

SOCIAL-CHAUVINISTS' WAR MANEUVERS

The Call's "Sooner Or Later" Debate

"By social-chauvinism we mean the acceptance of the idea of the defense of the fatherland in the present imperialist war, justification of an alliance between socialists and the bourgeoisie and the governments of their 'own' countries in this war, a refusal to propagate and support proletarian-revolutionary action against one's 'own' bourgeoisie, etc. It is perfectly obvious that social-chauvinism's basic ideological and political content fully coincides with the foundations of opportunism. It is *one and the same* tendency. . . . The idea of class collaboration is opportunism's main feature. The war has brought this idea to its logical conclusion. . . ."

"... Firstly, chauvinism and opportunism in the labor movement have the same economic basis: the alliance between a numerically small upper stratum of the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie—who get but morsels of the privileges of their 'own' national capital—against the masses of the proletarians, the masses of the toilers and the oppressed in general." (V.I. Lenin, "The Collapse of the Second International," *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 242, 244)

"The socialist, the revolutionary proletarian, the internationalist, argues differently. He says: 'The character of the war... depends on what class is waging the war, and on what politics this war is a continuation of. If the war is a reactionary, imperialist war, that is, if it is being waged by two world groups of the imperialist, rapacious, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie, then every bourgeoisie (even of the smallest country) becomes a participant in the plunder, and my duty as a representative of the revolutionary proletariat is to prepare for the world proletarian revolution. . . . I must argue, not from the point of view of 'my' country (for that is the argument of a wretched, stupid, petty-bourgeois nationalist who does not realize he is only a plaything in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie), but from the point of view of my share in the preparation, in the propaganda, and in the acceleration of the world proletarian revolution.'" (V.I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky," *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, pp. 286-287)

These two statements by the great revolutionary V.I. Lenin draw a clear and sharp line between revolutionaries and the many varieties of social-chauvinists who in any number of ways try to couch their subservience to the ruling powers under layers of "socialist," even "communist," rhetoric and phrases. In recent issues of *The Call*, the (for now) bi-weekly newspaper of the "Communist" Party Marxist-Leninist (CPML), a debate (of sorts) is being aired between a couple of different variations of the same "unite with the U.S. imperialists to defeat the Soviet social-imperialists" theme. The parties to the debate are the CPML, represented by one "C.E." (for "Chauvinist Expert," perhaps?) and the initiator of the debate, a small collective of some sort calling itself the "Communist" Unity Organization (CUO) joined by one Larry Harris, who appears to represent one trend of thought in the "Revolutionary" Workers Headquarters (a.k.a. the Mensheviks, who split from the RCP several years ago).

The controversy centers around a book put out by the CUO called *Sooner or Later*, by which is meant you have to side with U.S. imperialism against the Soviet imperialists "sooner or later," so why not capitulate in this way now and do it completely openly, and avoid the rush later. About the only thing

positive that can be said about this book is that its authors make only the shabbiest attempts to justify their naked calls for unity with the U.S. in its preparations to wage a world war against the Soviet Union to grab up a bigger share of the world for its blood-soaked empire, while the CPML in its answer to the CUO attempted a bit more to hide its capitulation to the bourgeoisie's war schemes. In fact the CUO authors have the declared intention of knocking down any argument in opposition to this noble goal of capitulation. But alas, they do not do too well. Their complete butchery and distortion of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought is shameless and unabashed. For example, compare the following passages from *Sooner or Later* with what Lenin had to say in the quotes at the beginning of this article:

"Given the present world situation in which the Soviet Union's fascist and hegemonist offensive has reached such threatening proportions, peace, national independence and democracy can only be saved by building the broadest possible united front, uniting all who can be united against the main enemy. . . ."

"... In the present situation of overwhelming Soviet military strength and the military weakness and disunity of the Second and Third worlds (Japan and the Western European countries, and the underdeveloped countries, respectively—RW), 'collective defense' requires the active participation of the United States. It is a 'positive factor' which must be mobilized against the main enemy.

"This does not mean that the U.S. has 'changed color,'" they hasten to point out (assuring us all the U.S. is not socialist). Thanks, for a minute there you almost had us convinced that it had. "The U.S. imperialists have an interest in peace only because they have an interest in the *status quo*, in the shoring up of the U.S. empire. But in this particular case the interests of the American bourgeoisie and that of the American and the world proletariat overlap, yet they do not coincide. . . ."

"As the clearest and most consistent supporters of the active defense of their own people, communists must then link the question of defense with the demands of the people for democratic rights and against the continuous deterioration of their standard of living."

We are treated in *Sooner or Later* to an amazing double-think exercise on diverting "along democratic and progressive lines" the "mass reaction to hegemonism" in the U.S. heralded by the reactionary demonstrations of "resistance to being pushed around" in Iran—yes, they really think there's a "progressive" side to the anti-Iranian demonstrations. Following this, the CUO advances the following stunning argument:

"The Soviet Union's hegemonist drive represents a clear and present danger to the independence of small, big and all countries and to world peace. In this there is a direct link to the interests of the American masses, for their peace and independence (make no mistake about it) are also menaced. By listening to the masses, by patiently pointing out to them their real enemies, we can indicate who their real allies are in the struggle against Soviet hegemonism. In the context of the mass movement which the pre-World War III period will unfold, we must then forge the 'democratic link' which binds together the interests of the masses at home and their interests abroad."

The CUO is of course eager to lay out the consequences of its strategy of

"united front" with the U.S. imperialists in this work. They openly call for increased U.S. military budgets, support for the draft, and other such immediate steps to strengthen their allies—the U.S. ruling class. In addition, they explicitly oppose all calls for the "unilateral" removal of U.S. bases around the world, in such colonies and neo-colonies as Puerto Rico and the Philippines.

CPML Says "Later"

But enough for now on the CUO, for they are quite open about their choice to openly and flagrantly capitulate sooner rather than later. The CPML, however, chooses a slightly slicker, more patient, more sophisticated route, preferring to do a little undercover work so as to bring some more troops along with them when the time is ripe. Thus their first response to *Sooner or Later* in the pages of the June 30, 1980 edition of *The Call*, in which C.E. puts up the appearance of opposing the CUO because "*Sooner or Later* pretty much gives a blank slate to the ruling class in formulating its own anti-Soviet agenda." But the only quarrel here is simply that the CUO is letting too much hang out too soon. According to C.E., CUO's error is that they have "a one-sided view of the (anti-Soviet—RW) united front." Yes, says C.E., "The CUO is correct in the sense that the U.S. does have a role to play in resisting Soviet aggression. To draw the U.S. into some kind of a front, to create obstacles to the Soviet drive and to promote any positive developments such as the U.S. votes in the UN on Afghanistan and Kampuchea—all are useful." But, "The CUO also goes much farther than *present conditions call for* in proposing support for American military preparations, generally supporting U.S. military expansion and the draft."

The CPML's real beef here is centered around the phrase "much farther than *present conditions call for*." And we shall soon see exactly what they think the present conditions do call for. But one thing is for sure: they have not in the past nor do they now shy away in the slightest from building support for U.S. imperialism under the guise of opposing Soviet hegemonism. In fact, like the CUO, they see this as their central task. The CPML's list of efforts on behalf of U.S. imperialism is long and smelly. For years, they objected to opposing U.S. arms shipments to the Shah of Iran, and while saying they opposed the Shah, they refused to go "so far" as to favor the slogan "Down with the Shah." This was because, according to them, the Shah had "an aspect" of defending then-U.S.-dominated Iran's "independence" against the Soviets. They would also never go so far as *Sooner or Later* and call openly for increased U.S. military spending. Oh, no. They would confine their remarks to criticizing any drop in proposed U.S. military expenditures (the B-1 bomber being a case in point) as being a "negative appeasement trend." They have more openly supported things like the U.S. Olympic boycott. There is hardly an issue of their newspaper that does not lament that the U.S. is supposedly not "getting tough" with the USSR and portray the U.S. as weak and impotent against the aggressive fascist Soviet Union. They're fond of quoting such bourgeois experts as Drew Middleton, defense analyst of the *New York Times*. The June 23, 1980 issue of *The Call*, for example, runs an article entitled "Reagan's China Plan Aids USSR," which begins (and this is no joke!): "Republican presidential candidate Ronald Rea-

gan fancies himself a 'hardliner' when it comes to standing up to Moscow. But if elected, his foreign policy platform will play right into the hands of the Soviet drive towards war." More "hardline" than Reagan, eh, *Call*!

In the face of such unbridled "doing the bourgeoisie one better," what can C.E. possibly be objecting to in *Sooner or Later*? The answer lies in looking at exactly what tactics the CPML thinks are appropriate under "present conditions." And herein lies the crux of CPML's dispute not only with the CUO but also with Larry Harris. Let's look briefly at the following passages from the August 4-17 *Call* reply by none other than C.E. to a letter by Larry Harris which criticizes C.E.'s first reply to the CUO for dumping on *Sooner or Later* and in particular for claiming that "*Sooner or Later* merges all of the demands of the workers and minorities into one demand for opposition to Soviet expansionism, when in fact two of the five sections of the book (pp. 70-104) are devoted to the relation between the domestic struggles of the workers and national minorities and the struggle against Soviet expansionism."

A quick note here. In this particular issue of their paper, the CPML employs a common tactic for them. First they run out two letters, Harris's and another one, both of which support the CUO and make no bones about tying the knot with U.S. imperialism. Then they run their response, which appears to be a milder and more reasonable position, but which is simply a slicker version of the same thing with certain tactical disagreements. By this method, they accomplish two things; first, it helps to cover their ass, but more importantly it allows them to run some things straight out without attaching their name to it. In fact, this is a big part of their carrying this whole "debate" in the pages of their paper in the first place. But back to C.E., whose response is titled "Don't Jump On the Patriotic Bandwagon." Note the following passages:

"While the authors speak of the need to 'link the question of defense with the demand of the people for democratic rights and against the continuous deterioration of their standard of living,' their program for doing so comes right out of the rhetoric of Business Week magazine and the capitalists' plan for a new 'social contract' between labor and business (Business Week, June 30).

"According to the authors, 'If the American worker is to cooperate by, say, restricting work actions at defense plants, then vigorous measures must be taken to assure his/her safety. . . and to prevent ownership from reaping the benefits of increased productivity' (p. 98). The CUO is even running ahead of the bourgeoisie in asking the workers to give up their right to strike for the war effort."

"To ask workers and minorities to accept the rule of the U.S. millionaires because it is not as bad as the fascist Soviet regime is the height of demagoguery. That is certainly not the question involved in the contemporary struggle of the people of the U.S.

"The fight in defense of the trade unions, the struggle for jobs and for the rights of Afro-Americans, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other minorities is in no way harmful to the needs of the international struggle. Why then dwell, as do the authors of *Sooner or Later*, on the subordination of the national struggle to the needs of the international

H-Bombs

Continued from page 2

missiles—so they, ironically, took up the cause of "safety."

Out in Omaha, Nebraska, Lt. General Lloyd Leavitt, Jr., vice commander of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) was holding his own press conference: "We have about the worst case we could have in terms of a Titan accident... A catastrophic failure of the Titan II." General Leavitt had just returned from Arkansas where he "looked into the hole where formerly the missile was." He described the missile as reduced to bits and pieces. The General went on to speculate that the missile's fuel tank at the bottom of the silo collapsed causing the missile to crumple and the fuel to be combined with its oxidizer and explode. The "critical question" he said was, "Did the fuel-air mixture reach a combustible point? The accident board will get into that."

The general's "critical question" could be answered very simply by looking at the glowing propaganda which the Air Force put out to justify the money for converting the Titan I to Titan II. The big attraction of the new version was its new fuel which could be stored right in the rocket, unlike the Titan I which used liquid oxygen and took 15 minutes to load. The new fuel required no ignition system, the Air Force bragged, since the two compounds ignite spontaneously on contact.

And as for how the missile might just crumple, a close reading of the Air Force's own report from last May shows that the corrosive fuels are now eating their way through the walls of the fuel tanks which were originally designed for a service life of only 10 years. The report brought out that 19 of the 54 Titans had already required one or more tank patches because of corrosion, and that between 1975 and 1979 there had been 125 accidents, with the frequency of leaks greatly increased within the last 2 years.

With millions of dollars in lawsuits pending against the government the press had no difficulty in finding farmers whose health had been wrecked and whose cattle had been killed as clouds of escaping nitrogen tetroxide have rolled across their farms over the last few years. But the press was just as quick to highlight a handful of fools, lauding them as "staunch individualists" who poo-pooed the

danger like the old man who refused to leave his house on Mt. St. Helens. (He blew up.) Hailed was the farmer who refused to evacuate the morning of the explosion until he had milked all 140 of his cows. Enterprising reporters even found a 79-year-old retired engineer in Damascus who had helped build the first atomic bomb that was dropped on Japan in World War 2. "It kind of reminded me of the old days," said Rex Peters, "the sound, the big fireball going up." But Peters wasn't a bit scared, knowing how safe the bombs are. "It was an accident by enlisted men, not scientists," he continued. "More people die from some sodbuster racing his car crazy on the road out here than die from this." His wife Flossie chimed in that there's nothing you can do about it anyway. "If this was going to be it, why that would be it."

Promoting patriotic fools to the hilt, the *New York Times* even reported one woman who stood at attention and saluted as the air force truck hauling away the H-bomb rolled past. They probably will have some people in this country who will want to ride the missile nosecones all the way to Moscow.

But combined with this kind of garbage was a slicker political campaign as the major papers and news magazines suddenly "revealed" who was really responsible for the U.S. still having these decaying timebombs around. Why it was the Russians, of course. In tones of "now it can be told" the *Washington Post* and other papers pointed to the SALT I agreement of 1972 as the root of the problem. In 1972, when the two imperialist superpowers entered into their first big arms agreement, it is alleged that Henry Kissinger offered to scrap the Titans in return for the Soviets scrapping their big SS9 missiles. This sort of swapping was at the heart of the first SALT treaty in which the superpowers tried to polish up their peace dove images by scrapping their older weapons systems, while replacing them with newer ones. Since the Russians considered their SS9 too valuable, their answer was Nyet. Thus the final treaty as it was made public and approved by Congress provided that the U.S. could scrap its older Titans for three nuclear missile submarines with an equivalent number of missiles while the Russians could make similar swaps for their SS7 and SS8 missiles (which are older than the SS9).

So why are the Titans still around? Apparently the U.S. today still has 41 nuclear subs instead of the 44 permitted

under SALT I if the Titan swap were made, and the U.S. is planning to scrap some of the old Polaris subs before it launches the three new Trident subs permitted by the agreement. To explain this discrepancy, U.S. newspapers revealed a little bit more of the imperialist power politics picture: secret treaties. But of course, they only revealed one such treaty, one that some in the ruling class now feel is unfavorable to the U.S. Supposedly under this secret clause in the SALT I treaty, Nixon agreed with Brezhnev to keep the Titans after all. Exactly what advantage the U.S. side felt it got out of this at the time is not clear, but you can bet there was one, since charity and kindness isn't their game. And surprise, surprise... the U.S. press didn't reveal any other secret clauses which are almost sure to exist and some of which are certainly more favorable to them and less so to the Soviets. In any case, the Titan missile was hardly a liability for the U.S., since it had the most powerful warhead in the whole U.S. arsenal and accounts for one-third of the megatonnage of the land based missile forces. The complaint today against the Titan, and the reason why some in the ruling class are jumping on the "safety" issue to get rid of it, is because it is somewhat less accurate than newer missiles, and therefore less likely to have an exact hit on Soviet missile silos. Of course the fact that it packs a larger explosion makes up some for the lesser accuracy, and besides, the U.S. has simply targeted the Titan for other targets that require a little less accuracy, such as industrial areas. To say the least, the Titan accuracy squabble is an intra-ruling class argument that the masses have absolutely no interest in taking sides in.

Of course the politicians are holding up a way to get out of the "Titan dilemma." President Carter announced that the U.S. will indeed begin phasing out the Titan II missiles—just as soon as the MX missiles are installed. Want to get rid of the creaking old missiles? Then vote for the new and bigger missiles guaranteed this time to explode where they are supposed to—in Russia.

There has also been a great deal of speculation about what might have happened if the hydrogen bomb which was thrown 200 yards by the force of the missile fuel explosion had itself exploded. As an indication of the possible results, we might recall that natives of the Marshall Islands in the Pacific are just now being allowed to return to their homes after some of their islands were used in the 1950s for H-bomb test

sites. Toxic levels of radiation lingered for years. This is only a small taste of the destruction they are planning right now for World War 3.

Yet the government is probably correct in its assertion that the type of massive explosion which threw the bomb from its silo in Arkansas would more likely make useless the firing mechanism than set the bomb off. But even this tenuous assurance was designed to cover up the real danger inherent in the Arkansas type accident—plutonium contamination.

All the nuclear weapons contain both the deadly plutonium-239 isotope as well as a large amount of conventional chemical explosive which could potentially blow the plutonium all over the landscape. In 1966, a B-52 accidentally dropped 4 H-bombs on the coast of Spain with two of them breaking open and spilling plutonium.

Plutonium's great danger comes from its extreme cancer-causing characteristics, the ease with which tiny particles can be inhaled, and its enormous half-life. The half-life of plutonium, the length of time it takes for a quantity to lose one-half of its radioactivity is 24,360 years.

While the air force trucked away the recovered H-bomb in a container with the neatly stenciled words "DO NOT DROP," the people of the world cannot forget for a minute that that is just exactly what the imperialists build nuclear bombs for—to drop. Last week, for sabre-rattling purposes, yet another nuclear policy Presidential Directive was leaked—columnist Jack Anderson reported last week the contents of Presidential Directive No. 51, outlining the U.S. policy for the use of nuclear weapons in the Middle East. According to the Anderson column, a squadron of B-52s stationed in Minot, North Dakota has been given the assignment which calls for the use of 19 nuclear weapons.

Each and every day both imperialist superpowers meticulously plan and increasingly rely upon the use of nuclear weapons from the opening rounds of their impending world struggle. It is typical—and sickening—imperialist politics that when their precious nuclear arsenal starts getting some bad publicity—as it did in Arkansas—they try to turn this around and claim it shows not the destructiveness of nuclear weapons and the imperialist system that spawns and plans to use them—but the need for more destructive nuclear weapons. □

MANEUVERS

Continued from page 6

struggle (p. 73)? Why then propose such a restriction of work actions?"

True, the CUO's rhetoric is straight out of *Business Week*, but C.E.'s is right out of the AFL-CIA's magazine *The Federationist*. Why dwell "on the subordination of the national struggle to the needs of the international struggle?", asks the CPML. Of course, CUO's "internationalism" amounts to the international interests of U.S. imperialism. But for the CPML, any "internationalism" (not to mention the proletarian internationalism in the international revolutionary interests of the working class) seems to be too much. In effect the CPML is criticizing the right-wing social chauvinists of CUO from the right—if that is possible. C.E. is certainly more in favor of tailing spontaneity. He is really saying that the CUO is being "too political" in directing the attention of the U.S. people away from daily and spontaneous struggles toward the political objective of opposing the Soviet Union. According to C.E., *Sooner or Later* is making the mistake of trying to raise the "dumb" masses' heads too far above the bread-and-butter issues. True, *Sooner or Later's* despicable goal of capitulating to U.S. imperialism is worthy and lofty, according to the CPML, but their means of doing so will only isolate the social-chauvinists from the masses. The whole point of this section in *Sooner or Later* that C.E. is criticizing

is that it is in the longer-term national interests of the U.S. working class to tighten its belts now, to make whatever short-term sacrifices are necessary, including signing no-strike agreements, etc., in order to help the U.S. out in winning the war and saving the nation, that is, saving the U.S. imperialist system. This is in fact not one single bit different from what many imperialist politicians are running out about "uniting to defend the country."

C.E., however, while not caring a bit about how reactionary all this is, realizes that it is not very popular at this time to "give up the right to strike for the war effort" in advance of the bourgeoisie—that will come later. How can we possibly get workers and others like Blacks and Chicanos to join our anti-hegemonist united front with such an "internationalist line"? This, in effect, is what the CPML is asking. Toward the end of the reply, C.E. says as much:

"Larry Harris obviously is in agreement with the CUO and this is certainly his right. But the problem here is not mainly how to interpret the CUO's book. Rather my review and his letter reveal two different approaches to the fight against hegemonism and world war..."

"Can the approach taken by the authors of *Sooner or Later* really mobilize the working and oppressed people in the U.S.?"

C.E. seems to realize that social-chauvinists like himself and the CUO have a particular job to do, one that is a bit different, though directed toward the same reactionary goal as outright chauvinists such as the imperialist politicians Carter, Reagan and Ander-

son. Good social-chauvinists must maintain some "socialist," or at least "in favor of the working people" type mask in order to deceive the masses of people who have a bit of a sense of class struggle and that their interests are not identical to the ruling class of imperialists. The special job of social-chauvinists is, as Lenin once put it, to "throw dust in the eyes" of these workers, and win them away from embarking on the path of revolutionary struggle against the imperialist bourgeoisie into being a loyal opposition.

Thus all this back and forth on the question of nationalism vs. internationalism is simply two versions of the same old reactionary social-chauvinism. And with their warning of "Don't jump on the patriotic bandwagon," the CPML really means, "Don't jump on so brazenly yet, help us fill up the wagon first." And the CPML is clutching today for every possible basis to do so. In an interview in the Summer 1980 issue of *Class Struggle*, CPML Chairman Mike Klonsky promises that the "struggle against hegemonism" is all around today: "It can be found in the workers' struggle where the sentiment for jobs and decent working conditions is not something totally separate from the longshoremen boycotting Soviet ships." Here, Klonsky's enthusiasm for reactionary ILA boss Teddy Gleason's practice of carrying out U.S. State Department orders is positively touching. Klonsky seems determined not to be outdone by CUO's extraordinary efforts in finding something progressive in the anti-Iranian demonstrations.

This approach leads him and the CPML to a related divergence with the

CUO and Larry Harris around the question of "Is there a democratic trend in U.S. foreign policy that can be united with?" The CUO, with its open political support for the U.S. government, now is compelled to come up with some sort of justification for it. Thus they have come up with the notion that there is "a shift in American politics" and that there is a democratic trend in the American ruling class represented by various politicians who not only are anti-Soviet but support "progressive policies toward the third world" and can therefore be united with. The CPML, on the other hand, has no immediate need for such a device and therefore contends that "no such democratic trend yet exists within any major faction of U.S. ruling circles" (our emphasis—RW). In response to Larry Harris's support for CUO's line on this question, C.E. replies:

"Without such an independent mobilization of labor and minorities with U.S. communists an active force in the struggle, can we place our hopes on any 'democratic current' within the ranks of the giant monopoly capitalists to oppose hegemonism? If such a current really has developed, who are its leaders and main representatives and how does Harris suggest we hook up with them?"

Show me. Show me, demands C.E., and it is quite likely that sometime in the future, at a more opportune or necessary time, perhaps "when the mass movement develops further," this "democratic trend" will begin to materialize before his eyes.

The CPML and Klonsky are confident that by pursuing reformism and

Continued on page 17

"Overthrow" Charges Still Stand

Atlanta Revolutionaries Back on the Street

Atlanta. The two revolutionaries arrested and charged with "advocating the overthrow of the government," were released from jail four weeks after their bust. (See *RW's* No. 70 and 71 for background). They had been arrested for putting up the "Create Public Opinion... Seize Power" poster, which is an important tool in getting the *Revolutionary Worker* newspaper known broadly and in achieving the battle to reach a sustained circulation of 100,000 papers sold every week. The supposedly simple process of finally bailing them out took an entire day, even though one of the people involved was their lawyer.

First, the legal team had to appear before the Superior Court judge, to get him to sign a statement saying exactly just what the bond was. It seems that there had been a legal ping-pong game going on, as first the Superior Court judge would overrule the city court judge, and lower the bail; then the city court judge would overrule the higher judge and raise the bail back up again... When the defense lawyer approached the Superior Court judge, the

robbed fossil was adamant that he could do nothing until it was okayed by the prosecutor—who was summoned to the courtroom. The judge tried to slime away from doing anything by indicating that it was the city judge who sets bond, but the prosecutor answered, "No, we do." So the judge set it at the lower bond and signed the paper.

But when the team went down to the Court Clerk to pay, the judge's signature hardly dry, they were sent back to the same judge. It seemed now that they needed another signed statement saying that they were allowed to pay the bond—this one only set the amount of bond! The judge hemmed and hawed, and called the prosecutor back into his court. Finally the legal team got the paper signed. In the middle of all this harassment the prosecutor turned to the defense lawyer and said that the D.A.'s office was not intending to prosecute on the felony "overthrow" charges anyway. It was another blatant example of the lies being spread by the state to throw people off guard, and to try to diffuse the growing support over

this outrageous attack on the RCP and its paper, the *Revolutionary Worker*.

It was learned from talking to the now freed revolutionaries that the male defendant (who is also a Mao Tsetung Defendant) had been held in maximum security all the four weeks. Some reactionary prisoners threatened him to move out of "their" cell. A letter to the warden written by one of these fools exclaimed: "This guy's a communist and is advocating the overthrow of the government right here in the jail!" Another prisoner fired off one of his own letters to the warden, declaring that if the revolutionary was moved, he wanted to be transferred with him. This prisoner, who is also an artist, was inspired by the copy of the *RW* that was given to him. He drew a colored picture of Lenin walking and talking to a crowd of workers after poring over the paper. He presented it to the comrade as he was leaving the jail. And over in the other defendant's cell, in the women's section, a fellow prisoner drafted the following support statement and had it signed by eight other women:

Jail is the wrong place to put revolutionaries, because when people locked up find out what the system is about, they want to destroy capitalism too. Like Fred Hampton said, "You can jail a revolutionary, but you can't jail a revolution."

We're supposed to have freedom of speech in this country, so why are they trying to hush us up? They say that we have to go by their laws, but they don't go by them. They say justice for all, but its only justice on behalf of the capitalists.

The capitalists know that the masses have to have leaders, so they try to lock revolutionaries up, but they don't understand that leadership goes on and on. We will speak with our mouths, or write with pen and paper and the Revolutionary Worker. If the people came together, the system doesn't have a fighting chance and that's what the capitalists are afraid of. Free our Co-conspirators.

*Signed by 8 women
in the Fulton County Jail*

MANEUVERS

Continued from page 14

economism, and generally worshipping spontaneity in the day to day struggles of the masses today, why, capitulation and more political social-chauvinism will just come naturally later on. (Especially with some coaching along the way—but just a little bit subtler coaching that *Sooner or Later* recommends.) And the CPML is right: their line has been tested by historical research. The parties of the Second International which in the "peaceful times" before World War I practiced opportunism in the form of economism, reformism, seeking union and and government positions at all costs—these parties immediately capitulated to "their own" bourgeoisie once World War I broke out and played an important role in sending the workers of Europe off to do battle against each other in the service of "their" respective bourgeoisies. As Lenin put it, "the boil burst." Opportunism in peaceful times became the rotten pus of social-chauvinism in wartime. "Social-chauvinism is an opportunism which has matured... grown so strong and brazen during the long period of comparatively 'peaceful' capitalism..." ("The Collapse of the Second International")

Decisive Struggle in the RCP

When the Mensheviks who now call themselves the Revolutionary Workers Headquarters (and with whom Larry Harris now seems to be associated) were still inside our Party, they taught us some things about this by way of negative example. Back in 1975, at the time of the founding of our Party, some of these people tried for a while to argue for a social-chauvinist line to be adopted by the RCP. In particular, they argued that we adopt the foreign policy of China (at the time still a revolutionary, socialist country under the leadership of Mao Tsetung) as our overall international line. This meant targeting the Soviet Union, which did represent the main danger to China, as the main enemy in the whole world struggle. The revolutionaries in Party leadership strongly opposed this at the time it came up, and waged a struggle to unite the Party against this social-chauvinism. The main leaders of the soon-to-be Menshevik faction gave these social-chauvinist arguments encouragement and some support, but they saw that this was not a battle they were likely to win in our Party at that

time. So they opted instead for ignoring the international struggle, dismissing it as "unimportant," and concentrating on huffing up an economist wind inside the Party. They met with some real success in this respect at that time, and hoped that this would set up the Party to capitulate on international matters later. And they kept raising "little points" of struggle at every chance to push this chauvinist line along, even while they concentrated on promoting economism. While they were defeated on all their chauvinist sorties, and some important struggle was unfolded inside the Party in 1976-77 against economism before their departure, it took the decisive struggle against these Mensheviks in 1977 which shaped up around the reactionary coup in China to really guarantee the continued existence of the RCP, USA as a revolutionary party in the face of intensifying contradictions in the world. So we have learned from our own experience, too, that economism is the grease for the skids to social-chauvinism and must be fought tooth and nail to stay on the revolutionary path.

The CPML has gone through a process slightly different from that of the Mensheviks who split from our Party. They have freed themselves somewhat from simply tailing after the foreign policy of China and have more wholeheartedly devoted themselves to promoting spontaneity in the U.S. class struggle. Thus they are more able, and have more of a necessity, to be flexible with their approach in order to reach the "broadest sectors of the American people."

This new broader approach of the CPML does not confine itself to the "labor movement" but extends to other movements as well such as the anti-draft movement, where they have been working to turn it in an "anti-hegemonist direction," to use Klonsky's euphemism, tailing behind the most backward trends in the movement and generally acting like a Trojan horse for the U.S. imperialists. Like other more openly bourgeois forces in the movement, whose opposition to the draft is based on "we don't need it now," the CPML is working in this movement now, aiming to turn it around later. They and people like them use flimsy excuses like this one: Right now the U.S. military is being readied for use against the Third World, and we should oppose this; they should be getting ready to resist the Soviets, and if they ever do that... well, then we should support their military efforts in this direction. This is a fairy tale about the nature of the U.S. military build-up, which, as an imperialist military

build-up, is directed against all potential enemies—but with special emphasis today on being ready to fight the Soviets (as opposed to the kind of weaponry, equipment and training they were into during the Vietnam era). Besides this, this "logic" is a reactionary set-up to turn the anti-draft movement around 180 degrees at a later date. Such is the CPML's role and reason for "going along with the tide" for the time being.

This "new" "become a significant political force" (for the U.S. ruling class) approach is what C.E. is trying to unite all social-chauvinists behind as the more realistic and effective way to accomplish the glorious ends to which they all aspire. In the Klonsky interview in *Class Struggle*, he makes an appeal exactly to forces like the *RWH* and the CUO:

"On the other hand, there are some small groups who try to mechanically copy China's foreign policy but without any attention paid to the concrete conditions here in the U.S. To their credit they are vocal in their opposition to the Soviet drive. But they have no real program for the working class and therefore are isolated from the masses. Who do they hope to bring into the united front? So without any regard for the past or for the present consciousness of the people they hope to lead, they solidly endorse the Carter Doctrine, the draft (even before Carter has called for it), a blank check in defense budget and put themselves at odds with every progressive force in the country. These people may have good intentions. But despite their denials, they are dogmatists who copy blindly from other countries or other periods in history and do a disservice to the anti-hegemonic united front.

"What is encouraging is that a significant trend is developing in the U.S. left which stands firmly in its opposition to hegemonism, but at the same time is developing its ties with the working class and progressive movements in the country. It is also encouraging that among these the Marxist-Leninist forces are developing more unity in their efforts to join in a single unified communist party.

"They are carrying out work in the peace movement and anti-draft movement to give them an anti-hegemonist direction and orientation." (Emphasis ours—*RW*)

And the CPML even offers this advice to "progressive, revolutionary and independence forces in other countries." For example, in opposing the CUO's call for supporting the maintenance of U.S. bases in Puerto Rico and the Philippines, C.E. writes:

"The authors are correct in trying to raise the vigilance of the people against the growing Soviet threat in these areas of U.S. domination. But their dogmatic, one-sided approach to the anti-U.S. struggle in Puerto Rico and the Philippines will only serve to isolate the Marxist-Leninist forces."

In other words, an open stand in support of the U.S. such as the CUO is calling for will only expose those in these countries who put forward such trash and thus render them ineffective in building the battle against the real enemy—the USSR—according to their particular conditions.

So far the CPML has left the authors of *Sooner or Later* with the last word—a full-page rebuttal to C.E. in the Sept. 8-21, 1980 *Call*. Appropriately, and in a conscious move by the CPML, the rebuttal is a call for C.E. to stop shilly-shallying around, cut out the crap and declare whether he supports the united front with U.S. imperialism and all that it entails, or not. The CUO writes:

"Some *Call* writers, including C.E., are having trouble with this view. They'd like to be regarded as supporters of the united front against hegemonism and China's position, but then they'd also like to be considered the most 'consistent' enemies of U.S. imperialism and leaders of the so-called 'mass anti-draft movement' (C.E.)..."

"The international situation is grim. War clouds continue to gather. If C.E. and others continue to oppose such steps as the modernization of U.S. forces and the draft (steps unpopular among some 'progressive' circles), then they have a duty to present a factual analysis of why they consider unnecessary what many consider absolutely essential."

We submit that the CPML has indeed made and presented their "analysis" in the pages of their newspaper and their journal; it is just that they have taken care to cover over their unity with the CUO on every fundamental question with a slightly thicker Marxist veneer than their fellow social-chauvinists do. We have seen just how much real solid unity there is among all three of the participants in this debate. In various ways, all of them propagate the idea that support for, and in fact alliance with, the U.S. imperialists in the coming war is not only necessary but desirable, and are working tirelessly toward this end. All wrap up this shameless support for one of the two biggest exploiters and plunderers in the history of the world in a package called the united front against hegemonism, by which they mean the Soviet Union—

Continued on page 24

NAVAJOS

Continued from page 21

dian heritage. Mrs. LaMone tried numerous times to get her back, but the Christians were too "civilized" to tell her where the little girl was. By chance, she was discovered at age 17 by one of the LaMones in a school in Farmington, a New Mexico city just outside the reservation, and when she was told what had happened, she fought to return to Burnham and her people.

The 1-2 punch of corporation and Christianity has resulted in a fierce determination on the part of many Navajos to uphold and defend their culture and the religion that is part of it. Larry Anderson invited us to participate in a sweat ceremony in his sweat lodge next to his home. Before we went in, he made a point of telling us, "We'll never let go of this, no matter what the system." The sweat ceremony is actually very healthful but it is also accompanied by much praying to the Great Spirit—including saying prayers for the "decision makers," in other words, the enemy. During a break in the ceremony, I asked Larry why he prayed for the oppressors. He answered, "Because that is the traditional way my elders have taught me... but when I get out of here (the sweat lodge), I'm a different person."

He was very emphatic in stating that this does not mean that he feels spiritualism is any less important to the Navajos and the whole Native American struggle. But he also made it

clear that he has sharp differences with those who use aspects of spiritual ideology to promote capitulation to the capitalists and oppose revolutionary struggle. The same point was made by Eugene and Harrison LaMone.

Larry Anderson clearly recognized the difference between communist ideology on the question of spiritualism and that of the Navajos and other Indians. He told us: "The struggle of the people, of many classes of people in this world today, comes under many titles or organizations or programs which these people have—these different ideas of government. We understand that the people, the virgin people, should be left the way it is... (The RCP has) a very good program, set up to see what the people's ideas are (and) the defense of what their (the RCP's) direction is. Their belief in spirituality is very much different than ours, from we as Indian people. Yes, we need changes, we understand that. Yes we need these ways to get new leadership. But the spirituality is very strong among Indian people. It will always stay with us, no matter under what system we live..."

For our part, we would continue to struggle for proletarian ideology including on this important question. At the same time, we recognized the protracted nature of such a struggle, spanning a period into the future, and certainly beyond the time when the people of this country overthrow the bourgeoisie. It's the struggle against the common enemy that fundamentally unites us. This is something that Larry Anderson recognized as well, and for

his part, he would continue to struggle for his ideas.

As we drove out toward Farmington, we couldn't help noticing that as soon as you cross the border of the reservation, everything seems a lot different. The fields are green and irrigated, the homes are lit up, there are no more outhouses. You pass between two huge power plants, belching their black smoke into the sky—they are on reservation land, but the highway is not. We tried to find a motel room in Farming-

ton, but there was literally none available. A waitress in a cafe explained: "The power plants and mines are running full tilt now. A lot of people come here from all over to get jobs... This is the only place in the country where there isn't a recession." While even she felt that this was probably just a temporary boom, I couldn't help thinking that less than a mile away was a land where there was permanent bust. Or rather, only as permanent as the capitalist system. It made me feel even more impatient.

IRAQ — IRAN

Continued from page 16

the Soviets risk losing the influence they have had in each country. Thus, at present they appear to be concentrating on exposing what their equally cutthroat U.S. rivals are up to, and on trying to offer their services as mediators in order to maximize their chances of coming out of the fighting with some gains.

Just how seriously the U.S. takes the possibility that the Soviets will be able to come out of the fighting with stronger ties to either Iran or Iraq—or possibly both—can be seen by a recent well-timed "leak" from inside the U.S. government that appeared in Jack Anderson's nationwide syndicated columns on September 24. This "leak"—really a not too subtle threat—reveals that in the last few months President Carter has issued secret orders to the Pentagon, "Presidential Directive Memorandum No. 51", to prepare a "limited strategic option" for use against Soviet forces in the Middle East. In simple language, the "peace-loving" U.S. imperialists are telling their Soviet counterparts, if you cross the border into "our" territory in Iran, or if you even threaten to, we're ready to nuke you!

This is also a lesson to those who think that the superpowers won't really go to war—even nuclear war—because of "all the destruction it would cause." Here they are setting off a war that has already destroyed one of the largest refineries in the world and much of Iran's and Iraq's oil facilities. This points out that everything hangs on military and political control. Control of Iran for them is more important than the oil supplies they'll lose for now;

they are being driven by forces beyond their control to do whatever is necessary, in fact to risk everything in order to have a grab at crushing their imperialist rivals and gaining world domination.

As the world situation is sharpening, the imperialists are taking more desperate gambles. They're unleashing forces beyond their control and much more is going up for grabs. This not only means far greater dangers of war, especially world war, but new possibilities for revolutionary advances.

MANEUVERS

Continued from page 17

which, they claim, is the biggest threat to world peace and the main source of war. This is exactly the method that the imperialist gangsters themselves use, each accusing the other of being the warmonger and the cause of their imperialist rivalry, when in fact it is the imperialists of every country who are all responsible.

All three of these social-chauvinists agree, too, that broad sections of the American people must be brought into the united front with their tormentors and the tormentors of a large section of the world's peoples, but here there are certain differences on tactics. The CUO

and those like Larry Harris believe that people can be convinced to enlist in the war effort with a straight-up call to "defend the fatherland." The CPML, however, chooses another, slicker and more spontaneous path. First hook people into the struggle for trade union reforms and into movements like the anti-draft struggle, draw them in a little, and then try to grab the tiger by the tail and put its power fully to use for U.S. imperialism at some later date. The existence of these tactical differences does not cause much concern for the CPML, which finds the *Sooner or Later* line a useful foil. This is why they have been so enthusiastically participating in this "debate" and promoting it wherever possible.

NEW PROGRAMME AND NEW CONSTITUTION OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY, USA
(DRAFTS FOR DISCUSSION) 1980

\$2.00 (plus 50¢ postage)
Available from RCP Publications
P.O. Box 3486, Chicago IL 60654
or at bookstores in your area.

Special Limited Offer

On the fourth anniversary of the death of Mao Tsetung and the arrest of his closest political allies, the "Gang of Four," you can purchase, at the discounts listed below, the writings of Mao as well as an unparalleled collection of books on the philosophy and politics of Mao, the Cultural Revolution in China, and the reactionary coup of 1976.

The Loss in China and the Revolutionary Legacy of Mao Tsetung, by Bob Avakian \$2.00
Blow-by-blow account of the struggle leading up to the coup, its historical roots and international implications. RCP Publications, 1978, 151 pages.

And Mao Makes 5, Mao Tsetung's Last Great Battle, edited and with an intro by Raymond Lotta \$5.95
Invaluable collection of articles and documents written under the leadership of Mao and the Four from 1973 to 1976, used to wage mass campaigns to politically arm the Chinese people. Also includes representative writings from the revisionists now in power. Banner Press, 1978, 522 pages.

Revolution and Counter-Revolution, The Revisionist Coup in China and the Struggle in the RCP, USA \$4.95
Examines and contrasts the line of Mao and the Four with that of the revisionists on the key questions as they were battled out in China. Through detailed and thorough analysis, predicted with uncanny accuracy the dismantling of socialism now taking place. Consists of polemics between the RCP leadership and a faction that split from the Party over the question of the coup. RCP Publications, 1978, 501 pages.

Mao Tsetung's Immortal Contributions, by Bob Avakian \$4.95
Important summation and study of Mao Tsetung Thought as applied to several major questions, most importantly on continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Traces the development of the contributions of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and then focuses on those of Mao. RCP Publications, 1979, 344 pages.

All Four Books For Only \$12.00

Selected Works of Mao Tsetung, Five Volumes: paper, each \$4.95, set \$24.75; cloth, each \$6.95, set \$34.75; **Selected Readings from the Works of Mao Tsetung**, paper, \$2.75; cloth, \$4.25; **Chairman Mao Talks to the People**, ed. by Stuart Schram, \$2.95; **Selected Military Writings of Mao Tsetung**, paper, \$4.95; cloth, \$6.95; red plastic cover, \$2.95; **Five Essays on Philosophy**, \$1.50; **Mao Tsetung on Literature and Art**, \$1.95.

30% Discount Off List Price on the Writings of Mao Tsetung

Order from Liberation Distributors, P.O. Box 5341, Chicago, IL 60680.

Also available through Revolution Books:

Washington, D.C.: 2438 18th St. N.W., 20009; **New York:** 16 E. 18th St., 10003; **Cambridge:** 233 Mass. Ave., 02139; **Detroit:** 5744 Woodward Ave., 48202; **Chicago:** 1727 S. Michigan Ave., 60616; **Honolulu:** 923 N. King, 96817; **Berkeley:** 1952 University Ave., 94704; **San Francisco:** Everybody's Bookstore, 17 Brenham Place, 94108; **Los Angeles:** Liberation Books, 2706 W. 7th St., 90057; **Seattle:** 1828 Broadway, 98122.

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION
THE LOSS IN CHINA AND THE REVOLUTIONARY LEGACY OF MAO TSETUNG
MAO TSETUNG'S IMMORTAL CONTRIBUTIONS
AND MAO MAKES 5