

## Dead Set Against Proletarian Discipline and Organization

The more this “movement” deviated toward opportunism, the more the “leaders” were bound to consider discipline as a restraint on the “free” development of their personalities. (This preoccupation takes up 90% of the thinking capacity of all opportunists.) As we said previously, their loose-knit social-democratic organizations, circles, “parties”, and groups have made it that much easier for the political police to infiltrate the communist and workers movements.

The petty bourgeois parties and groups all sneer at discipline, covered up under the pretext, take note, of “democratic centralism”!!! At one time or another, all these incorrigible opportunists have pretended to be the defenders of “democratic centralism”. This usually reflects the shaping up of an internal struggle of one or another faction, or the influence which a polemic against their line is having on their “honest” or wavering members. By distorting the principles of democratic centralism, the opportunists are able to get rid of the opposition and smash any possibility of ideological struggle breaking out of the permitted limits. They are thus able to coerce unenlightened persons, bringing some of them under opportunist hegemony against their will.

The opportunist movement has made such a mockery of democratic centralism, that many distortions of this principle of a communist organization and, above all, of the Party when it is founded, have been widespread, to the detriment of secrecy and conspiratorial work. This has made it possible for the political police to launch the activities described in a previous section of this article. Of course, hand in hand with the opportunists, the political police have a vested interest in keeping things loose--“open and aboveboard”. This is the guarantee of their success in the activity of sabotage.

It is therefore crucial that matters of organization be conducted along strictly defined Leninist norms. In his famous work which laid down the organizational principles of the Bolshevik Party, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, Lenin emphasized that:

**“In its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but organization. Disunited by the rule of anarchic competition in the bourgeois world, ground down by forced labour for capital, constantly thrust back to the ‘lower depths’ of utter destitution, savagery, and degeneration, the proletariat can, and inevitably will, become an invincible force only through its ideological unification on the principles of Marxism being reinforced by the material unity of organization [our emphasis—ed.] which welds millions of toilers into an army of the working class.”** (LCW, Vol. 7, p. 415)

By now, those readers who are convinced of the opportunist character and petty bourgeois basis of the “movement”, will comprehend why opportunism

in organizational matters runs like an uninterrupted thread throughout the “parties”, groups, and circles which make up the social-chauvinist and centrist trends in the “movement”. Such readers will begin to ponder over the level of organizational sabotage which was produced by following Mao Zedong’s opportunist line on organization. Mao’s treatment of organizational questions, like his treatment of all questions, was placed in easily memorized formulas. In organizational matters “Mao Zedong thought” inevitably led to anarchism. We previously discussed how this was done through the opportunist formula, “political line key link”. What followed was the clearest anti-Leninist line on organization coming out of “Mao Zedong thought”, which provided easy-to-memorize criteria for sabotaging democratic centralism in the entire movement:

1. the individual is subordinate to the organization:
2. the minority is subordinate to the majority:
3. the lower level is subordinate to the higher level: and
4. the entire membership is subordinate to the Central Committee.” (Mao Zedong, “Party Discipline”, MSW, Vol. 2, p. 204)

Mao had to make things simple for his opportunist faction in the “CPC”, who in turn deceived those ignorant of Marxism-Leninism into believing that these were the “four principles” of democratic centralism, which could be adapted to anything, even to a so-called “communist party.” Lenin, however, was an enemy of simple little formulas to be learned by rote. Lenin didn’t speak of the “four principles of democratic centralism.” He elaborated the question of discipline in the following way: **“I repeat, the experience of the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia has clearly shown even to those who are unable to think, or who have not had occasion to ponder over this question, that absolute centralization and the strictest discipline of the proletariat are one of the fundamental conditions for victory over the bourgeoisie.”** (*Left Wing Communism*, LSW, Vol. 10, 1938, International Publishers, p. 60-61) Is it any wonder why the Bolshevik model has been pushed into the background, why discipline and centralization have been non-existent in the so-called “movement”? The petty bourgeoisie could and did adapt willingly to Mao’s formula because the meaning of discipline and the need for centralization are totally missing from it.

Lenin had long ago unmasked opportunists like Mao, who were denying that the Party is built from above. Keeping in mind Mao’s four simple little criteria, let’s see how the opportunists Martov and Axelrod, exposed by Lenin, denied the need for discipline and organization. Lenin showed— **“... their advocacy of a diffuse, not strongly welded Party organization, and their hostility to the idea (the ‘bureaucratic’ idea) of building the Party from the top downward, starting from the Party Congress and the bodies set up by it.”** (LCW, Vol. 7, p. 206) In nearly 60 years, the “CPC” has had eleven congresses, most of which have been marked by factional infighting, and which were called in order to get rid of one faction or another—e.g.

- The 9th Congress—Liu Shao-chi
- The 10th Congress—Lin Piao, and
- The 11th Congress—the “gang of four.”

It is therefore quite obvious why Mao left the Party Congress out of the little formula. But Lenin has made clear that the highest expression of democratic centralism is the Party Congress. Lenin continued to show that the opportunists are hostile to discipline in **“their tendency to proceed from the bottom upwards, allowing every professor, every high school student, and every striker to declare himself a member of the Party.”** This is precisely Mao’s “from the masses, to the masses” – the bottom up approach.

Lenin warned against people like Mao – **“... their hostility to the ‘formalism’ which demands that a Party member should belong to one of the organizations recognized by the Party; their leaning towards the mentality of the bourgeois intellectual, who is only prepared to ‘accept organizational relations platonically’; their penchant for opportunist profundity and for anarchistic phrases.”** [emphasis ours—ed.] (Ibid) Stalin also warned about such people, who are out to destroy discipline through constant outcries about the lack of “democracy”. The opportunist antagonism toward strict centralization has been manifested in the hostility exhibited toward the very idea of the need to develop a leading center. It has been shown in the “equality of circles” line, which was exposed in the publication, “Joint Counter-proposal to the Multi-lateral Conference (MULC)”, by Demarcation and the U.S. Leninist Core.\* Here, as in so many questions, the centrists and social-chauvinists are one. The hypocrisy of the centrists, however, cannot be hidden for long. For example, prior to the MULC, WCC and KCRWC were against anyone (in principle, no less) who called themselves a center, while at the same time they declared that “building the center is the key link” (We sympathize with those readers who find this utterly confusing—but Leninism can do only so much to make heads where there exist only tails.) This centrist analysis called for a “center” where every circle had its say, where every circle could freely criticize Marxism-Leninism, and attack the Bolshevik model for the party, etc.

But today the story is already changing. Dizzy with their “success” in organizing the MULC, WCC and KCRWC seem to be feeling their Wheaties. Thus, they now say: “Democratic centralism also teaches there is not an equality of organizations—that there are different levels of development, that some organizations, by being able to sum up the views of other organizations, by having an advanced understanding of the situation, by putting forward guiding lines, become the leadership.” (WCC and KCRWC, “The Building of the Vanguard Party of the U.S. Proletariat”, p. 37)

Unable to cite anywhere that Lenin spoke of democratic centralism in such a vague, diffuse, and distorted manner, WCC and KCRWC immediately have to turn to Mao, who, incidentally, they criticize in the same pamphlet as having had a revisionist line on Party Building. But what is behind all this vagueness? Why have WCC and KCRWC retreated from the “unite to demarcate,” “equality of the circles” line, only so recently advanced? There is no

\* Available from Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks.

self-criticism, so what is this all about? Previously, in order to attack the U.S. Leninist Core and keep it from attending the MULC, WCC and KCRWC yelled to the rooftops their false accusations about “centers”, “provocateurs”, etc. Now this finds them in quite a predicament if they claim openly that they believe themselves to be the leadership over all the circles. Thus they must first develop a case, basing it on: (1) uneven development, (2) who can collect the most information and sum up views of others, (3) who can outfox the others and seize the upper hand by “putting forward guiding lines”!! These criteria, of course, are designed to fit the MULC co-ordinators, WCC and KCRWC, who are promoting themselves as the “center,” the leadership. In their attempts to completely distort democratic centralism, WCC and KCRWC reveal their anarchistic approach to organizational matters. Thus we are told: “So if democratic centralism in the organization does not lead to sectarianism (or equalitarianism) but rather combats it, then what of the view that our organizations are too small for higher and lower bodies?” (Ibid, p. 37)

In this way, anarchists individualistically brush aside the Leninist discipline and organization based on unity of ideas—the type of discipline and organization so indispensable to the proletariat. Instead, they make democratic centralism simply a question of “higher and lower bodies”, whose function is to “combat sectarianism and equalitarianism”. “Summing up ideas”, not “unity of ideas”, is put forward as the basis for this bureaucratic version of democratic centralism, a version which serves the petty bourgeoisie, not the proletariat. WCC and KCRWC obviously hope to use their latest “left” posturing around democratic centralism to further their careerist ambitions to be leaders of a new national opportunist organization.

Let these opportunist promoters of this latest attempt to undermine the Bolshevik model of organization take heed from the words of Lenin: **“Let me tell you gentlemen who are so solicitous about the younger brother that the proletariat is not afraid of organization and discipline! The proletariat will do nothing to have the worthy professors and high school students who do not want to join an organization recognized as Party members merely—because they work under the control of an organization. The proletariat is trained for organization by its whole life, far more radically than many an intellectual prig.”** (LCW, Vol. 7, p. 389)

It is the petty bourgeoisie who hates organization, discipline and unity of ideas based on Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy. It is the petty bourgeoisie who complains about “sectarianism” but blames their incapability of being disciplined on democratic centralism.

WCC and KCRWC are full of contradictory statements, such as, on the one hand, that Mao had a “revisionist line on the Party” (WCC and KCRWC, op cit. p. 23), while on the other hand, they turn to Mao as their authority on “forms” of democratic centralism, where they refer to his “Methods of Work of Party Committees”; (Ibid. p. 37) They divorce Mao’s “revisionist line on the Party” from his revisionist line on everything else! That is, while WCC and KCRWC are deciding whether Mao is 30–70 or 70–30 they fragment his

revisionist line on Party Building. They say, therefore, that Mao had a revisionist line on "two line struggle", but a Marxist-Leninist interpretation of organization. Thus reference is made to Mao's *revisionist* "Methods of Work of Party Committees." WCC and KCRWC obviously *did* study Mao's analysis very closely, and are applying *his* views on organization, rather than Lenin's. Unable to base themselves on the Bolshevik model, they skipped over Lenin's *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, totally distorted the Iskra period, proceeded to talk about voluntary unity while liquidating class conscious discipline, and finally put their plan for building yet another Menshevik party out into the open.

Previously, WCC and KCRWC were openly peddling the "center is the key link" line through a comedy of Maoist dialectics: "We see the principal contradiction in the party building movement as the contradiction between the absence and presence of genuine Marxist-Leninist leadership, with absence being the principal aspect". (WCC, KCRWC, KCPR, "Let's Move Party Building Forward," p. 4) Now, as they are dumping Mao bit by bit, we no longer see the hysterically funny formulas. However, the "center is the key link" remains intact, so the same old centrist calls for "unity" of the "movement" jump out once again.

For instance, WCC and KCRWC feel it necessary that "... groups join in a plan to centralize the movement." (WCC and KCRWC, op cit. p. 37) This is accomplished, they say, through "... the centralization of Marxist-Leninist line through the participation of groups in the movement and the centralization of such participation." (Ibid. p. 37)

This sounds like double-talk, but a closer look is very revealing. WCC-KCRWC are admitting that their plan is not to unite the politically conscious workers into a political vanguard Party of the proletariat. No, they are out to unite ("centralize") "the movement". Lenin, however, made it absolutely clear that, **"The Marxist organization unites politically conscious workers by its common programme, common tactics, common decisions on the attitude to reaction, capitalists, bourgeois democrats (Narodniks), etc."** (LCW, Vol. 19, p. 346)

WCC-KCRWC dismiss the questions of party programme, tactics, and decisions. With other anti-Party circles, they hold closed meetings behind the backs of the politically conscious workers, coming out publicly under the guise of being "against Mao and for Leninism", while in the same breath they come out with a "new" version of Mao's "unite, don't split" - i.e., "centralize the movement". It's the same old song with a new tune. The same WCC-KCRWC who so loudly denounced the "revolutionary wing" and disclaimed any connections to its politics, are calling for a "new revolutionary wing", or a "new" Unity committee.

These forces are appealing to the backwardness of circle spirit. Lenin dealt with the likes of them long ago. **"The liquidators have forgotten all those elementary truths that 'every worker should know and remember'. They have proved by their plan to 'divide equally' that they are correctly regarded as the vehicle of the non-party spirit, as renegades from Marxism and advocates of the**

**bourgeois influence over the proletariat."** (LCW, Vol. 19, p. 346) Thus by trying to divide things equally, but "centralized"(!), their *plan* to unite the "movement" seeks to strengthen the hegemony of the bourgeoisie over the workers. No wonder WCC and KCRWC must hide among their colleagues of the MULC and avoid the struggle to demarcate from opportunism!

The great Lenin taught that in the period of disunity, in the period of "circles", lines of demarcation had to be drawn—yet WCC and KCRWC who (mind you!) profess now to be of the opinion that the Bolshevik model is the only model on which to build the Party, have found a way to bring together the "movement", guaranteeing of course, "the participation of the groups in the movement". Who are the groups they are talking about? What *movement* are they referring to? Rather than a straight answer, we are treated to more of the same elusiveness, which is so characteristic of the opportunists. That is why Lenin said, **"When we speak of opportunism, we must never forget a characteristic feature of opportunism in every sphere, namely, its vagueness, amorphousness, elusiveness. An opportunist, by his very nature, will always evade taking a clear and decisive stand, he will always seek a middle course, he will always wriggle like a snake between two mutually exclusive points of view and try to 'agree' with both, and reduce the difference of opinion to petty amendments, doubts, innocent and pious suggestions and so on and so forth."** (LCW, Vol. 17, p. 404)

Since we can expect no greater clarity from these opportunists on their plan, we will move on to examine the organizational opportunism of yet another set of centrists, the "CPUSA-ML". While some forces grouped around the MULC give lip service to democratic centralism only to distort it, "CPUSA-ML" has totally disregarded the question, as seen in how completely open the "party" is. *Anyone* who wishes to speak to their Central Committee can do so by simply picking up the telephone and dialing the number printed publicly in their newspaper, *Unite!* Actually, as regards social-democracy, "CPUSA-ML" is in a race for first place with every single opportunist clique in the U.S.

All the opportunists are camera-happy. Pictures of their followers and even some innocent by-standers (who are in the way of the photographer) are plastered throughout their ragsheets. "CPUSA-ML" had a display of photos of their congress—even though Chairman Barry Weisberg must have suffered great embarrassment as the photos revealed that the congress was attended almost solely by himself and a large bouquet of flowers. The canker of legality continues to rot away, in the empty shells masquerading as "communist" organizations, "Marxist-Leninist" circles, "revolutionary workers" groups, and even "communist parties".

We have gone into the question of organization because it is high time that we put an end to the disgraceful state of organization—more correctly, the lack of organized activity of communist work. Above we showed that those who have renounced Leninism are the betrayers of the proletariat.

We have focused our polemics against two centrist groupings—the WCC-KCRWC, now in high gear, eager to create yet another Menshevik Party, and

“CPUSA-ML”, an existing Menshevik Party, which no longer feels compelled to even address the question of organization. Because the centrists are in reality the most dangerous of the opportunist forces due to their “left” cover, we have shown that in organizational matters, these centrists are no different than the open social-chauvinists—not even in form. WCC, KCRWC and “CPUSA-ML” (like the whole of this rotten movement) promote looseness, liberalism and outright social democracy. No matter how many economist ragsheets, shop papers, or reprints they publish, it is a horse of an entirely different color to set up an apparatus to diffuse Marxist-Leninist propaganda for the purpose of building the political Party of the proletariat to make socialist revolution.

The point is that many of these groups, whether amateurs or “professionals” as printers, are a danger to the proletariat. Their social democratic looseness is a shiningly clear reflection in their organizational line of their revisionism in politics and tactics. They build up an organizational apparatus *not* to build the political party of the proletariat, but rather to build their own cliques, which they call “vanguard parties of the proletariat”. The organization thus becomes another small piece of property in the hands of the petty bourgeois leaders, used to assist the bourgeoisie in the exploitation of the proletariat.

It is important to understand that the movement as a whole has adopted a liquidationist line on Party building by renouncing the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin as the model, and proceeding to build their cliques by whatever other model they choose. Look anywhere in the movement and one will see many organizations, “parties”, and “unity committees”, trying to hide the deep crisis of this “movement”. There are “marxist-leninist” collectives and coalitions, yet all have rejected the Bolshevik model on the basis that it is a “mechanical application”, “dogmatism” and “ultra-leftism”, to “learn from other experiences”, etc. Yet the point is not that class conscious workers refused to study “other experiences”; the point is that the model for the party is a settled question, and has been so since the collapse of the Second International, which proved once and for all that only the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin could lead the proletariat to victory, to the consolidation of socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

With hypocritical cries about “unity” under the heading, “unity to demarcate”, under the pious wishes and Menshevik formulas of “equality of circles/ and or parties”, liquidation of the Party of the proletariat has been the aim of the “movement”. Even *before* the formation of the party and as a way to *prevent* its formation, the “movement” has renounced Leninism. Bolshevism condemns the replacement of Leninism by Maoism or any other “ism”. Opportunism in organizational matters is but further proof of such renunciations of Leninism.

When Lenin fought the liquidators in Russia from 1909 to 1913, in the period of reaction, he said: “Liquidationism is, in fact, the spreading of these bourgeois ideas of renunciation and renegacy among the proletariat.” (LCW, Vol. 19, p. 155) And added: “Liquidationism means not only the liquidation (i.e. the dissolution, the destruction) of the old party of the working class

[here Lenin is referring to the old party because the liquidators were calling for a new open, legal party—ed.] it also means the destruction of the class independence of the proletariat, the corruption of its class consciousness by bourgeois ideas.” (Ibid, p. 155-156)

In the U.S. where there is no Party, the idea being spread by all these so-called “parties” is that the task of building the party has been completed. Thus the independent leading role of the proletariat is denied.

The bourgeoisie fears Bolshevism, its irreconcilable enemy, and utilizes many means to spread anti-communism. The parties of the petty bourgeoisie aid the bourgeoisie by spreading the idea that the Bolshevik model is not applicable. So they nourish in their bosoms a love for bourgeois democracy and show through the “openness” of their organizations that they have no intention of building anything remotely revolutionary (and may lightning strike anyone who dares build anything secret from the bourgeoisie—after all, we do have “uncurtailed liberties”). The spread of this corruption within the proletariat, the spread of the idea that bourgeois democracy is democracy for the masses of people, is the promotion of bourgeois ideology among the proletariat. In short it is the propagation of the very same idea the bourgeoisie spreads itself, but under the mask of “Marxism-Leninism”. What other idea can people get when they are flooded by “communist” literature that is full of names, times, places, names of factories, and plenty of pictures to back them up? What else is being promoted by the horrendous practice of all this “sincere” openness in matters of organization, contacts, members, meetings, phones, etc? In fact the only thing this “movement” is closed as a tomb about is ideological struggle and open polemics before all class conscious workers. This conspiracy against open debate on the part of the “parties” is supposedly done in the interest of the workers who the “movement” has determined are not interested in the complex questions of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. Of course the real purpose of concealing debate from the proletariat is to keep it weak and disunited, thus incapable of taking steps forward toward the seizure of political power. “Discussions,” said Lenin, “(talks, debates, disputes,) about parties and about common tactics are essential; without them the masses are disunited; without them common decisions are impossible and, therefore, unity of action is also impossible.” (“The Struggle for Marxism”, LCW, Vol. 19, p. 346) “Essential”, said Lenin! But here, too, Lenin’s teaching are renounced. Backroom politics instead of open polemics are justified on the grounds that workers *here* (unlike workers “in Russia”, or workers “in Lenin’s day”) would be bored, confused, or imposed upon by the political debate. This goes hand in hand with the opportunist campaign to promote disdain for Marxist-Leninist theory. The parties of the petty bourgeoisie put forward the same line promulgated by the bourgeoisie—i.e., that Marxist-Leninist theory is abstract, rigid, unnecessary, and inapplicable in a “great democratic society” like the U.S. The petty bourgeoisie dreams of reforms, and fears settling accounts in fundamental terms with the bourgeoisie. They talk of overthrowing the bourgeoisie, but fear to break away from it, because they are fearful of losing their privileges

and bribes. Therefore, from the petty bourgeois viewpoint it is only necessary to build organizations capable of leading legal, peaceful demonstrations, protests, and strikes which can achieve "new and more far-reaching reforms". It is, therefore, the task of genuine Marxist-Leninists to explain to the politically conscious workers that "The liquidators are petty bourgeois intellectuals, sent by the bourgeoisie to sow liberal corruption among the workers." (LCW, Vol. 19, p. 162)

In the U.S. there are a swarm of liquidators, hiding behind a centrist mask. The open social-chauvinists have pledged their allegiance to Mao's "CPC", or to the Krushchevite revisionists; however, the centrists pretend to swear by Leninism, while renouncing the Bolshevik model for the Party. And renunciation of the Bolshevik model is a renunciation of Leninism, no matter what mask it takes. The danger of this is that a certain indifference toward the questions of line, tactics and organization has manifested itself among the class conscious workers as a reflection of the influence of liquidationism. That which Lenin put forward in his fight against the liquidators must be borne in mind: "Clearly, the party can not exist unless it fights with might and main against those who seek to destroy it." (Ibid, p. 159)

The entire "movement" has served to spread an anti-party spirit, replacing it with corruption and intrigue. Therefore, in the U.S. where there is no Party and very little of the Party spirit, the Party clearly cannot be built unless a fight against all those who renounce Leninism and the Bolshevik model is carried out *ruthlessly and with all our energy*.

The promotion of indifference toward ideological struggle, questions of tactics, and organizational discipline, is meant to sow dissension, mistrust, and disunity among the class conscious proletarians. *Disunity breeds laxity, liberalism, and political inactivity*. We have seen through bitter experience how these defects have led to the undermining of the development of a leading center. The rupture with all forms of opportunism in the ideological, political, and organizational sphere, must be carried out to completion. The beginning steps are being taken. In order that these beginning steps become a decisive leap forward, the fight against this opportunist movement, rotten to the very core, must be expressed in a split from it, which must result in the organized activity of advanced workers to build the Party.

There is a legitimate dissatisfaction among the advanced workers. This is natural when an entire "movement", which is threatened by the very existence of advanced workers, has lowered the level of politics to a shameful disgrace, to simplistic event-recording ragsheets, devoid of any analysis.

The "movement", in fact has made a fetish of theoretical impoverishment. Thus the need arises to raise the theoretical level of the advanced workers, who will be won over to communism and the organized activity of professional revolutionary work. For as Stalin said:

"The most experienced and influential of the advanced workers must find a place in all the local organizations, the affairs of the organizations must be

concentrated in their strong hands, and it is they who must occupy the most important posts in the organizations, from practical and organizational posts to literary posts. It will not matter if the workers who occupy important posts are found to lack sufficient experience and training and even stumble at first—practice and the advice of more experienced comrades will widen their outlook and in the end train them to become real writers and leaders of the movement. It must not be forgotten that Bebels do not drop from the skies, they are trained only in the course of work, by practice, and our movement now needs Russian Bebels, experienced and mature leaders from the ranks of the workers, more than ever before." (Stalin, Collected Works, Vol. 1, p. 156)

Lines of demarcation cannot be *definitely and firmly* drawn unless the level of organization is raised to professional revolutionary activity. Renunciation of the Leninist Party of a New Type by the opportunist movement cannot be combatted unless definite steps are taken to draw up a plan to build the Party from the top down. This plan will be the subject of a forthcoming work by the Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks. Onward, Comrades, to weld the leading core.

**Build the Party of a New Type!**

**Down With Organizational Opportunism!**

**CONCLUSION—**

### **COLLAPSE OF THE MENSHEVIKS AND THE TASKS OF THE BOLSHEVIKS**

The past twenty years in the U.S. have been marked by the disgustingly rapid spread of opportunism, which gripped the intellectuals and wavering petty bourgeoisie who composed the social basis of the "movement".

The corruption of the "movement" is materially based on the crumbs it has received and privileges it has obtained from the super-profits of imperialism.

This "movement" is not an isolated phenomenon, but actually a replica of the stinking opportunism which has dominated the international "anti-revisionist communist movement".

With the total disintegration of the revisionist "CPUSA," a new covertly opportunist force was needed to promote the interest of the bourgeoisie more effectively.

Mao Zedong became the ideologue of this "movement", and under the guise of Marxism-Leninism many more years of betrayal were to ensue.

This book, in all of its sections, addresses precisely the ideological and social basis of this betrayal. The tricks utilized by these agents of the bourgeoisie who cloak themselves in the name of communism, are exposed in order that it be understood why it has taken so long to complete a rupture, a thorough split. Ugliness was painted in beauty. But once the covers are torn off, there remains nothing but decay, deception, corruption, and cowardice.