" organizations which had been around for a number of years (1973-1974), coming to the surface after RU had been totally discredited.

ATM as all know is now part of the social chauvinist clique—the three world-ist "League of Revolutionary Struggle-ML"—the "gotten together" bunch.

The analysis that there were two wings in the movement served to cover up the centrist trend as expressed in the fact that this so-called "wing" was composed of the very forces who had been conciliating to the social chauvinists all along the line, a faction of the Maoist trend, under the ideological and political influence of the gang of four.