

The Communist Party USA's Views on the State; or,
Right-wing 'Communism', a Senile Disorder

In the first issue of our theoretical journal we did not want to devote a lot of space to Olgin's polemic against Trotskyism, without dealing with the equally bourgeois propaganda of the revisionist CPUSA, in particular the 'New Program of the Communist Party USA'. This document is a complete and thorough exposition of bourgeois ideology within the working class movement. In the name of communism, the revisionists have distorted every basic tenet of Marx and Lenin. They have adapted Marxism-Leninism to the aims of the imperialists, and against the proletariat, on every question, from that of the state, to questions about violence, democracy, imperialism and fascism. We think it is important to deal carefully with these distortions, because they mean in practice that the working class is betrayed; that the working class is led down the path to fascist slaughter instead of to socialism. The line of the revisionist Communist Party is the theoretical justification for class collaboration with the imperialists, the butchers of the proletariat. We intend to show that the CPUSA is likewise the enemy of the proletariat, that its policy is counterrevolution in practice.

It will not be possible to deal with all of the trash in the 'New Program' in a single essay. We intend to take separate sections of it and treat them one at a time, even though the revisionist bourgeois theory and ideology is a white thread running throughout the Program, linking the separate questions in a disgusting knot of distortions and opportunism.

Here we want to deal with the section of the Program in Chapter 4, entitled 'The Socialist Path'. In this few pages there are several major distortions, all of which add up to the revisionists' furious battle to postpone the revolution and destroy the revolutionary movement. They say that our immediate strategy is not the dictatorship of the proletariat and the fight for socialism, that instead our present task is the formation of an 'anti-monopoly coalition' against 'monopoly' (the proletariat should ally with the 'small' bourgeoisie against the 'big' bourgeoisie). In other words, the US revolution will take place in two stages. First the anti-monopoly coalition stage to throw out the big imperialists, and then later on some time the fight for socialism. Further, they distort the Marxist-Leninist analysis of democracy, substituting democracy in general for class democracy and denying the class character of democracy. They talk about 'reversing the growth of militarism', 'averting monopoly violence', and contend that there is no need for the class to seize power by means of armed struggle. Finally, they evade entirely the question of the state, and the question of fascism, and divorce imperialist politics from imperialist economics.

We will deal with the deviations of the revisionists in several major areas having to do with the state, democracy, imperialism, and the concept of a revolutionary party. Our method will be to quote statements in the Program and compare them with Leninism, both separately and integrally according to topic.

THE STATE AND THE QUESTIONS OF VIOLENCE AND DEMOCRACY

The main aim of the revisionists in their Party Program for 1970 is to obscure the class nature of the state, which, as Lenin says, is 'the product and the manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms.' (The State and Revolution, Peking ed., p7) Further, Lenin says, 'The state is a machine for the suppression of one class by another, a machine for holding in obedience to one class, other, subordinated classes.' (The State, Peking ed., p14) As long as the revisionists can mask the class nature of the state, it is possible for them to peddle all kinds of falsifications about how it is possible to work within the imperialist bureaucracy and legal and electoral systems.

With the question of the state goes the question of violence, for the state machine is the means of control by violence of the wage-slave proletarians by the bourgeoisie. The CP must hide the class nature of the state and its violence in order to preach collaboration with the enemy and justify its prostration before mad dogs like Rockefeller and Nixon and other imperialists and lackeys. Therefore the Party Program makes a systematic effort to refute Lenin's thesis on the state, which is that it is composed of the military and bureaucracy (the latter being the parliament or Congress, the courts, various departments, the cabinet etc). The CP says,

'The principle machinery for violence in our society is the military establishment. Its subservience to monopoly is dramatized in the military-industrial complex. Clearly, dismantling of the military-industrial complex and reversal of the growth of militarism would have a decisive bearing on the circumstances attending revolutionary change.'

Here the CP laments the 'military-industrial complex', using the same public-relations nomenclature sniveled by ordinary bourgeois liberal democrats to hide the identity of the state with the 'special bodies of armed men which have prisons, etc,' (Lenin, State and Revolution, p10) which serve no other purpose but to enforce the will of the ruling class. How can there be any 'dismantling of the military-industrial complex' outside of the violent 'dismantling' (smashing!) of the entire bourgeois state machinery by the armed workers?

The CP, to go on, poses the question of violence in the abstract. Violence does not occur in the abstract, it takes certain concrete forms for certain purposes at definite times in history; it exists only in the concrete. There is no violence outside of the violence of one class directed toward another. The question here is one of the state violence of the bourgeoisie in suppression of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, but the CP seeks to make it a question of violence in general and so cover it up. There is simply no such thing as violence in general.

In the same way, the CP evades or obscures the question of the bureaucracy as a part of the state machine as described by Lenin. They say,

'Similarly, the struggle to invade "management prerogatives" and bureaucratic prerogatives in the administration of society, and to create agencies for direct popular participation in administrative and decision-making processes can seriously weaken the power bases from which monopoly could launch violence against the people.' Here the CP says the same thing about the state bureaucratic apparatus that they said about the military, namely, that it is separate and distinct from - in fact, bears nothing but an accidental relationship to - the bourgeois state. They imply that the state bureaucracy stands above classes: 'direct popular participation in administrative and decision-making processes' etc. What 'administrative and decision-making processes' are there in a bourgeois state other than those controlled by and for the bourgeoisie?? Marx says in The Civil War in France, 'The centralized state machinery, which, with its ubiquitous and complicated military, bureaucratic, clerical and judiciary organs, entombs (enmeshes) the living society like a boa constrictor.' (Peking ed., p162) Lenin, in The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, refers to the reasons given by Marx and Engels for why the bourgeois state must be smashed: 'In order to break down the resistance of the bourgeoisie, in order to inspire the reactionaries with fear, in order to maintain the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie, in order that the proletariat may forcibly hold down its adversaries.'

The CP says we should strive for 'direct popular participation in decision-making processes.' Lenin says, '

'The toiling masses are barred from participation in bourgeois parliaments (which never decide important questions under bourgeois democracy; they are decided by the stock exchange and the banks) by thousands of obstacles, and the workers know and feel, see and realize perfectly well that the bourgeois parliaments are institutions alien to them, instruments for the oppression of the proletarians by the bourgeoisie, institution of a hostile class, of the exploiting minority.'
(State and Revolution, Peking ed., p26)

The revisionists belabor and belabor the question of the bourgeois 'political processes', and it is in the context of such belaboring that the following 'formula' must be analyzed. 'Whether it attains the reins of government or not (OUR EMPHASIS) - an anti-monopoly alliance - either destroys monopoly or monopoly destroys it.' Here the question of state power is raised point blank, and dropped like a hot potato. The revisionists are telling the workers the bare-faced lie that it is unimportant whether or not state-power is taken from the imperialists! But there is no way to 'destroy monopoly' other than to take state power and crush the enemy. Otherwise the enemy crushes us. The enemy crushing us is fascism, but nothing is said of this either.

Later on the CP says that at some juncture, sometime off in the future, at a time they 'cannot now predict', the fight for socialism will become 'the immediate object of political battle'. What the CP is proposing is that the strategic aim of the proletariat in America at this time is not the struggle for state power and the establishment,

of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but that the task of the proletariat is to consolidate an 'anti-monopoly alliance' with the small bourgeoisie, or the 'left-wing' of the bourgeoisie. This is a two-stage theory for the American revolution, in effect a theory of no revolution at all, for under the conditions of modern imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism, there are only two roads: the road of the imperialists and of fascist attacks on the working class, or the road of proletarian revolution and the annihilation of the imperialist murderers and their system. That the CP seeks to divert the class from the path to liberation is evidenced further in another section of the Program (pp79-80), where they say that small business ('an elastic term stretching from the corner grocer to firms employing hundreds of workers'- OUR EMPHASIS) '...can be brought into alliance with the working class against monopoly.' That the CP has its true interests bound up with the preservation of imperialism is patently clear in their further remarks: 'It (SOCIALIST REVOLUTION) aims to end the despotic control over society by a financial oligarchy and to establish democratic control over the nation's economy as the firmest foundation for democratic self-rule in all aspects of national life.' Note the use of the word 'control'. What it amounts to is that the CP advocates abolition of the CONTROL of the financial oligarchy over society, and an end to the CONTROL of the economy by the bourgeoisie, but in no case do they advocate abolition of the bourgeoisie itself, or abolition of the capitalist system itself. They only want 'democratic control' over the present system. But isn't this what the bourgeoisie is already assuring us that we already have? - amid conditions of wage-slavery, police terror, conscription into the imperialist army, etc etc? The bourgeoisie has its 'democratic control' right now, since in a bourgeois state that's what democracy is, democracy for the bourgeoisie. The CP grovellingly pleads for more democracy for the bourgeoisie, not for the proletariat. For under the CP's version of 'socialism' the bourgeoisie would be able 'democratically' to organize counter-revolution, disrupt the state, rely on its international connections, and murder the workers. Lovely!

The CP doesn't even stop here in trying to make its case for the bourgeoisie. They say, 'But we believe that in today's world the possibility exists of creating such a relationship of forces that monopoly capital can be prevented from attempting to drown the popular will in blood.' First of all, what are the conditions of 'today's world' that the revisionists blur over? Can they be anything but the conditions of imperialism? No, but the revisionists identify imperialism as a policy preferred by finance capital in foreign affairs, not as a stage of capitalism. Further, what is the 'relationship of forces' the Party refers to? Under imperialism, the basic 'relationship of forces' can only be that between the international bourgeoisie and the international proletariat and toiling masses. The development of capitalism to its moribund stage has left us only two paths. The vague prate of the CP about 'relationship of forces' is a crude attempt to cover up this fact. Crude, because the arguments of the US modern revisionists (in conformity with the line of the revisionist center in Moscow) have not changed one whit from the arguments of the mouthpiece of the revisionist Second International, Kautsky, and, before him, Bernstein. Kautsky's arguments against Lenin in 1917 contained precisely the same vague references to changing the 'relationship of forces'. This

is what Lenin had to say about Kautsky:

'But we shall break with the opportunists, and the entire class-conscious proletariat will be with us in the fight - not to 'shift the relation of forces' (SIC!) but to overthrow the bourgeoisie, to destroy bourgeois parliamentarism, for a democratic republic after the type of the Commune, or a Republic of Workers' and Soldiers' deputies, for the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.' (State and Revolution, p142)

In addition, do the imperialists only ATTEMPT to drown the working class movement in blood? Do they not in fact do so daily? And is it not (at least partially) reported in the papers? What was the army doing at the Desire housing projects in New Orleans last month? What were the police doing at the Chicano Moratorium in East Los Angeles, when they fired on a peaceful demonstration of Chicano working people against the butchers' war in Vietnam? What can you call it but the rotten national chauvinism of the revisionists that prevents them from seeing these continual attacks on especially the Negro Nation and national minorities here as attacks on the working class, on 'the popular will'??

The CP has yet another version of 'shifting the relation of forces'. They say, 'Ultimately, the best guarantee for averting violence is the creation of a majority so overwhelming, so firm of purpose and commanding such positions of power as to restrain and minimize monopoly's use of force.' Isn't this just like Kautsky's arguments in 1917? and refuted by Lenin that same year?

'Infatuated with the "purity" of democracy, blind to its bourgeois character, he consistently urges that the majority, since it is the majority, need not "break down the resistance" of the minority, nor "forcibly hold it down" - it is sufficient to suppress cases of infringement of democracy....Kautsky... takes formal equality for actual equality.' (Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, p33)

The CP talks about 'commanding positions of power'. There are no positions to be commanded other than positions of state power to suppress by force the bourgeoisie, but the CP is silent about this. Their line is the same as Kautsky's: Why do we need a dictatorship when we have a majority?

'To confine Marxism to the doctrine of class struggle means curtailing Marxism, destroying it, reducing it to something which is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. Only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class-struggle to the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is what constitutes the most profound difference between the Marxist and the petty (as well as the big) bourgeois. (State and Revolution, p40)

The discrepancy between modern revisionism and Leninism is again obvious. Lenin says, 'No, democracy is not identical with the subordination of the minority. Democracy is a state which recognizes the subordination

of the minority to the majority, ie, an organization for the systematic use of violence by one class against another.' (Ibid., p97) Further, 'democracy for an insignificant minority, democracy for the rich - that is the democracy of capitalist society.' (Ibid., p104) How does the revisionist Program tamper with this basic tenet of Marxism? They say: 'Revolution, as our Declaration of Independence affirms, is the ultimate and most fundamental of democratic rights.' Was the Declaration of Independence not a declaration of independence for the fledgling bourgeoisie in America whose growth had been stunted by British colonialism? How can 'democratic right' be spoken of outside of the consideration, 'democracy for whom'? For the 'Founding Fathers', did the 'democratic right' of revolution apply to slaves, to the workers who did the fighting to kick the English out and then got screwed? Of course not. Similarly, the CP's drivel about democracy in general, ie 'universal' instead of proletarian democracy, can mean only one thing under conditions where the bourgeoisie holds state power, or where they have been overthrown but are still extremely strong - it can only mean giving full rein to the bourgeoisie. The Paris communards in 1871 who let the bourgeoisie go, let them regroup, call in Bismaarck's army and drown the revolution in blood, learned this lesson well. But the running dog CPUSA would lead us, like lambs, to an infinitely greater slaughter.

Throughout the section of the Party Program which we are dealing with here, this bourgeois concept of democracy in the abstract prevails: 'It (THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION) can only occur when millions ordinarily indifferent to the political process...are brought actively into political life.' Whose political process? Whose political life? What political process and political life can there be under imperialism than the bourgeois political process, unless it be a proletarian political process independent of the leadership and direction of the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie? The latter can only come into being with the development of proletarian leadership in the form of a Leninist party of a new type. But since the CP nowhere mentions such a thing, they can only mean the former (ie bourgeois) type of 'political process'. But we have already seen what Lenin said about the proletariat's faith in parliamentarism, and we see the truth of his words in real life every day. The CP, as usual, comes to a dead end, talking vaguely about a mass 'labor' party (of the English type), not a General Staff (a real communist party) that could lead the class to victory.

The revisionists continue to expose themselves. 'We seek a peaceful path,' 'we advocate social change through peaceful means...within the American Constitutional framework,' etc. They give lip service to 'other factors', saying that these peaceful and legal measures are not the 'sole historical factors that will determine the path of social change in the US.' But what can these bland oatmealy statements mean in the total absence of any discussion about preparing the workers for armed resistance and armed offensives (they consider the word 'offensive'...offensive) against the inevitable reaction of the ruling circles? It means the CP in practice denies the need for such preparation. This is tantamount to telling the workers to lie down and prostrate themselves before the fascist butchery (the 'other factor' besides 'peace and legality'!!) of the imperialist state. Have there

ever been any more thorough-going traitors to the working class than the stinking revisionist corpses of the Communist Party USA? its mentor the CPSU, and so on?

CIVIL WAR OR PEACEFUL TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM?

In State and Revolution (pp28-9), Lenin says that Marx's definition of the state was a slap in the face of the opportunists' prejudices concerning the 'peaceful development of democracy', and of the pretty pictures painted by the petty bourgeois democrats of the socialist transformation of society as a 'peaceful submission of the minority to the majority'. In light of this, let us examine what the modern revisionists of the CPUSA have to say: 'The question remains, however, whether the democratic will of the people can be brought to expression by relatively peaceful means, that is, without armed insurrection, without civil war.' Lenin says flatly, 'The supersession of the bourgeois state by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution.' Perhaps the CP would answer to this that Marx and Engels, at one time, proposed that it was possible to effect a peaceful transition to socialism in the US. (Marx did this indirectly in his letter to Kugelmann of April 12, 1871, quoted by Lenin on p44 of State and Revolution.) But what was the reason for this exclusion of the US (as well as of England)? They had no 'militarist clique' and a minimal state bureaucracy at that time. But Lenin continues:

'Today, in 1917, in the epoch of the first great imperialist war, this qualification made by Marx is no longer valid. Both England and America...have today completely sunk into the all-European filthy, bloody morass of bureaucratic-military institutions which subordinate everything to themselves and trample everything underfoot. Today, in England and in America, too, 'the preliminary condition for every real people's revolution' is the smashing, the destruction of the 'ready-made state machinery'....' (p45)

What could be plainer??

The CP goes on to say, 'It is naive to think that monopoly capital would be restrained by Constitutional scruples from resorting to violence to thwart the most democratic mandate for a socialist transformation....No ruling class relinquishes power passively and voluntarily.' Can this be understatement?? The bourgeoisie has shown itself not only to be not passive, but has shown that its apparatus is the historical epitome of the most highly organized violence. Lenin says, '...in every profound revolution, a prolonged, stubborn and desperate resistance of the exploiters, who for a number of years retain important practical advantages over the exploited, is the rule.' He says, '...the overthrown exploiters...throw themselves with energy grown tenfold...into the battle for recovery of the "paradise" of which they've been deprived.' (State and Revolution, p35) And yet the CP can talk of the possibility of peace with the bourgeoisie. It is of course legitimate to say that the proletariat seeks the most peaceful means to achieve its ends. But in light of the development of fascism in the USA only traitors confine themselves to discussion of peaceful and nonviolent methods of struggle against the state. Only traitors fail to discuss the international pressures which will force the US bourgeoisie to tighten the screws on its own working class:

the recovery of German and Japanese imperialists from World War II and their increasing encroachments on US 'turf', the failure of US neo-colonialism in Southeast Asia and elsewhere, and the formations of alliances among the great world powers in preparation for a third world conflict.

IMPERIALISM, POLICY OR STAGE?

Imperialism is not a policy preferred by monopoly capital, contrary to the pronouncements of the revisionist Communist Party USA. 'The main thrust,' says the CP Program, 'of the policy of world domination took shape in the immediate aftermath of World War II.' 'America's rulers...saw an era in which American monopolies would dominate vassal states.' This formulation is a pack of lies and distortions, given on p29 of the Program, not the section we are primarily dealing with in this essay, but one which lays the basis for the line on the question of imperialism which is implicit in 'The Socialist Path' section. Lenin says in Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, that capitalism entered the stage of imperialism on a world scale no later than the turn of the century. (Peking ed., p20etc) The vagaries of the CP about some of the US rulers seeing an opportunity for implementation of imperialist policies after World War II, are an attempt by the CP to cover up the well-known analysis by Lenin of what imperialism is. Imperialism is capitalism. The relationship is one of identity. By substituting a discussion of reactionary foreign policy for an explanation of the necessity for exporting capital, for merging bank and industrial capital, for uneven development, division of the world, inevitability of war etc etc, the revisionists seek to isolate imperialist economics from imperialist politics. To say that it is the preference of a section of the bourgeoisie and not economic necessity that determines the subjugation of small nations, etc, is to deny Leninism and plain facts we see everyday. The Party focuses on bourgeois personalities and their 'warlike' or 'peaceloving' qualities. But in fact, differences or contradictions of this type among the bourgeoisie are tactical differences within the framework of similar goals. In the end they represent merely the interests of different branches of (totally reactionary) finance capital. In no way do they represent the interests of the proletariat, as the CP tries to show.

That the CP wants us to separate imperialist economics from imperialist politics is evidenced several times in the Party Program section 'The Socialist Path'. The first of these is the statement, 'Monopoly cannot be supplanted by any other form of capitalism.' First we must ask, what is the function of using the word 'monopoly' throughout, and not the term 'imperialism'? Second, what is the function of calling monopoly or imperialism a 'form' and not a 'stage' of capitalism, as Lenin does? Is there any other 'form' of capitalism in a nation like the US than imperialism? No. Then the function of using 'form' to the exclusion of the scientific formulation 'stage' is to deny that imperialism is capitalism. This is the same distortion offered up by Kautsky, and refuted by Lenin in Imperialism. Lenin says,

'The capitalists divide the world not out of any particular malice, but because the degree of concentration which has been reached forces them to adopt this method in order to obtain profits... To substitute the question of the form of the struggle and agree-

ments (today peaceful, tomorrow warlike, the nextday warlike again) for the question of the substance of the struggle and agreements between capitalist combines is to sink to the role of a sophist.' (Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, Peking ed., p89) Further,

'The essence of the matter is that Kautsky detaches the politics of imperialism from its economics, speaks of annexations as being a policy "preferred" by finance and opposes to it another bourgeois policy which, he alleges, is possible on this very same basis of finance capital.' (Ibid., p110)

Another distortion of the CP on the question of the imperialist stage of capitalism revolves around the question whether militarism is one of its essential features. Lenin says, in The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky (again the CP is refurbishing Kautsky),

'...Premonopoly capitalism - which reached its zenith actually in the 1870s - by virtue of its fundamental economic traits, which found a most typical expression in England and America, distinguished by a, relatively speaking, maximum fondness for peace and freedom. Imperialism, on the other hand, ie, monopoly capitalism, which finally matured only in the twentieth century, is, by virtue of its fundamental economic traits, distinguished by a minimum fondness for peace and freedom, and by a maximum and universal development of militarism.' (p15, Peking ed.)

Under these conditions, which far from being modified, have become ever more acute, there can never exist the possibility spoken of here by the revisionists: 'Clearly, the dismantling of the military-industrial complex and reversal of the growth of militarism would have a decisive bearing on the circumstances attending revolutionary change. Lenin says of Kautsky's similar distortion, 'To "fail to notice" this (THE MAXIMUM TENDENCY TOWARD MILITARISM) in discussing the extent to which a peaceful or violent revolution is typical or probable is to stop at the position of a most ordinary lackey of the bourgeoisie.' (Ibid., p15)

A further distortion of the modern revisionists on the question of imperialism concerns economic crisis. In the New Program they say, 'A crisis resulting from a protracted war, from an attempts at a reactionary coup, or from an economic depression...all these are certainly possible (EMPHASIS ADDED) in our monopoly capitalist society. However, strategy cannot be hinged on such contingencies. (EMPHASIS ADDED) The CP distorts the Marxist-Leninist theory of crisis in two ways. On the one hand, they constantly refer to crises as "contingent" in order to create the impression that the contradictions of imperialism have lessened so as to allow collaboration with the bourgeoisie and "peaceful transition" and all kinds of social-chauvinism; on the other hand, they imply that the crises and demise of capitalism are inevitable without a major upheaval (protracted war, major depression etc), thus trying to persuade the proletariat to sit back and not pay too much attention to these 'possibilities' and 'contingencies' (perhaps they will soon cease altogether?), and simply wait for imperialism to die of itself.

The final distortion of the CP on imperialism that we will deal with here, has to do with their projection of a 'two-stage' theory of proletarian revolution in the US. They say early in the section beginning on p91 of their Program that what the American people need is an 'anti-monopoly coalition'. A little later they say that at some unpredictable point off in the future somewhere, the fight for socialism will become the immediate object of political struggle (which it isn't now, apparently). Continual references to 'popular forces', etc, and not to the proletariat, indicates again that the CP is not striving for a proletarian dictatorship, but an anti-monopoly coalition. The fact is that under the conditions of imperialism, even a bourgeois-democratic struggle in a colony has to be closely tied to the proletarian revolution and led by a proletarian party, because, if the revolution is led by the national bourgeoisie it will not be able to consolidate itself and survive even if victorious: the domination of a large chunk of the world by monopoly capital will not allow the independent development of capitalism anywhere. If a newly independent nation takes the capitalist instead of socialist road, sooner or later it will revert to dependence on imperialism, and return to the status of a colony or semi-colony.

This is the case for the colonies, which is the only case where the two-stage (first a democratic revolution made by several classes, then a socialist revolution establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat) is applicable. Why is it applicable? Because the growth of capitalism in the colonies has been stunted by imperialism, and the national bourgeoisie is anti-imperialist, and therefore ready to unite with the proletariat and peasantry. But...the CP proposes a two-stage revolution in the US. What does this mean? Is there such a thing as a progressive anti-imperialist national bourgeoisie in the US? Of course not. The US bourgeoisie is the US imperialists. The struggles of the peoples of Anglo-America and of the Negro Nation in the plantation and surrounding area in the South are struggles against imperialism and for socialism, for the dictatorship of the proletariat. There is no other path in the USA except the overthrow, the smashing, of imperialism. What the CP wants, then, is to subvert entirely the revolutionary movement, channel it into harmless channels. The two-stage theory, advocating as it does alliance with a section of the imperialist bourgeoisie (Kennedy, Johnson, etc), is a theory of counter-revolution, one which they eagerly put into practice.

A PARTY OF LENIN, OR A BOURGEOIS MASS PARTY?

We intend to show that the CP equates illegal revolutionary work with 'conspiracy', condemning such illegal work because it threatens the bourgeoisie whom the CP wishes to defend; that its concept of a revolutionary organization is one of a bourgeois mass party, not a Leninist party; finally, that according to the CP the tactics of such a party should be the same as those of the glorifiers of spontaneity that Lenin had to deal with - that is, 'tactics-as-process'. ~~All~~ this garbage is contained within the short section in the Program, 'The Socialist path.'

The remarks of the Party on the subject of conspiracies is the other aspect of their line on 'working within the system'. Legal work, consisting of participation in 'democratic processes' (bourgeois-democratic) and the formation of 'anti-monopoly coalitions' is all fine with

the CP. But 'conspiracy', identified solely with right-wing coups a la Latin America, is not permissible. This proves (if there was any doubt) that the CP is really the mouthpiece of US ruling circles. What is good for the bourgeoisie is alright with the Communist Party, and what the bourgeoisie says is illegal is taboo with the revisionists. They go to fantastic lengths to convince the proletariat not to overstep the bounds of bourgeois democracy, not to build an organization of revolutionaries, not to build a real communist party to lead the working class.

The statements of the CP on 'conspiracy' on pp91-2 of their Program go as follows: 'Reactionary coups can be brought off by conspiracies, but not social revolutions. Coups are manipulations at the top.... So profound a transformation cannot be made by a coup or conspiracy.' (The reader should compare these statements by the opportunist Menshevik statements of Lenin's opponents - Martov, Trotsky etc - at the Second Party Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, 1903. They are discussed in Lenin's One Step Forward, Two Steps Back.)

It could be said of the CP's remarks are directed against the activities of terrorists: bombings of public buildings, kidnaping of officials etc. This cannot be so for two reasons. First, it is the CP itself that in fact focuses in on individual members of the bourgeoisie instead of the class as a whole as the enemy, hence opening the door for terrorism. Second, and more important, it is the CP's line of 'tactics-as-process' (e.g., 'an encompassing struggle for progressively more radical measures' - p94, Program) that raises the spontaneity of which terrorism is a manifestation to the level of principle. As Lenin says in What is to be Done? in the section called 'What is there in common between Economism and Terrorism?',

'The Economists and present-day terrorists have one common root, namely, subservience to spontaneity....The Economists and the terrorists merely bow to different poles of spontaneity; the Economists bow to the spontaneity of 'the labor movement pure and simple'; while the terrorists bow to the spontaneity of the passionate indignation of intellectuals.'

Not to speak of a class party, a General Staff for the organization and leadership of the insurrection (in the context of a detailed discussion of revolution, no less), is to imply that the revolutionary party and preparation for civil war are unnecessary; is to imply utter subservience to spontaneity. And as Lenin has shown repeatedly, subservience to spontaneity is the key ingredient in the approach of terrorists to social revolution. Thus it is impossible for the revisionists to be attacking the present-day terrorists with their comments on conspiracies. Actually, they are attacking the Leninist concept of a Party of a new type, and they attack from the Right. Here is how they accomplish this.

To begin with, the statement of the CP on 'conspiracy' are as follows: 'Reactionary coups can be brought off by conspiracies, but not social revolution. Coups are manipulations at the top....So profound a transformation cannot be made by a coup or conspiracy.'

The CP has set up 'conspiracy' (what they really mean is illegal work) in opposition to 'social revolution'. They juxtapose 'conspiracy' with 'reactionary', implying that illegality ('conspiring') is undemocratic, because not everybody - namely, the bourgeoisie - is allowed to know about secret and illegal work. 'Coups', which are made by 'conspiracies' (the two words are used interchangeably), says the Party, 'are manipulations at the top.' Therefore, to carry this line of 'reasoning' to its logical conclusion, the Party is saying that all conspiracies aim toward 'manipulation at the top', and Good God! the CP wouldn't be caught dead 'manipulating at the top' of the bourgeois power structure!! Therefore, 'social revolution' as defined by the CP must stay away from any 'manipulations' of state power - in other words, must stay away from taking it, - instead confining itself to the lower level of mass spontaneity and 'anti-monopoly coalitions', etc. 'To organize' and 'to manipulate' are synonyms for the 'vanguard' (of social-fascism) CP.

To sum up our arguments against the revisionist line on the organization of revolutionaries and of illegal work, we quote from What is to be done? (Lenin, Selected Works in 3 vols, International Publ, vol 1 p201):

'Centralization of the most secret functions in an organization of revolutionaries will not diminish, but rather increase the extent and enhance the quality of the activity of a large number of other organizations, that are intended for a broad public and are therefore as loose and as non-secret as possible, such as workers' trade unions; workers' self-education circles and circles for reading illegal literature; and socialist, as well as democratic, circles among all other sections of the population, etc etc. We must have circles, trade unions and organizations everywhere in as large a number as possible and with the widest variety of functions; but it would be absurd and harmful to confound them with the organization of revolutionaries, to efface the borderline between them, to make still more hazy the all-too-faint recognition of the fact that in order to 'serve' the mass movement we must have people who will devote themselves exclusively to Social-Democratic activities, and that such people must train themselves patiently and steadfastly to be professional revolutionaries.'

Is not the line of the Revisionist Communist Party USA, which says nothing about, denies the need for a Leninist Party - is it not completely in contradiction to the science of Marxism-Leninism?

To conclude, the theories and ideology which are presented by the CP in the 'New Program of the CPUSA' are their attempt to justify, with revolutionary phrasemongering and vague rhetoric, what they

set out to accomplish in practice, namely counter-revolution. The CP, in order to capture the attention of the progressive and revolutionary elements of the proletariat, must mask its subversion with Marxism-Leninism. Inherent in these attempts to subvert the movement and turn revolutionaries into reformists is the need to obscure the class nature of the state and the fundamental economic and political features of imperialism. To obscure these things means, as we have seen, to open the door to a whole host of deviations and distortions. The task of real revolutionary communists, followers of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao, is to expose these distortions of the modern revisionists to the masses of workers, proletarian intellectuals and theoreticians, and other oppressed people in the US.

The theoretical, political and finally organizational dismemberment and destruction of the Communist Party USA is a task of first importance for Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people in general. Its completion will signal a great victory for the American working class and the international proletariat.

C. J.