

CANADA

On the "Third International"
Youth Camp" in Spain:

PROVOCATION UNDER COVER OF CRIES AGAINST PROVOCATION

Bolshevik Union of Canada

During the summer the international centrist trend headed by the Party of Labour of Albania held the so-called "Third International Youth Camp" at Valencia, Spain. This was allegedly an "anti-imperialist anti-fascist" youth camp. But the reality was quite another matter. The "anti-imperialism" consisted of attacking organizations that struggle against imperialism. One of the participating centrist parties, the so-called "CPUSA(ML)," said "the delegates did not shrink from the battle against imperialism when it presented itself at the conference" (*Unite!*, September 15, 1979). The camp organizers showed their "anti-fascism" by calling upon the Spanish police to disperse the so-called "imperialists" who were "sabotaging" the camp by distributing a leaflet.

Eleven centrist parties or their youth organizations have put out a "Communique on the Various Provocations Against the Third International Youth Camp" which puts forward unsubstantiated slanders about "provocations," but which in fact only exposes its signatories.

In order to cover for themselves the centrists said that holding the camp was a victory against the Spanish government. The "communique" says "the success was won against the Spanish government which had forbidden but was forced to lift its ban the day before the Camp opened" (*Unite!*, September 15, p. 3). But how did this motley crew of opportunists "force"

what they call a "monarcho-fascist" regime to allow them to have this camp? It is certainly not because of fear of these eleven centrist organizations. We are tempted to suspect that it must have something to do with "the battle against imperialism when it presented itself at the conference" since the Spanish police helped the camp organizers "battle against imperialism" by threatening to arrest not the camp organizers but the so-called "provocateurs"!

The Communist Party of Cyprus/Marxist-Leninist (Organizing Committee) described what happened in an open international letter. The camp organizers prohibited the Communist Party of Turkey (Marxist-Leninist) (TKP(ML)) and several Turkish anti-fascist anti-imperialist mass organizations from participating in the camp on the grounds that they oppose "KPD(ML)" of Germany, an opportunist sect in Turkey (TDFP-IÖ) and criticize the PLA "on certain international questions of Marxism-Leninism" (Open Letter). And then this is what the CPC/ML(OC) tells us happened.

ATIF, ATÖF, Partizan, TKP(ML)-TMLGB responded to the ban by issuing and distributing leaflets and opening banners at the entrance of the camp. The camp committee forced them to move from the space in front of the camp. But they continued their just action which we wholeheartedly supported by the side of the nearby road. A traffic warden and gendarme who tried to stop the action were persuaded to allow leafletting to go on for another hour. But the members of the Communist Party of Spain/ML who were in the festival committee arrived before the police abandoned the area. After a short conversation between authorities from PCE/ML and the fascist Spanish police, the police forced comrades from Turkey to stop their action or else they would be arrested.

By this action the festival committee and particularly PCE/ML have actually proved that they are prepared even to collaborate with the fascist police in order to prevent the spread of communist ideas that criticize their own views.

The centrists try to cover this up by saying in their "communique" that "primarily Turkish provocateurs occupied part of the camp. They attempted to provoke clashes in order to allow the police and civil guard to intervene. They distributed leaflets intended to spread unrest among Camp participants." But it was the camp organizers that invited "the police and Civil Guard to intervene." The opportunists reason that someone disagrees with us, this is a provocation, so we must call the police to stop this provocation, this is why those we disagree with "allow the police and Civil Guard to intervene." Those who invite the police "battle against imperialism" and those who the police are invited to arrest are allowing the police to intervene — this is the reasoning of the philistines that organized this camp.

And how were these so-called "Turkish provocateurs" spreading "unrest among Camp participants" through leaflets? The leaflet of the CPT(ML) said:

The CPT(M-L) defends the principled unity of all Marxist-Leninist forces in the international arena.

The CPT(ML) is against the reconciliation with the mistakes of each other and flattering among the fraternal M-L parties. The CPT(M-L) holds the view that discussion, criticism and self-criticism among the revolutionary and M-L forces is not harmful for principled unity; on the contrary it is a necessary condition.

The CPT(M-L) is also against hiding principal and important disagreements among fraternal organizations. It is for an open and public criticism. This attitude of the CPT(M-L) is in line with the theory and practice of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, who are the classics of M-L.

But our attitude is considered wrong by many forces. One section of those who consider our attitude wrong, as far as we are concerned, is Marxist-Leninists who commit important mistakes for the sake of "unity." The other section is the opportunist forces. They want to destroy the activities of Marxist-Leninists for setting up a principled unity and are frightened from open criticism and discussion. They take criticism to be a kind of "confession" continuously vacillating and after every mistake are saying "we did not make mistakes of principles any way." They try to prevent discussions in their hands.

It is obvious why this would "spread unrest among Camp participants" because it exposes the fraud the Camp organizers were engaged in and because it "provoked" "Camp participants" to discuss important questions rather than "testifying" their loyalty to the Camp organizers and the PLA. In addition to CPT(ML) there were a number of other parties and organizations who were there to have an open discussion of views who are all lumped together by the centrists as "various Maoist groups and provocateurs" who "carried out actions against the camp... to impede holding the camp and hinder its success." How is it that these groups "impeded holding the camp" by wanting to participate in it? Obviously it is their participation that would "hinder its success" — that is the success of the opportunists in suppressing any open and principled discussion. The centrists try to give the appearance of a political criticism by saying all of these groups are Maoist, but in fact the Camp organizers were all open adherents of Mao Tsetung Thought until the PLA told them to drop it, as the PLA had done. None of them have put forward any meaningful criticism for their adherence to Mao Tsetung Thought and still uphold the revisionist essence of Mao Tsetung Thought under the banner of "Hoxha Thought." These centrists also cover up the fact that some of these groups criticize Mao Tsetung Thought. But the problem for the centrists is that these groups say they want an open discussion of this important question. This is supposedly "provocation."

The centrists tell us that "the Third International Youth Camp replied to all provocations and took decisive measures. Prohibitions were declared, provocateurs were seized, and finally, all provocateurs were thrown out of the camp." To slightly reword this statement will show what really happened. It should read like this:

The Third International Youth Camp replied to all discussion and criticism by preventing it and

took decisive measures like collaborating with the police. Censorship was declared, any one who disagreed with us was seized, and finally those we disagreed with were beaten by our thugs and thrown out of the camp for the police to harrass and take pictures of.

The centrists follow this by saying "This has been a new experience which shows that the anti-fascist, anti-imperialist unity and the revolutionary struggle of youth can be strengthened only when every type of repression is met head on and all varieties of collaboration and provocation are combated." This should read:

This has been a repeat of an old experience which shows that fascist and imperialist unity and the counter-revolutionary struggle of lumpen and petty bourgeois youth can be strengthened only when every type of criticism is met head on with clubs and all varieties of Marxist-Leninist unity and criticism are combated.

Sectarianism or Social Fascism?

The "communique" says that "all this provocative cooperation with the fascist movement in Spain failed." This indeed is certainly misleading because the "provocative cooperation with the fascist movement in Spain" by the camp organizers certainly did not fail. The "PCE(ML)" and the others succeeded in allying with Franco's police to drive away anti-imperialists and anti-fascists from the camp. No wonder the Spanish government "lifted its ban the day before the Camp opened."

Stalin and the Comintern long ago exposed the relationship between fascism and social-fascism as being opposite sides of the same coin. We would be sadly deluding ourselves if we thought social-fascism is a thing of the past or that it is limited to the avowed followers of social-democracy or to avowed followers of Russian and Chinese revisionism. The facts are that the organizers of this camp operate with a social-democratic, menshevik, revisionist line that they try to mask as Marxist-Leninist and their activities at this camp show their willingness to not only carry out fascist-like repression but to openly collaborate with the fascist police. They are socialists only in words, they are fascists in deeds. Whether or not social-fascism characterizes the general work of all of these organizations in no way changes the fact that this activity in Spain was social-fascist and represents social-fascisation of this trend internationally. Of course we know only too well that Bains' so-called "Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist)" is a social-fascist group, something we have proven before. The most recent example is when a fascist gang and Bains' gang tried to destroy a demonstration of Blacks protesting police killings by provoking a fight with each other that allowed the police to move in.

The analysis of the camp made by the Canadian group "In Struggle" is profoundly mis-

taken and opportunist. In Struggle labelled what happened as "sectarianism" and thereby tries to cover up the political contradictions that exist and pretends that the only problem is sectarianism which can be corrected by everyone ceasing to be "sectarian."

This is an old tactic of In Struggle who never struggled against the social-chauvinist, right opportunist and revisionist line of the "CCL(ML)" (now the "Workers Communist Party (ML)" and instead called them sectarian for not "desiring unity" with In Struggle and not wanting to participate in In Struggle's conferences. In Struggle said that the Bolshevik Union was "sectarian" for participating in the conferences and raising differences and for attacking the League. The League is a gang of social-fascists who use the techniques of the camp on a regular basis. They even put In Struggle cadre in the hospital. In Struggle decided that the contradiction with the Bolshevik Union was antagonistic and thereafter engaged with the League and CPC(ML) in social-fascist attacks on the Bolshevik Union.

In Struggle is repeating this today by criticizing these forces as "sectarian" but calling on them to unite in one international organization with In Struggle. The Bolshevik Union are "police agents" and "agent provocateurs" according to In Struggle. Thus In Struggle does all the things they criticize as "sectarianism" to the Bolshevik Union.

In Struggle has never put forward one bit of proof of these slanderous accusations; they simply use them to avoid responding to our polemic. In Struggle reveals its utter hypocrisy with statements like "methods such as calling in the police or physically attacking other communists are totally inadmissible" (*In Struggle*, October 2, 1979, p. 14). But In Struggle used these very methods against the Bolshevik Union. Of course In Struggle could say we are not communists but this is exactly what the organizers of the camp said about those they used these methods against. And like In Struggle they offer no proof of this whatsoever.

The point, however, is that these methods are not only inadmissible, those that use them are not communists. Do communists "call on the police" to aid them in their disagreements with other communists? Do communists "physically attack other communists"? Simply to pose these questions shows the bankruptcy of In Struggle's position. Only for opportunists like In Struggle do "Communists" use such "inadmissible" methods.

In Struggle further exposes its utter hypocrisy by saying "However, what is even more serious is that these actions are signs of an utter refusal to debate openly questions which divide the communist movement." What is it a sign of when In Struggle uses these same actions to avoid debating openly with the Bolshevik Union?

Let us review a little history. Since In Struggle

gave its "definitive demarcation" against the Bolshevik Union because we say there is an antagonistic contradiction between Marxism-Leninism and the theory of "three worlds," In Struggle has carried out systematic repressive activity against the Bolshevik Union. At its next conference In Struggle not only physically attacked and ejected members of the Bolshevik Union, but also people who applauded our interventions and workers who disagreed with In Struggle's programme who had nothing to do with the Bolshevik Union. We will never forget the spectacle of In Struggle dragging away from the microphones and ejecting welfare recipients who criticized In Struggle for having the same programme on welfare rights as the bourgeois parties. They dragged away one 75 year old woman who they knew had a delicate heart condition. Four of their male security goons pushed around a 50 year old woman. They threw out a nine month pregnant woman who had to fight her way back in to get her other child from the daycare center — her crime: applauding the Bolshevik Union.

Ever since In Struggle has physically attacked us for distributing at their meetings and at other meetings. They have openly allied with the League and "CPC(ML)" to attack us. They helped the League publicly circulate the names of some of our cadre and they take pictures of our militants that no doubt fall into the hands of the police.

They have even tried to throw us out of mass organizations and physically attack our distributors at factory gates, picket lines and demonstrations. Why does In Struggle do all of this to what they call a "fringe group," a "small sect," "library rats" who "do no nothing in the working class"; it is because there is nothing In Struggle fears more than the Bolshevik Union — not because we attack them physically, because we never have — it is because we attack them ideologically with Bolshevism. And In Struggle has no mental defence.

If there is anyone who does not believe what we say about In Struggle, we invite them to come with one of our distributors to an In Struggle meeting and they will see for themselves. In Struggle is a group that thrives on hypocrisy so it does not bother them to condemn other groups for the very things they themselves do.

In Struggle's stand about the camp, however, is not principally a reflection of its hypocrisy, it is consistent with its Trotskyite aim of conciliating and uniting different international factions and trends. In Struggle is only criticizing the organizers of the camp because this kind of activity gets in the way of their ambitions. It is indeed strange that In Struggle nowhere mentions in its publications that it was at the camp and was excluded from participating as an organization. It is also strange that the "communique" does not mention In Struggle's "provocations." In Strug-

taken and opportunist. In Struggle labelled what happened as "sectarianism" and thereby tries to cover up the political contradictions that exist and pretends that the only problem is sectarianism which can be corrected by everyone ceasing to be "sectarian."

This is an old tactic of In Struggle who never struggled against the social-chauvinist, right opportunist and revisionist line of the "CCL(ML)" (now the "Workers Communist Party (ML)" and instead called them sectarian for not "desiring unity" with In Struggle and not wanting to participate in In Struggle's conferences. In Struggle said that the Bolshevik Union was "sectarian" for participating in the conferences and raising differences and for attacking the League. The League is a gang of social-fascists who use the techniques of the camp on a regular basis. They even put In Struggle cadre in the hospital. In Struggle decided that the contradiction with the Bolshevik Union was antagonistic and thereafter engaged with the League and CPC(ML) in social-fascist attacks on the Bolshevik Union.

In Struggle is repeating this today by criticizing these forces as "sectarian" but calling on them to unite in one international organization with In Struggle. The Bolshevik Union are "police agents" and "agent provocateurs" according to In Struggle. Thus In Struggle does all the things they criticize as "sectarianism" to the Bolshevik Union.

In Struggle has never put forward one bit of proof of these slanderous accusations; they simply use them to avoid responding to our polemic. In Struggle reveals its utter hypocrisy with statements like "methods such as calling in the police or physically attacking other communists are totally inadmissible" (*In Struggle*, October 2, 1979, p. 14). But In Struggle used these very methods against the Bolshevik Union. Of course In Struggle could say we are not communists but this is exactly what the organizers of the camp said about those they used these methods against. And like In Struggle they offer no proof of this whatsoever.

The point, however, is that these methods are not only inadmissible, those that use them are not communists. Do communists "call on the police" to aid them in their disagreements with other communists? Do communists "physically attack other communists"? Simply to pose these questions shows the bankruptcy of In Struggle's position. Only for opportunists like In Struggle do "Communists" use such "inadmissible" methods.

In Struggle further exposes its utter hypocrisy by saying "However, what is even more serious is that these actions are signs of an utter refusal to debate openly questions which divide the communist movement." What is it a sign of when In Struggle uses these same actions to avoid debating openly with the Bolshevik Union?

Let us review a little history. Since In Struggle

gave its "definitive demarcation" against the Bolshevik Union because we say there is an antagonistic contradiction between Marxism-Leninism and the theory of "three worlds." In Struggle has carried out systematic repressive activity against the Bolshevik Union. At its next conference In Struggle not only physically attacked and ejected members of the Bolshevik Union, but also people who applauded our interventions and workers who disagreed with In Struggle's programme who had nothing to do with the Bolshevik Union. We will never forget the spectacle of In Struggle dragging away from the microphones and ejecting welfare recipients who criticized In Struggle for having the same programme on welfare rights as the bourgeois parties. They dragged away one 75 year old woman who they knew had a delicate heart condition. Four of their male security goons pushed around a 50 year old woman. They threw out a nine month pregnant woman who had to fight her way back in to get her other child from the daycare center — her crime: applauding the Bolshevik Union.

Ever since In Struggle has physically attacked us for distributing at their meetings and at other meetings. They have openly allied with the League and "CPC(ML)" to attack us. They helped the League publicly circulate the names of some of our cadre and they take pictures of our militants that no doubt fall into the hands of the police.

They have even tried to throw us out of mass organizations and physically attack our distributors at factory gates, picket lines and demonstrations. Why does In Struggle do all of this to what they call a "fringe group," a "small sect," "library rats" who "do nothing in the working class"; it is because there is nothing In Struggle fears more than the Bolshevik Union — not because we attack them physically, because we never have — it is because we attack them ideologically with Bolshevism. And In Struggle has no mental defence.

If there is anyone who does not believe what we say about In Struggle, we invite them to come with one of our distributors to an In Struggle meeting and they will see for themselves. In Struggle is a group that thrives on hypocrisy so it does not bother them to condemn other groups for the very things they themselves do.

In Struggle's stand about the camp, however, is not principally a reflection of its hypocrisy, it is consistent with its Trotskyite aim of conciliating and uniting different international factions and trends. In Struggle is only criticizing the organizers of the camp because this kind of activity gets in the way of their ambitions. It is indeed strange that In Struggle nowhere mentions in its publications that it was at the camp and was excluded from participating as an organization. It is also strange that the "communique" does not mention In Struggle's "provocations." In Strug-

gle will not take a firm stand against these parties because this would limit its ability to manoeuvre and intrigue in order to reconcile different factions of mensheviks into a grand alliance against Bolshevism. "Sectarianism is an obstacle" to In Struggle's plans.

The PLA Stands Behind the Events at the Camp

In Struggle in all its talk about "sectarianism" avoids the political reality behind the actions of the centrists in Spain. What unites the signatories of the "communique" is their common adherence to and recognition by the PLA. The PLA is no more receptive to international debate and criticism than any of these parties. The PLA does not respond to criticism and unites with and encourages the kind of activity engaged in by these opportunists. Of course the PLA does not get involved directly in such a dirty affair, but when Raul Marco, leader of "PCE(ML)" and other centrist party leaders assembled, recently, to place a wreath on the grave of Hysni Kapo it would be naive to think nothing was discussed but general declarations about the "purity of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism."

The PLA, however, does not just oppose the answering of criticism, the PLA has specific foreign policy interests in encouraging the kind of activity that happened at the camp in Spain. This is why the focus of the slander campaign is on the Turkish party. The PLA has placed a great deal of emphasis on developing good relations with the regimes in Turkey and Greece, especially since it strained relations with China. The PLA has declared Turkey and Greece to be "sovereign and independent countries" which obviously has nothing to do with reality. Turkey is clearly a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country languishing under the yoke of imperialism and is increasingly the object of the struggle to redivide the world among the imperialists. Turkey is a country torn by economic and political crisis and social upheaval. The spontaneous resistance of the workers and peasants is greatly increasing in the face of massive unemployment and staggering inflation. The Kurdish nation and the other oppressed nationalities are also waging an intense struggle against national oppression.

The Turkish regime has responded to this with more and more armed repression of the masses. Martial law exists in much of Turkey and where the state does not carry on direct attacks on the workers and peasants it uses "unofficial" fascist gangs that terrorize the people unimpeded by the state. The PLA says it does not have relations with fascist countries but it is proud of its relations with the Turkish regime.

In the face of this tremendous development of the objective factors of revolution, at a time when the imperialists themselves are announcing far and wide that Turkey is a weak link in the imperialist chain, what is the PLA doing to aid the Turkish proletariat to lead the revolu-

tion? The answer can be seen in works like *Imperialism and the Revolution*, where Hoxha does not talk about it. Here is a country close to Albania that is moving closer and closer to the brink of revolution and what does the PLA do? The PLA prettifies the regime as "sovereign and independent," covers up its fascization and is pleased with its good attitude to Albania. Turkey is on the precipice of revolution and Hoxha says:

With Turkey also, we have friendly relations, which we would like to develop further. We are pleased to see that the Turkish AUTHORITIES have warmly and enthusiastically welcomed the performances of our artistic ensembles in their country, which strengthen the friendship between our peoples. (E. Hoxha, *Albania is Forging Ahead Confidently and Unafraid*, Tirana, 1978, p. 31)

But the PLA is not only taking a "neutral" stand for the sake of developing trade and relations, it is, as is proved with the events in Spain, working against the revolution. Not only did the camp organizers try to ban the CPT(ML), they tried to get them arrested knowing that it is an illegal party which faces particularly intense repression in Turkey and knowing this could lead to the worst of consequences, but they also tried to do this to members of Turkish mass organizations. But even worse they tried to equate these mass organizations with the Party which only can help the Turkish regime and the West German government to outlaw these groups. The CPC/ML(OC) points out that the camp organizers "tried to equalize ATIF and ATOF which are democratic mass organizations, to TKP/ML (CPT(ML)) which is an illegal party in her country. This attitude of the festival committee again is extremely provocative and it serves the police, the Turkish and German police who are hand in hand trying their best to ban ATIF and ATOF."

West Germany has extensive investments in Turkey as well as over two million immigrant Turkish workers in Germany who are tremendously exploited and militant in their resistance. Now that West Germany wants to recruit immigrants into its army it will even be more interested in suppressing ATIF and ATOF because of their work among Turkish immigrants in Germany. ATIF and ATOF in a leaflet distributed at the camp said "we consider that it is wrong and harmful to equalize democratic mass organizations with illegal parties and make such propaganda." We would be naive to think the camp organizers did not know this and in fact deliberately lent assistance to the Turkish and German police — just one more example of their social-fascist activity.

The position of the PLA can be seen most clearly in its support for the so-called "Revolutionary Communist Party of Turkey — Construction Organization" that helps the Turkish regime by denouncing CPT(ML)'s armed self-defense against fascist attacks as terrorism, opposes the armed struggle and prettifies the regime in Turkey. It is no coincidence that this organization came into existence with a great

deal of assistance and aid of "KPD(ML)" from Germany which openly allies with the Schmidt government.

The CPT(ML) has openly attacked this opportunist sect from Turkey and "KPD(ML)" and this is a grave threat to the PLA and its trend because the "KPD(ML)" also plays an important role in the PLA's foreign policy. "KPD(ML)" takes the position that if Strauss is elected Chancellor of Germany in the next election it will be the same thing as Hitler getting elected in 1933. It will mean fascism in Germany and therefore keeping Schmidt, the social-democrat, would be better.

The question of fascism, however, is not what is involved here. There is no question that Strauss is a reactionary. But he is no Hitler and not any more reactionary than Schmidt. What is at issue for the PLA here is not a resurgence of fascism but the difference in foreign policy between Schmidt and Strauss. The issue of fascism is the PLA's excuse to ally with one faction of the German bourgeoisie against another. Hoxha puts it this way, "the fascist group around Strauss, the Hitlerite generals, the powerful real revanchists of Bonn, are openly advertising themselves as China's closest allies." (*Imperialism and the Revolution*, Tirana, p. 32)

What the PLA is getting at is illustrated in Hua Kuo fung's recent visit to Germany where Schmidt gave him a rather cold reception, presumably making Schmidt not one of the "REAL revanchists of Bonn," whereas Strauss was very open in his praise for Hua and his support for an alliance with China, making Strauss the "REAL revanchist of Bonn"! The PLA prefers one set of German revanchists to another because of their attitude to China and raises the pretext of fascism to justify supporting the "progressive" group around Schmidt instead of "the fascist group around Strauss."

It is in this context that the camp organizers attacked a West German group. The "Communique" talks about "the German provocateurs and liquidators of the group 'Against the Current'." This group is attacked because of its relations with CPT(ML) and because of their history of opposing the chauvinism and opportunism of "KPD(ML)". They are called "liquidators" because they split from "KPD(ML)" and opposed its revisionist thesis of allying with certain factions of the bourgeoisie against other factions. As to being "provocateurs" this is the same unproven slander "KPD(ML)" peddles in Germany to try to cover its total inability to answer criticism.

The communique also attacks "the delegation of the Marxist-Leninist Party of Austria" because of its relations with CPT(ML) and Against the Tide and because of its criticisms of "KPD(ML)." This comes after most of these parties earlier this summer signed a joint declaration with the Austrian party about Stalin. The most "damning" criticism they can come up with is that "the MLP of Austria did not lift a finger in the organizing of the Camp or in program activities." This is supposedly

"provocation," unlike collaborating with the Spanish police! Of course they cover up that "The Austrian Marxist-Leninist Party (AMLPL) was not allowed to propagate their views and distribute their pamphlets in the camp. AMLPL was also 'advised' to stop collaborating with the 'agent-provocateurs.' The Austrian Marxist-Leninists did not obey such anti-Marxist regulations and decided not to join the camp officially" (Open Letter at CPC/ML (OC)).

The PLA considers Austria to be a "well-intentioned" imperialist power (Hoxha, *Albania is Forging Ahead Confidently and Unafraid*, p. 29). And despite its long-time relations with MLPA, apparently this is less important than "friendly approaches and normal trade and cultural relations" with the Austrian imperialists.

The "communiqué" attacks "a group of petty bourgeois students who have declared themselves to be the Marxist-Leninist Party of Cyprus." The Cyprus party states that "by saying the CPC/ML is a 'student organization abroad' the festival committee is only helping the police and no one else." No doubt the reactionaries in Cyprus try to say communism is something "foreign" to Cyprus and only comes from students who go abroad; they will no doubt use this "communiqué" to "prove" their point. This is the kind of lie the Tsarist police used to spread about the Bolsheviks. The PLA says very little about the situation in Cyprus. They have no desire to offend Greece and Turkey by condemning their reactionary participation in the partition of Cyprus.

If the PLA were a genuine Marxist-Leninist party, it would completely disassociate itself with what happened at the camp and condemn it, but the fact is the PLA supports this kind of social-fascist activity, and not simply because role of the PLA. It is totally erroneous to separate methods of struggle but because of its own nationalist interests. The PLA was the "silent partner" in what happened in Spain.

What happened in Spain cannot be properly exposed and combated without exposing the role of the PLA. It is totally erroneous to separate these centrist parties from the PLA. It is not enough to demarcate from this or that party. The PLA does not recognize and promote all these opportunist parties because it is a Marxist-Leninist party. If the exposure of the camp in Spain is confined to the opportunists directly involved, it will only cover for the PLA's continuing activities to sabotage the international communist movement. It is time to judge the PLA not by its incessant phrasemongering but to judge it by its practice. Where does the PLA stand on Vietnam, Iran, Zimbabwe, Nicaragua, Turkey, etc. — against the proletariat. Where does the PLA stand on the events in Spain — it stands behind and encourages social-fascism and counter-revolutionary activity. It is time to stop conciliating with these opportunists and organize an international split against them. The longer we wait the more damage they will do. How much will it take for some to stop conciliating with the PLA?

Agent Provocateurs

The baseless accusations of the "Communique" about "provocation" is just one example of a very disgusting practice that has been in prevalent use by opportunists around the world. In Canada we are quite use to the incessant accusations of being "agent-provocateurs," "police socialists," etc. All the opportunists are united together in throwing these labels at the Bolshevik Union. Of course they never stick but this is not the objective. It is to protect themselves from our Bolshevik criticism. The "CPC(ML)" and the League have always tried to insulate their cadre from the point of view of other groups to cover for their theoretical impoverishment. In Struggle finally succumbed to this openly after having engaged in it through rumours for a long time. In Struggle was losing more and more cadre to the Bolshevik Union because of its complete inability to respond to our polemic. So it engaged in the vilest slander campaign internally to get its cadre to stop reading our publications and has since made one unproven accusation after another. What happened to In Struggle in Spain is only what it has done to us for a long time.

We totally denounce this method of opportunists to avoid debate and criticism, but we have no illusions that they will abandon it. It is part of their arsenal against Marxism-Leninism. The opportunists and revisionists have learned from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin that engaging in a polemic with Bolsheviks means the exposure and defeat of the mensheviks, however they disguise themselves. So they try to slander communists and even competing cliques of opportunists.*

But only the naive and fools would think there is not a serious problem of provocateur activity in the international communist movement. The Comintern long ago exposed the nature of this kind of activity and we should learn the lesson. The Comintern stated that "the secret police deliberately spread rumors about provocation within the Party, themselves accused others of acts of provocation in order to cover their own tracks" (see article in *Lines of Demarcation* no. 14). The Comintern talks about how "various groups, for a number of years, accused each other of being provocateurs" and we are seeing a repeat of this experience today.

It is important to understand that provocateurs fall into several categories. There are the trained agents of the secret police who infiltrate communist organizations or who set up phoney organizations. Then there are their collaborators

*In this regard it is interesting to note that the "Communique" is signed by the Youth delegation of "CPC(ML)" and "CPUSA(ML)." Bains directly runs a group in the US called "COUSML" that calls "CPUSA(ML)" an organization of agent provocateurs. We have yet to find the "communiqué" in Bains' paper.

bribed or coerced into betraying the proletariat. But there are not only provocateurs that work for the western imperialists, there are those that work for the revisionists. As the Comintern said "the social-fascist party can slip 'its man' into every group of workers which splits from it and joins the Communist Party." Certainly during the split with the Russian revisionists they slipped 'their man' and even 'their parties' or factions that formed new parties into the international communist movement. Certainly the Chinese revisionists did the same thing in the split over the theory of "three worlds." The Albanian revisionists today are doing the same thing.

The general state of ideological confusion that reigns internationally is a perfect terrain for this swarm of agents to operate in, a place where they can promote this confusion and channel its development in certain directions. No doubt in many organizations there are competing factions of agents who represent different revisionist and imperialist interests, or even different factions from the same revisionist party.

For all the talk opportunists engage in about agents they never expose any in their own ranks, they are always from other groups or people who leave the party or who are purged for political reasons. This alone is proof of no real struggle against provocateurs. The Comintern said:

Such a point of view is absurd. It must be emphasised once more that provocation is one of the methods in the class struggle of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. Is it not obvious that the ruling class, utilising the entire apparatus of class rule, will — sooner or later — find ways and means of placing its spies in the party? It is enough to put the question to make it clear that there is not a party in which the enemy is unable to place its agents. That being so, it is not the open exposure of a provocateur that compromises the Party, but the inability to expose him, the inability to deal with this question seriously.

There is not the slightest doubt that it is much more difficult to discover provocateurs in the capitalist countries at the present time than in the old Tsarist times in Russia. The enemy has learned a great deal.

Since the death of Stalin revolutionaries have not learned much because they have abandoned the struggle against provocation. Now it is only used as a means of slander against opposing politics. This allows the real provocateurs to go about their work totally unimpeded.

Not only have we carried out a consistent struggle to prevent the infiltration of our organization, we have waged a persistent struggle against the infiltration of In Struggle and for this In Struggle has called us "provocateurs"! In Struggle is a large, loose organization that almost anyone can join and if it denies it is infiltrated, In Struggle is only showing its own total bankruptcy. Our articles on this matter

were reprinted in *Lines of Demarcation* no. 14.

We will say much more on this subject in the future, but at this point we want to stress the line of the Comintern that "it is not so important for the Communist Party to expose individual provocateurs as to fight against provocation as a system to deprive the bourgeoisie of this weapon of disrupting the revolutionary working class movement.

"Thus the struggle against provocation can be correctly carried on only as a component part of the general revolutionary class struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. And likewise there can be no real class struggle against capitalism unless a relentless struggle is waged against provocation as a means of disrupting the working class, as an instrument of bourgeois rule.

"But that means that it is fundamentally wrong to undertake the struggle against provocation as a separate campaign, carried through as a shock campaign, after which the matter is allowed to rest. Not a campaign, but systematic, persistent daily attention."

The activity of the centrists at the camp in Spain is a part of the system of provocation and it cannot be combated without realizing it.

November 1979

Lines of Demarcation no. 14