

# 1 STRUGGLE

## 2 ENEMIES

U.S. IMPERIALISM

MODERN SOVIET  
REVISIONISM

## 3 GUIDELINES

DEVELOPING  
FRATERNAL  
RELATIONS

CRITICISM-  
SELF-  
CRITICISM

BUILDING  
MASS-  
DEMOCRACY

## 4 LEVELS OF WORK

INVESTIGATION

EXTERNAL CONSOLIDATION

INTERNAL CONSOLIDATION

AGITATION

**SUPPORT THE INTERNATIONALISTS!**  
**MASS ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLES**

**ONE STRUGGLE  
TWO ENEMIES  
THREE GUIDELINES  
FOUR LEVELS OF WORK**

Statement Issued by  
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE  
INTERNATIONALISTS**

on the  
**FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE HISTORIC  
'NECESSITY FOR CHANGE' CONFERENCE**

**August 1-15, 1967**

Reprinted by the 'Necessity for Change' Institute of Ideological Studies (England -Ireland) to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the founding of the Internationalists March 13th, 1963.

'SEEK TRUTH' PAMPHLET NO.1 - Published by the 'Necessity for Change' Institute of Ideological Studies (England - Ireland), P.O. Box 158, London, N1 8BB, U.K.

The Internationalists have progressed on an unprecedented scale during the year since the First Historic Necessity For Change, Youth and Students Conference. This progress has been all-sided; we have further developed our theory and social practice we have moved from a primitive organisation to one based on One Struggle, Two Enemies, Three Guidelines and Four Levels of Work. Through mass work we have gathered rich experience about mass democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-revisionist struggles, and the extent to which the broad masses of the people are oppressed by the anti-democratic, anti-people and fascist forces. Our movement, which was purely a student movement until the Necessity For Change Conference in August, 1967, is now integrated with the working and oppressed people's struggles at the place of work, in the community and in the university and other educational institutes.

Our activities have increased in depth and scope since the historic conference. We aroused the masses over the problems confronting the working and oppressed people. In the universities we exposed the decadent, bourgeois educational system which trains lackeys of imperialism; in the community we focused on the heartless exploitation of the masses - in housing, exorbitant rents, rising costs of living, unemployment; and on the cultural front we exposed the modern Soviet revisionists and other liberal-bourgeois ideologies, e.g. 'Castroism', 'New Leftism' etc..

Because of these activities, for which the Internationalists gave leadership in theory and practice, and because of the historic upsurge of mass democracy in Trinity College, Dublin, the broad masses of the youth and students, as well as the workers and the genuinely patriotic and nationalist forces, see the Internationalists as a real alternative to the "revisionist" youth and student movements as well as their mass organisations, dogmatic 'marxist'

history of renegades, modern Soviet revisionists, trotskyists, pacifists and other anti-people, imperialist lackeys. They were detached from the real struggles of the masses: a significant number of them spent time with psychiatrists to try and deal with their own problems in private. Their theory and practice were in diametrical opposition. This is why they never analysed the superstructure as part and parcel of the economic base and vice-versa. In fact some even denied the existence of such a thing as the superstructure as they believed that culture and other parts of the superstructure are above politics and have no influence on the economic base. They remained bourgeois in their outlook. They emphasised "political struggles" but the main motive in doing so was to confuse and mislead the masses. They reduced politics and political struggles into absolute manoeuvres, negotiations, deals and compromise between the two contending classes. These forces of reaction, attempting to infiltrate the revolutionary ranks, came under fire right from the beginning and we established no unity with them. Absolute struggle against their counter-revolutionary, liberal-bourgeois line has always been the guideline for our movement. That is why we have not only concretely analysed politics, the concentrated expression of the economic base, but also its reflection, the culture (in ideological form) the two comprising the superstructure.

A resolute struggle took place which, at times, became antagonistic in our organisation and outside it, between those whose theory and practice were two diametrically opposed, exclusive and independent entities, and those who were fully integrated in their theory and practice. This led to the polarisation of the progressive and the genuinely revolutionary forces, on one hand, and the retrogressive and decaying reactionary forces on the other. The retrogressive and reactionary forces did not consider development as a process, as unfolding of contradictions, then leaps from one stage to another, but instead, insisted that development is either one big sweep from nowhere to the heavenly kingdom, or is not possible at all. They distrusted comrades and showed contempt for those who were struggling to develop the movement from a lower to a higher level by fully linking the movement with mass struggles. The reactionary forces put forward 'self-cultivation' as the method for individual progress and attempted to mentally deduce criteria for a

'good revolutionary'. This was the expert line, which was in complete opposition to the mass line. The expert line is the line of the elitists, the people who 'talk big' and are ready to become obedient lackeys of the imperialist state. For example, the worst form in which it manifests itself generally is that "I can't take this responsibility because I am not developed" or "How are you absolutely sure that what you are doing is absolutely right" or "Such and such person is developing so he is good and such and such person is not developing so he is not good" etc. This expert line is based on the bourgeois world outlook which is detached, one-sided and subjective and does not see that the world, social, physical and biological is all in a state of motion, change and development, and that we can see that the coming into being of the new and the going into extinction of the old, and that all phenomena are inter-dependent and interconnected and develop because of the contradictions inherent in them.

Thus the contradiction between "Action with analysis" versus "Action without analysis", is in essence, and in its most general and particular form the contradiction between the proletarian world outlook and the bourgeois world outlook. While the former is objective, all-sided, takes into consideration all the phenomena in the most general and particular forms, and is based on the development, motion and change in a given historical period, the latter is one-sided, subjective, unscientific and historically untested. Within our movement we are faced with the two lines.

There are two most basic, general and universally accepted world outlooks: the bourgeois world outlook, the outlook of the old society, the outlook of the decaying classes, as against the proletarian world outlook, the outlook of the new society, the outlook of scientific socialism. The bourgeois world outlook is passing away because it supports the old relations between exploiter and exploited, favouring the exploiting classes. The proletarian outlook is developing in depth and application. It is progressive because it reflects the new relations, the rule of the vast majority under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The two world outlooks are in unity in so far as the two are the antagonistic aspects of the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie, between the old and the new, between the progressive and the retrogressive. The two are

in life and death struggle. Struggle between the two is absolute while unity is relative. The struggle between the two will remain absolute until class society is finally, completely and utterly demolished with the emergence of the classless society.

The modern Soviet revisionists, China's Khrushchev and "revisionist" parties all over the world are attempting to distort the truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, by wailing that the world is not divided into two antagonistic parts, into the socialist camp and the imperialist camp. They wail that there is no struggle between the working and oppressed people on one hand, and the U.S. imperialists, modern Soviet revisionists and their lackeys all over the world on the other hand. They have been drum-beating all over the world that the struggle between the two antagonistic camps is not absolute. On the contrary, they say that unity is absolute and struggle is relative. They are attempting to mislead the world revolutionary masses and their struggles by poisoning them with the bogus theory that "Two Combines into One" as against "One Divides into Two" as the correct formulation of the basis of all development, motion and change. They are doing so because they are accomplices of U.S. imperialism and enemies of the working and oppressed people. It serves their interests to weaken the national liberation struggles. That is why they are aiding and abetting the most reactionary, decadent and pernicious of U.S. imperialists, while viciously maligning and slandering the People's Republic of China and Mao Tsetung Thought. They advocate that the two antagonistic systems can exist together peacefully, and repress the sharpening of the contradiction, making it dormant through mutual agreement and action. As a result of the combined efforts of the U.S. imperialists and modern Soviet revisionists, a new, peaceful and heavenly system will be evolved. With this, their attempt is to create the subjective condition for the acceptance of "Big Power Chauvinism" so that the exploitation of the world's people can be continued at an unprecedented rate, with absolute disregard for the suffering of the people, forever.

"Two Combines into One" is not objective, but subjective, not all-sided but one-sided, not a revolutionary but a reactionary theory. It stems from the bourgeois world outlook because it is metaphysical and based on a purely subjective recognition of the need for

'unity' by the U.S. imperialists and their accomplices, modern Soviet revisionism, so that their exploitation of the people can continue unhindered. The need of the people is the direct opposite; the waging of absolute struggle against the most oppressive and decadent system of exploitation, U.S. imperialism and its accomplices, the modern Soviet revisionists. As the national liberation struggle of the working and oppressed people of the world are developing in scope and increasing in depth and breadth, the cries of the 'need' for 'peace' and 'unity' are also increasing in pitch. This whole approach, on the part of the modern Soviet revisionists is metaphysical, because it is based on mental deduction, and idealism, because the material demands of history run contrary to such a theory. While the modern Soviet revisionists, (just like the revisionists of the Bernstein and Kautsky type), do recognise the existence of the two antagonistic classes and are materialist in that respect what they recognise is not the objective law of the development of class society and class struggle, but they have a subjective understanding to undermine the people's struggles against the oppressive forces. They fail to recognise the need for absolute struggle against the exploiters. They only recognise the absolute need for "unity". This is an out and out bourgeois outlook - vulgar materialism - and it supports the imperialist cause. This is the bourgeois outlook because the bourgeoisie also clamour about the "commonness of interests", "working together", and the need for "minimising conflict" and a "united effort" to get rid of all "problems". Modern Soviet Revisionists are presenting the same ideas under the guise of "peaceful coexistence" and "world peace."

"One Divides into Two", the struggle between the two, one destroying the other and in the process destroying itself, giving rise to a new one, new unity, new system. It is objective and all-sided - it is a revolutionary theory. It properly and correctly presents the reality of an era in which imperialism is heading towards total collapse and socialism is winning world-wide victories. The bourgeois world outlook and bourgeoisie are threatened with extinction. As the class struggle develops in depth and breadth all over the world, the objective needs of the world proletariat call for still higher development of the struggle against U.S. imperialism, modern Soviet revisionism and all kinds of putrid decaying reaction. The mass revolutionary struggles

emphasise the need for the intensification of struggle. Working consciously with all-sided depth analysis, proletarians around the world are escalating the struggle against the bourgeois lines in all fields. The most advanced, earth-shaking and deep-going revolution in the People's Republic of China is personally led by Chairman Mao Tsetung, the greatest Marxist-Leninist of the era in which imperialism is heading for total collapse while socialism is winning world-wide victories.

"Two Combines into One" versus "One Divides into Two" is the contradiction in its particular form, and is the reflection of the most general, universal and essential contradiction, i.e. the contradiction between the bourgeois world outlook and the proletarian world outlook. This formulation is the dividing line between imperialists and their accomplices, the modern Soviet revisionists, and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolutionaries, imbued with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. The former stand for class compromise, capitulation and the abandonment of class struggle. The latter correctly supports the sharpening of class contradictions, defending of the people's rights, and the intensification of class struggle. Thus the contradiction is between "compromise" versus "conflict" or struggle versus abandonment of struggle.

Struggle is the essence of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought. Compromise is the essence of modern Soviet revisionism.

Everything in its development goes through a process of change, a continuous unfolding, coming into being and going away. This process is the struggle between the two most pronounced, defined and particular aspects of the most general, essential and universal contradiction in a given historical period. Today the most particular, defined and acute struggle is taking place between U.S. imperialism on one hand, and the genuinely anti-imperialist forces on the other. At the same time, whosoever denies the fact that all the imperialist forces are favoured by modern Soviet revisionism, and the anti-imperialist forces, by contrast, are favoured by the anti-revisionist and anti-imperialist forces, is not a dialectical materialist and is thus aiding the imperialist camp.

While the most general contradiction is between the bourgeois world outlook and the proletarian outlook, the most particular contradiction is between U.S. imperialism and modern Soviet revisionism on the one hand, and on the other hand all the imperialist, anti-revisionist forces, - the vast majority of the working and oppressed people of the world. This particular contradiction will be resolved by the defeat of U.S. imperialism and modern Soviet revisionism, by the victory of the national liberation struggles and the successful emergence of socialism with the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

Our struggle is one. It is a struggle against U.S. imperialism and its accomplice, modern Soviet revisionism. Whosoever is fighting U.S. imperialism and is not fighting modern Soviet revisionism, or is spreading illusions about modern Soviet revisionism or is discouraging ideological struggles for the sake of 'unity' is not our friend but our enemy. We must fight the enemy within the revolutionary ranks ! You cannot win with snakes in your pockets.

We must consciously participate in the international struggle, national struggle and local struggle. The three struggles are aspects of the one most general and universal struggle, i. e. the struggle against U.S. imperialism, its accomplice modern Soviet revisionism, and all other kinds of reaction. But failure to grasp this struggle in its particular peculiarity on the international, national and local levels in a given historical period is to be mechanical in approach and to be detached in struggle. Our task is not only to find the general relationship of the contradiction, but also the particular form it takes at various levels. It will not be possible to wage a successful struggle against the enemy if we do not go from a lower to a higher level, from particular to general, seeking truth from facts in order to change the situation. This means analysing the local conditions, correlating them with the national conditions, with a full perspective of the international struggle, thus consolidating our ranks against the common enemy in a comprehensive and detailed manner.

We are fully conscious of the fact that local struggles will not be successful without national struggle and that national struggle will not be successful without international struggle. It does not follow

that local struggles cannot be waged and in time converted into national struggle or vice versa, nor that the national struggle does not reflect the international struggle and vice versa. On the contrary, particular conditions demand a particular form of struggle.

Local, national and international struggles are external to the movement if the same struggles are not waged consciously within the movement on all levels. Some dogmatists do not relate the struggles on the local, national and international levels to the struggles within the movement and they consider their narrow circle as the entire movement and fail to serve the interests of the wider struggle. Or they dismiss the movement among the masses as not worth bothering about. We must smash this attitude if we are going to work wholly and entirely in the service of the people.

The all-sided integration of the movement with the masses, with the historical process, and with the general and particular revolutionary orientation, can be achieved by following the world proletarian outlook, i. e., Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. That is why the Internationalists in their theory and practice, place proper emphasis on the basis of motion, development and change in social sciences, natural sciences and other fields; the role of consciousness in the development of world revolutionary struggles and the role of the superstructure, its relation to the economic base, and the role it plays during the revolutionary struggles against U.S. imperialism, modern Soviet revisionism and all kinds of reaction. These three most general aspects of the whole activity of our movement have a profound effect on the development of political consciousness. Dogmatists, again, fail to see the role of these three factors, and thus, true to their essence, are against the core, the kernel of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought.

## ONE STRUGGLE : TWO ENEMIES

### THE ROLE OF CONTRADICTION IN HISTORY

According to the bourgeois world outlook, the outlook of the reactionary ruling circles, the world does not move, change or develop

on account of the contradictions inherent in a phenomenon. The bourgeois world outlook contends that society moves, not because of the contradictions inherent in social phenomena, but because of the one sided role of the thinking of the ruling class which, according to the bourgeois world outlook, determines social change. So, in the social sciences taught in bourgeois institutions, we are taught that history moves because of the activities of various Kings and Queens, warlords, landlords, Prime Ministers and Presidents. Thus, we learn that people have no role to play, and that the activities of this elite is determined not by social conditions, but by the innate qualities of inherently superior beings.

During the recent upsurge of Afro-Americans against the brutal rule of white racist and imperialist ruling circles, Arnold Toynbee, a most detached and objective stooge of the decaying system, declared that 'violence' is inherent in man, and that 'violence' will not be combated because of man's nature. Thus he simply declares that the struggle of the Afro-American people has nothing to do with the economic base and superstructure of the imperialist system. The root cause of violence is said to be external to the social system, but innate in the basic nature of man, rather than determined by the social system which serves the interests of the ruling circles, who must use violence to protect their private property rights.

On the other hand, more 'enlightened' bourgeois social scientists talk about the perceptual existence of 'ghettos' as the root source of the problem. They argue that the sooner these slums are removed, the sooner the problem will be solved. They fail to recognise that these slum areas are an organic part of imperialist society, and that they will not disappear without the destruction of their root cause - the cancerous system of imperialist exploitation - and that thus the only direction we can take is to prepare for struggle against the imperialist system. But the bourgeois world outlook, because of its one-sidedness, and because it starts from inside the brain and works to the outside world, moving from the "ego" to material conditions, supports the imperialist system. The historical perspective of these agents of the bourgeoisie is metaphysical and idealist because it serves their interests to have it so, the interests of the reactionary and retrogressive imperialist

system.

The bourgeois world outlook considers change in the individual possible only if there exists the inherent possibility within that individual to bring about change. But when dealing with society, they change their stance to suggest that society changes, not because of contradictions inherent in the system, but because of the external role played by various members of the elite. Thus they are confounding right and wrong. While the basis of development and change, of consciousness and social law is the relations entered into by human beings in the struggle against nature, still, the basis of change within society is not a result of the roles played by individual men, but occurs because of the contradictions inherent in any given system. We can see quite clearly, for example, how class society developed from slavery to wage slavery. We can also see the continuous, progressive movement away from the non-scientific, to the scientific system of socialism. With the development of class society, we also see the development of class struggle, of scientific experimentation and production. Equally, we see the profound development of human consciousness.

As we have seen, the bourgeois theory of historical development is entirely one-sided. So is their theory of knowledge and consciousness. Because of the bourgeois world outlook and the interests of the reactionary ruling circles, the whole 'national culture' is developed to support the basic contention that history has already "become", that no further change can take place and that all future changes in detail will be brought about by the ingenuity of individual human beings. It is true that things have "become" for the bourgeoisie, and that the future development reflected in their present struggles calls for their extinction. The bourgeoisie is not the majority of the world's people, for whom things are in the process of becoming, for whom the future is bright, and for whom the day is coming when the world's people will be in the majority, and the elite in the minority. The democratic struggles of the world's people are gaining momentum. The day is not far off when the agents of crime, of ghosts and dragons and of misery will finally be wiped out.

What role does the bourgeois world outlook play in our movement?

How is it reflected ? How can it be combated ?

The role of the bourgeois world outlook in a revolutionary movement is, of course, one of subversion, of counter-revolution, which weakens the movement. But the forms it takes are sometimes hard to detect. The most important aspect that needs attention at the moment is the fact that some genuine and sincere comrades, who have a genuine progressive outlook, because of the dominant, rigid, imperialist cultural influence, fail to see that influence on their working style and way of living etc.. This attitude is consolidated in their one-sided view of history, i.e. their failure to see the development of the economic base and the cultural superstructure, and their corresponding incorrect appreciation of the role of the superstructure. These comrades are dialectical in their approach only to the extent that they see class struggle in the most general form, and in a mechanical manner, failing to see the class struggle that goes on in their working style and way of living. Historical development is all-sided and deep, unfolding the profoundest aspects of existence. But these comrades fail also to see that the decay of the monopoly capitalist system demands also the further decay of the superstructures. All those who fail to see this fact are mechanical in their approach.

The cultural disintegration of the imperialist society is not an accident, but a natural consequence of the decay of the economic base. Similarly, the development of socialist economic base demands the development of socialist superstructures. This can only be comprehended if we are creative in our application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. By doing so, the comrades who, up to now, have failed to fully understand, will also come to see and appreciate the role of conscious understanding in historical development.

To be mechanical, unconscious, and only subjectively in favour of class struggle, is to go over to the enemy and to be metaphysical and idealist in approach. This attitude within the movement is poisonous. We have some comrades who are dogmatists, who measure revolutionaries with an arbitrary "yardstick" rather than by conscious analysis of the facts. These comrades are the epitome of laziness, complacency and pigheadedness. They

interfere with the development of ideological struggles, are sloppy in the execution of tasks, and if they are allowed to have their way will finally lead the movement into total isolation from the masses. When dealing with the masses, they are dry, detached and dogmatic-completely unsympathetic to the cause of the people. They consider themselves as the creators of the revolution. By contrast, the correct approach is to see the masses and the masses alone as the makers of history, with ourselves as their servants. The dogmatists are merely another "elite" who think they are doing the masses a favour by supporting the revolution. In brief these comrades fail to help the movement, because they do not look at the organization as an organic thing, always developing and in the process of change. Instead they see it as dead, rigid and without a future. Thus they cannot see the contradictions inherent in the revolutionary organization and fail to organize in support of the progressive side. They see no contradiction between internal and external between investigation and agitation, between the mass of the people and the revolutionary vanguard, between theory and practice, between democracy and centralism. They look at things one-sidedly, usually in terms of "us" and "them", and fail to see the concrete contradiction.

The Internationalists, because of their total allegiance to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, have developed a revolutionary style of work based on the recognition of the particular need and demand of history - the intensification of the struggle against the common enemy. They recognise that the enemy wears two faces - that of U.S. imperialism, and that of modern Soviet revisionism. They recognise that the contradictions within the movement can only be resolved by waging struggles by following the Three Basic Guidelines. And finally, they recognise that without fully integrating with and mobilising the masses, we cannot have a revolution, nor fully develop the Four Levels of Work. This working style takes into consideration the fact that development means the unfolding and resolution of contradictions, and that this is true of the most general struggles as well as of the most particular struggles, and that it is our responsibility to remain in contact with the process of history.

Thus, we have contradictions on the local, national and

international levels. We also have contradictions within various revolutionary organisations.

The Internationalists correctly analysed in 1963 that there was no "academic atmosphere" on campuses. When we organized on that basis, we were not going against the trend of various 'revolutionary' movements who were fighting for peace, organizing on single issues and were very busy learning 'Marxism-Leninism' by rote.

The most general, basic and universal contradiction between exploiter and exploited on the international level, was reflected in the university by the abundance of one-sided reactionary 'facts'. The academic system was based on the memorization of 'facts' on the perceptual level. There was no possibility for dialogue on a concrete basis. All arguments were countered by the facile provision of mental reasons. Material conditions were ignored. Under these circumstances, the first task was to create an "academic atmosphere" by encouraging people to read, develop and exchange ideas, in order to confront the reactionary institution and build a material base for the development of revolutionary struggle against the oppressor class.

Thus, it was correct to give this slogan, because only through such a programme could the most universal contradiction be resolved. Any other slogans were counter-revolutionary. We advocated "Action with Analysis" as against complacent acceptance of "Action without Analysis". Through "Action with Analysis" on the local level, we participated in national and international struggle. By correlating the problems in the university, we related our problems to the monopoly capitalist system. We correctly analysed that overproduction in the capitalist system has generated a system of consumption which, in essence, stands for the repression of the "living ideas in one's mind" in order to serve the negative principle of "getting along for the purpose of keeping a job", and the buying of lost initiative by participating in the consumption of objects. This consumer life was the sole basis of the vacuousness, oppression and general degradation felt by the large majority of the petit-bourgeoisie in imperialist society.

We moved from the slogan of 'creating an academic atmosphere' on the campus to "Action with Analysis" to "Understanding requires the conscious participation of the individual in the act of finding-out". This latter was the slogan used to organize students, to fight the cold war and reactionary propaganda, to combat revisionists and trotskyists, to wage vigorous struggles in the classrooms, the community and the factories. "Class - struggle in the classroom" means organizing students to fight imperialism. Once the basic analysis is developed, then all the other problems come easy. But when organizations, on account of cold-war rhetoric and other fears, consciously avoid the real problems, they move away from the people toward the general betrayal of the people's struggles.

The early part of the sixties was a period when revolutionary organizations should have organized large-scale ideological struggles. But this was not done. Instead, emphasis was laid on detached action on isolated issues. Theory was detached from practice. One became 'revolutionary' by adopting left-wing phraseology and verbiage, while remaining totally bourgeois in attitude and outlook. These people did not put forward the basic contradiction in history; they did not sharpen contradictions; they avoided confrontation through compromise. The main culprits who followed this policy were the modern Soviet revisionists. They compromised with imperialism on all major issues. The Irish revisionists were no different. Nor were the English, Canadian, or any other. All of them followed the Khrushchevist line and betrayed the revolutionary struggles. If we do not have ideological struggle among the masses, how then, will the political consciousness of the masses develop? The revisionist clique has provided no answer. They showed no interest in discussing the issue, and finally degenerated even further into unashamedly supporting the alliance of U.S. imperialism with the modern Soviet revisionist clique.

Our movement was not far enough developed to combat this erroneous line, and we expected 'anti-revisionist' groups to fulfill the task. But these groups also were quacks, most of whom had no contact with the masses. They recognised the historical and theoretical errors of revisionism without understanding its

organizational faults. They failed to go to the masses, organizing themselves instead around various pubs in order to carry on cozy discussions in the air. Some of them advocated that 'revisionists' can only be defeated by the expert 'anti-revisionists'. They failed to correlate the most general (ie. theoretical) errors of revisionism to their most particular errors (ie. the way they failed to apply historical lessons to their own situation in various groups). They smugly carried out 'ideological struggles'. They, too, failed to grasp the role of contradiction in the development of history. They considered contradiction universally and generally but remained oblivious to the fact that they themselves were one-sided, subjective and mechanical.

The Internationalists recognised the contradiction between themselves and the enemy in the most general and the most particular form. This contradiction stood out in various forms at various levels. There are still those within our own organization who have either no capacity to grasp the role of contradiction in the development of various phenomena, or are actively liberal and bourgeois.

## ONE STRUGGLE : TWO ENEMIES

### THE ROLE OF CONSCIOUSNESS IN HISTORY

The bourgeois world outlook considers knowledge to be the accumulation of mentally-deduced data, and consciousness as the memorizing of that data. Consciousness, to the bourgeois is one-sided, subjective, and detached from the problems of the real world. Bourgeois educational institutions impart this consciousness to their 'elite' by processing individuals through an educational factory, the net product of which is a bourgeoisified human being, willing to have 'respect' for a master, and nothing but contempt for the masses.

The bourgeois theory of knowledge is the theory of pure reason, the theory of one-sided deduction of laws from 'facts' which are unscientific and which cannot be historically tested. For example, bourgeois authorities in the social sciences and natural sciences

lay a great deal of emphasis on the external causes responsible for the development of the existence of certain phenomena. Social phenomena are described by these bourgeois academicians as stemming from man's innate qualities which are imposed upon the external world. Never are social phenomena described as the consequence of the contradictions inherent in them.

These concepts are faulty. The bourgeois concept of a human being pretends to refer to an absolute quality of humanity, which in fact, is merely bourgeois humanity, and in no sense absolute or eternal. Man's response to the environment can only be tested if it is done on a scientific level and examined historically. Meanwhile, the bourgeois scientist pays no attention to the overwhelming evidence that man's social consciousness is the product of the superstructure and the economic base in any given society. Man's cultural advancement is dependent on the stage of the means of production, the productive forces, the scientific experimentation and the class struggle. According to the bourgeois theories, some nations are intrinsically incapable of achieving the level of cultural and economic development of the imperialist and revisionist countries. These theories are propagated to help the imperialists and revisionists mislead the masses of the people into believing that the progress of a country is not possible without the aid of U.S. imperialism or modern Soviet revisionists, in other words, that advancement is not possible without slavery.

In opposition to the bourgeois world outlook, the proletarian world outlook considers knowledge as the product of the material activity of man in terms of struggle for production, class-struggle and scientific experimentation. Man's consciousness is the reflection of the material conditions of the society. In their struggle against nature, men enter into certain relations of production determined by the economic base and its superstructure. Man's conscious activity stems from man's struggle with nature. Man is the father; earth, the mother of all products. According to the Marxist theory of knowledge, consciousness does not develop because of a one-sided, subjective and passive accumulation of data. Man's consciousness develops because of the contradictions inherent in the process of the development of the society and is caused by the bitter struggle which takes place

between contending classes, interests and nature.

Our theory of knowledge, as developed by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung, is a theory based on the concept that everything develops moves or changes because of the contradictions inherent in that thing. The basis for change is internal. The external condition comes into being because of the internal basis. Following this line, the role of consciousness or conscious understanding of phenomena is vital to any human activity in any given historical period. "Conscious understanding of phenomena" involves the isolation of the most general contradiction from its most particular expressions. The general exists only in the particular, and only from thence can it be isolated.

Thus, human consciousness develops out of grappling with phenomena, finding contradictions, and moulding our outlook accordingly. It is imperative that all revolutionaries understand the fact that without conscious participation there can be no real revolutionary movement, because "conscious participation" is the only way in which the revolutionary vanguard can come into possession of the vitally important scientific attitude.

The masses have no role to play in the imperialist and modern revisionist countries. Thus consciousness plays no role in the affairs of these countries. In fact, they force a system of rules and regulations on all the labouring masses to oppress them. Under the socialist system, however, real consciousness and the masses play the dominant role, "Mass-line" is the conscious participation of the masses in the solving of various problems confronting them. This is the line followed in the People's Republic of China under the brilliant leadership of Mao Tsetung Thought. By contrast, the 'expert line' develops rules and regulations to enslave the masses, keeping them in ignorance so that they will continue to serve the ruling classes.

The 'revisionist' consciousness is the consciousness of "Two Combines into One", of class collaboration, and of capitulation to U.S. imperialism. This can only be done by vulgarization of Marxism-Leninism, by slanders of Mao Tsetung, the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our era, and by distrust of the masses.

Imperialist consciousness is consciousness of the most detached and predatory nature, and is in total opposition to the interests of the masses. Imperialists also talk about class collaboration and "commonness of interests" - with imperialists as eternal rulers and the labouring masses as minions.

"Action with Analysis" versus "Action without Analysis"; "Conscious participation" versus "Participation by following rules and regulations blindly"; "Learning Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in the process of solving concrete problems" versus "Learning Marxism-Leninism by rote"; "Theory of knowledge based on scientific investigation and historically tested ideas" versus "Theory of knowledge based on mystery, on experience of the elitist in isolation from the struggles of the masses, on mental deductions and on historically untested ideas"; "Mass line" versus "Expert line"; "Socialist ethics ('Three Constantly Read' articles by Mao Tsetung) to serve the people" versus "Imperialist ethics to serve the fascists and imperialists to make super -profits for them in return for crumbs of bread" - these are the forms in which the most general and widespread contradiction between the proletarian world outlook and the bourgeois world outlook can be seen.

## ONE STRUGGLE : TWO ENEMIES

### THE ROLE OF MASS STRUGGLES IN HISTORY

The core of the ideological system of the exploiting classes is egoism and selfishness. As a result of the thousands of years of the existence of private property, such egoism has a deep-rooted influence.

The whole superstructure created on the economic base supports this egoism and selfishness. Because the motive for production is the making of profit under all circumstances and by any means, the imperialist society is teeming with contradictions. The superstructure is falling apart. Art and literature for example, are reduced largely to pornography because of the profitability of the trade. Everything from sports to the last detail in the home is

controlled by a super-profit-making complex. The educational system is clearly not geared to the development of human understanding or toward the encouragement of people to undertake productive activity. Instead, degrees are bestowed for the sole purpose of serving imperialism. Slavishness, selfishness and the lackey mentality are rewarded above all else. Children are brought up in imperialist society to look after their money, to be selfish and competitive without any regard for the welfare of the masses.

This forms the core of bourgeois 'individualism', which is really nothing except the right to be anti-people. This individualism is presented as something above question, like bourgeois law, politics, economics and social mores. Everything is for itself, detached and isolated from everything else. Everything exists for its own sake.

Under the imperialist system in the U.S. and other countries, this has brought about the disintegration of the social cohesiveness on one hand, while on the other hand giving rise to its antithesis, the development of mass anti-imperialist struggles. These mass struggles are not detached but are a real response of the progressive forces to eliminate the oppressive system of imperialism. The bourgeois superstructure, along with its economic base, is decaying rapidly. The alternative is also developing in leaps and bounds.

But this alternative is being confused by the popularisation of anti-communism and racism under the notions of 'modernising Marx', or having 'your own brand of Communism'. This is achieved by the inculcation into the minds of the masses of seventeenth and eighteenth century notions, such as the idea that "opinions govern the world" or that "it is up to you to believe what you want to believe". In other words, anti-communist and racist propaganda is being done to force the masses to accept the bourgeois world outlook. This work is done by popularising renegades and flunkies from Marxism-Leninism and by distorting the true picture of actual historical development. On the other hand, gloom is spread that nothing can be done about the problems which confront us. The only hope for the bourgeoisie is to render

the broad masses of the people passive by means of putting up 'experts' as the only people capable of correcting the situation.

Under the bourgeois system of private property, the vast majority of the broad masses are deprived of their basic rights. They have no role to play in the running of the society which converts them into producers on one hand and into consumers on the other. Mass initiative and participation in dealing with problems is discouraged. A tremendous amount of propaganda is poured into the mass-media against mass agitations. Experts' talk about the 'generation gap' as the root cause of the problem. Imperialists are desperately trying to repress the revolutionary will of the masses.

Last year, a fortnight before the Historic Necessity For Change Conference ended its deliberations, another conference wound up its business with the organization of a 'happening'. This conference, supported by the liberal bourgeois press, and blessed by the bourgeois authorities, herded up all the 'New Left', 'Marxist', and 'revolutionary scholars' and terminated with a full page advertisement in the London Times in favour of legalising marijuana. This conference, though it had 'revolutionary pretensions' called for rebellion against the bourgeois system by simply advocating individual indulgence in all kinds of perverse and decadent activities. Instead of calling for mass struggles against the bourgeois culture, the conference ratified still further degenerate bourgeois activities. The sole motive of this conference was to confuse and mislead the broad masses of the youth and students. This involves an appeal to the egos of these people by providing them with objects for their satisfaction, and protecting the interests of the imperialists by doing so.

This 'egoism', core of the ideological system of the exploiting classes, can only be combated by fully realising the importance of mass-struggles in history. Without the participation of the masses in the making of history, nothing is possible. The conscious participation of the masses in the making of world history, defeating the imperialists and their accomplices, the modern Soviet revisionists, is the motive force behind all our activities. But we cannot wage mass struggles by keeping bourgeois individualism, subjectivism and liberalism in our dealing with the problems of the masses, in the analysis of the concrete conditions, and in the execution of the various tasks confronting us. Neither can we wage struggles in isolation, away from the masses.

People who advocated "Action without Analysis" are afraid of mass struggles. They were bourgeois in their outlook and participated actively in the expression of 'egoism' and 'selfishness in their attitude towards others. These were pleasure seekers who cried for 'peace' so that their pleasure-seeking could continue. Their motive for pleasure-seeking was in direct contradiction with their 'professed aims' and they always propagated the imperialist culture.

Pleasure-seeking, indulgence in the consumption of objects, and "Action without Analysis" are the characteristics of 'New Left Types', 'philistines' and other bankrupt agents of the bourgeoisie. They have no place in the genuinely revolutionary struggles because these forces dampen the mass initiative. A large number of these people are genuinely confused and misled and we must help them to understand the direction towards which the historical process is heading. And the best way to help them is to introduce them to mass struggles, educate them and arm them with the proletarian world outlook.

The Internationalists have shown full faith in the masses in their five years of activity by properly relying on the masses and by supporting "Action with Analysis". The modern Soviet revisionists on the other hand, are the worst enemies of the people because they stand against mass struggles. Instead, they support elitist politics. The same is true of the imperialists. The only way the two can be smashed is by relying fully on mass struggles and standing firmly by the masses at all times. Egocentric 'Marxists', bourgeois individualists and subjectivists can solely be looked after through mass struggles, and not through 'private' chats. It was incorrect on our part to undertake 'private' discussions with these groups on the anti-imperialist, anti-revisionist front because their main motive is to satisfy their selfishness and harm the revolutionary movement. This situation was corrected soon after the Historic Necessity For Change Conference.

## THREE GUIDELINES

### NO.1

#### GUIDELINES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF FRATERNAL RELATIONS

Relationships between organizations and individuals are developed from the fundamental recognition of common aims and common

grounds. The common grounds must be developed in practice by pursuing the following guidelines:

1. There must exist a unity in theory and practice between individuals and organizations.

a: All relations must stem from the deep urge to further the common struggle against imperialism, and not just the development of organization as such.

b: All agreements on policy and method of work must be ratified and then made public in a manner mutually agreed upon by the organizations concerned.

c: All organizations and individuals who proclaim their anti-imperialist intent in theory but in practice are furthering the interests of imperialism (by making unprincipled criticisms of organizations and individuals or by causing dissension on account of individualist or subjectivist reasons) have no common grounds with genuinely anti-imperialist organizations.

d: Organizations and individuals who in theory align themselves against imperialism, but in practice fail to unify with other genuinely anti-imperialist forces must be exposed and there can be no unity with them (e.g., dogmatists and left-wing sectarians).

e: Fraternal relations amongst organizations must develop out of mutual experience and must serve the anti-imperialist cause. Fraternal relations based on hearsay are bound to deteriorate and are bound to hamper the development of a genuinely anti-imperialist movement.

f: Contradictions between fraternal organizations and individuals will exist and will be resolved through struggle. The people who advocate peace and unity at all costs must be critically dealt with. Unity-struggle-transformation must be the guidelines. It is the solving of contradictions not the evasion of them that will consolidate an organization.

g: All fraternal relations must, in principle, be considered temporary—what is permanent is the recognition of the necessity for unity against the common enemy. This will increase vigilance and enhance consolidation.

h; All differences between the two organizations must be critically discussed in a principled manner in private and, if and when the differences become basic, and there are no possibilities of unity, then all discussions and differences must be put forward to the public. In all cases the motivation for so doing must be to further the people's struggle and to increase vigilance against imperialism.

2. Violation of the above guidelines in theory or in practice must be considered basically counter-revolutionary at which stage any pretensions about being united in common struggle against the enemy must be labelled fraudulent.

## THREE GUIDELINES

### NO. 2

#### GUIDELINES FOR CRITICISM AND SELF-CRITICISM

1. Criticism-self-criticism is a revolutionary weapon in the hands of the Internationalists to strengthen the fighting capacity of our organisation and the working capacity of our cadres. It is a revolutionary weapon because it is used for the sole purpose of eliminating what is erroneous and divisive, and consolidating what is correct and progressive; unity-struggle-transformation is the guideline, and thus our ranks are closed against the common enemies of the people.

Criticism and self-criticism is the essential basis, or the kernel, of our organization, because it is the only militant, progressive way of acknowledging what is progressive and developing it further, creating principled contradictions and so purging the movement of bourgeois ideas and practices, and organizing rectification campaigns to strengthen the positive against the negative and to heighten our vigilance against the negative.

2. What differentiates a genuine Internationalist from everybody else is his organic capacity to relate the theory and practice of the organization to the theory and practice of each member. The genuine Internationalist consciously contributes to the moulding and developing of the individual to the theory and practice of the organization.

3. The aim of criticism-self-criticism is to develop the dialectical relationship between motive and effect, the individual and the organization, the organization and the masses, democracy and centralism.

The motto of our organization is SEEK TRUTH TO SERVE THE PEOPLE. All genuine Internationalists seek truth by analysing the objective world in its concrete historical development, analysing the objective deeds of the organization and its members in their historical development, and then relating their analysis to the motive of the organization and the political necessities of our epoch. Criticism which is based on historical analysis of investigated facts enables us to relate motive to social practice, and so to correct social practice .

Every cycle of struggle develops political consciousness, and deeper consciousness enables the individual to strengthen his "deep urge to further the common struggle against imperialism", which is the motive for unity in our organization and which in turn strengthens the fighting capacity of our organization.

Criticism to us means seeking truth for the sole purpose of serving the people. Self-criticism involves winning the approval of the masses for the motive and effect of our organization. In the past some Internationalists have practiced criticism-self-criticism, but with emphasis on getting approval from the organization for their motive and effect, thus depriving criticism-self-criticism of its essence, ie. "winning the approval of the masses".

In the final analysis, criticism-self-criticism must strengthen our "deep urge to further the common struggle against imperialism", with the effect that we win the approval of the masses on a wider and deeper scale, thus weakening the enemy and strengthening ourselves.

4. To have criticism-self-criticism without aiming to win the approval of the masses is to forget its essence and to practice it so as to develop the organization and its members as such. All criticism-self-criticism must take place as the result of the concrete demands of the masses.

To remain aloof from the problems of the masses and to organize activities just for the organization and its members is objectively to go over to the enemy camp. This attitude is in direct contradiction to the motive of our organization, and must be combated through active ideological struggles.

Criticism-self-criticism is the recognition of the necessity of winning the approval of the large masses of the people against the common enemy. Some comrades consider criticism-self-criticism as just another programme which is part of the Four Levels of Work, and so destroy it as a revolutionary weapon to strengthen the movement, making it a bureaucratic exercise. This can be corrected by waging an uncompromising struggle against criticism-self-criticism which develops out of factional struggles within the movement, or out of panic at the gravity of the situation. Members who conduct criticism-self-criticism in this way would like to attack the organization and use it for their own ends.

5. Self-criticism is not a "confessional session". Some comrades will confess to all the crimes in the world, without making any effort to discover the principal contradiction in their actions and to see them in their historical relations. They are therefore unable to correct their social practice, and in fact make the same mistakes the next day. Self-criticism means finding the main contradiction, analysing its opposing parts, deciding which aspect is dominant and what are its ramifications. This enables one to struggle with the dominant aspect in its particular forms and so correct oneself.

Those comrades who reduce their past actions to a homogeneous blackness or whiteness do not want to admit to themselves what their specific role in the movement has been. They seek to protect their souls, and not to strengthen their "deep urge to further the common struggle against imperialism".

6. All genuine Internationalists must be absolutely clear that criticism-self-criticism can only take place under specific material conditions and that the nature and extent of the struggle being waged will determine the nature and extent of criticism-self-criticism. It is pure idealism to think that there is an

eternal yardstick by which members can be judged. The nature and extent of criticism must be based on the immediate and ultimate needs of the movement. In the past, some comrades offered rigorous criticism of the ideology and motives of others when, in fact, the main task of the organization was to develop unity on the basis of "struggle to get rid of personal hang-ups" and "struggle against cold-war slogans". At this time criticism of ideology was inappropriate-what was needed was specific criticism of the liberal attitudes of various individuals. Instead of this, members were damned as having "theoretical possibilities" or "inherently bad motives". When the time came for the ideological struggle and discussion of motive, and when conditions were ripe to combat idealistic and empirio-critical tendencies, the same comrades panicked and started "group within the group activities", raising mental problems, and basing criticism on minor rather than major issues. If criticism-self-criticism does not meet the immediate and ultimate demands of the struggle, it is wasting the resources of the organization.

7. Criticism means seeking truth from facts and using the truth to change the world. Some comrades are good at criticising, but can only do so in a detached and isolated manner. They fail to wage an incessant struggle against erroneous ideas and practices, but content themselves with delivering "sermons" or "damning" the movement.

This one-sided 'analytical' approach does not start from the needs of the people but from a subjectivist 'analysis' and ignores the effect criticism may have on the common struggle against imperialism. The root cause of this and other erroneous forms of criticism-self-criticism is liberal bourgeois ideas, which appear in the form of empirio-criticism, mechanical materialism, and idealistic dialectics. When criticising, comrades with predominantly liberal-bourgeois ideas adopt a detached and purely analytical course of action. In other words they become "critics" and the organization becomes something detached from them which they are criticising. They eliminate themselves from the picture by failing to present their true historical role, and refuse to analyse the political necessities or to see how criticism can help the movement go forward. This

attitude can be eradicated by intensifying struggles on all levels, in the execution of tasks and in exposing those who are taking liberal attitudes in ideological struggles and in dealing with personal problems of individuals.

8. Some comrades within our movement do not understand the historical tasks of the movement or how they will be executed. These comrades live from one event to the next, and refuse to find out what is happening. Such comrades raise questions like "why don't we criticise such-and-such person?", "why doesn't so-and-so undertake self-criticism?", "nobody else really knows how committed I am to the movement", "how can you organize without my approval?", "why doesn't so-and-so say something?" or "such-and-such persons are developing, others are not". Strict rules and regulations, including rigorous criticism-self-criticism and ideological struggles in the masses, will help these comrades.

9. All genuine Internationalists understand that the people and the people alone are the makers of world history. Without a revolutionary theory and a revolutionary vanguard, the people have nothing. But without the active participation of the people in the revolutionary struggles, the revolutionary theory and the revolutionary vanguard are no good. The revolutionary theory is a guide to action. This guide to action means winning the approval and confidence of the masses. The liberal bourgeois are afraid of the masses, and only discuss problems in the open in an attempt to confuse the masses and win their approval in that way. When confronted by genuine revolutionaries, they take refuge in their privacies, and "would rather have discussions behind closed doors". The best way of eliminating these people from the revolutionary ranks and of helping them to get rid of their bad habits is to wage SELF-CRITICISM IN PRACTICE STRUGGLES among the masses. Nothing is worth hiding from the masses. This can only be achieved by a process of educating the masses, learning from them, and uniting with them. The tasks of the movement must be based on the tasks of the people.

SELF-CRITICISM IN PRACTICE must start from the general motive and move to the particular practice. It must be consciously kept in mind that the sole purpose of doing so is to

weaken the enemy and strengthen ourselves.

## THREE GUIDELINES

### NO.3

#### GUIDELINES FOR BUILDING MASS DEMOCRACY

1. In organizing mass democracy, our motive is to increase the political consciousness of the masses, release their initiative and unify them against our common enemy.

2. We must be fully conscious of the fact that a genuine mass-democratic struggle is a strong weapon in the hands of the genuinely progressive people to expose and demolish the 'ghosts' and 'dragons' spread by various imperialist stooges, modern Soviet revisionists, trotskysts, and other reactionaries. Only by initiating mass ideological struggles for democratic rights and struggling for better living, can we unify the masses against all the anti-people forces. We must fully rely on the people and help them. "The masses and the masses alone are the makers of world history."

3. Political consciousness of the masses and their capability to fight will not be enhanced if we keep our ideas away from the masses, have contempt for them and sneer at the thought of involving them in the solving of various problems. For this reason we must expose the anti-people forces to the masses. This cannot be done without waging mass ideological struggles amongst the masses.

4. Ideas are a great weapon which are used by the reactionary as well as by the revolutionary forces, but with different motives. The motive of reactionary ideas is to enslave the masses. The inculcation of the bourgeois world outlook is harmful to the fighting ability of the masses. But the motive of revolutionary ideas is to serve the people and increase their vigilance against retrogressive and reactionary ideas. Once ideas are grasped by the masses they become a material force to unify people to march forward and bring about the downfall of the backward ruling circles. Building mass democracy is a revolutionary way of achieving the growth of revolutionary ideas amongst the people. That is why reactionaries dread the thought of having their

ideas exposed to the masses. Thus, in order to expose reactionaries and their putrid, decaying ideas, it is imperative that mass ideological struggles take place.

5. In organizing mass democracy, we must first work out our ideas in our units, learn from the rich experience of other mass struggles - the experiences of other countries e.g. the Great October Revolution and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, and then demonstrate them to the masses by closely remaining in the context of their struggles. Any forms of social chauvinism or resistance to learning from other people's and other countries' experience is to go over to the enemy and to harm the people's cause. Thus working out ideas in the context of the struggles of the masses, fully relying on all genuine revolutionary experience, and putting faith in the masses by raising all issues amongst the masses, is the role of building mass democracy.

6. All genuine Internationalists must put their ideas to the test of the masses. They must not be afraid that their ideas will be proven wrong or rejected by the masses. As Comrade Mao Tse-tung points out, that "If we have shortcomings, we are not afraid to have them pointed out and criticised, because we serve the people". But without bringing our ideas to the masses we will not be able to see our shortcomings and have them corrected.

7. Mass ideological struggles are neither empty debates nor discussions of ideas which inhabit the skies. Building mass democracy means organizing the masses to solve concrete problems confronting them. Building mass democracy for its own sake is counter-revolutionary and must be opposed. All sophistry, rhetoric, uninvestigated ideas, must be outlawed by mobilising the masses against them. "No investigation, no right to speak" must be the guideline.

8. Care should be taken to expose those who partake in mass democracy meetings only in order to glorify themselves, especially those who are loud-mouthed, and who present themselves as 'experts' instead of as part of the masses. They are, at best, empirio-critics, and at worst idealist phrase-mongers. Their

main motive is to 'advise' and 'criticise' and they claim themselves to be most objective. Building mass democracy means participation of the masses in the development of ideas for the sole purpose of dealing with a concrete situation. "Follow Mass Line in Everything" must be the guideline. To be detached, isolated and above the masses means to be a tyrant, and 'expert' and an anti-people force.

9. Lastly, all whispers and slanders against genuine revolutionary organisations and the people must be brought to the mass democracy meetings. Imperialists, modern Soviet revisionists, trotskyists and various other liberal bourgeois partake in slander, character assassination and gossip as a means of furthering their political ends. We must expose them to the masses, bar them from mass meetings if they persist in those activities and draw a clear line between ourselves and the enemy. Anybody who refuses to come under the discipline of the masses must be severely dealt with.

## FOUR LEVELS OF WORK

The Internationalists are an organization of a "new type". They are of a "new type" because they are consciously based on the Four Levels of Work. The Four Levels of Work have been developed from a low level to a high level in the process of our development. Since 1963, ours has been the only youth and student movement based on "Action with Analysis". All other liberal-bourgeois youth and student organizations have either been involved in elitist politics of the student councils, or engrossed in problems of 'peace'. Our organization alone called for the "creation of an academic atmosphere in the universities", which in practice meant the initiation and development of struggle on the cultural level and in ideological form. We were the only organization which stood against cold war rhetoric and anti-communism, including all the muck of pacifism.

"Action with Analysis" meant adoption of a two-level organ-

isation. The first level consisted of the leading cadres. The second level took place in mass ideological struggles. "Action with Analysis" necessitated the development of revolutionary theory as well as the revolutionary vanguard. By the fall of 1966, the Internationalists not only began the development of organizational structures at more organized and formal levels, but they also introduced a weekly newspaper against prevailing ideas and practices. This newspaper became the major organ of agitation and thus gave rise to the third level of work. This level was the development of a material base in which a left-wing stand was possible. The academic discussion session gave place to a formal investigational institute, thus completing the growth and consolidation on the initial level of all levels of work which are necessary for genuinely revolutionary and democratic work.

The Internationalists are different from all other organizations because they demand "conscious participation of the individual in the act of finding out", which can only be achieved if organic and workable structures exist in the material world. Four Levels of Work is an organic and workable organizational structure because it depends on the initiative of the individual and the masses for successful growth. The Four Levels of Work clearly points out the path which all individuals who advocate genuinely revolutionary action must follow. It is Democratic Centralism in Action. The Four Levels of Work structure is supported by three guidelines so that the single and common struggle against the two enemies of the world's people can be waged on a large scale and on a deeper level.

The Four Levels of Work, first of all, involves internal consolidation of the vanguard group which analyses the facts and is guided by them (ie. "Action with Analysis"). Without internal consolidation and analysis, the vanguard group cannot lead mass ideological struggles. Our slogan is INTERNAL CONSOLIDATION: EXTERNAL STRENGTH.

Internal consolidation without revolutionary theory is impossible. It was therefore necessary to develop analysis of "corporate-sensate" culture, which was provided during the historic Necessity For Change Study Programme on February 15, 1967. Once the

analysis of imperialist society was presented to the membership, the movement quickly stepped from a relatively perceptual level to the conceptual level. It became clear that the individual problems of the student stemmed from the consumer industry of the monopoly capitalist society.

An alternative emerged in the process of this realisation; either move forward and further consolidate the revolutionary ranks by consciously and creatively adopting Marxism-Leninism as a guide to action, or go backward. The majority of the members went forward. They waged mass ideological struggles and paved the ground for the acceptance of progressive ideology against the reactionary cold war rhetoric and sophistry. Rhetoric and sophistry were banned at an early stage in our development. Cold war slogans were the next target. With the rise of the conceptual basis of our members, it became obvious that more than six months of production of our newspaper had a tremendous effect on the broad masses. They became more aware of the real world. The anti-consciousness of the liberal-bourgeois was questioned and exposed. This was external consolidation, which culminated in the upsurge of mass democracy at Trinity College in Dublin, and the rise of the movement in England, Ireland, Quebec and Canada.

As the external consolidation increased, it necessitated the establishment of a genuinely revolutionary investigational institute. An increasing number among the broad masses were asking for further "analysis", direction and guidance. This could not have been done on the previous informal basis, since it demanded prior preparation in terms of dealing with the concrete and particular problems of the masses. In the beginning of our movement, the problems of the masses were discussed on a randomized basis. But as the movement developed, the masses put forward their problems in particular and concrete form, necessitating the establishment of the Ideological Institute, which was accomplished on February 15, 1968.

Various aspects of the movement need explanation if we are to appreciate the full importance of the Four Levels of Work. It must be adequately explained how "Action with Analysis" led to the

incorporation of revolutionary ideology in the general framework of the organization. We must become aware of how various organs of the movement were no more than the necessary consequence of the growth of the movement. This needs special emphasis because several liberal-bourgeois and flunkies of various shades have compared the institutionalization of various organs of the movement to the constant urge of the petit-bourgeois to be doing something.

"Action with Analysis" versus "Action without Analysis" was the main contradiction during the early years of our movement. The predominant line in the Internationalists was "Action with Analysis" while the predominant line among various revisionist and pacifist as well as liberal-bourgeois organisations and movements was "Action without Analysis". "Action with Analysis" meant the subordination of all tasks of the movement to the primary task of analysis of the real world around us, and the correlation of various existing problems on the national and international levels. Bureaucratic tasks were always considered secondary. Discussion of analysis was primary.

Other organizations, which called for "Action without Analysis" became mainly concerned with the number of their membership. Fearful of alienating anyone by having analysis, they suffered from the worst kind of liberalism, and fell behind the tails of movements like Civil Rights or Viet Nam etc.. Naturally, without analysis they gave rise to huge bureaucratic networks.

By contrast, our movement was clearly a "new type" of movement. Our analysis started from various bourgeois philosophers as the guide to conscious adoption of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. On one hand, we were acutely aware of the fact that we, here in the imperialist countries, are suffering from oppression. On the other hand, we were also conscious of the fact that our imperialists were causing suffering all over this world.

We saw our salvation in the defeat of imperialism. This we could only bring about by organizing mass anti-imperialist struggles right here in the heartland of imperialism.

The "Action without Analysis" type of organizations were essentially anti-communist, advocating that the problem lay somewhere else, that they themselves were quite happy, and that they should help others to rid themselves of their unhappiness. These people were bourgeois stooges, vying for influence in left-wing circles.

We included ourselves among the oppressed, and on this account analysed the objective conditions around us. While one-sided 'Marxists' were busy reading books and learning 'Marxism' by rote, we gave vent to our initiative and to the "living ideas in our minds", creatively applying ourselves to the problems confronting us.

Knowing the history of colonialism and various other obvious facts, it was not too long before we realised that our own oppression is essentially the same kind of oppression suffered in the neo-colonial countries, and that the root cause of all oppression is imperialism. We constantly studied Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in order to deal with concrete problems. In the process of solving concrete problems in the real world, we came to learn revolutionary ideology in a concrete and creative manner. We related our analysis to the general theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, and reached particular decisions about the direction, the type of organization and the structures of our movement.

The contradiction between "Action with Analysis" versus "Action without Analysis" developed into "Learning Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in the process of solving problems" versus "Learning Marxism-Leninism by rote". The latter line was, in essence, contradictory to the idea of "mass line in everything", which was our way of defeating the self-cultivation and elitist line shown in the cases of the various one-sided organizations of 'Marxists' and flunkies. Learning Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in the process of solving problems required organic development of various programmes of our movement. It was abundantly clear, for example, in early 1967, that without an extensive study programme our movement could not go forward. (Ref. to Inaugural Address by Comrade Hardial Bains on February 15, 1968).

Every organization marches forward by solving the problems confronting it. The same is true of our organization. We developed Four Levels of Work in the process of solving our problems. Briefly, the Four Levels of Work are:

1. Internal Consolidation
2. External Consolidation
3. Investigation
4. Agitation

The Four Levels of Work are guided by Three Basic Guidelines :

1. Guidelines for the Development of Fraternal Relations
2. Guidelines for Criticism and Self-criticism
3. Guidelines for Building Mass Democracy

The Four Levels of Work and the Three Basic Guidelines are the antithesis of the bourgeois organizational structures, and of their motives. The Four Levels of Work are in absolute contradiction with one another. Unity between them is relative, but struggle is absolute. As the struggle intensifies, all liberal-bourgeois ideas come under fire. The movement is strengthened against the two enemies of the people—U.S. imperialism and its accomplice, modern Soviet revisionism. One struggle against two enemies. This guideline cannot be successful without following Four Levels of Work and Three Basic Guidelines.

Internal consolidation is the seeking of truth through facts for the sole purpose of serving the people. This involves study, investigation and analysis of the world around us finding the dominant aspect of the contradiction and being guided by it. The dominant aspect of the contradiction during 1963 to 1966 was the waging of struggles to defeat the line of "Action without Analysis", later transforming into defeating the self-cultivation and elitist line as we learned Marxism - Leninism - Mao Tsetung Thought. This cannot be done without correct analysis of the historical context, and the correlation of analysis with all the facets of our organization. It would indeed require genuine investigation of the system as a whole, its parts in themselves and in their relations; the role and development of the whole

system in relation to others; and the direction in which the system is moving, etc.. Without investigating politics, art, literature, science, religion, laws and in general the entire superstructure and economic base, internal consolidation is an empty phrase.

Internal consolidation and investigation are in contradiction because one is dependent on the other and at the same time in contradiction with the other. The struggle between the two is absolute while unity between them is relative. Internal consolidation without winning the approval of the masses is quite useless. "Winning the approval of the masses" means leading mass agitations in order to consolidate the external position of the organization. We go from external to internal and vice versa through mass work. Thus, internal consolidation is dependent on and in contradiction with external consolidation as well as with agitation. The same is true of internal consolidation and investigation. To give predominance to one over the other is to commit a basic theoretical error- to lapse into one-sidedness.

Neither, however, does it follow that under given historical circumstances, one may not take precedence over the others. For example, during the early period of our movement, external consolidation took precedence over everything else. Still, it must be understood that the purpose for our doing so was to consolidate our movement internally. Failure to appreciate this is to become a mechanical materialist.

Internal consolidation without external consolidation is not possible. Nor is it possible to investigate, do nothing else, and still call oneself a revolutionary. The role of investigation is directly linked with the internal consolidation of the movement in many ways. No plans, programmes and policies can be chalked out without proper and thoroughgoing investigation. In handling the internal affairs of the movement it is not possible to have criticism-self-criticism without investigation. In the same way, agitation, in the form of ideological struggles, and criticism-self-criticism sessions within the movement are necessary for the organic growth of the movement. Organs of internal agitation, meetings, conferences, plenary sessions, internal documents and publications are part and parcel of internal consolidation. A library, a

bookstore, and proper documentation of various internal ideological struggles is also very much desired.

Mass ideological struggles form the backbone of external consolidation. Struggle against rhetoric and sophistry, revisionism and trotskysm, necessitates the heightening of the political vigilance of the masses. This can only be achieved by the discussion of ideology at all opportunities. Mass political struggles must be waged on a principled level with provision of correct analysis by putting faith in the masses and wholly relying on them.

Small-scale libraries should be opened in the neighbourhoods. Mass circulation of newspapers and other publications is necessary. A bookstore which provides for the masses must be opened at various localities. The motive behind all these activities is to strengthen the movement and weaken the enemy. We have found in practice what we knew in theory—that investigation without agitation and other levels of work leads to expertism, self-cultivation and elitism. Agitation without paying attention to the needs of the other levels—i.e., agitation-in itself, without direction and care of the masses gives rise to romanticism, isolation and, finally, betrayal.

The Internationalists not only developed the Four Levels of Work and Three Basic Guidelines as the basis of the structure and function of the movement, but they also critically examined the necessity for the two. It was found that if a revolutionary movement fails to carry out Four Levels of Work and Three Guidelines, if it is rigid and one-sided and does not follow Four Levels of Work by putting proper emphasis on one rather than the other, as demanded by particular material conditions—that the movement inevitably betrays the people, and in the final analysis, becomes an anti-people movement.

Once the policies are formulated through struggle on Four levels, we must take these policies to the masses all over again and win their approval. This is an essential aspect of external consolidation. Policies, plans, and political programmes which do not emerge "from the masses" and are not presented "to the masses for their approval" are useless collections of dead words and will be the dream of subjectivist souls. We intend to learn from the masses and bring their rich experience to the organisation for

the purpose of widening our scope of work and improving our working ability so that we may serve them well. In short, Four Levels of Work means going from the objective to the subjective, from the masses to the organization and then back to the masses; - from democracy to centralism to democracy again.

The Four Levels of Work is democratic centralism in operation. The Four Levels undergo struggle and develop each other, in the process destroying each other and giving rise to higher and deeper levels of organization and strengthening democracy. In carrying out the Four Levels of Work, each unit is an autonomous agency, not connected bureaucratically to the centre or other units. Rather, they are organically linked through ideological struggle carried out on the internal level. This is not to say that Four Levels of Work is an utopian scheme which can easily be totally followed. It is, instead, a revolutionary working style and a guide to action.

In our development we have concrete examples of groups who pledged to follow Four Levels of Work and developed rules to do so, but failed in practice because their attitude was one of creating some new bureaucracy. They mechanically held meetings on various levels having no clue as to what the needs of the movement really were. They talked excitedly about Four Levels of Work, but ultimately became a rigid and dead group, the antithesis of what the working style of a genuine Internationalists group should be.

The sole source of strength in our movement is the masses. Each unit is absolutely united with the masses, integrated in their problems and solely at their service. That is why Four Levels of Work must take the Three Basic Guidelines for guidance. The strengthening of the link with the masses on the one hand, while on the other hand, waging internal struggles, consolidates democracy as well as centralism.

Going away from the masses means going away from democracy, which in turn gives rise to bureaucracy and inorganic organisation of the revisionist sort. The inseparable integration of the units with the masses strengthens the centre by bringing it closer to the masses. Taking the problems, policies and programmes of the

organisation to the masses further cements the foundations of democracy, while winning the approval of the masses strengthens centralism.

It is necessary for the centre and the masses to be linked both from the top downwards (ideological struggle in internal consolidation) and from the bottom upwards (bringing the problems, policies and programmes to the masses and winning their approval). All organisations which either advocated "Action without Analysis" or "Learning Marxism-Leninism by rote" showed contempt for the masses and failed to win their confidence and in fact are considered anti-people organisations by the people.

The contradiction, at this level of our development, on one hand, is between ourselves and "Marxist-Leninists" who advocate learning by rote, and on the other hand, between ourselves and social-chauvinists and revisionists supported by various flunkeys — people who move from one organisation to another to satisfy and appease their petit-bourgeois consciences. This contradiction is a basic one and is generally antagonistic.

But it is important that we be careful and not apply the colour black to everybody in these groups. Instead, we should organise mass democratic struggles among the masses on a still wider and deeper scale, expose the anti-people elements, win over the serious and genuine comrades from their ranks, and pave the way for further democratic struggles on a still higher level. The contradiction is manifest between those who creatively follow Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and who thus follow Four Levels of Work by sticking to the Three Basic Guidelines; and the dogmatists with their eternal "yardstick" — the modern revisionists, pacifists and other liberal-bourgeois flunkeys who are against Four Levels of Work and Three Basic Guidelines.

Four Levels of Work are based on the theory that one divides into two. A life and death struggle takes place between the two, ensuing in the destruction of one by the other. Thus a new totality is born — a new unity with new contradictions which is a further development of the previous one. You cannot have a pear tree becoming an apple-tree in the process of its development. In

the same way, you cannot have a class society solving its contradictions by compromising the antagonism between labour and capital as some revisionists suggest. Instead, you have the sharpening of contradictions based on the essence of class society, i.e., the exploitation of the large majority by the small minority. In the same way, our present contradictions are developed from the old. Struggle is the only absolute which has remained the guideline for our movement. Everything else has been transformed from the old to the new. From a mere discussion group, we have become a Marxist-Leninist Youth and Student Movement. We have moved from limited work in the universities to work in the communities, places of work, and in other institutions of learning. The reason for these developments is the First Guideline, Guidelines for the Development of Fraternal Relations - "the deep urge to further the common struggle against the enemy", which has been consciously grasped and followed and which could never have been achieved without following the other two guidelines - Guidelines for Criticism and Self-criticism and Guidelines for Building Mass Democracy.

Besides this our organization followed the "mass-line" in everything, in all our activities. Four Levels of Work is the best guarantee that the mass-line is not only continued on the present level, but also developed. Marxism-Leninism - Mao Tsetung Thought, in essence, is the theory of absolute struggle between the two opposing, contradictory and mutually dependent aspects of the contradiction with their identity of interests. It sees this struggle as the basis of all development.

In our movement, struggle takes place between self-cultivation and mass-line; expertism versus conscious participation in the solving of various problems confronting the movement and the people; empirio-criticism versus genuinely revolutionary criticism; detached attitudes towards the movement, the masses and others, versus integration with the movement, masses and others; internal consolidation and external consolidation versus investigation; and agitation or internal consolidation versus external consolidation or democracy versus centralism, etc. These struggles, as is obvious, are the development of the main contradiction, i.e., the contradiction between the interests of the masses, the large majority, and the interests of the small minority, the exploiting classes.

The Internationalists did not arrive at these conclusions by negating their class backgrounds in one easy stroke, but by paying attention to their living experience and by seeking truth from facts in order to serve the people. "Seeking truth from facts" means applying Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, as a guide to action. This stage was reached after fierce struggle against various kinds of dogmatists. What is the essence of Mao Tsetung Thought, the highest development of Marxism-Leninism, if not dialectical and historical materialism? In our fight against dogmatism we found that there are many comrades who understand the theoretical side of modern Soviet revisionism and imperialism, but who do not acknowledge the anti-people content of revisionist organisational methods and the influence of imperialist culture in revolutionary organisations.

This shows that these comrades understand only the superficial, external side of Mao Tsetung Thought, but are oblivious to the kernel, the core, the essence, i.e., struggle. They do not start from conscious analysis of facts, deriving guidance from theory, but instead rely smugly on theoretical formulae to guide their actions. When they come up against something which is not covered by their formulae, they are quite incapable of dealing with it. For example, when various dogmatists read about our slogan TO SEEK TRUTH TO SERVE THE PEOPLE and INTERNAL CONSOLIDATION: EXTERNAL STRENGTH, they sneered in disgust: Is this Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought?

Dear dogmatists! This is Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in action. The two slogans are a guide to all revolutionaries and thus are living Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought! Some even went so far as to ask "wherever did you read this"! This shows that they are incapable of grasping the essence of Mao Tsetung Thought, which is not a dogma, but a guide to action.

Such dogmatists shun creative study and application of Mao Tsetung Thought. If an organisation or group does not correspond to their "yardstick" they become hostile and antagonistic. Under the guise of "waging theoretical struggles against revisionism" or the pretext of "developing theory" or "drawing clear lines" or

"developing unity through ideological struggles", they fight empty and dogmatic battles. A large number of pubs are filled with such people. These comrades are responsible for retarding the development of revolutionary ideas and practices and must be severely dealt with in public. The fact that these comrades conduct their relations with others by "yardsticks" and not by applying Mao Tsetung Thought to the problems at hand, shows that they are not organised on the basis of democratic centralism, and are therefore organised on a revisionist basis. Four Levels of Work and Three Basic Guidelines, if creatively followed would eliminate these dogmatists from the revolutionary ranks. Because Four Levels of Work is democratic centralism in operation, the task of all genuine comrades is to grasp the essence and organise themselves on that basis.

We conclude this statement by quoting the first passage from the resolution adopted at the Historic Necessity For Change Conference: "The main contradiction of history, the antagonistic contradiction between exploiters and exploited, is sharpening all over the world. The imperialists, headed by the U.S., with the support of modern Soviet revisionists, headed by the Kossygin-Brezhnev ruling clique in the Soviet Union, are busy organising secret conferences, hatching plots to impose big nation chauvinism on the people of this world in order to legitimise and continue their exploitation of the people, including the American people. At the same time, they are developing techniques of mass murder and oppression. The anti-imperialists and their solid supporters the anti-revisionists, under the brilliant leadership of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, are uniting the working and oppressed people into one mighty storm against the enemy number one of the world's people, including the American people, namely, U.S. imperialism, and its accomplices, chief of whom are the modern Soviet revisionists. The imperialists and their accomplices are scared because they are attempting to run against the progressive current, the age of the world proletariat and scientific socialism, the main current of history. The anti-imperialists are gathering courage and are forcing the status-quo and reactionaries the world over to give way to the new. The people's wars in defence of their fatherlands and against the most decadent imperialism of our times, are flaring all over the world".

"DEATH TO U.S. IMPERIALISM!  
DEATH TO MODERN SOVIET REVISIONISM!  
DEATH TO ALL KINDS OF REACTION!  
LONG LIVE MARXISM-LENINISM-MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT!  
LONG LIVE PEOPLE'S WAR!  
LONG LIVE THE GREAT PROLETARIAN CULTURAL  
REVOLUTION!

These are the slogans working and oppressed people of the world  
have in their minds all the time."

Printed by Workers' England Publishing House  
569 Old Kent, London S.E.1 ENGLAND.



