

DEEPLY CRITICISE THE SPLITTIST AND IDEALIST

DOCUMENT OF THE ANTI-LEAGUE FACTION

At the beginning of January, the anti-league faction attempted to circulate to the rank-and-file of the RCL, a document entitled *The two-line struggle in the RCL is a struggle between Marxism and Revisionism*. The document was suppressed. Why? Is it because as the splittists like to claim, the PC and the CC are "afraid" of struggle? No. It was suppressed because factional activities and the ultra-democratic "appeal" of the splittists violated both the spirit and the rules of Democratic Centralism and thus viciously attacked the progress of the RCL in Party-building and attempted to throw us back to the days of the circles. It is essential for the RCL to stand firm on this question of principle, and defend our Democratic Centralism.

Now that the central bodies have thoroughly prevented the attempt to turn our organisational principles into those of bureaucratic anarchism, we ourselves are circulating a refutation of the factions all-round attack on the RCL as represented by their document, and are distributing also the factions own document for criticism. Undoubtedly the faction will continue to find means to attack the ideological and political line of the RCL, and its organisational principles. But their blows are puny. Their document represents the best they can cobble together. They have circulated documents individually before at their various levels, which anyone could see did not hold water and which received thorough criticism. The document they have circulated has dropped some of the most obvious lies and distortions, and "smartened up" the presentation of their line. It is the best thing they can do, so it is the one, we shall take to refute their stand.

For many months NR has been criticised for his splittism. One form of this splittism is to raise 1000 issues at once, knowing that every opportunist statement made as a brief comment needs a couple of pages to thoroughly expose. He has been particularly and consistently criticised for this style of flinging mud in the hope that some of it will stick. (It is no accident that in the faction's document - page 6 - they opportunistically turn round and try to criticise the RCL in its turn for this. It is a bald attempt to divert criticism.) Undoubtedly some mud will stick. We won't even try to answer every criticism and claim. The important thing is to take a stand on the principal questions, grasp the essential outlook of the faction, and thoroughly repudiate it. This circular is only a start, but an essential start. The points in it, we will go into more deeply later. At the same time, the faction opportunistically flip constantly from attacking the line of the RCL Manifesto, decisions of the CC, the PC and the Chairman as an individual. This is nothing surprising. It is part of a pattern of splittism, which we are by now thoroughly familiar with! In the main, we shall concentrate on upholding the correct stand of the RCL as an organisation. We cannot in this single document refute all the slanders and criticisms of the Chairman. We uphold the Chairman, as the comrade who has played the leading role in building the RCL. We strongly affirm he is still the leading comrade. Like all comrades, he has, on occasion, been in a minority. This is natural. We expect struggle to take place in League committees. All our comrades contribute to the collective wisdom, even when in a minority. The splittists cannot grasp this elementary fact.

Other points on the lies and distortions leveled against the Chairman have been made in the circular *Denounce MC's splittism* (II.12.78)

DENOUNCE BOURGEOIS FACTIONALISM

In their document the splitters admit that they have been working together. In innocent terms they add that they "did so openly, but have been accused of bourgeois factionalism".(p6). They have the vain hope that RCL comrades are naive enough not to know that the issue of "openness" or "secrecy" is totally irrelevant, and that either way they have flagrantly attacked the organisational principles of the RCL and established a bourgeois faction. This opportunist mask

of injured innocence, like much of their statement, is an out and out fraud. PD(MF) himself stated at PC 17 (December) "my association with cde MC is an open one, and I know it is a factional one". Trotsky's faction in the CPSU(B) was "open". It makes not one whit of difference.

This tiny clique has been meeting behind closed doors to plan strategy and tactics for overthrowing the line and leadership of the RCL, rather than working openly as individuals in their appropriate units and committees. The establishment of such a faction is nothing less than a declaration of causing a split. It has not been tolerated by any other communist organisations. It will not be by the RCL! Its nature is made more apparent by the fact that it consists of one PC, one CC and one R&F member. It set itself up as a separate organisation within the RCL. Its utter hypocrisy is apparent when it berates the "bureaucratic" centralism of the RCL for upholding the united face of leading committees (p4) and the principle of allowing comrades in the minority to "reserve their views" (p4) and struggle in an orderly manner (p6); yet simultaneously the anti-League faction struggles for unity among themselves (something they refuse to do with the vast majority of RCL cadres) and where they cannot agree they adopt the "principle" of the united face of the faction! So, for example, they do not mention once the theory of the three worlds in their document, because (while they are indeed united in their opposition to it) PR and NR claim to be the true representatives of the theory of the three worlds, PR even calling it a "new strategic line", whilst PD denounces it as an "opportunist theory" and calls on communists to "put China at arms length"! But the faction will have their unity at all costs, even on the basis of an opportunist compromise. Similarly, many of the attacks on the line of the RCL in other areas have never been supported by PD (a few of them we've never heard at all!) But for the splittists unity of the faction is all - unity of the RCL is nothing.

THE FACTION IS THE OUTCOME OF SPLITTIST ATTACKS

The establishment of the anti-League faction is itself only the culmination of a vicious splittist campaign waged by NR at the centre, and PR in her cell. It is a result of NR's attempt to change the line of the RCL, not by patient struggle and criticism, but through the means of waging a personal war of extermination against the Chairman, and on the basis of demagoguery. Opportunistically he directed his fire at an individual, when, in reality, he was attacking the Manifesto. His tactics were to sling more and more mud. It was a splittist stand from the start. It reached an extreme form when he denounced the Chairman as a "traitor to the working class". He had no desire to struggle for unity at a higher level, and thus strengthen the ideological and political line of the RCL. Even now the faction's documents seek not to reach clarity, but to sow confusion.

In April and on a number of subsequent occasions, NR proposed that at the next Congress, the united face of the PC and the CC should be broken. Why? Because NR did not even consider struggling consistently to win the CC to his position, but looked only to making a grand appeal to the R&F over the heads of the CC. He denies in essence, that struggle is the means to reach unity, and rejects the aim of unity as his starting point. Neither the PC nor the CC have, in fact, yet discussed the form of the next Congress. The issue is why NR kept raising the matter, and his anarchistic views on inner-Party struggle. This approach is continued in the faction's document (p4), where they demagogically declare that they "stand for a Central Committee which will open up the discussion and struggle when it is divided on major matters of principle...not one which attempts to conceal matters". Here we have it. No united face at all. For Bolsheviks, the first duty of the CC is to struggle for clarity and unity, and to give leadership. It is its duty to conscientiously and self-critically consider criticisms from below, and the centralised experience of the organisation as a whole. The faction's stand will end patient struggle for unity at the centre, and the systematic summing up of experience, and replace it with a continued free-for-all where the "best" demagogues rise

to the top. They will destroy our centralism and our proletarian democracy - particularly when they then continuously drive minorities out of the organisation even when they are prepared to subordinate themselves to the majority and work hard for the revolution! (p4).

NR's splittism has taken the form on the one hand of a vicious attack to disintegrate the opposition, including denouncing the Chairman, and later other PC comrades, as "traitors", "agents of imperialism", etc.; and on the other, the throwing of issue after issue into the melting pot and demanding that the bulk of the issues be resolved immediately. This relentless attack inevitably partially paralysed the centre, constantly side-tracked the struggle over the main issues, and sowed confusion - as it was meant to do.

This is what led to the correct demand to struggle "in an orderly fashion". It was NR's vicious splittism that led to action against him at the centre, when he refused to stop it. It is obvious that political differences cannot be resolved, and the line of the RCL cannot be strengthened when struggle is carried out in such an opportunist manner. Now, the faction turns round and says the PC has reduced "the whole struggle to one of 'style and methods of work', or to conceal the struggle, to suppress it..." (p4). No! It is NR who "suppressed" struggle - through his splittism; and the central committee after some concrete experience of it, fully recognised the fact, and therefore took steps to suppress splittism (whilst giving NR a way out). What is more PD, who is now part of the faction

propagating the lie that NR was silenced because of his political **line**, knows this so well that he vigorously supported the initial disciplinary action (at CC5. September) against NR, as did every other member of the CC. It was only at PC 17 (November) that PD suddenly changed his line, when he simultaneously attacked the theory of the three worlds as an "opportunist theory"! The scenario that the faction has tried to paint of the "minority" i.e. NR and PD being suppressed by the "majority" for "nearly a year" is an out-and-out lie and the faction knows it. The faction claim that R&F do not know that "MC was removed from the PC, because he dared to circulate (to the CC) the document, *The bourgeoisie has seized power on the PC*" (p6). Again, they attempt to paint a picture of suppression of political line. It is not the circulation of a document that led to his removal, but the circulation of a splittist document (see its title!) and his refusal to make a self-criticism for splittism that led to his removal. The faction in their document make great play of the fact that PD(MF) was removed from the SC when he came out in support of NR. They even underline it. (p6). What they don't mention is that PD did not oppose this because the SC was operating only as a consultative body for the Ch and it made no sense to have a consultative body of the two of them, after PD had come out backing splittism!

PR also had disciplinary action taken against her for splittism similar to NR's. The faction claim that she has been the victim of "lies and slanders" (p6&7). Again they "accidentally" fail to reveal that it was her own cell, after months of direct experience of her splittism, who voted unanimously apart from her (7.I) to put her on probation, and later to expel her.

What has not been suppressed is struggle over political line on the central bodies (except by NR's vicious splittism). The document on Proletarian Internationalism, for example, was discussed several times on the PC, then at CC5, then at the PC again, and then at CC6, and only then because they had individualistically walked out after every other CC member present voted for further disciplinary action against NR (which action still allowed him to take part in CC debate), and even when all of NR and MF's written amendments were put up for a vote in their absence.

The demagogy of the faction on the question of Democratic Centralism continues "We stand for a CC which encourages lower levels and the R&F to use their heads... and question CC directives, lines and policies...(and) feel free to voice their opinions" (p4). This is rich! It was precisely NR who as Secretary of the CC wielded a sledgehammer against any BC or DC who dared to criticise his leadership! It is NR who attacks those who disagree with him in a manner that suppresses democracy at every level! It is NR's frantic activism (for others) that denies R&F cadres time to consider leads from the centre, study and

* where it was passed as being generally correct. The only session at which NR and PD did not contribute was at CC 6,

therefore have the confidence to make criticisms! And it is this which led cadres, yet again, to criticise his style of work. To which he replied, yet again, that the PC was diverting the struggle into one of methods and style of work, away from issues of ideological and political line!

NR demands ultra-democracy for himself, and bureaucracy for others. All these things are precisely fundamental questions of ideological line. From his stand on Democratic Centralism, to his arrogance, to his failure to practice self-criticism, to his refusal to seek truth from facts, NR backed by the faction, takes the class stand of the petit-bourgeoisie. The RCL takes the stand of the proletariat. The factions constant attempts to oppose "methods and style of work" to "ideological and political line" are themselves nothing but a diversion. We are precisely struggling over major questions of ideological line.

As far their petit-bourgeois carping demagogy about "the widest democracy" and their belittling of the 'rules' of Democratic Centralism, Lenin has this to say, "The Party tie...must be founded on formal 'bureaucratically' worded rules (bureaucratic from the standpoint of the undisciplined intellectual), strict adherence to which can alone safeguard us from the wilfulness and caprices characteristic of the circles, from the circle methods of free-for-all scrapping that goes by the name of the free 'process' of the ideological struggle" (One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, p251, Peking Ed.)

THE IDEALIST METAPHYSICS OF THE FACTION ON PARTY-BUILDING

In total disregard for concrete reality and actual conditions, the faction wildly attacks the Party-building strategy of the RCL. (Another new flip by PD). The faction attacks the "line" which "concentrates in practice, on purely economic work in individual factories" (p2) and instead proposes that the RCL took a stand on concentrating its scarce resources on the industrial working class, and why in particular we concentrate on work in certain factories. It requires patient, long-term hard work to win the leadership of the working class, and build a Party with deep roots in it. For the faction shouting is enough.

Secondly, it is a fact that as well as taking a stand on the economic struggle, and on the struggle to turn the unions into fighting class organisations, the RCL distributes agitational material on other political struggles (they can't have forgotten the Zimbabwe campaign already!) and sells CS in the factories. That the RCL does purely economic work is a bare-faced lie. That the RCL concentrates its resources is true - and is entirely correct! (It is true that some units have at times made economist errors, but that is another matter entirely). The lies go on. The RCL they say is "only uniting with the working class". All comrades know this is not the line of the RCL either on paper or in practice. PR knows that the cell she was in is in practice leading the present wages struggle, as it led the campaign for solidarity with the people of Zimbabwe! The faction has deliberately lied in order to cover up a correct criticism of NR and PR that they ignore the mass line as the method of leadership; that they think that "you lead the workers by leading them" (sic). How profound. This criticism of them is clearly correct, and seen to be so by their insistence that we can lead all struggles of all classes and strata despite the size of the RCL. They can only say this because they deny any necessity to investigate, in order to give correct leadership. Their wild idealism leads them to believe that shouting "revolutionary" slogans is sufficient. The faction complains at 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..." (p2) If these opportunist demagogues and idealists would attempt to seek truth from facts, and do even a cursory investigation, they would discover that regardless of how many people want revolution, that the RCL has a limited number of members and supporters. They would discover the awful realities that there is indeed a contradiction between cadres and tasks, and that every day our comrades have to decide what are more important tasks, what are less important, and what can't be done yet. The demagogic ravings about the RCL's "snivelling" (p3) will not change these stubborn facts. It is one thing to have lofty revolutionary optimism; quite another to live on cloud nine.

*should lead the political struggles of all classes and strata. What proud revolutionary phrases! All comrades know why the RCL

The faction's frantic "practice! Practice! practice!" line has a number of repercussions, which the RCL learnt through some bitter experience, when *Build the League to build the Party (BTLTBTP)* was accepted as a guiding line. Study is inevitably pushed into the background. It is another stubborn fact, that comrades also need time to study theory, just as they need time to carry out practice. And it is the duty of the leadership to ensure that these are correctly balanced. Experience shows that when practical activity is pushed, without consideration of the overall workload, it is study, preparation for meetings and the work of developing contacts that gets pushed to one side. It sabotages our democracy; it sabotages the swelling of our ranks; and in turn it sabotages practice itself because theory is not guiding practice, and because cadres do not firmly grasp our line or conscientiously sum up their experience, centralise it and strengthen our line. In short, far from speeding the reconstruction of the proletarian party, and the development of its strong roots in the working class, it sabotages it. The saying "more haste, less speed" could not be more true. It is the faction who will lead anyone they can get to follow them into a petit-bourgeois "self-cultivating sect" (p3) totally divorced from the masses! A sect of shouters.

This is reality. Most RCL members know it from their own direct experience. If the faction spent less time indulging in "revolutionary" rhetoric, and more time listening to the rank-and-file (Yes, they should practice what they preach and listen to the opinions of lower levels) they would know it too. Neither will the effects of the "Practice! Practice! Practice!" line be any more overcome by simultaneously and just as idealistically screaming "Theory! Theory! Theory!" as the faction does on page 3 of their document.

The anti-League faction has learnt nothing from BTLTBTP. Despite the factions' claims there has been no serious self-criticism by NR, and the wild idealism of the faction's document betrays that fact.

Which brings us to BTLTBTP itself. The faction correctly quoted a PC minute that the germ of the error about practice being primary lies in the lead *General plan for work at BC level* (p6), but the fact is that at that time, the *General plan* and the central leadership maintained a situation where theory still guided practice, it was indeed an error, an incorrect formula designed to push our practice forward after a long period of intense internal work in founding the RCL. The aim was correct. But it is only with the adoption of BTLTBTP and when NR had responsibility for leading the branches that the organisation was thrown totally out of gear. Further BTLTBTP makes just as important errors in its "pretentiousness and glibness in 'solving' contradictions" and its author, NR has learnt nothing from that and is still a demagogue. It is true also, that the underlying cause for NR's draft being passed, lies in ideological weaknesses and errors of the RCL generally, and particularly the CC. But the CC has learnt, and is still learning, from past errors. Now it does recognise demagogy and grasp more deeply the relation of theory to practice, and "leaders" like NR, who have not learnt, are not finding it so easy to mislead again!

THE FACTION'S WILD LEFT-DEVIATION ON INTERNATIONAL CLASS STRUGGLE.

The ultra-left idealism of the faction runs rampant when they get on to the international class struggle. The "ideological" basis of their distortion is summed up when they attack the chairman (they mean the RCL, the manifesto and the theory of the 3 worlds) for thinking that "stones can become chickens or that imperialist countries can wage just wars." (p.3) Fine words! What "revolutionary" sentiments! But it is the faction who can't tell stones from eggs! It is they who cannot unite theory and practice. Have they forgotten the 1941-1945 war already? Have they forgotten the stand of the international communist movement, of Stalin, of Mao Zedong? It is true that imperialists always have their own motives in wars, and the proletariat have theirs. That is why, when the proletariat does form alliances it must combine unity with struggle, as the alliance is in fact the road to revolution - not the abandonment of it. But it is the faction who preach trotskyite metaphysics when they deny the possibility of alliances under any conditions.

To the faction the difference between a world hegemonist power and a second rate imperialist powers boils down only to one being a bit bigger than the other. They do not understand the nature of hegemonism. They do not understand that the contradiction between the first and second world is more than a matter of fighting over

shares of the third world, that the second world itself has become a target for the superpowers, so much so that it is the focus of superpower contention. It is because of their total failure to grasp this contradiction that they do indeed take a dogmatist stand, not for saying that the world is divided into oppressor and oppressed nations. (p.3) but for not applying this to the present international situation and grasping that the essential thing about the world today is that it is divided into 3. Yet 2 members of the faction (NR & PR) preposterously claim that it is the RCL which is "distorting the theory of the 3 worlds". We can only suggest that they read the *Peoples Daily* pamphlet. It is not surprising that NR can claim that the ACW pamphlet attacking the RCL is 70% correct, while the manifesto is a revisionist line.

From this failure to comprehend that the world is divided into 3, the splitters raise the "call" for an "international united front against imperialism, colonialism, and hegemonism" whilst the RCL, like the CPC and the vast bulk of the international communist movement support the construction of the "broadest possible international united front against hegemonism" and simultaneously support the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism. Whilst British imperialism will not support the struggle of the third world people and countries, it can indeed "line up" against superpower hegemonism for its own interests. That is why it viciously attacked Democratic Kampuchea, but also voted at the UN for the demand that the hegemonist invasion forces withdraw.

On the struggle of the third world, the RCL has already passed resolutions supporting the peoples and countries of the third world and the leading role of the international proletariat. The manifesto does indeed contain rightist errors, which are being corrected, but the faction is using this as an excuse for their thorough left deviation.

As for the relationship of the struggle for socialism, and the struggle to defend national independence against hegemonism, the line of the RCL clearly states that the struggle to defend national independence is a component part of the socialist revolution. It is a lie to imply that the RCL takes the stand of the interim committee. (p.1). This is a continuation of the splitters' crude smear campaign by means of hints and innuendoes that the PC, and in particular the chairman, really support the revisionist class collaborationist line of the interim committee, and are waiting for an opportunity to sneak it in to the RCL bit by bit. These opportunist liars know that it was the chairman who led the opposition to the interim committee line at the "M-L consultative conference", and who proposed the severance of relations with the PCP(ML)! Still it is a traditional practice of opportunists, who can't knock down a line, to invent a distortion, an aunt sally, and knock that down instead! "But", the faction cries, "you deleted "at the soonest time" from the *Proletarian Internationalism* line". (p.1) Yes. But does anyone really think that the CC prefers revolution later? Of course not, the phrase was deleted purely because it was seen as doing nothing more than striking an empty pose. A style typical of NR. (PD and NR would know this if they had bothered to stay at the CC and listen to other CC members.)

Throughout the document, the faction tries to soften our opposition to Soviet Social Imperialism. It is a lie that the RCL believes that SSI is the primary target in each country "Because it is so world-wide" (p.4). The RCL does however, correctly hold that SSI is the primary target in Britain, in comparison to US imperialism. Not because the character of the next war will be determined by "who fires the first shot" (More lies), but because it is SSI that is most likely to attempt to reduce western Europe to the level of vassal states, as it has done in eastern Europe. Our demagogues sound off about the impossibility of striking "real blows" and say we are "waving cardboard swords" and shadow boxing". Fine words, but it is the duty of communist to prepare the working class against real dangers and for the coming battles so that we will indeed strike real blows against hegemonism.

What is more the RCL grasps that SSI is the least understood, and therefore we must pay more attention to it. Last but not least, we are fighting now against revisionism and opportunism within the ranks of the working class movement, and our

struggle to expose SSI is also tearing away the false mask of socialism from the opportunists, and helping us to defeat sham marxism. Thus strengthening the proletarian forces in Britain, today. (But here too, just as they would beseech us to soften our opposition to SSI, the splittists, under cover of being so revolutionary, would have us weaken our opposition to opportunism, too! (p.2))

The RCL supports the revolutionary national democratic struggle against British imperialism. But the RCL also grasps the need to arm the British working class on the world situation, when we do it. One of the weaknesses in the Zimbabwe campaign is the *Class Struggle*, while correctly opposing mainly British and US imperialism, did little to warn of the danger of the tiger at the back door, and therefore little to prepare workers for the struggles which will be taking place next year. And when the PC instructed the Editorial Committee to carry a particular article and point out this danger, and the CS Ed. in turn wrote a letter to RR, the regular writer on Zimbabwe, instructing her to do this. She ignored democratic centralism and individualistically failed to mention SSI once.

The faction attacks the chairman for "dragging his feet" on the Zimbabwe campaign. It was the chairman who struggled for the change of slogans in order to strengthen the campaign. It was the faction who tried to prevent him speaking at the London meeting. The Chairman has indeed made ∇ criticisms of aspects of the campaign - as have most branch reports. This is part of the democracy of the RCL. If comrades cannot make criticisms without having caps put on their heads in the style of gang of four, we will never be more all-sided. The CC will discuss the positive and negative experience of the Zimbabwe campaign, and take its summary to all cdes, as soon as it can.

As for ending the campaign, NR himself, recognised in August that campaigns are precisely campaigns - special mobilisations require a particular effort for a particular period. Inevitably they end. He recognised, then, that the RCL would have to consciously sum up all its experience, before it decided on future campaigns. Only later did he see the possibility of a superficial appeal on the basis of demagogic slanders that the PC was not interested in supporting the struggle in Zimbabwe, and is therefore composed of "social-chauvinist" traitors, because it refused to start a second campaign without looking at the situation in the RCL overall. This absurd attack could just as easily be turned round, by saying that because of the Zimbabwe campaign, we couldn't have a campaign against the oppression of national minorities in Britain, and that therefore NR must be a racist! Such "polemics" are meaningless. But that is the sort of rubbish the faction is talking.

The faction attacks the "absurd circular" on the change of slogans in the Zimbabwe campaign (p5). Again, it would be a correct criticism that the circular did not explain the significance of the changed slogans. But this is not what upsets the faction. What gets up their noses, is that the CC refused to open up an anarchist free-for-all throughout the RCL without struggling further to reach unity, and that the significance of the additional slogan is that it raises the question of the threat from both superpowers, correcting an ultra-left (really ultra right) line of ignoring the danger from SSI. The other reason for circulating this issue was that the PC voted eventually for the change unanimously - showing that differences could be narrowed through struggle (although PR failed to implement it).

The total betrayal of the faction to the struggle against SSI is shown by their outraged attack on the RCL's "splittism" towards Vietnam (p.2) - at the very time that the Vietnamese authorities are invading Kampuchea! It is another lie that CS did not pin the blame on SSI, but we correctly put weight on the Regional hegemonists who were actually invading Kampuchea. It is also a lie that CS did not direct its main fire at SSI on the struggle in Ethiopia and Eritrea. But here we also correctly supported the armed liberation movements (EPRP, EPLF, ELF) which is what elsewhere in their document the faction attack us for not doing. What CS did handle incorrectly was the contradiction between Ethiopia and Somalia, but the only time this was raised on the Publications Sub. Committee (of which PD was the squad leader) was when the CS Ed. raised the matter, and made self-criticism. It is yet one more lie to claim that CS has a policy different to that. CS's "splittist attack" on India can only refer to the fraternal support given by CS when IPANA asked for a precis of their material on the murder of their cdes to be printed! None of these specific

criticisms of the faction have ever been raised by PD, who was the publication officer at the time. He could have raised them. He has certainly not been suppressed! But the faction forget this minor point in their desire to sling whatever mud they can invent to "prove" that the RCL is revisionist, and the future lies with their split.

Similarly, the bourgeois faction invents another lie, and attacks CS for attacking "backward workers under the guise of fighting racism". NR has before claimed that we don't mainly attack state oppression. What rubbish! That is just what CS does, and all RCL cdes, who read CS know it. (Again, this is a new line of PD's which he has not voiced before).

On every principal question the faction's document is either wildly ultra-leftist, or full of lies and distortions. Comrades, criticise the splittism, factionalism and idealism of NR, PD and PR. The RCL will advance through this struggle to be even stronger and more united ideologically, politically and organisationally.

C.C. 29.1.79