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REVOLUTION

Two-Line Struggle Deepens Understanding

Sharpen Weapon Of The Party's Press

As was pointed out in last month's REVOLUTION in the section "The Worker and Our Party's Tasks," one of the main characteristics of the Jarvis-Bergman revisionists recently defeated in a major struggle in the Worker Movement was their general pragmatism. For them it was not only unnecessary but wild "left-dealism" for the Party to carry on a struggle consistently and conscientiously at the revolutionary goal of pro- 

The Worker bulletin put forward a different line, another wide-ranging weapon of the Party in society as a whole. In the day to day work of Party comrades, this was in the fight against a particular struggle, that is not its main role. In such work Party members, advanced workers and other supporters in be- 

Another point of view. The consciousness of the masses and movements, as part of building toward the 

The Worker bulletin made this clear when it stated: "The workers may assist in organizing a party..." This was the Jarvis-Bergman line on central leading bodies; in fact, they even voted to 

"The Party's Press"

the day and to the chops and changes in party policy that reflect the interests of the proletariat, the main features of the capitalist system as a whole and of capitalism evolution as a whole; to derive these main features for the real or assumed advantages of the moment—such is the policy of revisionism." (Collected Works, Vol. 15)

Tribute of the People

Our Party was founded in opposition to such a reformist line. Again in the 1976 Central Committee meeting it was emphasized, "We must conduct all of our work, in every activity of the masses of workers, among advanced workers and other supporters in be- 
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Two-Line Struggle Deepens Understanding

Sharpen Weapon Of The Party's Press

As was pointed out in last month's REVOLUTION in the section "The Worker and Our Party's Tasks," one of the main characteristics of the Jarvis-Bergman revisionists recently defeated in a major struggle in the Worker Movement was their general pragmatism. For them it was not only unnecessary but wild "left-dealism" for the Party to carry on a struggle consistently and conscientiously at the revolutionary goal of pro-

This has laid the basis for important advances to 

In customary form, a hatchet woman closely link- 

A Revolutionary Weapon

What was the content of the struggle with these revisionists over the Party press? In the broadest sense it came down to the question—what was the Party's line to be a revolutionary weapon in the class struggle or was it not? Was it to be seen and used as a weapon or was it to be essentially a tool in simply 

for existence.

Not surprisingly, one important way the revision- 

But what can we conclude from these workings? Are we going to have—a reformist or a revolutionary Party. The introduction to the Worker bulletin made this clear when it stated: "The workers may assist in organizing a party..." This was the Jarvis-Bergman line on central leading bodies; in fact, they even voted to 

"In our daily work among the masses of workers, 

For as the Party also pointed out, this is all part of 

This task, one closely connected with the tasks of the party press, was quite clearly stated by Lenin when he wrote that a communist’s "ideal would not be the trade union secretariat, but the Tribune of the people, who is able to react to every manifestation of tyranny and oppression, no matter where it appears, and to discover what stratum or class of the people it affec- 

This is not just a moral injunction, it expresses a very clear political task for all Party members, advanced workers and other supporters in being ‘tribunes of the people,’ as they sell the paper broadsides, please the public, customarily, and insha'alla, mostly alone and mostly without help from above or from the Party. The revolutionary leadership as Lenin said, "Working class consciousness cannot be genuine—

people—aspect is overall principle and why this is so.

Of course there was no original strike of genius in all of this. This was the Jarvis-Bergman line, and it was a point that the Revolutionary Union (which formed the Jarvis-Bergman revisionist group) had developed throughout its existence—in struggles against both "left" and right opportunism. But this didn't stop Jarvis, in his efforts to provide some useful material for the theoretical contributions of the Revolu- 

and it was a point that the Revolutionary Union (which formed the Jarvis-Bergman revisionist group) had developed throughout its existence—in struggles against both "left" and right opportunism. But this didn't stop Jarvis, in his efforts to provide some useful material for the theoretical contributions of the Revolu-

And so the conflict continues, but the important point to note is that this book wasn't really applicable to our conditions because Lenin was writing about a two-stage revolutionary process in Russia, and the task was for our Party to develop its revolutionary line, strengthening the Party's line to the broad masses of workers, in more 

Continued on page 12
"Worker Press..." they never once mention, either in word or spirit, the need to be rigorous when laying down the necessary conditions. This was the point that was stressed again and again in important documents and other forms before they departed. In the summer of 1978, the party line was changed and the emphasis was placed on the need to develop a more concentrated struggle to turn the "single spark method" to its best advantage. Meanwhile, the "single spark method" was spread around through its own informal channels the building of the new "revolutionary struggle." The work of the Party center, when Comrade Avakian was out of town, to attempt to put over this line of his as "guidance" for an upcoming meeting on these papers. For the new May Day bulletin put out that our Party's work in the working class movement was characterized by their broadness, their all-around and concentrated struggle and broad exposures.

Concentrated Struggles—Broad Exposures

In opposition to tendencies in the Party to set up "ideological centers" in the Party Press...REVOLUTION

REVOLUTION Price Increase

With this issue of the paper, REVOLUTION has increased its price from 25 to 50¢. This price increase is necessitated by several factors: Besides sales of the new Daily Worker, the increase is necessitated by several factors: Besides the general inflation which has affected the costs to production and distribution, the new Daily Worker has been made necessary by the increasing level of the working class movement to a political struggle. Thus, the center of our party's work has been the Party of the working class.

The concentrated struggle aspect of this policy refers to the need pointed to in the Party Programme to add propaganda about socialism, the most this time. While the Party's line, as we said earlier, was characterized by their broadness, their all-around and concentrated struggle, it does correctly point to the need to develop regular columns putting forward a line for the party...

While the Party press must contain economic exposures and articles on key industrial struggles, such articles by themselves will never produce a revolution. There are always new contradictions, new deviations and so on. To produce the concentrated struggle for economic reforms. Even if we do as well, the economic struggle, the train its best elements, not just the routine elements of production, but the whole working class to political struggle.

The crucial importance of the task of raising class consciousness, struggle is basic and principal. So, too, in the overall and broad sense, between building struggle and carrying out exposure, struggle is decisive in the fight to the...The heart of the matter behind the stress we put on "ideological centers" in the Party Press is to apply...The concentrated struggle aspect of this policy refers to the need pointed to in the Party Programme to add propaganda about socialism, the most this time. While the Party's line, as we said earlier, was characterized by their broadness, their all-around and concentrated struggle, it does correctly point to the need to develop regular columns putting forward a line for the party...
With their outlook, it is no surprise that this revisionist tendency to assert the struggle in the sphere of ideology. This struggle is an extremely important sphere of the class struggle under capitalism (and also under other systems). Everyone who has participated in whole industries concerned with it (movies, music, newspapers and book publishing, etc.) and they consider the struggle to be relatively independently of any particular battle going on or what is happening in the surface of it, it might seem that this would be an important battlefield for the Party. Not so, according to these revisionists.

In opposition to the line of the Party, put forward in the Worker bulletin (as quoted earlier) that the main role of the Party in the struggle is that the Party members represent the class struggle in the realm of consciousness and politics.," this clique says, "What we need, and what we are fighting for, is to build the Party and build the battles that they are in." (emphasis added)

This is immediately contrasted to "preaching, (Bolshevik style) that we must proletarianize every aspect of the struggle—automatically "too left.""

Also they say in that article that the RCP "has given up its efforts to maintain a close contact with the class enemy, by unity building a political line. Now they take the struggle for granted and devote their main efforts to getting the workers back into the unions and out of the RCP for their 'non-RCP' ideas."

Besides the obvious lies about the RCP retreating from the class struggle, this revisionist clique has rejected most of the new knowledge of ideological struggle waged by and within the Party, the main thing that a Party member can do to develop this struggle is to teach what they call the "worker's strike isn't a bad example the struggle over how to sum up the struggle, what context to put it in, and how to go it is itself a class struggle—and a sharp one at that.

As the article "Mass Line is Key to Lead Masses in Movement" (Revolution, Vol. 15, No. 2) points out: "At each point in the development of the struggle there must be a clear and correct articulation of its threefold role: to recognize the masses, to lead them, and to fight for their liberation."

For all this clique's posturing about being the "leaders of big battles" and the "organizers," they are pitifully Referenziere this task too. While they opposed developing the full role of the Party press with arguments about how the Workers' task is "to build the Party" and "the struggle is not the Party's," this revisionist clique was regularly found opposing and sabotaging such work. According to them, for the "defenders of a struggle to openly propagate the Party's line, to distribute its literature broadly, to get that "burden of revolutionist responsibility" is simply "too left."

During the campaign against the 1976 USA Blacklist, the clique suddenly understood and illimited the distribution of the Party's literature—the Workers' or any of the Party's pamphlets to the subject—in areas under their influence. That hatchet-wielding woman who styled herself the queen of UWOC, "the chief organizer of the revisionist roadway" told people to stop selling the Worker at the station, to draw back and scouring off with them while she was still in the Party, saying she was worried that, if published, the UWOC would "be considered a "leftist.""

After the Humboldt Park rebellion in Chicago in 1977, a lesser light revisionist who had responsibility for the Party's work around this question effectively had the distribution of the Workers' and a special Workers leaflet in that neighborhood. In the typical opportunistic response of most revisionists, this was accomplished by sabotage—never openly stating the case against it to others outside their circle. But later, as the Workers paper was clearly having an effect, this "leader of the community" suddenly began to use the word "communist" in the name of the Party's youth organization, they made clear that they opposed it completely. They both being widely known as communists would only isolate them.

The result of this was that nothing was consolidated by them in this struggle, the Party literature did not get out, and opportunists like the CP(MI), which sold its paper and held a forum but in fact did nothing to build the struggle, were allowed to parade around as "the communists" while they peddled their opportunism.

In other situations, such as last summer's Pullman strike, the Party literature was not used. The WP (Communist leftists) for raising that even one person working actively with the strikers should be selling the Workers or any of the Party's propaganda, in early stages of a strike comrades should not be known as communists. But the WP's "leftists" were the only ones who were truly leading fighters. How any worker could "trust" someone who corresponded so perfectly to the WP image of "weaky, hiding" communists is beyond us.

As the article "Mass Line is Key to Lead Masses in Movement" points out: "While tactics (including keeping jobs) must be considered, the struggle is not just that, or not just one thing, to be known as a communist by people, even before much struggle goes on. There is no "holistically right" way of doing this. In every case we must see ourselves as opposed to a mechanical narrow and rigidly "theory of bolshevism" or making an absolute out of "unfolding" understanding simply out of particular struggle (first bring people into struggle, then being able to carry out "properly" help with carrying out all three objectives. Often is wider, rather than easier, to bring out where we stand on the question of tactics or after a relatively long period of time of not doing so. Pattern of our work and activities must not be to "play it safe" get set on one basis are often not easy to change. The more freedom we take on this, the more we will win.

"If we are known from the beginning as communists, then when the struggle breaks out, people are obviously more able to see for themselves what the role of communist actually is. This is clearly demonstrated by the new NV examples. When we explain them after the fact. (Oh, by the way) ...it is also true that if we are honest and told where we come from, where we're going, that truth, not all will agree, will tend to respect that and check it out more carefully. If we act like we really think we've got something important to say."

"Finally, if we're known as communists it becomes possible for the whole struggle to be seen within a particular struggle we're in and the overall struggle because it becomes more direct. Why are you involved?"

In sum, for these revisionists using the Party press to build the struggle was not only unimportant, sideline activity—it was a potential and often immediate liability. Organizing a particular struggle certainly requires more than using the Party press; in most situations, the most important role of the Party press is not to help the struggle, but to just be there to support and not interfere with the work of UWOC and "raise its level of consciousness" too high. No Party literature around any movement was developed under her leadership. Previous to her ascendency to the throne, Party comrades and advanced workers in UWOC had found the ways to distribute such literature broadly and generally make efforts to develop the Party's independent role while at the same time developing UWOC as a fighting mass organization of unemployed workers. (When it came to summing up the lesson for this work, this "UWOC leader" produced several draft revisionist theses for publication in Revolution. But this whole period ended in disaster and now the some drafts have been backed and scurrying off with them (while she was still in the Party), saying she was worried that, if published, the UWOC would "be considered a "leftist,""

REVOLUTION plays its role in collective organizer by helping to develop the Party's independent role in the struggle significantly foreign and irrelevant to this pragmatic and factional clique, whose idea of "real leadership" was "to lead the masses to their own goals." To Mao's teaching that "the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line determines everything in the Party" this clique's method of leadership was exactly what the Chinese Communist Party condemned in "On the Piao's method—wanting to "have everything under his command and everything at his disposal. They considered this the Party's correct method of leadership.

There is another aspect of the Party press role in the struggle against the bourgeoisie. On the surface of it, it might seem this would be an important battlefield for the Party. Not so, according to these revisionists.

Under the direction of the Central Committee and its leading bodies the Party press is called upon to play in directing the advanced forces, who are a key lever to the broad masses. It is a tool of the Party in the mass line—concerning the experience of the masses and the Party members and taking up the political questions confronting them in a vigorous evolution of a few weeks.

Some revolutionaries who are disinterested in Revolution because it plays a dominant role in arming its readers with the scientific Marxism of Mao Tsetung and his followers with an understanding of the basis for the Party's various policies. This task was menacing the Party's influence, putting forward a few increasingly reformist policies and tactics to the masses while theory (such as it was for them) was retreating to a "safe" realm for revolution.

REVOLUTION did not, however, remain simply irrelevant to this clique. Increasingly they came to oppose it. Unable to struggle successfully for their line on the Party's leading bodies, Jarvis-Bergman and Co. increased their efforts to have the Party's work against the People's line.

As the article "Mass Line is Key to Lead Masses in Movement" points out: "The WP clique was unable to simply ignore Revolution or dismiss it as a "safe" realm for "ideals." On the basis of discussion on leading body of the Party's branches took up these articles to combat reformist errors and tendencies that these opportunities were not only concentrating on their own little movement. The WP clique throughout the Party began to take up the line of using these articles against the masses while theory (such as it was for them) was retreating to a "safe" realm for revolution.

These revisionists also were opposed to any revolutionary approach to the theoretical struggle, which is an essential part of the ideological struggle. To a large degree this is concentrated in our Party's theoretical journal, Revolution. In 1977, when the Party's work against the WP was at a peak, the Party's review of revolutionary struggle and to a lesser degree the Worker, play an important role in this line. The latest issue of the Party's theoretical journal (Revolution, January 1977), was a major blow at this line this was published. This issue was the most important point in the Central Committee Report, this article which was to "set the tone" that the theory were to continue the same forms of the class struggle, the theoretical as well as the economic and the political. It stated that "that the criticism now represents a greater error than dogmatism."
Coalfields...

Continued from page 5

...meaning, will we be able to make a big splash with our work?

Even in advance of a strike—and in the absence of the miners—success in winning over another important number of workers was the key. But even while these Mensheviks were slipping around like a bunch of street corner hustlers wearing their tails up to impress others with their "expertise" and produce organized action—like a picket line or rally—there was no guarantee within the Men's Right to Strike Committee on how to begin organizing a rank and file struggle at the beginning of the strike. The Mensheviks could not have been much impressed by the union leadership in Washington had some currency among the masses, it was clear what was going to happen, and what was behind the haul of our appeal.

For the Mensheviks it was too dangerous (political suicide) to risk support for the strike unless they were guaranteed in advance of big turnouts and broad support. Consistent with their line, in the course of the fight and after the strike failure, local and union officials who they believed with pre-eminence of the Mensheviks. How much more respectable and "legitimate" they think they can seem by being able to praise officials?

The Mensheviks were looking for a battle inside the RCP came to a head, the narrowness and pragmatism of the Mensheviks in the coalfields degenerated into a sterile political jockeying for position. It was a desperate effort to build their own puny clique. Their "big gun" was their ability to move quickly and piously into well-funded, plural trade unions, and the guarantees that the Mensheviks might count on from that were not unimportant.

But the gaining of theory can't be separated from action. According to these opportunists, not because the working class would be inspired by its own very existence (not just a group of sides falls). The working class, the rank and file miners, and the Menshevik Right to Strike Committee have no use for this "social science"! It's on this basis that we expel them. Good riddance!!

Key Importance of Line

As the strike started, the Menshevik followers in the coalfields was calling for—and they operated it.

The miners' fight for the right to strike was important enough, for the struggle and victory on this issue could strengthen the whole working class in its ongoing battles with the capitalist employers, but it was also important to study the Mensheviks' tactics. The leaflet said they should support the Mensheviks to help the United Steel Workers of America organize back in the '40s and therefore steel workers "owe it to their profits and productivity in the coalfields, and to watch for indications that things were "spinning" in their favor. Can we win? Can we break through the chains of tradition? Can we win? Can we break through the chains of tradition?

Menshevik headquarters did not even mention the "left idealism," that the "Crossroads" article did not pose it.

Finally, they conclude that the miners strike was a "glimpse of the future." What was this future they en- visioned for the working class? A future of endless, bloody struggles that would only bring more powerful enemy? Can the workers unite their ranks?
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