

DEEPLY CRITICISE THE SPLITTIST AND IDEALIST

DOCUMENT OF THE ANTI-LEAGUE FACTION

At the beginning of January, the anti-league faction attempted to circulate to the rank-and-file of the RCL, a document entitled *The two-line struggle in the RCL is a struggle between Marxism and Revisionism*. The document was suppressed. Why? Is it because as the splittists like to claim, the PC and the CC are "afraid" of struggle? No. It was suppressed because factional activities and the ultra-democratic "appeal" of the splittists violated both the spirit and the rules of Democratic Centralism and thus viciously attacked the progress of the RCL in Party-building and attempted to throw us back to the days of the circles. It is essential for the RCL to stand firm on this question of principle, and defend our Democratic Centralism.

Now that the central bodies have thoroughly prevented the attempt to turn our organisational principles into those of bureaucratic anarchism, we ourselves are circulating a refutation of the factions all-round attack on the RCL as represented by their document, and are distributing also the factions own document for criticism. Undoubtedly the faction will continue to find means to attack the ideological and political line of the RCL, and its organisational principles. But their blows are puny. Their document represents the best they can cobble together. They have circulated documents individually before at their various levels, which anyone could see did not hold water and which received thorough criticism. The document they have circulated has dropped some of the most obvious lies and distortions, and "smartened up" the presentation of their line. It is the best thing they can do, so it is the one, we shall take to refute their stand.

For many months NR has been criticised for his splittism. One form of this splittism is to raise 1000 issues at once, knowing that every opportunist statement made as a brief comment needs a couple of pages to thoroughly expose. He has been particularly and consistently criticised for this style of flinging mud in the hope that some of it will stick. (It is no accident that in the faction's document - page 6 - they opportunistically turn round and try to criticise the RCL in its turn for this. It is a bald attempt to divert criticism.) Undoubtedly some mud will stick. We won't even try to answer every criticism and claim. The important thing is to take a stand on the principal questions, grasp the essential outlook of the faction, and thoroughly repudiate it. This circular is only a start, but an essential start. The points in it, we will go into more deeply later. At the same time, the faction opportunistically flip constantly from attacking the line of the RCL Manifesto, decisions of the CC, the PC and the Chairman as an individual. This is nothing surprising. It is part of a pattern of splittism, which we are by now thoroughly familiar with! In the main, we shall concentrate on upholding the correct stand of the RCL as an organisation. We cannot in this single document refute all the slanders and criticisms of the Chairman. We uphold the Chairman, as the comrade who has played the leading role in building the RCL. We strongly affirm he is still the leading comrade. Like all comrades, he has, on occasion, been in a minority. This is natural. We expect struggle to take place in League committees. All our comrades contribute to the collective wisdom, even when in a minority. The splittists cannot grasp this elementary fact.

Other points on the lies and distortions leveled against the Chairman have been made in the circular *Denounce MC's splittism* (II.12.78)

DENOUNCE BOURGEOIS FACTIONALISM

In their document the splitters admit that they have been working together. In innocent terms they add that they "did so openly, but have been accused of bourgeois factionalism".(p6). They have the vain hope that RCL comrades are naive enough not to know that the issue of "openness" or "secrecy" is totally irrelevant, and that either way they have flagrantly attacked the organisational principles of the RCL and established a bourgeois faction. This opportunist mask

of injured innocence, like much of their statement, is an out and out fraud. PD(MF) himself stated at PC I7 (December) "my association with cde MC is an open one, and I know it is a factional one". Trotsky's faction in the CPSU(B) was "open". It makes not one whit of difference.

This tiny clique has been meeting behind closed doors to plan strategy and tactics for overthrowing the line and leadership of the RCL, rather than working openly as individuals in their appropriate units and committees. The establishment of such a faction is nothing less than a declaration of causing a split. It has not been tolerated by any other communist organisations. It will not be by the RCL! Its nature is made more apparent by the fact that it consists of one PC, one CC and one R&F member. It set itself up as a separate organisation within the RCL. Its utter hypocrisy is apparent when it berates the "bureaucratic" centralism of the RCL for upholding the united face of leading committees (p4) and the principle of allowing comrades in the minority to "reserve their views" (p4) and struggle in an orderly manner (p6); yet simultaneously the anti-League faction struggles for unity among themselves (something they refuse to do with the vast majority of RCL cadres) and where they cannot agree they adopt the "principle" of the united face of the faction! So, for example, they do not mention once the theory of the three worlds in their document, because (while they are indeed united in their opposition to it) PR and NR claim to be the true representatives of the theory of the three worlds, PR even calling it a "new strategic line", whilst PD denounces it as an "opportunist theory" and calls on communists to "put China at arms length"! But the faction will have their unity at all costs, even on the basis of an opportunist compromise. Similarly, many of the attacks on the line of the RCL in other areas have never been supported by PD (a few of them we've never heard at all!) But for the splittists unity of the faction is all - unity of the RCL is nothing.

THE FACTION IS THE OUTCOME OF SPLITTIST ATTACKS

The establishment of the anti-League faction is itself only the culmination of a vicious splittist campaign waged by NR at the centre, and PR in her cell. It is a result of NR's attempt to change the line of the RCL, not by patient struggle and criticism, but through the means of waging a personal war of extermination against the Chairman, and on the basis of demagoguery. Opportunistically he directed his fire at an individual, when, in reality, he was attacking the Manifesto. His tactics were to sling more and more mud. It was a splittist stand from the start. It reached an extreme form when he denounced the Chairman as a "traitor to the working class". He had no desire to struggle for unity at a higher level, and thus strengthen the ideological and political line of the RCL. Even now the faction's documents seek not to reach clarity, but to sow confusion.

In April and on a number of subsequent occasions, NR proposed that at the next Congress, the united face of the PC and the CC should be broken. Why? Because NR did not even consider struggling consistently to win the CC to his position, but looked only to making a grand appeal to the R&F over the heads of the CC. He denies in essence, that struggle is the means to reach unity, and rejects the aim of unity as his starting point. Neither the PC nor the CC have, in fact, yet discussed the form of the next Congress. The issue is why NR kept raising the matter, and his anarchistic views on inner-Party struggle. This approach is continued in the faction's document (p4), where they demagogically declare that they "stand for a Central Committee which will open up the discussion and struggle when it is divided on major matters of principle...not one which attempts to conceal matters". Here we have it. No united face at all. For Bolsheviks, the first duty of the CC is to struggle for clarity and unity, and to give leadership. It is its duty to conscientiously and self-critically consider criticisms from below, and the centralised experience of the organisation as a whole. The faction's stand will end patient struggle for unity at the centre, and the systematic summing up of experience, and replace it with a continued free-for-all where the "best" demagogues rise

to the top. They will destroy our centralism and our proletarian democracy - particularly when they then continuously drive minorities out of the organisation even when they are prepared to subordinate themselves to the majority and work hard for the revolution! (p4).

NR's splittism has taken the form on the one hand of a vicious attack to disintegrate the opposition, including denouncing the Chairman, and later other PC comrades, as "traitors", "agents of imperialism", etc.; and on the other, the throwing of issue after issue into the melting pot and demanding that the bulk of the issues be resolved immediately. This relentless attack inevitable partially paralysed the centre, constantly side-tracked the struggle over the main issues, and sowed confusion - as it was meant to do.

This is what led to the correct demand to struggle "in an orderly fashion". It was NR's vicious splittism that led to action against him at the centre, when he refused to stop it. It is obvious that political differences cannot be resolved, and the line of the RCL cannot be strengthened when struggle is carried out in such an opportunist manner. Now, the faction turns round and says the PC has reduced "the whole struggle to one of 'style and methods of work', or to conceal the struggle, to suppress it..." (p4). No! It is NR who "suppressed" struggle - through his splittism; and the central committee after some concrete experience of it, fully recognised the fact, and therefore took steps to suppress splittism (whilst giving NR a way out). What is more PD, who is now part of the faction

propagating the lie that NR was silenced because of his political **line**, knows this so well that he vigorously supported the initial disciplinary action (at CC5. September) against NR, as did every other member of the CC. It was only at PC 17 (November) that PD suddenly changed his line, when he simultaneously attacked the theory of the three worlds as an "opportunist theory"! The scenario that the faction has tried to paint of the "minority" i.e. NR and PD being suppressed by the "majority" for "nearly a year" is an out-and-out lie and the faction knows it. The faction claim that R&F do not know that "MC was removed from the PC, because he dared to circulate (to the CC) the document, *The bourgeoisie has seized power on the PC*" (p6). Again, they attempt to paint a picture of suppression of political line. It is not the circulation of a document that led to his removal, but the circulation of a splittist document (see its title!) and his refusal to make a self-criticism for splittism that led to his removal. The faction in their document make great play of the fact that PD(MF) was removed from the SC when he came out in support of NR. They even underline it. (p6). What they don't mention is that PD did not oppose this because the SC was operating only as a consultative body for the Ch and it made no sense to have a consultative body of the two of them, after PD had come out backing splittism!

PR also had disciplinary action taken against her for splittism similar to NR's. The faction claim that she has been the victim of "lies and slanders" (p6&7). Again they "accidentally" fail to reveal that it was her own cell, after months of direct experience of her splittism, who voted unanimously apart from her (7.I) to put her on probation, and later to expel her.

What has not been suppressed is struggle over political line on the central bodies (except by NR's vicious splittism). The document on Proletarian Internationalism, for example, was discussed several times on the PC, then at CC5, then at the PC again, and then at CC6, and only then because they had individualistically walked out after every other CC member present voted for further disciplinary action against NR (which action still allowed him to take part in CC debate), and even when all of NR and MF's written amendments were put up for a vote in their absence.

The demagogy of the faction on the question of Democratic Centralism continues "We stand for a CC which encourages lower levels and the R&F to use their heads... and question CC directives, lines and policies...(and) feel free to voice their opinions" (p4). This is rich! It was precisely NR who as Secretary of the CC wielded a sledgehammer against any BC or DC who dared to criticise his leadership! It is NR who attacks those who disagree with him in a manner that suppresses democracy at every level! It is NR's frantic activism (for others) that denies R&F cadres time to consider leads from the centre, study and

* where it was passed as being generally correct. The only session at which NR and PD did not contribute was at CC 6,

therefore have the confidence to make criticisms! And it is this which led cadres, yet again, to criticise his style of work. To which he replied, yet again, that the PC was diverting the struggle into one of methods and style of work, away from issues of ideological and political line!

NR demands ultra-democracy for himself, and bureaucracy for others. All these things are precisely fundamental questions of ideological line. From his stand on Democratic Centralism, to his arrogance, to his failure to practice self-criticism, to his refusal to seek truth from facts, NR backed by the faction, takes the class stand of the petit-bourgeoisie. The RCL takes the stand of the proletariat. The factions constant attempts to oppose "methods and style of work" to "ideological and political line" are themselves nothing but a diversion. We are precisely struggling over major questions of ideological line.

As far their petit-bourgeois carping demagogy about "the widest democracy" and their belittling of the 'rules' of Democratic Centralism, Lenin has this to say, "The Party tie...must be founded on formal 'bureaucratically' worded rules (bureaucratic from the standpoint of the undisciplined intellectual), strict adherence to which can alone safeguard us from the wilfulness and caprices characteristic of the circles, from the circle methods of free-for-all scrapping that goes by the name of the free 'process' of the ideological struggle" (One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, p251, Peking Ed.)

THE IDEALIST METAPHYSICS OF THE FACTION ON PARTY-BUILDING

In total disregard for concrete reality and actual conditions, the faction wildly attacks the Party-building strategy of the RCL. (Another new flip by PD). The faction attacks the "line" which "concentrates in practice, on purely economic work in individual factories" (p2) and instead proposes that the RCL took a stand on concentrating its scarce resources on the industrial working class, and why in particular we concentrate on work in certain factories. It requires patient, long-term hard work to win the leadership of the working class, and build a Party with deep roots in it. For the faction shouting is enough.

Secondly, it is a fact that as well as taking a stand on the economic struggle, and on the struggle to turn the unions into fighting class organisations, the RCL distributes agitational material on other political struggles (they can't have forgotten the Zimbabwe campaign already!) and sells CS in the factories. That the RCL does purely economic work is a bare-faced lie. That the RCL concentrates its resources is true - and is entirely correct! (It is true that some units have at times made economist errors, but that is another matter entirely). The lies go on. The RCL they say is "only uniting with the working class". All comrades know this is not the line of the RCL either on paper or in practice. PR knows that the cell she was in is in practice leading the present wages struggle, as it led the campaign for solidarity with the people of Zimbabwe! The faction has deliberately lied in order to cover up a correct criticism of NR and PR that they ignore the mass line as the method of leadership; that they think that "you lead the workers by leading them" (sic). How profound. This criticism of them is clearly correct, and seen to be so by their insistence that we can lead all struggles of all classes and strata despite the size of the RCL. They can only say this because they deny any necessity to investigate, in order to give correct leadership. Their wild idealism leads them to believe that shouting "revolutionary" slogans is sufficient. The faction complains at the "constant pulling back of our work using the pretext of the contradiction between cadres and tasks. There are millions of people who want revolution..." (p2) If these opportunist demagogues and idealists would attempt to seek truth from facts, and do even a cursory investigation, they would discover that regardless of how many people want revolution, that the RCL has a limited number of members and supporters. They would discover the awful realities that there is indeed a contradiction between cadres and tasks, and that every day our comrades have to decide what are more important tasks, what are less important, and what can't be done yet. The demagogic ravings about the RCL's "snivelling" (p3) will not change these stubborn facts. It is one thing to have lofty revolutionary optimism; quite another to live on cloud nine.

*should lead the political struggles of all classes and strata. What proud revolutionary phrases! All comrades know why the RCL

