

question or another doesn't mean a shared outlook. It is the outlook of the proletariat, and not just a few questions which must be the basis of our unity.

But what of those who have broken with the revisionist "theory of three worlds?" The absence of self-criticism we referred to earlier is evidence of a continuing reluctance to make a fundamental theoretical break with revisionism. This is even more apparent among those who are now willing to leap into an affair with the RCP because of agreement on one or two points and who forget about their history of white chauvinism, economism and pragmatic maneuvering. MLOC even claimed that the break with the "theory of three worlds" was now the decisive break with revisionism, although they have not made the slightest criticism of their own economism. Unless our political break with revisionism is deepened by doing the theoretical work of the U.S. revolution, even those serious Marxist-Leninists who now oppose the "theory of three worlds" will fall into revisionism on some new question in another few years.

We're feeling our way along an unfamiliar and mountainous path in the dark without benefit of a light. At a bend in the trail some of the group plunge into the gorge. Will we laugh at their stupidity and then walk on in the dark until we ourselves fall at the next bend? Or will we attempt to strike a light?

Appendix - On the question of Which Countries are Socialist

Some months ago we circulated a draft of the present article among a number of Marxist-Leninist groups and individuals with a request for comments. We received one criticism which we would like to respond to publicly, because we think it represents an outlook and viewpoint that are fairly widespread in our movement. This is on the question of whether Korea and Vietnam (and other countries of Indochina) are socialist. The criticism asserted that Vietnam and Korea are both bourgeois revisionist countries and questioned whether or not that was our line as well. It pointed to Vietnam's takeover of Kampuchea, the fact that both Vietnam and Korea consider the Soviet Union a socialist country, Vietnam's entry into COMECON, and Korea's pushing the idea of "nonalignment" as evidence for this assertion. Further, the criticism stated that if we did uphold Vietnam and Korea as socialist, this would represent a major difference in our analyses of the international situation.

We think there is evidence, including the points outlined above, that Korea and Vietnam are heading along the road of bourgeois degeneration. We think that this evidence is particularly strong in the case of Vietnam, given its practice in the past year or so. But we do not think that this is sufficient for a Marxist-Leninist approach to the question. The question of whether or not a country is socialist must be answered by an examination of the country's economic base (are socialist relations of production in effect or not) and superstructure (primarily, is the proletariat exercising its dictatorship or not). We have not seen, or done, any analysis of these questions that would permit us to decide conclusively that Vietnam or Korea are bourgeois-revisionist countries.

To do this analysis, it is necessary to do some serious investigation. This is particularly important to grasp the present situation in Indochina, which is a matter of serious concern for the communist movement. This situation is obviously complex, but most self-proclaimed revolutionaries have adopted a facile attitude towards it, choosing sides and then backing up their position with information from whomever they like (Vietnam, China, Pol Pot, etc.). We would appreciate it if anyone with solid information would send it to us.

But what about the lines and practices of Vietnam and Korea that are mentioned in the criticism? Don't they by themselves show that these countries are no longer socialist? We do not believe in the bourgeois-liberal theory of many forms of socialism, but we also do not believe that one, or even several, serious deviations are enough to automatically make a country revisionist. The question has to be looked at dialectically. A revisionist line, unchallenged, can lead to the domination by revisionism and the bourgeoisie. Stalin believed for a time that antagonistic classes had been abolished in the Soviet Union under socialism, and therefore errors were made in the class struggle. This helped permit the rise to power of the Khrushchov revisionist clique after Stalin's death. Mao believed in the inevitability of two-line struggle within the party and tolerated factionalism. This allowed the Hua-Deng clique to take power after Mao's death. But this does not mean that Stalin and Mao were revisionists. During its war of liberation Vietnam was firmly fighting U.S. imperialism, relying mainly on its own efforts, and upholding the unity of the three Indochinese peoples. But even under Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam considered the Soviet Union to be a socialist country, and supported its invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 (though only with words, not with troops). It refused to recognize even the possibility of a socialist country degenerating into capitalism. This has clearly led to its increased dependence on Soviet social-imperialism. But does this mean that the Vietnamese revolution was therefore led by revisionists, i.e. by the bourgeoisie?

We see this method of trying to determine whether or not a country is socialist, or whether or not a party is Marxist-Leninist, by examining their position and practice on just certain questions, even very important ones, as another example of making political line the key link. We have tried to make clear in our literature (see in particular Red Dawn #2, Section G) that agreement on certain political questions does not by itself mean real ideological unity; such agreement can be based on very different outlooks. In this case, while a party or country may have certain opportunist lines and practices, which certainly indicates at least an ideological weakness, it does not necessarily mean that the party or country is fundamentally revisionist. Its overall line and practice must be considered.

Unfortunately, this method has also been used by the Party of Labor of Albania in its conclusion that Mao was not a Marxist-Leninist and China was never socialist, based on its criticisms (even many correct ones) of Mao and the Communist Party of China. This method is taken to the extreme by the Bolshevik Union of Canada (and apparently others in the U.S. who have not yet publicly put forward their position). They consider Enver Hoxha a revisionist for not denouncing Mao earlier

and for fraternal relations with the phony Communist Party of Canada (M-L) of Hardial Bains. We hope people will be wary of where this method can lead.

To return to our original point, in the present article we tried to show how both the Soviet Union and China are today bourgeois-revisionist countries. (See Section I on "The Five Basic Features of Imperialism and the Division of the World Today" as well as "Revisionism in the Formerly Socialist Countries".) We pointed out briefly how the restoration of capitalism can be seen in both the base and superstructure, and not just the political line in these countries. On the other hand, we see Albania as a genuine socialist country not only based on its opposition to both Soviet and Chinese revisionism, its leading role in exposing the revisionist theory of the three worlds, and its upholding of the Leninist norms of party building. We also see the leading role of the working class in both the party and state (read, for example, both Albania's party and state constitutions), their consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and their plans for building an independent socialist economy. Although even here our conclusions must be limited, as they are based almost entirely on Albania's own literature, we see all evidence pointing to the fact that Albania is a genuine socialist country.

In a sense, rejecting parties and countries as revisionist on the basis of one or two lines is a direct outgrowth of using parties, countries, and individuals as our compass, instead of Marxism-Leninism. When you regard an individual as the embodiment of perfection, there is a tendency to turn them into the source of all evil when you discover their errors. Many in our movement found themselves disoriented when they realized that the parties they relied on were shifting in their views. Some stuck with these parties anyway, some found new parties to hitch themselves to, some rejected all existing parties. We feel that we should learn to rely on Marxism-Leninism instead.

One final point in reply to the criticism made of our draft. We would not by itself consider differences on Vietnam and Korea to be major ones in our analyses of the international situation. We would, however, consider more serious the question of whether a dialectical materialist method was used at arriving at ones conclusions.