

THE BOURGEOISIE HAS SEIZED POWER ON THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE!

Comrades of the Central Committee,

Led by the opportunist who is currently the Chairman of the Central Committee, the bourgeoisie has seized power on the Political Committee. Its aim is to disarm the working class and people and prevent the British revolution. Even more, it wants to mobilise the working class and people of Britain to fight for its aims on the battlefields of Europe against its imperialist rivals. The bourgeoisie has found mouthpieces for these aims in our organization who excuse, prettify, embellish and support British and US imperialism.

At PC16, the PC finally split into an opportunist majority and a Marxist minority. The split on ideological and political line which has been brewing almost since the founding of the RCLB and whose seeds were sown prior to the founding Congress has become an accomplished fact. No matter on what subordinate issues the majority and minority have differences amongst themselves, the essence of the matter is that on the most fundamental and crucial questions of the revolution in Britain and the world, the minority have held up the banner of Marxism and revolution, whilst the majority (even if only temporarily and irrespective of their subjective desires) have dragged the banner of revolutionary Marxism in the mud and deserted to the side of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

The two-line struggle in the RCLB is a struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. *

Inevitably, and at every level of the organization, comrades have spoken out against the bourgeoisie. The struggle has broken out particularly acutely on the Standing Committee and the Political Committee. The bourgeoisie has responded with repression in order to conceal its presence on the PC. When the Secretary made the accusation that the Chairman is a "traitor to the working class" did the PC organise a discussion of whether or not the statement is true? Of course not - because such a discussion would have revealed the utter treachery of the Chairman's bourgeois line. Instead the succeeded into the CC into suspending the Secretary from his posts. When the third comrade on the Standing Committee came out in support of the Secretary, the PC immediately responded by suspending the SC.

Comrades, when the RCLB was founded nearly eighteen months ago, a potential vanguard organization of the working class was founded. It was only a potential vanguard organization because from the very beginning the RCL was crippled by a serious right opportunist deviation running throughout the ideological and political line of the Manifesto and the practice of the RCLB.

Almost from the inception of the RCL there has been opposition to this deviation, mainly (but by no means entirely) from comrades MC & MF. How has the bourgeoisie responded? With the vigorous unfolding of the two-line struggle? No, these snivelling bourgeois apologists whimper on about 'style of work' instead of confronting line with line - they do this because their rotten revisionist line cannot stand the light of day! With the slogan of 'style of work' they desperately try to prevent the relentless struggle which the proletariat must wage in order to defeat the bourgeoisie in the RCL.

When in the heat of battle the Chairman is called a "traitor", the statement is deemed impermissible in principle, and a statement is sent out to the rank-and-file which totally avoids any mention of the ideological and political line and the circumstances in which the accusation was made. This is rotten revisionism which alleges that such a statement cannot be correct, irrespective of the truth or untruth of the accusation. Only the bourgeoisie is afraid of honest discussion and struggle - the proletariat has nothing to hide. So why has the PC covered up the content of the ideological and political line?

Under a false flag.

Comrades, if the PC has its way, after the forthcoming CC the PC will unfold a banner. It will call this banner 'Fight Menshevism and Splittism,' and under this banner, under a false flag of 'Bolshevism', it will unleash a campaign of lies, smears, slander and innuendo against the minority on the PC, mainly against the Secretary of the Central Committee. They will do this because in their desperate fear of the proletarian minority they will stoop to any despicable trick to distract attention from their attempts to cover up the right opportunist deviation, and their rotten revisionism in trying to consolidate and deepen it.

Unlike the majority, the minority will fight on the basis of line. The minority has now also unfolded a banner, a banner which says "the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything." It is this which the majority, mainly the opportunist TE, consistently deny. TE has tried one dirty trick after another, anything rather than fight on line. He has absurdly demanded that we have a 'cult of the individual' about him; made paranoid accusations that the Secretary has been 'plotting' to seize power in the organization; attempted a putsch in May to remove the Secretary from his posts; and has now nearly succeeded in a putsch to remove the Secretary from his posts, take away his vote on the PC & CC, and suspend the SC because he is in a minority on it.

Marxism and Revisionism.

Now, under the guise of fighting the 'Menshevism and Splittism' of the minority, TE will attempt to drive the RCLB finally and irrevocably into the camp of opportunism. He will try to launch this campaign without the slightest mention of the ideological and political content of the two-line struggle. It is TE and the rest of the majority who are the real Mensheviks. It is they who deny that the ideological and political line decides everything, they who deny that unity must be principled unity and they who propagate the rotten Menshevik line of 'unity' between Marxism and revisionism.

Their most despicable trick is to argue that there must be 'freedom' for the airing of "democratic views" on the PC. Under this banner TE has tried to sneak Yugoslavia into the socialist countries, peddled revisionist trash on the dictatorship of the proletariat and on the 'peaceful road to socialism.' under the guise of fighting 'dogmatism.'

There must be no freedom to propagate revisionism on the PC! Comrades should study again Lenin's words that:

"Freedom is a grand word, but under the banner of free trade, the most predatory wars were conducted; under the banner of free labour, the toilers were robbed. The modern use of the term 'freedom of criticism' contains the same inherent falsehood. Those who are really convinced that they have advanced science would demand, not freedom for the new views to continue side by side with the old, but the substitution of the new views for the old." ('What Is To Be Done', Peking ed., p 10.)

Like the Russian critics of Marxism, TE and the majority use the slogan of 'freedom' to preach opportunism, revisionism and eclecticism, they demand the "freedom to introduce bourgeois ideas and bourgeois elements into socialism." (Ibid, p 9.) By the use of this trick they have temporarily succeeded in labelling the Secretary a 'splitter' and MF a 'suppoter of splittism.' Who are the real splitters? Those who practice revisionism or those who call practitioners of revisionism 'traitors?' As the CPC said in 1963:

"The genuine revolutionary unity of the proletariat can be attained only by upholding principle and upholding Marxism-Leninism. Unity bought by forsaking principles and by wallowing in the mire with

opportunists ceases to be proletarian unity; instead, as Lenin said, "it means in practice unity of the proletariat with the national bourgeoisie and a split in the international proletariat, unity of lackeys and a split among the revolutionaries." ("Polemics on the General Line", p 317.)

'Democratic-Centralism' or Bourgeois Dictatorship?

Another opportunist trick the majority use is to parade themselves as upholders of 'democratic-centralism.' But under the rule of these people democratic-centralism ceases to be democratic-centralism and becomes a method of imposing a bourgeois dictatorship. The majority on the PC have refused to admit that the CC is subordinate to the Congress, denying that there must be full rights to express opinions at the Congress and no restrictions on the rights of all delegates, including those from the CC, to speak out in the interests of the working class, and they have refused even to consider the question of the circulation of minority views on the CC to the r&f. They have refused even to discuss these matters on the PC. They do this because their rotten, revisionist line cannot stand up to a struggle by the proletariat in the organization. If their line is correct what are they afraid of? But of course their line is revisionist so they do not dare to open up the struggle.

Democratic-centralism is essential in a proletarian organization, because only democratic-centralism can ensure that the proletariat can fight in a unified, disciplined way. But the discipline of the proletariat exists to enable the proletariat to defeat the bourgeoisie inside and outside the organization. If a right opportunist line exists in the organization, then so-called 'proletarian discipline' is in fact a bourgeois dictatorship. Unless the proletariat is allowed to fight the bourgeoisie, it has not the slightest obligation to accept the 'discipline' of the bourgeoisie. A proletarian minority cannot be subordinate to a bourgeois majority! The proletariat in the organization will fight back against the bourgeoisie which has seized power on the PC, assert its rights and duties and if necessary defy the opportunist majority on the PC and be entirely justified in the eyes of the proletariat in so doing.

The opportunist majority on the PC has in general attempted to suppress two-line struggle. The most glaring example of this is the document criticizing 'BTLTBTP,' where it says in the section entitled 'Complacency in the Ideological Sphere.' that "It is essential that ideological education is carried on as a normal practice." which was inserted by the opportunist majority in opposition to the minority's formulation of "this complacency can only disarm comrades and prevent them from fully waging a protracted struggle against bourgeois ideas in our own ranks." The majority line is a revisionist denial that active ideological struggle is the "weapon for ensuring unity within the Party." The reason of course for their line is smugness and complacency about our ideological and political line and fear that anybody would try to struggle against it. The majority want the r&f to passively wait to be 'educated' on whatever opportunist line they try to foist on them and try to prohibit anybody struggling against it. As they have for example just written to the Ln. DC inciting them to take disciplinary action against a r&f cde. who dares to struggle against their opportunist line.

Comrades,

the RCLB is on the verge of a split -caused by the revisionism and putschism of the majority on the PC headed by TE. All honest comrades must repudiate this revisionism and putschism. The minority on the PC and all other honest comrades must take their stand on the side of the proletariat and the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought.

If there is a split it will be entirely the responsibility of the majority and chiefly of TE. These comrades are working for the bourgeoisie and there can be no principled unity with their line:

"The splitters in the communist ranks are those who, to meet the needs of the bourgeoisie, split with Marxism-Leninism, with the revolutionary proletarian party and with the revolutionary proletariat and the broad masses of the labouring people; and they remain splitters even when for a time they are in the majority or hold the leading posts." (Ibid, p 316.)

Fight the right opportunist deviation in the ideological and political line of the RCLB!

The RCL is crippled as an organization of the working class by three serious right opportunist political errors - social-chauvinism, economism and sectarianism. These right opportunist errors are the result of serious revisionist theoretical errors which in turn based on right opportunism ideologically.

Although these errors are the collective responsibility of the present CC (including of course the minority on the PC), the headquarters of this right opportunism is TE, who, supported by the majority on the PC, is desperately trying to prevent these errors from being uncovered, to justify them and to consolidate and deepen them.

Social-Chauvinism.

The line of the Manifesto of the RCL is a line of alliance with British and US imperialism against Soviet social-imperialism and a line of utterly failing to take seriously our obligations to struggle in the closest solidarity with those exploited and oppressed by British imperialism.

The implicit line of the Manifesto is that our main blow must be struck not against British, and then against US, imperialism, but first of all against Soviet social-imperialism. Although in words the Manifesto claims that our main duty is to make socialist revolution here, its real intention is quite different.

If we were serious about socialist revolution in Britain we would consider that our first and foremost contribution to the struggle of the international proletariat and oppressed peoples and nations is to strike blows first at British imperialism. But where is the demand to withdraw all overseas British troops, installations and military bases? Instead we support NATO and British troops and bases in Cyprus, Gibraltar, Malta, Germany etc.. Similarly, we support the EEC and its inevitable attempts to struggle with the two superpowers in order to continue to exploit and oppress the working class of Britain and Europe and the people and countries of the third world.

If we were serious about fighting the two superpowers we would attack first the US, not the Soviet Union. The US is the superpower which actually has military bases and troops here and with which our bourgeoisie is militarily and politically allied. Our line though is to fight the SU, not the US. Instead of leading the masses in a struggle to expell the US from Britain and for Britain to withdraw from NATO and all other imperialist alliances, we have social-chauvinist demonstrations against Soviet social-imperialism (It has now actually been proposed by TE that we should have a joint demonstration with the Young Conservatives next year!)

If we were serious about fighting against imperialist war we would resolutely fight the war preparations of British and US imperialism. Instead we pretend that the next war may be a war of 'national independence' of Britain against the Soviet Union, when it is quite evident that the next war will be a world-war of the US-led western imperialist bloc against the Soviet Union, and propagate also the revisionist myth that an imperialist country

like Britain can fight a 'just war.' Comrades, whether we like it or not we are siding with the war preparations of Britain and US imperialism!

If we were serious about upholding internationalism we would see to it that proletarian internationalism was a guiding principle in the Manifesto. Instead the Manifesto doesn't even mention it, except to justify 'defence of national independence' in Europe. Instead of proletarian internationalism, the most crucial aspect of which for Communists in an imperialist country is that "no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations" ('Lenin on the National and Colonial Questions', p10), we preach and practice social-chauvinism. In paras. B11 & B12 of the Manifesto we treat struggling in solidarity with those peoples and nations exploited and oppressed by British imperialism as secondary to and conditional struggling for 'national independence' for Britain, an imperialist country. Thus we fail to mention British imperialism in articles on Azania, thus we outrageously treat Northern Ireland as part of the British state, thus we fail even to mention British imperialism's attacks on Kampuchea, whilst correctly exposing the Soviet Union's attack. And thus the majority has now abandoned our practical work on the struggle in Zimbabwe! Look also how we criticise the Soviet Union's attempts to attack and split the third world, as in Indo-China, but maintain a discreet and utterly contemptible silence about such things as the US's attempts to split the ranks of the Arabs and Palestinians ranks through the recent Camp David agreement.

Now TE and the opportunist majority want to consolidate these errors into our line, by amending the Manifesto accordingly. TE, supported in general by the opportunist majority, has demanded that we "subordinate" our revolution to that world-wide, that we struggle against British imperialism only "in the course of" the struggle against the two superpowers, that we treat the Soviet Union as "the primary target" in the struggle against hegemonism, that we treat the "struggle for British national independence" as our "biggest contribution" to the international united front. TE has dismissed the minority's principled opposition to this revisionist trash as "petty bourgeois fanaticism" and "left-wing childishness." He has also used this line to consistently oppose and drag his feet on Zimbabwe work, going to the extent of calling it a "diversion". He pours scorn on those who say that our first and foremost duty is to overthrow British imperialism as "dogmatists" and "idealists."

Economism.

Economism has for a long time been a problem in the RCL. Although the CC discussed the problem at the January CC, the lead given by me was inadequate and the problem remains extremely deep-seated in our line.

Marx and Engels said that:

"...every movement in which the working class as a class confronts the ruling classes...is a political movement..." ('Selected Letters', Peking ed., p42.)

Lenin later developed this to talk of political movements on the economic and political levels. Even on the level of giving leadership to the political movement on the economic terrain - take for example the current struggle of the working class against the 5% - we are incapable of giving bold leadership to the working class. Why? - because of our implicit line (which TE now wishes to make explicit) that there is a 'contradiction' between Party-building and mass work. If we consider that these are two separate things, instead of seeing that the Party can only be built in the course of bold and vigorous mass work, then we can devote ourselves to snug and cosy 'Party-building' work amongst ourselves, whilst considering that giving a lead to the working class is a luxury which can wait 'til later. And this is exactly what has happened. In Ln., the DC, under the influence of this pernicious line gave out no leaflets at the industrial work factory

for the meeting on April 29th or for the current series of meetings of the theory of three worlds, on the grounds that these are 'Party-building' meetings. This is nothing but the old Russian economist's line of the political struggle for the intellectuals whilst leaving the workers to get on with the wages struggle. Look also at the fact the PC has virtually abdicated from its responsibility to lead the class struggle since the outbreak of the two-line struggle - on the grounds that one is to do with Party-building whilst the other is not. The inevitable and necessary consequence of our line on the 'contradiction' between Party-building and mass work is firstly, 'Party-building' meetings to which workers are not invited and, secondly, no lead at all to the objectively existing class struggle and thereby leaving the workers to the wages struggle.

TE now wants to compound the felony by saying that 'base-building' is part of Party-building but mass work is not. Despite saying that in doing this we must "attempt" to give a lead to the mass struggle, under the influence of the line on the 'contradiction' between Party-building and mass work, this view of things can only lead to attempting to 'build bases' on the basis of the wages struggle. Our 'mass work' guided by this line can only be leading economic struggles in separate factories against individual capitalists, rather than giving political leadership to the whole class to fight the bourgeois state. TE is in fact postulating yet another recipe for opportunism - a 'contradiction' between base-building and mass work. Yet the only purpose of base-building is to lead the masses!

Similarly, our one-sided interpretation of 'devoting all resources' in mass work to mean firstly, exclusive factory work and, secondly, not leading the working class to lead the whole people, inevitably fosters economism. We are leaving to fight on purely economic issues and splitting them off the vast numbers of people who are not proletarians, but who are allies of the working class against the bourgeoisie. We must ponder deeply Lenin's words that:

"Marxism recognises the class struggle as fully developed 'nationwide' only when, not only embraces politics but also takes in politics the most essential thing: the structure of state power." ('Lenin on the Struggle Against Revisionism', p 30).

The working class, led by the Communists, must fight against the bourgeoisie on each and every front that the bourgeois state attacks the working class - on the housing front, on the educational front, on the transport front etc., etc.. It is simply not enough to pat ourselves on the back because 'CS' has started doing some limited propaganda on such things as health and the Astrid Proll case. We must do far, far more - we must train and lead the working class in collective combat against the bourgeois state on all the burning issues of the day.

The mass line is also disgracefully and opportunistically used to propagate economism in the RCL. On the pretext that mass work should be what the masses want to do (instead of in the first place what conforms to their objective needs and interests) we attempt to confine our work to purely economic issues or at best to raise only those political issues which the masses themselves raise. On these pretexts TE has disgracefully said that the Zimbabwe campaign is not mass work, that it "violates" the mass line. On this pretext also the opportunist majority said that internal factory collections should only be carried out if "in conformity with the level of the consciousness of the workers." These comrades should study Lenin's words that:

"We are not children to be fed on the thin gruel of economic politics alone; we want to know everything that others know, we want to learn the details of all aspects of political life and to take part actively in every single political event. In order that we may do this, the intellectuals must talk to us less of

what we already know, and tell us more about what we do not yet know and what we can never learn from our factory and 'economic' experience, that is, you must give us political knowledge." ('What Is To Be Done', Peking ed., pp90/91).

They should ponder also over the difference between Mao's views on mass work in China, where as Mao said "...since there is no economic basis for social reformism in colonial and semi-colonial China as there is in Europe, the whole proletariat, with the exception of a few scabs, is most revolutionary." ('Selected Works', vol. 2, p 324.), and consider also whether or not they are, as Lenin so scathingly observed "blam(ing) the masses of the workers for (their) own philistinism." ('What Is To Be Done', p 87). The workers in Britain already have a view of Zimbabwe - the bourgeois view. In our mass work we are fighting the bourgeoisie for the leadership of the working class - we can either give bold leadership on the proletarian view on the struggle in Zimbabwe (and the million and one issues that need to be raised) or we can leave the working class to succumb to imperialist prejudices. The bourgeoisie has already raised the political issue of Zimbabwe - by appealing to the working class to support their threatened invasion - and yet the snivelling philistines of the PC majority appeal to the mass line to excuse their treachery! The fact that the mass of workers in this country are strongly influenced by bourgeois ideology in general and social-democracy in particular must by no means be used as an excuse to use the mass line to preclude us from raising the Zimbabwe question in practice - that really would be 'blaming the masses for (one's) own philistinism - but to "preach to the uneducated masses that the maturing revolution is necessary, to prove that it is inevitable, to explain its benefits to the people, and to prepare the proletariat and all the tailing and exploited masses for it." (Lenin- 'The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky.' Peking ed., pp84/85.)

Sectarianism

The question of economism is closely linked with the question of sectarism and in the RCL has the same roots. The RCL has many of the characteristics of a sect - isolation and separation from the masses. We have always found it extremely difficult to carry out bold and vigorous mass work. There are many reasons for this, not least of which is the fact that under the guise of practicing the mass line we refuse to give bold political leadership to the class. Many honest comrades have tried to overcome this and yet collectively the RCL has failed to try to even begin to lead the class.

The first and foremost reason is yet again the arbitrary and metaphysical assertion that there is a 'contradiction' between Party-building and mass work. Because of this we find one excuse after another for keeping the masses at arms length. How many workers came on the August 26th. demonstration? How many branches even tried to rally workers to support it. How many workers or other revolutionary people have been recruited through our mass work. If it comes to that why should they when we refuse to lead the class struggle. We should ponder deeply the fact that after an initial process of a few months duration when we recruited a few intellectuals, the recruitment of the RCL is virtually stagnant and that 'CS' sales are in the same position.

As a result of this arbitrarily conceived 'contradiction' between Party-building and mass work, we are currently in the sectarian and absurdly idealist position of attempting to 'build bases' in the industrial working class without taking at all seriously our responsibilities to give bold and wise leadership to the objectively existing class struggle. In mass work, as in other sphere of revolutionary work, the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything. And yet 'CS' totally fails to give a lead (as opposed to a mere commentary) as such burning questions of the day as the current Ford strike. The only bases we will build on this basis will be bases of intellectuals 'sent-in' to industrial work and totally isolated from and looked on with contempt by the masses.

This refusal to give a lead to the working class manifests in many other ways - take for example the absurd May Day call of 'CS' to the working class that "May Day this year must be made a mass demonstration of opposition to these viscious attacks on workers" published only on May Day itself. Or take the fact that the PC is currently patting itself on the back for proposing to publish a leaflet 'summing up' the Ford strike after it is over. This is a grotesque caricature of revolutionary leadership!

TE has fought a consistent and largely successful battle on the PC against leading the working class. Apart from the question of the 'contradiction' between Party-building and mass work, he propagates the myth that what he calls 'Bolshevism' involves only questions of theory, ideology and organization, denying that a Bolshevik Party is also one which is bound up with every fibre of its being with the working class. As Stalin said the Party must be "...part of the class, closely bound up with it by all the fibres of its being." ('Foundations of Leninism,' Peking ed., p 104). If the Party does not lead the masses there is not the slightest reason for its existence.

Another serious error of sectarianism is the way 'CS' incites our comrades into sectarian attacks on backward workers under the guise of 'combatting rasicism.' It does this by portraying the enemy as "rasicism" (i.e., incorredt ideas in workers minds) and not the actual oppression of the state on national minority workers. It therefore elevates what is an ideological contradiction among the people into a political contradiction with our enemies. (we of course only fight the bourgeoisie politically, not ideologically). In doing this it falls for and supports the bourgeoisie's attempts to racially divide the working class. Closely related is the sectarian policy of 'CS' of striking the main blow at the opportunists instead of attempting to unite all who can be united in struggle against the main enemy, the bourgeoisie. (This is in fact the line of the Manifesto, bu the PC chooses to ignore this.)

Revisionism instead of Marxism - the 'theoretical' basis of right opportunism in the RCLB.

1. Revisionist Errors on the nature of the State.

"The struggle for the emancipation of the working masses from the influence of the bourgeoisie in general, and of the imperialist bourgeoisie in particular, is impossible without a struggle against opportunist prejudices concerning the 'state'" (Lenin - The State and Revolution', Peking ed., p2).

As the threat of imperialist war looms larger, so the attempts of the bourgeoisie to disarm the working class ideologically and theoretically increase. It is not at all surprising that the RCL has been far from immune from this process.

According to Marx and Lenin the state is "an organ of class rule, an organ for the oppression of one class by another." (Op. Cit., p10). But the RCL, far from recognising this and leading the working class and people in combatting and overthrowing the bourgeois state, consistently avoid the question of the class nature of the state and instead propose to lead the working class in strengthening the state.

Instead of demanding the abolition of the standing army the RCL supports British membership of NATO and military integration by the European bourgeoisie, thus completely revising one of the most important of Marxist teachings on the state, that "A standing army and police are the chief instruments of force of the state power." (Op. Cit., p12). Of course, the opportunist majority will claim that this is entirely correct, that it is (sic.) a 'dialectical' policy, because of the need to prepare for a 'just war' of national independence', but as we shall see, on this also they revise fundamental teachings on the state. Form the moment it is sufficient to point out that they completely cover up the fact that the "...army is the most

ossified instrument for supporting the old regime, the most hardened bulwark of bourgeois discipline, buttressing up the rule of capital and fostering among the working people the servile spirit of submission and subjection to capital." (Lenin - 'The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky.', p 76). An oppressed class that does not understand this is a class that cannot seize state power and 'Communists' who fail to teach them this deserve all the odium that history will inevitably pile on them.

Even on the everyday class struggle the question of the state is generally avoided, as we have seen in the section of this document on economism. And every fortnight 'CS' teaches the working class that his most important enemy is not the bourgeois state but the capitalist who immediately exploits him. It does this, for example, in its persistent use of such sloppy colloquialisms as 'bosses' and its equally persistent refusal to take seriously its duty to educate the working class about the bourgeois state. Its one thing to publish articles on Astrid Proll, its entirely another to teach the working class that the state, whether it oppresses them their teachers, the DHSS office, the courts etc is the ideal collective body of all the capitalists and must be fought collectively and as a state. We instead teach the working class that the state which oppresses Astrid Proll and sends soldiers to Northern Ireland has got nothing to do with them. This sort of 'propaganda' is quite acceptable to the bourgeoisie, who are quite willing to recognise the class struggle so long as the nature of the state is not touched upon.

In order to try to drive us further into the morass of opportunism TE is now getting ready to attack one of the most fundamental of Marxist teachings on the state by saying that the view that "the supersession of the bourgeois state by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution." (Lenin - 'State and Revolution', p 27) is "dogmatist." Lenin's "in gneral" must be taken to mean that a peacefull transition is a question of only the most remote pãssibility, not of practical politics. So why does TE bother to raise the question? - because his outlook is eclectic and revisionism not Marxism.

2. Revisionist errors in not recognising the UTTERLY reactionary nature of imperialism.

Implicit in the line of the Manifesto is the view that British imperialism has a 'dual nature' (a view which TE has put verbally many times. The Manifesto also makes a gross theoretical error in para. B13 by talking about struggling against Britain's "imperialist nature." These views are completely in contradiction with Lenin's correct view that imperialism is "reaction all along the line." These elementary errors open the door wide to the most gross errors of social-chauvinism.

Britain does not have a 'dual nature'. It has contradictions both with the third world (contradictions between oppressor and oppressed nations) and with the first world (contradictions of an inter-imperialist nature). But the RCL arbitrarily lumps these two different types of contradictions together and comes up with the conclusion that they are two aspects of one contradiction and hey presto! Britain has a dual nature! We shall see later what other amazing conjuring tricks with dialectics TE has up his sleeve. This revisionist trick leads onto the errors in para . B20 of the Manifesto where we pretend that our support for British 'defence' preparations is given to only those preparations which are 'defensive' and not to those which are aggressive - as though the British state (which is the property of the ruling class) can act in the interests of the people. This is the old revisionist confidence trick of the neutral or malleable state. Or perhaps the proletariat will use a 'portion' of state power - a portion which TE has argued on the question of Yugoslavia it is possible for the proletariat to hold?

The most glaring error is that under the guise of making preparations for a 'just war of national independence', the RCL is attempting to ally the working class with the war preparations of British and US imperialism.

We must take as our starting point in an analysis of Britain that imperialism is moribund, decaying, parasitic capitalism, and that capitalism has long since exhausted any progressive features in Britain. As far as the national movement in countries like Britain is concerned, Lenin had this to say:

"In these countries, which hitherto have been in the van of mankind, particularly in 1759-1871, the process of forming national states has been consummated. In these countries the national movement is a thing of an irrevocable past, and it would be an absurd reactionary utopia to try to revive it." ('A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism', Moscow ed., p 17).

Why? Because as Lenin also says:

"In the western countries the national movement is a thing of the distant past. In England, France, Germany etc., the 'fatherland' is a dead letter, it has played its historical role, i.e., the national movement cannot yield here anything progressive, anything that will elevate new masses to a new new economic and political life. History's next step here is not transition from feudalism or from patriarchal savagery to national progress, to a cultured and politically free fatherland, but transition from a 'fatherland' that has outlived its day, that is capitalistically overripe, to socialism." (Op. Cit., p 18).

In analysing Britain we must ask ourselves - which class force is holding back the further development of the productive forces, i.e., we must make a political analysis based on economics. The only materialist answer we can come to is to say - it is the British monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie. The fundamental contradiction in Britain between the relations of production and the forces of production is manifested in a principal contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. British imperialism is "rotting alive" as the Manifesto says, and only the socialist revolution has any answer to this. It's a rotten trick to say as the Manifesto does that the principal contradiction in Britain will become one with a superpower if Britain is threatened by invasion or is actually invaded by one of them. The principal contradiction changes in such circumstances only in an oppressed nation, i.e., a nation in which nationalism and the bourgeoisie still have a potentially progressive role to play. As Mao says the principal contradiction changes "when imperialism launches a war of aggression against such a country." ('Selected Readings, p110 (my emphasis.)). In an imperialist country we must look, not at the fact that 'our' country is being invaded, but at the politics of which the war is a continuation.

"War is the continuation of politics. Consequently, we must examine the policy pursued prior to the war, the policy that led to and brought about the war. If it was an imperialist policy, i.e., one designed to safeguard the interests of finance capital and rob and oppress colonies and foreign countries, then the war stemming from that policy is imperialist." (Lenin - Op. Cit., p 12).

What other sort of policy does the British imperialist bourgeoisie have in mind comrades? And what other sort of policy is it actually carrying out?

Only in the event of Britain being actually conquered by a superpower (or any other country) would the principal contradiction change, because then the foreign enemy, not the domestic bourgeoisie, would be the force holding back the further development of the productive forces.

It is true that Britain today is not the chief warmonger it was in 1914 and 1939. Today British imperialism is preparing to go to war in an alliance with one of the two superpowers, US imperialism. This too the Manifesto covers up; by putting the main thrust on the extremely unlikely possibility of a war in which the US is not involved; by putting the main emphasis

in the struggle against superpower hegemonism against the Soviet Union, not the United States; and by refusing to make any concrete proposals to fight Britain's military alliance with US imperialism. We carefully cover up the fact that Britain is link in the world imperialist system, and that there is no way that an imperialist country can go to war without propping up that world imperialist system. Lenin scathingly refers to those who 'forget' "the international connections which make the war an imperialist war and his bourgeoisie a link in the chain of imperialist plunder." and points out that "...every bourgeoisie (even of the smallest country) becomes a participant in the plunder." ('The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky', pp 79 & 80)

Another rotten trick the opportunists use to try to cover up their vile alliance with imperialism is to deny the class content of the war and to use the sleight-of-hand of saying that what matters is who fires the first shot. They do this by perverting the correct view that the Soviet Union is the expansionist superpower into meaning that we (who have the task of fighting the US superpower in the struggle against superpower hegemonism) should treat as the "primary target in the struggle against hegemonism" the Soviet Union, and by inventing some mythical development of Marxism by Stalin and Mao whereby we should ally with "defensive" imperialist powers against "aggressive" imperialist powers. This completely denies Lenin's analysis of 1914 (which is still entirely correct today) of:

"...picture to yours lives a slave-owner who owned 100 slaves going to war against a slave-owner who owned 200 slaves for a more 'just' distribution of slaves. Clearly, the application of the term 'defensive war', or war 'for the defence of the fatherland,' in such a case would be historically false, and in practice would be sheer deception of the common people, of philistines, of ignorant people, by the astute slave-owners." ('Lenin on War and Peace', pp6/7.)

This line is the abominable line of 'defence of the fatherland' of the opportunists of the second international, of whom Lenin said "The Frenchman, German or Italian who says: 'Socialism is opposed to violence against nations, therefore I defend myself when my country is invaded,' betrays socialism and internationalism, because such a man sees only his own 'country,' he puts 'his own'...'bourgeoisie' above everything else." ('The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky.' p 79.)

The opportunist majority on the PC led by TE has tried to embellish this line further by arguing that we must 'distinguish' between Britain and the British bourgeoisie, thus covering up the fact that the policies of a state are determined by the ruling class and opening the door even wider to social-chauvinism. What utter depths of revisionism they are prepared to stoop to!

The proletariat must throw all this revisionist trash overboard and in the event of imperialist war must raise the banner 'turn the imperialist war into civil war.' Only by resolutely fighting for this slogan and the line it represents can we defeat the attempts of the imperialists to hitch the proletariat to their war chariot and the consequent defeat of the world proletarian revolution for another thirty years. The philistine majority on the PC dare not raise this banner and instead want to raise the banner of 'defence of the fatherland.' They entirely merit Rosa Luxemburg's description of German social-democracy in 1914 as : "stinking corpse."

The Manifesto also makes use of its erroneous analysis of imperialism to propagate the social-chauvinist line that Britain should 'line up' or 'unite' with the third world, thus completely forgetting that Britain's relations with the third world can only be ones of imperialist plunder. This is closely related to the Manifesto's gross error in not clearly stating the fundamental division of the world into two worlds of oppressor and oppressed nations, a division which Lenin called "the fundamental feature of our era", as well as pointing out the division of the world into three.

Its one thing for the third world to exploit the contradictions between the first and second world. Its entirely another for us to support the British imperialists into trying to take advantage of the contradiction between the first and third world. We must struggle to force the bourgeoisie to support the just demands of the third world; we must not support them intensifying their exploitation and oppression of third world, as the French and Belgians (and the rest of the imperialist crew) did in Zaire under the false flag of supporting these countries against hegemonism. The line of 'lining up' or 'uniting' with the third world is a theoretical justification for this opportunism and it is a line which repeats Kautsky's errors of separating politics from economics and foreign politics from domestic politics. Again to quote Lenin:

"It is fundamentally wrong, un-Marxist and unscientific, to single out 'foreign' policy from policy in general, let alone counterpose foreign policy to home policy. Both in foreign and home policy imperialism strives towards violations of democracy, towards reaction." ('A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism', p 22).

Revisionist Errors on revolution as the motor of history.

The Manifesto amazingly fails to refer to the socialist revolution in the advanced capitalist countries and the new-democratic revolution in the oppressed nations as the two main revolutionary currents of our time. It also refers only to the third world countries as the main force in "fighting hegemonism" (sic.) These are no mere accidental oversights - they reflect the ideological outlook of TE who has not the slightest conception of revolution as the motor of history.

Although 'CS' now does occasionally print articles on the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle within third countries (after a long period when it was thought indecent to mention them (except for ones directed against Soviet social-imperialism)) it is still extremely bashful about it (viz. the squeamishness about the recent struggle in Iran), and the right are fighting a rearguard action against seeing the seizure of state power through new-democratic revolution as the highest form of the anti-imperialist struggle of the third world. So opportunist is TE on this issue that at one time he was fond of saying that because the Shah of Iran (at that time) was playing a relatively progressive role in OPEC we should not at the same time as supporting the Shah's stand also do propaganda on the revolutionary struggle within Iran. We welcome any positive anti-imperialist measures by the Shah, but the revolutionary people of Iran and similar countries like Burma, Brazil, Malaysia etc., will have to actually overthrow their local ruling bourgeoisies in order to make their best possible contribution to the world proletarian revolution, whilst at the same time supporting all genuine anti-imperialist measures of their governments and forcing them through struggle to take an even better stand.

TE was at one time on the verge of saying that the struggle for a new international economic order was more important than the struggle for new-democratic revolution. At another time he said that MC's proposed amendment to the Manifesto to include a specific reference to the socialist and new-democratic revolutions as the two main revolutionary currents of our time was opposed to the 'theory of the three worlds! But his main opposition to a revolutionary application of the theory of the three worlds is to say that the 'countries and people', not the 'people and countries', are the main force in fighting imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism. The formulation itself is not that important, but what lies behind it is. TE wants to say 'countries and people' in order to hand over leadership to the bourgeoisie and blur the fact that the new-democratic revolution is a stage that the struggle has to go through on the march to communism, and in fact to blur the fact that, no matter what forms it goes through, the contradiction between oppressed and oppressor nations can only be resolved by the revolutionary seizure of power by the revolutionary people led by the

proletariat. He gave his game away by virtuglly denying that armed struggle is still necessary in some recent amendments to the resolution on national-democratic revolution.

For TE the wholly prgressive and objectively revocoutionary struggle of the third world countries in such bodies as the UN, OPEC, ASEAN, the non-aligned movement is everything and the revolutionary struggle within these countries is nothing. Under a different form he ressurects Kruschev's theory that economic tasks are the main thing, whilst the revolutionary struggle is no longer necessary. We fully support the tremendous revolutionary struggle being waged by the third world countries in general but to put this in the first place is to liquidate the revolution and support imperialism. Why does TE do this? Because as in the rest of his social-imperialist line he wants to support British imperialism, not the revolutionary people. His line is a social-chauvinist line which throws overboard our responsibility to ally with the revolutionary struggles in such countries as Malaysia, struggles directed against British imperialism, and puts in the first place such revisionist trash as 'uniting' with countries like Malaysia. This is a recipe (again like Kruschev's) for abolishing the task of combatting neo-colonialism. TE's main crime therefore is not that his line will stop the people of the third world countries from having revolution (we can be entirely confident that that they will take no notice of TE's revisionist line) but that it will prevent us from firmly allying with the revolutionary struggle of the people of these countries to abolish imperialist exploitation of their countries. It will also of course prevent us from seeing who are our firmest allies in our revolutionary struggle. TE wants us to not take at all seriously our responsibility to educate and lead the British proletariat in fighting in the closest solidarity with the hundreds of millions of people around the world who are subject to the most viscious exploitation and oppression by British imperialism. It is under the influence of this line that 'CS' consistently fails to report on the struggles which are taking place every day against British imperialism - in Malta, in Cyprus, in Bermuda, in Belize, in Iran etcc., etc., etc.

Even on the question of the revolution in Britain TE is speading the view that "our main contribution to the international united front" is to struggle for national independence (this is of course our implicit line already) - a contemptible opp. tunist line which we have already looked at.

Underlying all this vile revisionism is TE's line that the international class struggle "now takes place mainly between countries." Whereas in reality the struggle of the international proletariat takes place mainly in seperate countries as we shall see in the next section. By the "international class struggle" TE actually means the class struggle as it takes place between countries and thereby considers that world communism will be acheived by the proletariat and revolutionary people sitting back and waiting for the bourgeoisie to hand them communism on a plate.

Trotskyist errors on the 'World Revolution.'

The struggle and revolutionary people, particularly in the era of imperialism, because of the uneven development of capitalism, takes place mainly in each country. As Marx and Engels said:

"Though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat is at first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie."

Lenin later developed this thesis to say " There is only one kind of internationalism in deed: working wholeheartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in one's own country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy and material aid) such, and only such, a struggle and such a line in every country without exception." ('The Tasks

of the Proletariat in Our Revolution') For TE though it is now "dogmatist" to uphold the views of Marx, Engels and Lenin. The view of the Manifesto is that internationalism means upholding "the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality." (para. 15) The opportunist majority on the PC have now smuggled this into the resolution on 'Proletarian Internationalism' as the first principle of internationalism. Yet in the real world in which we live (as opposed to the idealist world of the majority) only by fighting first and foremost against British imperialism in the struggle for socialist revolution can we really put the common interest first. The opportunist view of the majority sounds very revolutionary, but the reason it has been inserted is to provide the theoretical justification for throwing overboard our duty to smash British imperialism and to support all other revolutionary struggles in other countries.

Under the fake 'left' mask of upholding the interests of the "entire proletariat" the majority support the EEC and NATO because it is allegedly in the "entire proletariat's" interest. Also under this false flag we can conveniently forget about supporting in practice struggles like those in Zimbabwe, because it is allegedly in the "entire proletariat's" interest to put first the struggle for British national independence.

It is only "dogmatist" to still uphold the views of Marx, Engels and Lenin today, to those who, like TE, under the guise of "upholding the interests of the entire proletariat" and "subordinating our revolution to that world-wide," want to subordinate the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat in each country to the predatory aims of British and US imperialism.

TE's bourgeois ideology is the fundamental reason for the RCLB's opportunist and revisionist errors.

As Chairman Mao said "We should rid our ranks of all impotent thinking. All views that overestimate the strength of the enemy and underestimate the strength of the people are wrong." ('Selected Work.', vol. 4, p173.) This is precisely the view of TE and in the sphere of ideology TE's views have inevitably profoundly influenced the RCL. The outlook of the RCL is bourgeois pessimism and defeatism which cannot see that the triumph of the proletariat and revolutionary people around the world is inevitable, along with the realization of world communism. On the way though they will have to defeat those who, like TE, because of their bourgeois world outlook, think that world communism will be achieved through stinking class-collaborationism and who simply do not understand (or who do not want to understand) a fundamental principle of dialectical and historical materialism - that the most fundamental and decisive advances in human history have been and will continue to be made through class struggle, of which the highest form is revolution. As Lenin said:

"The two basic (or two possible? or two historically observable?) conceptions of development (evolution) are: development as decrease and increase, as repetition, and development as a unity of opposites (the development as a unity of opposites (the division of a unity into mutually exclusive opposites and their reciprocal relation." (Cited in 'On Contradiction', Mao - 'Selected Readings, 86)

For TE, it is not the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between socialism and imperialism, which is the force propelling forward human history in our era (development as a unity of opposites) but collaboration between them (development as decrease and increase). For TE it is not revolution which is the motor of history but his very distorted version of the united front. We shall in the rest of this document show how TE's bourgeois ideology has led the RCL into consistently making several bourgeois ideological errors.

1. Idealism, metaphysics and mechanical materialism.

The principal contradiction in the world today is between the oppressed and oppressor nations!

TE though says (probably supported by the opportunist majority) that the principal contradiction is that between the oppressed people and nations and the two superpowers (we shall see later how he really thinks that the principal contradiction is between the two superpowers) but even if he were right about the contradiction which in words he puts forward as the principal one, he mechanically uses this to propagate such erroneous views (supported of course by the majority) as "subordinating our revolution" to that world-wide and fighting British imperialism "in the course of the struggle against superpower hegemonism." He does this because he uses the concept of the principal contradiction in the world to throw overboard the duty of the proletariat and revolutionary people to fight in the first place the reactionaries in their own country (whether domestic or foreign). consider

This approach to the world-wide struggle for revolution against imperialism is implicit in the line of the Manifesto. The Manifesto opportunistically avoids stating the four fundamental contradictions in the world and is thus able to 'forget' that the principal contradiction in the world today is that between the oppressor and oppressed nations. Glossing over this contradiction and substituting for it the contradiction between the two superpowers and the oppressed peoples and nations (the implicit line of the Manifesto) - a contradiction which is only the most important way the contradiction between the oppressor and oppressed nations manifests itself - enables us to also 'forget' that our main contribution (as communists in an imperialist country) is to smash British imperialism. Instead we have the implicit line of parts B12 and B13 of the Manifesto of smashing British imperialism in the course of the struggle against superpower hegemonism. This is nothing but vulgar metaphysics and mechanical materialism. It is also a line which 'forgets' in similar mechanical fashion that the revolutionary tasks of the proletariat in each country are determined mainly by the principal contradiction in the particular country, not by the principal contradiction in the world. In doing this we throw overboard the particular responsibilities of the proletariat in each country for an alleged 'general' interest which is in fact the interests of the bourgeoisie. In reality the general takes account of the particular but cannot replace it. As the CPC said in 1963 of the four fundamental contradictions in the world as they then manifested themselves "It is inevitable that these contradictions will give rise to popular revolutions, which alone can resolve them." ('Polemic on the General Line', p7).

Gross idealism manifests itself therefore in the RCL's current practice where we have consistently dealt the main blow in the struggle against superpower hegemonism against the Soviet Union, totally 'forgetting' that it is the US superpower which actually has military bases here and a military alliance with 'our' bourgeoisie. Thus we go out shadow-boxing on August 20th. each year whilst doing nothing in practice about US bases in Britain. This is a line which thinks that imperialism can be defeated without striking material blows at an enemy which we can actually fight. It is also a line which mechanically considers that because the Soviet Union is the more dangerous superpower on a world scale it must be treated as the "primary target in the struggle against hegemonism" in each country. What lamentable failure to make a concrete analysis of class forces in each country and what utter social-chauvinism! It is regrettable but true that all those comrades who have demonstrated on August 20th. for the last two years have been unwitting pawns in the plot of the British imperialists to ally with US imperialism and to gain share of the theive's booty from the next imperialist world war.

Metaphysics also shows up sharply in the RCL in such matters as our approach to such contradictions as that between theory and practice and that between our resources and our tasks. In all of these contradictions we can see only the struggle between the two aspects of the contradiction, not the unity between them. In effect we treat them, not as two aspects of one contradiction,

but as two entirely separate things. Instead of seeing that each is the indispensable condition for the other, that each propels the other forward, we reduce these matters a vulgar question of which is 'primary' and a mere question of how many hours are spent on one and how many hours on the other. Take for example the contradiction between theory and practice: It is now quite clear that TE is perverting the correct criticism of 'BTLTBTP' to launch an all-round attack on practice. In his October circular to BSSs/DSs he refers to doing mass work "whenever the opportunity arises" - as though it didn't arise every day. He also mechanically separates theory from practice by putting as the primary means of resolving this contradiction to a matter of allocating so many hours to one and so many hours to other. This has to be done but in the first place we must deeply understand that the purpose of our theory is to lead our practice and that the vigorous development of both propels the other forward. If we do not use our theory to lead bold and vigorous mass work (and under the influence of the opportunist line on the 'contradiction' between Party-building and mass work we cannot) then there is not the slightest reason for our existence and we may as well retire to universities to study bourgeois sociology.

2. Imperialism and all reactionaries are doomed!

The line of the RCL, again stemming from TE's bourgeois world outlook, is one which sees only the surface and superficial phenomena that the imperialists are outwardly strong. Because we are not thoroughgoing materialists who see that history is on our side, we cannot see that it is the people who are strong and that imperialism is doomed. In the face of difficulties and adversity our consistent approach is not to have contempt for them in the first place and only then take them seriously, but to fear them because we have no faith in the masses. But as Mao says: "Except for cowards and the opportunist gentlemen, most people, and primarily the Communists, invariably put optimism and contempt for difficulties first." ('Peking Review', 13.9.77., p8.)

As the earlier section said our implicit line is that the principal contradiction in the world is that between the two superpowers. This is quite clear in our line that war is "inevitable," not in the correct sense that war is inevitable so long as imperialism exists, but in the opportunist's sense that revolution cannot prevent war. If we really thought the principal contradiction in the world was between the oppressed people and nations (leaving aside that this is an incorrect formulation) we would then immediately ask "what is the principal aspect of this contradiction (bearing in mind Mao's point that "the nature of a thing is mainly determined by the principal aspect of the contradiction") and come up with the answer "the revolutionary upsurge of the third world people and countries," particularly when it profoundly affects as it undoubtedly does, all the other fundamental contradictions in the world, and come to the materialist analysis that revolution is entirely capable of preventing war (not that it will inevitably prevent war.) If however, when confronted with superpower and other imperialist contention and war preparations, you act like a rabbit confronted with a stoat and become paralysed with fear, you will forget about revolution and turn to the bourgeoisie to ally with them in order to defeat the superpowers. No comrades, our line must be "either war will give rise to revolution, or revolution will prevent war."

Our present line is the rightist mirror-image of Hoxha's ultra-imperialism. Hoxha blots out all other contradictions in the world by seeing only superpower collusion, and denies that war is inevitable as long as imperialism exists. The RCL blots out all other contradictions by seeing only superpower contention and denies that revolution can prevent war. Both practice and preach ultra-imperialism.

Our opportunist interpretation of the correct view that war is inevitable as long as imperialism exists is of course inseparably connected with our opportunist line on inter-imperialist rivalry and war itself. In the inter-imperialist contradiction between the Soviet Union and Britain we can see only the strength of the Soviet Union, forget the strength of the proletariat in both countries and fall for the British bourgeoisie's attempts to get us to support their

war preparations. One justification of TE and others for this line is that we are "accumulating strength." A proposition which is undoubtedly true, but which in the hands of these people becomes not a tactical assessment of the balance of class forces and a call to struggle against revisionism, but an opportunist excuse to jettison our strategic line. If we are weak we must adjust our tactics accordingly, we must not though change our strategy. As Stalin said "Tactics are a part of strategy, subordinate to it and serving it." ('Foundations of Leninism', p 86).

This "accumulating strength" line has actually been put forward as a filthy excuse for supporting the EEC and NATO and in general supporting the war preparations of British and US imperialism. As yet another example, instead of preparing the the working class for revolution, and, in the event of war, turning their guns on the imperialists, we instead actually call on the imperialists to build up their war machine under the flag of "opposing appeasement." Lenin points out in the 'Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky' that if a revolutionary situation does not exist, then the duty of Communists is not to desert to the bourgeoisie, as TE has done, but to prove that the revolution is inevitable and to prepare the masses for it. Lenin denounces those leaders who:

"...failed in their duty to carry on revolutionary agitation, revolutionary propaganda, revolutionary work among the masses to overcome their inertness, who in fact worked against the revolutionary aspirations and instincts which are always deep aglow deep down among the masses of the oppressed class." (Op. Cit., p 86).

The line of accumulating strength put forward by some comrades is nothing but a prostitution of Marxism and the argument of renegades, cowards and philistines.

Our bourgeois pessimism and defeatism manifests itself in many other ways. Take for example the contradiction between our resources and our tasks. All opportunists use this contradiction to justify sluggishness and conservatism. All we can see is a small number of comrades - we cannot see the thousands of advanced workers and the millions of workers who are waiting for a lead and waiting to be lead in struggle. We have no conception that a relatively small number of communists inspired by a correct ideological and political line and fired with the burning conviction in the necessity and inevitableness of revolution can mobilise the masses in large numbers. We on the contrary preach opportunism at the workers and do so (inevitably) in a manner without conviction and then "blame the masses for (our) own philistinism" when they fail to respond by deciding that are "no advanced workers" at factory A, or that "the workers are all backward" at factory B. The fable of the foolish old man is a good fable but it has been perverted by us into a concept of a gallant little band slowly and steadily increasing their numbers, not of us moving the masses. As well as the 'foolish old man' we must remember that 'a single spark can start a prarie fire.'

Take also the level of study done in the organization. Not only does 'TE' attack practice by the use of the 'contradiction' between Party-building and mass work, he also leads the opportunist majority to attack theory by his opportunism on the contradiction between our resources and our tasks. Out of pitiful fear of 'overtaxing' comrades we have a situation where we take four months to study 'Wages, Price and Profit,' and where we refuse to give real leadership on innumerable questions on the excuse that "we musn't circulate too many documents." This liquidation of theory and line is a monstrous crime which will ensure that our organization will never be able to put consciousness in command of the class struggle. With hindsight we can now see that the campaign to study the 'Quotations' was an opportunist short-cut to grasping theory which like all short-cuts of this nature got us nowhere. It is simply impossible to study Marxist theory in this piece-meal fashion. Marxism is not easy, nor is it common-sense, its science and hard work - lets start to take theory seriously!

Comrades of the Central Committee,

This meeting is an historic turning-point in the struggle to rebuild the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class and to lead the revolution. We can allow the opportunist majority on the PC to cover up the right opportunist deviation in the RCL, and, under cover of a campaign of lies, smears and slanders against the minority, deepen and consolidate this line, in which case the RCL will become a revisionist organization - or, we can leave this meeting determined to repudiate the right opportunist deviation, sweep the line of the majority into the dustbin of history where it belongs and at this meeting repudiate also the putsch of the majority, led by the opportunist TE!

The choice is yours - with the opportunist majority or with the Marxist minority!

EXPOSE, CRITICISE AND REPUDIATE THE RIGHT OPPORTUNIST DEVIATION
IN THE MANIFESTO OF THE RCLB!

CONDEMN THE OPPORTUNIST PUTSCH OF THE PC MAJORITY HEADED BY TE!

MC. 26.11.78.