says nothing to substantiate and prove the attacks, it is only a continuation of the attacks against these parties saying that, "They distributed leaflets, intending to spread unrest amongst the camp’s participants," and that "their work consisted of purely and simply arouses attacks against the camp, hurling slanders and insults to sow division and confusion amongst the participants." Is this the proof the "communique" gives us against these so-called "provocateurs"? Does distributing a leaflet on the differences in the international communist movement amount to intentions of "spreading unrest" amongst the participants? These accusations are pure slander, typical of all opportunists, the purpose of which is to prevent exposure of the differences in the International communist movement.

The "communique" does not say one word about the differences that exist and does not even criticize the positions of these parties. It only accuses them of being provocateurs. Does wanting a frank open discussion amongst communists amount to an act of provocation? Of course not! We uphold the Leninist principles that only open discussion and debate lays the basis necessary to build and achieve genuine unity. Only the opportunists try to sabotage and repress open debate because they know only too well that Marxism-Leninism can conquer revisionism, (represented by the two international currents; the social-chauvinists who are openly collaborating with U.S. imperialism or Russian or Chinese social-imperialism, as well as centrists who are grouped under the leadership of the Party of Labor of Albania with their theory of the "three superpowers," supposedly "opposed" to the "theory of three worlds," the Maoists and semi-trotskites) because the Marxist-Leninists do not fear criticisms. As for the opportunists of all shades, they tremble when they hear mention of any criticism directed at them and use even social-fascist methods of physical attack to avoid facing these criticisms.

We condemn this "communique" for the use of unsubstantiated accusations of provocation, and for the unprincipled methods used to resolve the differences in the international communist movement!

Being conscious of the fact that it is not Marxist-Leninist unity, but rather, a commitment to debate for building genuine unity based on Marxist-Leninist principles and proletarian internationalism, we commit ourselves to participate in international discussion and debates. We take the position of denouncing this summer camp for the reasons already stated.

March 4, 1980

A FOOL'S PARADISE

The Bolshevik League
of the United States

Two opinions are currently expressed regarding the state of affairs within the communist movement, both internationally and in the U.S. One opinion, the dominant one, is that the prevailing lack of Leninist norms is a favorable condition in that questions of politics and tactics cannot be debated and discussed. This is the position of opportunism (of whatever shade) which lives in mortal fear of the open discussion of politics, in mortal fear of polemics.

Lenin expressed the second position to which we also hold:

"Open polemics, conducted in full view of all Russian Social-Democrats and class conscious workers, are necessary and desirable in order to clarify the depth of existing differences, in order to combat the extremes into which representatives of various views, various localities or various "specialties" of the revolutionary movement inevitably fall. Indeed, we regard one of the drawbacks of the present day movement to be the absence of open polemics between avowedly differing views, the effort to conceal differences on fundamental questions" ("Draft Declaration of Iskra and Zarya," LCW 4:328, Moscow, 1972).

Only the politically blind could fail to see the absence of open polemics today, a condition caused by and lauded by the opportunists. We, too, are interested in combating the extremes of opportunism that the social-nationalist leaders and their henchmen have "naturally" fallen into. We are greatly interested in finding
out through open polemics, the depth of existing differences; we are willing to discuss disputed questions from all angles, etc. This however, does not meet with approval from our opponents — in point of fact this position of principle regarding the question of International relations meets with either the continued “conspiracy of silence” or open repression and hostilities.

The dominance of bourgeois relations in the communist movement has given birth to a particularly vile and dangerous variant of opportunism, a trend that carries the silent renunciation of Leninist norms to their bloody end. Violent suppression of debate has come to challenge the recent slogan issued by the Bolsheviks to the effect that the “Ice Must be Broken.”

Recent events in Valencia, Spain (forceful suppression of discussion at the so-called Third International Youth Camp) and in Greensboro, North Carolina (the killing of five “communists” by the Klu Klux Klan) reflects the rise in violent social-fascist activity on the part of our opponents or at least a section of our opponents.

The workers must be educated to repel the attempts of the social-fascists who conceal with communist catchwords their terrorist program of violent suppression of debate to gain further influence in the working class. The trend of social-fascism has arisen with the aid and encouragement of both the social-chauvinists and the centrists, and has its origins in the suppression of Leninist norms and their re-establishment with philistine silence that began some twenty six years ago, after the death of Stalin and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

In 1937 and again in 1960, the Moscow Declarations, signed by twelve (1957) and later eighty one (1960) “workers” and “communist” parties signalled the official international renunciation of Leninist norms of relations and struggle. Social-democratic niceties replaced Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism in the International “communist movement” as the slogans of “fraternal relations” and “non-interference in the affairs of others” were placed in command. Whenever disputes broke out (the “Sino-Soviet Split”) they broke out not for ideological-political reasons, but for reasons of economic dependence or independency from the Moscow leaders. The aforementioned Sino-Soviet dispute only arose when Russia refused more “economic aid” to China, who in turn had refused to follow Moscow’s dictates to the letter. The Albania-Tito dispute became a matter of public record when the Russian leaders in their rapprochement with the renegade Tito had determined that Albania’s economic and political significance did not warrant the amount of “aid” she was receiving and this money could be better spent on Tito.

The renunciation of Leninist norms was seen in the complete refusal to engage in debate and polemics within the “communist movement.” An air of social-democratic philistinism prevailed within all the parties and in each party’s relations with another.

Is it not clear that the slogans “fraternal relations among parties” and “non-interference in the internal affairs of others” had the effect of unleashing anti-Leninist relations among all the parties in the “International Communist Movement”? Social-Democratic niceties, however are only effective means of placation to a point, as is proved by the history of the suppression of various opposition factions within both the CPC (Lin Piao, Liu Shao-Chi) and PLA.

Slowly, and with great pains, Bolshevism is being re-established. It is this fact, more than any other, that has resulted in the use of tactics within the “communist movement” (among the opportunists) that are rightly called social-fascist. The communist movement is in deep crisis — years of philistine social-democracy are giving way to vicious social-fascism. Dimitrov was a thousand times right when he said it is social-democracy that paved the way for fascism in Europe in the 1920’s and 30’s. It is the same social-democracy that has paved the way for the wave of social-fascist activity that has become so prevalent of late.

The lack of Leninist norms that have charted international relations since the death of Stalin are under challenge from Bolshevism. Debate on crucial questions of the proletarian revolution world-wide is being re-kindled. Against this new situation is flung the twin brother of social-democracy, social-fascism.

Imperialist economism, the relegation of the proletariat to the economic struggle alone, the attempt to secure from imperialism’s superprofits a better deal for workers of the great power countries — is the political expression of social-democracy; while on the other hand, the suppression by whatever means, of Bolshevism is the political expression of social-fascism. The revisionist dominated “international communist movement” attempted to quell opposition to its policies of support for the bourgeoisie through the “peaceful” means of burying scientific socialism and renouncing Leninist norms. This has proved to be fruitless in the face of the call for re-establishment of Leninist norms, in the face of the attempts to break the ice surrounding the questions of socialist revolution. A section of the opportunists internationally has taken it upon themselves to aid the struggle against Leninism through the employment of tactics of social-fascism. We consciously use the term tactics because ideologically (as regards outlook) there are no major disagreements among those following the “peaceful” and “violent” roads to the suppression of Leninism. Social-Democracy had transformed into social-fascism. Unless this is understood it is impossible to understand anything at all in the present international opportunism movement.

Many people have failed to understand the danger posed to the communist and working class movements by the activities of the social-fascists. This failure to understand and combat with all one’s strength this dangerous trend will
result in the further degradation of communism in the eyes and minds of the proletariat. Refusal to combat this trend places one in the position of an abettor of social-fascism. Therefore to rally to the side of open debate, to resolutely and unflinchingly expose all manifestations of social-fascism is required in our present situation, in order to sweep away the confusion that has been placed in the proletariat's mind by the opportunists regarding the aims and activities of Bolshevism.

The American working class is miserably deficient in its revolutionary thought and action. This state of affairs has been brought about by the historically “pure” development of capitalism, the rapid domination of bourgeois democratic traditions and the “democratic” illusions resulting therefrom, and in the absence historically of any traditions of Bolshevism. This situation is compounded by the position of U.S. imperialism, as the leader of one of two major blocks, enjoying the ability to bribe a sector of the most highly paid workers through its plunder of the colonies and semi-colonies. The bourgeoisie influence of this labor aristocracy is great (especially in the trade unions) and enhanced even more by the existence of its political representatives (parties) that call themselves “communist.”

Historically marxism has had to fight every step of the way for hegemony within the workers movement. The opponents of Marx and Engels often referred to themselves as “Marxists” (especially after the two great leaders’ deaths) in order to seek influence among the proletarian masses. Marxian-Leninism has had to confront the same problem — that of exposing those bourgeois pseudo-communists who cloud the thinking of the proletariat with their shielded opportunism.

There presently exist in the U.S. no fewer than five so-called communist parties, all claiming leadership of the workers’ movement and all either tainting helplessly behind the spontaneous outbursts (Communist Party U.S.A. (M-L) and Communist Party U.S.A. (M-L)) or terroristically attempting to incite the proletariat into engaging in suicidal battles with one or another reactionary force (Communist Workers Party, Revolutionary Communist Party).

These parties are made up almost entirely of labor aristocrats (albeit many of these are “transformed” students) intent on securing greater wages at the expense of the oppressed classes and nations; or by utterly frenzied petty bourgeois anarchists (such as Bob Avakian, Chairman of RCP) bent on excursively forcing a working class they consider stupid and docile to commit acts which satiate the frenzy of the petty bourgeois leaders for the spilling of blood.

It is the anarchist social-fascist parties who are leading the way in the present spreading of confusion and mistrust among the proletariat for the banner of communism. The other opportunist parties, far from being “critical” of these terrorist elements, laud the fact that they have succeeded where others have failed — in slandering the name of communism in the headlines of the American (and we might add, the international) press with their recent activities.

No one incident so pointedly proves our assertion of the social-fascist character of these parties than the recent events in Greensboro, North Carolina. The Communist Workers Party (formerly the Workers’ Viewpoint Organization) provoked the killing of five of its members by the reactionary Klu Klux Klan and Nazi Party at a demonstration called under the slogan “Death to the Klan” (A Strange turn of events indeed!)

No one — not even CWP — disputes the fact that these killings were provoked. On the contrary, say our social-fascists, they provide the basis to further the growth of the CWP! The Greensboro incident is not an isolated occurrence, it is rather the natural result of the provocative politics that the CWP and its forerunner, Workers Viewpoint, have engaged in. This insidious organization, born in secrecy in the mid 1970’s and emerging openly in 1973 has long been known as the advanced detachment of the social-fascist current. Unable to refute the criticism of its political line, WVO resorted to physical beatings to quell the debate. The most widely known incidents of their social-fascist activity have been directed since 1976 against not only the lefts but even against their fellow opportunists, who were unwilling at the time to follow the excitative path.

It is without question that the bourgeoisie desires the slander of communism far more from “communists” themselves, than from the avowed anti-communists commentators (William F. Buckley, etc.) who have no influence within the working class movement. The massive amount of press that the Greensboro incident received bears this out. The strength of the social-fascist trend lies precisely in its alliance with the bourgeoisie — in the fact that the bourgeoisie, through its press, has displayed the willingness to follow and publish, the absurdities carried on by the social-fascists under the stolen banner of communism. How many articles have appeared in the bourgeois press concerning the split with opportunism, the rupture with social-chauvinism and centrism that has been affected by the Bolsheviks in recent months. This, of course will not be made known to the workers through the bourgeois press — this fact is of great worry to the bourgeoisie and hence the terrorist activities of the “communists” are all we can expect in the pages of bourgeois (and petty bourgeois) yellow journalism.

The Bolsheviks, and only the Bolsheviks, must and will publicize the dangers of terrorism and social-fascism to the workers. The Bolsheviks must break the ice (and cracks are already to be observed) in regard to open debate. The proletariat suffers greatly from the picture of communism painted by the social-fascists and framed by the bourgeoisie. Our most immediate task must be the thorough exposure of the social-fascists and their programme of terror that is being advanced no longer in their miserable rag sheets alone; but increasingly by the bourgeoisie and liberal press as well. Failure to carry out
this pressing exposure will cripple the ability of Bolshevism to secure for itself, first a foothold, and later, complete authority among the class conscious workers whose consciousness is daily endangered by the social-fascists. A fool’s paradise is a wise man’s hell and the present hellish state of affairs threatens the proletariat and the young Bolsheviks with languishing in “paradise” unless victory is achieved in the routing of the social-fascists.

It is not enough to be content with the fact that the social-fascists are unable to win large numbers to their side, from the ranks of the workers. This fact is of little consolation so long as the alliance of the social-fascists with the bourgeoisie continues (and it will continue so long as imperialism exists). Complacency regarding the esteem of Bolshevism in the minds of the workers, especially the class conscious among them, will result in the further domination of opportunism in the working class movement. Failure to open the debate that the opportunists (particularly now the social-fascists) have closed will result in the continued subjugation of Leninist norms and hence the continued burying of differences and disputes. We are in a critical situation, one that requires the utmost in skill and perseverance from the Bolsheviks if the twenty odd year history of philistinism and opportunism is to be buried. We must resolve not to let another day pass where the activities of social-fascism go unexposed.

Let the social-fascists’ paradise soon become their hell!

December 1979

On the “Third International” Youth Camp” in Spain:
PROVOCATION UNDER COVER OF CRIES AGAINST PROVOCATION

Bolshevik Union of Canada

During the summer the international centrist trend headed by the Party of Labour of Albania held the so-called “Third International Youth Camp” at Valencia, Spain. This was allegedly an “anti-imperialist anti-fascist” youth camp. But the reality was quite another matter. The “anti-imperialism” consisted of attacking organizations that struggle against imperialism. One of the participating centrist parties, the so-called “CPUSA(ML),” said “the delegates did not shrink from the battle against imperialism when it presented itself at the conference” (Unite!, September 15, 1979). The camp organizers showed their “anti-fascism” by calling upon the Spanish police to disperse the so-called “imperialists” who were “sabotaging” the camp by distributing a leaflet.

Eleven centrist parties or their youth organizations have put out a “Communique on the Various Provocations Against the Third International Youth Camp” which puts forward unsubstantiated slanders about “provocations,” but which in fact only exposes its signatories.

In order to cover for themselves the centrists said that holding the camp was a victory against the Spanish government. The “communique” says “the success was won against the Spanish government which had forbidden but was forced to lift its ban the day before the Camp opened” (Unite!, September 15, p. 3). But how did this motley crew of opportunists “force”