

MANY PARTIES OF THE OLD TYPE-

An Analysis of the U.S.

"Communist Movement"

It cannot be regarded as an accident that all the petty bourgeois parties, which styled themselves "revolutionary" and "socialist" parties in order to deceive the people—the Socialist Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, anarchists, nationalists—became counter-revolutionary parties even *before* the October Socialist Revolution and later turned into agents of foreign bourgeois espionage services, into a gang of spies, wreckers, diversionists, assassins and traitors to the country.

J. V. Stalin – History of the CPSU(B)

Concealment of Superprofits In Defense of Privileges

The foul stench of opportunism is so great in the U.S. "anti-revisionist" movement that it is necessary to trace its rotten development, with the purpose of uncovering what has been hidden and what new forms this opportunism is assuming. The aim of this section of this work on Party Building is to show where lines of demarcation have been *truly* drawn and where there is still a need to demarcate from the marsh of opportunism, which can be correctly described as a rotting corpse.

In order that everything that has happened be understood, i.e., the creation of a number of opportunist parties and organizations, we must begin from Lenin's analysis of imperialism. Lenin continually pointed out that: "Imperialism means the progressively mounting oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of Great Powers; it means a period of wars between the latter to extend and consolidate the oppression of nations; it means a period in which the masses of the people are deceived by hypocritical social-patriots, i.e. individuals who, *under the pretext* of the 'freedom of nations,' 'the right of nations to self determination' and 'defense of the fatherland' justify and defend the oppression of the majority of the world's nations by the Great Powers.

That is why the focal point in the Social-Democratic programme must be that division of nations into oppressor and oppressed which forms the *essence*

of imperialism, and is deceitfully evaded by social-chauvinists and Kautsky.” (“The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self Determination,” LCW 21:409)

U.S. imperialism is a colossal imperialist great power. The opportunists in the U.S. have had great difficulty in their attempts to deny this fact. Thus, to evade the question of the division of the world into oppressor and oppressed nations, the opportunist movement in the U.S. took up the Chinese variety of modern revisionism and social-chauvinist “theory of the three worlds.”

The camouflaging of this theory at its inception was designed to deceive the international proletariat. Under a centrist posture, the world’s proletariat and oppressed peoples were rallied to the “united front against imperialism” line of the Chinese revisionists. The “Communist Party U.S.A.” (“CPUSA”) had already, long before the revisionist take-over in the Soviet Union after Stalin’s death, degenerated into a social-chauvinist clique. Earl Browder was the father of modern revisionism. It was no coincidence that in the gut of world wide reaction, U.S. imperialism, such traitors as Browder and Foster would come to the fore to betray the international proletariat, under the signboard of Marxism-Leninism. It is no accident because as Lenin stressed: “Capital exports produce an income of from eight to ten billion francs per annum, according to pre-war prices and pre-war bourgeois statistics. Now, of course, they produce much more than that.

Obviously, out of such enormous super profits (since they are obtained over and above the profits which capitalists squeeze out of the workers of their ‘home’ country) it is possible to bribe the labour leaders and the upper stratum of the labour aristocracy. And the capitalists of the ‘advanced’ countries are bribing them; they bribe them in a thousand different ways, directly and indirect, overt and covert.” (*Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Vol. 19, pp. 89-90, International Publishers.) Furthermore, said Lenin, “The exploitation of all countries by one privileged, financially rich country has remained and has become more intense. A handful of rich countries—there are only four of them, if we are to speak of independent, and really gigantic ‘modern’ wealth: England, France, the United States and Germany—have developed monopoly to vast proportions, obtain super-profits amounting to hundreds of millions, even billions, ‘ride on the backs’ of hundreds and hundreds of millions of the populations of foreign countries, fight among each other for the division of a particularly rich, particularly fat and particularly easy spoils.” (LCW, Vol. 19:346, International Publishers.)

By generalizing the terms imperialism, the working class, exploitation, national oppression, democracy etc, the social-chauvinists in the U.S. have succeeded in covering up the question of super profits. U.S. imperialism’s position in the world imperialist market remains a top dog position, since it has been successful in carving out for itself an enormous chunk of the world from which it reaps super profits. The 1976 statistics show that the rate of return is about 5% for U.S. corporations as overall profits from sales; rate of return from “developed” countries is 11.9%, and from the “developing” countries

25.2%.* That is, 5 times greater a rate of return from the colonies and semi-colonies. With such enormous gains it has bribed a section of the proletariat, which enjoys vast economic and political privileges and is ideologically totally bound up with the bourgeoisie. This stratum of workers enjoys quite a comfortable life at the expense of the proletariat and oppressed masses throughout the world, particularly at the expense of the proletariat and oppressed masses in the colonies and semi-colonies. However the bribed stratum is not alone in “benefiting” from the super profits of imperialism. In comparison to the proletariat of the colonies and semi-colonies, the working class of the U.S., i.e., of the oppressor nation, enjoys economic and political privileges.

Lenin explains this in detail: “Is the actual condition of the workers in the oppressing nations the same as the workers in the oppressed nations from the standpoint of the national problem?” “No,” answers Lenin, “they are not the same. (1) Economically, the difference is that sections of the working class in the oppressing nations receive crumbs of the super profits which the bourgeoisie of the oppressing nations obtain by the extra exploitation of the workers of the oppressed nations. Moreover, economic data show that a larger percentage of the workers of the oppressing nations become ‘foremen’ than the workers of the oppressed nations, i.e. a larger percentage rise to the position of the labour aristocracy. This is a fact. To a certain degree the workers of the oppressing nation share with their bourgeoisie in the plunder of the workers (and the masses of the population) of the oppressed nations.” (“A Caricature of Marxism and ‘Imperialist Economism’”, Vol. 19, pg. 242, International Publishers.) This is the first point, one which has been totally concealed by the entire opportunist movement, in defense of its own bourgeoisie, as we shall show. The second point Lenin makes is that: “Politically the difference is that the workers of the oppressing nations occupy a privileged position in many spheres of political life compared with the workers of the oppressed nations.” (Ibid.)

Thus the economic source of opportunism is based in the crumbs dished out from the super profits of imperialism. The social basis of this opportunism in the working class is the labor hacks and labor aristocrats who benefit directly from the superprofits of imperialism.

The result of this economic and political bribery manifest itself in an intimate collaboration between these sold-out workers and the bourgeoisie. This situation has created a split in the working class between the labor aristocrats, who have deserted to the camp of the bourgeoisie, and the rest of the working class. This stratum of workers spreads corruption and bourgeois degeneracy amongst the proletariat. The proletariat of this Great Power, U.S. imperialism, is blinded by the privileges it enjoys in comparison to the proletariat of the oppressed nations.

These factors combined with the fact that Marxism-Leninism has not had a victory in seizing hegemony over the working class, i.e., in the absence of its

* Statistics from *Business Week*, March 21, 1977, p. 77 and *Survey of Current Business*, August 1977

political party, makes the labour movement in the U.S. a reformist led movement, which serves as a tool in the hands of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, to further exploit not only the U.S. working class, but over and beyond, the proletariat and oppressed masses of the colonies and semi-colonies.

The petty-bourgeoisie as a class is a privileged class, a small-property-owning class. In a great power like the U.S., the petty bourgeoisie enjoys extensive privileges. As a class the petty-bourgeoisie is reactionary and defends the interests of imperialism. However, the petty-bourgeoisie, like the bourgeoisie, is a dying class, one which has no future. According to its class interest, it defends a dying system, one which as Lenin said is moribund, parasitic and decaying.

Reactionary patriotism — i.e. nationalism, is a characteristic feature of both the labour aristocracy and the petty-bourgeoisie, which expresses the agonizing cries of a stratum of workers and a class that have placed their hopes and aspirations in their bourgeoisie and a dying out system. Karl Marx made the following analysis: **“The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are therefore not revolutionary, but conservative. Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheels of history. If by chance, they are revolutionary, they are so only in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat, they thus defend not their present, but their future interests, they desert their own standpoint to place themselves at that of the proletariat.”** (*Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Peking, pg. 44.)

The so-called “anti-revisionist communist movement” in the U.S. has been and remains a movement of the petty bourgeoisie—one which tries to give itself the appearance of having “transformed” into a movement (parties, etc.) which stands at the head of the proletariat, in the proletariat’s interest.

However, this is a fraud. The “fightback” against the bourgeoisie is precisely to “save from extinction their existence. . .” The most shrewd representatives of the petty bourgeoisie are those that call themselves “communists.” They are shrewd as a fox because they know that **“the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class.”** (Ibid, Marx, pg. 44.)

By pretending to be “communists,” these petty bourgeois apologists of imperialism talk of “socialism” but in deeds prettify capitalism, and sabotage the struggle for socialist revolution. They talk of internationalism, but spread nationalism in the midst of the proletariat, as a way to keep the proletariat under the hegemony of “their” own bourgeoisie.

The “CPUSA” was (and remains) a petty bourgeois party whose social basis within the working class is the labor aristocracy. Defending the interests of this small stratum of the proletariat, i.e., the labor aristocracy, it entered into class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. Those honest workers who had joined it in times of severe economic crisis, such as in the 1930’s, left in mass as its rancid history of social-chauvinism became more apparent. Thus, the “CPUSA” lost whatever temporary support the working class had given it, diminishing its

usefulness to the bourgeoisie. A new force of opportunism was needed. A “new left” movement to replace the “CPUSA” was born.

An examination of the “new left” will bring to light the opportunist nature and petty bourgeois character of the “movement”.

In order that we place this examination in its proper perspective, we must first of all begin from the premise, so completely “forgotten,” i.e. that this opportunist “movement” has been the *product* of U.S. imperialism. Lenin put it like this: **“Is there any connection between imperialism and that monstrously disgusting victory which opportunism (in the form of social-chauvinism) has gained over the labour movement in Europe? This is the fundamental question of modern socialism.”** (LCW, Vol. 19, p. 337, International Publishers.)

This fundamental question of modern socialism was liquidated by the Chinese as well as all the revisionists. Thus the “new left” in the U.S. under the banner of “anti-imperialism” could present itself in left phraseology as “revolutionary”, without having to address the real basis of imperialism or the connection between imperialism and the victory of social-chauvinism over the working class movement in the U.S. Thus, the polemics between the open social-chauvinists (the Krushchevites) and the centrists (the Maoists) was reduced to a “Sino-Soviet Split,” and elevated to a fraud, i.e., supposedly, Marxism-Leninism vs. Krushchevite revisionism. Hence, everyone who sided with the Krushchevite revisionists were openly proclaiming their social-chauvinist postures, while those who sided with China and Mao’s “CPC” continued to camouflage it under the guise of defense of Marxism-Leninism. This situation created the basis for a severe ideological crisis. The 60’s in the U.S. “movement” was a period of an all-embracing eclecticism. “Mao Zedong Thought” flourished in a hundred schools of bourgeois thought. Bourgeois nationalism seized an upper hand, and with the full-scale propagation of eclecticism: Fanon, Kwame Nkrumah, Castro, Che Guevara, Kim il Sung and Regis Debray sunk roots in the student, anti-war, national and feminist movements. Trotskyism tried to rear its ugly head once again; “Mao Zedong Thought” made it possible.

Let’s examine one of the prime organizations where this eclecticism reigned, The Students for a Democratic Society, (SDS).

SDS: Grandchild of the 2nd International, Father of the “Anti-Revisionist Communist Movement”

Wherein lie the origins of the “anti-revisionist communist movement”? . . . Of the “New Left”? In order to trace the roots of the petty bourgeois-led “anti-revisionist communist movement” one needs to examine the movement of the 1960’s, most especially the predecessor of almost all the main “parties” presently existing, from which all the “new” leaders originated, the Students for a Democratic Society, (SDS). *

*Much of the material for this section was taken from the book, *SDS*, by Kirkpatrick Sales, Vintage Books, 1974.