

*Political Bureau
Report to the
Central Committee*

September 2, 1978



Political Bureau Report
to the Committee

Contents

Introduction	1
The Struggle for Peace and the National Liberation Movement.....	3
The World Communist Movement.....	10
The National Struggle.....	17
The Trade Union Movement.....	18
The National Movement in the USNA.....	20
The Political Life in the Country.....	22
The Party.....	24

© Workers Press
Chicago
1979

Political Bureau Report to the Central Committee

September 2, 1978.

I. INTRODUCTION

The salient feature of the international situation is the cyclical crisis of modern capitalism, which has developed as an expression of the application of science in all human endeavor. The capitalist method of expropriation of the social product is at its zenith. We live in a world of unprecedented revolutionization of the means of production, one in which scientific progress is unashamedly prostituted to the demand of capitalist industry for more and cheaper commodities. Let us see if the economists of the right or the left could add to this:

In these crises, the contradiction between social production and capitalist appropriation comes to a violent explosion. The circulation of commodities is for the moment reduced to nothing; the means of circulation, money, becomes an obstacle to circulation; all the laws of commodity production and commodity circulation are turned upside down. The economic collision has reached its culminating point: the mode of production rebels against the mode of exchange; the productive forces rebel against the mode of production, which they have outgrown. (Engels, *Anti-Duhring*, International Publishers, Marxist Library, p. 302.)

Private expropriation of the social product cannot long exist with electronic technology. The current economic crisis confirms this. However, the capitalist ruling class finds itself in a truly new situation, which we must describe in order to understand the efforts toward preventing the economic crisis from following its natural path to a political crisis with all the inevitable consequences for mankind.

What is new and vital to world capitalist politics is the historic victory of the international financier over the industrialist. This is registered in all fields of political struggle: the transition from the direct colony to the neocolony; the dismantling of major tariffs and trade barriers; the industrialization of the backward areas; the rapid rise of the standard of living of the peoples of the so-called "Western world"; the disorganization of the communist movement.

International politics and economics within the imperialist bloc are interdependent. Economically, the crisis of abundance seriously threatens the political control of the international financier. This control must by nature be international, for it rests almost exclusively on the bribery of the vast majority of the peoples of the advanced countries. But the continuation of bribery on this scale depends on world consumption outstripping production. Once production begins to outstrip consumption, the pressures of an unemployed population and a sharp reduction in sales and consequently profits are bound to develop irresistible pressures for protectionism with all its consequences. The financier's rule depends on the national front, which in turn rests on the political stability provided by the continu-

ing bribery of the people. The international commodity glut is curtailing this bribery, whether in the form of high paying jobs or extensive credit and social privileges. This creates the possibility of winning the workers to the view that they and the national industrialists have a common stake in the struggle against the "foreign competition."

However, this is not 1912 and foreign competition is shored up by loans from international financiers who will not casually accept the development of national lines of struggle. Their efforts to prevent the economic crisis from becoming a political one are the source of "Trilateralism" and all the harebrained schemes to avert a catastrophe.

In the financial arena, the frantic maneuvers of the US imperialists have partially and momentarily stabilized their lion's share of the international market. Standing almost alone, the Communist Labor Party projected that the decline of the dollar's relative value was a carefully monitored maneuver from a position of strength to block the aggressive attempts of especially the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan to expand their share of the market. In relation to gold, German and Japanese commodities are becoming more expensive, while US commodities are becoming cheaper. The dollar is currently stabilized against gold and the other "hard" currencies. How has this been accomplished? Simply by shifting the burden to the backs of the workers. Thus inflation manifests itself by a cheapening of the dollar internationally accompanied by a domestic rise of prices.

The stabilization is only momentary because the weapon of inflation is a two-edged sword bound to diminish the profitability of capital and create the conditions for new recessions. There are deep contradictions in this process. Inflation of the dollar improves the international position of US commodities. Simultaneously, it erodes the national market. The more expensive goods become, the less money the people have to use for non-necessary hard goods (e.g., cars, washing machines) because more of their earnings go to necessities. The base of any bourgeoisie is the national market, and the base of "American prosperity" is the sale of hard goods. A decline in the national market is bound to affect the international market and the national bourgeoisie's share within it. The deep contradiction in which the British find themselves is evidence of this. More importantly, such cuts in the standard of living of the workers gives birth to a round of struggle. Marx and Engels correctly noted that prosperity is the worst enemy of revolution. The trade union structure and its leaders, the consolidation and legitimizing of revisionism, the political dependence of the working class—all this is the result of prolonged capitalist imperialist prosperity and its attendant bribery of the workers.

The assertion of the basic laws of capitalism jeopardizes this relationship. For example: private investment in the US has fallen to 18% of the gross national product, compared to 35% in the Federal Republic of Germany; capital investment in the US is last place of eight major industrial nations; current statistics show that 59% of all US families are slipping backward economically.

Despite the heightening contradictions of capitalism, this does not herald the oft promised "skids to oblivion" or the "twilight of US capitalism." No, it means that a very powerful capitalist structure, with considerable reserves, must retrench. This slow process will take place only where necessary. US investment and control is pointed more and more toward food production, health and technology. Ever greater sections of the earth's population depend to some degree on US agricultural and pharmaceutical exports. The great technological

gap between the US and all other states is a decisive weapon in the economic struggle. As long as the imperialists can shift the burden to the backs of the neocolonies and the US working class, they remain in a relatively strong position.

On the other hand, the US's position is in fact weakening. This is due to the laws of uneven development, of capitalist accumulation and concentration. A polarity—first economic and then political—is developing between US imperialism and the rest of the capitalist world, between the handful of monopolists and the masses, and between world imperialism and the dependent nations.

Expression of this are the increased concentration of wealth in the hands of fewer and fewer big monopolies, the impoverishment of the masses, a galloping technological revolution and the consequent tendency toward economic stagnation. Stagnation reflects the cornerstone of Marxist economics—the inevitable split between absolute wealth and poverty. This develops not simply through exploitation, but through the decline of the price and value of labor power by the constant cheapening of the cost of its production. No longer is this restricted to the developing countries: government statistics show that now there are some 30 million employable people in the US constituting a permanent army of the unemployed.

In summary, the two gigantic expansions of the international market which followed World War II temporarily stabilized capitalism. These expansions greatly revolutionized the means of production, setting the stage for the pending crisis. The first expansion was the reconstruction following World War 2; the second was the transformation of the direct colonies into neocolonies. Can there be a third great expansion? The financial giants will certainly try to develop one. They are transforming capitalism's historic war to eliminate the non-producing consumer (the idle poor) into a war to eliminate the non-consuming producer of the neo-colonies. This last possible expansion of the world market would require a tremendous increase of income in the neocolonies as a base for consumption. Without such an expansion a glut will surely develop, accompanied by a recession in hard goods, spreading layoffs and the development of a depression.

II. THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Our Party upholds Lenin's thesis that imperialism cannot survive without colonies. The social struggles of the neocolonies are increasingly important, despite a news blackout in the US bourgeois press. These struggles have been the hub around which have revolved both the policies of the international financier and the Brezhnev grouping.

The national liberation movement is a process—from something to something. The fight against direct colonialism was constantly publicized by both the Kennedy and Khrushchov groupings. Kennedy, spokesman of the international financier, understood that overt anti-communism and direct colonialism were fetters on the growth of capitalism. The Khrushchov grouping, on the other hand, was thrown into the arms of the international financier by its own interests in this struggle. These revisionists clearly saw that the main and immediate enemy of the Soviet Union was the "most reactionary imperialistic chauvinistic section of finance capital," i.e., the direct colonialist, the industrialist. This was the "common cause" which Khrushchov so often stated and Kennedy so ably ignored. Consequently, from either point of view, the more reactionary current within the national liberation movement benefitted from the contradictory interests of both

sides. In most cases, the direct colony became a neo-colony with blessings all along the way.

The Khrushchov grouping scored a coup by convincing the world communist movement that the USSR's and the USNA's struggle for detente was the sole form of the battle for peaceful coexistence.

Actually, the emergence of either detente or confrontation is not a subjective question. Rather, objective factors quite often dictate the choice of one tactic over another. The first period of detente was the common war against Hitler fascism. Mutual benefit made detente possible. On the US's side, Hitler fascism was incompatible with the demands of the international financier. On the Soviet Union's side, Hitler had always made it clear that he would stop at nothing until he had conquered the USSR. The war's end eroded this mutual benefit and with it, detente. The US imperialists immediately returned to the tactical policy of brinkmanship or aggression; the USSR was compelled to rely on the corresponding tactic of firm confrontation to impose peaceful coexistence. The basis of this change was imperialism's historic need for constant expansion and socialism's equally historic need to defend not only its own territory but new revolutions spawned by imperialism.

As soon as the US's international policy changed, so did its national policy. Brinkmanship and aggression toward the USSR was incompatible with liberalism toward the domestic communist movement. The swift and fascist-like reaction in the US effectively shattered the flabby CPUSA. The goal of this internal policy, known as McCarthyism, was the halt of the leftward drift of the trade union movement and the abolition of left progressive sentiment in support of the Soviet Union. They accomplished this goal in the unions with the carrot of increased bribery and the stick of the Taft-Hartley Act. The unprepared communist movement was dispersed through a campaign of terror.

So immense was the destruction of World War II that no single country could advance the money necessary for reconstruction. Consequently, the various financial oligarchies of the world came together to underwrite especially the rebuilding of the Federal Republic of Germany. This period ended with an internationalist oligarchy, led by the US financiers, in political control of the entire capitalist world. They turned their attention to dismantling the direct colonial system to expand their areas of investment. This system, which overwhelmingly limited trade to the colonizer and the colonized, prevented the free flow of capital so necessary to the financiers.

The transformation of direct colonies to neocolonies necessitated the cooperation of the USSR. For fifty years the Comintern and the various national communist parties had attempted to implement the Leninist concept that the struggle against imperialism had to be carried out in the colonies. This had placed these parties in a decisive position throughout the colonial world insofar as the national movements were either created by or at least had very strong ties with the communist parties of the colonizing countries. The latter parties in turn were most strongly influenced by the USSR.

The Khrushchov grouping immediately accepted the opportunity to reestablish detente for two basic reasons: 1. the financiers would gain political hegemony in Europe by taking political power out of the hands of the industrialists, thus preventing the immediate re-emergence of European fascism; and 2. relaxation of tension with the USNA would allow for the peaceful reconstruction of the Soviet Union, the indispensable precondition of a continued rise in the standard

of living, without which the revisionists could not stay in power. The Soviet bureaucracy, which had just seized power by means of a coup, could neither consolidate nor legitimize its revisionist projections without these conditions. Conversely, the international financial group headed by US imperialism could not realize its aims without assisting the consolidation of revisionism in the USSR. Thus the political mutual benefit mirrored an economic mutual benefit.

The relatively long period of peaceful relations between the USSR and the USNA reflects their cooperation in the elimination of direct colonialism. To do this they had to overcome the most determined resistance from the entrenched industrial sector in the advanced capitalist countries. In France, this process almost led to a fascist coup d'état.

Detente, though a feature of this period, did not comprise its qualitative aspect. We reassert Stalin's position: the relation between the USSR and the US was and is one of peaceful coexistence between states with opposing economic systems. The USSR realized that revolution could not be imposed from the "outside." Under the conditions of peaceful coexistence the internal contradictions within the capitalist countries could develop toward revolution. The majority of the world's population wants peaceful coexistence because it is the only alternative at the present time to destructive weapons. One hundred years ago, war killed 98 soldiers for every 2 civilians; World War II killed 98 civilians for every 2 soldiers. Finally, the absence of confrontation embodied in the tactic of detente allowed the US to extend its economic domination over the former direct colonies of Europe and to consolidate its political control over its own working class.

Within the framework of the struggle for peaceful coexistence, two major tactics have been employed: detente, or the relaxation of tensions (strictly between the US and the USSR, we might add), and confrontation. We have no abstract condemnation of detente, simply because tactical considerations can never be the cornerstone of a Communist Party. *Which* tactic to employ is determined by the international situation at a given point. For a Leninist party the overriding consideration in the choice of tactics must be proletarian internationalism, i.e., the subordination of the needs of any one state or nation to those of the international proletariat.

The state structures and the economic bases of the USSR and the US are antagonistic. The revisionists' temporary control over the Soviet state does not alter this, and in fact they have no desire to change their country's economic base. Hence, every political advance of the USSR is a threat to US imperialism and vice versa. Detente can flourish only if there is no political advance on either side.

But imperialism has to expand and historically capitalism is not arising—it is declining. The political advances of the USSR are historic and not subjective. Neither Kennedy and Khrushchov nor Carter and Brezhnev can alter this. The two sides must struggle politically. Every political struggle is a class struggle, just as every class struggle is a political struggle. The class struggle of the workers to control the means of production, as an objective law of history, can be directed only against US imperialism and consequently acts as an objective force undermining the tactic of detente. This process of mass confrontation with US imperialism so threatened peaceful coexistence between the USSR and the US some 20 years ago that the betrayal of the revolution by the Khrushchov group was summed up as "peace above all."

The "elevation of detente to the level of strategy" allowed the revisionists to succeed in: 1) divorcing this tactic from the communist policy of peaceful coex-

istence; 2) separating the foreign policy of the USSR from proletarian internationalism; and 3) disorienting the entire world communist movement from the time of Stalin's death up to the present day. The essence of revisionism has always been the alteration of Marxist theory to fit the needs of the moment rather than the final aims of the proletariat. No revisionist, however, has ever succeeded in altering an economy.

Now that a pole of theoretical clarity has been established, we can proceed to analyze the development of the national liberation movement and the quest for peace and socialism since the days of Khrushchov.

A new wave of liberation struggles is underway in almost all the neocolonies. This extremely complicated process is receiving precious little help from any of the major powers. It is a process which threatens to upset the delicate balance between these powers. It is a process validating the theories of Lenin and Stalin on the national question and confirming the historical experience of the Soviet revolution. Stalin summed this up:

Thus the October Revolution, having put an end to the old, bourgeois movement for national emancipation, inaugurated the era of a new, socialist movement of the workers and peasants of the oppressed nationalities, directed against all oppression, which also means national oppression, against the rule of the bourgeoisie, their "own" and foreign, and against imperialism in general. (Stalin, *The October Revolution and the National Question*, International Publishers Marxist Library, p. 74).

These are the tasks of this new wave of the national liberation movement. However, we must analyze the economies of these neocolonies to see why this thesis is historically valid.

The national state of the neocolony commanded some allegiance from the people only on the basis of raising their miserable standard of living. This rise in living standards depended on some degree of national industrialization. To obtain the funds for this, the backward nations are forced to sell more of their products at ever higher prices to the advanced sector of the world. However, when all the neocolonies are struggling to produce more of the same products and to sell them at higher prices, they collide with the basic laws of capitalism. The more they produce—and they all produce essentially the same commodities—the more they compete. Competition leads to a fall in the price of their commodities in the international market. Thus the Herculean efforts of the neocolonies to earn capital for industrialization land them in the pothouse.

Laws of international financial capitalism tie the backward countries to the advanced with bonds stronger than those chaining Prometheus to the rock. There are but two paths: slavishly to cling to the \$80 or \$100 per capita income (as in Africa, including Egypt) and sink ever lower into moral and intellectual degradation; or boldly and resolutely to prepare the peoples for the inevitable war of liberation. The latter course is well under way.

What are the results in the international arena? They are placing the national interests of the Soviet Union and the US on a collision course. No matter how much the former declares for peace at any price, the latter cannot sit idly while the backward countries battle their way to real freedom. At the same time, the vital interests of the Soviets lie in assisting that battle, despite the dangers. Hence the years of slaughter and exploitation of the colonies demand historical retribution which takes the form of a growing danger of war between the major powers.

Some reactionary neocolonial regimes learned to play the game of international politics very well. Twenty years ago it was fashionable for any country to receive

US aid merely by expressing their anti-communism. The more difficult the US found it to uphold fascist regimes outside this hemisphere, the more the ploy was stodd on its head. Clearly reactionary regimes received hundred of millions of dollars in military aid from the Soviet Union. Once the socialist cow was milked dry, these regimes threw off their lamb's cloak, bared their newly-acquired fangs and attacked their peaceful neighbors. Thus vast amounts of soviet war material were captured in Ethiopia which the "Marxist" Somali regime used in its war of aggression there.

What is our estimate of this "disinterested" military aid to the new states in Africa and Asia, or in the case of Peru in Latin America? First, our Party never strays from the Marxist approach to the state. There is no classless state, or, to use the sugar-coated revisionist term, a "state of the whole people." Such a state exists neither in advanced Soviet society nor in economically backward sub-Saharan Africa. Either a dictatorship of the proletariat or a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The entirely contradictory aims of these classes exclude the possibility of sharing power in the same state for any length of time. Not that the newly constructed bourgeois state necessarily attacks the toiling strata immediately. However, that such a state will attack and oppress this strata is a socio-historic law.

The leadership of the CPSU is more acquainted with this law than we are. Why then have they assisted such butchers as Sadat without even commerial guarantees for the payment of loans? It stemmed from the nonsense that Khrushchov spouted and Brezhnev endorsed of the "non-capitalist" road of development. Of course, Khrushchov was more specific and added that it was also a "non-socialist" road. This totally antiMarxist concept is based on the fact that the national bourgeoisie, born fighting against the feudalists, the imperialists and the workers, tends to nationalize some industries to provide a stable base for individual enterprise as well as to have a mighty club with which to attack the working class. Small wonder that the Soviet people are tricked into supplying Syria with the arms to smash the leftist and Palestinian resistance against the Falangist counterrevolution in Lebanon.

The foreign policy of the USSR is determined by its national interests. This policy states: "What is good for the Soviet Union is good for everyone." Thus the simultaneous support of Ethiopia and Somalia rested on their national need to have a base in the horn of Africa to retain access to the Red Sea. Whomever the victor, the Soviet Union emerges ahead—or that is their hope. Sometimes this nationalist policy coincides with the national liberation movements—as in Angola—and sometimes it does not—as in the Middle East. This fundamental error places the Soviet foreign policy in direct contradiction to proletarian internationalism. This "policy" toward the national liberation movement has also been quite acceptable to the US.

But history never stands still. The struggle against direct colonialism is turning into one against neocolonialism, and this can only be a fight directly for socialism. The US has no choice but to meet this with violence, either directly or indirectly. The USSR has no choice but to be drawn in. The antagonistic nature of the state structures of the USSR and the US as well as the enormous size of the USSR's socialist proletariat are compelling the leaders of the CPSU to re-examine their tactics. Here is exactly where the elevation of detente to the level of strategy is placing the Brezhnev grouping in an untenable position which will eventually force them into the back seat of the movement for peace and socialism. Let us see why this is so.

It is one thing to talk of detente, or the relaxation of tensions, in the Congo or Algeria, where the direct defense of socialism was not the immediate issue. To be sure, the revolution in the Congo was betrayed, but the Soviet leaders were able to justify their actions because it was in such a nascent stage. In addition, this period clearly proved that the tactic of detente depended entirely on the coincidence of the USSR's and the US's national interests, real or perceived. The emerging neocolonial bourgeoisie was a perfect reflection of Khrushchov's theories. The translation of the "classless state" in the Soviet Union was the "non-capitalist and non-socialist road of development" in the neocolonies. As for the US, we have already discussed the barriers which direct colonialism represented to the international financiers.

Now, though, the content of the struggle has changed. Where in Asia, Africa or Latin America is the neocolonial bourgeoisie capable of leading any social transformation? There is only one step left in these countries, and that is the direct struggle for socialism, a struggle which the US and Europe are meeting with brute force. New situations demand new tactics. Slowly but surely the tactic of confrontation is emerging as the most viable and responsible one in the maintenance of peaceful coexistence.

It is in this light that the leadership of the Soviet Union has a bounden duty to the world's proletariat to re-examine its foreign policy and to stop forcing their theoretical and political confusion onto the world communist movement. Only under the whip of history have they shown that they understand the purely tactical nature of detente. When the US attacked socialist Cuba, the leaders of the CPSU, clumsily to be sure, shifted to the tactic of confrontation as the only way to guarantee momentary peaceful coexistence between the Soviet Union and the US.

Even then the Soviet leaders' nationalism predominated. They defended Cuba because an abandonment of a country which has already achieved socialism would expose them to attack from their own left wing, and "Stalinist" section of the Party. But when the US attacked the Dominican Republic a short time later, these "socialist" leaders were silent. Detente between the US and the USSR developed clearly at the expense of the peoples of the neocolonial world. Far from the equivalent of *world* peace, detente was and is strictly a compromise between two minorities in control of their state apparatus—the international financiers and the revisionists.

The Soviet leaders are not the first to stand in such a theoretical and practical muddle. We recall the leaders of the Second International who categorically insisted that imperialist war could be avoided. The closer war came, the more adamant they were. Why? Their exalted position in the trade union movement, their social privileges derived from that, depended on the accuracy of their projections. The minute war started, they were finished—theoretically, politically and physically as an International. Similarly, today's leaders of the old Third International are also locked into a projection: peace at any cost, peace as a fight separate from socialism, peace as a relaxation of tension between the two powers with the most nuclear armaments. These leaders too have an exalted position within their own party. Social privilege is the hallmark of the Brezhnev grouping in the CPSU, but it rests on the prestige they enjoy in the world communist movement.

In their blind confidence they have made detente into a strategy. This represented far more than mere rhetoric on Brezhnev's part. There cannot be two

strategies. The elevation of detente to the level of strategy by not only Brezhnev but also the international financiers has necessitated the imposition of certain conditions on both powers. The US has carried out its side of the deal by not supporting directly any attempt to break away from the Soviet orbit. Thus Soviet troops smashed the counterrevolution in Hungary and Czechoslovakia with only verbal protests from the US. Now more and more pressure is being put on the USSR to carry out its side of the bargain, i.e., that the soviets give no support to the neocolonies to break away from the orbit of the international financiers. During the period of the transformation from the direct colony to the neocolony, the Soviet leaders could accomplish this by supporting petty-bourgeois nationalists who, though they were leaders of the national liberation movements, would clearly never lead their countries into socialism.

But now the struggle against direct colonialism is complete. The battle has been won. The Trilateralists in Washington and the modern revisionists in Moscow owe their political stability to a process that has run its course. The choices today are either to find a new basis for detente or to return to the policy of brinkmanship met by confrontation. The stakes for both sides are extremely high. This alone explains Brezhnev's replacement of the strategy of revolution with the strategy of detente.

However, such a strategy poses serious problems, particularly in the developing countries which are fighting not for a different form of capitalism, but for its elimination altogether. What does the elevation of detente to the level of strategy mean in such countries? What will the fulfillment of the conditions of detente—that is, the guarantee of each side's territorial orbit—mean for the leaders of the socialist movement? Ultimately, it can only mean the same thing for the modern revisionists as it meant for the leaders of the Second International after the war started. They will move from being subjective obstacles in the development of the revolutionary movement to objective obstacles. The modern revisionists can only be true to their declared strategy of detente by stopping the revolution short, by allowing the revolutionaries to seize state power but preventing them from changing the production relations.

Or the revisionists could abandon this strategy. For the reasons mentioned, that would surely be the beginning of their end.

Leaders must lead. Political leadership is tied to objective historical demands. Those who cannot understand or stand in the way of those demands soon enough leave the stage and are replaced with leaders who are capable of bringing clarity to the movement. Those who do not learn from the history of the Second International undoubtedly will be forced to relive it.

Will a new international communist movement arise on the ashes of the old? There is no doubt that it is already doing so. It is emerging as an expression of polarity. On the one side is a revisionism stabilized internally on the basis of social and economic bribery and privilege and externally on the basis of an alliance of international communism and the colonial petty-bourgeoisie. On the other side is a growing Marxist movement throughout the world whose cornerstone is the international struggle for peace and socialism.

We are proud to be a part of that Marxist movement. Our Party stands for peace. Given the destructive capacity of the major nations, we take peace as one of our fundamental aims and indeed as one of the main goals of communism. Every major socialist revolution rose out of the struggle for peace. War, however, arises from the exploitation of the toiling masses. To fight for communism in the US without the fight for peace is to betray communism. To fight for peace without the fight for communism in the US is to betray peace.

III. THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The establishment of a polarity, even though still primarily on a theoretical level, is one of the most important developments in the international communist movement in twenty-five years. For ever since Stalin's death and the purge of the Molotov grouping in the Soviet Union the international movement has muddled in confusion. Let us see why this is so.

Change is a result of the movement of contradiction based on polarity. In the beginning stages of growth of any phenomenon, the contradictory poles may be rather ill-defined, hidden in a sense, by a "middle ground." For example, capitalism at its birth emerged in a society with few proletarians, few capitalists and a great mass of petty-bourgeoisie. The quantitative steps which the capitalist system takes toward the new quality of socialism are described by the growth of the proletariat in size and influence; a consolidation of the political and economic power of the capitalist class; and finally, a decline of the petty-bourgeoisie. A quantitative increase in polarity is a prelude to a qualitative change. It is important to see that this quantitative increase is not necessarily synonymous with an increase in size alone. Proof of this is the fact that the capitalist class in the US is getting smaller *numerically* every year, while the polarity between capitalists and proletarians steadily grows.

So it is with the socialist movement, which consists of two contradictory poles—revisionism and Marxism. The growing polarity in the communist movement has been marked by a new level of disintegration, with fewer parties than ever adhering to the monolith that was once the Third International.

The profound changes in the international communist movement have created a great deal of confusion, mainly centered around two points: the change of the Third International from a pole representing Marxism into one representing revisionism; and the requirements of establishing a new Marxist pole within the world communist movement.

First let us examine the transformation of the old Third International. What was the basis of unity of the Comintern parties under Lenin and Stalin? We all have observed politically, practically and theoretically how relatively simple it is to hold something together as long as there is no change in the environment. Or conversely, we have all experienced the difficulties of maintaining unity in the face of a rather rapidly changing environment. In other words, the most difficult thing is to change an organization at such a pace as to maintain a given relationship with an environment changing from objective and hence uncontrollable causes. A new environment excites a different set of contradictions within a phenomenon, causing it either to die or leap forward to a new qualitative level.

The parties of the Comintern were born under certain conditions, and their inability to change will surely condemn them to history's graveyard. Briefly, these were the conditions for the birth of the parties of the Comintern:

The world had been completely divided between the imperialist groups; the process of outward motion against the defenseless, backward peoples had turned into an implosion characterized by the First World War. Stalin described the political content of the period.

The proletarian revolution has become an immediate practical question, when the old period of preparing the working class for the revolution had reached and grew into a new period of direct onslaught upon capitalism. (*Foundations of Leninism*, International Publishers, Marxist Library, p. 11)

Thus this period also marked the disintegration of the parties of the Second International because they could not change. The groupings that broke off from the Social Democratic International were regrouped according to a certain stage of human development. That stage was marked by the establishment of the first socialist state; the preparations to meet the international counterrevolution directed by Hitler; the defeat of the counterrevolution; the emancipation of a large area of Europe and Asia; the change in the relationship of socialist and imperialist forces; the struggle to recover from the devastation of the war; and a relatively long period of peace among the major powers. History tends to advance in waves, and a cycle was completed from the beginning of World War I to the end of World War II. Within this cycle the groundwork was developing for the next period.

One of the most important aspects of this was the development of the United Front in the countries ravaged by Hitler. The Nazi occupation was not only against the interests of the toiling masses. There was also extreme repression of the pettybourgeoisie. The fact that both the working classes and the pettybourgeoisie were the targets of the fascist offensive was the basis of Dimitrov's and the Comintern's strategy of a united front and a popular front. The united front, based on the unity of action of the trade union movement, would preserve the hegemony and independence of the working class; it would also guarantee that the communist parties remain parties of the leaders of the proletariat and not become "mass" parties. The popular front, with the united front of the working class at its core, would draw in all other classes into a popular, patriotic front. Never did the Comintern propose to merge these two fronts, since that would constitute a violation of one of the fundamental tenets of Marxism: "The workmen have no country."

In fact, however, that is exactly what happened. So violent and so sudden was the fascist oppression, so immediate was its attack on the working class, so barbaric its suppression of the communist parties, that the natural drift was solely toward the popular, patriotic front. The popular fronts in Europe were hardly based on a united front of the working classes of the individual nations, much less on a front of all the workers of Europe independent of nationality. The national petty-bourgeoisie—more articulate, better able to circumvent the immediate repression of the workers—rose to the forefront. They were faced with a dilemma: their relation to the communists. There was no question that the communists were the most resolute fighters against fascism from Madrid to Warsaw. The petty-bourgeoisie could either maintain their pre-war anticommunism and risk isolation and utter defeat; or they could come to grips with the communists and use their parties as a vehicle for saving their own lives and countries. Naturally, they followed the latter course and quickly assumed leading positions in many of the weakened, besieged communist parties.

By the war's end, the theory of the united front in relation to the pettybourgeois democrats, as first formulated by Marx in 1850, had not changed: "The relation of the revolutionary workers' party to the petty bourgeois democrats is this: it marches together with them against the faction which it aims at overthrowing; it opposes them in everything whereby they seek to consolidate their position in their own interests." (Marx, "Address to the Central Committee of the Communist League," *Handbook of Marxism*, International Pub., p. 63)

The reality was very different. Hitler's defeat was marked by the rise of "People's Democracies" in the East and mass communist parties in the West.

Everywhere the relations between the parties of the now disbanded Comintern had to be readjusted to reflect the gap between this reality and what theoretically would have been in the best interests of the proletariat. So long as Stalin lived, so long as the Bolshevik section of the CPSU and other parties constituted a majority, the petty-bourgeois leaders of the European communist parties did not dare legitimize this compromise with the formulation of new "theories."

Khrushchov marked the beginning of this new cycle in the communist movement, which is after 25 years coming to an end. This cycle is marked by: 1) the transformation of the old Third International from a pole representing Marxism to one representing revisionism; 2) the development of contradictory tendencies within this revisionist pole; and 3) the creation of the conditions for the development of a new Marxist pole, absolutely opposed to revisionism. An analysis of the history of this cycle confirms our optimism that the world communists will at long last reassert their leadership.

By the end of World War II, profound changes rocked the economies of Europe. Latent contradictions within the communist movement were excited to life and the communist parties began falling inward. Around the world this process was accompanied by the development of new groups which took the new situation into consideration.

Khrushchov arose as a consequence of the war. Hitler's defeat in Eastern Europe meant the triumphant advance of socialism. In Western Europe it meant, under the direction of Wall Street, the historic defeat of the basis of Hitlerism—the national industrialists. A certain unity between Wall Street and the Khrushchovites formed on the basis of common opposition to direct colonialism and the identity of hostility to the political supremacy of the industrial giants of Europe. However, the rise of the financier in Europe meant an expansion of bribery, including democracy, for Europeans. It also meant its opposite—war and fascism—in the colonies and neocolonies. China, scarred by her recent colonial and semi-colonial past, could and did not accept a concept of detente based on an alliance with the financier. Thus a polarity between Moscow and Peking—with Moscow on the right—formed.

Khrushchov's forces profoundly affected Europe. The European communist parties openly became mass parties and hence petty bourgeois parties in order to secure the bribery offered by international finance. A Leninist party is at once an organization of the practical leaders of the proletariat as well as the subjective expression of the objective movement, in other words, a unity of theory and practice. This includes members of the revolutionary intelligentsia, but not the petty-bourgeoisie who make their living from the exploitation of labor power. A mass party, on the other hand, is made up of all those who oppose this or that particular policy, from monopoly capitalists down. Especially in the capitalist countries, mass parties cannot help but become parties which are led in fact by the petty-bourgeoisie. In Europe, these elements demanded and got a new concept in "proletarian internationalism": poly-centrism, or more accurately, petty-bourgeois nationalism transported into the working class movement.

The actual victory of polycentrism and petty-bourgeois nationalism in these parties was a culmination of the history of the united front during World War II; the entrenchment of the petty-bourgeoisie in the parties; and the domination of these parties by a Soviet party which had itself embraced the concept of a mass party.

The Soviet Union's domination of the European parties gave the leaders of the

latter a perfect excuse to break away and become purely national parties. For one thing, the proletarian sections of these parties would not tolerate political dependence on a foreign party. The absolute demand of the world's proletariat to defend the Soviet Union when it was under attack from Hitler was one thing; Khrushchov's demand to follow an anti-Marxist foreign policy was a horse of another color. This was turned into a demand for many centers in the international communist movement, the precondition for the hegemony of the nationalist elements within these parties.

The end of Moscow's political control was a pyrrhic victory. Polycentrism became an established fact at the expense of the effectiveness of the parties. Why? Because proletarian internationalism, which they rejected, is the indispensable foundation of the national revolutionary movement. International capitalism has called into existence an international proletariat. These international capitalists maneuver their reserves in the worldwide fight against the workers. The working class must do the same. Proletarian internationalism is the voluntary submission of the needs of the part to the needs of the whole. The consolidation of petty-bourgeois nationalism within the European parties only meant the substitution of direct control by Moscow for an indirect, historical control by the international financiers. Nevertheless, we in the USNA cannot forget that the European communists face problems we do not have. In many countries they must fight practically feudal elements. The Vatican does not hesitate to use its power and influence against communism in any form. Hundred of thousands of NATO troops are poised to crush any serious attempt by the communists to seize power. As if this were not enough, the countries of Europe are so economically dependent that if the proletariat of one country seized state power alone, they would be faced with an almost insurmountable economic crisis the next day. However, the European parties, instead of responding to these circumstances with programs based on proletarian internationalism, made some very unhistoric compromises with the bourgeoisie. With their maneuverability reduced to nothing, the parties of Western Europe could do little else but try to get along with the international financiers.

This state of affairs has been erroneously described as "Eurocommunism." Eurocommunism implies two things: monolithic parties consolidated around a particular theory and secondly, a unity of parties against the CPSU. In fact, neither of these conditions exist. A mass party cannot be a monolithic party. No doubt the European parties, while controlled mostly by the petty-bourgeoisie, at the same time represent the proletariat at least physically if not politically. So long as they do so and remain mass parties, they will never be monolithic; they will always contain two contradictory and even hostile sections representing the two classes. The prerequisite of a monolithic party based on unity of action is the drive to achieve the practical and political independence of the proletariat. As for their so-called unity against Moscow, what is there to unite them? Their rejection of Moscow's party of the whole people? Or perhaps Brezhnev's compromise with the international financiers? In fact, the petty-bourgeois leaders of the European parties ended up polemicizing against exactly the same thing Khrushchov and Brezhnev had disavowed for years—the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Thus they sided with Moscow in the struggle against Peking. However, the bribery in Europe and the subsequent demand for polycentrism created a struggle within this alliance, with Moscow now on the "left." The CPSU, accustomed to accepting any violence against the theories of Marxism, suddenly confronted the

attacks on their Soviet state by their former sycophants in Western Europe. The CPSU cannot tolerate such attacks from fraternal parties. Any breach in the front lays the entire bureaucratic apparatus open for assault, whether bourgeois or not. Since the leaders of the European parties attacked the Soviets with the same weapons Khrushchov used against Stalin, the defense of the Soviet state implied or actually meant the defense of Stalin and the Leninist conception of the state. Consequently, the CPSU has not and dare not enter into theoretical polemics with the Khrushchov-spawned *enfants terribles* of Europe. Their only response has been that they are anti-Soviet without any discussion of their anti-communism.

The communist movement absolutely needs theoretical justification for all that is done. The parties of Europe had to be answered. Obviously, the Soviets could not do it. The Eastern European parties, dependent on the Soviets for defense and the continued rapid rise in their standards of living, were disqualified. The parties of the colonial or neocolonial world could not do it, since the reply would have to come from a "disinterested" party in a major capitalist state. The CPUSA, ugly duckling of the world communist movement, became the beautiful princess. They responded with the slogan that Eurocommunism was Browderism, an inevitable pronouncement, since Browderism was the only other "theory" evolved from the CPUSA. Their basic theory still is anarcho-syndicalism, including American exceptionalism.

The CPUSA was entirely correct in describing "Eurocommunism" as Browderism. The trouble is, they never said what Browderism really was. They describe its features, the phraseology, etc., and show that this is the modus operandi of the European parties. The description of features does not constitute a theoretical and qualitative understanding. Even if the CPUSA theoreticians could define Browderism, they dare not do so, because, as we shall see, they have never purged their party of it.

Party members at the beginning of World War II went off to the recruiting center singing, "Browder is our leader, we shall not be moved." By the end of the war, the words had been changed to, "Browder is our misleader, he must be removed." That was about the limit of the explanation given to Party members. True, the Party issued a pamphlet "On the Struggle Against Revisionism," which described how Browder tried to liquidate the Party, how he was a revisionist, etc., but which ignored the conditions and the process which had taken place.

What is revisionism? It is the anti-Marxist current within the Marxist movement. As it was known to Marx, Engels and Lenin, it arose under the conditions of unchallenged supremacy of the industrialists. The class struggle was clear and sharp. The social basis of revisionism was the outright purchase of the top strata of the trade union bureaucracy and the bribery of the top elements of the skilled trades. Its ideological base was the ruined petty-bourgeoisie forced into the ranks of the proletariat. These "wooden links" weakened the entire chain of the working class struggle.

Browderism, as a "new" revisionism, had to reflect something "new"—the political victory of the international financier as represented by Roosevelt. The situation was this: the Republican Party, the political expression of the industrialists, had held almost uninterrupted power since the Civil War. However, the Great Depression sank the Grand Old Party along with the economic stability of national industry. Internationally, the Hitler fascists threatened Wall Street's investments. The mobilization of the nation to fight Germany could only take

place through the wholesale bribery of the people. The Roosevelt period, the "New Deal," was precisely that. While it was a period of great advance for the people of the US, it was also a period of unparalleled exploitation of the colonial peoples. The New Deal won over the working class movement to the international policies of the financier. Through their political power the representatives of the financier could and did force the industrialists to grant certain concessions to the workers. The Democratic Party became known as the party of the people. Earl Browder stepped into this situation. His philosophy was no more than a justification of the dependence of the revolutionary movement on Roosevelt and all he represented. Thus Browderism emerged as the theory of the coincidence of interests of the financier and the working class movement against the national industrialist and the peoples of the colonial world. Truman's "Square Deal," Kennedy's "Fair Deal," and Johnson's "New Society"—also periods of unparalleled bribery—coincided with the most genocidal wars against the colonial peoples.

In the continuing struggle against Browderism, the CPUSA never fails to urge the working class to support the "lesser evil," i.e., the Democrats, against the common enemy, the Republicans.

Many of the communist parties of Europe, along with the Japanese party, express all the features of Browderism. They shine in patriotic, maudlin, populist "love of the people." In the quest for liberty and democracy, the petty-bourgeois leaders of these parties have reached new heights, but the struggles in the colonies have been conveniently ignored. They outshone one another in denouncing "Stalinism." When necessary they have joined the financiers in attacking the Soviets for closing their markets to the mountains of European commodities.

Were it not for the theoretical confusion within these parties, their leaders would be swiftly expelled, along with their banners of "the masses" and the "mass movement," totally disregarding the role of the proletariat as the social vanguard; totally disregarding the reality that the proletariat, the creation of large industry, is the only social element capable of rallying the masses and leading them in a determined attack against all exploitation.

It is abundantly clear now that the Chinese leadership does not represent a Marxist opposition to the revisionism of the Soviet bloc or the European parties. In the 1960's, when Mao Tse Tung was still politically active, there was reason to hope that the Chinese Communist Party would even become the center of an international reassertion of Marxism. The first step away from this direction was taken when the leaders of the CPC failed to make the distinction between the objective socialist economic base of the Soviet Union and the subjective leadership of the revisionists. Still, these leaders were part of the communist movement.

This is no longer the case. The leadership of the CPC is unashamedly counter-revolutionary. They use their supposed hatred of the Soviet Union to mask their support of the most reactionary dictators as well as the US imperialists in an attempt to crush revolution. They publicly call on the US to form a united front to wage war on the Soviet people. Because of the relatively undeveloped socialist production relations in China, they are under no compulsion even to hide their opportunism and nationalism with Marxist phraseology. Most importantly, the leaders of the CPC do not have to respond to a population immersed in socialist production relations like the leaders of the CPSU must.

The split between the Chinese and Albanian parties completes the disintegration of the old Comintern. Chained by the anti-Marxist estimate of the "restoration of capitalism" in the socialist camp, the leaders of the Albanian party have

objectively joined with their antagonists, the leaders of the CPC, in condemning revolution.

The absence of a Marxist pole in the communist movement created a historical demand for a new international center. While one left group after another recognized this and stumbled over each other to become this center practically, they ignored its prerequisite—the combination of a theory and a practical movement developed in opposition to the revisionist pole.

The theoretical aspect proves once again Lenin's thesis that without a revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement. A revolutionary theory cannot be based on the subjective projections of this or that communist party, e.g., detente as a strategy, peace at any cost, or the restoration of capitalism under socialism. Nor can it be based on the rejection of these ideas, even though it be a Marxist one. It can only derive from one thing: the objective, historical demands of the international working class *as a class for itself, independent of any national or state boundaries*. The reassertion of Lenin's formulation of peaceful coexistence, of Marx's concept of proletarian internationalism, of Lenin's dictatorship of the proletariat—these form the cornerstone of the Marxist pole in the communist movement.

This assertion of the theoretical basis naturally took place outside the struggle of the working class. The Communist Labor Party is extremely proud to have played a significant part in that process, one which we intend to keep playing in the future.

Now its necessary complement is occurring—the fight for the *actual* unity of the world's working class. The revolution in Ethiopia heralded this fight, a revolution which began totally outside the revisionist pole. Independent Marxists throughout the Caribbean are waging the same fight. The Marxist vanguard fighters from the impoverished toilers of Trinidad, Tobago, Jamaica, the Bahamas and Guyana are charting a new course in light of the bankrupt leadership of their petty-bourgeoisie. In Latin America more and more revolutionaries have stopped looking to Moscow or Peking for help. They have every reason to expect a policy from the Communist Labor Party fully in accord with proletarian internationalism.

Our Party has consistently taken an independent position, one which has angered every party caught within the revisionist pole of the contradiction within the world communist movement. They dislike our independence. They disdain our "dogmatic" clinging to Marxism. They laugh at our relatively small size. No matter. We recall all the parties of the Second International united in their scorn of the tiny revolutionary movement in Russia in 1900. Seventeen years later this same movement reduced that powerful International to irrelevance. We extend the hand of comradeship to all. We are able to separate the tactical considerations of the moment from our strategic goals.

The theoretical as well as the practical establishment of the Marxist pole within the international communist movement, as embryonic as it may be, is of extraordinary importance. It is this which leads us to the conclusion that we are at the threshold of a new and glorious stage of the movement of the worldwide proletariat to establish its political hegemony and finally its dictatorship.

IV. THE NATIONAL STRUGGLE

Comrades, our assessment of the national struggle and our tactical projections rest on Lenin's thesis that a revolution results from a political crisis and a political crisis rests upon and arises from an economic crisis. The scope of our political work is always conditioned by the extent of the economic crisis. That is precisely why we are organized to take full advantage of the reciprocal action between the political and the economic. While restricting one another, they condition one another, and thus undergo a mutual preparation toward further development.

Everyone admits today that our country is in the early stages of a truly devastating crisis. However, the bourgeoisie of this very wealthy and powerful country still has considerable maneuverability. Their ability to shift the economic consequences of the crisis onto the backs of the already starving masses of especially Latin America demonstrates this very well. Because our country is so large and productive, a considerable portion of production is consumed within our borders. This gives the USNA capitalists a certain stability lacking with the English or French bourgeoisie, in whose countries foreign trade dominates the gross national product.

Despite all this, capitalism asserts itself. The glutting of the national markets of Europe and Japan, the hopeless impoverishment in the neocolonies, the socialist countries' determination to defend their consumer markets, add up to a crisis for US capitalism. The US trade deficit is the worst in its history, bad enough to begin shaking the US's long enjoyed political stability. As long as the economy constantly expanded, the industrial groupings accepted Wall Street's domination. But today's developing stagnation along with greatly diminished superprofits has provoked a struggle within the bourgeoisie over their "fair" share of the pie. Each group is politically jockeying for position, and will do so for some time. Finally there will be a political realignment. The most articulate sector of the working class to feel the pinch is the organized section. They help arouse their allies and the hangers-on amidst the petty-bourgeoisie and the intellectuals. The expression of their discontent is a serious struggle to form a mass people's party.

Shrinking social bribery more and more exposed the Democratic Party as the political apparatus of Wall Street instead of organized labor and the lower middle class. No longer are Negroes, women, Indian Peoples, etc., guaranteed a voice in the Democratic Party. The economic situation precludes the possibility of broad national unity through bribery against foreign "enemies" such as the Vietnamese.

If allowed to drift, conditions are ripening for the emergence of a right-wing social democratic movement. Social democracy first developed as an eclectic unity of the workers and the bourgeoisie against the feudalists. In the immediate past, it has existed essentially as a rallying point for the anti-Sovieteers. Nonetheless, their calls for "pure democracy" and "fair play" have attracted—and will continue to do so for some time—the loyalties of a number of advanced workers.

We must never forget the basic conclusion of Marxism: mankind creates its own history. If we passively observe the formation of this inevitable party, it will become what the present participants want it to become. We must therefore redouble our efforts to influence the direction of this party.

We note that the areas where this new party is developing and where the CLP ran candidates are basically the same. Both the left and the right scrutinized our

militant campaigns and saw them as a harbinger of the future. Their political sense surely told them that if a small, inexperienced communist party like ours could be accepted by the masses as a legitimate political expression within the working class through our enthusiastic campaigns, then it was time for them to provide some alternative between a capitalist and a communist orientation. Our electoral work in New York, Detroit, San Francisco and Los Angeles spurred the motion toward the formation of a mass party of labor. We are in a good position because these are the same areas where a third party movement is developing.

Naturally, the motion within and around the development of this new party is quite varied and contradictory. The main point is that we must use our Marxism to see the inevitable formation of this party, and begin now to construct it as a political instrument in the united front of the working class against war and fascism.

V. THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The broadest and most articulate voice of the working class is the trade union movement. It is beginning to stir. No longer can union members ignore the class collaborationist policies of the top leadership. These policies are directly affecting their pocketbook, and they don't like the feeling. The rebelliousness of a broad strata of lower level union officials is a daily phenomenon. One of the most encouraging aspects of this is the growing alliance between the trade unions and the Negro people's liberation movement. Years ago the unions were often content to wish the Negro people well in their struggle. Because of the swift and continuing proletarianization of the Negro people, as well as many positive results of affirmative action, no official dare ignore the democratic and just demands of the Negro movement. Part of this is simply good political sense. An ever growing number of officials, as well as workers, see that the route of attack against the entire working class is through the Negro worker. The natural sympathies of the workers for fair play now have a concrete basis for expression. This is especially true because of the deepening split between the Carter administration and the Negro masses. The difference between the present and the past is that the defense of the Negro worker is the defense of the union and not simply an expression of fair play.

The skill of leadership in any field is the ability to organize a particular class or group to do what is objectively required by history. That is why the basis of our trade union activity is the struggle against the Taft-Hartley Act. The vast majority of workers bitterly oppose Taft-Hartley; the trade union movement which has shrunk while the working class has grown, must either expand or die. Without overturning Taft-Hartley, it will never expand. Through this issue we are gathering around us quite a number of militant trade union officials and members who respect us for this fight. The march by the heroines and heroes of the Texas Farmworkers Union proved the concern over Taft-Hartley throughout the South as well as the willingness to join with anyone entering the fight. This march dramatically demonstrated the connection between the struggle against Taft-Hartley and the general Negro people's liberation movement.

One of the most dramatic expressions of the Party's maturity is the increased involvement in the trade union movement. Our leadership in this movement depends on our utilization of our Marxist philosophy. What does Marxism teach us about the trade union movement? First, that the structure and goals of the trade union movement reflect a specific stage of capitalism and therefore a social

environment. The development of the AFL was a reflection of a country entering into imperialism. Certainly by the time it had matured, the AFL was clearly the organization of the skilled trades. The imperialist ideological expressions, the violent anticommunism, were all the reflections of a union movement in a country at a certain stage of social development. Because in 1925 some 45% of the population lived in the rural areas and the country was firmly in the hands of the party representing the industrial grouping, industrial unions were practically an impossibility. However, if the embryonic forms of such unions—e.g., the Trade Union Unity League and the National Union Movement—had not started under such conditions, then it still would have been impossible to build the CIO when conditions changed in 1936. The CIO was built within the context of the political victory of Wall Street and the necessity of national unity against the colonial peoples on the one hand and the Hitlerites on the other hand. Under specific conditions, the AFL's main purpose was the protection of the interests of the Anglo American skilled tradesman. Its demands were almost exclusively economic. Under other conditions, the CIO was built on a broader and more democratic basis. Still, no one can deny that it centered on the demands of the Anglo American worker in the mass production industries.

Times have changed. A large section of industry has fled the highly organized Northeast and North Central part of the country for the South and Southwest. Even though the primary reason for the flight was economic, it has led to a host of political questions. In the 1930's, 40's and through the 50's, the idea of organizing the South was more a moral than an economic one. The few half hearted attempts at organization floundered on the fact that the Southern workers, black and white, demanded more than a redress of economic grievances. There were burning social and political questions involved in the unionization of the South. The CIO's failure to make a real effort to organize the South indicated that the leadership very well knew that they were not structured to deal with the social and political consequences of a proletariat split by national divisions, the result of the national antagonism between the oppressor nation, Anglo America, and the oppressed nation, the Negro Nation, as well as centuries of ingrained color prejudice. In short, the social situation of the South demanded that any successful union would have to begin with a struggle for the unity of the working class. That would have no other meaning than the social and political equality of the Southern black worker and upon this basis, the struggle for the economic equality of all.

The dramatic changes in the structure and location of industry in the US have made the organization of labor in the South and the Southwest the common demand of the entire working class. How can political groupings and unions tied to Wall Street lead this struggle? The unions emerging in the South and Southwest will be the most militant and politically oriented in our history. This may well be beyond the grasp of the existing trade union apparatus. However, nothing ever grew from nothing, and whatever will tackle the South has its present roots in the AFL-CIO. Division is the normal process of growth. Therefore, we shall continue to demand in the unions we influence that Southern organization become the number one task on the agenda. Not only is this the only way to stop the runaway shop, it is also the inescapable moral duty of the organized sector of the class to extend its organization to the unorganized sector. This brings us full circle. Twist and turn as the unions may, they cannot organize the South without first overthrowing the Taft-Hartley Act. Our cadre—within the unions and without—have

been real heroes in the militant implementation of this line.

Another aspect of this struggle is the situation among the Mexican unions. It is small wonder that entire industries, especially in electronics, are moving to Mexico. The dues of the Anglo American workers have financed a murderous campaign by the CIA, through the AFL-CIO, to saddle the Mexican proletariat with the most treacherous set of labor gangsters in the Western Hemisphere. This is an adjunct to the fact that the international unions, always an aspect of Canadian economic life, have only been extended to Mexico in a token way. Up to now, the rationalization has been that the multinational corporations first went to Canada. But now those same giants of auto and electronics are taking over Mexico; it is therefore indispensable to the welfare of the proletariat on both sides of the border to develop international unions to include Mexico as well as Canada.

VI. THE NATIONAL MOVEMENT IN THE USNA

Every aspect of this report has touched on the Negro question. The evolution of our country's history has made the national question an integral part of the proletarian movement. This is not simply because of the common opposition to imperialism or because of the question of the strategy and tactics of the struggle to divest US imperialism of its human and material reserves. It is also a result of the rapid growth of the big cities and the related decline of the countryside. Thus the Negro liberation movement, while not a part of the working class, is fundamentally guided and populated by people who are not simply workers in the plants, but who are quite often officials of the unions. The formulation, "the Negro people and the working class" was always chauvinist and incorrect; now events are exposing its rottenness in a practical way. Not only are the majority of the Negro people a part of the working class, but the Negro people's liberation movement no longer has a base or goals apart from the proletariat. Thus the Negro liberation movement is bound to become more oriented toward the proletariat. On the other hand, the general development of class consciousness and the expansion of the trade unions are bound to be more anti-imperialist, more anti-capitalist and more militant because of the impossibility of the Negro people's movement compromising on the level of bribery.

What are the political results of some 15 years of integration? First, the Negro middle class to a great extent is integrated. They may pretend that they have their cushy jobs because of their struggle for separation or cultural nationalism, but they know very well that they have been integrated in an effort to decapitate the Negro liberation movement. But just the opposite happened. Not only have Negro proletarians taken their places in the movement, but there is a growing awareness of class differentiation within the Negro people. It should be plain now that Negro liberation cannot exceed the level of the Anglo American worker. Despite the growing identity of the working class movement and the Negro people's liberation movement, to gloss over the differences would be fatal. Under existing conditions the liberation movement is still objectively struggling in the direction of the erection of a national state. Certainly the crisis will exacerbate this tendency. Also, as the bribery of the masses diminishes, the first and hardest hit are the Negro people. Not that the government has lost its "sensitivity"—but that bribery was a means and not an end. The achievement of that end precludes the use of more means. However, one of the effects of the past 15 years has been the tremendous political clout in the hands of the Negro people. It will not be so

easy to drive them backward again. This, though, is the demand of monopoly capitalism and it is going to provide the basis for a profound new radicalization of the Negro masses.

In a different form, this radicalization has been sweeping over the Mexican national minority and the Mexican nationals for some time. This motion is no longer limited to the Southwest, but has a profound impact on the politics and trade unions of every major city in the country. The national minority workers have one thing in common. In their relentless search for work they have left their roots, and today the Mexican national minority is found from the coalfields of West Virginia to the docks in Seattle, from the truckstops of National City to the railyards of Bangor.

The fate of these workers surely will affect the whole proletariat. The historic revolution gathering strength in Mexico is greatly exciting the political tendencies of the Mexican minority. Their homeland is in a hopeless economic bind. The removal of the toilers from the land; the concentration of the dispossessed farmers within and around a few big cities; the increased fascization of the political system; the proliferation of revolutionary tendencies and organizations: these all describe the formation of the revolution. It is not a one-sided affair and the CIA has no intention of passively letting the Mexicans conquer Mexico. Their plans for abduction, murder and torture have already been formulated and publicly announced. However, the national minority in the USNA maintains strong family, cultural and political ties with Mexico. The stirring of the Mexican proletariat is bound to shake up and further politicize the national minority here. Their inevitable spontaneous organizational, logistical and political support to that revolution will naturally affect the whole of the proletariat. We have always had warm relations with the progressive sections of the Mexican national minority movements. We must labor to deepen and broaden those ties. A great deal of our success in this will depend on the publication and wide distribution of our position on the Mexican national minority of the Southwest.

As the Mexican and Negro national minority movements grow more militant, we will be caught in a difficult dialectic. There will rise—and indeed there already has arisen—a certain tendency, very revolutionary on the surface, to transform our Party into the Party of the Negro or Mexican people. This is a self-defeating position. We are not and cannot become a party of the minorities and oppressed peoples. We are a party which embodies theory as well as practical leadership of the proletariat. Naturally, large sections of the Negro and Mexican national minority workers will be attracted to our Party. That is because they are part of the proletariat of the USNA. However, the fight for the equality and emancipation of the oppressed peoples is the task of the proletariat. We must organize them to do this; we cannot attempt to transfer to the Party an historical assignment of the class. We must resist the feeling that it would be easier to do the job ourselves, rather than convince the Anglo American proletariat how and why they must do the job.

One of our continually weak areas of work is among the Indian peoples of the Southwest. In other parts of the country we have made some real strides forward, but our work lags because we have not been able to issue a comprehensive statement of our understanding of this question. We have gathered around us a considerable amount of knowledge of the history and political movement of the Indian peoples. But we have yet to organize that knowledge into a draft position of the working class in regard to this important question.

The extremely fluid political situation in Puerto Rico has affected our Puerto Rican work. Nevertheless, we shall continue our policy of concrete assistance to the liberation movement in Puerto Rico. The growing struggles of the Puerto Rican national minority have kept this national colonial question before the entire world. The basis of our activity is the demand for the immediate independence of Puerto Rico.

VII. THE POLITICAL LIFE IN THE COUNTRY

We should take note of certain changes in the left of this country. First, let us deal with the situation amongst the "new left."

This "new left," having arisen from right-wing social democracy, has easily developed "anti-revisionism" into "anti-Sovietism." As they consolidate these positions and base them in the specifics of "theory" and "ideology" they are markedly drifting toward Trotskyism. At the same time, the isolation of these groupings, from one another and from the workers, is becoming more and more pronounced. This isolation leads them to raid one another's membership and try to swallow up some of the independent groupings which arise now and then.

The largest number of lefts in this country are the independents. These individuals and small groupings are repulsed by the "new left" and the liberalism and opportunism of the CPUSA. Many of them have passed through the CPUSA or some other left organization. Their outlook ranges from the extreme right to the extreme left. Many of them are marked by excessive intellectualism. Nevertheless, they represent a force that, as the crisis deepens, will grow in importance. Some of them have already "discovered" the CLP.

Our policy of disengagement from the anti-Sovieteers was and is correct. We will not conduct polemics with liars and counter-revolutionaries.

Among the independents, however, there are groupings and a large number of intellectuals galvanizing around certain concepts of Marxism. Quite often, because of their lack of experience and their intellectualism, they attack what they quite incorrectly consider to be the CLP's position. We recognize the difference between confusion and sabotage. We are and have always been ready to meet with and polemicize with any grouping on the level of honesty and in the broad interests of our working class. This position needs to be restated because the "new left" is entering a new round of destructive polemics and the tendency will be to draw us in.

While approaching all groups with a frank and comradely spirit, we cannot deviate from our policy of concentration of our efforts to establish ourselves in the organized labor movement. This demands special and continuous polemics against any revisionist projections of the major revolutionary group, the CPUSA. Such polemics must, first, rest on a Marxist understanding of the United Front, and second, be based on practical consequences of practical work.

In 1850, Karl Marx formulated the basic tactics of the united front of the working class in the "Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League." Through the particular situation today is very different, the content is remarkably similar:

... when the democratic petty bourgeoisie are everywhere oppressed, they preach in general unity and reconciliation to the proletariat, they offer it their hand and strive for the establishment of a large opposition party, that is, they strive to entangle the workers in a party organization in which general social-democratic phrases predominate, behind which

their special interests are concealed and in which the particular demands of the proletariat may not be brought forward for the sake of beloved peace. Such a union would turn out solely to their advantage, and altogether to the disadvantage of the proletariat. The proletariat would lose its whole independent, laboriously achieved position and once more sink down to being an appendage of official bourgeois democracy. This union must, therefore, be most decisively rejected.

Because the CPUSA is the largest and most influential organization of the socialist left in the USNA, it is almost impossible to carry out struggles within the working class toward the formation of a real united front without running into some aspect of the organization or the line of the CPUSA. In the process of making a united front based on the unity of action of the trade union movement, there will be more and more occasions calling for united activity between the CLP and CPUSA within the trade union movement itself. Because the "new left" groupings are so isolated from the working class and so enamored of Trotskyite positions, there is no basis in reality for activity with them. There are some comrades (or rather, ex-comrades) who left the Party claiming that our policy of forcing the CPUSA into united activity on concrete issues was tantamount to leading the Party back into the CPUSA. That is because they confuse the coincidence of certain goals, e.g., repeal of Taft-Hartley, peace, support of integration, etc., with the tactics and methods of building the united front.

Our tactics in the united front flow from our strategy of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the USNA. That is why we consider the united front as a bridge to the proletarian revolution. The CPUSA, on the other hand, elevates the tactical goals of the united front to the level of strategy. Theirs is the classic revisionist formula: the movement is everything, the final aim nothing. The totally different strategies of our two organizations will eventually be reflected in the tactics of building the united front. The relinquishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a strategy precludes the necessary independence of the proletariat. Thus the CPUSA's tactics inevitably drift toward positions which are acceptable to the petty bourgeois democrats as well as the upper strata of the workers. Because in our country today there is no independent voice of the working class, these tactics eventually if not immediately lead to the hegemony of the petty bourgeois democrats over the working class movement, thus perpetuating the current state of affairs.

The CLP's tactics in the united front are consistent with Marx's and Engels' advice to the Communist League:

The relation of the revolutionary workers' party to the petty bourgeois democrats is this: it marches with them against the faction which it aims at overthrowing; it opposes them in everything whereby they seek to consolidate their own interests."

These tactics as well as the understanding of the difference between our strategies will never be implemented unless we ensure the Marxist-Leninist education of our cadre. In the last period of time, our education has slipped somewhat, mainly because of our greatly increased political activity. Our contribution to the struggle against Taft-Hartley, our participation in the TFW march, the electoral campaigns, the strike struggles, the great work in the South, all are activities that a far larger and more mature party would be proud of. Many of our own comrades do not realize the significance of these struggles or of our growing influence because of them. Our efforts to lead the fight instead of tailing after it and acting

as a "support committee" have been a rich experience. The most dangerous aspect of the slipping educational process inside the Party is the treatment of the revisionists simply as another negative tendency within the working class. No one has formulated a theoretical basis for this. It simply arises spontaneously when practical work ceases to be guided by theory. This is expressed in many ways. For example, we are running into a number of individual members of the CPUSA who do not understand our differences and do not want to deepen them. These "good guys" tend to disarm many comrades. It should be quite clear that the current policy of the CPUSA is to destroy the CLP. Their major weapons are slander and political pressure against any who want to unite.

Many new comrades have come into the Party since the days when we were struggling for our existence. They have not had the experiences, and without a thorough education on the source and role of revisionism, they cannot properly carry out the practical fight against it in the labor movement. We intend to redouble our vigilance and work in this regard, especially in light of the CPUSA's announced policy of concentration on trade union work. It is also clear that the CPUSA will try to rally its disunited membership around Gus Hall's latest report, *The Crisis of Everyday Living*. We intend to study that document and in a Marxist light use it as one of the main battle grounds between us. But to do so means to restructure and reorganize the basis of our movement—Marxist-Leninist education.

We do not propose to change our basic tactic of forcing the CPUSA into united activity in the trade union movement, first on a local and finally on a national level. This is absolutely necessary since it is the only way that the two lines can be compared and the struggle for hegemony of the working class carried out. Eventually, we will force them into principled relations with us, if for no other reason that everywhere they turn they either make fools of themselves by trying to fight us, or we find a basis of collective effort. To strengthen principled relationships, more and more polemics against certain incorrect aspects of the CPUSA line are necessary. Not name calling—but scientific analysis and a struggle for theoretical clarity. If the CPUSA takes this as an insult, then they expose their lack of a scientific and objective approach to the class struggle. We tell the CPUSA now as in the past: we will not "go away." Neither you, nor your master, the CPSU, will crush us. Disregard us, and we will grow and learn to accomplish the tasks of our Party. Unite with us on concrete and basic issues and, while we reserve the right to principled criticism, we keep our word to both friend and foe.

VIII. THE PARTY

We are now at the end and most important part of the report. We are justifiably proud of our Party. Immediately before, during and after the Founding Conference, every political grouping in the US—from the CPUSA and all their offshoots, from the Trotskyites and their myriad of groupings, to the gangs spawned by the Soviet-baiting League for Industrial Democracy—they all attacked us. This undoubtedly was the first and last time the entire left united. They could not unite against capitalism, but through the FBI and the CIA they could and did unite against us. We survived their efforts, and the isolation imposed by these groups drove us into the working class. Among the workers and their struggles we are undergoing a transformation.

However, we cannot afford to wallow in the luxury of retrospect. Our most immediate task is the charting of our future line of march. We have simply indicated the fundamental nature of the stirring in our working class, as well as the possibility and probability of radical changes in the international situation. The environment in which our Party lives is our class. Our philosophy teaches us and our experience has confirmed that when the environment changes, everything dependent on it either changes accordingly or dies. Therefore, we must change as much as the proletariat. If we cannot keep up, we will lose our connections and render ourselves ineffective as leaders. In this respect we mutually condition each other. Our fight to change the working class inevitably leads us to our own metamorphosis. On the other hand, when the proletariat changes, it alters not only itself but everything connected with it. We must make a concerted effort to develop at exactly the points the class must develop: theoretically, ideologically and organizationally.

First we must define our Party. It is a contradictory unity of the subjective expression of the objective movement on the one hand and the organization of the practical leaders of the proletariat on the other hand. Those who think this is merely a rhetorical expression should analyze the parties which have chosen to become either one or the other. A party which is the former at the expense of the latter can only degenerate into a petty bourgeois intellectual sect. On the other hand, a party which is only the organization of the proletariat's practical leaders cannot help but drift into syndicalism and reformism. The CPUSA, which never respected Marxism, is an excellent example of this.

Only a party which is both of these, which embodies their contradictory aspects, and in which these aspects mutually condition each other—only such a party can truly lead the working class to socialism. That is the party we are building and we can state frankly that we are the only ones in the country who are capable of doing so.

Our political task is to sum up the experience and position of the working class and develop the line of march in the form of a program and political line. But that is just the beginning and the easiest part of the task. The real problem is making the program of the Party the program of the class. It can only be done on the basis of their experience, only by raising the correct slogans on the basis of the program. It does not help, if at the moment of confusion in the heat of the struggle, we forget our party program and political line and simply raise the same slogans as the current misleaders of the class. But how can we convince the class of a political program unmastered by our own cadre, a program and political line only half-heartedly believed by our own membership? We cannot. We have already been through the process of raising this or that point of the program in a very mechanical way; it did not produce results. But the answer to this is not to swing over to the other side and shelve the program and political line in favor of a spontaneous approach smoothed over with pseudo-Marxism. The point is that our cadre must master the program and political line, and bring these to the working class through analysis.

The problem boils down to the same old question: does the Party or the class make the revolution? If it is the class, then it is necessary to explain patiently the situation in terms of their own experience and bring them one political step forward. But we have to be able to analyze the situation thoroughly to explain it to them. This means contribution of thoughts and ideas on the part of each com-

rade. It means the mastery of applied dialectics. It means the development of ideas in the context of a militant, class conscious, partisan, scientific view of the entire process.

Engels repeatedly pointed out to the revolutionaries that the class struggle is fought out on three fronts: the economic, the struggle for wages and conditions; the political, the daily tactical maneuvering of the class struggle in the legislative field; and the theoretical, the recognition of socialism as a science and the treatment of it as such—the persistent study of it. Why do we attach so much importance to the question of theory? Because there are no objective, concrete socialist relations in this country. Therefore, our only guide is theoretical. The acceptance of any other guide leads to reformism and tailing after the mass movement. We have had a considerable amount of experience working with the CPUSA and have all been shocked at their theoretical backwardness. We should take warning from their negative example. We cannot hope to lead the masses without an unending struggle to master the theory of Marxism, not as a dry formula, but as a guide for our activity. Not only must we master it, we must give it to the masses, especially to the workers. Can the workers, particularly in a country like ours with its vast communication system, develop the revolutionary process without theoretical clarity? They hunger for theory. Our class is a fairly literate class; they read a lot and every piece of bourgeois trash contains some “theory” for them. We must learn how to get theoretical concepts over to the masses, but we cannot do it until we have mastered it in such a way that we can state the most complex concepts simply and directly to the people. One of Stalin’s greatest attributes was that he gave scientific socialism to the masses perhaps more than any single leader in history.

One of the most complex struggles we face is the fight for firm ideological convictions. It is difficult to develop ideology in a period of relative class peace. Ideology is connected to science, but it is also an expression of the summation of experience. A story illustrates this. A sailor during the war fell overboard in the Pacific. Near drowning, he prayed for help. A giant turtle rose beneath him. For two and a half days he rode the turtle until a ship sighted and rescued him. He became a priest. Another sailor survived a U-boat attack off the coast of Africa. He climbed aboard a small raft and for three months drifted across the Atlantic to the coast of Brazil. When he was rescued, he was in excellent mental and physical condition. He became an advisor to the Navy on survival and finally wrote a pamphlet on the science of survival.

Once one’s concepts are verified by experience, one develops an ideological conviction. No one could convince one of these sailors about reliance on God and the other about reliance on science. This is also the situation in the Party. At a certain stage of development, based on a particular combination of scientific understanding and experience, the comrades developed an ideological outlook. Now the Party is elevating itself; the working class is doing the same. One aspect of the role of the Party is to develop a class conscious ideology among the workers. But this cannot be done by a party that under these conditions does not purge itself of all aspects of bourgeois ideology—selfishness, passivity, hedonism, pessimism, coarseness and crudeness in relations with comrades and workers. All these negative concepts flow from a certain body of experience and a certain “scientific” understanding of the world around us. Develop our scientific understanding, broaden our experience and it shows in the militancy of our ideological convictions. Of course, the converse is also true. A comrade, especial-

ly a leading comrade, who expresses a mixture of proletarian and bourgeois ideology reveals that his understanding is also a mixture of bourgeois and proletarian. In this respect we must comment on the role of leaders. We can summarize our experience in one sentence: leaders march at the head of the column. Wherever the Party is and wherever it is going, the leaders led it there and there is no possibility of shifting this responsibility.

Finally, we must have organization. Lenin often said that the proletariat's only weapon was organization. Where do they learn the correct organizational forms? From the communist vanguard. The working class is preparing to go through some fundamental organizational changes. We must accept the task of helping to shape their new attitudes and tasks into organizational forms. But how can we do it if we ourselves are sloppily and poorly organized? Our projections regarding the international situation, particularly concerning the development of confrontation between the US and the USSR and the consequent repression of the communist movement, should constitute a word to the wise. Our urgent need is to understand the link between our political line and the absolute demand to tighten up our structure so that we become a truly Leninist organization of revolutionaries.

Comrades, based upon the new stirring in the working class, our Party finds itself in a new environment which makes possible and demands a corresponding change in the Party. This entire report has dealt with this concept—change, change and more change. That is the law of life. As in all changes, a certain retrograde motion develops as resistance to that change. We shall mobilize all the existing theoretical, political and organizational weapons to smash this resistance and move the Party forward to the next stage of its development. We face the coming period with confidence in our cadre, our class and our Party. All our projections flow from the certain knowledge that the ultimate victory of our class and Party are equally inevitable.

Peoples Tribune

is the political paper of the Communist Labor Party. It offers a consistent scientific analysis of national and international affairs and strives to bring conscious revolutionary leadership to the daily unfolding struggles of the working class, such as the recent coal miners' strike. People read the *Peoples Tribune* not just to find out what is going on in the world, but to understand it and do something about it. Published bi-weekly.

Proletariat

is a Marxist-Leninist theoretical journal published by the Communist Labor Party. It provides a forum for debate and polemics on theoretical questions facing the working class movement. Recent issues of *Proletariat* have featured articles on socialist culture, the Cuban revolution, discrimination in sports, and Carter's energy program, as well as analyses of the contradictions in finance capital and of the Comintern position of the Negro question. Upcoming issues will include articles on the trade unions, revisionism in the world communist movement and the question of the Third World. A special double issue on dialectical materialism will be published this summer. Published quarterly.

one-year subscription to the *Peoples Tribune*

individuals: \$6.00
libraries and other institutions: \$10.00
international air mail: \$10.50

one-year subscription to the *Proletariat*

individuals: \$5.00
libraries and other institutions: \$10.00
international air mail: \$10.50

Peoples Tribune/Proletariat
P.O. Box 3774
Chicago IL 60654