

DETROIT REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT RECORDS

BOX 13 OF 16

FOLDER 6

**CL PUBLICATION PROLITARIAT
1972 2 OF 2**

Soviet Republic. But such a conclusion would be groundless. The fact that the workers' State has maintained itself against the whole world in a single country, and in a backward country at that, bears witness to the colossal might of the proletariat, which in other countries more advanced, more civilized, will be capable of performing real wonders. But, although we have held out ground in the political and military sense as a State, we have not yet set to work to create a Socialist society and have not even approached this stage. So long as the bourgeoisie remains in power in the other European countries, we are compelled, in our struggle against economic isolation, to seek for agreements with the capitalist world; at the same time one may say with certainty that these agreements may at best help us to cure some of our economic ills, to take one or another step forward, but that genuine advance in the construction of Socialist economy in Russia will become possible only after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe." (Leon Trotsky, Collected Works, Russian Edition, Vol.III, Part I, pp.92-92.)

This is how Trotsky interprets away the successes of the proletarian revolution in Russia. He is wrong but he heaps one fantastic assertion on the other to cover up his original error. The workers did maintain their power in Russia; the proletarian revolution did hold its own in the face of a hostile world, but Trotsky must always remain right. It is the revolution which, in his interpretation, is always wrong. Socialism in Russia cannot be built without the victory of the proletariat "in most important countries of Europe". What is built in Russia, therefore, is not Socialism.

So he wrote in 1922. So he writes in 1935 when he declares that the Soviet Union is approaching "its general crisis".

"The political crises converge towards the general crisis which is creeping onward and which expresses itself in the fact that despite the titanic expenditures of energy by the masses and the greatest technological successes, the economic achievements keep lagging far behind, and the overwhelming majority of the population continues to lead a poverty-stricken existence." (Leon Trotsky, The Kirov Assassination, 1935, p.12.)

Here we have approached the very fountain-head of Trotsky's method. To prove that Socialism in one country is impossible, he attempts to prove that the achievements of the Soviet Union are the reverse of socialist construction. To reinforce his arguments he heads the counter-revolution which attempts to damage Socialist construction and destroy the Soviet Union.

Trotsky remains true to himself throughout.

THE REVOLUTION AND THE PEASANTRY

That ingenious theory about the impossibility of Socialism in a single country has been misnamed "the permanent revolution". The term is misleading, like many other quasi-Marxist terms used by Trotsky. It is the exact opposite of what Marxism understands under permanent revolution. Trotsky's "permanent revolution" is an attempt at explaining why a revolution in a single country must fail from within even if it is not crushed from without. The explanation is that the proletariat has no allies in a socialist revolution within the country where such a revolution takes place. In particular, Trotskyism tries to prove that the peasant masses do not represent a revolutionary reserve, and that therefore a revolution in a single country is bound to succumb to the counter-revolutionary forces, which also include the peasantry, unless aid comes from a victorious revolution in other countries. Trotsky's "permanent revolution" is thus an expression of the disbelief in the ability of the proletariat to carry with it in the revolution the broad masses of the other exploited and oppressed classes of the population.

The Marxian theory of revolution is based just on this conception of the proletariat being the leader of all the exploited and oppressed in the revolution. Hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution is the foundation of the Marxian understanding of revolution. It found its classical expression as early as 1850 in a piece of writing by Marx and Engels entitled Appeal of the Central Committee to the Communist League.

In that document, which was addressed to one of the first revolutionary working-class organizations in Europe, Marx and Engels pointed out the tasks of a revolutionary workers' party in a revolution such as took place in various countries of Europe in 1848, namely, in a revolution against the feudal system. The authors, having in mind the interests of the working class and being fully aware of the fact that a bourgeois-democratic revolution, i.e., a revolution establishing a bourgeois democracy, can never satisfy the real demands of the workers, nevertheless did not see the workers as isolated from all the other forces in the revolution. They formulated the task of the workers in the following way: Together with the petty-bourgeois democrats against the old system; against the petty-bourgeois democrats, together with the village poor when the former wish to entrench themselves and become the ruling power in the State. The document continues:

"While the democratic bourgeois wish to terminate the revolution as quickly as possible with the view to confine themselves at best to the realization of only these demands (the demands of the petty bourgeoisie), our interests and our tasks consist in making the revolution permanent until all more or less property-owning classes have been removed from power, until the proletariat has conquered State power, until the union of the proletarians not only in one country, but in all leading countries of the world, has developed to such an extent, that competition between the proletarians of those countries has ceased and at least the decisive

productive forces are concentrated in the hands of the proletarians. What we are concerned with is not a change in private property, but the abolition of private property, not softening class contradictions, but abolishing classes, not improving existing society, but founding a new society." (Our emphasis - M.J.C.) (Marx and Engels, Selected Works, Russian Edition, Vol.III, p.483.)

We have here, in a remarkably clear form, the meaning of a permanent revolution as understood by Marx and Engels, are not interested in terminating the revolution, that is to say, the bourgeois-democratic revolution. We are interested in making it a permanent revolution, that is to say, in making it pass from one stage to the other, from a bourgeois-democratic revolution to a socialist revolution, from a revolution that tries to improve existing society, to a revolution that founds a new society, from a revolution in which the bourgeoisie is the dominant power and holds the means of production to a revolution where the proletariat is in power and nationalizes all means of production, from a class society to a classless society. But while the bourgeois-democratic revolution is in progress, the workers must not forget that they are the leaders of all the exploited.

"As in the first French revolution, the petty bourgeois will give over the feudal estates to the peasants as free property, i.e., they will wish to retain the rural proletariat and create a petty-bourgeois peasant class....The workers must counteract this plan in the interests of the village proletariat and in their own interests. They must demand that the confiscated property should become State property and should be transformed into workers' colonies that are cultivated by the village proletariat organized in associations and utilizing all the advantages of large-scale agriculture. Under conditions where bourgeois property relations are being shaken, the principle of public ownership will thus be placed on a firm basis. As the democrats unite with the peasants, so the workers must unite with the village proletariat." (Ibid., p.487.)

We have here the sketch of an alliance of the workers with the other exploited and the defense of the interests of the latter in the revolution.

The theory and practice of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution were developed and perfected in the Russian Revolution by the Bolsheviks with Lenin.

Absolutism reigned in Russia. The system was semi-feudal. Power was in the hands of the landed aristocracy and a powerful bureaucracy. The Tsar considered himself the foremost landowner. When capitalism developed in the last quarter of the 19th century, Tsarism reluctantly yielded a few-governmental positions to the representatives of the wealthy manufacturers and bankers. A new industry with a modern proletariat had come into being, but strong remnants of feudalism reigned in the village. The peasants did not even possess the full right to choose their place of living. The landlords had privileges over the peasants reminiscent of those under serfdom. The broad masses of the population, workers,

peasants, lower middle class of the cities, had almost no political rights. Time came when the revolution appeared inevitable. It was in the interests of the workers and of the other exploited masses that the working class should take the lead - the hegemony - in the revolution. This is what the Bolsheviks fought for.

What shall the working class demand of the coming revolution?, they asked. What is its task in the revolution? The Socialists of the Menshevik brand (social-reformists) was the establishment of a democracy after the English or French pattern. The Mensheviks said the workers should content themselves with constitutional liberties and participation in a bourgeois parliament. This they thought was the maximum anybody could wish under the given conditions. As to the introduction of socialism, they relegated this to the dim and distant future; if ever they thought of socialism, they saw it coming - by degrees, of course, and without violent upheavals - in perhaps a hundred or two hundred years after the bourgeois-democratic revolution. In fact, they never thought of socialism in connection with the revolution that was the order of the day.

Quite different was the attitude of the Bolsheviks with Lenin at their head. As early as 1894, in winding up his treatise, Who Are the "Friends of the People?" in which he defines the role of the proletariat and its party, Lenin says:

"When its (the Proletariat's) advanced representatives will have assimilated the ideas of scientific socialism, the idea of the historic role of the Russian worker, when these ideas will have become widespread, and there will be created among the workers stable organizations which transform the now sporadic economic warfare of the workers into a conscious class struggle, - then the Russian worker, rising at the head of all the democratic elements, will throw down absolutism and lead the Russian proletariat (hand in hand with the proletariat of all countries) on the straight road of open political struggle to a victorious Communist revolution." (V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Russian Edition, Vol. I, p. 194.)

We have here a complete outline of the theory of the permanent revolution. The proletariat is marching at the head of the other democratic elements towards a bourgeois-democratic revolution; together with these elements it overthrows absolutism and establishes a bourgeois democracy; it does not stop at that, however, but continues fighting until it overthrows the capitalist system and establishes Communism.

This is the Leninist formulation of the permanent revolution. It consists of two elements: First, the proletariat is leading the other elements of the exploited; the proletariat is "the only and the natural representative of the toiling and exploited population"; second, the revolution passes from the first to the second stage, from its bourgeois-democratic to its socialist stage.

This approach to the permanent revolution implied the idea of a revolutionary alliance between the city workers and the peasants.

Lenin's Bolshevik argument, as formulated more than once during 1905 and in subsequent years, runs as follows: The liberals, representing the bourgeoisie, are in favor of the revolution, but in an inconsistent, selfish and cowardly manner. As soon as its narrow selfish interests are satisfied, the bourgeoisie as a mass will turn its back to the people, to the revolution, and will join hands against them with autocracy. Who then will remain? The proletariat and the peasantry. Even when we deal with a democratic revolution only, it is clear from the very outset that the proletariat alone is capable of bringing such a revolution to its logical conclusion, because the proletariat goes much further than that. The proletariat alone is the unwavering and unyielding element in the revolution. The peasantry is interested not so much in constitutional guarantees for private property as in taking away from the landowners the land, one of the mainstays of private property.

Lenin therefore taught that it was the task of the proletariat to unite with the peasantry in order as far as possible to drive forward the bourgeois-democratic revolution. This, he said, could be accomplished by uniting with the peasantry as a whole. As soon as the bourgeois-democratic revolution is accomplished, the proletariat, in alliance with the semi-proletarian elements of the peasantry, i.e., with the poorest peasants, he said, will be able to carry through the abolition of capitalism, thereby overcoming the resistance of the bourgeoisie and the richer peasants.

The plan was sound. It was in accordance with the social forces as they existed in Russia and in full harmony with the doctrine of Marx and Engels.

In order that the transition from a bourgeois-democratic revolution to a socialist revolution might be possible, Lenin said, power must not be allowed to pass into the hands of the bourgeoisie at all. In other words, even in the bourgeois-democratic revolution the bourgeoisie must not be allowed to become the ruling class. Power must pass into the hands of the victorious workers and peasants who establish the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. As soon as the proletariat is strong enough, as soon as conditions are favorable, it proceeds to the next stage, to a socialist revolution. It establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We thus have in Lenin's conception two stages of the revolution: (1) the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, and, immediately following it, (2) the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Why the former? Because it is necessary to break the resistance of the landowners, the rich bourgeoisie and the Tsar's officialdom and for that you need an alliance with all the peasants. "Without the (revolutionary-democratic) dictatorship it is impossible to break this resistance, to repel the counter-revolutionary attempts."

"But of course this will be, not a socialist, but a democratic dictatorship. It will not be able to touch upon the foundations of capitalism (without a whole series of intermediary stages of revolutionary development). At best it will be able to introduce

a fundamental redivision of land property in favor of the peasantry, to carry through a consistent and full democratism up to and including a republic, to eradicate all Asiatic slave features not only from village life, but also from factory life, to make the beginning of an earnest improvement of the situation of the workers and of raising their standards of living, and, last but not least, to transfer the revolutionary conflagration to Europe. Such a victory will by no means make our bourgeois revolution a socialist revolution; the democratic overthrow will not immediately reach beyond the framework of bourgeois social-economic relations; nevertheless the significance of such a victory will be gigantic for the future development both of Russia and of the whole world. Nothing will so much arouse the revolutionary energy of the world proletariat, nothing will so much shorten the road that leads to its full victory as this decisive victory of the revolution that has begun in Russia." (V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Russian Edition, Vol. VIII, pp.62-63.)

Will there be a long interval between the first and the second stage of the revolution? Of course, delays are possible; defeats are sometimes unavoidable. At the time when the above lines were written (July, 1905) the outcome of the then developing revolution was far from certain. Lenin himself stressed the fact that he was "not inclined to senseless optimism on this score", that he realized "the tremendous difficulty of this task". However, he said, "we must wish for victory and know how to show the real way to it". This way, as pointed out by Lenin, was an immediate transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the socialist revolution.

"From the democratic revolution we will immediately begin, just in accordance with the measure of our strength, the strength of the conscious and organized proletariat, to pass over to the socialist revolution. We stand in favor of the permanent revolution (Our emphasis - M.J.O.). We shall not stop midway....Without lapsing into adventurism, without being unfaithful to our scientific conscience, without running after cheap popularity, we can and do say only one thing: We will, with all our power, help the entire peasantry to carry through the democratic revolution, in order that we, the Party of the proletariat, may be the easier enabled to pass, as quickly as possible, to a new, higher task - the socialist revolution." (V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Russian Edition, Vol. VIII, pp. 186-187.)

Help the entire peasantry carry through the democratic revolution! The meaning and content of the democratic revolution for the Bolsheviks consists in abolishing, in relation to the peasantry, all remnants of feudalism. Once this is accomplished, once power is in the hands of the proletariat and the peasantry as a whole, once the resistance of the formerly ruling classes has been broken, once the proletariat has, in the process of the revolution, grown stronger and better organized, the road is open to the socialist revolution. The road will be travelled by the proletariat in alliance, not with the peasantry as a whole, because the rich peasants will naturally be against the socialist revolution, but in alliance with the semi-proletarian elements of the

population.

Here is Lenin's classic formula:

"The proletariat must carry through, to the very end, the democratic revolution by attaching to itself the mass of the peasantry in order to crush by force the resistance of autocracy and to paralyze the instability of the bourgeoisie. The proletariat must accomplish the socialist revolution by attaching to itself the mass of the semi-proletarian elements of the population in order to crush by force the resistance of the bourgeoisie and to paralyze the instability of the petty bourgeoisie." (Lenin's emphasis) (V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Russian Edition, Vol. VIII, p. 96.)

We have dwelt at length on the Leninist theory of permanent revolution, because only on this basis is it possible to judge Trotsky's perversion of the theory of permanent revolution. The Trotsky thing is in substance a negation of the proletarian revolution. He clings to it, thinking that this is his own contribution to the science of revolution, but in reality it is a piece of Menshevism garbed in "revolutionary" phrases.

He stated his "theory" in the following way:

"The Russian proletariat, finding itself in possession of power - even if this were only a consequence of a temporary combination of forces in our bourgeois revolution - will meet with organized hostility on the part of world reaction, and with readiness for organized support on the part of the world proletariat. Left to its own forces, the working class of Russia will inevitably be crushed by the counter-revolution the moment the peasantry will turn away from it (Our italics - M.J.O.). Nothing will remain for it but to link up the fate of its political domination, and consequently the fate of the entire Russian revolution, with the fate of a socialist revolution in Europe. That colossal State political power which it gets from the temporary combination of forces in the Russian bourgeois revolution, the working class will thrust upon the scales of the class struggle of the entire capitalist world. With State power in its hands, with the counter-revolution behind its back, with the European reaction in front of it, it will issue to its brothers the world over the old battle-cry, which this time will be the battle-cry of the last attack, 'Workers of the world, unite!'" (L. Trotsky, Summing Up and Perspectives, 1906).

The style is dramatic, but the contents, defeatist. If one is to assume that the working class of Russia is alone, that it has no allies, then it cannot get into possession of State power at all. If one is to assume that by some miracle it has gained power but that European reaction is in front of it and nine-tenths of the population behind its back are hostile, then of what avail can be the battle-cry? Revolutions, even when conditions are ripe, take time to develop. The battle-cry of the

of the proletariat that is beset by enemies may not immediately arouse the workers of other countries. Moreover, a similar class situation prevails in some other countries as well. There, too, the peasantry forms a large part of the population. There, too, according to Trotsky, the workers must have the counter-revolution behind their back and the world reaction in front of them. A revolution, according to Trotsky, is an impossibility in a single country.

To take an example nearer to home. In the United States we have an industrial proletariat (in manufacturing, mining and transportation) which forms a large section but by no means the majority of the population. There are tens of millions of small and middle farmers, small traders, petty-bourgeois intellectuals - a huge part of the people. It follows from Trotsky's "original" idea that the workers could not have the support of these millions in a revolution against capitalism, that they would inevitably unite with the exploiters against the revolutionary proletariat. It follows that there could be no hope for a revolution under any circumstances.

The champion of what he calls "permanent revolution" champions permanent defeat.

The Bolsheviks knew that in Russia, as in any other capitalist country, the proletariat was the only consistently revolutionary class, and they worked to secure its hegemony in the revolution. Yet they also knew that the peasants were an inexhaustible reserve of revolutionary energy. And their estimate proved true. Leading the land-hungry peasants - in uniforms as soldiers or without uniforms as semi-serfs - was it possible for the proletariat to accomplish the February, 1917, revolution. Leading, not the peasantry as a whole, but the poorest peasants who were both against the capitalists of the cities and against the capitalists of the village, i.e., the rich peasants (kulaks), and with the middle peasantry neutralized, was it possible for the proletariat, with the Bolshevik Party as its vanguard and "All power to the Soviets" as its slogan, to accomplish the October, 1917, revolution which established the dictatorship of the proletariat. Leading the millions of the poorest peasants who willingly joined the Red Army to defend the conquests of the revolution, was it possible for the proletariat - with the Bolsheviks at its head - to win the civil war and secure the final victory of the revolution.

History has eloquently refuted Trotsky's "permanent revolution". Yet he never relinquished this stupid concept, which, by the way, is not even his own invention: it was first advanced by a Social-Democrat by the name of Parvus, who later turned violent social-patriot during the World War. Its basic idea that the peasantry as a whole is counter-revolutionary is a Menshevik conception.

Years pass. Revolutions come and go. First the 1905 revolution, then the period of counter-revolution, then the period of upswing, then the February revolution, then the October revolution. Huge masses of peasants are drawn into the revolution and give it that mass character which is requisite for victory. Collectivization of agriculture is introduced, the kulaks are liquidated as a class, the difference between middle and

and poor peasant disappears due to common membership in the collective farm. But our pessimist still holds fast to "his" idea of the peasantry being ultimately hostile to the revolution.

He learns nothing.

In 1909 he foresees a situation where the workers in power, once undertaking to introduce a number of socialist measures, would inevitably come into conflict with the peasants. "The conflict," he says, "must end either by the workers being chastised by the peasant party or by the latter being removed from power." (Article entitled, "Our Controversies", reprinted in his book, 1905, p. 285). It doesn't enter Trotsky's mind that the proletariat may introduce such measures as would elicit the support of the large masses of peasantry and thus ensure a united march toward socialism.

Again, in 1915, in the Paris paper, Nashe Slovo, he emphasizes the fact that one must not cherish "exaggerated hopes concerning its (the peasantry's) revolutionary role". (Ibid., p. 255.)

Again, in 1922, after five years of dictatorship of the proletariat so replete with the experiences of peasant masses supporting the revolution, he writes a preface to a collection of his articles which is published under the general title, 1905, in which he says:

"It was during the interval between January 9 and the general strike of October, 1905, that the views on the character of the revolutionary development of Russia, which came to be known as the theory of the 'permanent revolution', gradually crystalized in the author's mind. This somewhat complicated term represented a rather simple idea... The revolution would not be able to solve its immediate bourgeois problems except by placing the proletariat in power. And the latter, upon assuming power, would not be able to limit itself to the bourgeois framework of the revolution. On the contrary, precisely in order to secure its victory, the proletarian vanguard would be forced in the very early stages of its rule to make deep inroads not only into feudal property but into capitalist property as well. In this the proletariat will come into hostile collision, not only with the bourgeois groupings which supported the proletariat during the first stages of revolutionary struggle, but also with the broad masses of the peasants who were instrumental in bringing it into power. The contradictions in the situation of the workers' government in a backward country with an overwhelming majority of peasants can be solved only on an international scale, on the arena of the world proletarian revolution." (L. Trotsky, 1905, Preface.)

Trotsky still clings to his "simple" idea to this very day. This idea has made Trotskyism the vanguard of counter-revolution. Need one argue against it? The lessons of history are clear enough. Not only would the conquest of power and the repulsion of the capitalists and landlords have been impossible for the proletariat of Russia without the aid of millions and millions of peasants, but the upbuilding of socialism would

not have been possible either. Socialism, said Stalin, is not something peculiar to the towns alone. Socialism is an organization of economic life that can be established only by cooperation of industry and agriculture on the basis of socializing the means of production. Socialism is impossible without union between industry and agriculture. Agriculture means not only land and implements, but, in the first place, peasants, living millions of peasants.

When the proletariat under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party expropriated the manufacturers and bankers in the early stages of the socialist revolution in Russia, who was it that formed its armed force? The Red Army in which the peasants formed a large part. When the rebellions of the kulaks against the Soviet power on the Volga and in many other districts of Russia had to be quelled in 1918-1920, who did it? The same Red Army in which the poor and middle peasants were numerically strong. When the proletariat began to "dekulakize" the rich peasants with the introduction of collectivization in the villages, who was its main support and who were its allies? Its main support were the poorest peasants in whose interests it was to carry out such expropriation. Its allies were the middle peasants. Suppose there were an attack upon the Soviet Union - who would be in the first ranks of defense? The Red Army, which consists of workers and collective farmers.

What is there to the Trotsky "peculiarity" of the permanent revolution? It is an exploded idea. It is counter-revolution of a "peculiar" kind. It is in contradiction to widely known and undisputed facts. It is in contradiction to Lenin's understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat (says Lenin) is a special form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the toilers, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of the toilers (the petty bourgeoisie, the small craftsmen, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc.), or the majority of these; it is an alliance against capital, an alliance aiming at the complete overthrow of capital, at the complete suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie and of any attempts, on their part, at restoration, an alliance aiming at the final establishment and consolidation of socialism." (V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Russian Edition, Vo. XXIV, p. 311.)

Trotsky's theory sounds "revolutionary" only to the uninformed. It implies that the share-croppers of the South in the U.S.A. will turn against the workers the moment they begin, after the seizure of power, to take away the mines and mills from the capitalists of, say, Alabama; that the tenant farmers of the Middle West will join the armies of Morgan and Ford to fight the taking over by the workers of the automobile plants, railroads and banks; that the large mass of the small citizenry of New York will turn against the workers introducing socialist measures in this world metropolis. This is what the blind fail to notice in Trotsky's "variety of Menshevism", as it was called by Stalin.

* * *

Trotsky does not stop at this "peculiarity", however. This is only his base, his starting point. He draws from it "peculiar" conclusions, each more fantastic than the other. What follows from a wrong premise is a number of counter-revolutionary conclusions which make up the main features of Trotskyism:

1. The basis is: The impossibility of socialism in one country;
2. Hence - the assertion that what is going on in the Soviet Union is not socialism;
3. Hence - the conclusion that what is being built in Russia is "national socialism";
4. Hence - the conclusion that the "national-socialist" government of the Soviet Union is "Thermidorian", i.e., counter-revolutionary, and stands in the way of the world revolution;
5. Hence - the assertion that the Communist International, which is dominated by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which is the party of "national socialism", is blocking the way of the world revolution;
6. Hence - the conclusion that the crying need of the world proletariat is to build a "fourth international" to be led by the "great strategist" of the revolution, Leon Trotsky.
7. It follows from the above that support of intervention and the killing of Soviet leaders are revolutionary acts.

As you see, there is logic in these ravings. They all follow with iron-clad necessity from the fountainhead of the Trotskyite denial of socialism in a single country. That they do not happen to tally with historic facts is not the Trotskyites' fault.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE RIGHT DEVIATION

Comrade Kim Il Sung, the vigorous and class conscious Marxist-Leninist Leader and Premier of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea), has repeatedly done the utmost possible in his victorious socialist country "...for the development, support and awakening of the revolution 'in all countries.'" (1) Comrade Kim Il Sung has been waging a principled struggle in defense of the socialist camp and international communist movement on the one hand and against the subversive activities and schemes of the USNA imperialists, international bourgeoisie and all forces of reaction on the other. In conjunction with his internationalist duty, Comrade Kim Il Sung has continuously been waging a relentless struggle against the splitting activities of the Right and "Left" opportunists by again upholding the unity of the socialist camp and the cohesion of the international communist movement. Comrade Kim Il Sung has stated,

"The socialist camp and the international communist movement are decisive factors in the development of the history of mankind at the present time. They are the greatest revolutionary forces of our times, standing face to face with imperialism and the forces of reaction. The existence of a united and powerful socialist camp and international communist movement checks the imperialist policy of aggression and war and inspires the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of the whole world." (2)

The Communist League's position on the current principal contradiction in the world today is that it is between the imperialist camp and the colonies; therefore, as the National Liberation struggles continue to expand in the colonies, the areas under imperialist domination continue to contract, thereby putting the imperialists and especially the USNA imperialists in a very difficult position, forcing them to turn inward against their own proletariat in an attempt to put the burden of the crisis on its back. As these areas continue to contract, the oppression of areas under imperialist domination is intensified, thus giving rise to new National Liberation struggles in which the imperialists have reached such a stage in this present epoch that they are compelled to turn on one another in an attempt to redivide an already divided world in which the only possible division is to take one another's colonial possessions through another world war. This is the vicious circle from which the imperialists cannot escape.

Because of the indomitable resistance of the world's peoples, primarily the Vietnamese in their National Liberation struggle against USNA imperialism, and because of the growing strength of the other imperialists, USNA imperialism has been trying also to shift the responsibility and crisis of the war in Indochina onto the backs of other imperialists, and particularly Japan, thus causing splits in the imperialist camp and forcing realignments unfavorable to US imperialism such as the one between Japanese imperialism and Soviet imperialism, which has forced USNA imperialism to seek temporary refuge with the People's Republic of China. Comrade V. I. Lenin described this motion when he said,

"The current international situation is such that some sort of a temporary, unstable equilibrium, but equilibrium for all that, has been established; it is the kind of equilibrium under which the imperialist powers have been compelled to abandon their desire to hurl themselves at Soviet Russia, despite their hatred of her, because the disintegration of the capitalist world is steadily progressing, unity is steadily diminishing, while the onslaught of the forces of the oppressed colonies, which have a population of over a thousand million, is increasing from year to year, month to month, and even week to week." (3)

Recognizing that USNA imperialism has changed its form but not its fascist, aggressive, plundering content, the Communist League in its People's Tribune has made this observation clear by stating,

"The Communist League ardently supports the Communist Party of China in utilizing the policy of peaceful coexistence between the People's Republic of China and the USNA imperialists at this time. We know the Chinese will use this period of peaceful coexistence to strengthen in every possible way the socialist countries and their allies. We, inside the imperialist countries must also use this period to strengthen and consolidate our forces to prepare for the inevitable turning of peace into war and bourgeois democracy into fascism." (4)

Recognizing the political subterfuge of USNA imperialism both internationally and nationally, we comrades in the Detroit area have been and are continuing to counter the petty-bourgeois tendencies of Right and "Left" opportunism that have historically been perpetrated by the Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA) as agents of the USNA monopoly capitalist class and the revisionist Soviet social-imperialists in the Detroit area. In order to defend the socialist camp and the international communist movement of which we are members, we must in "this period strengthen and consolidate our forces" by taking a principled stand against these spontaneous deviations of Right and "Left" opportunism within our ranks, the effects of which are to weaken us in the face of the USNA monopoly capitalist class and all forces of reaction. The CPUSA with its reformist and syndicalist policies has kept the industrial proletariat in this area - especially the Negro national minority proletariat - in a state of chaotic, spontaneous confusion. Reformism has landed the area in a lull, thus making the principal aspect of our spontaneity the Right opportunist deviation. Comrade Mao Tse-tung in his famous essay "On Practice" generally describes both aspects of opportunism when he states,

"It often happens, however, that thinking lags behind reality; this is because man's cognition is limited by numerous social conditions. We are opposed to die-hards in the revolutionary ranks whose thinking fails to advance with changing objective circumstances and has manifested itself historically as Right opportunism. These people fail to see that the struggle of opposites has already pushed the objective process forward while their knowledge has stopped at the old stage. This is characteristic of the thinking of all die-hards. Their thinking is divorced from social practice, and they cannot march ahead to guide the chariot of society; they simply trail behind grumbling that it goes too fast and trying to drag it back or turn it in the opposite direction." (5)

History in the Detroit area has been infested by two illusory opportunist opposites. First, during the "Ultra-Left" syndicalist upsurge in the area, revolutionary illusions ran rampant. But the moment these upsurges subsided a lull set in, giving the workers the spontaneously opposite illusion that reformism was the solution to their repulsive industrial work. The reformism during this lull was buttressed by a class-collaborationist financial economic assistance large enough to deaden any syndicalist strikes and by a political ideology of bourgeois racism denying the class struggle and the Negro national colonial question. All of these economic and political "gifts" were "graciously" bestowed upon the active Negro national minority industrial proletariat by the CPUSA in the Detroit area with the understanding that this assistance was being done for those who were "organizing only black workers." Of course, the economic control of this financial "gift" and the political

education on racism was all in the hands of the CPUSA's politically controlled Negro national minority petty-bourgeois intellectuals such as lawyers, teachers, students, members of the labor aristocracy and skilled tradesmen. A Reformist organization was established by the CPUSA to co-opt all organizational activities of the Negro national minority industrial proletariat; it denied the use of Communism, but accepted the fascist and white chauvinist non-reformist organizational institution based on the bourgeois tool, racism. The results of such a populist reformist policy had reinforced a heavy class-collaborationist tendency between the counter-revolutionary "ultra-leftist" Negro national minority petty-bourgeois leadership who had done all the leading and thinking, and the Negro national minority industrial proletariat who had literally been doing all the fighting, getting hit upside the head, going to jail, getting fired and dying. The corrupt and opportunist leadership of these petty-bourgeois elements is clearly understood by the Communist League in its historic work The Negro National Colonial Question:

"There can be no doubt that under the hegemony of the Negro workers the whole movement will leap forward. The imperialists know this better than we do. This is the reason that they will pay any price to keep the movement in the hands of non-violent elements - that is, in the hands of the compromised syndicalist populist Communist Party of the United States of America and their assistants." (6)

These non-violent elements and agents of the CPUSA had used the organization mentioned above and similar organizations as fund raisers to support trade union organizing activities of only Negro national minority proletarians, as well as women's cooperatives, support of independent slates for parliamentary parties (constantly leading to parliamentary struggles on community issues), as the decisive weapon against fascist oppression of the Negro people. Obviously, these customary methods of struggle against components of the USNA monopoly capitalist class such as General Motors (GM) and the United Auto Workers (UAW) had proven to be totally inadequate. As a natural result, the death blow was being struck against the militant industrial Negro national minority proletariat by the "petty bourgeois, compromised syndicalist populist CPUSA and their assistants." This type of death blow by the counter-revolutionary CPUSA revisionists and their agents supporting "moribund capitalism" was understood and stated explicitly in Comrade J. V. Stalin's classic work Foundations of Leninism:

"Lenin called imperialism 'moribund capitalism.' Why? Because imperialism carries the contradictions of capitalism to their last bounds, to the extreme limit, beyond which revolution begins.... 'The first contradiction' is the contradiction between labor and capital. Imperialism is the omnipotence of the monopoly trusts and syndicates, of the banks and the financial oligarchy in industrial countries. In the fight against this omnipotence, the customary methods of the working class trade unions and co-operatives, parliamentary parties and the parliamentary struggle have proved to be totally inadequate. Either place yourself at the mercy of capital, eke out a wretched existence as of old and sink lower and lower, or adopt a new weapon - this is the alternative imperialism puts before the vast masses of the proletariat. Imperialism brings the working class to revolution." (7)

Workers unemployed from syndicalist strikes, financially dependent upon opportunist petty-bourgeois non-violent leadership of CPUSA agents, sinking lower into organizational chaos of ultra-democracy, without the weapon of criticism and self-criticism to use against the opportunist leadership, which

was constantly making commandist demands on the workers, forcing them against their will or before their level of knowledge had been reached concerning certain actions to be taken, constantly striking poses in order to intimidate people, and constantly having the attitude of considering the workers backward - all this inevitably led this class-collaborationist merry-go-round between the revolutionary Negro national minority industrial proletariat and the opportunist, petty-bourgeois, compromised syndicalist populist CPUSA and their assistants to a needed split.

Thus, at this time, without a clear and decisive leadership, the workers were thrown into ideological confusion, organizational chaos and political vacillation,

The opposition to this dissolute state of affairs was put forth by Marxism-Leninism Mao Tsetung's Thought as embodied in the People's Tribune, the political paper of the Communist League, and in the League cadre. There was waged an ideological, political, organizational and theoretical "forced march" struggle to clarify positions of the Communist League embodied in such articles as "Racism, Tool of the Ruling Class," "Struggle against White Chauvinism," "Build a Revolutionary Press, Build a Communist Party," "Dialectics of the Development of the Communist League," and "Syndicalism Disarms the Proletariat." (8) These, along with the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course, set the subjective basis for "consolidating" this ideological unity in the material unity of the organization of the proletariat, which is democratic centralism. At this point, having united the People's Tribune with the objective class struggle of the Negro national minority industrial proletariat, the workers we mentioned above then became members of the Communist League. How correct the CL's position of the Negro National Colonial Question is when we say that there can be no doubt that under the hegemony of the Negro workers the whole movement will leap forward, is plain. The imperialists know this better than we do. Because of the heavy class-collaborationist attitudes pushed by the previous opportunist petty-bourgeois leadership in the Detroit area and their policy of unprincipled peace, non-struggle and the arrogant snobbishness of considering the workers backward, the workers had developed an attitude in opposition to active ideological struggle in general and in opposition to criticism and self-criticism against the leadership, old acquaintances, close friends, loved ones and old subordinates in particular. The principal aspect of this right opportunist "all unity and no struggle" contradiction is refusal to criticize class-collaborationist leadership and friends. Comrade J. V. Stalin in 1926 spoke to this type of situation and its solution:

"It seems to me that in the matter of the inner-party ideological struggle, Hansen is preaching a sort of parson's morality, one entirely unbecoming a Communist Party. Apparently, he is not opposed to an ideological struggle. But he would like to conduct it in such a way as not to discredit any of the opposition leaders. I must say that no such struggle ever happens. I must say that one who is prepared to tolerate a struggle only provided that none of the leaders is in any way compromised, denies the possibility of waging any kind of struggle within the Party. Ought we to disclose mistakes committed by party leaders? Ought we to bring those mistakes to light so as to educate the party masses on the basis of the mistakes of the leaders? I think we ought to do so. I think there is no other way of correcting mistakes. I think the method of slurring over mistakes is not our method. But it follows from this that there can be no inner-party struggle and correction of mistakes without some leader or other being in some way compromised. That may be sad, but nothing can be done about it, because we are powerless against the inevitable." (9)

So, how should the struggle against the right danger be waged? It should be waged like all struggles should be waged against erroneous tendencies in the CL, as Comrade Mao has instructed us to wage them: "Always and everywhere we should adhere to principle and wage a tireless struggle against all incorrect ideas and actions so as to consolidate the collective life of the CL and strengthen ties between leadership and the masses." But there are those in our area who have a different position on ideological struggle. They do not understand or forget that opposition and views of different kinds in the CL are a reflection of the class struggle in society within the CL. They do not recognize that all feelings and thoughts are determined by objective reality and are independent of man's will. They do not recognize that as long as classes, class contradictions and class struggle exist, and the bourgeoisie and its poisonous influence exist in society, it is inevitable that all types of ideological disease will constantly creep into the CL, especially in the Detroit area. They don't recognize this objective law of development, and not subjectively studying it, they refuse criticism and self-criticism, they refuse active ideological struggle. Therefore, not adhering to principles of Marxism-Leninism Mao Tsetung's Thought, always and everywhere, they deny themselves the only way to learn from our mistakes and grow.

Since everything divides into two, it should be understandable that the USNA monopoly capitalist class is much stronger than we are at this time. Since we are weaker, but growing stronger, our growth in general will be gradual growth; therefore, our struggle to defeat the USNA imperialists will be protracted. But some of our comrades, though giving lip service to the protractedness of our struggle, ideologically wish that its acuteness and complicatedness would be shorter and that everything would be plain sailing, or "All unity and no struggle."

In Peking Review #52, 1971, it was stated that such comrades, who lack the revolutionary attitude of carrying the revolution through to the end, "Very often they find themselves mentally unprepared when confronted with bad things, and when a bad thing has actually happened, they find it rather hard to understand and are sometimes even full of undue anxieties. All these do not conform to dialectics of the development of history." (10) Obviously, these people actually fail to see that, as Comrade Mao says, the struggle of opposites has already pushed the objective process forward while their thinking has stopped at the old stage. Our comrades in the Detroit area as far as active ideological struggle towards the leadership and friends is concerned have historically shown themselves in the CL to be under the influence of the class-collaborationist disease of right opportunism.

As we mentioned earlier, there are in the Detroit area enemies of the Negro national minority industrial proletariat; highly bribed petty-bourgeois intelligentsia "left" opportunists who have used the form of Left phrases to cover up their counter-revolutionary Right opportunist content. They were and still are in the direct pay of the CPUSA; therefore, they are agents of the USNA monopoly capitalist class.

The Negro national minority industrial proletariat was heavily influenced by the "ultra-left" (phrase-mongering of these petty-bourgeois intellectuals) and the workers were quickly led onto the road of counter-revolution. Comrade Mao Tsetung has described this second aspect of petty-bourgeois opportunism bent on phrase-mongering when he says,

"We are also opposed to 'Left' phrase-mongering. The thinking of 'Leftists' outstrips a given stage of development of the objective process. Some regard their fantasies as truth, while others strain to realize in the present an ideal which can only be realized in the future. They alienate themselves from the current practice of the majority of people and the realities of the

They both also weaken the proletariat in the face of the onslaught of the imperialist - 52 -

"Left" & "Right" SAME IN CONTENT DIFFERS IN FORM
Crickets
Both have in common Left & Right

Trotskyist
counter-
revolution
in disguise
Chresty
of Trotskyism
M. J. D. J.

day, and show themselves adventurist in their actions." (11)

Being the opportunists they were, these assistants of the CPUSA could not lead, but had to be led by the revolution. Therefore they took the road of counter-revolution and developed a very insecure conceit towards the workers to cover up their lack of revolutionary thoroughness. Comrade V. I. Lenin has said that these opportunists falsely accuse revolutionaries of being opportunist by considering the workers backward and incapable of managing their own affairs, and living under the fantasy that they are the "only" and the "real" revolutionaries. With such an aprioristic point of view, denying the objective truth that the vanguard class is the proletariat, this petty-bourgeois ilk refused the Leninist method of self-criticism, practiced slurring over shortcomings and covering up vexed questions from the workers. All this made this petty-bourgeois cabal extremely difficult to get along with. In fact, this petty-bourgeois cabal felt that they were above criticism. In fact, they denied the objective class struggle by calling for a Black Marxist-Leninist Party to be the vanguard of the proletarian socialist revolution in the USNA with themselves at the head. Likewise they denied the existence of the Negro Nation. Their "ultra-left" opportunist line of, at one time, going it alone without any other nationalities but Negroes, and at another time going it only with the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, displayed their vacillating and opportunist nature which denies any revolution at all. These phrase-mongering petty-bourgeois intellectuals actually hated the workers, as history has subsequently shown. Although they advocated revolution, they were actually afraid of it and of the militant industrial Negro national minority proletariat which is an integral part of the Anglo-American working class and a key link to the Negro Nation.

Obviously, wherever there is a Right deviation there is also a "Left" deviation. The "ultra-lefts" duped the Negro national minority industrial proletariat with "left" opportunist "revolutionary" phrase-mongering which led these workers' revolutionary aspirations into reformist politics of the bourgeoisie which supported these petty-bourgeois agents' counter-revolutionary aspirations of becoming bourgeois politicians working for the CPUSA. The inevitable split between these two classes left the Negro national minority industrial proletarians influenced by the Right deviation of denying the class struggle, and they began to practice class collaboration with the CPUSA. The Intermediates between the two opportunist deviations, both coming from the CPUSA and their assistants and both serving to weaken us before the onslaught of the USNA monopoly capitalist class, stand basically on the side of the CL's influence in the Detroit area. Although this "Left" influence exists in the CL area in Detroit and constitutes the non-principal aspect of our contradiction, the Right deviation of class collaboration with the former leadership and friends constitutes the principal aspect of our contradiction at the present time, and it is diminishing. Comrade J. V. Stalin has "commanded" us to solve this immediate task in the CL by stating about such a situation:

"The immediate task is, while combatting "ultra-left" deviations, resolutely to combat the danger from the Right with the aim of altogether isolating and completely eliminating the Rights. To unite all the genuine revolutionary elements in the Party for the purpose of completely eliminating the Right groups - such is the Party's task, such is the way out of the crisis. Unless this is done it is useless even to think of Bolshevizing the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

"That, of course, does not mean that all the Rights must necessarily be

expelled. Expulsion is not the decisive weapon in the struggle against the Rights. The main thing is to give the Right groups a drubbing, ideologically and morally, in the course of a struggle based on principle and to draw the mass of the Party membership into the struggle. That is one of the chief and most important means of educating the Party in the spirit of Bolshevism. Expulsion must come, if it is really necessary, as a natural result of the ideological rout of the enemy." (12)

Threats of splits were repeatedly prevalent because of the constant refusals to engage in active ideological struggle regarding criticism or self-criticism of the former rank and file and leadership. Tirades of striking a pose in order to intimidate the new CL leadership in the Detroit area, and refusal to accept the new democratic centralist organizational discipline because of the previous liberal and ultra-democratic syndicalist chaos, brought forth desperate stands of maintaining the denial of the ideological struggle in order to preserve the Right opportunist deviation of class collaboration and to deny the class struggle which is so essential to the building of a Bolshevized party and to the making of a revolution in the USNA.

These threats of splits and the striking of poses in order to intimidate people did not succeed. As one of the Comrades recognized when attacks of these sorts were launched against the CL leadership, they were meant to frighten the CL leadership and prevent active ideological struggle. This comrade recognized that the CL leadership was a seasoned leadership and that threats of a split could not frighten it. In fact, a statement concerning the leadership's active ideological struggle against the class collaborationist Right deviation against criticism and self-criticism was made by one of the CL comrades to the effect, "You are a communist aren't you?"* Our position in the Communist League is that if these intimidators are opposed to making revolution in this country and if they insist on passing from threats to action, the CL leadership in the Detroit area assures them that they and they alone will suffer.

To sum up, The CL leadership understands that the chief danger at present comes from the Right. The only way to defeat it is to wage an active ideological struggle of a determined and uncompromising nature, always and everywhere adhering to principle. In this way, by uniting all of the revolutionary forces in the CL area in Detroit, by grounding ourselves in the membership in the area, by winning over the relatively active revolutionary forces, by relying on them to win over the intermediate forces and by raising their consciousness to the nature of the struggle in order to unite them to isolate the Right deviators and eventually to win them over to the line of the CL leadership by active ideological struggle - in this way and in only this way the CL leadership in the Detroit area will be victorious over the Right danger of class collaborationism with the former leadership and friends.

The lull we are in has its positive side in terms of our task of party building, and we must and are taking advantage of it. As Comrade J. V. Stalin said:

"Advantage must be taken of the lull to strengthen the Party, to Bolshevize it and make it 'always ready for all possible complications;' for 'we know neither the day nor the hour' wherein 'the bridegroom cometh' to open the road for a new revolutionary upsurge." (13)

DOWN WITH RIGHT AND "LEFT" OPPORTUNISM!
DOWN WITH MODERN REVISIONISM!
DOWN WITH SOVIET REVISIONISM!

DOWN WITH THE CPUSA!
BUILD A REVOLUTIONARY PRESS! BUILD A COMMUNIST PARTY!
DOWN WITH THE US MONOPOLY CAPITALIST CLASS OF NORTH AMERICA!
FREE THE NEGRO NATION AND PUERTO RICO!
REGIONAL AUTONOMY FOR THE SOUTHWEST!

B. W.
for the Detroit Area

* "You are a communist aren't you?" This comrade's reference was to his immediate but now overcome ideological shortcomings at the time. He was basically saying to me to be strong, fear no sacrifice and surmount every difficulty to win victory. Or in times of difficulty, we must not lose sight of our achievements, se must see the bright future and we must pluck up our courage as Mao Tsetung has stated.

- Footnote by the CL leadership in Detroit

FOOTNOTES

1. V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, Progress Publishers, Moscow, vol 23, p 385
2. Kim Il Sung, "For Unity: Against Division," from Kim Il Sung - a Political Biography - III, Guardian Books, New York, 1970, p 590
3. Lenin, "Speech in Closing the Conference, May 28, Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (B)," Collected Works, vol 32, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, p 436
4. People's Tribune, "Chinese Meet Nixon - Why?" Vol 4, no 3, p 10
5. Mao Tsetung, "On Practice," FLP Peking, 1966, p 17
6. Negro National Colonial Question (Communist League), First Edition, 1972, p 38
7. J. V. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, Ch 1, "The Historical Roots of Leninism," FLP Peking, 1970, p 4 no 1,
8. People's Tribune, articles in this order: Vol 1, /p 1, 1969; Vol 3, no 6, p 9, 1971; Vol 3, no 9, p 11, 1971; Internal document, 1972; Vol 3, no 10, p 1, 1971
9. J. V. Stalin, "The Fight Against Right and 'Ultra-Left' Deviations - Two Speeches Delivered at a Meeting of the Presidium of the ECCI, January 22, 1926," Ch II, pp 5-6, FLPH, Moscow, 1954
10. Peking Review, #52, Dec 24, 1971, p 6
11. Op. cit., "On Practice," p 18
12. J. V. Stalin, Works, Vol 7, 1925, FLPH, Moscow, 1954, p 66

EXPOSE PHONY POPULISM AS FASCISM IN DISGUISE!

In March 1971 there appeared in the People's Tribune (volume 3, number 3) an article entitled "American Populism: Fascism in Disguise." We pointed out that the USNA imperialists and their flunkys were coming forth with a new political line with which they hoped to appeal to the increasingly dissatisfied and rebellious working class and other oppressed strata within the USNA state. The new line boiled down to, "Soak the rich." Of course, demagogues like George Wallace were even then old hands at championing the rights of "the little guy" (if he's Anglo) against "the rich." But the corporation lawyer Nixon calling for "a new American revolution," as he did in the 1971 State of the Union message? This was something rather new.

Since then the thing has developed. Even the long-obscure term we used in the article, "populism," has been resurrected by the bourgeoisie. One example. Senator Fred Harris (Oklahoma), in an article called "The Real Populism Fights Unequal Wealth," ends by asking the question, "Will we permit the encroachment of the powerful few upon the rights of the many?" The new populism's answer is no." (1)

As Marxist-Leninists we are not too inspired by Harris's or George McGovern's new populism, which echoes a political movement which was hopelessly compromised and discredited 70 years ago. Nor does the big USNA imperialist bourgeoisie seem to fear the "soak the rich" "power to the people" line. For example, from an article in the New York Times called "No Radical Economics via McGovern":

"The economist for a major American business group and the head of a big mutual fund organization said at an international gathering today that they did not see radical economic changes in store for the US if Senator George McGovern was elected president.

"But the economist, Albert T. Sommers of the Conference Board, asserted that the business community would be 'more comfortable' and the stock market would perform better if President Nixon were re-elected.

"Both Howard Stein, chairman of the Dreyfus Corporation, and Mr. Sommers, responding to questions on the financial outlook at a meeting sponsored by the Conference Board, explained that views of presidential candidates tended to moderate after they won elections." (2)

Even before this, McGovern, on May 22, had attempted to make the imperialists feel more "comfortable" with him by running a "full page ad in the Wall Street Journal to explain to businessmen what his tax proposals" (supposedly higher taxes on corporations and wealthy individuals) "would not mean." (3)

That there still may be doubt among businessmen as to McGovern's politics and economics we can only attribute to the hide-bound stupidity of certain particularly philistine sections of the bourgeoisie. We are far more interested in the more intelligent (and dangerous) imperialists who are using the "new populism" for their own purposes, to attack the working class. In order to understand why they are using the "anti-richman" line in such a heavy way at the present time we must understand where we are now at historically. In addition, in order to expose the populist line and understand how to fight it in a really mass way (an increasingly important task for communists), we must have an understanding of the social motion of populism, including its historical development. To do this properly we have to go back to Lenin. As far as we know USNA populism has never been examined from a Marxist-Leninist angle, except by the Communist League, and our work till now has necessarily been only skeletal. In the history of the working-

class movement in this country only the Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA) was ever in a position even to attempt to analyze populism, but it was so bogged down in the subjective, petty-bourgeois swamp of populism itself that its feeble efforts came to nothing. The stock CPUSA document on the subject, Anna Rochester's The Populist Movement in the USA (1943), is a piece of hack journalism that reads like a bourgeois highschool textbook. Anna Rochester does not make the slightest attempt to analyze what the Populist movement was and what it became except that it was mainly farmers against monopolies. This failure is not accidental. Had the Party honestly shown the class-base and social motion of populism it would have had to expose itself (with its American exceptionalism, its anti-monopoly coalition, etc) as populist. But we will get into that later. For now we will merely say that this paper is an attempt to develop and deepen our comrades' and friends' understanding of the extremely important question of populism, and of how the bourgeoisie and their "working-class" flunkies, the CPUSA revisionists, are using it to try and disrupt and destroy the arising and developing revolutionary working class movement in the USNA.

THE CURRENT RISE OF POPULISM

There is a growing crisis inside the USNA. This crisis is being brought on by the economic contradictions of capitalism in general, and the growing revolutionary movement in the colonies and semi-colonies and the growing contradictions among the imperialist countries in particular. The crisis is just beginning to mean for the vast majority of the people in the USNA a great impoverishment and lowering of living standards. The fascist wage-price (really just wage) freeze, high unemployment, rising prices, the devaluation of the dollar, the gold crisis - these are just some of the ways in which the growing crisis is manifesting itself. In order for the USNA imperialists to continue making maximum profits they must shift the burden of the growing difficulties more and more onto the backs of the working class. The reaction to the impoverishment and fascist attacks has been spontaneous fightbacks by many strata of the working class, which are resisting the best they can but which at the same time lack genuine revolutionary leadership, that is, a real Marxist-Leninist communist party. The present "leaders" of the working class are selling it out.

The class is more and more rejecting the present structure and demanding changes which will guarantee concrete, palpable results. Seeing the growing social consciousness of the masses, that is, their growing awareness that the rich are getting richer because the poor are getting poorer, the USNA imperialists are putting forth their so-called "third alternative" - one that is neither for the present rich, monopoly capitalists, the imperialists, nor for (supposedly even worse) the communists. This third alternative promises "the people" a new way of life, one where "the people," the majority, rule and obtain the things they need through a fairer distribution of the wealth and a return to them of the "power" which they once had but which has been "usurped" (as McGovern said in a speech on July 7, 1972). This third alternative is phony populism. Its purpose is to oppose the class struggle and replace it by a phony "popular" movement whose real aim is not to reform the system but to pave the way for fascism.

Populism has many forms and appearances. Wallace is a populist par excellence. He champions the "little guy" versus the rich, snobbish, Wall Street bankers, etc. McGovern uses populism with his tax reform programs, guaranteed annual income for every individual, etc. Nader's "consumerism" is populist, as are all the slogans that set "the poor against the rich," that call for "a People's Party," "all power to the people," and so on and so forth. Populism does away with classes and instead matches the "poor" ("the people" - workers, lumpens, petty-bourgeois and even some bigger bourgeois) against the "rich" "usurpers." Why does the imperialist bourgeoisie dig populism?

We can see why if we remember that fascism can't and doesn't come to power by openly calling for "the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinist and most imperialist elements of finance capital. (4) On the contrary, fascism must appear to be what it isn't, it must appear as its very opposite, as a mass movement of and in behalf of the vast majority. "What is the source of the influence of fascism on certain sections of the masses? Fascism is able to attract the masses because it demagogically appeals to their most urgent needs and demands." (5) It is precisely upon these most urgent needs and demands of the working class that the appeal of the present populist movement in all its aspects rests. Populists such as Wallace and McGovern come from the right politically, but use left-sounding slogans to get support. It is these left-sounding slogans, the increasingly revolutionary (or really pseudo-revolutionary) rhetoric, the militant popular demagogy that set the populist apart from the ordinary bourgeois liberal. There is no difference in class stand. The extreme ease with which an ordinary liberal like Teddy Kennedy can ask (as he did a year or so ago) the populist question, "Why should a poor man fight a rich man's war?" and appeal to the masses in a populist way illustrates this. In fact, the increasing use of populist rhetoric by liberals and straightforward reactionaries alike (Nixon's "new American Revolution", etc) shows that populism is really on the rise. The imperialists understand perfectly well the growing social consciousness of the masses due to the decay of imperialism, and are consciously trying to cover up the class struggle with vagueness and confusion and hence to keep the working class under the leadership of bourgeois politicians and other demagogues. The imperialists do not mind being hated by the masses, but they do mind being overthrown and replaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat. Hence the third alternative, which tells us we can turn back the wheel of history to a time of "free enterprise" and petty production when "anybody could strike it rich" - or at least to a more recent time when USNA imperialism held greater sway in the world and the working class was more heavily bribed.

"This dream of a third alternative is in fact illusory. On the one side, it is the echo of the conceptions of the past period, of the period of liberal capitalism, which was already perishing with the advent of imperialism and which cannot be revived when the conditions that gave rise to it have passed away, in the stage of the extreme decay of capitalism and of the extreme intensification of the class struggle." (6)

The imperialists peddle the third alternative on the grounds that under capitalism (even in this period of extreme decay) "the people" really have strength and power if we decide to use it. Or else if we take the power we used to have back from the "usurpers" (McGovern, et al), "the powerful few" who are "encroaching on the rights of the many." What tool do the people have for doing this? The democratically constructed system of government - the state. The rotten CPUSA says exactly the same things as the outspoken anti-communist populists, mainly on the theme of our regaining freedom, rights, etc, from the usurpers. Charlene Mitchell, talking about the freeing of Angela Davis, informs us that "Angela's freedom is directly linked to our ability to restore basic fundamental democratic rights." (7) What rights she is talking about "restoring," and when did we have them in the first place, remain the CPUSA's secret. Similarly, thirty years ago, Anna Rochester was telling us that "Populism sought to overthrow the 'invisible government' by monopoly and finance and to recapture (?) for the masses of people - workers, farmers, small producers, small businessmen and professionals - the control of the government." (8) Rochester and the CPUSA "forget" of course that the USNA was founded on capitalism (and on a very brutal form of capitalism, capitalist slavery, to boot) and that to talk about the masses ever having had "control of the government" (which they must have if they are going to recapture

it) is to prove oneself either a fool or a knave. The revisionists are both. Their line of recapturing and restoring completely jibes with their third-grade textbook historical outlook on their supraclass heroes like Jefferson, Franklin, Lincoln, Douglass, etc etc - not bourgeois, according to the Party, but "democrats" - in the abstract - leaders of "the masses of people" when they had "control of the government."

We can easily see that Spiro Agnew was wrong when he said that the liberals were tailing behind the Communist Party USA. On the contrary, it is the CP which is tailing behind the liberals - and populists.

Lenin, speaking of the Russian populists, the Narodniks, makes short work of their line on the power of the masses in capitalist society: He says they talk

"...as though strength were already on the side of the working people and their ideologists, and all that remained was to indicate the 'immediate,' the 'expedient,' etc, methods of using this strength.

"This is a sickening lie from beginning to end." (9)

At the present time, what lies behind this lie and its tellers is fascism.

"The characteristic feature of fascism is that, as a consequence of the shock suffered by the capitalist economic system and of special objective and subjective conditions, the bourgeoisie - in order to hinder the development of the revolution - utilizes the discontent of the petty and middle, urban and rural bourgeoisie and even certain sections of the declassed proletariat, for the purpose of creating a reactionary mass movement."
"In periods of acute crisis for the bourgeoisie, fascism resorts to anti-capitalist phraseology, but after it has established itself at the helm of the state, it casts aside its anti-capitalist rattle, and discloses itself as a terrorist dictatorship of big capital." (10)

But this is not the end. The fascists must then attempt to stabilize their rule by fulfilling their promises to at least certain strata of the working class and other groupings from which they must get support to survive the revolutionary onslaught of the vast majority. Comprador fascist regimes such as in South Vietnam, Spain, South Africa, Brazil etc can survive only as long as the USNA imperialists pay the bills. But who will pay the USNA fascists' bills except the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies and the most exploited and oppressed workers within the Anglo-American nation itself? In other words, the USNA imperialists have to and will continue to have to expand their base of bribery by trying to further enslave and re-enslave the colonies and semi-colonies. They are preparing for new wars of fascist aggression now principally through use of their weapon, white chauvinism, the principal ideology of aggressive USNA fascism. But further, one of the most fundamental aspects of USNA populism, fascism's disguise, is both historically and at the present time white chauvinism, (or what is incorrectly referred to as "racism"), although often (in the case of Negro, Puerto Rican, Mexican national minority populists, etc) white chauvinism must necessarily manifest itself in terms of its opposite, bourgeois nationalism. We will explain this point more when we get to the CPUSA's populism and its use of "racism." But the intimate connection between populism and white chauvinism should be clear to everyone. Wallace is the most obvious example, but there are thousands of others, for example the International Ladies Garment Workers Union "buy American" campaign, where they set the "American worker" against the "cheap foreign labor" from Korea, Taiwan, Japan, etc and tell us to "buy American" because it's the only way us poor folks can keep our jobs, etc etc ad nauseum.

We must oppose and expose phony populism. We must see it as social motion toward fascism. We must ceaselessly uncover the real class contradictions hidden under populist demagoguery and point out the real, revolutionary alternative to this motion. Proletarian internationalism and the dictatorship of the proletariat alone will provide this alternative. To fight for them on a scale that can really influence the masses and enable us to lead the class struggle we must build a communist party worthy of the name.

POPULISM IN RUSSIA

At this point we would like to show the Leninist views on populism or Narodism (an exact equivalent in Russian of the word populism. Narod, like the Latin word populus, means "people"). This will give us a good base for understanding the class basis and historical motion of USNA populism.

Firstly, why was the struggle against Narodism, the first major struggle that Lenin waged, necessary for the formation of an independent proletarian revolutionary party of a new type? The struggle was waged "at a time when no social-democratic movement in Russia yet existed. (In the the mid-1890s) It was first necessary to prepare the theoretical, ideological groundwork for such a movement. The chief ideological obstacle to the spread of Marxism and of the social-democratic movement was the Narodnik views which at that time prevailed among the advanced workers and the revolutionary-minded intelligentsia." (11) In The Development of Capitalism in Russia, The Economic Content of Narodism, What "The Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight against the Social-Democrats, The Heritage We Renounce, etc., Lenin dealt the Narodniks blows from which they never could recover. Again and again he exposes the economic and social motion of society and how the Narodniks were trying to hold history back.

"Narodism, which stands for levelling out the peasantry... is 'regressive' because it desires to keep capital within those medieval forms that combine exploitation with scattered, technically backward production and with personal pressure on the producer."

Narodism seeks to stop the differentiation of the peasantry into different classes, a differentiation in which the minority become rich peasants, capitalist peasants (employers of others' labor power), and the majority become increasingly more impoverished and hence rural proletarians or semi-proletarians, migrant workers or sharecroppers, etc. Whereas under feudalism the countryside was (in terms of the peasant masses) rigidly stratified and socially static, under capitalism rapid transitions take place which leave a few rich and the majority worse off than before. Narodism is clearly the ideology of the petty-bourgeois peasantry trying to stem the tide of its disintegration (that is, its differentiation into bourgeoisie and proletariat; under the irresistible influence of the towns, the market). It is a petty-bourgeois negation of the inevitable and historically progressive development and consolidation of capitalist rule, based on the rapid development and improvement of the productive forces resulting in a potentially inexhaustible source of well-being for the whole of society once the whole of society is actually in control and in a position to utilize these productive forces. It is a negation of (most importantly) the class struggle, the very thing which, with the victory of the proletariat, will ensure the most rapid development of the productive forces in behalf of the whole society, the masses of toilers. Narodism, in short, is the negation of the role of the proletariat and the proletarian dictatorship, the only force on Earth capable of suppressing the overthrown exploiters and building socialism. Narodism was a reaction to the spread of capitalism on the part of the small farmers and handicraftsmen, who were losing their land and tools and becoming proletarianized.

How the original populist movement in the USNA was similar to its Russian counterpart we shall see in a moment. But first let us sample the inexhaustible treasury of Lenin on Narodism and try to sum up his analysis.

The essence of Narodism lies "in representing the interests of the small producer." (13) Lenin describes the socialist theories of the petty-bourgeois populists as "absolutely reactionary inasmuch as they claim to be socialist theories." (14) The reason for this lies not only in that they try to roll back the wheels of history, but also in that they obscure the class struggle. "They are reactionary, lastly, because they simply cannot understand the necessity for a struggle, a desperate struggle of the working people themselves for their emancipation." (15) "They are reactionary in depicting our state as something standing above classes and therefore fit and capable of rendering serious and honest aid to the exploited population." (16) The Narodniks believed they could attain utopia by fighting to reform the system, by fighting against the abuses of capitalism, but not against the capitalist system itself (which they often denied even existed in Russia). Their influence among the revolutionaries and working class in general (the majority of whom had just recently left the farm) had to be broken in order for a party to be built that could lead the class out of the stage of social consciousness to the higher stage of class consciousness and class conscious revolt.

Lastly, we should mention a particularly obnoxious but important aspect of Narodism, that is, its sentimental, idealist, romantic, philistine view of the past - that presumably idyllic, folksy, patriarchal past that never existed in the way that Narodniks saw it but which they nonetheless wanted to go back to. Lenin compares the reactionary Narodniks of the 1890s with the great bourgeois democrats (Chernachevsky, Herzen, etc) of the 1860s, whose "heritage" the Narodniks claimed to represent:

"Even more at variance with this tradition (of the 60s) is Narodism's idealization and over-embellishment of the countryside. This false idealization, which desired at all costs to see something specific in our rural system, something quite unlike the rural system in every other country in the period of pre-capitalist relations, is in naked contradiction to the traditions of the sober and realistic heritage. The wider and more deeply capitalism developed, the more distinctly did the countryside display the contradictions common to every commodity-capitalist society, the more and more glaring did the antithesis stand out between the Narodniks' honey talk about the peasant's 'community spirit,' 'artel spirit,' etc, on the one hand, and the actual division of the peasantry into a rural bourgeoisie and a rural proletariat on the other, and the more rapidly did the Narodniks, who continued to look upon things with the eyes of the peasant, change from sentimental romanticists into ideologists of the petty bourgeoisie, because in modern society the small producer changes into a commodity producer.... Better stagnation than capitalist progress - this, essentially, is every Narodnik's attitude to the countryside...." (17)

This philistine sentimentality about a past that never existed is the hallmark of the petty bourgeoisie. Keep in mind Anna Rochester's sympathetic account of the Populists trying to "recapture" "the control of the government" for "the masses of people." Needless to say the opposite side of this sentimental coin is fear of progress, of revolution, of the working class and its dictatorship. Let us quote what Engels has to say about these petty-bourgeois (he is speaking of the Proudhonists, but it could just as well apply to the populists, Russian and USNA):

*annotated
PB base*
"27 years ago I described in The Conditions of the Working Class in England the main features of just this process of driving workers from hearth and home as it took place in the 18th Century in England. The infamies of which the landowners and factory-owners were guilty in so doing, and the deleterious

effects, material and moral, which this expulsion inevitably had on the workers concerned in the first place, are there also described as they deserve. But could it ever enter my head to regard this, which was in the circumstances an absolutely necessary historical process of development, as a retrogression 'below the savages?' Impossible! The English proletarian of 1872 is on an infinitely higher level than the rural weaver of 1772 with his 'hearth and home.' Will the troglodyte with his cave, the Australian aborigine with his clay hut, and the Indian with his hearth ever accomplish a June insurrection and a Paris Commune?" (18)

Or an October Revolution? Will the petty-bourgeois troglodytes of the CPUSA ever succeed in leading the working class anywhere but into fascism? They couldn't - even if they wanted to.

petty bourgeois use of populism & how the bourgeois will use the PB
POPULISM IN THE USNA
PB - wants to hold history back

Now let us go back in history to show what populism was originally in the USNA. On the basis of this we will understand why the present populist movement is a phony populist movement. But before doing so we should state, so there will be no misunderstanding, that we are not, when we compare Russian and USNA populism, saying that the two social systems were identical. In a letter to the Russian Danielson in 1893, Engels, talking about an article by Mr. B. V. Struve on the question of developing capitalism in Russia, states:

"I must agree with him in this one point, that for me, too, the present capitalistic phase of development in Russia appears an unavoidable consequence of the historical conditions as created by the Crimean War, the way in which the change of 1861 in agrarian conditions was accomplished, and the political stagnation in Europe generally. Where he is decidedly wrong is in comparing the present state of Russia with that of the United States in order to refute what he calls your pessimistic views of the future. He says the evil consequences of modern capitalism in Russia will be as easily overcome as they are in the United States. There he quite forgets, that the US are modern, bourgeois from the very origin; that they were founded by petits bourgeois and peasants who ran away from European feudalism to establish a purely bourgeois society. Whereas in Russia we have a groundwork of a primitive communistic character, a pre-civilization Gentilesellschaft (a form of tribal society based on the gens, joint family), crumbling to ruins, it is true, but still serving as the groundwork, the material upon which the capitalistic revolution (for it is a real social revolution) acts and operates. In America, Geldwirtschaft (money economy) has been fully established for more than a century, in Russia Naturalwirtschaft (natural economy) was all but exclusively the rule. Therefore it stands to reason that the change, in Russia, must be far more violent, far more incisive, and accompanied by immensely greater sufferings than it can be in America." (19)

Keeping this important difference in mind, however, we are completely justified in comparing Russian and USNA populism, which were both ideological expressions of the petty, mainly agricultural producers during the rise, extension and consolidation by the big bourgeoisie of their home market. "Populism in the US was rooted primarily in the farmers and other small producers and traders - classes which had dominated economic life (?) until they were oppressed and displaced by the growth of industry." (20) The Granger movement of the farmers against the railroads and other monopolies from the 1870s on; the Greenback movement which demanded more (cheaper) money in circulation to facilitate debt payments and commodity sales; the Freesilver movement of the 1880s and 1890s; the People's Party (the Populists) and the election of many Populists to state and federal offices - all had their

base in the petty bourgeoisie, all protested the ruin of the small producers by the monopolies and banks which were rapidly being consolidated into modern USNA imperialism. These movements were all retrogressive in the sense of trying to hold back the development of history. Like the Narodniks, who were Russian exceptionalists - they believed that Russia could remain non-capitalist or that it could "skip" capitalism - the USNA populists were "American exceptionalists". What happened to them? Representing a disintegrating class, the populists disintegrated with it. The majority were co-opted into the Democratic Party which demagogically appealed to the "farm vote" while all the time being the tool of big capital. A minority, the more discontented, went over to the Socialist Party and finally to the CPUSA, where their descendants to this day carry out their populist policies (disguised as Marxism). It is no accident that the core of the Party's program is "anti-monopoly coalition" instead of the dictatorship of the proletariat (a bogey nowhere to be found in their New Program of 1970). Nor is it an accident that a current CPUSA pamphlet (by Victor Perlo) is entitled, populistically, "Robbing the Poor to Fatten the Rich," or that the principal Party tactic at this time is building a "Politics of People's Action," of building, in fact, a new "people's party." This is nothing but the same old greasy populism with some watery "Marxism" poured on to make it more palatable. "The CP is tied by a thousand financial, social and political threads to the liberal Anglo-American bourgeoisie." (21) This is why they changed the name of their east coast paper from the Daily Worker to the Daily World. "Worker" is sectarian, and because the CPUSA talks about the working class only as one more element in the syndicalist cabal they propose as their anti-monopoly coalition. They are just like their ancestors, the original populists, who welcomed the support of the industrial proletariat in the 80s and even put some "workers'" demands in their platform, but who nonetheless represented a different class altogether.

The populism of the late 1800s and early 1900s within the USNA can and should be compared with Russian Narodism of the same period. Both were characterized by exceptionalism, Russian and "American." Here is Stalin on the Narodniks:

"First, the Narodniks asserted that capitalism was something 'accidental' in Russia, that it would not develop, and that therefore the proletariat would not grow and develop either.

"Secondly, the Narodniks did not regard the working class as the foremost class in the revolution. They dreamed of attaining socialism without the proletariat. They considered that the principal revolutionary force was the peasantry - led by the intelligentsia - and the peasant commune, which they regarded as the embryo and foundation of socialism.

"Thirdly, the Narodniks' view of the whole course of human history was erroneous and harmful. They neither knew nor understood the laws of the economic and political development of society. In this respect they were quite backward. According to them, history was made not by classes, and not by struggle of classes, but by outstanding individuals - 'heroes' - who were blindly followed by the masses, the 'mob,' the people, the classes." (22)

When we compare these main errors of the Russian Narodniks with those of the USNA populists we find many similarities. * *went to Democratic Party & CPUSA*

Firstly, the original populists of the 1870s and 80s viewed monopoly of the home market and the squeezing out of the small producer not as an inevitable development of the economic structure of capitalist society, as a progressive development, but as a deviation, something which could and should be stopped.

Second, nowhere did the populists of the USNA see the proletariat - the class that grows and develops precisely as a result of the growth and development of capitalist production - as the leading class, the class under whose leadership society will break the fetters of capitalist relations of production and move forward. On the contrary, the populists thought that the ruined, pushed out, declassed, disintegrating petty-bourgeois strata were in themselves (and not as future proletarians) the real revolutionary force.

Third, the USNA populists, like their Russian counterparts, believed that individuals alone make history, that "good" individuals, once in office, could be capable of helping "the little guy" or at least of forcing the government to do so. Hence the bourgeois belief on the part of the populists that Ben Tillman and Tom Watson in their day and McGovern and Chisolm etc in ours, simply by their personal integrity (??) - Chisolm is "unbought and unbossed" etc - could take on the rich in behalf of the people.

But our analysis of the original USNA populist movement will be inadequate if we simply compare it to Russian Narodism without discussing the particular social and historical environment in which the former grew and developed and turned into its opposite. As the Communist League Negro National Colonial Question points out, the populist movement came about during the period of reconstruction after the Civil War.

"...The Northern finance capitalists were faced with the delicate task of defeating the enemy (the southern planters) politically without disturbing the existing capitalist property relations. They found the answer in the Populist movement. Here, 'poor' people were thrown into the struggle against the 'rich' without any consideration as to class and history. Thus a political front was skillfully built that threw the energies of the ex-slaves, poor Anglo-Americans and the free Negroes against the existing power of the landlords."

During the early period of the Populist movement it was necessary for the Northern bourgeoisie to some extent to push for Anglo-Negro unity.

"The democratic, anti-monopoly Populist movement that reached its high point just before the counter-revolution was led, in the South, by such men as Ben Tillman and Tom Watson. These so-called leaders were opportunist vacillating men who constantly compromised with the landlords while trying to fight them. The most crucial and decisive question was the question of the unity of the Negro and Anglo-American masses. Despite all the speeches to the contrary, Watson, Tillman et al, never moved to do away with Negro segregation in the Farmers' Alliance. The only outcome of a revolutionary mass movement led by vacillating, petty-bourgeois leaders was the fascist drive.

"Just as the Populist movement was led by Tillman and Co. when the monopolies needed to crush the landlords, so the 'revolt of the poor whites' was also led by Tillman and Co. when there was the need to crush Populism and especially the Negro masses." (24)

Originally a democratic upsurge of the masses, the Populist movement became fascist. Since the League understands the ideological and social threads connecting populism with the bourgeoisie we can see why. When the Northern bourgeoisie needed a certain amount of unity among the masses, the populists to a certain extent pushed for unity. When the Northern bourgeoisie needed to crush the Negro people and with them all the oppressed, the populist leaders openly pushed rabid white chauvinism and fascism.

weird accident

The CPUSA, "analyzing" the exact same historical events, is totally unable and unwilling to understand the change that took place in the Populist movement. The CP sees the fascization of the movement as a quirk. Besides referring the reader to the inconsistencies and vacillations of Foster in his characterizations of Watson and Tillman in The Negro National Colonial Question, let us quote a couple of examples of Anna Rochester's "analysis" of the populists:

"Even in these earlier years (the 90s), his fellow members of the little Populist caucus were realizing that Tom (Watson) was 'difficult,' but they never dreamed that fourteen years later he would - still under the populist banner - demand that Negroes be excluded from political life; that in 1910 he would not only return to the Democratic fold but work with the Georgia party machine of bankers and industrialists, while he threw his energies into poisonous hatred of Negroes, Catholics and Jews." (25)

"While the People's Party recognized from several angles the importance of protecting the Negro vote, as a decisive factor in the struggle against the Bourbon Democrats, there is no clear indication that the Populists were prepared to make political equality for the Negro people a major issue. White populists in the South seem to have had little understanding of racial discrimination as essentially a crime against the democratic principles which they professed." (26)

The "difficulty" of certain individuals, "little understanding of racial discrimination as essentially a crime" on the part of others - this is CPUSA analysis. One more:

"But the 'paramount issue' raised by the Democrats in 1900 was opposition to the imperialist expansion which in 1898 had reached a new stage of development with the war against Spain. They overlooked, of course, the Venezuelan episode of 1895 when a Democrat, President Cleveland, had stretched the Monroe Doctrine almost to the point of war against Great Britain; with his assertion that 'Today the US is practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition.' And neither Democrats, Republicans, nor Populists seemed to grasp the connection between our imperialist advance over subject peoples and the increasing power of monopoly at home. The inner relationship of domestic and foreign policy was not yet clear." (27) (Emphasis ours)

Not imperialism, but the lack of "clarity" ^{*Narrow*} on the part of the good imperialists is the enemy. This is indeed the philistine's-eye-view of history. No wonder the Party, even before it became totally corrupt, was completely unable to explain anything.

* * * * *

Comparing early USNA populism with Russian Narodism we can see its reactionary character, its obscuring of the class struggle, the nature of the state and the need for "a struggle, a desperate struggle of the working people for their own emancipation," as Lenin says. Although at the beginning the populist movement had a democratic content, in the course of the enslavement of the Negro Nation it lost even this progressive aspect and became reactionary not only economically but politically.

Today, is there any possibility of populism having a progressive content? No. First, there is no large class of small producers who are in a life and death struggle with monopoly capitalism. Most of the small-scale production that exists is allowed to exist by the imperialists for the sole purpose of providing them with a reactionary base. The small shopkeepers, small farmers and other petty bourgeois in general stand in opposition to the working class and are

under their thumb ideologically as well as economically. Therefore the slogans, calls, programs, parties, movements etc which play on the populist traditions of the past do not have as their origin a definite class other than the bourgeoisie itself, and are in this respect phony. Second, and more important, the new-style populism does in fact originate with the bourgeoisie and their flunkys - the Wallaces, Harrises, McGoverns, etc, and the Communist Party USA. In no way does it represent the spontaneous, democratic upsurge of the masses. On the contrary, it represents the conscious opposition by the imperialists to the spontaneous movement of the working class, instinctively revolutionary but not yet fully conscious itself. The imperialists allow the McGoverns and Wallaces to speak out demagogically against both "the rich" and the communists. Under the pretext of fighting both the Wallaces and McGoverns develop a movement to kill off or buy off the real revolutionary leaders of the working class while leaving the imperialists and their state intact, weakening the class further and preparing the groundwork for the coming to power of open fascism.

At this point we must ask the question, What is the material base for this newtype phony populism in the USNA? Generally speaking, the objective reason for the imperialists' past ability to dull and cover up the class contradictions within the USNA has been the enslavement of the colonial and semi-colonial world and the bribery of the working class (not to mention other strata) on the basis of the superprofits from the colonies. Everyone, no matter who he is and how little he has, is bribed both materially and socially over the colonial peoples outside the USNA in general and the Anglo-American nation in particular. For the workers (mainly Anglo) and people in general with easy, highly bribed jobs, the present economic crisis has made them uptight and wanting to get back the full bribe which they have begun to lose. Objectively the bribe is largely responsible for the low general level of class consciousness of the USNA working class. Subjectively, of course, the CPUSA's treachery has helped the imperialists keep the working class movement on a low level.

A phony populist movement can flourish in a period in which class distinctions are not immediately clear and when the leading role of the proletariat has not yet been established in practice. At such a time it is easy for the imperialists to invent theories about "the people" who comprise quite different strata of the population but who are treated as a homogeneous grouping led by the petty-bourgeois flunkys of the imperialists, the politicians, and so on.

The make-up or class base of the populist movement is sections of the petty bourgeoisie and a section of the most bribed workers. It is made to look like a "middle-class" movement. "But fascism is also often presented as a middle-class movement in the sense of an independent movement of the middle-class, as a 'third party' independent of capital and labor, in opposition to both the organized working class and large-scale capital." (For example, the constant complaining heard about "big business and big labor," etc.) "The fascist dictatorship is accordingly presented as a 'conquest of power' by the middle class in opposition to both the organized working class and to the previous domination of finance capital." (28)

The history of phony populism in Europe and now here in the USNA makes it clear that the middle class or petty bourgeoisie cannot be independent but must serve either finance capital or the proletariat.

"The impoverished and desperate middle class is driven from its former philistine slumbers into political activity. But this political activity takes on a new character. Whereas the Bernsteinian dreams has seen in the middle class a stabilizing and harmonizing factor in the social structure, wedded to liberalism and social reform, and smoothing over the antagonism

of classes, the new dispossessed and ruined middle-class elements break out as an extremely unstable, violent force potentially revolutionary or, alternately, ultra-reactionary, without clear social basis or consciousness, but recklessly seeking any line of immediate action, which may offer hope of immediate relief (relief from debts, state aid to small businesses, smashing the large stores, etc), or the prospect of jobs (the new bureaucracy, mercenary fighting forces, displacement of Jews (Note: or Negroes and other national minorities in the USNA), war.

"In what direction, however, can these middle-class elements turn their political activity? They can in practice only line up in the service of either finance capital or of the proletariat. The myth of their 'independent' role, of the 'third party,' is still endeavored to be hung before them." (29)

And what is the role of the "left" (viz the CPUSA and other so-called working class leaders) in maintaining populist delusions, and how do these populist delusions aid the imperialists in creating social-chauvinism? Not only does the CPUSA create confusion theoretically on the role of the proletariat in the social revolution, but its theoretical deviations and revisionism in general leads directly to ideological confusion in the working class. For example, because of their political opportunism, the CPUSA pushes the line that the national minority workers are not part of the working class. ("The workers, with such allies as the small farmers, urban middle strata, intellectuals and the specially oppressed minorities..." (30) (Emphasis added) Or, "The fight against racism is thus basic to the class struggle in the US. Chauvinism, or what is more popularly called racism (!!), serves the very opposite of the interests of the working class and the Black people." (31) (Emphasis added)) Notice also that the middle-class is treated not as having a dual nature, but as an ally of the working class without qualification. The CPUSA line says that the national minority workers are different, that they play an external role in the class struggle. Hence the CPUSA calls for a "people's movement" - or populist movement - which will include this oppressed sector the population against monopoly. The result is division of the working class along national lines. Thus the populist line diverts the working class as a whole away from struggle against the bourgeoisie as a whole, and leaves the class ideologically and organizationally confused.

We should here mention perhaps the most important way that the CPUSA actually aids the imperialist bourgeoisie in creating the conditions for fascism, that is, how it helps undermine the unity of the working class during this period of growing populism. It is their pushing of the line of "racism." In the USNA today this line means that it is not the imperialist bourgeoisie that oppresses the colonies and particularly the national minorities, but the "racism" of the Anglo workers. This line keeps the working class divided because it isn't the "racism" of the Anglo workers that keeps the class divided (although white chauvinism re-enforces the division), but the material and social bribe that the Anglo-American workers receive over the oppressed nations (Negro Nation in particular) and the national minorities from the oppressed nations. And the basis for this bribe, as we stated earlier, is the oppression of the colonies by imperialism itself.

The reason for the incorrect line of "racism" held by the CPUSA (among other reasons - ie, the wishes of the State Department) is rooted in the CPUSA's failure "to distinguish between the Negro people which was developed as a people prior to the Civil War, and the Negro national movement which developed only after the defeat of reconstruction." (32) It is this failure to see the national oppression of the Negro and other peoples that allows for the CPUSA to push the line that it is the color or "race" of a people that determines their being

oppressed by another "race." By virtue of the anarcho-sindicalist nature of the movement which develops from this imperialist line the Negro, Puerto Rican, Mexican and other national minorities are brought into the populist movement, but without ever gaining unity with the rest of the working class. No matter how many demands, programs etc are raised and no matter how many are fulfilled no link is ever made between the national minority workers and the most down-trodden Anglo workers. (The CPUSA makes sure of this by putting forth such outright fascist slogans as "Black power to Black people, Brown power to Brown people, White power to White people," etc etc ad nauseum). On the other hand the middle class or petty bourgeoisie and the most bribed workers (particularly Anglo), discontented with the partial losing of their bribe, are utilized by the imperialists in the populist movement under the guise of fighting the rich, of anti-monopoly. Again the CPUSA is instrumental in this. When bribed workers not only get back what they lost but get more (for example, in the recent West Coast longshore strike - see People's Tribune, volume 4, number 2), the CPUSA hails the increased bribe as a victory for the working class. The "victorious" worker then says to himself, or is told by the imperialists, "See, you got it. Why can't they (the most exploited and oppressed, the unemployed, etc) get it? It's because they're lazy, stupid, they can't fight, etc." Through increasing divisions in the working class the imperialists are trying to give themselves the necessary social base for the open taking of power by the fascists and the driving down of the national minorities in particular but also the whole, or almost the whole of the working class.

The imperialists push the line of "racism" among the more bribed Anglo workers to prove the "superiority" of the Anglo workers and reinforce the whole imperialist system. They push the line of "racism" on the national minorities to keep them divided from their Anglo counterparts. The CPUSA pushes "racism" to corrupt the revolutionary leadership of the proletariat and the revolutionary-minded petty bourgeois. The result is the undermining of the unity of the class and the laying of conditions (under "progressive" populist slogans) for the fascist dictatorship. The CPUSA's revisionism has caused great confusion among the revolutionary-minded radicals on the Left and even among the advanced workers who have risen up spontaneously. Wishy-washy ideas about getting the "rich," fighting the "ultra-Rights," kicking "monopoly," all have come from the CPUSA distortion of the class struggle. In the absence of a revolutionary party the class will continue to flounder because they are bombarded every waking minute by bourgeois propaganda that re-enforces the confusion and pushes fascism.

The CPUSA says that the present problem in society is that of monopolies and that once we get rid of them everything will be OK. How does this differ from the line of the original populists? It doesn't except that the CPUSA pushes the populist line under the cover of Marxism and of representing the working class. They refuse to expose imperialism as a system and to show that the progress of mankind and the building of a new society depends on the overthrow of the entire capitalist class and the smashing of their state. They refuse to show that the destruction of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie can only be accomplished by its opposite, the dictatorship of the proletariat. The populism of the CPUSA is clearly characterized by Lenin as follows:

"The difference between Narodism and Marxism lies wholly in the character of their criticism of Russian capitalism. The Narodnik thinks that to criticize capitalism it is sufficient to indicate the existence of exploitation, the interaction between exploitation and politics, etc. The Marxist thinks it necessary to explain and also to link together the phenomena of exploitation as a system of certain relations of production, as a special social-economic formation, the laws of the functioning and development of

which have to be studied objectively. The Narodnik thinks it sufficient, in criticizing capitalism, to condemn it from the angle of his ideas, from the angle of 'modern science and modern social ideas.' The Marxist thinks it necessary to trace in detail the classes that are formed in capitalist society, he considers valid only criticism that is based on the precise viewpoint of a definite class, criticism that is based on the precise formulation of the social process actually taking place and not on the ethical judgement of the 'individual.'" (33)

The phony populism the CPUSA pushes is connected with their anarcho-syndicalism. Present-day anarcho-syndicalism says that the oppressed should throw off their immediate oppressors without regard to or in consideration of the nature of the whole capitalist system and its state. For example men should be overthrown by women, bosses by workers, whites by blacks, etc. This theory, like the theory of "racism," objectively helps keep the working class divided and under the leadership of the bourgeoisie, both big and petty. "Although the theoretical and political projections of the movement are syndicalist, the concrete applications transform it into its opposite - with which it is completely united. In practice, syndicalism (which comes from the left) is expressed as modern populism (which comes from the right). The reason for this is that both of these bourgeois outlooks disregard the basic social motion, which is the class struggle." (34) "It would seem that the most casual examination would show that the emancipation of any exploited class or group is impossible without the overthrow, of the system that exploits. More yet, it is clearly seen that the proletariat cannot emancipate itself without emancipating every oppressed class and group within the country. Therefore, it would seem that every oppressed grouping, every exploited class, fights first of all for the unity of the proletariat. That is the overriding condition for its own emancipation." (35)

To combat the syndicalist motion of the present movement, a genuine communist party will show economically why capitalism came about, where it's going and why the proletariat, and it alone, will free all of society. Does the CPUSA do this? Hell no. They mumble their counter-revolutionary slimy populist position about monopoly being the reason - not the capitalist mode of production - for the oppression of students, farmers, workers, Negroes, etc, and that all we need to do is join together and fight to reform the system with "people's power." Not the dictatorship of the proletariat crushing the dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie, but "people's power" modifying "monopoly's power." How vile a betrayal of Leninism, and what a faithful rendition of the populist line of the 1880s! And what a sneaky way of uniting syndicalism and populism.

Is it any wonder that, given the long-time hegemony of the CPUSA in the working class movement, the working class is confused and backward? Every time it rises up spontaneously the revisionist hyenas of the CPUSA and groups influenced by it descend to kill the fightback. "From the beginning the Communist League recognized that the root of every anti-working class deviation in the left was the counter-revolutionary revisionism of the CPUSA." (36) And we should not expect that these attacks will lessen - they will increase - as the working class movement, under correct communist leadership, becomes more conscious of its needs and aims. The CPUSA will use the various syndicalist, 'populist groupings it has fathered against the working class and its communist leadership, and will try to destroy us. Let them try. Theoretically strong and ideologically ready, we are becoming and will continue to become more than a match for the CPUSA and its lackeys. A real communist party will be built and consolidated on the basis of destroying the CPUSA, and the working class will at last have the leadership it deserves.

SUMMATION

In the USNA at the present time in history any talk about "a people's movement" is foolishness, and reference to "the people" is an illusion. Talk like this comes from the petty bourgeoisie and is the expression of their fightback against dis-integration. Marx says,

"The democrat, because he represents the petty bourgeoisie, that is a transition class, in which the interests of two classes are simultaneously mutually blunted, imagines himself to be elevated above class antagonism generally. The democrats concede that a privileged class confronts them, but they, along with all the rest of the nation, form the people. What they represent is the people's rights. What interests them is the people's interests. Accordingly...they do not need to examine the interests and positions of the different classes. They do not need to weigh their own resources too critically..." (37)

Today the movement of "the people" is mainly a movement of the petty bourgeoisie and the bribed workers who have been living off the bribe of the imperialist oppression and exploitation of the colonies. The people's movement aims at regaining the full bribe which is being lost. And the only way that the bribe can be regained is by the further subjugation of the colonies and their more brutal oppression. "If fascism is allowed to develop in the US it will be ten times more ruthless than German nazism. The German fascists needed fascism in order to launch their wars of aggression - the US capitalists need fascism in order to continue their wars of aggression." (38) Within the Anglo-American nation this concretely means a deepening of the fascist, white chauvinist attacks against the national minorities. Externally, this means organizing strata of the working class (including the consolidation of the most exploited and oppressed, the most helpless, into mercenary armies, etc) around a program of wars of aggression and counter-revolution against the peoples of the world. "Fascism, in short, is a movement of mixed elements, predominantly petty-bourgeois, but also slum proletariat and the demoralized working class, financed and directed by finance capital, by the big industries, landlords and financiers, to defeat the working class and smash the working class organizations." (39) Is modern-day phony populism an aspect of this push toward fascism? We think we've shown that it is. Just as the rising imperialists turned the originally democratic populist movement around in order to enslave the Negro Nation in the 1880s and 90s, so the present-day imperialists are resurrecting populist demagoguery in order to drive the Negro people back into slavery, attack the Puerto Rican people, the Mexican national minority, the poor Anglo-American workers, and drive toward fascism and new imperialist wars. There should be no talk on our part about a new, spontaneous, honest populist movement - the phony populism of the present day was originated, bought and paid for by the big imperialists whose handmaiden is the CPUSA. Populism is reactionary. At best it is naive utopianism. At worst it is blatant demagoguery and a cloak for fascism.

How do we fight it? First, we must struggle for theoretical clarity - we must mercilessly expose the petty-bourgeois delusions and uncover the underlying class contradictions which are pushing history forward. We must expose the populist philosophy and oppose it with historical materialism.

"The objectivist speaks of the necessity of a given historical process; the materialist gives an exact picture of the given social-economic formation and of the antagonistic relations to which it gives rise. When demonstrating the necessity for a given series of facts, the objectivist always runs the risk of becoming an apologist for those facts; the materialist

discloses the class contradictions and in so doing defines his standpoint. The objectivist speaks of 'insurmountable historical tendencies;' the materialist speaks of the class which 'directs' the given economic system, giving rise to such and such forms of counteraction by other classes. Thus, on the one hand, the materialist is more consistent than the objectivist, and gives profounder and fuller effect to his objectivism. He does not limit himself to speaking of the necessity of a process, but ascertains exactly what social-economic formation gives the process its content, exactly what class determines this necessity." (40)

Phony populism is here, as in Russia, a real social force "inasmuch as it defends general bourgeois interests." (41) For "...the distinctive and basic feature of the petty bourgeoisie is to battle against bourgeoisdom with the instruments of bourgeois society itself." (42)

Specifically, we must expose the CPUSA's role of allying with the bourgeois liberals to spawn populist delusions and disarm the working class and leave it open for fascist onslaught. Lenin especially puts down the CPUSA's line on leaving capitalism intact and only fighting monopoly - little business against the big - poor against rich. "...To leave the capitalist 'school' with its bloodsuckers in complete immunity and to want to eliminate its capitalist products by means of liberal half-measures is to be a true 'friend of the people!'" (43)

Let us sum up the connection between fascism and the CPUSA's now populist, now social-democratic policies.

"Fascism bases itself primarily, for its social basis, on the miscellaneous petty-bourgeois strata, the peasantry, the declassed elements and backward workers. Social-democracy bases itself on the upper strata of the industrial workers. The bourgeoisie builds its rule on the support of both, bringing now one, now the other, to the forefront, and utilizing both for its support. Fascism can never become the main basis of the bourgeoisie in the same sense as social democracy (although it may become its main and sole governmental instrument when the crisis requires the coercion of all the workers, and the hold of social democracy is in danger of weakening), because fascism never wins the main body of the industrial workers with traditions of organization - the sole power that can overthrow capitalism. Here the role of social democracy remains of decisive importance, even after the establishment of the fascist dictatorship." (44)

The role of the CPUSA as a populist and social-democratic organization is to ideologically prepare the way for fascism and to carry its ideology into the sphere of organizational principles (syndicalism, anti-monopoly coalition, etc).

"Social democracy thus prepared the way ideologically for fascism; first, by the abandonment or corruption of Marxism; second, by the denial of internationalism and attaching of the workers to the service of 'their own' imperialist state; third by the war on communism and the proletarian revolution; fourth, by the distortion of 'socialism' or the use of vaguely 'socialist' phrases ('the new social order,' 'the commonwealth,' 'industry as a public service,' etc) to cover monopoly capitalism; fifth, by the advocacy of class-collaboration and the unification of the working class organizations with the capitalist state. All this provides the ideological basis and groundwork for fascism, which represents the final stage of the policy of the complete absorption of the working class, bound hand and foot, into capitalism and the capitalist state. The whole propaganda and line of

social democracy confused, weakened and battered down the class conscious socialist outlook of those workers who were under its influence, prevented the spread of revolutionary Marxist understanding, fostered semi-fascist conceptions of nationalism, imperialism and class collaboration, and thus left the masses an easy prey to fascism." (45)

Historically in Germany and Italy fascism came to power when the capitalist institutions broke down and the working class was ready for a revolutionary change, but was without leadership and hemmed in by populist-talking reformist leadership. Dutt talks about this stage of the movement and consolidation of a fascist dictatorship: "That stage arises when the breakdown of the old capitalist institutions and the advance of the working class movement has reached a point at which the working class should advance to the seizure of power, but when the working class is held in by reformist leadership." (46)

The CPUSA distorts what a state is. They believe (or rather, pretend to believe) that we live in a democracy, which has been partially usurped by monopoly but which can be "recaptured" (Anna Rochester) if "the people" try. Lenin says:

"Being hostile to capitalism, the small producers constitute a transitory class that is closely connected with the bourgeoisie and for that reason is incapable of understanding that the large-scale capitalism it dislikes is not fortuitous, but is a direct product of the entire contemporary economic (and social, and political, and judicial) system arising out of the struggle of mutually opposite social forces. Only inability to understand this can lead to such absolute stupidity as that of appealing to the 'state' as though the political system is not rooted in the economic, does not express it, does not serve it." (47)

"...The Narodniks reveal their petty-bourgeois nature once and for all; their insistence on paltry, middle-class reforms, arising out of their absolute inability to understand the class struggle, places them on the side of the liberals against those who take the side of the 'antipode' (Note: the proletariat in this case), seeing it as the only creator, so to speak, of the good things in question." (48)

The only difference between the CPUSA and the Narodniks on this question is that the CPUSA consciously covers up the class struggle with struggle for paltry reforms - "Free our beautiful sister Angela," black sheriffs, community control of the police, review boards so "illegals" can be deported democratically, etc. Again, Lenin nails them to the wall:

"...The basic characteristic feature of Narodism - the capacity for compromise." (49)

We believe that the growth of the CPUSA in this country will come simultaneously with the growth of the populist movement. And vice versa, the overcoming, the smashing and death of the revisionist CPUSA (politically and ideologically as well as organizationally) will come about with the transformation of the working class's consciousness from social or populist consciousness to class consciousness. The more educated and experienced the working class becomes the more exposed the CPUSA's treachery will become. The more the populist movement is exposed as reactionary, the more exposed will be the CPUSA.

It is our duty, the duty of the class conscious communists, to take the struggle against populism to the masses by fighting with them to raise their consciousness. It is our duty to give the class an understanding of its long-range, international interests. "As the capitalists intensify the exploitation here at home, the

workers are going to fight back. That fightback today, has to take the form of social consciousness - of a populist sort of struggle. The reason for this is that the workers cannot develop class consciousness by themselves. They have to be taught this form of consciousness. This is the task and role of the communist parties." (50) Therefore, we need to build a communist party to bring class consciousness to the masses; and with it we need to build a class conscious mass struggle.

The opposition to a phony populist movement is a revolutionary mass struggle led by the conscious vanguard, a Leninist communist party. The revolutionary mass struggle need not be socialist or communist, but it must be anti-fascist and pro-communist. Such a movement, involving all of the discontented population and led by the proletariat and its party cannot have fighting monopoly as its goal. It must clearly fight to overthrow the whole capitalist system. It must fight for any reforms and changes which will benefit the revolutionary population, but it must never sacrifice the long-range interests of the masses, proletarian internationalism. It must recognize the leading role of the proletariat and be in favor of the proletariat seizing power.

This mass struggle will not try to retard the development of society and drive it back to "the good old days" when there was more bribery. On the contrary, it will speed up the process of the development of the class struggle.

"...Our Narodniks are incapable of understanding how one can fight capitalism by speeding up its development, and not by 'holding it up,' not by pulling it back, but by pushing it forward, not in reactionary, but in progressive fashion." (51)

By struggling among the masses we will develop a class struggle that goes far beyond populism. "One must not hide but expose - one must not dream that 'it would be better without struggle,' but must develop the stability, continuity, consistency, and chiefly, ideological nature of the struggle." (52) This is how communists fight in the mass movement!

The working class as a whole cannot be diverted from phony populism and a fascist onslaught unless there is a militant Marxist-Leninist communist party to lead the way. Since there isn't yet such a communist party we must build one. We must see the building of it as the practical solution to the problem of the ideological and political and practical disorganization of the working class. The struggle against fascism and its populist demagogy can be resolved in practice only by the organization that a class party can provide - one that fights for the dictatorship of the proletariat all the way.

We will build a party that fights for the independence of the Negro Nation, Puerto Rico and regional autonomy for the Southwest - that is, for true equality in the working class. We will oppose the widespread populist-syndicalist line that says that everyone should do their own thing against "monopoly" with a clear Marxist-Leninist line on what the class needs now and what it will need in the future.

FIGHT FOR CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE WORKING CLASS
MOVEMENT!

BUILD A CLASS PARTY!

G. D.

J. A.

New York

FOOTNOTES

1. N Y Times, May 25, 1972
2. N Y Times, May 31, 1972
3. N Y Times, July 2, 1972
4. Georgi Dimitrov, United Front Against Fascism, International Publishers, New York, 1938, p 10
5. Ibid, p 13
6. R Palme Dutt, Fascism and Social Revolution, International Publishers, New York, 1935, p 16
7. People's Tribune (Communist League), vol 4, no 6, p 6 (1972)
8. Anna Rochester, The Populist Movement in the United States, International Publishers, New York, 1943, p 121
9. V I Lenin, The Economic Content of Narodism, Collected Works, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1963, vol 1, p 391
10. Op cit, Dutt, p 109
11. History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), FLPH, Moscow, 1939, p 10
12. Op cit, Economic Content, etc, p 485
13. Ibid, p 404
14. V I Lenin, "What "The Friends of the People" Are and How the Fight Against the Social Democrats, FLPH, Moscow, 1963, vol 1, p 288 (Collected Works)
15. Ibid, p 286
16. Ibid, p 286
17. V I Lenin, The Heritage We Renounce, Collected Works, FLPH, Moscow, vol 2, p 519
18. Frederick Engels, The Housing Question, Marxist Library vol 23, International Publishers, New York (publ. in the USSR, no date), p 28
19. Frederick Engels, Letter to Danielson (Nikolai --on), Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels, International Publishers, New York, 1942, p 513
20. Op cit, Rochester, p 124
21. Negro National Colonial Question (Communist League), 1972, p 31
22. Op Cit, History of CPSU (B), pp 11-12
23. Op cit, Negro National Colonial Question, p 22
24. Ibid, p 25
25. Op cit, Rochester, p 57
26. Ibid, p 60
27. Ibid, p 110
28. Op cit, Dutt, p 97
29. Ibid, p 106
30. Communist Party of the USA, New Program, May 1970, New Outlook Publishers, New York, p 15
31. Henry Winston, Fight Racism, New Outlook Pub., New York, 1972, p 2
32. Op cit, NNCQ, p 21
33. Op cit, Lenin, Economic Content, etc, pp 443-4
34. People's Tribune, vol 3, no 10, p 2
35. Ibid, p 2
36. Ibid, vol 3, no 3, p ?
37. Quoted by Lenin, op cit, Economic Content, etc, p 447
38. Communist League, Constitution, p 1
39. Op cit, Dutt, p 102
40. Lenin, op cit, Economic Content, etc, pp401-2
41. Ibid, p 422
42. Ibid, p 348
43. Lenin, op cit, "Friends of the People", pp230-1
44. Op cit, Dutt, pp 174-5

45. Op cit, Dutt, p 182
46. Ibid, p 108
47. Lenin, op cit, Economic Content, etc, pp 354-5
48. Ibid, p 363
49. Ibid
50. People's Tribune, vol 3, no 3, p 9
51. Lenin, op cit, Economic Content, etc, p 353
52. Ibid, p 351

notes from Proletariat

Stinky Errors

1. Lemp - Highest stage of capitalism
∴ dev. contradictions at
diff. times in diff. countries
Leninist. "uneven dev. of capitalism"
redemption of already divided world thru
military conquests
nationalism in 1 country
2. Instats Marx - Marx talked in terms of
permanence - from feudalism -
bourgeois dem - socialism - comm.

1. TROTSKYISM NOT A PECULIARITY OF AN INDIVIDUAL,
IT IS A SOCIAL PHENOMENON

2. TROTSKYISM IS EXPRESSION OF ATTITUDE OF A CERTAIN CLASS
"THE PETTY BOURGEOISIE."

3. MARX SAID IT IS "TRANSITIONAL CLASS IN WHICH THE INTERESTS OF
TWO CLASSES ARE SIMULTANEOUSLY BLUNTED".

4.