

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: Opportunism of All Sorts Covers for Revisionism & Soviet Social-Imperialism

The following are excerpts from the pamphlet entitled "The African People's Struggle Will Surely Triumph—Build the Communist Leadership of the African Liberation Support Committee" published by Workers Viewpoint Organization in 1977. Although certain significant changes have taken place internationally, the line presented still retains its correct thrust. In this period of great disorder in the world, there is a revisionist wind blowing strongly and we must be vigilant about it—especially about belittling the role of Soviet social-imperialism. In doing so, we will arm ourselves with the correct grasp of Chairman Mao's correct and deep sizing up of the balance of forces in the world as reflected in his three worlds theory.

(Continued from the February 15th issue of Workers Viewpoint Newspaper.)

The Factors For Both War And Revolution Are On The Rise

The situation in the 1960's, when the oppressed nations' struggle against imperialism was undeniably the principal contradiction in the world, determined that the danger of world war still existed but was small, and revolution was the main trend. That is what Chairman Mao summed up in his famous statement in 1970:

A new upsurge in the struggle against U.S. imperialism is now emerging throughout the world. Ever since World War 2, U.S. imperialism and its followers have been continuously launching wars of aggression and the people in various countries have been continuously waging revolutionary wars to defeat the aggressors. The danger of a new world war still exists, and the people of all countries must get prepared. But revolution is the main trend in the world today.

(People of the World, Unite and Defeat the U.S. Aggressors and All Their Running Dogs, May 20, 1970)

Today's situation, where all the fundamental contradictions in the world are sharpening, particularly those between the two superpowers and between the oppressed nations and the superpowers, creates a situation where the factors for both war and revolution are on the rise. Either war will give rise to revolution or revolution will prevent the war. These are the two possible paths to revolution. The more likely situation is that world war will give rise to revolution, though we cannot predict the exact course history will take.

The ATM, of course, ignoring all facts and the rapid change in the world situation in the last few years, continues to keep their heads buried in the 1960's. They summed up 1975:

The trend of the international situation in 1975 confirmed that Revolution indeed is the main trend in the world today.

(Revolutionary Cause, Vol. 1, No. 2, Jan. 1976)

In taking this position, the ATM is actually saying, in the context of struggle around the dialectics between world war and revolution, that *revolution will prevent world war*.



Seeing through opportunists who cover for Soviet social-imperialism, the Iranian people's revolution is a powerful example of how the third world is the main force against the two superpowers, both the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Sophistry And Eclecticism

The catch here that the ATM demagogues use is the word "revolution", used in the most general, vague sense:

Revolution is the main trend in the world today and will continue to be so long as we are in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution . . . people are moving history forward toward revolution and . . . revolution is indeed the main trend in the world, in spite of the imperialists' attempts to reverse this irresistible historical trend.

(Revolutionary Cause, Vol. 1, No. 8, p. 4)

It is clear as daylight that the ATM is playing on the difference between the general motion of history under imperialism and throughout all historical periods and a concrete analysis of a concrete situation, the concrete dialectics at any given moment.

In discussing which of the two paths towards revolution is most likely and which will give a correct view as to how best to prepare for the immediate period ahead, ATM's sophistry is borrowed from MLOC and PRRWO (the "old" PRRWO, if ATM prefers).

For that matter, if the ATM wants to equate the statement that "revolution is the main trend today" with the historical truth that "the people are moving history forward toward revolution" throughout the whole era of imperialism, why stop there? Haven't

the people been "moving history forward toward revolution" throughout all of history, from primitive communalism to slavery from slavery to feudalism and from feudalism to capitalism?

Misused in this way, by butchering up Chairman Mao's May 20th statement, particularly the part on the essence of inter-imperialist rivalry, then the slogan "revolution is the main trend today" reduces itself to fundamental historical materialist laws, that "the masses are the makers of history" and history develops towards progress, which are laws that are universally valid at all times.

In 1975-6, the CPC has advanced another concrete analysis of the two trends of war and revolution, saying that "The factors for both revolution and war are increasing." (Documents of the First Session

of the Fourth National People's Congress of the People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, Jan. 1976, p. 59)

Take the years 1912 and 1935, which were just before the outbreak of World Wars 1 and 2. They both fell in the epoch of imperialism, the eve of socialist revolution. The world's people were certainly moving history forward toward revolution. But could anyone say that in 1912 and 1935 the danger of war existed but was relatively small, and revolution was the main trend? We certainly aren't comparing today's situation to those of 1912 or 1935. But this certainly exposes the absurdity of ATM's generalities and sophistry.

Everybody knows of this slogan of the CPC's. Everybody knows that the CPC has not referred to Chairman Mao's May 1970 statement since late 1974 and early 1975. And so don't those who quote these statements actually have real disagreements with the line of the CPC on the international situation or have real ulterior motives?

ATM not only evades the concrete questions, but actually is underhandedly pushing a centrist line on the role of the Soviet Social-Imperialists. Why? Because ATM does not understand the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and does not believe that the Soviet Union is the most dangerous source of world war. In fact, they don't even believe in Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought, thinking

Continued on page 21

Int'l Situation

Continued from page 12

MLMTT is only applicable to Chinese conditions, for the Chinese revolution. In negating the contribution of Chairman Mao on the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, through his summing up of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and class struggle in China it's no wonder ATM cannot understand Soviet Social-Imperialism and thus the danger of world war today. It is no wonder they have an opportunist line on the international situation.

STRATEGY & TACTICS: OL & RCP REVISE MARXISM

ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

OL, RCP Distort the Direction of the Main Blow

What is the direction of the main blow and what is the content of the OL's "innovation" that Soviet Social-Imperialism is in fact the direction of the main blow? What is the RCP's position on the direction of the main blow? And why is their position also incorrect and, in fact, a position permitting them to mutate, in the fashion of the notorious *Guardian*, away from the correct verdict on the nature and role of Soviet Social-Imperialism?

Lenin applied the content of the direction of the main blow in the struggle against Czarism during the first stage, the bourgeois democratic stage of the Russian Revolution. In that struggle, Stalin summed up:

Direction of Main Blow: liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie, which was serving to win over the peasantry and liquidate the revolution by a compromise with Tsarism.

(*Foundations of Leninism*)

Lenin vividly described the *class nature* and class relations of the liberal bourgeoisie represented by the Cadets, and the motion of other classes in class struggle. For example, the Cadets were the social props in the first stage of revolution. On their class character, Lenin remarked:

It is to the advantage of the Russian liberal to pose before the Russian readers as a representative of the whole 'democratic opposition' in general . . . when the Cadet looks to the fight he draws distinct lines of 'class contradiction': here the nobility, there the big bourgeoisie. But the moment the liberal turns his glance to the left, he puts the word 'class contradiction' in ironical quotation marks. The class distinction disappears: the liberal, the capacity of the general 'democratic opposition', are supposed to represent the peasants, the workers and the urban democrats (urban petty bourgeoisie - ed.).

(*Political Parties in the Five Years of the Third Duma*)

The liberals need voters, they need a crowd that would trust and follow them (in order to compel the Purishkeviches to make room), but they fear the political independence of the crowds.

(*Liberalism and Democracy*)

As we can see here, Lenin's understanding of the social prop is based on *class analysis*, *class struggle*, and its *motion*. The OL, in copping to a correct line only in form, is copping only to the phrases and words, for example, as we illustrated before, using the term 'liberal bourgeoisie' in both the U.S. and in Mexico (which is very dangerous) in the same way. This again, of course, is something these hopeless pedants like OL and Nicholas cannot help but practice.

Using a similar methodology of grasping class analysis and changes in class relations, Lenin and Stalin summed up the role of the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries as the direction of the main blow during the 2nd stage of the Russian revolution. For they strove to put an end to the revolution by compromising with the imperialists because of their fear of the working class and its revolutionary alliance with the lower and middle peasantry.

RCP's View on Direction of the Main Blow

While the OL flips from liquidating the direction of the main blow (i.e. historically, their line that liberals and militant trade union misleaders are direct reserves of the proletariat, rather than the direction of the main blow) to their "everything is liberal" line, the RCP, to their 'credit', still stubbornly holds onto their consistently opportunist line that Stalin was wrong on the question of the direction of the main blow.

Both Superpowers are the Targets of Revolution: U.S. Imperialism is More Exposed Soviet Social-Imperialism is More Hidden & Dangerous

On the international situation this same line, which in essence does not distinguish, as the way Malcolm X once put it, the difference between the 'wolf and the fox', shows that the RCP does not and cannot tell the difference between U.S. Imperialism and Soviet Social-Imperialism. While the U.S. has been most thoroughly exposed over the past two to three decades, the Soviet revisionists are much more sinister and dangerous since they still fly the flag of 'socialism'. They are only just beginning to be exposed to the people of the world.

This line of not distinguishing the 'wolf' from the 'fox' is essentially the line that does not view the Soviet Social-Imperialists as the most *dangerous* (the most treacherous and deceptive, the hidden danger to many) of the two main enemies of the people of the world - the Two Superpowers.

It is no accident, then, that the pragmatist RCP only sees Soviet Social-Imperialism as a main danger to China and not to the people of the world. Because they see danger only as a *direct* physical threat, they thus view Soviet Social-Imperialism as only the main danger to China since the Soviet Union is right next to China. In any case, certainly the RCP is inching its way, in the manner of the *Guardian* in the last few years, to reverse the verdict on the role and nature of the Soviet Social-Imperialists. This line certainly can justify this.

Avakian, Word Magician; Fight Appeasement?"

In the RCP's recent international conference,



in which the RCP was attempting to apply the line of 'winning over the middle forces', but in fact conciliated to all forms of opportunism, Avakian demagogically tried to muddle the question of the 'main danger' and justify the RCP's emerging centrist line on this question of Soviet Social-Imperialism by posing the point this way:

"...what does it mean for U.S. revolutionaries, the working class and people in the U.S. to so-call 'fight appeasement' and fight against a section of the ruling class that carries out so-called 'appeasement policies' the way it is being raised by some like Hinton and the OL and others like today. It means urging our own imperialists to be more vigorous in carrying out their own imperialist aims and intentions for domination, exploitation and oppression." (*Revolution*, Dec. 1976)

Now forces like the OL, as we pointed out earlier, certainly don't know what they are talking about. And we also disagree with Hinton's 'neutralizing U.S. Imperialism' line. But the point is precisely that the Soviet Social-Imperialists are the main danger and therefore their detente scheme, as well as the appeasement line of some U.S. monopoly interests, must be exposed. Exposure of detente and appeasement is extremely important. Chairman Mao formulated the line to expose appeasement and detente, to educate the people of the world, and in order to prepare and alert the people so they can turn world war around to revolution in as many countries as possible. These are some reasons why we must expose detente and appeasement as it is the fastest, most deceptive and quickest way to world war. The demagoguery of the RCP is by playing with semantics, by changing the term 'exposure of appeasement' to 'fight appeasement'.

RCP, in debating the OL, is actually looking for a bogus target to hit. In debating the spineless OL, the RCP tries to make themselves look good. But they are just opportunist twins that complement each other so well!

Avakian, by demagogically toying with sophistry, by twisting words and playing with semantics, by changing 'exposure of appeasement' to 'fight appeasement', objectively makes people think that raising vigilance on appeasement and detente is actually holding the line of siding with one imperialist to fight another. This is, of course, totally sham. There is no such thing as 'fight appeasement'. Appeasement itself is a dangerous *line* which feeds the other imperialist's appetite, provoking its wild ambitions.

The main thing is whether communists recognize and expose the danger of the appeasement line. Whether we realize that the Soviet Social-Imperialists are more dangerous in the sense of being younger, leaner, more disguised and sinister than the U.S. Imperialists. Based on that, there is the need to make that distinction to warn the working class and other oppressed people and countries of the world. In refusing to make such a distinction, the RCP inevitably aids the Soviet Social-Imperialists and does great harm to the U.S. proletariat as well as peoples around the world struggling against the Superpowers.