

The Two-Line Struggle in the RCLB is a Struggle between the RCLB and
Revisionism.

Comrades of the RCLB,

The RCL is at the cross-roads. It can march down the road to revolution or down the road to class-collaboration, social-chauvinism and betrayal of the British and world-wide revolution. This is what the two-line struggle is all about. When the RCL was founded eighteen months ago, a potential vanguard organization of the working class was founded. It was only a potential vanguard because it was crippled from the very beginning by a severe right opportunist deviation in its ideological and political line, expressed chiefly in the Manifesto. The minority on the CC, comrades MC (Neil Redfern) and MF (Phil Dixon) are struggling for a campaign to expose, criticise and repudiate this right opportunist deviation, whilst the majority on the CC have been fooled by the opportunist majority on the PC, headed by the revisionist TE (Chris Burford), into supporting their plot to cover up the right opportunist deviation, deepen, consolidate and systematise it and to drive the RCL finally and irrevocably into the marsh of opportunism. They must not be allowed to do this. Comrades at every level of the organization, and in different parts of the country, are rebelling against the opportunist majority on the PC - all honest comrades, all comrades who want revolution, must also rebel and defy the opportunist majority on the PC, overthrow them and rescue the RCL from the bourgeois agents who have seized power on the PC.

What the two-line struggle is REALLY about and what the Marxist minority stand for.

Politically.

1. We stand for socialist revolution in Britain and overthrowing British imperialism as our main contribution to the world-wide proletarian revolution. We are opposed to the RCL's line of strengthening the bourgeois state by supporting the EEC and NATO and military integration by the European bourgeoisie. Burford and the opportunist majority stand for "subordinating" our revolution to that world-wide - by which pseudo-dialectical claptrap they mean subordinating the proletarian revolution to the aims of British imperialism. By denying that revolution in Britain is our foremost internationalist task, alliance with British imperialism "in the national interest" is considered as a revolutionary thing even though it lets 'our' bourgeoisie off the hook and deals no real blows against the superpowers. This is why the last CC meeting deleted the words "at the soonest time" after "political power" in para. 8 of the resolution on 'Proletarian Internationallism' recently circulated.

2. We support the international united front against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism, headed by the two superpowers. We see the British revolution as our main contribution to the world revolution and to that united front. This means striking our main blow in the international class struggle against British imperialism. We are opposed to the RCL's policy of letting British imperialism off the hook - of virtually ignoring British imperialism in Kampuchea, Bermuda, Hong Kong etc., etc.. We are opposed to the RCL's line that British imperialism should "line up" or "unite" with the third world - this social-chauvinist line which other 'Marxist-Leninists' used to justify support of French and Belgian intervention in Zaire and which is used to support 'our' bourgeoisie's attempts to exploit the contradiction between the first and third worlds and which covers up the fact that the imperialists have to attack the third world. Burford and the opportunist majority stand for 'fighting' British imperialism "in the course of the struggle against superpower hegemonism," in other words for throwing overboard the primary responsibility of Communists in an imperialist country to struggle against 'their' bourgeoisie and instead supporting those exploited and oppressed by British imperialism as a subordinate matter to struggling for British 'national independence.' On the contrary, we stand for subordinating the struggle for national sovereignty to our revolutionary struggle against the British bourgeoisie. For example we will lead the people of Britain against the US bases here as part of the struggle against the British bourgeoisie who want to keep the bases.

3. We therefore stand for fighting for the closest possible support with those exploited and oppressed by British imperialism, and we are opposed to the social-chauvinist treachery of the majority on this question. After a nine month rearguard action against the Zimbabwe campaign Burford has succeeded in ending it without any commitment to further campaigns (not co-incidentally at the same meeting at which MC was removed from the PC), and thus committed vile treachery to the revolutions in Zimbabwe and Britain. Burford also wants to cover up British imperialist neo-colonial control of third world countries by putting in the first place the struggle of third world countries, not people, ignoring the necessity for proletarian leadership in the anti-imperialist struggle of the third world. ~~Wherever third world leaders take an anti-imperialist stand we will support them. Where on the other hand they ally themselves with imperialism and collaborate in holding back the productive forces in third world countries, we will support the inevitable movements of the peoples of such countries to overthrow these leaders as part of the new-democratic revolution. Our support for the anti-imperialist struggles of third world countries and nations is UNCONDITIONAL.~~

4. We are thoroughgoing enemies of imperialism and therefore thoroughgoing supporters of all struggles directed against imperialism. We recognise that the people and countries of the third world have won great victories against imperialism and we support the unity of these peoples and countries against imperialism. We recognise that the imperialists try to break this unity and to cause division and strife. Where this occurs we will attack those responsible. We are utterly opposed to 'Class Struggle's' splittist attacks on Ethiopia, India and Vietnam, which fail to nail the real culprit and in fact let the Soviet Union off the hook. We are opposed to the line of 'CS' of almost exclusively attacking the Soviet Union. We stand for exposing all imperialist powers, first and foremost British imperialism, but also Britain's ally, the USA. We lay weight on the importance, when exposing the Soviet Union, of showing that Britain and the USA are not an alternative, but are in essence not one jot better.

5. We stand for internationalism against bourgeois nationalism and the war preparations of British and US imperialism. We are opposed to the line of the RCL that British imperialism can fight a just war against another imperialist country, the Soviet Union, a line which ignores also the fact that imperialism is a world system, in which each imperialist country is tied with a thousand-and-one threads to all other imperialist countries. We are opposed to the attempts of the RCL to cover up the alliance of British imperialism with US imperialism and its war preparations by pretending that the next war might not be a world imperialist war. We are opposed to the RCL's line of treating the Soviet Union as the "primary target in the struggle against hegemonism," thereby ignoring the fact that it is the US which actually has bases, troops and installations in Britain and with which 'our' bourgeoisie is politically and militarily allied.

In short, we are totally opposed to the RCL's line of trying to drive the working class and people of Britain to die yet again in their millions on the imperialist battlefields of Europe.

6. We stand for actually leading the working class and people in struggle against the bourgeoisie and their state. We are opposed to the consistent failure of the RCL to give a lead to the working class, even on the economic struggle (look for example at our total failure to give a lead to the struggle against the 5%), under the influence of the Burford line that there is a 'contradiction' between Party-building and mass work. We are opposed to the disgraceful opportunist evasions of our responsibility to lead the working class under the pretext of "using the mass line," and instead only "uniting" with the working class, thereby leaving leadership of the working class to the bourgeoisie, as in the Zimbabwe work, where Burford has said our work "violates the mass line," that its "not mass work" and that its a "diversion." We are opposed to the economism of the RCL which virtually ignores our responsibility to lead in practice the political struggle and the struggle of other classes and strata, and which instead concentrates in practice on purely economic work in individual factories. We are opposed to the sectarianism of the RCL which attacks backward workers under the guise of fighting 'fascism,' and which attacks the opportunists before it attacks the bourgeoisie. We are opposed to the constant pulling-back of our work using the pretext of the contradiction between cadres and tasks. There are millions of people who want revolution - we must lead them and build the Party on that basis, not constantly

all about our small numbers, or pretend that we shouldn't lead the masses because we are at the stage of the 'first historical task of revolution.'

In short, we stand for building a Party which really leads the masses and is bound up with them with every fibre of its being. We are opposed to the type of self-cultivating sect which Burford wants us to build.

Theoretically.

1. We stand for Marxism against Revisionism, which is the 'theoretical' basis of right opportunism in the RCLB.

We are against revisionist distortions of Marxist teachings on the state; distortions which deny that the state is an instrument for the oppression of one class by another and that the politics of a state are determined by which class controls the state machine.

We stand for an unequivocal statement that we cannot seize state power except by violent revolution, which the Manifesto avoids stating (para. C4) and a view which Burford says is "dogmatist."

We stand for a firm understanding that Britain is an imperialist country and that all its actions are imperialist. We are opposed to the evasion of this question in the Manifesto which, instead of taking British imperialism as our starting point, doesn't even mention it until the 16th. para., and which propagates such utter revisionism as saying we must struggle against Britain's "imperialist nature." We are opposed to Burford's even greater depths of revisionism when he speaks of Britain's "dual nature" and that we must "distinguish" between "Britain and the British bourgeoisie."

We therefore stand for smashing the bourgeois state, not strengthening it as the Manifesto does.

We therefore stand four square on the teachings of Lenin on war and revolution and against the wholesale attack on Leninism in the Manifesto. An attack which denies that imperialist war is in fact imperialist war and which says instead that a war of a small imperialist country against a big one is a "just" war, and which, under the chauvinist flag of "opposing appeasement," propagates the view that what matters is not the class character of the war, but who fired the first shot.

We stand by the Leninist view that a fundamental feature of imperialism is the division of the world into oppressor and oppressed nations. We oppose Burford's filthy revisionism in saying that this view is "dogmatist."

We stand for Lenin's and MaoTsetung teachings on armed struggle and are opposed to Burford's implicit view that armed struggle is not strictly necessary in the formally independent countries of the third world.

We stand for Lenin's and MaoTsetung's teachings on the dictatorship of the proletariat and oppose Burford's views on "dual power", under which bourgeois trash he tries to sneak Yugoslavia into the socialist countries.

2. We stand for an organization with a thorough grasp of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, in opposition to the opportunist majority who oppose this; who stand for the study of Marxism in bits and pieces and random quotations torn out of their historical and political context, not in its entirety and as a comprehensive system; who oppose arming the rank-and-file with a deep understanding of Marxist theory and who instead insist that we must spend four months to study 'Wages, Price and Profit' (and then only in part.)

Ideologically.

We stand for dialectical and historical materialism; i.e., we stand for the world outlook of the proletariat, a world outlook of courage and struggle, based on the firm conviction that the world will eventually be ours because history is on our side.

We are opposed to Burford's idealism, which (for example) thinks that we can win by shadow-boxing with our secondary enemies like the Soviet Union, instead of fighting our bigger enemies of British and US imperialism.

We are opposed to Burford's metaphysics, which (for example) cannot see the unity between such things as theory and practice, and thinks instead that they are two entirely separate things; which thinks that stones can become chickens or that imperialist countries can wage just wars.

We are opposed to the RCL's mechanical materialism which (for example) thinks that the Soviet Union is the "primary target" in each country because it is so world-wide, and which thinks that the principal contradiction in the world is what determines our tasks, instead of making a concrete analysis of the class forces in each country.

We are opposed to Burford's (and the RCL's) vulgar, phoney and opportunist 'dialectics', which (for example) says that Britain has a "dual nature," or supports "only" European military integration for "self-defence."

In short and in general we are opposed to Burford's bourgeois world outlook (which has profoundly influenced the RCL), an outlook paralysed with fear in front of the imperialists and which has not one iota of faith in the revolutionary potential of the proletariat and people, and which therefore seizes on every opportunity to practice class collaborationism and preach revisionism.

Organizationally.

1. We stand for democratic-centralism, not the bourgeois dictatorship which in the RCL passes for democratic-centralism.

We stand for a Central Committee which has the courage, honesty and faith in the rank-and-file to open up the discussion and struggle when it is divided on major matters of principle; not for the method of the opportunist majority of preventing the minority stating its views.

We stand for a Central Committee which is prepared to take the rank-and-file into its confidence and actually tell them what's going on, not one which attempts to conceal matters.

We stand for a Central Committee which encourages lower levels and the rank-and-file to use their own heads and question CC directives, lines and policies, not one which tells comrades that their only duty is to show "a willingness to understand and implement" and "test the line in practice," i.e., to show religious faith and follow blindly.

We stand for a democratic-centralist structure where comrades at every level feel free to voice their opinions and vote yes or no, not one where they have to shut up and put their hands up blindly following "higher levels."

In short we stand for the widest democracy inside the organization in order to strengthen our fighting capacity to fight in a unified and disciplined manner against the class enemy.

2. We stand also for an organization unified on a correct ideological and political line. We are opposed to the opportunist line of unity between Marxism and revisionism, of allowing Marxists and opportunists to exist side-by-side in the same organization. This is the line of "reserving views" on questions of principle - a line which allows opportunists to hide in the organization and sabotage it. How can we have a revolution if we allow to exist in our ranks people who are opposed to revolution? This is why Burford must be expelled if he doesn't sincerely change his line, and why MC was not being splittist in making such a statement. (The snivelling opportunists on the PC expell people also - but for daring to struggle, not for class line.)

What the Opportunist Majority has done in the Two-Line Struggle.

The two-line struggle has been raging on the PC and CC for nearly a year - in all that time the opportunist majority has desperately tried to avoid struggling on line, and has instead tried to reduce the whole struggle to one of 'style and method of work,' to conceal the struggle, to suppress it and to slander and smear the proletarian minority.

Concealing the two-line struggle.

1. When the Secretary called the Chairman a "traitor to the working class," instead of discussing whether or not the statement was true, it was deemed impermissible in principle, thus denying that two-line struggle is a struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. At the CC meeting in question the then Secretary was ruled out of order and not allowed to speak fully when he tried to explain why he considered the Chairman a traitor.

2. When the rank-and-file were informed of the decision to remove the Secretary from his posts they were not informed of the ideological and political content of why the accusation was made against the Chairman and the circumstances in which it was made! Is it not astounding that a Secretary of the CC can disappear from the organization's life without the membership being told of the line on which the struggle took place? Even in the recent circular on MC's so-called splittism, line enters into it only incidentally because it can no longer be avoided. The attacks on MC's alleged 'splittism' are nothing but the old opportunist's parrot-cry of "unity," that it is unity for unity's sake, not unity based on line, on principle.

3. The PC is still refusing to tell the rank-and-file what the two-line struggle is about - look at its absurd circular of 17th. Sept. urging the rank-and-file to study the changed slogans on the Zimbabwe campaign, instead of telling cdes. what the struggle is all about.

4. All this is happening because the PC is terrified that its revisionist line will be exposed by the proletarian minority if open struggle takes place. This is why it has written to the Ln. DC telling them that MC's statement to them that "class struggle is propelling the RCL forward" is a splittist statement! What a give-away - to uphold class struggle is splittist! And how this exposes their rotten opportunism. What the PC wants to do is to drive the opposition out of the organization and then try to foist its revisionist line on the RCL.

Suppressing the two-line struggle and attempting to resolve it by organizational means.

For the whole period of the two-line struggle Burford has tried to ruthlessly suppress all opposition to him. This is his record of bourgeois power struggling over the past year.

1. On his return from leave of absence in Feb. 1978 he tried to resolve the ideological and political differences which were rapidly maturing by demanding that the RCL have a "cult of the individual" about him. The PC rejected this absurd demand and minuted "agreed that there can be no question of a cult of the individual at the present stage of our development." Although Burford is too dishonest to say so, this is why he opposed both MC and himself being publically named - he said "we should have a cult of the individual about only one comrade, not two."

2. For the next three months or so the struggle grew in intensity and was at times very bitter, in the main no one side gained the ascendancy. Suddenly, two weeks prior to the June PC, Burford demanded that the PC propose to the next CC (the end of June) that MC be "removed from the post of Secretary." This was before the CC had even been informed of the content of the two-line struggle. Furthermore, and typical of the utter contempt with which Burford regards the rank-and-file, he declared that the rank-and-file should "at this stage be given only the general reasons for it" i.e., not told of the specific content of the two-line struggle. The PC rejected this proposal with only Burford voting in favour.

3. Unreconciled to his defeat, two weeks later he launched a paranoid attack on the Secretary at the June plenum of the CC and accused him of having been plotting to "seize power" in the RCL for several months. As evidence for this he produced among other things MC's proposal that there should be a Second Congress! The CC rejected these accusations and passed a minute saying "This CC does not accept the charges made by the Chairman of the CC that the Secretary of the CC has been plotting to seize the leadership of the RCL." Only Burford and one other voted against the minute.

4. The two-line struggle on the CC was waged with increasing intensity and in September the Secretary called Burford a "traitor." Refusing any serious discussion of whether or not the charge was true, Burford proceeded to wage a war of extermination against the Secretary and succeeded in fooling the CC into removing the Secretary from his posts. Cdes. know the rest of this buisness; the putsch which Burford launched in May came into fruition.

5. What the rank-and-file have not been told is that the SC was suspended because comrade MF, the third comrade on the SC, came out in support for MC. You also do not know that MC was removed from the PC because he dared to circulate the document "The Bourgeoisie has seized power on the PC." MC will now only be allowed to remain on the CC if he struggles in an "orderly manner," i.e., knuckles under to Burford's revisionism. If he dares to circulate his views to the rank-and-file he will be expelled! What a caricature of democratic-centralism when a comrade is prevented from stating his views and is expelled if he does!

6. At the December PC MF was removed from the PC and the PC took decisions to expell MC & MF at the next CC. This is because the comrades concerned have been forced to work together; they did so openly but have been accused of "bourgeois factionalism."

7. Consistent opposition to Burford and the opportunist majority has also come from cde. PR, a rank-and-file cde. in Ln.. She has been persecuted for her opposition by the Ln. DC who, incited by the PC, put her on probation. She also is down for expulsion unless she knuckles under (struggles in an "orderly manner.")

8. Another very serious means of suppressing struggle employed by the opportunist majority is to deny the minority the right to struggle. Although the CC is seriously divided on matters of principle, the majority has not agreed that the minority should have the right to put its views. They have even gone to the length of denying that the CC is subordinate to the Congress by refusing to agree that at the Congress the minority should have the right to speak out freely. What a grotesque travesty of democratic-centralism and how utterly bankrupt it reveals their line be when they are terrified of free and open struggle at the Congress! Comrades, should note that it was only as a result of MC's struggle against bureaucrat-centralism that the CC itself was allowed to hear all the views on the PC (prior to this the CC was presented with a united face by the PC.)

Slander and smears against the Proletarian Minority.

It is impossible in this document to refute one-by-one all the lies, slanders, smears, distortions and half-truths in the document of the PC "Denounce MC's Splitism." The document is an account of a struggle of Marxism against revisionism seen through the eyes of opportunists. We can only expose the grossest slanders and lies.

1. The whole line of the document is that we should treat as a 'contradiction among the people' the contradiction between those who want revolution and those who want to practice class-collaborationism and ally with British and US imperialism. The specific case is a contradiction between those who want to fulfill our internationalist obligations to support in practice the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe and those who want to betray that duty. These are not contradictions among the people, they are contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, they are antagonistic contradictions and became so the minute Burford began practising a consistent social-imperialist line. The majority's slander that MC is acting like the 'gang of four' is absurd. The error of the 'gang of four' was not that they attacked people as 'capitalist roaders,' but that they attacked the wrong people as 'capitalist roaders!' It is not wrong in itself to call Burford a traitor, it is only wrong if he is not a traitor. Comrades can see from this document that Burford has for a long time been committing vile treachery to the proletarian revolution.

2. 'BTLTBTP.' The document perverts the correct criticism of 'BTLTBTP' into an attack on MC. Although MC must (and has) accepted the primary responsibility for the serious errors of this document, the basic cause lies in ideological weaknesses and errors of the whole organization. The opportunists ignore this, and furthermore, completely ignore Burford's responsibility for the error. The CC came to the conclusion that the root of the error of 'BTLTBTP' was in a document drafted by Burford - the 'General Plan for Work at BC level' of September 1977, in which Burford wrote "In building the League practice is now primary although theory is still important." This is the same line as 'BTLTBTP' as the CC acknowledged when it passed a PC minute of May 1978 saying "The germ of this error is in the lead 'general Plan for work at BC level.'" It also ignores the fact that

MC has made a substantial self-criticism for his part in the errors of 'BILTSAP', but at this day Burford still resists making a self-criticism for his errors.

3. The accusation that MC "pushed through" a "splittist division of authority" in the RCL ignores the fact that Burford himself proposed that MC be Secretary, although it is true that he opposed MC being named (because of his obsession with a 'cult of the individual.')

It also ignores the fact that the decision was welcomed by all the CC comrades who spoke (all of whom supported the decision.) It is a bare-faced lie to say that there was "no discussion" of the question.

4. The Second Congress. It is a lie to say that the statement "there was no possibility of a thorough...discussion of lines" is a "brazen falsehood." If comrades look at the full statement which reads "there was no possibility of a thorough summing up of experience and discussion of lines and leadership," they will see that what was being referred to (and what was said at the CC) was that at the Founding Congress there had been no opportunity to discuss such questions as industrial work, PODE, publications etc., and no discussion of leadership. Burford is a liar on this and many other questions.

5. It is again a lie that MC has denounced the CC as a whole as "opportunists and traitors" and "declared his intention to denounce the CC as a whole as counter-revolutionary." MC has explicitly said (at the last CC) that he did not regard the CC as a whole as opportunists and he made it clear that it is the opportunist majority on the PC headed by Burford who must be the target of attack. This lie of Burford is a crude attempt to make the rank-and-file think that MC is attacking and denouncing everybody who doesn't agree with him in contrast to parson Burford, whereas in fact it is only through getting to know Burford's rotten opportunism over a period of time that all comrades will see through him. Comrades outside the PC who support Burford at this time are wrong, but in most cases they are not opportunists.

6. Similar lies and slanders have been circulated in Ln. against cde. PR, also for opposing the opportunist majority.

Comrades of the RCL,

The two-line struggle is against splittism - but the real splitters in our organization are those who preach and practice revisionism. As the CPC said in 1964 in struggle against the CPSU:

"...the history of the international communist movement demonstrates that in every period the struggle between the defenders of unity and the creators of splits is in essence one between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism-revisionism, between the upholders of Marxism and the traitors to Marxism." ('Polemic on the General Line...', p 314).

Comrades, the real splitters in the RCL are those who:

"...to meet the needs of the bourgeoisie, split with Marxism-Leninism, with the revolutionary proletarian party and with the revolutionary proletariat and the broad masses of the labouring people; and they remain splitters even when for a time they are in the majority or hold the leading posts." (Ibid, p316 (our emphasis)).

Comrades, we are accused of 'splittism' because we declare that there can be no principled unity between us and Burford and his henchmen on the PC, but again we quote the CPC:

"Unity is a great thing and a great slogan. But what the workers' cause needs is the unity of Marxists, not unity between Marxists and opponents distorters of Marxism." (Ibid, p311 (emphasis in original)).

Comrades, the future of the RCL is in your hands - only you can foil Burford's plot to turn what is still a potential vanguard organization of the working class into a rotten revisionist mouthpiece for the predatory war-aims of British and US imperialism.

DEMAND AN EMERGENCY CONGRESS OF THE RCL BY THE END OF FEBRUARY in order to ratify or reject the measures taken against MC, MF and PR.

In the first place demand that your cell or branch discuss this document.

Vote and pass resolutions in your cell or branch supporting MC, MF and PR and denouncing the opportunist majority on the PC.

If your cell or branch won't do this then exercise your constitutional right to bypass them and write directly to the CC.

If your DC/BC won't support your cell or branch and tries to suppress expressions of support, then also bypass them and write direct to the CC.

(as the opportunist majority cannot be trusted to carry out the demand for an emergency Congress send copies of any resolutions, letters etc. to Phil Dixon).

Workers of all countries, unite! Workers and oppressed peoples and nations, unite!

Neil Redfern
Phil Dixon
Pat Redfern.

1.1.79.