

Two Rotten Eggs Laid by Mao Zedong: “Political Line is Key Link”, and “Theory is Principal”

The influence of Mao's gang of four was most entrenched in the centrist forces we have above discussed. The gang's series of articles from 1972 to 1976 appearing in *Peking Review* and other pamphlets were meant to prop up the dying thoughts of Mao Zedong, in crisis due to the event of the collapse of another Mao lackey—Lin Piao.

Such gems as the “key link” fetishism and the revisionist trash on philosophy were aimed at consolidating the influence of Mao's gang internationally, through the application of “Chairman Mao's revolutionary line.” Hence, the “U.S. movement” and its “revolutionary wing” were fertile ground for “poli-

tical line key link”, and “theory is primary,” a natural breeding place for this centrist trash to blossom. In this section we will therefore address these “two poisonous weeds” and show how in fact the forces grouped around the “MULC” are rehabilitating Mao’s gang and the “revolutionary wing”, in the typical despicable fashion of labelling out-and-out right opportunism as “ultra-leftism”.

Many of these “new circles”, e.g. “WCC” and “KCRWC”, have concluded that “Political line key link” was an “ultra-left” position, so they criticize themselves from the right for “ultra-leftism.” They failed to realize that “political line key link” served the centrist trend and liquidationism. This opportunist line was based on the centrist assumption that an ideological break with revisionism had been made by 1972. Serving to cover up for social-chauvinism, it was asserted that what was needed was unity on “political line.” It was thought that by pursuing a “struggle for unity on political line,” the majority of the movement could “unite.” The Lefts conciliated with this, making the assumption that what was meant by this was the application of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions, which would serve to demarcate the sham from the genuine.

But this assumption proved to be a dream—or a nightmare! The conciliation by the Lefts was due to the incorrect analysis that the ideological break with revisionism had taken place. In 1972, however, the exact opposite was the case. The revisionist “CPC” had made their alliance with the U.S. imperialists an openly known fact through Nixon’s visit to China. The centrist forces internationally had kept this openly social-chauvinist act of the “CPC” well covered up. Nothing was said at the time except by the Trotskyites, who were only too happy to throw around their usual rhetoric to confuse people. This had the effect of assisting the “CPC” in consolidating support for its alliance with U.S. imperialism. The centrists justified this openly social-chauvinist maneuver on the part of the “CPC” as “China’s great strategic thinking,” “state to state relations,” “China’s business who it chose to collaborate with”(!!!), etc. Far from there being an ideological break with revisionism, there was a further nurturing of centrism as an international phenomenon. “Political line key link” served to obscure this fact.

It was the centrists who covered up and continued to cover up for open social-chauvinism, leading to the disarming of the revolutionary proletariat internationally. The defects in the analysis made of the “anti-revisionist communist movement” reflected all the characteristics of the centrist current. It was, in actuality, an “anti-Soviet” bloc, pro-U.S. imperialist movement, that promoted Mao Zedong and Chinese revisionism, a movement that subordinated the interests of the international proletariat to petty-bourgeois and bourgeois nationalism. At the time Mao’s gang of centrists internationally were covering up for Chinese imperialist ambitions. Therefore, to conclude that in 1972, an ideological break had taken place, manifested, at best, gross ideological backwardness, or, in most cases, rancid opportunism.

The truth of the matter was that the self-proclaimed international vanguard, the “CPC,” was worshipped like a saint on an altar. U.S. Marxist-Leninists were

not grounding themselves firmly in Leninism through concentrated study and work based on Leninist norms. There was a combining of Leninism with “Mao Zedong Thought,” which is anti-Leninist. It was for this reason, and this reason primarily, that there could not be the consolidation of a Leninist core of professional revolutionaries.

Leninism was subordinated to revisionism, the proletariat to the petty bourgeoisie, the building of the party to the mass movement. Theory was subordinated to “practice,” and ideological struggle to a phantom “unity” which did not exist. Rather than the supposed ideological break with opportunism, ideological confusion was widespread. Instead of ideological unity, disunity reigned, and instead of drawing the lines of demarcation necessary to achieve real unity, there was conciliation to opportunism and Maoist “unity,” i.e., “big” organization fever, which stank of unprincipled alignments and re-alignments. “Political line is key link” created a basis for birds of a feather to flock together, as the saying goes. On some political positions “unity” could be reached, while on other questions differences came to the fore.

The differences were sharpest around the need to reaffirm Leninism—especially in relation to the principal task of Party Building. Leninism calls for the Party to be built on new revolutionary lines as opposed to the Social-Democratic parties of the old type. It calls for the struggle to build the Party from above as opposed to building it from the “mass movement,” the struggle to model the Party after the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin as opposed to the “CPC” or the “CPUSA”. Leninism calls for a Party that purges itself of opportunist and undesirable elements rather than a party that allows opportunism to exist within the ranks. The Bolshevik Party is based on the proletariat, composed of its best elements, its most devoted men and women, rather than being based in the petty bourgeoisie and labor aristocracy. It is a vanguard Party armed with revolutionary theory, capable of leading the whole movement and implementing its political line, because it possesses the ideological solidification and organization capable of doing so. Such a Party has a deep knowledge of the laws of the movement, the laws of the revolution, rather than a party which tails at the end of the spontaneous movement only able to record events.

Stalin described the Party as one which “adopts the point of view of the vanguard of the proletariat, which is capable of raising the masses to the level of the class interests of the proletariat, is capable of diverting the working class from the path of craft unionism and converting it into an independent political force. The Party is the political leader of the working class.” (Stalin, *Leninism*, International Publishers, p. 89.) “Political line key link” served to hinder the development of the working class into an independent political force by serving to sabotage the organization of the work. This formulation could never lead to a Party which is a vanguard Party of the working class, which at the same time is a unit of the class, “intimately bound to it with every fibre of its being.” (Stalin, *Ibid.*) It could never lead to a Party which enjoys moral and political authority amongst the masses, because it has shown

itself capable of leading both in theory and organization. It could never lead to a Party whose leading role the masses would recognize and accept.

Such a Party would be a far cry from the self-proclaimed parties that exist in the U.S., where there's a new "party" every other day. The proletariat knows nothing about these parties, much less accepts *leadership* from them. The proletariat needs its own political Party, which must be the organized detachment of the working class. Says Stalin: "Under the capitalist system the Party's tasks are huge and varied. The Party must lead the struggle of the proletariat under the exceptionally difficult circumstances of inner as well as outer development; it must lead the proletariat in its attacks when the situation calls for an attack; it must withdraw the proletariat from the blows of a powerful opponent when the situation calls for retreat; it must imbue the millions of unorganized non-party workers with the spirit of discipline and system in fighting, with the spirit of organization and perseverance. *But the Party can acquit itself of these tasks only if it itself is the embodiment of discipline and organization, if it itself is the organized detachment of the proletariat.* Unless these conditions are fulfilled, it is idle talk about the Party really leading the vast masses of the proletariat. The Party is the organized detachment of the proletariat." [our emphasis—ed.] (Ibid., pp. 90-91)

It goes without saying that this type of Party is not built overnight or without difficulties, nor could it be established on the basis of the U.S. "anti-revisionist communist movement," rotten to the bone! "Political line key link" served to sabotage the question of discipline and organization; it served tactics-as-process and stood opposed to tactics-as-plan. The "plans" for party building in the U.S. have been copied after either the "CPUSA" or the "CPC". The "CPUSA" had a history of factions and chronic impotence. It was and is organized along grossly social-democratic lines, its revisionist line being manifested organizationally in ultra-democracy. The "CPUSA" holds open Party Conventions, long ago liquidating even in *word* the Party Congress.

The "CPC", also riddled by factions, admittedly containing the bourgeoisie inside the party, was ultra-democratic to such an extreme that it was supervised by the open bourgeois parties in China. These were the very bourgeois parties whose existence Mao and Co. had guaranteed by Mao's call for "mutual co-existence" side by side with the "Communist" Party.

Such models for the "parties" in the U.S. explained the reason why hostility toward secrecy, discipline, confidence, and monolithic unity based on one Marxist-Leninist line, is such a widespread phenomenon in the U.S. movement. The Bolshevik model, the Leninist plan for party building, which alone leads to the creation of the vanguard Party, stands in irreconcilable contradiction to the existence of factions. The Party is the expression of unity of will and unity of action. Stalin explains this in precise detail: "...iron discipline in the Party is impossible without unity of will, and without absolute and complete unity of action on the part of all the members of the Party. This does not mean, of course, that the possibility of conflicts of opinion within the Party is thus excluded. On the contrary, iron discipline does not preclude but presupposes crit-

icism and conflict of opinion within the Party. Least of all does it mean that this discipline must be 'blind' discipline. *On the contrary, iron discipline does not preclude but presupposes conscious and voluntary submission, for only conscious discipline can be truly iron discipline.*" [our emphasis—Ed.] (Ibid., pg. 96)

These principles of discipline and unity have been completely liquidated by the Maoists who call for a "hundred schools of thought to contend" and blossom, for the creation of many factions, and for submission through dictate and coercion, rather than voluntary submission and conscious discipline. Many factions, many lines, the social-democratic outcry of "be open and aboveboard", are all attacks on the Leninist norms which stand for one line, monolithic unity, and complete secrecy against a vicious enemy.

The Maoist movement in the U.S. has been a thorough accomplice of the counter-revolution, raising to a principle that making errors is a good thing. After all, they argue, "the world is in great disorder under heaven and this is a good thing". There is no mention of scientific laws. Instead, the compiling of errors builds up and reaches a point where it turns into its opposite, into "success", a la the absurdity of Maoist "dialectics".

The implications are therefore quite clear: many lines, many thoughts, many factions, many errors, many "centers". The results are no discipline, no unity of will, no unity of action, cover-up of mistakes—all this accompanied by high pretensions of being the vanguard Party. But Stalin is quite clear when he says, quoting Lenin, "Whoever in the least weakens the iron discipline of the Party of the proletariat (especially during the dictatorship) actually aids the bourgeoisie against the proletariat". (Ibid., pg. 97)

It is history now that the "CPC" did everything in its power to prevent the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The factionalism which became the rule expressed the fact that the bourgeoisie and not the proletariat was in power all along. The cover of "communist" was maintained in order that the national bourgeoisie could protect itself against the great imperialist powers, while establishing itself disguised as the representatives of justice and progress for the people of the world. But the tremendous corruption with the "CPC", the snake pit which in reality it represented, was revealed in the total lack of discipline, wracked from top to bottom by factions and thriving on scandals—"wall posters" they were called. With a true understanding of the history of the CPSU (B) all will immediately understand that the "CPC" had nothing in common with anything remotely Bolshevik. In referring back to Stalin, we find this very important point in regard to discipline: "...after a discussion has been closed, after criticism has run its course and a decision has been made, unity of will and unity of action of all Party members become indispensable conditions without which Party unity and iron discipline in the Party are inconceivable." (Ibid., pg. 97)

The petty-bourgeoisie knows of no such discipline. The Mensheviks have no need whatever of iron discipline: their parties are parties of peace. Thus they can afford the luxury of the liberalism to freely form factions. These parties

fight against establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat or work at disintegrating it after it has been established. They have no desire to lead the proletariat to power—in fact, it goes against their class interests. These are the parties who carry out the traditions of the Second International. These are the accomplices of the “CPC,” the “CPUSA,” the Yugoslav League of “Communists,” the present-day “CPSU,” the Euro “Communists,” the Maoists, and the “ex”-Maoist centrists.

Stalin made clear that the distinction between the Parties of the Second International and those of the Third Communist International lay in the fact that it is the Parties of the Third International who **“organize their activities on the basis [our italics-ed.] of the task of achieving and strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat.”** Stalin continues to elaborate, therefore, that the Parties of the Third International **“cannot afford to be ‘liberal’ or to permit the formation of factions. The Party is synonymous with unity of will, which leaves no room for any factionalism or division of authority in the Party.”** (Ibid p. 97)

All the Leninist principles of the Party have been so distorted and shoved to the background by all Mensheviks, especially by the Maoists (present and past Maoists), that we have reprinted in full the section by Stalin in *Foundations of Leninism* entitled “The Party.” (see Appendix) These principles must be reaffirmed and defended if we are to build the vanguard Party of the Proletariat, demarcated from the parties of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie.

We have already established how “political line key link” sabotaged the ideological task of drawing lines of demarcation in order to establish real unity, discipline, and organization. This had the disastrous result of strengthening the centrist current by misplacing the direction of the main blow and creating a basis for the development of a conciliatory attitude towards the right. Everyone could “unite” on “political line key link.” Even the social-chauvinists of “CP-ML” were able to assimilate “political line key link” and the “CPUSA-ML” held it dear to its heart. This centrist position served to hide the differences, the deep ideological disunity and disparity in views that existed, and covered up the corruption in the “CPC.”

The damage done by political line fetishism was to destroy the real meaning and importance of the questions of Bolshevik organization and democratic centralism. It stemmed from the Maoist position that “line” determines everything. But Stalin has made clear: **“Some people think that it is sufficient to draw up a correct Party line, proclaim it from the housetops, state it in the form of general theses and resolutions, and take a vote and carry unanimously for victory to come of itself, spontaneously, as it were. This of course, is wrong. It is a gross delusion. Only incorrigible bureaucrats and Red Tapists can think so.”** (Report to the 17th Party Congress, SCW, Vol. 13) These gross delusions, this spontaneous view of “victory” was intimately bound up in everything which flowed from “political line key link.” But Stalin said that, **“these successes and victories did not come spontaneously, but as a result of a fierce struggle for the application of the Party line. Victory never comes of itself, it has to be attained.”** (Ibid.)

“Political line key link” did nothing by way of resolving tactical questions. Ideological and political line unities were *never* consolidated because nothing was done to implement them organizationally. Maoism has been so deeply rooted that organization has meant nothing, and so, very little in terms of actual success has been achieved. Stalin, however, had explicitly drawn the conclusion that **“after the correct line has been laid down, after a correct solution of the problem has been found, success depends on how the work is organized.”** (Ibid.)

Due to the deep ideological disunity which has reigned, covered up with “political line key link,” there could not be the drawing out of the problems nor the finding of correct solutions. Thus, “political line key link” could *never* lead to the organization of the work. Instead, tactics-as-a-process, was the natural outcome of “political line key link.” Many plans were pragmatically discussed; some were implemented; none gave the expected results. The substitution of “Mao Zedong Thought” for Marxism-Leninism kept the proletariat disarmed theoretically. Mao’s simplistic formulas and clichés do not provide the tools of scientific socialism for analyzing and solving problems. Therefore Maoist “solutions” are recipes for defeat rather than revolution.

Failure after failure in all these years cannot all be credited to amateurishness and primitiveness. The problem must be addressed from the point of view of a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the social and ideological causes of the mistakes. There must be a repudiation of and a rupture with the conciliatory attitude, as a condition to strengthen the fight against the centrists and to cause a split with the open social-chauvinists whom the centrists harbor and protect. Uncorrected amateurishness and primitive methods have led to the weakening of the genuine forces. But that amateurishness must be combatted in the struggle to draw lines of demarcation between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism.

Typical of the argument against “political line key link” is “WCC’s” assertion that this line leads to sectarianism, to drawing premature lines of demarcation. We have shown how in fact “political line key link” avoids drawing *any* lines of demarcation, and in fact perpetuates the rightist economism and reformist politics which described the “practice” of the “wing,” and now of the circles.

The lessons we have been drawing throughout this analysis serve as bitter examples of the results of ignorance by choice. Inconsistency must be corrected by consciously rooting revolutionary activity in Leninism in a strictly orthodox and professional manner. The total absence of Leninist norms, the backroom maneuvering and deceitful masquerade carried on by the “CPC”, were exhibited in their naked form in the pro-Chinese revisionist movement of the U.S. A thorough split with this movement is a necessary condition for re-establishing Leninism and building the Party of the Proletariat.

Without a resolute fight against the conciliatory attitude towards opportunism, it is impossible to effectively aim the main blow at the centrists. There must be a rooting out of the influences of “Mao Zedong Thought”, such as “political line key link,” “organization key link,” or other variations of this

inanity and anti-Leninism in order to create that split. We find it necessary to emphasize this point because of the rightist cover-up of this highly dangerous line and the conciliatory attitude towards it. This has manifested itself in the many attempts to "unite" this rotten movement.

"Theory is Principal"

The "two wings" of this movement were equally opportunist. The openly social-chauvinist wing openly attacked Marxism-Leninism and was clearly anti-theory.* Yet the centrists took the mask of defending Leninism from the angle that "theory is primary," only to sabotage any real motion toward revolutionary practical activity. The centrists, after all, are internationalists in words and need cheap talk and high-sounding theoretical sophistry to hide their social-chauvinism.

These two component parts of the "New Left" pro-Chinese revisionist movement were guided by "Mao Zedong Thought" to attack Leninism from one or another angle—one open, the other more hidden and thus more dangerous. The more hidden forces, the centrists, developed a "wing" corresponding to their "theory trend." It was formally established by the "Revolutionary Wing," but the members of that "Revolutionary Wing" were not the exclusive proponents of that brand of centrism.

Others in the "theory trend" were forces like "Workers Congress" ("WC") who made the call for an "Iskra organization." No more rightist interpretation of Lenin's plan for Iskra could have been possible. Everything boiled down (according to "WC") to political exposures; thus, they liquidated the work of doing ongoing and systematic propaganda activity to win advanced workers to communism, develop study circles, and carry out the theoretical work necessary to begin to introduce the program into the polemics. Yet "WC" believed themselves to be a "real center." Even the "political exposures" done by "WC" were not what Lenin described political exposures to be:

"Working class consciousness cannot be genuine political consciousness unless the workers are trained to respond to *all cases, without exception, of tyranny, oppression, violence and abuse, no matter what class is affected. Moreover, to respond from a Social-Democratic, and not from any other point of view. The consciousness of the masses of the workers cannot be genuine class consciousness, unless the workers learn to observe from concrete and above all from topical (current), political facts and events, every other social class and all manifestations of the intellectual, ethical, and political life of these classes; unless they learn to apply in practice the materialist analysis and the materialist*

* One example of many will always stand out—Bob Avakian ("RCP," the "RU")'s demagogic speech in the fall of 1974, when in open forums he ridiculed Lenin's teaching that "without revolutionary theory there is no revolutionary movement." See section—Split and Decayed for an account of this incident.

estimate of *all* aspects of the life and activity of *all* classes, strata and groups of the population. Those who concentrate the attention, observation and consciousness of the working class exclusively, or even mainly, upon itself alone are not Social Democrats. . . .

In order to become a Social-Democrat, the worker must have a clear picture in his mind of the economic nature and the social and political features of the landlord and the priest, the high state official and the peasant, the student and the tramp; he must know their strong and weak points; he must see the meaning of all the catchwords and sophisms by which each class and each stratum *camouflages* its selfish strivings and its real 'inside workings'; he must understand what interests certain institutions and certain laws reflect and how they reflect them." (*What Is To Be Done*, Peking, pp. 86-67.)

Instead, what was printed in the pages of the *Communist* (today an openly social-chauvinist organ promoting the theory of "three worlds") was factory exposures, which boiled down to recording events with a "theoretical" cover.

"Theory as primary" was the centrist sabotage against building the party of Lenin and Stalin. People who could not help but adapt themselves to an opportunist line dropped the "all practice/no theory" line for a line of "theory is primary." Yet they did not do the practice of carrying out that theoretical work. In essence, proponents of both these lines wind up belittling the role of the conscious element. They hatch up conspiracies to halt the building of the Party in order to prevent the overthrow of the bourgeoisie by driving a wedge between theory and practice. As to the correct relationship between the two, Lenin made it perfectly clear: "**The position is altogether different when the task of the socialists is understood to mean that they must be the ideological leaders of the proletariat in its genuine struggle against real enemies, who stand on the real path of present social and economic development. In these circumstances theoretical and practical work *merge into a single task* [our italics—ed.], which the veteran German Social Democrat Liebknecht aptly described as: *studieren, propagandieren, organisieren.*" [study, propagandize, organize] (*What The Friends of the People Are*, LSW I: 452)**

To prevent *this* merging, the "movement" argued, a la Mao Zedong, as to what was "primary," thus liquidating both theoretical and practical work, from one or another angle. Thus, the development of ideological leaders has been prevented almost entirely.

The need for discipline and organization has been likewise negated by the "movement," most especially in hidden form by the centrists who raise "theory is principal," going against what Lenin had to say:

"It is impossible to be an ideological leader without performing the above mentioned theoretical work, just as it is impossible to be one without *directing the work* [italics ours—ed.] to meet the requirements of the cause, without propagating the deductions drawn from this theory among the workers and helping to organize them." (Ibid.)

The manifestation of belittling the role of the conscious element from behind such sophistry as the "primacy" of theory or practice has meant render-

ing it impossible to develop and organize the proletariat's independent political Party. The petty-bourgeois ideologues have no cause to lead or defend. Yet the opportunists invariably brag about what good "leaders" they are, how much they have done, and how correct they've been all along. Their activities, however, consist of building their own group, party, or circle to defend the interests of a small minority of workers, the labor aristocracy.

Organizational tasks are thus reduced to the development of their own group, while each group then accuses the dozen or so other groups of sectarianism. All claim to be the leading group, yet none has understood what it means to develop a leading center, and those who do understand what it means work actively to sabotage its development.

The opportunist movement has denied the vanguard role of the proletariat. Thus, their lines of "build the mass movement," or struggle "for new and more far-reaching reforms," makes them hostile to the very idea of developing a core of professional revolutionaries. This has been reflected in how they have twisted the meaning of developing a leading center, by raising either "practice" or "theory" as principal.

The "movement" missed the whole point of what was meant by political activity, distorting political activity to mean tailing behind the masses. This is yet more proof of the impotent state of the "movement" which thrives on fragmentation and sectarian diplomacy. Hostile to Leninism, they have disregarded that: **"The Political activities of Social-Democrats consist of assisting the development and organization of the labour movement in Russia, of transforming it from the present state of sporadic attempts at protesting, 'riots' and strikes lacking a leading idea, into an organized struggle of the whole of the Russian working class directed against the bourgeois regime and striving towards the expropriation of the expropriators and the abolition of the social system based on the oppression of the toilers."** (Friends. . . op cit. p. 452-3)

The opportunists will never be able to organize the struggle of the whole working class against the bourgeois dictatorship. Nor does their class interest allow them to do so. They are guided neither by convictions nor principles. The activities of the genuine communists, on the other hand, are based in the Marxist-Leninist conviction that the proletariat alone stands as the revolutionary class in the whole of this society, the only class able to lead the oppressed masses as a whole toward the abolition of the exploitation of man by man.

The theoretical and practical work must be merged into one in order that this conviction is translated into an organized struggle which will lead to the founding of the Leninist Party of a new type and proletarian revolution. The centrist meddling with the correct relationship of theory and practice has been extremely dangerous precisely because of its hidden, elusive, and ambiguous nature, covered up with leftist phrasology. This made it possible for centrism to gain influence over an ideologically backward movement, hungry for theoretical work, thirsty for answers to the questions posed by practice. It is imperative that we aim the main blow at the centrists, in order that the harmony between theory and practice can be re-established.

The "COUSML" with its *r-r-revolutionary* denunciations, has been another proponent of "theory is principal." "Theory primary" provides a convenient shield for reproduction of materials, abstract debate, intellectual orbiting, general pronouncements without proven conclusions, i.e. all those things which allow sects like "COUSML" to operate freely without having to fear "going out on on a limb". So for instance they can easily change from a center "disseminating Mao Zedong Thought" to a center disseminating whatever other thought they choose, call it proletarian internationalism, while not having to answer for the fact that sabotage of proletarian revolution in the U.S. is the practical activity of "COUSML."*

Mao's Gang Takes New Covers

It is important to take note that due to the open alliances between the Chinese revisionists and U.S. imperialism the centrists have had to take on new covers. Now it is quite fashionable to criticize Chinese revisionism, including "Mao Zedong Thought," yet there is no self-criticism of the lines the "ex"-Maoists have held. Since Mao and the "CPC" are so thoroughly stripped of all covers, the centrists have had to put fresh masks over the old lines.

"COUSML" and "CPUSA-ML" deliver criticisms of the "CPC" and Mao. They treat us to the opportunist maneuvers of either pretending that they never upheld the "CPC" or Mao, or admitting that they did, but with no self-criticism or elaboration. They think it sufficient to act ignorant of the facts or to point out that "everybody did it" so it is unnecessary to delve into the consequences of what "everyone did." There are also those forces who tail behind "CPUSA-ML" and "COUSML" like the circles organized around the "MULC,"** who are "demarcated" from the "three worlds" theory but have gone back and forth from not wanting to address the question of Mao to "criticizing" Mao for his "revisionist line on Party building." These circles, in fact, continue to manifest the worst aspects of "Mao Zedong Thought."

None of these forces dare to delve into the history of the pro-Chinese "communist movement," all deny the international character of the movement; thus, all liquidate the fact that these trends are international phenomena. The centrist forces of today, who are not "new" as they pretend, except for adopting new covers, continue along the line of unity with the social-chauvinists and subordination of the lefts to the rights, going "against the tide" of Marxism-Leninism.

We are sure that they had expectations that the analysis by the Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks of the pro-Chinese revisionist movement and the conclusions

* See Section—Split and Decayed.

** See "Joint Counterproposal to the Proposal for the MULC" - By Demarcation and the U.S. Leninist Core—available from the Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks.

in relation to the centrist "Wing" would suit their rightist desires. The forces grouped around the "WCC" and the "KCRWC" had attempted a sabotage of this analysis and blow at centrism by asking that we emphasize the aspect of agent-provocateur activity. (They were not, they said, interested in line! !) In fact, the attempt to sabotage this analysis went to the point of lunacy. They asked for "self-criticism" for agent provocateur activity! ! Aside from the fact that this slanderous accusation is unequivocally false and criminal, the fact of the matter is that the first to yell "agent provocateurs" are provocateurs themselves. The duty of Marxist-Leninists is to combat agent provocateur activity, and only people who are complete fools or agents themselves would ask for "self-criticism" from those they accuse of being provocateurs.

It was these actions on the part of "WCC" and "KCRWC" and the whole line of the MULC which were polemicized against in "The Joint Counter-Proposal" by Demarcation and the U.S. Leninist Core, and indictment of the unprincipled and thoroughly opportunist line and maneuvers of the petty bourgeois philistines of "WCC" and "KCRWC." We are sure that what would have suited these two groups and "PC" would have been an analysis which concluded, as they did, that the "Wing" was ultra-leftist. Then they could have continued to cover up for the right opportunism of the "Wing" as a way to cover up their own adaptation to the line and tactics of the infamous "Revolutionary Wing."

Unfortunately for "WCC", "KCRWC", and "PC", they will have to make this rightist analysis (i.e., that "left" opportunism is the main danger) themselves, relying on the purged rightist elements from the "Wing" whom they harbor and hide out in their "new" collectives. In one way or another, they hope this will lead to the rise of a new "Revolutionary Wing." "WCC" has every intention of forming an organization or at least a coalition of the "Wing" type out of the MULC.

Of course, all these saintly circles deny their participation in the centrist "Wing." "KCRWC" at first denied its alliances to Workers Viewpoint Organization once a member of the "Revolutionary Wing." Now they admit the flirting that went on between them and WVO, the most rancidly unprincipled, most theoretically developed of the centrist forces, who were developing "Party Building theory" and the "Anti-revisionist premises" much like the "Party Building theory" of WCC and KCRWC. They all call for "freedom of criticism," the "freedom" to revise Marxism-Leninism to suit their opportunist purposes.

The Red Dawn Committee has been dragged out of its state of impotence and obvious inactivity to play a role of sabotage with the MULC. It has dug a leaflet out of its hibernation closet, a leaflet which condemned the "Wing," and specifically the Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization, for "social-fascism," a leaflet which defended WVO as victims of attacks by PRRWO.

David Perez of Red Dawn knows the truth very well. (He was one of the opportunists who founded The Young Lords Party and PRRWO.) But his careerist ambitions make him a cowardly liar. For years D. Perez has been dreaming of the day when he could be in the milieu of elements like Klonsky

and Avakian and has been maneuvering to reach their super-careerist status.

Perhaps Red Dawn will explain how it was that this infamous document, now re-circulated by them, was used to invite OL, RU, PSP, "COUSML", "ML-OC", Resistencia, El Comite, IWK, and the rest of the swamp of opportunists, to a meeting (see *Red Dawn I*) with the social-chauvinists and centrists to supposedly condemn social-fascism! But this maneuver on Perez's part flopped, and the only ones committed to cover up the truth were individuals purged from PRRWO on the basis of trotskyite or Khrushchevite revisionist lines they pursued—such as Juan Gonzalez, Pablo Yoruba Guzman, Benjamin Cruz, Iris Morales, Gloria Colon, Juan Fi Ortiz. There were also lumpen elements, still grudging that they were kicked out of PRRWO, scum grouped in Lincoln Detox. Red Dawn's leader, David Perez, was so desperate for allies in his campaign of slander that he showed just how low he would crawl to bring together anti-Leninist degenerate elements. His cowardly maneuver to create a coalition with the social-chauvinists went under the pretext of the bold-faced lie that he was singled out for attack and was physically threatened. Through peddling this absurd fabrication, he managed to drum up some support.

Just a few words are in order about the lines defended by the elements purged from PRRWO and around which they organized whole factions.

Juan Gonzalez, whom "CPML" promotes today as a veteran "Puerto Rican activist," held that the history of the CPSU(B) was best written by Trotsky, and so everyone should study Trotsky's history of the CPSU. History has known no greater social-fascist than Trotsky, yet Gonzalez could easily mask himself as a "purged victim," sign a petition supposedly against social-fascism, and sneak back into the "movement." (Perez, by the way, is perfectly aware of Gonzalez's past, and opportunist lines.)

Pablo Yoruba Guzman's line was straight-up "peaceful transition to socialism." He openly and categorically whimpered about having no contradictions with the bourgeoisie, and made it clear that he believed in "evolution," not "revolution." Today Guzman is a disc jockey on a number of stations, including WBLS, a big disco station in New York. Part of the way he got ahead in his career was through his open defense of U.S. imperialist aggression. One example to document this point—When the Vietnamese national liberation war against U.S. imperialism triumphed and the U.S. imperialists were kicked out, it was this pitiful creature Guzman, calling himself on the air, "the master of time and space," who hailed it as a victory for "Salsa." He also broadcast his high hopes and aspirations for new ways to protect the bourgeoisie's interests in Vietnam: "Good! Now we can open up a Salsa bar in Hanoi!" Guzman has certainly proved his bootlicking capacity to get to where he is today!

Juan Fi Ortiz has been hailed by the purged elements for being a "consistent Marxist-Leninist." Juan Fi Ortiz, however, was a rabid supporter of Juan Mari Bras, the leader of the pro-Soviet Puerto Rican "Socialist Party" in Puerto Rico. Ortiz led a faction out of the YLP to join "PSP" in Puerto Rico in 1972, when he made this statement: "Juan Mari Bras is the greatest Marxist of our era, and PSP is the vanguard Party of Puerto Rico." Juan Fi Ortiz was also of the opin-

ion that in the U.S., the RU was the vanguard and that ultra-leftism was the main danger. He has to lie about this history in order to cover up his real anti-Leninist and anti-Party activities, which found him in the Anti-Fascist Commentator group after splitting from PSP.

The lumpen elements of Lincoln Detox have had a bone to pick with Marxism-Leninism because Marx correctly analyzed them to be the "dangerous class." David Perez stooped down to this "dangerous class" for support. In fact, many of the lumpens who formed Lincoln Detox were his fellow "leaders" of YLP. YLP was actually the catalyst behind the Lincoln Hospital Detox program. All the opportunists hail the "good old days" of the YLP and have several times tried to rehabilitate it through the Puerto Rican Nationalist Movement.

Actually, all these forces are quite dangerous. The seriousness of the attack, the lies and fabrications, has been quite desperate. It was to be expected that such an alignment and such an attack would be made. Unfortunately, there was no exposure of this classical centrist maneuver because of the situation we have analyzed in every section of this book. David Perez had once advanced the centrist line that centrists in all countries had to be assisted because they were fighting the revisionists in revisionist parties—especially the centrists in PSP. At the time, although polemics were waged against this thoroughly opportunist line, which catered to the Khrushchevite brand of social-chauvinism, it was believed that Perez was a thoroughly muddle-headed person. But it was soon found out that he was an unscrupulous opportunist who could easily adapt to any line and any trend convenient to his ambitions. The lies he and the others fabricated about the threats to their physical well-being, etc., are typical of petty bourgeois elements exposed for their opportunism. The hysteria they tried to generate around "social-fascism in PRRWO" was intended to cover the real basis of the variant of revisionism they propagate.

David Perez was also purged from PRRWO later to become a central committee member of "Workers Congress" (at the time a centrist split off from the Black Workers Congress) whom he had been factionalizing with inside PRRWO. He took the opportunist position that "if the U.S. were invaded by the Soviet Union, the people of the U.S. would have to unite including the U.S. bourgeoisie(!)" Needless to say, Perez never repudiated this position. If he had, perhaps Red Dawn could be doing more in terms of being anti-"three worlds" than just mouthing it. Rather than polemics against the theory of the "three worlds" we are bombarded by unprincipled attacks on Demarcation, which split from Red Dawn. Their maneuvers to give legitimacy to the slanders against Demarcation and the U.S. Leninist Core are supported by many of the forces around the MULC.

Now Red Dawn is treated as the authority on history by the more cowardly circles who are using these attacks to shield themselves from the past polemics of Demarcation and the U.S. Leninist Core and the present polemics of the

* "The 'dangerous class', the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society, may, here and there, be swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution; its conditions of life, however, prepare it far more for the part of a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue." (*Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Peking ed., p. 44)

Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks. We would like to see even an attempt by our cowardly opponents to sum up their own histories in relation to trends rather than the soap operas they are accustomed to calling "self-criticisms." We have no illusions, however, that we will see such a thing. In fact, rather than make a thorough rupture with opportunism, these circles are moving further to the right as they make their rupture with Leninism, clean up their act, and attempt to pick up where the "Revolutionary Wing" and the gang of four left off.

Such is the fate of all those who refuse after repeated warnings to break with Menshevism and take up the defense of orthodox Marxism-Leninism. Those who refuse to uphold Leninism will continue to fail to see, or choose not to see, that Leninism and opportunism cannot be reconciled. Everything which led to the hotbed of centrism in the "Revolutionary Wing" is clear evidence of this fact. Even those who are too narrow or too ideologically backward to see it as an international phenomenon will have to admit this has been documented in the history of the centrist "Wing." This centrist "Wing" and the centrists today are part of an international trend which has been correctly analyzed by Lenin and Stalin as camouflaged opportunism. To be able to fight the centrists correctly, it must be remembered that they and the open social-chauvinists are mortal enemies of the proletariat.

Social Chauvinists and Centrists Cover Up for Political Police Activity *

The social chauvinists and centrists are social props of the bourgeoisie. They apologize for imperialism and teach the workers to accept their condition as wage slaves. Behind them are still another layer of counter-revolution—the military props, the political police. The bourgeoisie admits daily to the use of agent infiltration, experiments with mind-control drugs, assassinations,** and CIA training of butchers to torture the revolutionary leaders of the masses in the colonies, semi-colonies, other capitalist countries and within the borders of its own country. The social chauvinists and centrists, by way of their loose-knit parties and organizations, make it easy for wholesale police infiltration to take place. Through these "communist" groups, the political police are able to monitor the entire movement. Through their implantation in the proletariat, the opportunists provide a means by which the political police are able to spy on the proletariat. Through their participation in "defense" committees, community groups, women's organizations, and groups of the nationally oppressed, they open the door for the political police to spy on all these activities of the oppressed masses. The Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks, as the result of an investigation into the agent provocateur activities within the centrist, so-called revolutionary wing, has made the following analysis of just one very small, but

* We urge the reader to refer now to the Comintern article in the Appendix, on provocateurs.

** For example the pamphlet, "Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification," U.S. Government Printing Office, Wash., 1977, in which certain information was admitted regarding the CIA's extensive use of LSD and other drugs. "That report discusses techniques for human assessment and unorthodox methods of communications; *discrediting and disabling materials which can be covertly administered*; . . . research being done on "K" (Knockout) material, alcohol tolerance, and hypnosis; research on LSD; anti-personnel harassment and *assassination delivery systems* including aerosol generators and other spray devices. . ." (p. 7, Our italics-ed.)