

"volunteer army," (composed primarily of oppressed nationality youths unable to find jobs) as a world-wide counter-revolutionary force; the rapid increase of auxiliary police groups of all kinds; the militarizing of such youth groups as the Boy Scouts, who are now being indoctrinated to emulate the Green Berets; the increasing number of films whose main point is that fascism is the only answer to "lawlessness" and "crime in the streets;" the spending of millions of dollars by urban police units for the most up-to-date and lethal equipment for "keeping the peace." And each of us can think of countless other examples.

In recognizing the attack of the bourgeoisie on the working class and especially the oppressed national sectors of the class, we must also recognize the intensification of the imperialists' anti-Communist campaign. Fearing most of all the development of a genuine, Bolshevik, multi-national Communist party, the bourgeoisie has stepped up its efforts to discredit our great revolutionary leader, Comrade Stalin. Their printing houses gush out tons of trash distorting history, trying to pass off the treacherous dog, Trotsky, as a leader of the great Bolshevik Party, while slandering the millions of Russians who fought to uphold Marxism-Leninism and defend the socialist fatherland, led by Stalin. In this attack on Stalin, they join hands with the Soviet Revisionists.

In this attempt to throw confusion into the ranks of the proletariat and keep the proletariat enslaved under bourgeois ideology, the imperialists are aided by the revisionists and right opportunists who negate the importance of revolutionary theory and the revolutionary party, who worship the spontaneous movement, who cloak their opportunism and dishonesty under the guise of Marxism-Leninism, who raise the red flag to smash the red flag - the CPUSA, and within the Communist movement the RU, the OL, the Guardian, PSP and CL.

Watergate

Fascism is an inevitable tendency in capitalism. The essence of fascism is the violent attempt to suppress and overcome the ever-growing contradictions of capitalist society. In Fascism and Social Revolution R. Palme Dutt characterizes it in this way:

"Fascism is not merely the expression of a particular movement, of a particular party within modern society, but that it is the most complete expression of the whole tendency of modern capitalism in decay, as the final attempt to defeat the working class revolution and organize society on the basis of decay. This tendency runs through all modern capitalist countries without exception, and the advent of open Fascism to power is only its final and completed expression."³¹

Restating the communist position on this question, Dutt reaffirms that the realization of fascism is not inevitable and declares that:

"The workers' dictatorship is the only alternative to the capitalist dictatorship, which at present is increasingly

passing from the older 'democratic' to Fascist forms. The victory of Fascism, against the victory of the capitalist counter-revolution and the unlimited subjection of the working class. The path of the bourgeois democracy ends in Fascism."³²

(See section on Strategy and Tactics for further discussion of this topic)

In The United Front Against War and Fascism, Georgi Dimitroff explained that fascism does not come in one blow and cannot be conceived of in a simplified form. He also stated that fascism usually comes to power in the course of a mutual, and at times, severe struggle against the old bourgeois parties, or a definite section of these parties, in the course of a struggle within the fascist camp itself.

He also stated that the development of fascism would take different forms in different countries. He said:

"In certain countries, principally those in which fascism does not enjoy a broad mass basis and in which the struggle of the various groups within the fascist bourgeoisie itself is fairly acute, fascism does not immediately venture to abolish parliament, but allows the other bourgeois parties, as well as the Social-Democratic parties, to retain a certain degree of legality. In other countries, where the ruling bourgeoisie fears an early outbreak of revolution, fascism establishes its unrestricted political monopoly, either immediately or by intensifying its reign of terror against and persecution of all competing parties and groups. This does not prevent fascism, when its position becomes particularly acute, from endeavoring to extend its basis without altering its class nature, combining open terrorist dictatorship with a crude sham of parliamentarism."³³

He said that American fascism, for instance, "...tries to portray itself as the custodian of the constitution and 'American Democracy.'"³⁴

Taking into consideration the points raised above, we understand that in the struggle against the right opportunists who would lull the proletariat to sleep by denying the existence of a fascist menace in the U.S., the PRRWO has recently held a "left" position on fascism -- in essence confusing the growing menace of fascism with the advent of fascism itself. It is undeniable that with the increasing revolutionary movement of the masses and the sharpening of contradictions domestically and internationally, the menace of fascism is growing dangerously. However, it would be incorrect to conclude that the bourgeoisie has exhausted totally the mileage it can squeeze from bourgeois democracy. Although confidence in all U.S. institutions, including government is at an all-time low, (N.Y. Post, Sept. 30, 1974, p. 37) the bourgeoisie still has maneuverability under the "old forms" of dictatorship over the proletariat.

Repudiating the incorrect position that Watergate was simply another part of the "impending fascist offensive" against the working class, we also reject the rightist position that Watergate represented a struggle between "democracy" and fascism.

None of Nixon's policies against the people prompted his imperialist critics to oust him. When the Pentagon Papers revealed his lies, when

the FBI murdered Fred Hampton, when Nixon froze wages and let prices and monopoly profits soar, when he ordered intensified bombing of IndoChina - none of these crimes were made into a "scandal" by the bourgeoisie. Only after the uncovering of Watergate (and we know the bourgeoisie has been conducting activities like this for years), and the attacks on other sectors of the bourgeoisie and their agents, like Cox and Richardson, and the public insubordination of Nixon to Congress and the courts, did the bourgeoisie make Watergate a "scandal." The "crimes" he was accused of, are only Watergate itself, destroying evidence, etc.

No sector of the Bourgeoisie is interested in the rights of the people at home or abroad. They are interested only in their continued parasitic rule. The bourgeoisie has unity around their goals: to insure profits by maintaining and expanding the control over the world's people. They have tactical differences on how best to do this. But any grouping within the bourgeoisie will take fascist measures when necessary to suppress the growing revolutionary tide. Witness so-called "liberal" JFK during the Cuban missile crisis or John Lindsay's use of the TPF in NYC.

Watergate and Nixon's forced resignation reveal that the imperialist crisis is most definitely sharpening the contradictions within the ruling class.

On the one side, you have what Dimitroff called a "populist movement" moving for power. They call for an end to corruption in government, and involvement in IndoChina, "honest government" and rights for the working man. In the U.S. today, this "populist movement" is made up of Kennedy, McGovern, Wallace, the Black bourgeoisie, Black muslims (who recently saluted Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago) backed by Morgan, Ford, and Harriman.

Another grouping moving for power is the Rockefeller Gang. Gerald Ford and Kissinger are both Rockefeller men. Since Nixon's forced resignation, Republicans have been increasingly rallying behind Nelson Rockefeller for vice-president. Furthermore, although the media is portraying Ford as a moderate, in reality he is a staunch reactionary. As House Republican leader, Ford fought against Medicare, housing bills, raises in the minimum wage, moves to divert highway funds to mass transit, against the poverty programs, and grants for education and the alleviation of pollution. On foreign policy, he was characterized by the NY Times as:

"...by instinct a hard-line Pentagon-oriented coldwarrior, although he has moulded his attitudes to fit the Nixon-Kissinger policies of detente. And because he is a more genuine and principled conservative than Richard Nixon, Mr. Ford is rigid, sometimes even stubborn."³⁵

Newsweek magazine described Ford this way:

"Ford is believed to be at least as right-minded as Nixon in most policy areas..he is not an idea man and has scant grounding in economics or foreign affairs...he is an Eagle Scout who can repeat the code verbatim...served in the Navy in WWII..elected to the House of Representatives in 1948...rose to chairmanship

of the House Republican Conference...he attacked LBJ for failing to wage an all-out war (on Vietnam-editor)"³⁶

Obviously, Ford, although a "loyal" reactionary, is weak. This means an increased role for the Cabinet (Kissinger, Haig, etc.). It also means that under the guise of "healing national wounds," Ford will invite key monopoly capitalists like the Rockefellers to participate more openly in the running of the government. (Note: since this was written, Nelson Rockefeller has been chosen by Ford to be "his vice-president.") As their handpicked puppet, Ford, like all presidents, will serve his monopoly capitalist masters by using his "executive privileges" to guarantee their interests and crush the growing revolutionary trend.

We hold that Watergate represents an increasingly vicious struggle among the imperialists themselves. In this, it reflects the objective inevitable decline of the old regime. However, in a short-term sense, we see the gains of the bourgeoisie from Watergate as two-fold.

First, they are using it to pump new life into the illusion that this country is a "democracy." They are consciously shifting attention to Watergate as if it were the primary aspect of the imperialist crisis, implying that when Watergate is over and Nixon is gone, the crisis is over. They are saying that the impeachment proceeding and resignation prove that the "democratic system" really works, and that now faith and confidence have been restored in America. Finally, now that the crisis is over, they say, we must all work together to heal the wounds; they call for a period of national reconciliation -- a call for class collaboration and class peace.

Second, in the furor over Nixon, many people have failed to realize that the bourgeoisie has accomplished something unprecedented in history. For the first time, both the president and vice-president will be appointed outright by the monopoly capitalists, without even the facade of an election. In addition, even the bourgeois press has stated that because of the unprecedented nature of this "crisis", Ford will have to depend more on his veterans in the cabinet (who are always appointed, never elected). On the night of the resignation, CBS television said specifically that both General Haig and Melvin Laird, both military men, will be playing a greater role in government than ever before. These events cannot be ignored. We hold that the direct entrance of monopoly capitalist pig Rockefeller into the government and the increased role played by the military represents a strengthening of the fascist menace and an indication that the bourgeoisie understands all too well that their increasingly exposed bourgeois democracy will soon be unable to stop the rapidly growing revolutionary tide.

Watergate then is clearly another symptom of the rapidly deepening imperialist crisis. In no way was the impeachment or resignation of Nixon the primary aspect of this crisis, although this is what the bourgeoisie would have us believe in order to cover up the (a) sharpening of the principal contradiction in the world -- between dying imperialism and the national liberation struggles, and (b) the intensifying of the fundamental and principal contradiction within the U.S. -- between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

In dealing with Watergate, the tactics of the bourgeoisie were to concentrate on Nixon to obscure the root causes of the crisis which is being laid on the backs of the working class, divert the focus of mass anger away from the bourgeois state and the bourgeoisie as a class, lead the masses down the path of reformism and away from proletarian revolution. With the outright aid of the "CP"USA and because of the erroneous lines of opportunists within the communist movement and errors by honest communists, the bourgeoisie was temporarily able to accomplish many of these goals in relation to Watergate -- although since then, it is apparent that they are still having difficulties consolidating these, restoring faith in American "Democracy," and putting Watergate behind them (i.e., Nixon's pardon and the resulting struggle).

Within the communist movement itself, there were both right and left deviations on this question. The primary deviation was the right -- which trailed after the bourgeoisie, concentrated on Nixon and the impeachment itself, created illusions about bourgeois democracy, in some cases reduced Watergate to a question of bourgeois democracy vs. fascism, and in other cases ignored the rising fascist menace altogether. The left deviation failed to take advantage of Watergate to take the consciousness of the people to a higher level, or pulled back from the struggle, ignored it as "insignificant", or summed it up simply as a further sign of fascism's imminent offensive.

Neither of these positions made correct use of the sharpening contradictions among our class enemies. The communists as a whole failed to do the necessary education about the bourgeois state and the interconnections and inter-rivalries among the bourgeoisie so that the masses can see that the whole bourgeois class is thoroughly rotten and is responsible for the situation confronting us today. Analysis of the true nature of the imperialist crisis would have led the proletariat to a deeper understanding of why party building is the central task, what this means to the working class, and why the political, economic, and social demands of the class can only be met under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In order to learn from our errors, it is necessary to do a dialectical and all-sided analysis of why we made these errors, what were the conditions that gave rise to them. To sum up our errors around Watergate we have to look at the state of the communist movement. Watergate was an issue that called for a nationwide response -- a coordinated effort to bring a scientific socialist analysis of this situation to the working class. However, this was objectively impossible given the general state of the communist movement at the time. Why?

At the time, there was a life-and-death struggle going on in the new communist movement. An intense split had taken place with the right opportunists. The period was marked by an intense ideological struggle, a shifting of forces, widespread repudiation of erroneous positions. This struggle and split with opportunism primarily represented a forward motion for the communist movement as more and more honest comrades repudiated the worshipping of spontaneity and grasped that party building was the central task around which all our work had to revolve. During this time, the struggle against opportunism took on primary importance; and this was correct.

At the same time, the communist movement continued to be plagued by small-circle mentality, narrowness and amateurishness. In addition to lacking the machinery, the organization necessary to meet the demands facing us, we also lacked ideological clarity. It was during this period that the hidden Trotskyites of the CL were also able to make temporary inroads. Because of all these factors, the communist movement was unable to meet the immediate requirements of the time-- the demands of the times were greater than we could rise to for objective reasons.

As part of the communist movement, the PRRWO accepts our responsibility to analyze the role we played in this situation, our contributions and our errors. We hold that there were both objective and subjective reasons for the errors made by communists around Watergate, and that the objective reasons stated above were primary. However, we must also draw lessons from the subjective errors made.

In the struggle against the right opportunists who belittle the role of the party, of theory, and of the conscious, advanced workers -- left deviations developed. While struggling for the correct dialectical relationship between theory and practice, many communists around the country became mechanical and drew an artificial and incorrect division between party building and work among the masses, often seeing the first to the exclusion of the second.

Using ourselves as an example, first we acknowledge that years of belittling theory greatly hindered our ability to analyze Watergate itself. Although we had summed up Watergate as the main political issue facing the masses and the energy crisis as the main economic issue, theoretically we were unprepared to make an in-depth analysis of either at the time. Thus, while we recognized the bankruptcy of such lines as "Throw the Bum Out" and "Dump Nixon" and waged a vigorous struggle to expose them, we failed to put forward an independent line on Watergate. Our political weaknesses were revealed by our failure to link up party building with the task of building the revolutionary activity of the masses around this important question. Whatever our intentions, this represented a break in the dialectic between objective and subjective, a left error).

In summary then -- while in the long-range sense, we can say that Watergate reflected the intensification of contradictions among the bourgeoisie and therefore objectively a further step down the path of inevitable doom for imperialism -- in the immediate tactical sense, we feel it is incorrect to say Watergate represented "a victory" for the proletariat. Because of the objective situation in the communist movement and the resulting errors of communists, the bourgeoisie was able to temporarily mask themselves and what was really going on.

While we are clear that Watergate itself did not mark the beginning of an all-out fascist offensive, it would be complacency to deny that it strengthened the fascist menace. Now, there are some straight-up right opportunists who deny that fascism can happen in the U.S. and say we are only trying to "scare" the workers by all this talk about fascism -- these forces will pave the way for fascism by disarming the workers and creating all kinds of illusions in their minds. However, there are also honest comrades who we feel are making a right error by negating the significance of recent events in the U.S. We understand that many of these errors are being made as result of the intense and correct struggle to unmask the hidden trotskyites, the CL, but once again we must guard

against throwing the baby out with the bathwater. CL's bankrupt position has been exposed: they believe counter-revolution is the main trend in the world today and that U.S. imperialism is growing in power, that it is not moribund and decaying; and therefore they underestimate the revolutionary power of the masses. We are correct to reject this garbage, but at the same time we cannot reject or ignore steps being taken by the bourgeoisie to try to save their dying system -- steps being taken in the real world.

We had stated earlier that the revisionists, the erroneous lines of opportunists within the communist movement, and the errors of honest communists aided the bourgeoisie in diverting the focus of mass anger and preventing a more thorough exposure of the entire bourgeois class around Watergate. In order to learn from these errors, we will examine in closer detail the answer of various groups to the imperialist crisis and Watergate.

"CP"-USA

The "CP"-USA was caught in a predicament by Watergate. On the one hand as a bureaucratic appendage of the Soviet revisionists, they had to echo the Soviet line that the attacks on Nixon were attacks on "detente." On the other hand, as agents of the U.S. monopoly capitalists, they had to side-track the masses by tailing after the so-called "liberal" bourgeoisie in their impeachment drive. However, it was to the interests of both the U.S. imperialists and the U.S.S.R. social-imperialists that the proletariat be diverted from a Marxist analysis of the situation and the tasks ahead for the working class -- and in this the "CP" served them well.

"Dump Nixon, not milk."37

"The cold warriors are not against Watergate...Nixon must be impeached, but the people must be aware of the phony ultra-right impeachers...They do not want to impeach Watergate. They want to impeach detente."38

"Arnold Johnson, a political committee member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party here, says the Party is using Watergate to point out what it calls 'the lack of the integrity of the ruling class in government.'"39

The "CP" said the masses must organize to oust the "White House gang" and struggle for broad democracy and a responsive government (!) to hold new elections and stop monopoly fascism. They clearly stated that Watergate was a struggle between democracy and fascism.

After Nixon's resignation, the "CP" took a "hard" stance and showed how its position differed from that of the "liberal" bourgeoisie and the labor unions.

"The Communist Party's position is radically different. No honeymoon; no compromises, but a demand for a hearing for the real voices of the rank-and-file of labor and the people.

"In a statement issued Wednesday, Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, called on President Ford and congressional leaders to invite the Communist Party and spokesmen

"from trade unions, consumer groups, tenant organizations, Black and other minority organizations to a proposed economic summit conference to present their proposals for programs and policies to combat inflation.

"There is a world of difference between this approach and a honeymoon with a big-business oriented Administration."⁴⁰

Those are straight out revisionist, class-collaborationist dogs who offer to work with the bourgeoisie. Like the treacherous Soviet revisionists, they have rejected Lenin's thesis that the state is an instrument for the exploitation of the oppressed class and must be smashed through a violent revolution. Instead, they reduce the class struggle to a question of the "lack of integrity of the ruling class" and portray the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie as simply a "big-business oriented Administration", telling people they must fight to change the orientation of the administration, fight for a "responsive" bourgeois dictatorship.

The "CP"-USA is a devoted follower of the Khrushchvite thesis of "peaceful transition to socialism," both in theory and practice. Following instructions from the Moscow revisionists, they peddle the garbage that imperialism has become more tolerant, reasonable, and moderate; and that in the "new conditions" allegedly created by present-day world development, they are no longer able to pass to counter-revolution. The conclusion of the revisionists from this erroneous argument is that we can have "peaceful coexistence" and a peaceful transition to a "new order." Thus Gus Hall, chief windbag of the "CP" calls for a joint "economic summit conference" with our class enemies, propagating peaceful illusions and trying to divert the masses from revolutionary struggle.

By causing the working masses to remain undecided and disoriented, these revisionists weaken their revolutionary spirit and immobilize them in the face of the fascist threats of the bourgeoisie. Their role as agents of the bourgeoisie is to paralyze the masses' revolutionary capacity to carry out firm revolutionary actions against the counter-revolutionary plans and actions of the bourgeoisie.

These snakes pave the way for fascist reaction. History has proven, and recent events in Chile for example (where it was not yet a question of socialism, but of a democratic regime) made clear, that the establishment of socialism through the parliamentary road is utterly impossible. To reinforce these very key points, we quote from "The Tragic Events in Chile--a Lesson for Revolutionaries the World Over" from Albania Today.

"The revolutionary and progressive forces in Chile suffered a defeat. This is very serious but temporary. A constitutional government may be overthrown, thousands of people may be killed and dozens of concentration camps set up. But the spirit of freedom, the spirit of revolt of the people, can neither be killed nor imprisoned. The people resist, which proves that the working masses are not reconciled to defeat, that they intend to draw conclusions from it and to advance on the revolutionary road. The liberation struggle against reaction and imperialism has its zig-zags, its ups and downs. There is no doubt that the Chilean people who have so many

"times given proof of patriotism, who greatly love freedom and justice, and profoundly hate imperialism and reaction, will know how to mobilize their forces and struggle tit for tat against the enemies to win final victory.

"If all this is a grave, but temporary, misfortune for the Chilean people, for the modern revisionists it constitutes an all around failure, an utter defeat of their opportunist theories. The revisionists, from those of Moscow to those of Italy, France and elsewhere cited the 'Chilean experience' as a concrete example of their 'new' theories of the 'peaceful road of revolution,' the transition to socialism under the leadership of many parties, the moderation of the nature of imperialism, the extinction of the class struggle in the conditions of peaceful coexistence, etc. The revisionist press capitalized greatly on the 'Chilean road' to publicize the opportunist theses of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and the reformist and utopian programme of the Togliattist type. (Togliatti is the leader of the Italian revisionist "CP" - editor).

From the 'Chilean experience', the revisionists expected not only verification of their theories of 'the parliamentary road', but also a 'classic' example of the building of socialism under the leadership of a coalition of Marxist and bourgeois parties. They hoped to see a confirmation of their thesis that the transition to socialism is possible through parliamentary elections and without revolution, that socialism can be built not only without smashing the old bourgeois state machine, but with its aid, not only without establishing peoples' revolutionary power, but by negating it.

"...All the programmatic documents of the Western revisionist parties, adopted since the 20th Congress of the CPSU, absolutize the 'parliamentary road' of transition from capitalism to socialism, while the non-peaceful road is entirely excluded. In practice these parties have finally renounced revolutionary struggle, and they strive for reforms of narrow economic or administrative character. These parties have turned into bourgeois opposition parties and have become candidates to ensure the administration of the wealth of the bourgeoisie just as the old social-democratic parties have done so far."⁴¹

In reference specifically to the cowardly and counter-revolutionary role of the "Communist Party" of Chile, the Albanian comrades said:

"The Communist Party of Chile, one of the main forces of the Allende Government was a fervent partisan of the Khrushchevite thesis of 'peaceful transition'.....

"The revisionists, as was foreseen by the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties, and proved in practice, were against revolution and aimed at turning the country, just as they did the Soviet Union, into a capitalist country, from a base of revolution into a base of counter-revolution. They worked for a very long period of time to sow confusion in the ranks of

"the revolutionaries and undermine the revolution. Everywhere and at every moment they have acted as fire extinguishers of revolutionary battles and of national liberation struggles. 'Although for demagogical purposes they pretend to be for revolution'--Comrade Enver Hoxha has said-- 'through their views and actions the revisionists seek to nip it in the bud or sabotage it when it bursts out.' Their departure from Marxism-Leninism, their abandonment of the class interests of the proletariat, their treachery to the cause of the national liberation of the peoples, led the revisionists to completely deny revolution. For them, the theory and practice of revolution was reduced to some reformist demands, which can be met in the framework of the capitalist order without affecting its basis. The revisionists try to prove that the boundary between revolution and reforms has been wiped out, that under the present-day conditions of world development there is no longer any need for revolutionary overthrow because, they allege, the present technical-scientific revolution is doing away with the social class contradictions of the bourgeois society, and is a means for the integration of capitalism into socialism, a means to create a 'new society' of prosperity for all. Thus, according to this disorienting logic, one can no longer speak about exploiter and exploited; thus according to them, the social revolution, the smashing of the bourgeois state machine and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat becomes unnecessary." 42

Following the counter-revolutionary line of the Soviet revisionists, this is the role played by the "Communist Party" of Chile in aiding the fascist attack on the Chilean people. This is also the role the "CP"-USA and all other revisionists in this country will play if they are not exposed, attacked and destroyed along with the bourgeois state they serve.

Here, we would stress again:

"The opportunists are bourgeois enemies of the proletarian revolution and real agents of the bourgeoisie in the working class movement." 43

"Unless a determined, ruthless struggle all along the line is conducted against opportunism, it is useless to talk about the struggle against imperialism." 44

There are many honest revolutionary and progressive-minded people, both inside and outside of organizations, who are being led into the swamp of revisionism by devious, hidden revisionists. Take, for example, the honest forces left within the PSP and other organizations like the RU, OL, and the Guardian.

PSP has been steadily solidifying its relationship with the "CP"-USA. A few years ago, Claridad carried a front-cover picture of Gus Hall, leader of the "CP"-USA with his arm around Juan Mari Bras, leader of the PSP. Today, their relationship has matured and grown, and now they publicly demonstrate their ideological and political unity. PSP cadres have consciously been kept from the diligent, systematic study of Marxism-

Leninism, especially the righteous teachings of comrades Stalin and Mao Tse Tung. They are being fooled into believing that the Soviet Union and countries like Hungary and Bulgaria are socialist countries. Their revolutionary energies are being channeled into one reformist scheme after another. In February 1974, they were collecting petitions demanding that heat and hot water not be cut because of the "energy crisis." Now, in the summer of 1974, they are selling tickets to fill Madison Square Garden in NYC with 20,000 people who support their slogan, "A Bicentennial Without Colonies" as a means of "aiding" the liberation of Puerto Rico. In this "campaign" they have allied themselves "with whoever supports the liberation of Puerto Rico." Under this cover, they have formed a coalition with the "CP"-USA and its appendages, like the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression.

The sponsors of the Oct. 27th rally in Madison Square Garden also include revisionists and social-pacifists from around the country, as well as some "liberals" who want to form a "mass party of the people" instead of a Leninist party based on Marxism-Leninism, the politically conscious advanced section of the class, a party based on iron discipline, a discipline guaranteed by democratic centralism. Clearly this coalition PSP has put together does not represent the relentless struggle against opportunism necessary for the defeat of imperialism and liberation of Puerto Rico and all colonies.

When presented with this criticism, PSP has replied that Lenin himself did not rule out coalitions with non-proletarian elements. This is absolutely true. However, there are two points to be made here. First Lenin taught that communists must never reject out-of-hand maneuvers, compromises, and tactics that raise the general level of proletarian class consciousness, revolutionary spirit and ability to fight and win. Without compromising on principles, we must learn how to take advantage of every opportunity of gaining a mass ally, even though this ally is "temporary, vascillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional." Second, Lenin also teaches that even while advocating these tactical alliances, we must never cease our relentless ideological and political struggle against those forces which carry and spread bourgeois ideology among the proletariat. The opportunists conveniently eliminate this very important second point.

A further example of conciliation with opportunism is seen in the Guardian, who through Irwin Silber, worries that we have been too hard on the revisionists and warns us not to forget the "honest folk" in the "CP"-USA.

"If the new communist movement's exposure of revisionism has been its major ideological achievement, we must nevertheless recognize that the struggle against revisionism has frequently been pursued in a mechanistic fashion. At all times, it is absolutely essential to differentiate between those who have been tricked by revisionist ideology--not only among the working masses but within the left generally and even within the ranks of the CPUSA--and the active ideologists and promulgators of this brand of counter-revolution." (our emphasis)45

This is exactly the same thing RU did in its call for unity with the "CP"-USA's "veteran fighters who still want to make revolution" in a leaflet they distributed at the 1974 "CP" Mayday rally in NYC (and which is reproduced in this pamphlet.) Most RU cadres themselves had never seen or heard about this leaflet; and it becomes increasingly clear that as the bankruptcy of the RU line is more and more exposed to the masses, some of the RU leaders who came from the ranks of the "CP"-USA but never repudiated or totally broke with revisionism are looking to link up with the "CP" again.

In answer to this, we stand with Lenin:

"Against the social-traitors, against reformism and opportunism this political line can and must be followed in all spheres of the struggle without exception."⁴⁶

The "CP"-USA abandoned Marxism-Leninism decades ago. Therefore, to talk about "honest veterans" that are still in the "CP" is nonsense. We can also say without hesitation that the "CP" has been exposed among the advanced elements and is no longer able to fool comrades in this category. Furthermore, the best way to prevent some new honest person from being taken in by these charlatans is to wage an uncompromising fight to expose them and anyone who would conceal their true nature.

Revolutionary Union

The "CP"-USA comes right out and says Watergate is a struggle between the "democratic" and "non-democratic" sectors of the bourgeoisie and tries to lead the masses down the road of reformism and class-collaboration--into the arms of the bourgeoisie. The Revolutionary Union, does the same thing, but tries to cloak itself under the banner of Marxism-leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought.

The RU, representing most clearly the main danger of right opportunism in our movement, is chock full of revisionist theories which they attempt to peddle. Although they have not yet degenerated to the thoroughly revisionist level of the "CP"USA, their line on many questions (such as this one) is clear example of the revisionist aspects which result in ideological, political and sometimes organizational unity with these sworn enemies of Marxism-Leninism. Though not in word, they in deeds "begin to conduct a policy which amounts to a renunciation of the class struggle".

Our analysis of the revisionism of the RU appears throughout this pamphlet. In this section we will deal specifically with how this revisionism is exposed by RU's response to Watergate and the imperialist crisis.

As a starting point, it is important to keep in mind a number of key points:

1. It is the responsibility of communists to unite scientific socialism, communism, with the workers' movement--which left to itself cannot rise above trade union consciousness.

"The task of theory, the aim of the Marxist -Leninist science, is to assist the proletariat in its struggle--to present the class struggle objectively as the product of a definite system of productive relations; so that the proletariat is able to understand the necessity of this class struggle, its content, history, and conditions of development. Thus, theory serves the proletariat as a means of ending the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie as quickly and easily as possible."⁴⁷

2. It is the responsibility of Marxist-Leninists to organize the workers into:

"...big, strong and properly functioning organizations--capable of functioning properly under all circumstances--organizations permeated with the spirit of the class struggle, clearly realizing their ⁴⁸aims and trained in the thoroughly Marxist world outlook.

These are not organizations which regard reforms as a partial realization of socialism and not organizations which deny the absolute need for the qualitative leap represented by proletarian revolution and think we can effect the capitalist system without this.

3. It is the responsibility of communists to expose the defeat the social-reformists (socialists in word, reformist in deeds) who say loudly that they are for socialism and proletarian revolution, but whose every deed is aimed at the partial patching up of the doomed capitalist regime. Their objective is to divide, confuse, and weaken the working class in order to maintain the rule of the bourgeoisie and stop the revolutionary overthrow of that rule.

4. It is the responsibility of communists to educate the proletariat as to the historical role of his class. The proletariat who has not become conscious of this task is:

"...A slave who does not realize his slavish condition; at best he is a slave who fights to improve his conditions as a slave, but not for the overthrow of slavery."⁴⁹

It is absolutely essential to struggle against the revisionists who recognize only reforms and renounce revolution, whose formula (first articulated by Bernstein) --"the movement is everything, the final aim is nothing,"-- is designed to keep the proletariat a slave, struggling for reforms and under the hegemony of bourgeois ideology.

To combat these opportunists, it is the responsibility of communists to work tirelessly to propagate the idea of revolution and to prepare the proletariat for it.

5. It is the responsibility of communists to wage a relentless fight to expose and destroy the opportunists of all shades:

"...Objectively the opportunists are a section of the petty bourgeoisie and of certain working class strata (the labor aristocracy, editor) that have been bribed out of imperialist super-profits and converted into watchdogs of capitalism and corrupters of the labour movement."⁵⁰

Anyone who does not fulfill this task or calls for tactical unity with opportunism without struggling against this opportunism is objectively defending the continued enslavement of the working class by the bourgeoisie through the medium of its agents in the labor and communist movements.

Again, we point to the policy of the Bolsheviks which Lenin discussed in Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder. In this work, he stated quite clearly that the Bolsheviks had found it necessary to conclude numerous "practical compromises" with the bourgeois liberals prior to the defeat of the Tsar. The Bolsheviks did this:

"...while at the same time it was able to wage an unremitting and merciless ideological and political struggle against bourgeois liberalism and against the slightest manifestation of its influence in the working class movement."⁵¹

Lenin also explained that even during the periods when the Bolsheviks were formally united with the Mensheviks in the Social-Democratic Party, they

"...never ceased our ideological and political struggle against them as opportunists and vehicles of bourgeois influence among the proletariat."⁵²

6. It is the responsibility of communists to struggle resolutely against the economists who limit the class struggle to the fight for reforms and concessions, and attempt to keep the proletariat away from the political struggle-- the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The essential, most important aspect of the entire proletarian class struggle is the question of state power.

"Those who recognize only the class struggle are not yet Marxists; they may be found to be still within the boundaries of bourgeois thinking and bourgeois politics. To confine Marxism to the doctrine of class struggle means curtailing Marxism, distorting 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 recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is what constitutes the most profound difference between the Marxist and the ordinary petty (as well as big) bourgeoisie."⁵³

7. It is the responsibility of communists to systematically imbue the masses with the understanding that violent revolution to smash the bourgeois state machine is an absolute necessity and lies at the root of all the teachings of the great Marxists.

With these points in mind, let us examine RU's line on Watergate and see how they have fulfilled the responsibilities they claim to accept.

In November, 1973, RU unveiled its latest scheme: "Throw the Bum Out--Organize to Fight"; they said:

"The kicking out of Richard Nixon has become a mass demand of the American people. The Revolutionary Union supports this demand and believes it is very important now to mobilize mass

struggle in support of it, around the general slogan, "Throw the Bum Out! Organize to Fight!..."

"Ordinarily, the RU and other communist organizations do not raise the demand for the ouster of a particular bourgeois politician. Our aim is to build the mass struggle of the working class and all oppressed people against the imperialist system, with the final aim of overthrowing it and establishing the rule of the working class to build socialism and advance society toward communism."

"But at this time, organizing struggle to throw out Nixon is an important part of building the overall struggle against imperialism and developing it toward its final goal of revolution. This is so not because booting out Nixon will mean any basic change in the policies of the ruling class. It cannot and will not change the nature of imperialism and the imperialist state--the police, army, courts and bureaucracies in particular--which are controlled by the monopoly-capitalists to oppress the masses of the people. But booting him out can strike an important tactical blow against the whole imperialist ruling class."⁵⁴

Admitting that booting Nixon out would not mean any basic change in the imperialist system or in the living conditions of the masses, RU nevertheless urged the masses to devote their revolutionary energies to "mobilizing mass action to Throw the Bum Out" in order to "strike a blow against the whole ruling class and the imperialist system." They never explained how you can strike a blow at your enemy by doing something that will have no effect on him. Only a misguided fool or a servant of the bourgeoisie would mislead the people by getting them involved consciously in a struggle that will not change their conditions in anyway.

Initially, RU made a shallow analysis that "Nixon miscalculated" and made a:

"...big gamble that the people will not rise up to resist his flaunting of bourgeois legality and that rival sections of the ruling class will not really resort to impeaching him."⁵⁵

They stated further that the ruling class as a whole was against impeachment because it would mean a "loss of authority for U.S. imperialism."

Like "liberal" congresswoman Bella Abzug and the "CP"-USA, RU said that "the people must impeach Nixon." But to cover themselves, they added "because this will help us make proletarian revolution."

In January 1974, the RU tried to cover their tracks (without doing any self-criticism of course), and warned people not to make the mistake of thinking that dumping Nixon would solve any problems:

"In conducting these demonstrations and developing the national campaign, it is extremely important to make the whole ruling class and the capitalist system, and not just Nixon, the focus of attack. It is correct to make Nixon a

focus of attack, for the various reasons put forward in the November Revolution, but not the focus, in such a way that we cover the nature of the system and the fact that it is the system and the entire ruling class that is the enemy.

To put it another way, the fight to Throw the Bum out is one tactic of the proletariat at this time, along with the fight against the energy freeze, the wage freeze, aggression in Indo-China and the Middle East, etc. We should not be putting forward the idea that throwing out Nixon is the way to solve all these other problems, or we will be in danger of degenerating into revisionism."⁵⁶

So, what have we here? In November, in words, the RU said the people must make the whole system the focus of attack; but in deeds they focused on one individual. In January, they remind us "the whole system is our enemy." But they say nothing about how the proletariat must organize itself to get rid of this system. Instead, they offer us some more "tactics" for "fighting back"--boiled down to their essence, they can be reduced to: "we need more mass demonstrations to deal with our problems. For each problem, we must have a mass mobilization and mass demonstration."

In doing this, the RU has not covered itself; it has only added fuel to the fire that has already been lit under their buns, and further exposed their totally bankrupt nature.

In What Is To Be Done? Lenin polemicized against the RabocheyeDyelo and Rabocheye Mysl. He explained how these economists saw a contradiction with his saying that : Social Democracy utilizes all means of struggles that are expedient; and that without a strong, steeled-in-struggle organization you can't have a systematic plan that is based on firm principles and carried out unswervingly. In essence, Lenin was arguing that tactics had to be part of, and subordinate to, a plan, a strategy; and that the proletariat needed a genuine Communist party to lead it and to develop and carry out this elaborate plan.

The economists on the other hand, said that tactics grow along with the growth of the Party. They further expressed this theory in the words: That struggle is desirable which is possible and the struggle which is possible is the one that is going on at the given moment. Lenin summed this trash up. He called it for what it was:

"This is precisely the trend of unbounded opportunism which passively adapts itself to spontaneity..It means belittling the initiative and energy of class conscious fighters."⁵⁷

Like the old economists, RU limits the Communists' task to accelerating the development of the objective processes, especially the spontaneous movements.

Can all these "tactics" laid out by RU be the plan to lead the proletarian revolution? What happened to the building of the party? What role do the advanced workers play? What is the role of theory? How is the proletariat prepared for the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie--

by simply going to a lot of demonstrations? Do these things happen spontaneously? Is that why RU doesn't mention them and instead urges the masses to have more and more demonstrations? Of course not. But it is precisely because RU doesn't want them to happen at all that it tries to drag the proletariat backward and tie it to the tail of every economic struggle that erupts. In essence, RU believes that workers acquire consciousness of their status in society and can gain their fundamental class needs through waging the economic struggles; they believe that consciousness comes from within the spontaneous movement and that, therefore, the party will arise from the mass movement. They thereby deny the vanguard role of the party, reject consistent organization and preparation of the proletariat, and belittle the importance of socialist consciousness and theory.

"Unfair," some people may cry. Didn't RU say in the May 1974 Revolution that party building was now the central task? True enough, we would answer these "fair-minded" people who are upset by our "obsession" with drawing the line of demarcation. But as is discussed in another part of this pamphlet, RU's present position on party building is simply a cover-up for the worshipping of spontaneity which is the ideological root of its slimey opportunism.

In the same month, May 1974, they also put out a call to their May Day rally in NYC. In this leaflet, they raise empiricism and learning only from direct experience to a principle, and negate the importance of Marxism-Leninism. They say:

"All of these battles build on the lessons of the past and they teach us how to fight in the present."⁵⁸

The leaflet never mentions Marxism-Leninism.

They also reduce the role of the Communist party to that of a party of peaceful reforms. Ignoring the fact that a genuine Communist party leads the fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat, they say:

"In the past, May Day was always called by the Communist Party, which led the fight for better conditions. Communists believe that the working people should control the country, that until we do, none of us will have a decent life. But now the so-called Communist party has forgotten about their principles and made its peace with the bosses."⁵⁹

On May Day, the day of the international proletariat, the RU didn't mention our great revolutionary teachers, Marx and Lenin, or the importance of building a genuine Communist Party, or the tasks before us--the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

In addition, they openly conciliate with the revisionist slime of the "CP"-USA. These bourgeois agents didn't "forget" their principles. **THEY HAVE CONSCIOUSLY REVISED MARXISM-LENINISM.**

In this call for May Day, RU showed once again how they take from Marxism all that is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. This includes the struggle for reforms and economic gains, the class struggle (without the dictatorship of the proletariat, of course), a "general recognition of socialist ideals," and the substitution of a "new order" for capitalism. However, they repudiate totally the revolutionary content of Marxism.

As late as August 1974, the RU was still paying lip service to the building of the party. In response to Watergate, all they could tell the masses was "Kick 'em while they're down":

"The ruling class has its plans, but the people have their own agenda. The struggle to kick out Nixon is a tactic on the road to building a united front against imperialism, a revolutionary workers movement, and a new Communist party. That the ruling class has to consider getting rid of Nixon shows that their system is in crisis, that their class is in trouble. The spirit in which we have to approach responding to their circus is to make more trouble for them: Kick them while they're down."⁶⁰

It is also extremely important to examine how RU's "Throw the Bum Out" line is applied in the "mass, anti-imperialist" organizations created by the RU (and in most parts of the country made up almost entirely of RU members, and a few other honest folk who have been temporarily fooled by RU's opportunist line.)

"Not fighting to throw out Nixon out would mean that we can't fight back. It's all one system, monopoly capitalism or imperialism and the government is at the head of it. Now is the time to win some concessions and score some victories. Now is the time to strip the mask off law and order and defend our right to live and fight. If we start making trouble, united and strong, and demand that he get out, we will serve notice to the imperialists that we are fed up and willing to fight."⁶¹

"...We can throw Nixon out on his ear and at the same time show all the politicians and businessmen that we won't take it anymore.. But if we fight to throw Nixon out, the rich will have no choice but to dump him. And we'll be building our own strength to carry on the fight against wage controls, no-strike deals, police terror, and all the other attacks coming down on us. Now's the time to show our real strength. --THROW THE BUM OUT, ORGANIZE TO FIGHT!"⁶²

"...The one thing NONE of the politicians and their corporate lackers want is for the PEOPLE to push Nixon out through protests and demonstrations...Nixon is Public Bum No.1. By throwing him out through mass protests and demonstrations, we will be hitting the rest of the imperialists, too, and helping to build up the movement of the people that will finally throw them all out..."⁶³

We think the time is right to build a mass movement, the thing the giant monopolists and their mouthpieces fear the most. A militant mass movement that will kick Nixon out while at the same time giving a kick in the teeth to the entire ruling class while they are down and in disarray."⁶⁴

"Although dumping Nixon won't solve our problems, it will be a big victory for the peoples' movement against this system. It's our fight that sends these jokers packing, not the congress or the 'institutions.' LBJ didn't just step down. He was moved out by the people through mass demonstrations and militant protest. This is what we have to do to Nixon. The April demonstration in Washington where 10,000 marched is a good example. We have to get rid of Nixon and all those who oppress us! Let's build the people's movement to "Throw the Bum Out!"⁶⁵

In summary, "Throw the Bum Out" carried into practice provides these "lessons" for the masses:

1. We can only build our strength through mass struggles against each of our many problems.

(This raises empiricism to a principle, negates the importance of the conscious factor and the need for learning from the historic experience of the proletariat, summed up by Marxism-Leninism. It also denies that:

"...the fundamental economic interests of the proletariat can be satisfied only by a proletarian revolution that will replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat."⁶⁶

It is the same thing as "the movement is everything, the final aim is nothing.")

2. What the bourgeoisie fears most of all is a mass movement, and our mass demonstrations will influence them to dump Nixon.

(This is the same as the "CP"-USA's "fight" for a "responsive" bourgeois dictatorship. The bourgeoisie have already proven that spontaneous mass movements alone can only win concessions and will not destroy the bourgeois state. For Communists, it is incorrect to make the struggle for minor concessions primary over the question of state power. What the bourgeoisie fear most is a proletarian revolution, the loss of state power to the armed proletariat, led by its party and armed with Marxism-Leninism.)

3. By throwing Nixon out, we hit at the rest of the imperialists.

(This leads us to throwing the bourgeoisie out one by one--a series of reformist struggles which avoid the key question of state power. By calling Nixon's resignation "a victory" for the proletariat, RU prepares the way to deviate the proletariat through further struggles like this. They deny what we must do to really win "victories," the tasks before us. By leading the proletariat to believe that this is the best way to really hurt the imperialists, they in fact protect the imperialists.)

Here we see the RU's unity with the "liberal" senators and congressment as well as with the "CP"-USA. (Although they deny this in words, their deeds tell the truth.) The so-called liberals also talk about how

the "rich" mistreat and take advantage of the "poor." They also launch "attacks" on big business. They too say that Nixon (the individual) must be held accountable for his crimes against the "people." They too try to divert the energies of the masses into channels "acceptable" to the ruling class--and these include "militant" mass demonstrations at which they are even willing to speak; because, like the RU, what they fear most is the "unacceptable channel" of proletarian revolution.

October League

The OL response to Watergate is "Dump Nixon." They say:

"The paralysis of the Congress demonstrates more concretely than ever the need to build the mass people's movement to dump Nixon. As demonstrators gathered in New York, Chicago, Tampa, and other cities last month in opposition to Nixon's policies, the question that came to the fore was whether or not the Congress was going to act, or merely use the impeachment question for their own immediate political needs while the country suffers the effects of the corruption-ridden administration?

"...The politicians who have spoken out have only done so because of the tremendous mass sentiment to dump Nixon. This sentiment must be developed further, and organized so that pressure remains on Congress to act. The Dump Nixon coalitions which have grown up across the country are a healthy step in this direction...

"The Dump Nixon movement aims itself both at the immediate task of dumping Nixon, and the more general task of organizing the people to fight the rising fascist tide and the assault on people's living standards."67

Does OL expose the true nature of the bourgeois state? Obviously not. Instead, they mumble that Congress is "paralyzed" and the masses must pressure them to dump Nixon. This is a revisionist line which fools the people into fighting for a "responsive" bourgeois dictatorship. The bourgeois state is an instrument of class rule; it is responsive only to the interests of the bourgeoisie. To divert the revolutionary anger of the masses, the bourgeoisie will make only tactical concessions, concessions which in no way challenge their rule. This is exactly why the bourgeois state must be destroyed by the revolutionary violence of proletarian revolution. To lead the masses to think otherwise, or not to raise this, is objectively to push the idea of revolution being a series of peaceful reforms--"peaceful transition to socialism."

How can the OL call themselves "Communists" and say that the question that came to the fore was whether or not Congress was going to act and reduce the entire Watergate issue to Nixon (the individual's) policies. What the country is suffering is not the "effects of the corruption-ridden administration"--it is the dictatorship of the bourgeois class that is causing the suffering of the masses. And neither a Dump Nixon movement or an act of Congress can end the rule of the bourgeoisie.

Communist League

CL's line is "Nixon, Ford Resign - New Elections!" For all their "left" posturing, CL put forward essentially the same solution as the "CP"-USA on Watergate. They say:

"The Los Angeles Committee for New Presidential Elections" was formed to respond to the obvious need for an independent voice for the workers and other truly progressive people. It is financially independent, but most of all its independence is maintained by a consistent fight for the position that we cannot rely on, and follow, the leadership of the elected government officials, but instead the changes that are becoming more and more urgent can only be made by our own efforts; that we must take an active role in who governs and through what policies."⁶⁸

Later, this article recounts how the Committee gathered 2,000 petitions against Nixon and took them to a city councilman "where the class nature of these representatives was fully exposed." This issue of the paper also reprinted a cartoon leaflet by the L.A. Committee which read that the "Nixon administration has completely sold out to the big capitalists," and included a cartoon of a protestor carrying a picket sign which read "Down with Nixon."

Obviously, this garbage does not expose the true nature of bourgeois democracy. Furthermore it encourages the people to work through the system, saying that the fact that there is no "constitutional provision for special presidential elections" is only "an obstacle to be removed from our path." By not exposing the bourgeois state as the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and by focusing in on Nixon and not the entire bourgeois class, CL defends the bourgeoisie lie that the state exists to defend the interests of all.

Nixon did not sell out - the entire governmental structure was conceived of by the ruling class and serves only the ruling class. It is criminal to create the illusion among the working class that under bourgeois rule we can "take an active part in who governs and through what policies." This negates totally the teachings of Marxism-Leninism which state:

"I have already advised you to turn for help to Engels' book, The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. This book says that every state in which private ownership of the land and means of production exists, in which capital dominates however democratic it may be, is a capitalist state, a machine used by the capitalists to keep the working class and the poor peasants in subjection; while universal suffrage, a Constituent Assembly, parliament are merely a form, a sort of promissory note, which does not alter the essence of the matter.

"The forms of domination of the state may vary: capital manifests power in one way where one form exists, and in another way where another form exists - but essentially the power is in the hands of capital, whether there are voting qualifications or not -- in fact the more democratic it is the cruder and more cynical is the rule of capitalism. One of the most democratic republics in the world is the United States of America, yet nowhere (and those who were there after 1905 probably know it)

"is the power of capital, the power of a handful of billionaires over the whole of society, so crude and so openly corrupt as in America."69

Anti-Fascist Commentator

This group says that the principal contradiction in the U.S. is now between bourgeois democracy and fascism, not between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. They say Communists can and must unite with the so-called "left" or liberal wing of the bourgeoisie, because there is a strategic split among the capitalists.

However, they worry about the weaknesses of Nixon's opposition:

"For some time now, it has been a standoff-back and forth a little, but not too much happening. True, Nixon has had to pull in his horns a little, to bide his time for a while -- and the country has not gone so far to the right that we can't even recognize it, as Mitchell promised at one point. But there has been no great era of reform ushered in either. It has been a very uneasy period of stalemate.

"This is not a good thing. It gives Nixon a chance. It gives reaction a chance. The opposition is throwing away all its moral capital."70

To justify their class-collaborationist policy of uniting with the "good capitalists," this group says that one sector of the bourgeoisie has a "devotion to democracy," but that it is very limited, because while they oppose Nixon, they also fear the people. Obviously, if we unite with these people, as they insist we must, we better be careful not to be too militant and scare them away.

"Nevertheless, it remains our opinion that the only correct tactic for the left and progressive forces today are to reach and rely on the working people and ally with all others to the extent they are willing to fight, and as long as they are willing to fight against the danger of fascism, against letting Nixon get away, for impeachment, for preserving and expanding the rights and liberties we have. The people will need these rights both to fight the attacks against them, and to train and educate themselves to one day do away with the capitalist system."71

If we follow this bankrupt line, that "one day" when we do away with the capitalist system will be far away indeed.

*

*

*

What is the answer of Marxist-Leninists to all these organizations whose lines we have discussed?

We are in the period of party building -- the building of a genuine Communist party is our central task. (see Report on Party Building).

This means that we are in a period where we must first struggle for the clarity of the Marxist-Leninist line. We must unite genuine Marxists-Leninists around this line; and we must take scientific socialism to the advanced elements. These forces must be trained to be able to give the masses a scientific analysis of what is happening and what must be done. In order to do this, we, the Communists must be trained.

Primary in this period is the dissemination of Marxism-Leninism, the work of explaining in detail key problems of Marxism-Leninism to the advanced elements. Secondly, we have to selectively choose those struggles which we will directly lead. We must choose struggles which will raise the general level of proletarian class consciousness and revolutionary spirit and from which the entire Communist movement can learn when they are summed up and which can, through correct tactics, intensify the ever sharpening contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat so our strategy can be accomplished.

In this, we must keep in mind the responsibilities of Communists, never sacrificing our long-range goal for each twist and turn in the objective processes. We must never propose actions that won't accomplish anything and must give guidance on winning immediate demands without losing sight of our final aim -- which must always be our primary focus.

"It would be absolutely incorrect to suppose that, in order to carry on a direct struggle for the socialist revolution, we can or must throw away the struggle for reforms. By no means. We cannot know how soon we will achieve success, how soon objective conditions will permit the coming of this revolution. We must support every improvement, real improvement of both the economic and political conditions of the masses. The difference between us and the reformists (i.e. in Switzerland - with the Grutlants) consists not in that we are against reforms while they are for reforms. Nothing of the sort. They limit themselves to reforms and owing to this descend, according to the apt expression of one (unusual!) revolutionary contributor of the Schweizerische Metallarbeiterzeitung (no.40), to the role of more "nurses of capitalism." We tell the workers: vote for proportional, and such elections, but do not restrict thereby your activity, put in the foreground the systematic dissemination of the idea of immediate socialist revolution, prepare for it and all along the line introduce the corresponding radical changes in all Party activity. The conditions of bourgeois democracy very often compel us to adopt this or that position towards a mass of petty and minute reforms, but we must be able to learn or adopt a position for reforms so (in such a manner) that - to put it somewhat simply for the sake of greater clarity - in every half hour speech we speak five minutes about reforms and 25 minutes about the coming revolution."?

The revisionists say everything is primary except for building of the party and the preparation of the proletariat for the armed seizure of state

power and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They are also preoccupied with the question of reforms and constantly attack the Marxists for "negating the objective factor" and not believing in reform struggles. Meanwhile, in their presentations, they devote the majority of their time to summarizing all the reform struggles in the country, and in the last few minutes mention that we need a party.

Let us see further how the policies of the opportunists concretely aid the bourgeoisie. In the struggle against growing fascism, for instance, we learn from Dimitroff that the prevention of fascism depends on:

1. the militant activity displayed by the working class itself
2. the existence of a strong revolutionary party correctly leading the struggle of the toilers against fascism
3. whether the revolutionary proletariat exercises vigilance and takes action at the proper time."⁷³

Dimitroff makes it clear that fascism was able to come to power primarily because the policy of class-collaboration with the bourgeoisie pursued by the opportunist social-democratic leaders left the working class split, politically and organizationally disarmed in the face of the fascist onslaught.

The social-fascists and social-reformists who only raise the immediate demands and collaborate with the so-called liberal bourgeoisie only aid and do the work of the fascists. By not exposing the state, they aid the state. By not arming the proletariat with scientific socialism and by holding back the formation of the party, they do the work of the bourgeoisie.

These are not new errors. Lenin had to deal some death blows to the jive opportunists of his time who preached class collaboration and reformism and wanted to confine the proletariat to trade union struggle, who refused to recognize and fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat, who tried to rob Marxism of its revolutionary content and reduce it to something even the bourgeoisie could accept.

In the struggle against the opportunist forces in the Second International led by the renegade Kautsky, Lenin said:

"The bourgeoisie needs lackeys whom a section of the working class could trust and who would paint in fine colors, embellish the bourgeoisie with talk about the possibility of the reformist path, who would throw dust in the eyes of the people by this talk, who would divert the people from revolution by depicting in glowing colors the charms and the possibilities of the reformist path.

"All the writings of the Kautskys, like those of our Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, reduce themselves to such painting and to the whining of cowardly philistines who fear revolution."⁷⁴

So we see that these muddle heads, like the RU, OL, CL and others have not created anything new, but have revived the revisionist ideas of Kautsky, Bernstein and company, who try to create a middle road for proletarian revolution, to reconcile, to unite the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the proletariat. What a philistine idea!

So we see why these opportunists want to defuse the explosive domestic situation and reduce it to a series of peaceful reform struggles. We understand why they do not want to arm the proletariat with the science of Marxism-Leninism, the history of the international proletariat's struggle against all forms of exploitation, oppression, and opportunism. Because this history would educate the proletariat as to the historic role of the opportunists, and will enable the proletariat to kick them into the museum of antiquities along with the bourgeoisie they serve.

**DOWN WITH IMPERIALISM, SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM & ALL FORMS OF OPPORTUNISM!
UP WITH THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT!**

FOOTNOTES - DOMESTIC SITUATION

- 1 Peking Review #3, January 18, 1974, p. 7
- 2 Political Economy, Leontov, p. 179
- 3 Political Economy, Eaton,
- 4 "The Lessons of the Crisis," Lenin's Collected Works, Vol. IV, Bk. 1, 1972, International Publishers, N.Y.
- 5 "Rates of Development of Socialist Albania," Albania Today, March-April, 1974
- 6 Fortune magazine, January 1971, p. 71
- 7 The Rich and the Superrich, Ferdinand Lundberg, p. 9;
The Enemy, Felix Greene, Vintage Bks., p. 254
- 8 Albania Today, *ibid.*
- 9 U.S. News & World Report, May 20, 1974, p. 24
- 10 Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, Engels, International Publishers, 1935, p. 64-65
- 11 United Front Against War and Fascism, Dimitroff, p. 11
- 12 Albania Today, *ibid.*
- 13 U.S. News & World Report, November 26, 1973, p. 17
- 14 U.S. News & World Report, December 10, 1973, p. 17
- 15 Peking Review #11, March 15, 1974, p. 5
- 16 "The Energy Crisis and the Real Crisis Behind It," United Front Press, 1974
- 17 Peking Review #11, *ibid.*, p. 6
- 18 "The Energy Crisis and the Real Crisis Behind It," *ibid.*, p. 4-5
- 19 The Energy Cartel, Medvin Norman, Vintage Books; 1974, p. 5
- 20 "The Energy Crisis and the Real Crisis Behind It," *ibid.*, p. 6
- 21 The Enemy, Felix Greene, Vintage Books, p. 16

FOOTNOTES - DOMESTIC SITUATION (CON.)

- 22 Daily News, January 24, 1974, p. 3
- 23 Daily News, *ibid.*, p. 64
- 24 Peking Review #31, August 7, 1974, p. 20
- 25 Party Building Outline and Study Guide, joint document,
PRRWO and BWC
- 26 "The Objective and Subjective Factors in the Revolution,"
Albania Today, January, 1973
- 27 "The Objective and Subjective Factors in the Revolution," *ibid.*
- 28 *ibid.*
- 29 The Present Situation and Our Tasks, Foreign Languages Press,
Peking, 1967, p. 23
- 30 Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse Tung, p. 83
- 31 Fascism and Social Revolution, Dutt, p. 13
- 32 *ibid.*, p. 306, emphasis in the original
- 33 United Front Against War and Fascism, Dimitroff, p. 8
- 34 *ibid.*
- 35 New York Times, August 11, 1974, Section 4, p. 3
- 36 Newsweek, August 19, 1974, p. 23

37. "Daily World", July 27, 1974
38. "Daily World", May 3, 1974
39. "New York Post", May 24, 1974, p.34
40. "Daily World", editorial, August 17, 1974
41. "Albania Today", supplement, April, 1973
42. "Ibid"
43. Imperialism, the Eve of Proletarian Revolution, Lenin, Peking edition, 1960, p.80
44. Ibid, p.83
45. "Guardian", August 14, 1974, p.8
46. On the Struggle Against Revisionism, Lenin, Peking edition, 1960, p.77
47. "What the Friends of the People Are", Marx, Engels, Marxism, p.110-111
48. "Differences in the European Labor Movement", Marx, Engels, Marxism, p.301-302
49. "Reformism in Russian Social Democratic Movement", Marx, Engels, Marxism, p.315-316
50. "Imperialism and the Split in Socialism," Marx, Engels, Marxism, p.373
51. Left Wing Communism, Lenin, p. 68 (Peking Edition)
52. Ibid, p.69
53. State and Revolution, Lenin, p.40
54. "Revolution", November, 1973
55. "Ibid"
56. "Revolution", January, 1974
57. What is to be Done, Lenin, p.57-60
58. RU MayDay Leaflet
59. Ibid
60. "Revolution", August, 1974
61. "The Worker", November, 1973, p.4
62. "People Get Ready," Cleveland Workers Paper, December, 1973, p.7
63. "Tiger Paper", RU collective at Manhattan Community College
64. "Fight Back", Newspaper of the Attica Brigade, April, 1974, p.7
65. "Bay Area Worker", June 1974, p.3
66. What is to be Done, Lenin, p.57
67. "The Call", April, 1974, p.12
68. "Western Worker", published by the CL, March, 1974, p.1
69. The State, Lenin, Peking edition, 1970, p.21
70. "The Commentator", July-August, 1974, p.5
71. "Ibid"
72. "Propositions of Principle on the Question of War", December 1916, quoted in On the Struggle Against Revisionism, Lenin, Peking Edition, p.34-35
73. United Front Against Fascism, Dimitroff, p.12
74. "Tasks of the Third International", Lenin, Vol.10, Selected Works of Lenin, International Publishers, 1938, p.49