

C.L. Response To Conciliators

Over the past several years it has become increasingly clear that the Communist League could not continue the ideological, theoretical and practical fight against the revisionist CPUSA (Communist Party of the USA) without using our guns on the conciliators of revisionism. These conciliators long ago placed themselves as buffers between us and the revisionist CPUSA. It has become impossible for us to struggle with the center of revisionism without coming to grips with the CPUSA spawned gangs. These groups appear to oppose the CPUSA but in fact cover for it and act as the left flank guards for the consolidation and preservation of revisionism.

Even though we knew that the struggle was inevitable, we held off exposing these gangs. We believed it necessary to level all our fire against the main center of international revisionism--the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and secondly the CPUSA. We are thankful that the situa-

tion has changed and now our theoretical and ideological hands are untied.

In spite of the lack of concrete facts and any theoretical investigation there is a clear theoretical line that runs throughout the attack on the C.L. printed above. That theoretical line concerns itself with the non-existent "third alternative to imperialism and socialism". This line, which the imperialists manufactured during the Soviet revolution, was resurrected by the ideologists of USNA imperialism, routed through Moscow and into the political offspring of the CPUSA, the "New Left".

We are accused of opposing this third alternative--this third world. Apparently we are dragged into the court of the petty bourgeois radicals, charged by the conciliators of revisionism, and ordered by the syndicalist judge to give a yes or no answer to the question, "Have you stopped beating your wife?" Since there are

no yes or no answers to questions of tactics and strategy, we want to present our case to the vanguard of the proletariat--the most advanced and revolutionary workers, and if possible to the above mentioned groups who have signed the attack.

Since we are Marxist-Leninists and not a union of "revolutionaries", or syndicalists representing the particular aspirations of local groupings, we must proceed from theoretical considerations in every struggle.

From the standpoint of dialectical materialism, can there be a third force in any entity? Marxism denies this possibility. In the process of motion each stage is marked by the simultaneous emergence of position and opposition or of thesis and antithesis. Mao Tse Tung's On Contradiction is a simply written, deep analysis of this process. There is not and cannot be a third factor.

(cont. on p. 7)

CL Reply (cont. from p. 2)

In the history of capitalism, "free enterprise" developed a gigantic accumulation of financial capital. At the point where investment in the national market and the national productive process became unprofitable this accumulation of capital was invested overseas. Thus a higher stage in the development of capitalism was reached: imperialism, the export of finance capital. Imperialism created its antithesis--the colonies. This international capital quickly conquered the world. World War 1 signified the complete conquest of backward peoples, the further accumulation of finance capital, and the inevitability of war to re-divide the colonies which were and are the condition for the existence of imperialism.

October 17, 1917, marked the world shaking birth of a second "world"--the world of socialism. Socialism sprang from the imperialist world and separated from it, that is, formed an external contradiction to the imperialist system. Thus the internal contradiction of imperialism is the colonies. The external contradiction is the socialist world.

There is no possible 3rd factor from the standpoint of theory and philosophy. Thesis: capitalist imperialism, anti-thesis: the proletariat and the toiling masses, synthesis: socialism. This is the motion of history.

Philosophically and theoretically these conciliators try to present the revolutionary movement with an undiscovered third dimension of dialectical motion. They pretend to dis-

(cont. on p. 8)

Reply to attack on C.L.

(cont. from p. 7)

cover an anti-antithesis existing within the internal structure of imperialism. We invite these conciliators to keep their undialectical improvements on Marxism to themselves--to us their "improvements" stink of the CIA (Central Intelligence Agency).

It would be bad enough to charge these philosophical Neanderthals with eclecticism. However, philosophy isn't at all the question. The real question is political and we are going to have to look at the hows and whys of this third world nonsense.

The concept of the "third world" has a material base and arose under certain conditions and at a certain time in history. This concept arose during the middle 1950's when the Chinese revolution was defeating its internal enemies, and the Khrushchev gang was consolidating its power and rapidly dismembering the monolithic character of the world Communist movement, and consequently placing the needs of the particular struggles above the needs of the general struggle.

A main aspect of this counter-revolutionary motion was consolidated by the calling of the Afro Asian Conference at Bandung, Java. The purpose of this conference was to consolidate a powerful bloc of "colored" peoples behind the arch comprador, Nehru of India. Another major goal was to win over revolutionary China to the side of the comprador regimes, or at least to test and see if China was more "Asian" or more "Communist".

The results of the Bandung Conference are well known. Through the manouvering of a host of feudal and comprador counter-revolutionary gangs, Nehru did indeed, for a moment, emerge as the leader of a "new political force". The attempt to isolate or corrupt China failed, and China too emerged politically stronger than before the conference. Any cursory analysis reveals the impossible contradictions of Bandung. The Afro Asian Conference represented everything from the slave owning empires of Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia to the revolutionary socialist state of the People's Republic of China. It was impossible to securely hang the label of "anti-imperialism" on two thirds of the regimes present at Bandung. Nonetheless, the political task of the imperialists was to create a grouping that would appear to be anti-imperialist and at the same time be non-communist. The thinking behind this was to give the masses of Africa and Asia a third choice, making it possible to be anti-imperialist and at the same time non-communist if not anti-communist.

The teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the October revolution have had a profound impact on the struggling colonial masses. Stalin sums up this teaching: 1) That the national and colonial questions are inseparable from the question of emancipation from the power of capital; 2) That imperialism (the highest form of capitalism) cannot exist without the political and economic enslavement of non-sovereign nations and colonies; 3) That the non-sovereign nations and colonies cannot be emancipated without the overthrow of the power of capital; and 4) That the victory of the proletariat cannot be a lasting one unless the non-sovereign nations and colonies are emancipated from the yoke of imperialism. (Stalin, Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, Int. Pub., Page 114)

These teachings--proven correct by history--had to be subverted and ignored, hence the necessity of the third choice. This third choice however, had to be an understandable concept not simply words. The fact that the majority of the countries signing the Bandung communique were feudalistic and comprador regimes prevented the imperialists from giving it a militant and anti-imperialist label. The leadership of the United States and Britain balked at any color identification such as a movement of the colored masses of the world. It was Khrushchev and the world revisionists who provided the way out. In An Account To The Party And The People (Report of the C.C. CPSU, To the 22nd Congress of the Party, Oct. 17, 1961) Khrushchev stated, "The position of imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America, where the colonialists until recently oppressed hundreds of millions of people is getting shakier. The revolutionary struggle of the peoples of those continents is rapidly gaining momentum. In the course of the past six years twenty-eight states have won political independence. The sixties of our century will go down in history as years of the complete disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism." (p. 22) Further, "The countries that have liberated themselves from the colonial yoke have achieved certain successes in national and cultural regeneration." (p. 23) And further, "The countries that have gained their freedom from colonial oppression have entered a new phase of development." (p. 24)

The concepts of "underdeveloped" and "countries that have gained their freedom..." runs through out the revisionist political statements. It was the revisionists, in service to the imperialists, who

have developed this third force concept.

The truth of the matter is that the capitalists understand the dialectical process just as we do. They understand that if they don't provide the alternatives to imperialism, we will. They want and have a situation where they both pose and oppose.

Let us look at the situation in the so-called third world. Marxism teaches us that politics is a concentrated expression of economics. How is it possible then that a country can be politically free when the economic structure is controlled by foreign capitalists. It is precisely because of this inevitable political control through control of the finances that the revisionists in all capitalist countries--especially in the semi-colonies--cannot help but become entangled with the interests of the national bourgeoisie, and through them entangled with the interests of the imperialist groupings.

The heavy artillery in the arsenal of the revisionists and the conciliators is the concept of the "underdeveloped", "emerging" countries. We must examine this concept in the light of Marxism and the class struggle. The first question is--emerging from what to what? The emerging nation is nothing less than a semi-colony, a colony in motion--or as Khrushchev puts it--entering a new stage. Let us examine this stage.

"The facts are clear. After World War II the imperialists have certainly not given up colonialism, but have merely adopted a new form, neo-colonialism. An important characteristic of such neo-colonialism is that the imperialists have been forced to change their old style of direct colonial rule in some areas and to adopt a new style of colonial rule and exploitation by relying on the agents they have selected and trained. The imperialists headed by the United States enslave or control the colonial countries and countries which have already declared their independence by organizing military blocs, setting up military bases, establishing "federations" or "communities", and fostering puppet regimes. By means of economic "aid" or other forms, they retain these countries as markets for their goods, sources of raw material and outlets for their export of capital, plunder the riches and suck the blood of the people of these countries. Moreover, they use the United Nations as an important tool for interfering in the internal affairs of such countries and for subjecting them to military, economic and cultural aggression. When

(cont. on p. 9)

CL Reply

(cont. from p. 8)

they are unable to continue their rule over these countries by "peaceful" means, they engineer military coups d'etat, carry out subversion or even resort to direct armed intervention and aggression.

"The United States is most energetic and cunning in promoting neo-colonialism. With this weapon, the U.S. imperialists are trying hard to grab the colonies and spheres of influence of other imperialists and to establish world domination.

"This neo-colonialism is a more pernicious and sinister form of colonialism." (from The Polemic On The General Line Of The International Communist Movement, Foreign Languages Press, Peking 1965, p. 190)

It is clear that the new stage, the "third world", is nothing more or less than the political expression of neo-colonialism.

Let us examine concretely the politics of neo-colonialism. The slaughter of the revolutionaries in Indonesia is a prime example of the politics of neo-colonialism. The blood bath in Cambodia, the

brutal dictatorships of Egypt and throughout sub-Sahara Africa, and the gorilla regimes of Latin America all testify to the politics of the "third world".

We cannot move on without exposing all of the ideologists of this reactionary theory. For example, it is no accident that Franz Fanon's fascist theories developed from and completely mesh with this third alternative concept. Here however, the alternative to the working class is the lumpen-proletariat. The inevitable result of this "theory" applied to the conditions of the Anglo-American nation is to stay away from the Anglo-American people in the working class and concentrate on "hurling" the national minorities (the "colored" peoples) into combat with the bourgeois state. The "politics" of the third world are the politics of slaughter of the oppressed peoples inside the boundaries of the USNA, and throughout the world.

Aided by Khrushchev revisionism this third world concept has also been imported into the so called Marxist-Leninist movement. For the past decade the prime tactic of the CIA has been to separate the great Chinese revolution and especially the great Marxist-Leninist Mao Tse Tung from the

world revolution that was initiated by the Bolshevik Party in 1917. Opposing Mao to Lenin and especially Stalin, quoting the teachings of Mao out of the historical and political context, these enemies of the working class have served for a long time to disrupt and disorganize the revolutionary movement.

Life asserts itself and that assertion is quickening. The imperialists, their handmaidens the revisionists, and their lap dogs the conciliators are in their last trench. They cannot stop history. We would like to caution the many honest revolutionaries who have been caught up by the left phraseology of the conciliators to look carefully at the star you are hitching your wagon to. All falling stars appear very attractive and brilliant--but they do not shine for long.

We declare before all our enemies--the working class will be united, nations will be liberated by overthrowing capital, socialism is inevitable. All the dirty manouvering and backstabbing by the conciliators will not deter or halt the process of history.

In the following issue we will deal with the specifics of the political projections of the Revolutionary Union (RU) and the rest of this cabal.