

WM. Z. FOSTER, A KRUSCHEVITE REVISIONIST;

"C" P "ML", FOSTERITE REVISIONISTS

It's no wonder that a number of revisionist parties and organizations hail as a "great leader" the arch-revisionist, once general secretary of the "Communist" Party, USA, William Z. Foster. Both "Revolutionary Communist" Party ("RC" P) and "Communist" Party "Marxist-Leninist" ("C" P "ML") have devoted a number of articles praising Foster's "leadership" and Foster's "great" struggle against Earl Browder, and promote Foster's books, for example American Trade Unionism. The "Central Organization of U.S. 'Marxist-Leninists'" ("COUSML") has named all of its bookstores the William Z. Foster Bookstore, and "Marxist-Leninist" Organizing Committee ("ML" OC) is fond of quoting from the many "contributions" in "theory" of William Z. Foster.

All in all there has been a historical cover-up of the history of this renegade, whose many cohorts are today found in the highest leading bodies of the "C" P "ML" and "RC" P/"RW" H ("Revolutionary Workers" Headquarters), those highly praised "veterans".

William Z. Foster is dead, sure enough, but the revisionist line of "peaceful transition to socialism", which attacks proletarian revolution by violent means in the U.S., the social-chauvinist line he represented which attacks the international proletariat and the wars of national liberation movements, are very much alive in the "C" P "ML", "RC" P/"RW" H, and the newly formed "League for Revolutionary Struggle". His attacks on Comrade Stalin, his total devotion and loyalty to N. Krushchev and capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union, his praises to the 20th Congress of the "Communist" Party of the Soviet Union, are hence all con-

veniently swept under the rug, as "past history". As are the criticisms of Comrade Stalin towards the factionalist Foster rather "forgotten". In 1929 Comrade Stalin had this to say of William Z. Foster, having to expose in an open letter to the "C" P USA why Foster wanted to keep his conversation with Comrade Stalin a "secret":

"What did Comrade Foster talk to me about? He complained of the factionalism and unprincipledness of Comrade Lovestone's group. What did I answer him? I admitted these sins on the part of the Lovestone group, but at the same time added that the same sins were characteristic of the Foster group. On the basis of this Comrade Foster arrives at the singular conclusion that I sympathize with the minority group. Where is the foundation, one asks? On what grounds is Foster pleased to think that I fail to see the defects of the minority group and even sympathize with that group? Is it not obvious that with Comrade Foster the wish is father to the thought? (Stalin's Speeches on the American Communist Party, Speech Delivered in the American Commission of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I., May 6, 1929)

In the struggle to build a genuine Communist Party of the U.S. proletariat, and in order to hammer out the Party's Marxist-Leninist line and program, a summation of the revisionist line developed by the "C" P USA, its refusal to implement the directives of the Third Communist International and an exposure of the leading revisionists in the U.S. historically and presently are both crucial and inseparable.

Long overdue, this article is intended to clarify for all class conscious proletarians where the truth lies regarding the years of betrayal prior to 1957 by the revisionist "C" P USA and it's so-hailed "leader" William Z. Foster, and will by no means attempt to replace a much more in-depth analysis of the history of the communist movement in the U.S., plagued with long traditions of revisionism. We are in the process of undertaking this more detailed analysis, and present this as a beginning summation of this particular revisionist's role in setting back proletarian revolution in the U.S., his thorough class-capitulationist line, and by so doing prove that the present revisionist parties and organizations, particularly "C" P "ML" are not Marxist-Leninist as they proclaim, but Fosterite revisionists.

LONG HISTORY OF ECONOMISM STILL PLAGUES THE MOVEMENT

The self-admiration workerism, trade union politics of William Z. Foster, today expressed in every rag-sheet of the revisionist parties -- "C" P "ML", "RC" P/"RW" H, and the Gotten Together League -- has a long history. The economist William Z. Foster rose in the ranks of the "C" P USA as a "representative" of the working class. Unlike Eugene Debs, who Lenin termed the Bebel of the American working class movement, who spent many years of his life in prison denouncing the imperialist war, one of the best sons of the working class, William Z. Foster was a trade unionist, a labor liberal, a "militant worker", who professed to possess "vision" and "planning".

In an interview on the occasion of Foster's 75th birthday in 1956, he had this to say:

"Gompers didn't want to try to organize steel anymore than did Judge Gary, the president of U.S. Steel. And when we got him, by hook or crook, to hold a meeting

and discuss the question, the first thing Gompers did was turn to me and say: 'Well, Brother Foster, what do you propose?'

Well, we had a plan and we told him and the others the plan in detail, and that with 100 organizers and \$750,000 and full support we could organize the steel workers so that within six weeks of starting we would be strong enough to present our demands to the steel bosses. But it had to be done nationally, in 70 or 80 centers and with speed and that then it could be done." (Political Affairs, March, 1956, pp. 29-30)

So here we have Foster recalling how when a young trade union "militant" he got Gompers, an arch anti-communist union bureaucrat, right-hand man of the U.S. bourgeoisie, to collaborate in a union drive in a steel workers strike. Was this a mistake? A lack of experience? No, it was not. Foster was a class collaborator, who was out to build a career for himself which he pursued through his thorough allegiance to bourgeois democracy, legalism, social-chauvinism (patriotism), indeed a thorough anti-Leninist.

The significance of Foster's collaboration by "hook or by crook" with Gompers is found deeply rooted in the revisionist line on trade union work which he upheld and defended in the "C" P USA as far back as 1939.

Foster was an arch-defender of trade union neutrality, a liquidator of the Party in organizational matters and a staunch bureaucrat; leaving behind, for "C" P "ML" to run with, the "class struggle within the trade unions" line.

This is what he had to say in 1939:

"The organizational forms of Communist trade union work have changed radically in the present period. Some methods, formerly correct, no longer correspond to the situation

in the labor movement. Thus the Party members do not now participate in groupings or other organized activities within the unions. The Party also discountenances the formation of progressive groups, blocs and caucuses in unions; it has liquidated its own Communist fractions, discontinued its shop papers, and it is now modifying its system of industrial branches. Communists function in the trade unions solely through the regular committees and institutions of the movement. The Communists are the best fighters for democracy and discipline in the trade union movement and are resolutely opposed to all forms of group or clique control." ("Twenty Years of Communist Trade Union Policy", Twenty Years of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., 1919-1939, p. 814)

By liquidating the Party fractions, thereby also liquidating Marxist-Leninist propaganda to arm the advanced workers in the strategic and tactical questions involved in carrying out proletarian revolution, the Party was flooded with "efficient" bureaucrats, the social basis of revisionism in the working class movement, the labor aristocracy. Efficient bureaucrats was Foster's goal, and to a large extent he accomplished it, by not strengthening but indeed weakening and finally destroying all possibility of bolshevization of the "C" P USA. There still lingers on some of those very same "C" P USA "communists" as top leaders of the AFL-CIO, who stand out in their demagogic red-baiting, being joined by "Fightback" committee representatives of the "C" P "ML" "efficiency experts", who are "waging class struggle within the trade unions", as shown in their "Jobs or Income Now" campaigns, vigorously endorsed by union bureaucrats throughout the country.

FOSTER THE DEMOCRAT

Foster was a New Dealer, a Franklin Roosevelt man, a democrat. In his

own treacherous words, during the 1939 campaign for the Democratic Party --

"The coming national elections will be the most important since the days of the Civil War, and they will constitute a milestone in the history of the United States. In order that the forces of democracy shall win this crucial election struggle there needs to be a broad democratic front of workers, farmers, professionals and small business people built up. This alliance of the democratic strata of the people, the bulk of our nation, can and must be united around an effective program for national and social security; for jobs, democracy and peace. Necessarily, the organized workers should form the backbone of this great democratic front." (ibid., p. 815)

Here we have not the party of the working class in the leadership of the toiling masses to overthrow the bourgeoisie, build socialism and live under true democracy, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the trade union in leadership, in collaboration with the bourgeoisie, for a "democratic" society, to refashion capitalism, to "defend (bourgeois) democracy", in pursuit of national "security", national "interest".

Democracy and peace under the iron fist of the bourgeoisie? In the absence of the dictatorship of the proletariat? In the very insides of the bastion of reaction in the world, the U.S.A.? Foster was a true friend of the bourgeoisie, an apologist, a collaborator, the trade unionist, the bourgeois democrat, a thorough revisionist.

FOSTER CHARTS OUT THE ROAD TO HELL

Foster propagated "peaceful transition to socialism" in every word that he uttered through every question that

he addressed, and by 1949 had succeeded in introducing his program of "peaceful transition" into a pamphlet which he wrote, entitled "In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders", published in July, 1949. He says:

"Previously I have stated that the communist movement, in this country as well as abroad, has been going along on the practical working theory that in this period, because of the mass struggle against fascism and war, it has become possible in a whole number of democratic countries legally to elect democratic governments, which could, by curbing and defeating all capitalist violence, orientate in the direction of building socialism."

So here Foster proposes "peaceful transition" for a "number" of capitalist countries, through elections, through the "curbing" of capitalist violence. We remind the reader that Foster is writing here in 1949.

Lenin had already written The State and Revolution in 1917, which defended and developed the teachings of Marx and Engels on the question of the State, which the yellow-bellied cowards of the Second International, with the renegade Kautsky at the head, had revised.

Said Comrade Lenin:

"We have already said above, and shall show more fully later, that the teaching of Marx and Engels concerning the inevitability of a violent revolution refers to the bourgeois state. The latter cannot be superseded by the proletarian state (the dictatorship of the proletariat) through the process of 'withering away,' but, as a general rule, only through a violent revolution. The panygeric Engels sang in its honour, and which fully corresponds to Marx's repeated declarations (recall the concluding passages of The Poverty of Philosophy and the

Communist Manifesto, with their proud and open proclamation of the inevitability of a violent revolution; recall what Marx wrote nearly thirty years later, in criticizing the Gotha Program of 1875, when he mercilessly castigated the opportunist character of that program)--this panegyric is by no means a mere 'impulse', a mere declamation or a polemical sally. The necessity of systematically imbuing the masses with this and precisely this view of violent revolution lies at the root of all the teachings of Marx and Engels. The betrayal of their teachings by the now predominant social-chauvinist and Kautskyite trends is expressed in striking relief by the neglect of such propaganda and agitation by both these trends.

The supersession of the bourgeois state by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution." (The State and Revolution, 1973 Peking Edition, pp. 24-25)

The inevitability of a violent revolution and the organisation of the class struggle of the proletariat towards this end demarcates genuine Marxist-Leninists from opportunists of all hues on the question of the state. The overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the seizure of state power, the smashing of the bourgeois state, in order to expropriate the bourgeoisie of all the land, banks, and all the means of production, as Marx said, "to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible." (Manifesto of the Communist Party, 1975 Peking Edition, p. 59)

But the anti-Marxist-Leninist Foster instead had this plan--

"1. We propose the election of a

democratic government based on a broad united front coalition of workers, farmers, Negroes, professionals, small business men and other elements, willing to fight against monopoly, fascism and war.

2. Our Party holds that such an anti-fascist, anti-war democratic coalition, once in political office, would be compelled to move forward and to take effective measures to curb and break the power of the monopolies. Such anti-monopoly measures it would have the full legal right to adopt and to enforce, as would any other duly constituted government.

3. Such a democratic, anti-fascist, anti-war government, under the violent attacks of the capitalists and under the progressive pressure of the masses, would necessarily move toward Socialism." (pp. 89-90 of "In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders" by Foster, July, 1949, quoted by Benjamin J. Davis in Political Affairs, April, 1956, "Foster: Fighter for Correct Theory", p. 42)

Here is the naked propagation of two stage revolution, which in new forms is propagated by the "C" P "ML" today. First, Foster proposes a People's Democracy, all under the guise of completing some "democratic task", then through peaceful evolution onward to "socialism". Foster, the labor liberal who deserted to the side of the bourgeoisie, an admirer of Roosevelt, had been proposing this plan to the bourgeoisie for a number of years, including actively campaigning for the Roosevelt democratic ticket in 1939 and giving his open support in 1940 and 1944.

But Roosevelt offended Foster, by not dishing out the crumbs that Foster so eagerly worked for, betrayed the proletariat for; for whom he so loyally served as a total lackey -- he longed to be a cabinet member, a Secretary of Labor.

He said in his infamous book, Outline Political History of the Americas,

"While as a liberal he favored trade unions, Roosevelt clearly acted then in the interest of the capitalist system by making the concessions he did to the workers and the Negro people. For if he had not made these concessions the masses, in view of their militant mood, would very probably have gone much further to the left and wrung far more vital reforms from the employers and the government in open struggle. Another major result for capitalism, was that they kept the workers locked within the two-party system. Without such concessions undoubtedly a great new labor or people's party would have been born during the pre-World War II years, just after the big economic crisis. This would have been a blow to the capitalists. After all, Roosevelt set sharp limits to his concessions to the workers. In the democratic World War II the workers were justified in accepting posts in the wartime bourgeois government, but Roosevelt wanted no such close collaboration. Thus, in Great Britain during the war years even the Tory Prime Minister Churchill formed a coalition government with labor; yet in the United States the liberal President Roosevelt not only did not establish such a government jointly with labor, but he did not accept even one trade union leader into his cabinet during the entire thirteen years of his presidency. Nor did Roosevelt entrust a single labor leader with a responsible government wartime executive post, the most he ever gave to labor being third-line positions in an advisory capacity." (pp. 428-429)

Picking a bone with Franklin D. Roosevelt in no way changed Foster's dreams and hopes of partaking actively along

with the bourgeoisie in "running the country well". He advocated "curbing the employers' violence", the disarming of the proletariat, the "road to socialism", which he so egocentrically professed to chart, was the road to slaughter, for the proletariat and all the toiling masses which he professed to "lead".

Speaking of the massacres of workers in the U.S. historically, he places the violent oppression and exploitation of the working class and oppressed masses as something of the past, while claiming that the growth of trade unions had forced a back-down on the part of bourgeois violence. Of course, past and contemporary history, as the future, will continue to prove what the teachers of the international proletariat, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin documented as an inevitable law, that as long as the bourgeoisie is in power it will remain armed to the teeth, aggressive, violent and bloodthirsty, victimizing the exploited and oppressed masses to secure maximum profits and protect its private ownership of the means of production, through the continual beefing up of its state apparatus.

But the total coward, spineless phillistine Foster, concealed this truth from the workers, he spoke in the tongue of a traitor and said,

" This decisively important fact is also a reality in the United States, where the employers once freely used extreme violence in strikes. It is only twenty years ago since the capitalists made their factories into veritable forts, and every big strike was the scene of widespread bloodshed, with the employers boldly using troops, police, and armed company thugs against the strikers. In fact, many of the strikes of a few decades ago were veritable small civil wars. But now, since the enormous growth in size and solidarity of labor's organizations,

(the trade unions are presently about five times as large as they were a generation ago), the employers are manifestly having far more trouble in cowing the workers during strikes by the use of their armed forces. Strike violence by employers is by no means ended, of course, and it may at any time flare up afresh. But the important thing obviously is that the workers, through their economic and political strength, have done much to curb and diminish it, at least, where bourgeois democratic conditions prevail. This is one of their elementary necessities for a successful strike strategy." (Political Affairs, April, 1956, "The Road to Socialism (Part I)", pp. 18-19)

This call to the proletariat to put its arms down, and just concentrate on building its unions, while concealing that imperialism is aggressive by its very nature, runs throughout Foster's history and is the protrait of a scab, a bribed and privileged labor aristocrat, a revisionist, a social-chauvinist, who represented the interest of a small minority of workers who live off the bribes handed to them on a platter from the blood-stained superprofits of imperialism, derived by force from the colonies and neo-colonies.

In return, this bribed stratum within the working class spreads class collaboration, anti-communism, chauvinism reformism, corruption and bourgeois decadence. They stand with their own bourgeoisie in the imperialist wars of aggression. Defending pillage, plunder, supporting their own bourgeoisie's total backing of the reactionary regimes in the colonies and neo-colonies. This stratum of privileged workers stands opposed to the just revolutionary wars of national liberation, and work actively for the continual subjugation of oppressed nations.

Within the U.S. they partake in

such right-wing groups as the Ku Klux Klan, the John Birch Society, the Minutemen, who have thrived and continue to thrive on the blood of masses of Afro-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, and the Native Peoples in the U.S. The apple pie, love-it-or-leave-it, "Buy American, Be American" advocates. In the trade unions they form the hard core reactionary elements, the highly skilled, highly paid, in the Teamsters, Construction, Steel Workers, Machinists unions, the defenders of "national interest"; many themselves have become the union's hierarchy, the union bureaucrats, who enjoy big fat salaries, positions of privilege, wining and dining, stealing from the workers' union dues to feast at conventions in Las Vegas and Florida, or in colonial possessions of the U.S. like Puerto Rico or Hawaii. These right-hand men of the bourgeoisie, settlers of "disputes" between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, represent their interest as shown in how they defend and insist upon speed-ups, "quality control", and who have helped to design the no-strike clauses within virtually every contract. The spokesmen for the better sale of labor power.

Others of this bribed stratum have passed over to the bourgeois managerial stratum, becoming foremen, plant supervisors, or remain as labor aristocrats, the faithful spies of the bourgeoisie, constantly ratting out workers' struggles. Totally isolated from the rest of the proletariat by their mode of life and their role as totally subservient lackies of the bourgeoisie, the labor aristocracy constitutes the 5th column, the agents of the bourgeoisie within the ranks of the proletariat.

This is the stratum of workers, this parasitic, reactionary minority, which William Z. Foster, Earl Browder, Dennis and Gates, the "leaders" of the "C" PUSA represented. Making the "C" P USA not a party of war against the

bourgeoisie, but a party of peace, the third of bourgeois parties in the U.S.

WHEREIN LIE THE CAUSES OF THE LOW LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE U.S. PROLETARIAT

The "C" PUSA's betrayal dates further back than where we originally had estimated, 1957. We thought it coincided with the 20th Congress of the "C" PSU. We thought that because the "C" PUSA was a section of the Comintern; but the "C" PUSA thought of itself as an "affiliate", so that it would not have to abide by the decisions of the Third Communist International. Already, at least by 1939, Foster was putting forward a revisionist line, Browderite revisionism is known to be a predecessor to Krushchevite revisionism, while others of the revisionist clique like Gates and Dennis' writings indicate that much of the "C" PUSA's leadership were revisionists by the late 30's, hiding behind each other, Foster particularly hiding in his factional fight with Lovestone, and then scoring points in his supposed struggle against Browderite revisionism. By the late 1940's already, the consolidated program of the "C" PUSA led by Foster was the revisionist "peaceful transition to socialism", so that by the time of the 20th Congress of the "C" PSU and the rise of Krushchevite revisionism, the "C" PUSA had already long ago deserted to the camp of revisionism, and not later, as we had incorrectly estimated. The lesson to draw here, is how necessary it is to make a systematic and deep-going analysis of the history of revisionism in the U.S., in particular the betrayal of the "C" PUSA, discarding all previous distortions and cover-ups by the inheritors of these traditions of treacherous betrayal, the "RC" P and "C" P "ML". Partly and primarily due to our own belittlement of theory and underestimating the absolute necessity of the primacy of propa-

ganda activity in this period of party building, and secondarily because of the misinformation and cover-up by the revisionists, the Revolutionary Union - later the "Revolutionary Communist" Party, and the October League - later the "Communist" Party "Marxist-Leninist", we arrived at the wrong conclusion in relation to the history of betrayal of the "C" PUSA. At least 18 years in addition of revisionist betrayal is not a question of semantics, or a game of dates. The serious consequences are the reality of not 20 years in which the U.S. proletariat has been disarmed, lacking its mightiest of weapons, the Party of the proletariat, but at least 40 years, and in historical terms our analysis may prove that the U.S. proletariat has never had its own political party.

What is revealed, therefore, are the causes of the low level of consciousness in the ranks of the proletariat as a whole, and in particular, the reason for the scatterdness of the class conscious proletarians. The tremendous difficulties in welding an organization of professional revolutionaries, a Leninist Core, held back by the influence of a hidden and historically rooted (both ideologically and socially) revisionist line in the U.S. communist movement, which shamelessly stands out in its history for traditions of belittling theory.

In the fight for the one Marxist-Leninist line, as the key link to building the Party of a new type, the central task of all class conscious proletarians, it is therefore evermore crucial that the serious work of analysing and drawing out the relations in line between the old and new revisionist parties in the U.S. be done, and that the primacy of the role of theory and propaganda be firmly grasped.

A difficulty in carrying out this scientific work, revolutionary practice, has been the number of revision-

ist groupings in this country, who have spread wide-scale ideological confusion. By understanding in essence the old and new forms that revisionism has taken, by understanding and analysing the different trends and tendencies and striking yet more blows at right opportunism in the course of welding a tightly knit, disciplined organization of professional revolutionaries, and by repulsing the pernicious influence of revisionism, in the strictest adherence to Marxism-Leninism and in defense of its purity, sharp lines of demarcation will be drawn, no matter how many groupings crop up. By so drawing sharp lines of demarcation we will move forward towards actually welding the organization of professional revolutionaries capable of hammering out the Marxist-Leninist Program, Strategy and Tactics for proletarian revolution in the U.S., which will be fought for until its implementation and through the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the one Marxist-Leninist Party of the U.S. proletariat.

By strictly adhering to the Leninist norms and conducting the fight in regards to building the Party of a new type, we shall, at the same time, root out the historical liquidationist trend within the U.S.

The role of the Marxist-Leninist Party as the vanguard fighter, leader and organizer of the class struggle of the proletariat for the seizure of state power, (and the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat to retain power until the complete abolition of private property and classless society, that is, the communist society) has been historically liquidated. On this question, as well as all others, Foster was no different than Browder.

By reducing the Party to an instrument of peace, the Foster-Browderite revisionists in the U.S. liquidated the mightiest of the proletariat's weapons in its struggle for the forceful over-

throw of the bourgeoisie, to an instrument at the service of the bourgeoisie, as a reformist appendage of the bourgeoisie, who, while professing to be communist, spread anti-communism and assisted the bourgeoisie in red-baiting and persecution of the class conscious proletarians in the U.S., lending a faithful hand to strengthening the iron claw of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The "C" PUSA cowed and capitulated under pressure. To the charges of the bourgeoisie that the "C" PUSA was "un-American", the "C" PUSA fell to its knees begging the bourgeoisie to recognize its patriotism. Unbridled social-chauvinism and social-pacifism and class collaboration aptly describes the history of the "C" PUSA. Under the circumstances, to constitute themselves the "Party" and reconstitute the "Party" as they did, and dissolving the "Party" at various times -- 1939, 1944, just to name two specific instances, was of no difficulty.

LIQUIDATIONISM MASKED BEHIND CALLS OF "UNITY"

We have already shown how Foster called for the liquidation of the Party in 1939, dissolving the Party fractions and instead developing efficient trade union officials. This pernicious and stubborn venom still lingers on. Saddled by legalism and the "American dream" of the revisionist parties, of passing over to socialism peacefully by strengthening bourgeois democracy, what we find today is the liquidationist trend, masked by calls for "Unity of the great majority of Marxist-Leninists" -- Third Worldists Unite! -- for what? To fight for a reformist program, the Fightback, the Jobs or Income, the anti-Bakke, to issue bulletins at trade union conventions, the Tax Revolt, etc. "Hurry, hurry", say the revisionists, "all this talk of Party building, all this call to polemics, all this theory, these dogmas,

this 'idealism and metaphysics', all this 'talk of propaganda' 'isolates' us from the masses."

Run they say, catch up, they say, to the tail of the spontaneous mass movement, and the more they worship, the more leaflets preaching economism they hand out, the more strikes that they supposedly lead, then all the more these "united Marxist-Leninists" can compete over who brought more "masses" out to this or that activity; over who can claim more numbers at their conferences or in their rag-sheets; over who has lulled the greatest numbers of masses to sleep. To illustrate this point, we'll quote here from the documents of the "newly formed" League of Revolutionary Struggle "ML" -- they have gotten together, A.T.M. and I.W.K., finally!! (August Twenty-Ninth Movement and I Wor Kuen) Describing A.T.M.'s work among the masses,

"A.T.M.'s mass work which included work in Gregg Jones struggle, in the molders strike, in the coalition against police abuse in Los Angeles (Note: Since the police 'strike' in Memphis is hailed as a workers struggle by 'C'P 'ML' -- the League's close associates -- maybe the new League can take out time to explain the differences between police in L.A. and police in Memphis? - Leninist Core), in the Danny Trevino struggle, in the Western Yarns struggle, in the Major Safe strike, in the Mecha's, in Frente Revolucionario de Aztlan, in the Albuquerque Public Schools struggle, in the Chilili land Struggle, in the St. Lukes 23 struggle in Chicago, in the strike around Benito Jaurez High School struggles in Chicago, in the strike of the Browning-Ferris Industries, garbage workers in Santa Barbara, California, in a high school student

struggle in Oxnard, California, in auto, in electronics, in garment, in the Caterpillar Strike, as well as in other areas such as the first Alamosa Conference." ("Statements on the Founding of the League of Revolutionary Struggle, 'ML'", p. 106)

The bourgeoisie must be impressed! More crumbs for the social-chauvinists.

Some comrades kept ignorant of Marxism-Leninism might be fooled by the above list, yet other comrades are past the days of being taken in by claims of "ties with the masses", but to all, the question should arise, what was the line of conduct? What was achieved in terms of winning advanced workers to communism? What was the content of the propaganda activity? Was there any propaganda activity?

On page 111 of this document we find --

"A.T.M.'s work during this convention (1977 U.A.W. convention-L.C.) consisted (our emphasis-ed.) in issuing a series of bulletins during this convention to all the major auto plants in California." (ibid.)

So the answer is--No--it did not consist of propaganda as the chief form of activity, which they despise as "ultra-leftism", it did not consist of Communist work, it "consisted of issuing bulletins".

Historically the revisionists have been knocking themselves out to outdo the labor bureaucrats. The Fosterite revisionists, those who today stand with the revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of China, don't have to worry over "trifle" things like charting out the road toward the seizure of state power by the proletariat, in the one stage socialist revolution in the U.S. Questions of line, program,

strategy and tactics, therefore, have little or no priority, why should they? Foster and the revisionists of the "C" PUSA have left them their inheritance. While those "veterans" on their leadership assure their implementation, and train their successors in how best to deceive the proletariat.

After all, says Otis Hyde, the problem is one of leadership in this country -- so he advises his successors "boldly take leadership in this country because time is running short" -- that is to say, that the "C" P "ML" founding represents putting the "C" PUSA back on its feet, minus the USA, plus "ML". Says Klonsky, "...we have once again set the Party of the U.S. proletariat back upon its feet" (Documents of the Founding Congress of the "C" P "ML", p. 12); no minus or additions can hide the fact that the "C" P "ML" are Fosterite revisionists. Nor do they claim to hide this fact. On page 17 of the documents of their founding congress, they are again proud of their traditions, and state:

" We accept the great working class traditions from Weydemeyer, and John Brown to Debs, Ruthenburg, Foster, Dubois, Haywood and all the rest. But we are not content to dwell on history or traditions. (Why dwell? Cover-up is more "C" P "ML"'s specialty-L.C.) We are making our own history." (ibid.)

Its more correct if Klonsky would say, adding to an already shameful history. Let's take a closer look at some of the men whom "C" P "ML" has lumped together on an equal footing. Eugene Debs, the Bebel of the U.S., was a proletarian internationalist, feared no hardship, imprisonment nor death, committing his entire life to the cause of the complete emancipation of the proletariat. On the first anniversary of the Great October 1917 Revolution, Eugene Debs,

while being held captive by the U.S. bourgeoisie, awaiting his sentence for having been found guilty for his active leadership within the ranks of the proletariat in opposition to the imperialist war, wrote --

" On this anniversary day we pledge you brave and unflinching comrades of the Soviet Republic not only to protest against our government meddling in your affairs and interfering with your plans, but to summon to your aid all the progressive forces of our proletariat and render you freely all assistance in our power."

And from behind the bars of the Atlanta Federal prison, where he was sent to serve a 10 year sentence by the terrified bourgeoisie, Comrade Debs, at the age of 68 and on the occasion of the third anniversary of the Great October 1917 Revolution of Lenin and Stalin, wrote --

" The emancipation of Russia and the establishment of the Workers Republic is an inspiration to the workers of the world. I am sure that the same spirit that conquered capitalism will develop geniuses that will conquer the devastating diseases you inherit from capitalism in Russia and combat the present mad methods of alien capitalist governments who seek to destroy the newly emancipated people of Soviet Russia."

Eugene Debs went to prison as a proletarian internationalist, a true Marxist-Leninist, and as his prosecutors and accusers tried to break his spirit and deprive the working class of one of its outstanding leaders, he raised his head up high and said,

"I am a Bolshevik from the crown of my head to the tips of my toes."

As for Harry Haywood, a member of the "C"P "ML"'s Central Committee, a third worldist, social-chauvinist, in his own words, a "Black Bolshevik". What does history reveal? Harry Haywood was expelled from the "C"PUSA in 1959. Why he stayed in the "C"PUSA at all is evident in his present stance. A Fosterite revisionist, Haywood is among the "veterans" which "C"P "ML" claimed responsibility for, hiding out and harboring.

Where Debs was a proletarian internationalist, Haywood claims to be a petty bourgeois nationalist, a "Black Bolshevik"; where Debs spent many years of his life in prison opposing the imperialist war, Haywood stands for defending the "privileges" of his own bourgeoisie in the colonies and neo-colonies, which runs throughout "C"P "ML"'s line and program, as has been shown in their support of the invasion of Zaire (See Bolshevik, Vol. 8, No. 3); their unbridled opportunist wiggling, their lack of a clear stance and their yellow journalism approach on Nicaragua, where they are claiming U.S. "influence" in Central America. All to cover up neo-colonialism, U.S. imperialism, aggression and control, and total historical installation and back-up of the reactionary Samoza regime. "C"P "ML" is awaiting a resolution in Congress like they did over the Panama Canal. Getting off their pot and fully supporting the U.S. bourgeoisie and the Panamanian compradore bourgeoisie, by calling for support of the treaty.

It takes a lot of crust to place Debs, Foster and Haywood as representing the fine traditions of the U.S. proletariat. Only Debs, the Bolshevik from head to toe, represented the finest traditions and the interest of the millions of deprived, exploited and oppressed proletarians. Foster and Haywood represented and represent the

interest of that bought-off, bribed minority of labor aristocrats. Where Debs called for no interference of the U.S. imperialists in the affairs of other nations, opposing imperialist wars of aggression, openly propagandizing, organizing and agitating for the socialist revolution, the social-chauvinist Haywood, Klonsky & Co. call for more interference by treaties designed to cover up the forceful subjugation of the colonies and neo-colonies.

Who, by all means, call upon the U.S. imperialists to defend its possessions. Clearly Debs demarcated himself as a Leninist from all those who wave the yellow flag of the cowardly phillistines of the Second International. He said:

" I am not a capitalist soldier; I am a proletarian revolutionist. I do not belong to the regular army of the plutocracy, but to the irregular army of the people. I refuse to obey any command to fight from the ruling class. I am opposed to every war but one: I am for that war with heart and soul, and that is the worldwide war of the social revolution. In that war I am prepared to fight in any way the ruling class may make necessary..." (Quoted by Lenin from a speech at an International Meeting in Berne, Lenin on the United States, p. 206)

Foster believed in "peaceful transition to socialism", and made an open alliance with his own bourgeoisie during World War II. "C"P "ML" can therefore claim to be following in Foster's traditions without twisting the truth, and in fact, "C"P "ML" is carrying out his traditions, learning how Foster denounced Lenin and Stalin while claiming to be a Marxist-Leninist, "C"P "ML" also claims to be Marxist-Leninist while denouncing Lenin and Stalin.

FACTS THAT POINT OUT THE STARK REALITIES

When Krushchev came out with his all-out attack of slander and villification towards the great Marxist-Leninist leader and teacher of the international proletariat, Joseph Stalin, the "C"PUSA, led by William Z. Foster, praised Krushchev's report to the 20th Congress and reprinted in full the infamous "On the Cult of the Individual".

When the revisionist leaders of the C.P.C. withdrew all aid from the Peoples Socialist Republic of Albania, "C"P "ML" reprinted the great-power chauvinist letter which the revisionist leaders of the C.P.C. handed to the Albanian comrades at the Albanian Embassy in China. "C"P "ML" had nothing to say on behalf of their own "Party". When Hua Kuo-feng, and the rest of the revisionist leaders in the CPC rushed to re-publish "The Ten Major Relationships", which contains an attack on Comrade Stalin within it, "C"P "ML" jumped to aid in its distribution; when Krushchev kneeled before Tito, the "C"PUSA hailed the reconciliation of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. When, at the invitation of the revisionist leadership, Tito went to China, "C"P "ML" remained silent. But when Hua Kuo-feng went on his mission of superpower politics and rapprochement with U.S. imperialism, to Romania and Yugoslavia, "C"P "ML" hailed it as a "historic trip to Europe". When Krushchevite revisionism reared its ugly head and Soviet social-imperialist superpower politics were in the making, the "C"PUSA jumped to organize for "normalization" of relations between the Krushchevite revisionists and the U.S. imperialists. How proud they were of the love that existed, which they played cupid for, between their own bourgeoisie and the modern revisionists headquartered in the

Kremlin. When the revisionists in China were staging their step-by-step rapprochement with U.S. imperialism, including Nixon's visit, Kissinger's private meetings in China, Vance and Brzezinski, the ex-president Ford as well as Henry Ford recently, Edward Kennedy, a host of top-level union bureaucrats, and the thousands of tourists now trampling underfoot the victories of the Chinese Revolution, the Klonsky group of revisionists and all the third worldists which they provide a loose center of gravity for, rushed to the outcries of "normalization" of relations between China and the U.S. Among the crumbs which they receive for their assistance in imperialist penetration is their travel agency franchise, for the organization of American tourism to China, while acting as the open spokesmen and representatives of the third worldist revisionists.

Making reference to Hua Kuo-feng's trip to Romania and Yugoslavia, says the newly formed Gotten Together League --

" During his visit, Chairman Hua held productive (our emphasis-ed.) talks with Romania's President Ceausescu, Yugoslavia's president Tito and other state leaders of the two countries." (Unity, Vol. 1, No. 1)

Further on in the same article these revisionists say that the trip struck a blow at both superpowers, of course they cannot find proof anywhere where this is the case, especially for the U.S. So, immediately they rush to explain how in fact they mean to the Soviet social-imperialists, which then lays bare the superpower politics and goals of this hailed "historic trip".

"...especially the Soviet Union, which has tried to exercise complete control over the Balkan region for years." (ibid.)

China in pursuit of its own social-

imperialist interest is competing with the Soviet social-imperialists in the Balkans, much to the approval of the U.S. imperialists, who coached the revisionists in China and aided them by giving all signals "go" to their faithful lap dog Tito.

Far from threatening the U.S. imperialists, the fact is that this move was a calculated, premeditated move by the U.S. imperialists, an aid to imperialist war preparations and the result of great-power chauvinist politics which China has embarked upon. Just a few weeks prior to Hua entering the "gates of heaven" for all revisionists and spending time with their mentor Tito, withdrawal of aid from Albania, the only socialist country in the Balkans and the world, on the part of the Chinese government went down. If only on the basis of simple arithmetic, since the third worldists have no principles to draw upon, if the Gotten Together League were to look at its hypocritical outcries of Soviet social-imperialist control in the Balkans, they might be able to add one plus one and maybe come up with two? We'll do our best to assist them in this matter.

That is, while subverting socialist construction in Albania by its unilateral decision to withdraw all aid and technicians from Albania, while giving away Albania's defense secrets publicly to such arch-enemies of the international proletariat as Josep Tito, and the rest of the capitalist and revisionist world, while pursuing this attack on the international proletariat by deliberately trying to undermine its only fortress, the Peoples Socialist Republic of Albania, and holding "productive talks" with denounced revisionist traitors like Tito who has been dreaming and plotting for the day to annex Albania, which long ago exposed Tito's plan to make Albania the 7th Yugoslav republic -- (1) the pursuit of super-

power interest is what the trip to "Europe" was all about, and (2) through its attacks on socialism in China by opening its doors to imperialist penetration, moving to restore capitalism and by its great-power chauvinist hostile acts towards Albania, the revisionist leadership of the CPC has deserted to the camp of the enemy. Can the League add? The present revisionists in the U.S. have no interest in setting things on any level or from any angle on correct conclusions. Not any more than the "C" PUSA did.

THE DIRECTION OF THE MAIN BLOW

The stark reality of the deep-rooted ideological and social basis of revisionism in the U.S. drives home to all genuine Marxist-Leninists the absolute necessity to stand on the orthodoxy of Marxism-Leninism, to consistently study and implement Marxism-Leninism, to defend its purity and unmask and fight all distortions, to heighten yet more the struggle against right opportunism and specifically to wage an all out struggle against social-chauvinism. The Party of the proletariat in the U.S. cannot be forged and consolidated if class conscious proletarians remain scattered and the necessary struggle against social-chauvinism and all forms of revisionism and opportunism remains fragmented. The shameful history of social-chauvinism in the U.S., which has as its goal and only purpose the open alliance between the so-called "socialist", "communist", "majority of Marxist-Leninists" and the bourgeoisie, while defending its own bourgeoisie's "right" to plunder and rob the colonies and neo-colonies, stands as the direct obstacle to the formation of the genuine Communist Party of the U.S. proletariat, and the proletarian revolution which it will lead.

The principles guiding the forma-

tion and consolidation of the Party of a new type were laid down by Lenin and Stalin. And it is only the Party of a new type which can represent the interest of the working class, which stands in direct opposition to all the bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties. It cannot be insisted upon enough -- without an unhesitating struggle against all forms of opportunism, specifically right opportunism as the main danger, not just today but historically in the U.S., the fight to weld a truly united Party of the U.S. proletariat to carry to completion proletarian revolution continues to be seriously set back, with catastrophic consequences for the international proletariat. By analyzing history from the Marxist-Leninist perspective, not for the purpose of lamentation, but to draw correct conclusions, and by understanding in an all-sided and comprehensive way the role of revisionism in the U.S., the class conscious proletarians will be able to guide more resolutely the struggle against modern revisionism in the U.S., aided in this by the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations internationally who are welding greater unity in the fight for the one Marxist-Leninist line. In the U.S., genuine Marxist-Leninists in the Leninist Core continue to carry out the hammering out of the Party's line and program, strategy and tactics, in a tit-for-tat struggle against revisionism. This continues to be our orientation, our focus, the central task -- to build the Party of Lenin and Stalin. The struggle to weed out, to repulse the pernicious influence of the rotten, stinking theory of the "Three Worlds" is scoring victory in the international Communist movement, led by the Party of Labour of Albania with Comrade Enver Hoxha at the head. The modern revisionists in the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and China are receiving crushing blows.

The "C" P "ML", the newly formed Gotten Together League, must shut their

eyes to this reality and have convinced themselves that all is fine, since they have succeeded in impressing their petty bourgeois following through their self-admiration societies of alliances and re-alliances, etc. They "puff their chests out" and rejoice at what they fantasize is the "destruction" of the genuine Marxist-Leninists in the U.S. They are proud of their consistency in slandering the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces, as they worship spontaneity, and label as "ultra-left" any opposition to their reformist program.

They take time out in their "Exclusively for Members" periodic conferences and conventions, their vacations at their summer camps to get away from the "accursed" problem they face -- of how to continue to cover their shameful and treacherous acts, how best to keep shamming while spending hours and weeks of discussions on how to find new ways and perfect the old in deceiving the proletariat and oppressed masses. How best to spread anti-communism in the pages of their new "improved 14-inch Call", strengthen the influence of bourgeois ideology among the masses while they continue their social-fascist attacks on the class conscious proletarians. In this way, they succeed in getting financed by some bleeding-heart liberals, who can now parade themselves in the U.S.-China People's Friendship Association as friends of the "people" while not having to worry about proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialist construction, the abolition of private property, all questions of principle which OL/"C"P "ML" long ago renounced. Many of these bleeding-heart liberals are the "veteran" fighters who still want to "make revolution", those sometime active or previous members of the "C" PUSA, like Esther Gollobin of the New York U.S.-China People's Friendship Association, who said just recently, in "China and Us", Vol. 7, No. 4:

"Senator Edward Kennedy, reflecting on his winter trip to the Peoples Republic of China accompanied by members of his family, writes in the L.A. Times (July 23, 1978) -- 'I believe that the President can and should establish full diplomatic relations with Peking as soon as possible' --

and, says Gollobin,

"A rapidly developing area for building understanding and friendship is the contemporary China study of the United Methodist Church." (p. 4)

These faithful democrats, believers of god and the spiritual life and the "values of capitalism", pat themselves on the back for a "job well done" -- they have assisted their bourgeoisie in imperialist penetration once again.

It is these bleeding-heart liberals, along with the petty bourgeois intellectuals and labor aristocrats who form the social basis of support for groups like the "C" P "ML" and the newly formed Gotten Together League, as well as all the other revisionist groupings in the U.S.

In historical terms, as well as presently and in the future of the proletariat's struggle for the seizure of state power, there will continue to be a life and death struggle to drive out the labor aristocracy, including the union bureaucracy, from the ranks of the working class, as inseparably connected to the forceful overthrow of the ruling class. The parties of the petty bourgeoisie and labor aristocracy, the revisionist parties, play a very specifically dangerous role within the counter-revolution.

These social props of imperialism, who do just that -- prop up their own bourgeoisie -- stand as the direct obstacle to victory. They run to their

master's aid when their masters are in trouble, they counsel the bourgeoisie on how to resolve its problems, and apologize for its "mistakes"; they excuse the bloody massacres of the masses internationally, and help their own bourgeoisie on how to perfect their methods of butchery, exploitation and plunder, it is as Lenin described them-- the bourgeoisie's "open or masked henchmen" (see V.I. Lenin, "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat"). It stands to reason, therefore, the direction of the main blow in this stage of proletarian revolution in the U.S., for the seizure of state power, must be directed at the henchmen, the revisionist parties, the representatives of the labor aristocracy, who continue to try to win the mass of proletarians and all the oppressed to unite with the bourgeoisie and desert the path of the revolution -- the total isolation of the revisionist bourgeois parties is the aim of the direction of the main blow.

It's no accident then, why the "C"P "ML" covers up the history of revisionism in the U.S. and their beloved leader, the renegade Foster, while distorting totally the question of strategy and tactics, reducing strategy to a tactic, "the United Front Against Imperialism", and tactics as a process, while then moving to relegate the questions of strategy and tactics to a settled matter.

In this way they do not deal with strategy as an elaborate plan, which remains fundamentally unchanged for the whole stage of the revolution; they can therefore tamper with the principles laid down by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the question of strategy and tactics, which, as Stalin said--

"The Strategy and Tactics of Leninism constitutes the science of leadership in the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat." (The

Foundations of Leninism, 1970 Peking Edition, p. 84)

Furthermore, says Comrade Stalin,

"Strategy is the determination of the direction of the main blow of the proletariat at a given stage of the revolution, the elaboration of a corresponding plan for the disposition of the revolutionary forces (main and secondary reserves) the fight to carry out this plan throughout the given stage of the revolution." (ibid.)

With Stalin as our guide, let's now proceed to show how the "C"P "ML" attack these fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, by totally distorting the revolutionary essence on the question of the strategy and tactics of Leninism. First, on the question of the direction of the main blow, says the renegade Klonsky--

"The task of 'driving out the bureaucrats' which is now understood by many of the more advanced workers (as opposed to the less advanced? -L.C.), must become a task that is understood, supported and fought for by the broad masses of the workers. Only in this way can our Strategy of 'Aiming the Main Blow' at the reformist and revisionist union leaders succeed in isolating them and freeing the trade union movement from the chains of bourgeois ideology." (Documents of the Founding Congress of the "C"P "ML", p. 35)

First we are told that the broad masses of workers must understand the "task of driving out the bureaucrats" because "only" in this way can the strategy of "aiming the main blow" at reformist and revisionist leaders succeed.

How are the masses of workers to understand this question of strategy?

When, (1) it is separated from the question of the Party's program from where strategy and tactics is derived; and (2) "C"P "ML"'s purpose of isolating the union bureaucrats, the "reformist and revisionist union leaders" is for "freeing the trade union movement" from the "chains of bourgeois ideology". We are left then, supposedly, with trade unions without "reformist and revisionist union leaders" and this supposedly guarantees trade unions free from bourgeois ideology. The ABC's of Marxism-Leninism teaches us that trade unionism is bourgeois ideology, and that as long as the bourgeoisie is in power, bourgeois ideology, which is the oldest and most influential, remains dominant. No amount of replacing the old union bureaucrats with "C"P "ML" cadres is going to change a thing. Furthermore, the responsibility of Communists is to divert the spontaneous mass movement away from bourgeois ideology and bring it under the influence of Communist ideology.

The direction of the main blow as elaborated by Lenin and Stalin deals with isolating the social props of imperialism, in order to get to the target of the revolution, the bourgeoisie, as the class which must be overthrown by forceful means and expropriated.

But here the renegade Klonsky lays out his cards on the table. Get rid of the old windbag bureaucrats, replace them with "C"P "ML" "Fightback militants", new windbags, efficient officials as local presidents, committeemen, shop stewards, and up to president of the international, give a more militant face to the trade union -- "class struggle within the trade unions" -- get the bourgeoisie to grant some reforms like "affirmative action in hiring, training and promotion" (p. 111, *ibid.*), and in return the "C"P "ML" promises to liquidate the struggle for the Party and not to offend the bourgeoisie or lead

the proletariat in its overthrow and expropriation by not diverting the masses away from bourgeois ideology, while promising a "peaceful road to socialism", the "freeing of trade unions" from the "chains of bourgeois ideology", fully assisting their bourgeoisie in strengthening the chains of wage slavery, for trade unions are an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie under capitalism, in its own interest, for the negotiation of the better sale of labor power. But "C"P "ML" promises workers to get the "translation of work rules, contracts and union meetings" (*ibid.*, p. 119). After all, the social-chauvinists of "C"P "ML" wouldn't want immigrant workers to misunderstand the work rules established by the bourgeoisie designed to maintain law and order, while they reap surplus value in their pursuit of maximum profits.

While under capitalism the "C"P "ML" promises to rid the trade unions of bourgeois ideology, is it not clear that they want to get rid of the old bureaucrats in pursuit of their positions of privilege and wealth? This is why it's not till "under socialism" that they treat the question of schools of socialism -- here is what they say:

"The trade unions will serve as schools of Communism and as schools for training workers to manage production and advance socialist construction." (*ibid.*, p. 119)

By reducing the fight against the labor aristocracy and their organized representatives to a fight against a handful of old windbags, the bribed stratum in the ranks of the working class then remain the privileged few technocratic trainers, engineers, the managers, within "C"P "ML"'s brand of "socialism", no different than Tito's brand of "socialism".

The problem, as "C"P "ML" elaborates

it, is one of "leadership in this country", a problem of management, so get rid of the totally discredited Millers and George Meanys, etc., and replace them with the college, ivy league, clean, well-mannered reporters of the "C" P "ML". The revisionist theory of "workers' self-management" is masked by rhetoric that is designed to discredit Marxism-Leninism, the scientific socialist doctrine. By attacking the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the only means by which the proletariat will construct socialism, covering up that under capitalism what exists is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, "C" P "ML" presents a quite acceptable program of reforms to the bourgeoisie, who as Lenin taught us, recognized the class struggle before Marx. What is totally unacceptable to the bourgeoisie is their forceful overthrow, the replacement of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat, so this is most conveniently omitted by the "C" P "ML" when discussing every question, as we have analyzed here and in other sections of this journal.

DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS OR BLATANT SOCIAL-CHAUVINISM?

The "C" P "ML", like the "C" P USA before them, propagates the revisionist theory of extending democracy under capitalism. This they do by their "Fight-back" or other coalitions which are defending "democratic rights".

Comrade Enver Hoxha, in a speech which he delivered at the meeting of the General Council of the Democratic Front of Albania on September 20, 1978, said:

"A society which defends and relies on the exploiting order is neither progressive nor democratic."

Does "C" P "ML" dare attempt to refute this Marxist-Leninist analysis? Since

it cannot be refuted, the cowardly phillistines of the "C" P "ML" conceal this truth from the proletariat, and instead, while distorting and revising all the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, under the guise of "Champions of the People" in the "Fight-back" for "Democratic Rights", says,

"This fightback movement will rally the broad masses to fight in defense of democratic rights and against superpower war preparations, the brutal attacks on the national minorities and the threat of fascism." (Documents, p. 88)

Now, to bring out to the light of day the truth concealed behind these hypocritical outcries and agitational slogans, which amount to nothing but a cover for social-chauvinism, flip the pages of the little yellow book (red only in disguise) to page 133 -- "The Puerto Rican People", where they explain how they see extending these "democratic rights" to the outright colonies of U.S. imperialism, like Puerto Rico. Social-chauvinism rears its ugly head and we are told,

"... 'U.S. citizenship' granted to the Puerto Rican People has meant nothing more than the 'right' to fight and die in U.S. imperialism's wars of aggression, while being denied basic democratic rights, such as the right to vote in U.S. elections."

First, the yellow-bellied cowards of the "C" P "ML" reduce the forceful draft of the Puerto Rican men into the U.S. imperialist army as a "right" granted through "U.S. citizenship"; then they proceed to propagate the Statehood plan for legalizing the already outright colonial subjugation of Puerto Rico which has existed since 1898, by calling for the "right to vote in U.S. elections".

The truly democratic demand which

proletarian internationalism recognizes as just, is the right of the oppressed Puerto Rican Nation to self-determination, the right to Political Secession. Instead, "C"P "ML" calls for the further subjugation so they can swell up their bottomless pockets with more crumbs, adding San Juan, as they do already with Honolulu, as another "American city".

Rather than demand that the U.S. imperialists get out of the colonies and neo-colonies, which the proletariat itself assures as the first order of business when it is in power, the "C"P "ML" calls for the "right" to elections, revealing its faith in bourgeois democracy, its total subservient role as an appendage of bourgeois parliamentarism, while openly making known its open alliance with the U.S. imperialists, whose "right" to plunder, exploit, oppress and enslave the peoples of the world it so vehemently defends, under the guise of "fighting back" for "democratic rights".

There is no honest man or woman whose conscience is not stirred and whose insides are not turned against this openly social-chauvinist clique, who dares parade itself as a "Marxist-Leninist" party, while carrying on in the traditions of the traitors William Z. Foster, Dennis, Ford, and the rest of the "C"PUSA. Nor will the class conscious proletarians remain silent, or be silenced ever, in its education of the proletariat in Marxism-Leninism. The Party will lead the working class and all the toiling masses, who will repulse and drive out social-chauvinism into the pits of hell, along with imperialism, which it serves. It's no shock that within the very insides of this bastion of worldwide reaction should emerge some of the most boot-licking renegades and agents of U.S. imperialism. The material basis-- the plunder, the robbery and super-

exploitation of the colonies and neo-colonies. The U.S. imperialists take out some crumbs from their super-profits and throw them out at the braggarts who claim to be "leading the masses", but who represent a minority, who in reality are beggars for these crumbs. Browder, Foster, Avakian, Bergman, Jarvis, Klonsky and Haywood & Co. belong to this parasitic minority of social-chauvinist "leaders".

Belonging to the great army of the international proletariat, the class conscious proletarians in the U.S. stand with the majority, the masses of the proletarians, with the exploited and the oppressed, who, fearing neither hardship nor death, will succeed in imbuing the masses with the spirit of proletarian internationalism, and while building and consolidating the General Staff of the proletariat, the U.S. Bolshevik Party, deal crushing blows at revisionism in the U.S., and carry through to the end proletarian revolution, for fundamental change in society, establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, construct socialism, and onward to the abolition of classes.

Long Live Marxism-Leninism!!

Down With the Social-Chauvinist
"C"P "ML", the Successors of
the "C"PUSA!!