

Gus Hall on Watergate and Brezhnev's Visit

CPUSA Defends Imperialists

On June 30th of this year, Gus Hall, General Secretary of the CPUSA, delivered a dull, but significant speech in Chicago, Illinois, encompassing the Party's line on Watergate and the Brezhnev summit meeting with Nixon. The significance of this speech lies not in the correctness and analytical nature of the speech, but rather in the exposition of the CPUSA for what it is: a liberal, class collaborating, bourgeois party. The speech deserves comment solely because of the effect of the revisionists on the working class movement. The ideology of revisionism reaches far and wide and it must be exposed so we can unite the working class, build a real Communist Party and go on to a victorious socialist revolution.

Hall's analysis of the Watergate affair is very similar to that of the bourgeois press. He pointed to the scandalous nature of the affair, to the role of "big business" in the affair and the push that Watergate represents toward what Hall termed a "government within a government." In past People's Tribunes, we have stated the reasons for the Watergate scandal. It is not just an ordinary scandal, but rather is a result of the contradictions within the ruling class itself. The CPUSA's analysis of the Watergate affair is cursory and superficial and does not expose the contradictions in capitalism in order to raise the consciousness of the proletariat, but instead covers up the situation so as to paralyze the class from taking any real revolutionary action.

Hall said that "big business" is behind the Watergate affair, that Watergate is a ploy for big business to make more profits. How this is done, and exactly who big business is, was not explained. In fact, Hall had a hard time spitting out the word imperialists. He would much rather speak of "big business" which does not at all explain the social relations that exist under capitalism and "cleverly" disguises the class nature of the state.

What does a "government within a government" really mean? Why is this situation unique to the USNA? In the traditional CPUSA style of "American Exceptionalism" Hall declared that the push toward fascism in this country will take a different form than it has taken in the other countries that have had fascist governments. He said the state form is "na-

tional in form, but fascist in content." What does that mean? He never discussed that.

He blamed the Democratic Party for not taking a militant stand against Watergate, and warned the liberals in this country that their day of persecution would come. He spoke of the "invisible" government, for example, the National Security Commission, and said that Nixon has too much power; that obviously the Executive branch of the government has outstripped the other branches of the government. Hall's bomb shell was the thrilling and suspenseful "T-day." That is "take-over day," when the government will scrap the constitution and round-up all those "liberals" and "communists" who do not agree or accept the "new state form." Of course there will have been signs of this take-over: executive power allowing for creeping fascism. On and on he rambled without saying anything, and at the same time, saying a lot. He made it very clear that what we need is a broad peoples' movement. We need not a class party, but a labor based political party, a party that represents the interests of all classes, even "small business" who is being pushed out of the picture. He said that we need a party that will be a forum where the liberals can continue to control the working class. This is the same slogan that Hubert Humphrey has been pushing since 1948! Hall called for stripping the Executive branch of its power, in essence allowing Senator Fulbright to lead our class. Fulbright has been screaming about limiting Executive power for years. Hall called for doing away with loan sharks, racism and anti-communism.

One thing he advocated that had some validity was the impeachment of Nixon and new elections. One reason the CPUSA adopted this slogan was because of the work the CL has done around Watergate. For example, a Teamster local on the West Coast unanimously passed a CL sponsored resolution calling for Nixon's resignation and new elections. In addition organizing work in other unions from coast to coast and other working class organizations has been carried out. Sorry, General Secretary Hall, you stole it from us! But in stealing, Hall raised this slogan in such a manner that gave absolutely no direction to the working class.

CPUSA

Cont. from p. 4

Why doesn't Hall expose the real nature of fascism? Why doesn't he arm the working class with an understanding of the contradictions in capitalist society? Why does he hide the true nature of capitalism? Why? Because the CPUSA is a liberal, petty bourgeois, populist party. Because they do not want revolution, but rather want to help the fascists take power, by disarming the proletariat, by disorganizing the proletariat, by channeling the faith of the working class into the electoral system.

They say that all the working class has to do is vote into power some "good guys" like Gus Hall, for example, and all our problems will be solved. The CPUSA does not call for a Party of a New Type, a party that transforms "the spontaneous struggle of the workers against the oppressors, by means of the organization of the work-

ers, propaganda and agitation among them, into a struggle of the whole class, into the struggle of a definite political party for definite political and socialist ideals." (1)

Nor does the Party expose the true nature of fascism and what it means to the working class. As Dimitroff said, "Fascism in power is the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital." (2) What fascism really means to the working class is rabid chauvinism, war, reaction, counter-revolution, oppression, and misery for the working class. Hall also did not show the working class that there is a way to stop fascism. He spoke not of a united working class, but rather separated the national minorities from the rest of the working class. He pushed disunity of the class. As can be seen, the Party effectively sways the class away from revolution

and onto the path of reforming capitalism.

Lastly, just a few words on the Brezhnev-Nixon meeting. Hall's analysis was that Brezhnev came from a position of strength, that the USSR is taking advantage of the political crisis in the USNA. He said that Brezhnev came to smash the trade embargo imposed by the USNA. He assured us that Brezhnev has no illusions about blending socialism and capitalism. Nixon is the man in trouble, not Brezhnev. But what about the agricultural crisis in the USSR? The industry in the USSR is now being opened to USNA and European imperialist investment and exploitation and the Soviet working class, who once was the most advanced politically and economically in the world, is now suffering from the indignities of unemployment, piece rates on work and foreign exploitation. Hall did not at all point to the struggle that is going on in the USSR to consolidate the

Cont. on p. 8

CPUSA

Cont. from p. 5

power of the bourgeoisie. Why didn't he speak to all this? Because Hall and the CPUSA are an appendage of the CPSU, a lackey of both the USSR social-imperialists and the USNA imperialists.

So we see that the position of the CPUSA on both Brezhnev and Watergate are significant because both these positions work against the interests of the working class and against the building of a real Communist Party and the inevitable socialist revolution. Revisionism opens the door to fascism. It weakens the working class and strengthens bourgeois ideology. Only with a relentless struggle

bring consciousness to the class struggle so that we can overthrow this rotten capitalist system and establish the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

FIGHT FOR DECENT HOUSING!

BUILD A MULTI-NATIONAL MARXIST-LENINIST COMMUNIST PARTY!

1) Engels, The Housing Question, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1970, p. 71.

against revisionism can we defeat imperialism and have a socialist revolution.

1) Lenin, Revolutionary Party of a New Type, Peking, 1960.

2) Dimitroff, United Front Against Fascism, New Century Publishers, 1935, p. 7.