

## **SDS: Grandchild of the 2nd International, Father of the “Anti-Revisionist Communist Movement”**

Wherein lie the origins of the “anti-revisionist communist movement”? . . . Of the “New Left”? In order to trace the roots of the petty bourgeois-led “anti-revisionist communist movement” one needs to examine the movement of the 1960’s, most especially the predecessor of almost all the main “parties” presently existing, from which all the “new” leaders originated, the Students for a Democratic Society, (SDS). \*

---

\*Much of the material for this section was taken from the book, *SDS*, by Kirkpatrick Sales, Vintage Books, 1974.

The SDS was founded in 1960, with its two main leaders being Al Haber and Tom Hayden, both social-democrats. The origins of SDS itself dates back further than 1960. SDS, formerly known as the Student League for Industrial Democracy was the student branch of the social-democratic organization, the League for Industrial Democracy (LID). LID, which was originally called the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, (ISS) was formed in 1905 by such social-democrats as Upton Sinclair and Jack London. The ISS politics in this period were basically a variant of the opportunist, social-chauvinist politics of the Second International. From its origins the LID was based on the petty bourgeoisie and intellectuals in the universities, and took on the task of strengthening the positions of the labor aristocracy and the petty bourgeoisie. It was financed, like the SDS, by unions such as the United Auto Workers, or International Ladies Garment Workers Union and from the bourgeoisie itself.

The aim of the LID was in essence to create the "left" wing of the bourgeoisie in the U.S. Its politics consisted of social-democracy and rabid anti-communism. In fact, it changed its name from Intercollegiate Socialist Society to the League for Industrial Democracy due to the "leftism" of the term "socialist". LID began to refer to itself as a liberal group rather than a socialist grouping. And LID, even after the period of the Cold War and the McCarthy era of red-baiting, etc. continued the rabid anti-communism. It was in full unison with the bourgeoisie in its anti-communism, red baiting on the campuses, and propping up the labor aristocracy. The task of SLID created by LID was to develop social-democracy and "leaders" amongst the universities in order to ensure the future existence of LID and the spread of social-democracy, of social-chauvinism.

However, SLID, a tiny sect amongst the intellectual strata, was solely an intellectual-educational society amongst the students. In the late 50's and early 1960's, some of the SLID members, younger than their parents organization, LID, (and in whose eyes the LID was a "bit" too conservative) saw the need to change SLID a bit, to become more active in building a "new Left", a "left" wing of the bourgeoisie. To them, the name "Student League for Industrial Democracy" was too labor-oriented. They, e.g. Al Haber and Tom Hayden, began to put forth the views of America needing change—at a time when the U.S. had just come out of the Cold War, had started a "secret" war with Vietnam, and a "democratic" movement of Blacks was on the upsurge, the development of the Civil Rights movement)—and that the only ones capable of making "democratic" change were the intellectuals in the universities. Thus, Students for a Democratic Society, the student group of the League for Industrial Democracy was formed, (SDS was the "autonomous" student branch of LID up till 1965 when they broke with LID due to SDS being too militant and having alliances with "CPUSA", PLP and other "communists".)

SDS had the task of making the "middle class", the petty bourgeoisie and intellectual strata, the main force in changing America. It called for those privileged students—"bred in at least modest comfort, housed now in universities"

—to side with the SDS and develop the "new left" (as opposed to the "old left", i.e. the "CPUSA's" "communism" and "socialism" of the 1930's to 1950's), the new "left wing" of the bourgeoisie. SDS changed its view from the McCarthy Period of *rabid* anti-communism and allowed alliances with the "CPUSA" youth group and the trotskyites. Their anti-communism was "less rabid". That is, while the LID pursued its agent activity of anti-communism, allowing *no* alliances whatsoever with "communism" or "socialism", constantly red-baiting, the SDS differed with its parent organization on how to promote anti-communism. The SDS approach was more "liberal". It did not want to continue the red-baiting of the Cold War period, preferring to allow certain alliances with "communists" and "socialists" (i.e. the revisionist "CPUSA" and the trotskyites who in reality the SDS really didn't fear for the SDS viewed these "communists" as being actually thoroughgoing reformists), yet continuing in its social-democratic traditions of condemning and slandering communism as "anti-democratic" and "authoritarian."

In SDS' first basic programme, they put forth: "Students for a Democratic Society is an association of young people on the left. It seeks to create a sustained community of educational and political concern: one bringing together liberals and radicals, activists and scholars, students and faculty."

It maintains a *vision* of a democratic society, where at all levels the people have control of the decisions which affect them and the resources on which they are dependent. It seeks a *relevance* through the continual focus on realities and on the programs necessary to effect change at the most basic levels of economic, political and social organization. It feels the *urgency* to put forth a radical, democratic program counterposed to authoritarian movements both of communism and the domestic right." (SDS, p. 56)

The above, different from the rabid anti-communism of LID, nevertheless, put forth its anti-communism and its social-democratic program. SDS then began to elaborate its strategy, putting forth pamphlets, literature expressing the need for a more "democratic" America, began to establish a "Student Vanguard" to create this "New Left". SDS began to tail the Civil Rights movement, constituting itself as the "white middle class" support of the bourgeois led Civil Rights movement and concentrated all its energies on the "domestic democratic movements" and stayed away from analyzing the developing "secret" war of the U.S. with Vietnam. In the early 60's, its programme was basically one of reforming the USA. It began to raise the need for the "white intellectual students" to go amongst the "poor" and help organize them. It even studied the lessons of the Narodniks of Russia in the 1870's and 1880's of going amongst "the people" and leading them to salvation. Rejected by Black bourgeois nationalists like Stokely Carmichael of SNCC who told SDS that SNCC will take care of the Blacks, and failing in their reformist community programs such as the ERAP (Economic Research and Action Project) and JOIN committees (Jobs or Income Now—one of the carryovers to the "anti-revisionist communist movement" by the mature "social-democrats", or Maoists, like Klonsky and Avakian), began to again concentrate mainly on building the cam-

puses as the vanguard of the "new Left". SDS, up to 1965 when the draft came down on college students, was in search of a domestic issue to which it could rally students. It began to form alliances with other student groups and with pacifist unions who were beginning to protest the war on the grounds that it was immoral and that the U.S. should spend its money not on war but on reforms in the U.S. The SDS tried everything, from community organizing, support for civil rights, pushing for reform bills in the legislation, to support and promotion of the Free Speech Movement at Berkely (i.e. a movement of academic freedom later to become the student power movement) to then, some anti-war sentiments in alliance with other pacifists groups, "CPUSA" youth group and trotskyite groups.

It is around this time too that the Progressive Labor Movement, later in 1965, becoming the Progressive Labor Party, gets formed becoming the first franchised agents of Chinese revisionism in the U.S., propagating "wildly" "Mao Zedong Thought" as the guiding ideology for the "movement". PLP, due to its lack of ties with the working class, began to concentrate on the developing student movement under the guise of developing a worker-student alliance. The PLP in 1964 formed a student group called the May 2nd Movement (M2M) which was to be "anti-imperialist," and principally agitated for an anti-war movement amongst the student movement. The PL, contrary to the claims of it being at first "staunch communists", were a group of ex-CPUSA'ers and petty bourgeois students. In November 1974, the PL-dominated (or more correctly, controlled) M2M, put forward its supposedly "anti-imperialist" program, actually a social chauvinist, patriotic anti-war statement, exposing its true colors, later to be patched up in "Maoist" and anti-imperialist colors. M2M put forward in opposition to the war the following: "WE THE UNDERSIGNED ARE YOUNG AMERICANS OF DRAFT AGE. We understand our *obligation to defend our country* [sic—social chauvinism and patriotism indeed—our *emphasis-ed.*] and to serve in the armed forces but we object to being asked to support the war in South Vietnam.

Believing that United States participation in that war is for the suppression of the Vietnamese struggle for national independence, we see no justification for our involvement. We agree with Senator Wayne Morse, who said on the floor of the Senate on March 4, 1964, regarding South Vietnam, that "We should never have gone in. We should never have stayed in. We should get out." BELIEVING THAT WE SHOULD NOT BE ASKED TO FIGHT AGAINST THE PEOPLE OF VIETNAM, WE HEREWITH STATE OUR REFUSAL TO DO SO." (SDS, p. 160)

So the PL's M2M, which was supposed to be the "genuine left" of the developing movement was in fact the "extreme left" of the developing "left wing" of the bourgeoisie, and patriotic at that. SDS, while in the search for THE ISSUE around which to rally the students, began to grow, recruiting the "guilt-feeling," demoralized and idealistic, intellectual petty bourgeoisie and children of the bourgeoisie, however not in as large numbers as what was to be

the case in the spring of 1965. In February, 1965, Lyndon Johnson escalated the imperialist military attack on Vietnam, instituting an all-out draft affecting now, not just the working class youth and oppressed nationalities (whom the SDS really didn't care much about) but, the children of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie in the universities. It was this draft that sparked the spontaneous outbursts and protests against the war by the student movement. From this spontaneous outburst of students all over the campuses, the SDS, with its broad "social-democratic" program, as opposed to the revisionist and trotskyite programs of the "CPUSA"s youth group, the DuBois Club, the PL-M2M, and other trotskyite groups such as the Young Socialist Alliance (of the Socialist Workers Party), the Youth Against War and Fascism (of the trotskyite Workers World Party), etc., began to recruit into its ranks thousands of students.

With the draft now endangering the comfortable and privileged positions of the petty bourgeoisie (among whom only a small minority expressed moral opposition to the war), there began a pacifist anti-war movement, which became more militant and resistant as their demonstrations failed to bring an end to the draft. The petty bourgeois social-democrats, of the type of Tom Hayden, Al Haber, etc., fearing the developing militancy, began to take a back-seat role in SDS, and they were then regarded as the "old guard". The new radicalized, frenzied, petty bourgeois elements, such as Carl Davidson, Mike Klonsky, Barry Weisberg, Bob Avakian, Mark Rudd, and Bernardine Dohrn, began to take the reins of SDS. The SDS by 1965 broke with the LID, becoming independent, taking the road of Student Power, anti-war, and draft resistance. It quickly changed from the tactics of peaceful demonstrations, teach-ins, and petition drives, to the more "militant tactics" of campus take-overs, increased bombings to protest the war (from the more terroristic elements), anarchism and general defiance of the legality of bourgeois democracy.

From amongst these radicalized petty bourgeoisie arose the new "Marxists", who expressed opposition to the social-democrats (of the Tom Hayden type) and to the "CPUSA" and the PLP (for PLP was striving to take over the SDS, so many of the petty bourgeois students turned away from PLP's fanatical Maoism, always with the Red Book in hand, as they declared Maoism to be the answer to all the problems.).

These new "Marxists", followers of Che Guevara, Ho Chi Minh, Mao Zedong, and Trotsky, began to put forth the "new working class theories" that the "notion" of the "old, worn out, dogmatic Marxism", that the proletariat is the vanguard, had outlived its time.

The "new working class" theories put forth that the working class was made up of people who had technical, clerical and professional jobs, thereby requiring an educational background. These petty bourgeois theoreticians stated that the students "will by and large constitute this new working class, are becoming the most structurally relevant and necessary components of the productive processes of modern American capitalism", are in fact the vanguard of the "revolution". (SDS, p. 338)

Thus, to them, in essence, the campuses, universities, students, were the source to find the vanguard of the "movement".

Anti-imperialism, (i.e, imperialism as being just a negative policy of the rich capitalists, the line of Kautskyism) began to be widespread among the SDS.

Leaders of SDS, such as Carl Davidson (later a *Guardian* correspondent, and presently a member of the Central Committee of the social chauvinist "CPML"), put forth the task of developing a syndicalist, student power movement, advocating free universities and their takeover by students.

It is also in 1965 that the PLP has a convention and introduces an astonishing plan within its ranks: that of making the PLP, which had claimed to be the "communist proletarian, vanguard", a party of the working class. On its convention of 1965, PLP's chairman Miton Rosen wrote: "The key ideological breakthrough of the convention was posing the question of having a serious party, or having more of the same [i.e. concentrating on being the advance detachment of the "petty bourgeois, social-democratic movement"—ed.] What differentiated the two was whether or not the party was to be a party of the working class, [Really! And we were supposed to believe that the PLP was already the Party of the working class.—ed.] or whether it would preserve all the same middle class aspects [which till this day it still has—ed.] of the other new formations among Black and white student types. We *chose* to become a party of the working class. [sic!—our emphasis—ed.] For PLP this was a profound decision. Because, to accomplish this meant not a partial transformation of the party, and the individual members of the party, but a total transformation of both." (SDS, p. 218)

It is apparent to all that the PLP *was not* (nor did it ever become) a party of the working class, but that it was composed of the petty bourgeoisie. PLP, in the 60's the first franchised agents of Chinese revisionism in the U.S., was just an example of what was later to become the *norm* of the many parties of the old type of the "anti-revisionist communist movement" of the 1970's. Rosen later admitted that at its 1965 convention (where the PLP finally agreed to become a "serious, working class party") it had a laughable grand total of no more than four workers amongst the two hundred people that attended this first convention of the PLP.

Stalin, in *Foundations of Leninism*, states explicitly that the proletarian Party is the *advanced detachment*, a *part of*, a *section* of the working class. Yet PLP, a year after its formation, at its first convention (structured organizationally after the "CPUSA") is still discussing and deciding whether it should *become* a "serious, working class party" composed of students, intellectuals, ex-"CPUSA"ers and only four "workers" !

Indeed, even the supposedly anti-Krushchev "Marxists-Leninists" of the 60's, like PLP and the developing, new "revolutionary," petty bourgeois "Marxists-Leninists" within SDS, like Carl Davidson, Mike Klonsky, Barry Weisberg, Bob Avakian, etc.—all Maoist adherents, were all, self-admittedly, shock troops of

the petty bourgeois, opportunist led student movement of the 60's.

Carl Davidson, for example, one of the chief early advocates of revisionism in the SDS (aside from the PLP and CPUSA'ers in SDS who were not as widely influential in SDS at this period) put forth in his program for the movement, *A Student Syndicalist Movement: University Reform Revisited*, that: "... *Our universities are already the chief agents for social change in the direction of 1984.*"

To clarify the task he set forth for the student movement in 1966, Davidson, this Wobbly—syndicalist—soon to become Maoist, put forth the following as the main task of the student movement: "That every SDS chapter organize a student syndicalist movement on its campus. . . In the labor struggle, the syndicalist unions worked for industrial democracy and worker's control, rather than better wages and working conditions. Likewise, and I cannot repeat this often enough, the issue for us is student control (along with a yet-to-be-liberated faculty in some areas). . . . What we do want is a union of students where the students themselves decide what kind of rules they want or don't want. Or whether they need rules at all." (SDS, p. 291)

Hence, Student Power was on its path, proclaiming to be the vanguard of the movement. Along with this reformist and anarchist trend amongst the student movement arose the bourgeois-degenerate youth culture, the "do—your—own thing", drug culture, the hippies and yippies; yet to add more to the dominance of bourgeois ideology amongst the student and anti-war movement of the petty bourgeoisie.

With all these bourgeois currents running through SDS, it at the same time expressed a disdain for theory, most especially, a disdain for scientific socialism. To SDS, theory as a guide to action was *heresy*. What mattered to SDS was the Movement, the task of whipping up the mass of students to take control of the campuses and do whatever they saw fit to do with it. They indeed continued the legacy of Bernstein, "the movement is everything, the final aim is nothing". This anti-theory, anti-ideology line was expressed in the *New Left Notes*, of SDS, stating that the program of SDS "does not talk about politics or the taking of power. . . It talks about resistance. . . the movement."

Further stating: "At its present stage of development, SDS cannot be understood in terms of traditional political organization. Neither ideological clarity (as political analysis) nor organizational stability are fundamentally important to SDS'ers. What counts is that which creates *movement*. What counts is that SDS be where the action is. What counts is that SDS be involved in the creation of a cutting-edge in the freedom struggle." (SDS, p. 316)

In pointing out this anti-Leninist line, we by no means expect that SDS at that time would have put forward a correct line on this question. By no means, on the contrary, with all the opportunists within SDS, it could not but formulate such a task. However, we'd like to point out that this basic anti-Leninist view became *the trademark* of the petty bourgeoisie in the "anti-revisionist communist movement" of the 1970's. The anti-theory line dominated, as we'll show

further on, this opportunist movement. "Freedom of Criticism" and the "Movement is everything. . ." became the guiding ideological principles, along with Mao Zedong Thought, of the opportunist movement of the seventies. Along with this anti-theory, anti-Leninist line is the advocacy of a loose-knit organization, in the traditions of the 2nd International, the hostility towards a discipline organization, was in fact brought to the "anti-revisionist" movement, as will be shown later on. The Davidsons, Klonskyites, Avakianites, etc., brought all their petty bourgeois cargo into the movement of the seventies. For this reason we cite the above.

With this movement, led by all variant forms of opportunism: Krushchevite revisionism, Maoism (from the PLP'ers), social-democracy, anarchism, the degenerate "do-your-own-thing" drug culture, and a developing adventurist and terrorist trend, soon to be crystallized in the Weathermen, the bourgeois state apparatus (the FBI, CIA, the Army, Red Squads, informers, administration, etc.) came down on the movement, infiltrated its ranks, spread its anti-communism and red-baiting, and conducted its provocateur activity. The state apparatus repressively came down especially hard on the movement of the oppressed Black nation and oppressed national minorities, arresting, murdering, harrasing many of the leaders of these movements.

For many in the SDS, the repression that came upon the "movement" as a whole, and in particular, the repression on the campuses, coupled with the failure in ending the draft, failing in making America more democratic, and not being able to establish a cohesive "left" wing of the bourgeoisie, never mind a cohesive revolutionary organization, shattered their illusions of the role of SDS as *the* revolutionary organization.

By late 1967 and 1968 the self-proclaimed "Marxist-Leninists", whether it be PLP or the SDS "ML"ers, began to raise within the SDS that students, *as a separate movement*, were not the vanguard, but that the working class was. That is, the working class had the potential of being the vanguard once the "revolutionary, Marxist, students" of SDS go amongst the working class and "lead" it to "victory". More clearly, the task ahead was for the petty-bourgeois radicals to take hegemony of the working class movement, spreading the petty-bourgeois theories, hesitations, vacillations amongst the proletariat and promoting the economist, anti-theory and "movement" line amongst the proletariat. This line of implanting the students in the working class materializes with the development of an embryo of the "anti-revisionist communist movement" by 1969. However, the advocates of this line began to promote it widely in SDS as early as 1967.

The PLP, for example, began to promote widely in SDS the worker-student alliance, which advocated that students, especially during the summer, should get working class jobs and spread "anti-imperialism". The PLP, which was in a crisis where various factions had split from it, was in dire need of membership. Having no base in the working class, and losing many of the old ex-CPUSA'ers in its crisis, the PLP looked at the SDS for its source of new recruits. Thus, the worker-student alliance plan of PLP was the justification for PLP seeking its

base among the students.

Meanwhile, in SDS, petty-bourgeois intellectuals such as Mike Klonsky (whose father was a former organizational secretary for the "CPUSA" in Pennsylvania—explaining where Klonsky gained his organizational skills and his politics), Steve Hamilton (a founder of the Bay Area Revolutionary Union), and Bob Avakian, (the main founder of RU and later the RCP) began to put forth the need for SDS to concentrate on organizing in the working class communities, concentrating on the youth, the "vanguard" of the revolution.

The petty-bourgeois radicals of SDS did not know what to do with SDS, for despite all their resistance, militancy, and "revolutionism" they did not really have any solution for the movement, nor know where to go.

Thus, the factional in-fighting in SDS, already a trademark of SDS, grew sharper with the two poles of the worship of spontaneity crystallizing themselves. As cited above, there developed a "Marxian", Maoist-economist trend advocating the implantation of the student movement into the working class movement, and a frenzied adventurist, terrorist trend advocating direct military confrontation with the "pig state"; for these "left" adventurists the revolution had started and "picking up the gun" was the task at hand.

The advocates of "going to the working class" put forward the *Revolutionary Youth Movement* proposal, the seed of the *implantation* line. The thrust of this proposal, put forth by non other than Mike Klonsky (present chairman of the social chauvinist, Chinese franchised agent,— "CPML"), determined the task of the student movement to be one of going amongst the working class youth, who had the potential of becoming the vanguard, thereby leading the "adult" working class toward the "downfall of capitalism". Allow us to quote in length the RYM proposal by Klonsky for it is truly a gem in that it exposes the true plans that these petty-bourgeois leaders implemented, later giving birth to the "anti-revisionist movement".

Klonsky, quoted in the *New Left Notes* of December, 1968, states: "The main task now is to begin moving beyond the limitations of struggle placed upon a student movement. We must realize our potential to reach out to new constituencies both on and off campus and build SDS into a youth movement that is revolutionary."

This, by the way, he concluded, by proclaiming that the demonstration and riot that broke out in the Chicago Democratic National Convention of 1968 (of which many of those present at the demonstration were undercover police), was supposedly led by "working class youth". Thus, to Klonsky it was the youth who were the vanguard, not *just* students. But allow us to continue quoting Klonsky: "The notion that we must remain simply "anti-imperialist student organization" is no longer viable. The nature of our struggle is such that it necessitates an organization that is made up of youth and not just students, and that these youths become class conscious. This means that our struggles must be integrated into the struggles of working people.....

"Because we can organize—as a student movement—around those contradictions which affect youth, specifically, we can organize young working

people into our class-conscious anti-capitalist movement. These young workers will (a) strengthen the anti-capitalist movement among the work-force, (b) provide an organic link between the student movement and the movement of working people, and (c) add to the effect that we will have as a critical force on older working people today.”

Thus, Klonsky's RYM plan, supported by Bob Avakian and all the rest of the herd of our present day economists, called for the *integration* of the student movement with the working class movement. That is, not necessarily that the proletariat was the vanguard, the only thorough-going revolutionary class, but that the youth, including not only students, (though they'll bring the "class consciousness") but the working class and "Third world" youth, are the vanguard of the movement. He states that the task was to organize the youth to "our", i.e., the student movements', "class conscious anti-capitalist movement".

Likewise, the R.U.'s perspective on the question "what is to be done?" in the student movement was stated in *Red Papers 1, 2,3* as follows: "The question before SDS and the movement generally today is: what is the road to the proletariat? how can we build working class leadership in the struggle against U.S. Imperialism? For SDS this certainly does not mean that we should stop or cut back in support of Third World liberation. In fact, we should accelerate and heighten our activity. But, at the same time, we must recognize that next to Third World people, youth in the working class, especially among industrial workers, are the main road to arousing and activating the entire working class." (p.35)

For starters, the student movement was neither class conscious nor anti-capitalist, but largely a reformist and anarchistic movement.

However, in these statements lie the plan for the working class to be led by the petty-bourgeoisie, for to say that the "young workers" must be won over to the "student anti-capitalist movement" is but the open proclamation for the petty-bourgeoisie to seize hegemony of the working class movement by corrupting first the youth, and later, as the plan was unfolded and implemented, taking over trade union positions, and strengthening the positions of the labor aristocracy. Thus, indeed, the RYM proposal, later modified a bit more in RYM 2, was, along with the PLP's worker-student alliance, but the *blueprint* of the new developing "Maoist" petty-bourgeois movement to seize hegemony of the proletariat.

The RYM proposal was put forth at the SDS national convention in the fall of 1968. It rallied such "leaders" of the developing economist and terrorist currents as Mike Klonsky, Bob Avakian, and Carl Davidson for the developing Maoist, economist trend, and Bernardine Dohrn and Mark Rudd for the terrorist, "Weatherman", current. At this convention a sharp struggle broke out with the RYM/Weatherman forces in opposition and pursuing a split with PLP. The PLP, already rapidly degenerating further into neo-Trotskyism, advocated the line that "all nationalism is reactionary", that the Vietnamese party was revisionist for not following the line of "no com-

promise" and allowing for negotiations, and placed itself in contradiction to many SDS'ers, especially those pursuing the terrorist road for calling out Fidel Castro as a revisionist and the Cuban revolution as sold-out. At the same time PLP, whose petty-bourgeois cadres were trying to pass themselves off as "genuine communists", was always maneuvering within SDS to seize the leadership in order to ensure that they, PLP, eventually would control SDS in order to have the largest section of implanted students in the working class, thus ensuring that PLP's petty-bourgeois and neo-Trotskyite line would have hegemony over the proletariat.

The struggle sharpened throughout the spring of 1969, culminating at the June SDS national convention.

The RYM/Weatherman faction of SDS, in order to defeat and purge the PLP, pursued the alliance with the "Third Worldist" revolutionaries of the U.S., who to them were the vanguard of the revolution in the U.S. at the time, most especially, the Black Panther Party. The RYM/Weatherman faction got the BPP, The Brown Berets (a group of Chicanos) and the Young Lords Organization (a group of mainly Puerto Ricans) to speak on their behalf and to condemn the PLP as counter-revolutionary. The PLP, who had already denounced "all nationalism as reactionary" and therefore regarded the BPP, The Brown Berets, the YLO, etc. as reactionary, was placed in a very awkward position at the convention, to say the least. However, the BPP statement which condemned the PLP as counter-revolutionaries, promoted bourgeois nationalism, and came out with degenerate and sexist slogans which divided the convention, many rallying to the side of PLP, who began to chant, Fight Male Chauvinism!

The result of the convention was the formation of "two" SDS',—one dominated by PLP, known from then on as the PL-SDS, and the other being the RYM/Weatherman-SDS. It should be noted that the various factions were only united for one brief moment, when the representative of the revisionist "CPUSA" took the floor to present their proposal. For an instant the tension subsided as all factions shouted in unison: "Smash revisionism! Smash revisionism!" It should be pointed out that the "CPUSA" representative at this convention was Mickey Jarvis, later a leader of the Maoist "RCP" and now a leader of the pro-"three worlds" RWH !!

By 1969, the "movement" was already completely split up, and had given birth to the origins of the "anti-revisionist communist movement".

While in RYM, Bob Avakian had already begun to maneuver on how he could develop a plan to go to the head of the opportunist movement and seize the leadership. He had already formed the Bay Area Revolutionary Union, along with Steve Hamilton and Bruce Franklin. Klonsky's aspirations were to make RYM the party, but this failed. So already the careerist Avakian was a step ahead of Klonsky (who eventually formed the October League) in the new race for leadership of the developing "anti-revisionist" movement.

Among the groups from the movement of the oppressed nationalities that took Mao Zedong Thought as their guiding ideology were: the Young Lords Party, later to be the Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization; the

League of Revolutionary Black Workers, which later formed, along with other groups, the Black Workers Congress; and I Wor Kuen.

The fact however remains that the anti-Leninist lines, the opportunism of the "anti-revisionist communist movement", stem from prior to its actual birth. This new "communist movement" was but the materialization of the petty-bourgeoisie striving to take hegemony of the working class movement.

Facts indeed show that the SDS is the direct link connecting the "anti-revisionist-communist movement" to social-democracy, the opportunism of the Second International. All the opportunist baggage of the Second International, of Trotskyism, modern revisionism, Maoism, and adventurism was brought into this "anti-revisionist communist movement", creating great set backs in establishing a genuine Bolshevik trend demarcated from all the above.