

PARTY AFFAIRS

A PUBLICATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.
23 West 26th Street, New York, N.Y. 10010

Vol. 3, No. 4

Price 25c



March 21, 1969

THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

by Erik Bert

The Draft Political Resolution for the 19th convention is a major contribution in arming the party ideologically. The resolution devotes special attention to the ideological arena for two reasons: (1) Imperialism, spearheaded by U.S. capitalism, has launched a massive world-wide ideological offensive for the subversion of the working class movement, including its Marxist contingents (12, 13). (2) This ideological aggression has inflicted blows on our ranks (not least because of "serious shortcomings in the party's ideological work" /71/) and on other sectors of the world Marxist movement. Imperialism has assigned a new role to the ideological struggle as a "central factor in the world struggle between the two system" (14), the resolution points out. "Imperialism's shift toward increased ideological warfare," "on a world scale," includes an "active campaign of ideological subversion" in our own country. The ideological struggle therefore "takes on a new centrality in the work of our party" (13, 14, 61).

The precondition for an effective united ideological struggle is the realization that "Any idea of ideological coexistence with imperialism is a dangerous myth" (14). That notion may be expressed in ideological passivity, perhaps on the ground that ideological conviction and partisanship can be traded off for unity in action with non-Marxists. Such ideological passivity by Marxists would be, however, most harmful to the immediate struggles, apart from its dire long-range consequences.

The core of the ideological issue is the class nature of capitalist society, the class struggle under capitalism, the historic role of the working class in the struggle against capitalism and in the attainment of socialism, and the class character of the international confrontation with imperialism. Restatement of these elementary Marxist principles is necessary because they are under attack in imperialism's ideological offensive, because the defense of these principles is crucial to the struggle against capitalism, and because the Marxist movement has suffered setbacks, here and globally, on this elementary front.

The resolution points out that there are "two basic classes in present-day society" (29). This division exists within each capitalist country and in the division between the "two world systems" (29), capitalism and socialism. As the resolution puts it:

"A deeper understanding of these basic class relationships and the direction of their development is essential for the progressive and revolutionary

movement. Without this it can become lost in a mire of confusion, in a swamp of classlessness. Without this we cannot give leadership to the struggles of our class or our people" (30).

The ideological basis of Marxism, the resolution points out, is "the role of the working class in the struggle against the evils of monopoly capitalism, and in the struggle for its overthrow" (67). In this context, it should be emphasized that "We have not yet oriented the party properly toward the working class" (70).

"The Central aim of capitalist ideology," as the resolution says, is "to conceal from the working class the nature of capital, to hide its class antagonisms." "The central aim of Marxism," on the contrary, "is to expose the true nature of capitalist class relationships" (37). The purpose of capitalist ideology is to maintain capitalism, the purpose of Marxism is to destroy capitalism (37). The "class struggle" must be, therefore, the "cornerstone" of the party's existence (62).

In capitalist society the working class alone "is capable of welding that unity of the people, that coalition of forces that is capable of resisting monopoly, and that united movement of the people that will overthrow capitalism" (67). The heart of this coalition is "the Negro-labor alliance" (5).

The essence of the repeated, and persisting, attempts to revise Marxism lies in the attempt to undermine the Marxist understanding of the working class. "The roots of revisionism," the resolution says, "lie in the refusal to accept the class struggle as the point of reference in the struggle for social progress" (61).

The attempt to revise Marxism is cultivated in two strains. One strain attempts to convince the working class that progress and security can be achieved through partnership with capital, with the capitalist class. That is the Right strain. It is, in essence, "class collaboration" (62). The other strain, avowedly 'radical,' argues in effect that progress and security can be achieved without the working class playing the leading role. That is the 'Left' strain. It denies the "historic role of the working class" and "seeks out some other class, groups, or sects" as the leading force in capitalist society (62).

The "method of capitalist ideology is to create a false sense of class partnership" (37). The method of a "revolutionary party," on the contrary, is to "expose class contradictions and bring to the fore the class interests of the working class" (37). The belief in class partnership which the capitalist class fosters is paralleled by the 'radical' contention, spread widely in recent years among the middle class and students, that the American "workers have been 'co-opted' by the capitalists ... are no longer being exploited and have become willing collaborators of the bosses" (37). The ideology of partnership, on the Right, and the ideology of classless 'radicalism,' on the 'Left,' share, thus, the doctrine of class collaboration: The Right prefers it to the working class, the 'Left' accuses the working class of having accepted it.

Within the working class the "ideological ball for capitalism" is carried by the present "dominant sections of the AFL-CIO leadership." "These leaders seek to replace the class struggle with class collaboration or, more accurately, class submission" (38).

Two alternative concepts confront the "broad radical movement" in respect to "direction, policies and tactics" (57), the resolution points out. One concept, "middle class radicalism," "rejects the class struggle and, especially, rejects the working class as the prime mover of social progress" (49, 57). The "opposing concept, Marxism, considers the class struggle its starting point" (58), and the working class as the historically destined grave digger of capitalism. The petty-bourgeois viewpoint "leads to concepts of anarchistic action by elite groups" (57). (Such "anarchistic influences," the resolution warns, "would destroy the power of the working class, the effectiveness of any people's organization and, not least, that of the party" /66/.) Marxism, on the contrary, "sees the masses as the makers of history" (58); holds that "there is no other instrument of victory than the action of the people" (61).

The effort of class collaborationist trade union leaders to damp the militancy of the working class is complemented by the petty-bourgeois concept that the "working class... cannot be won... for the present struggle" (37). This latter concept would exclude from the struggle against capitalism that class which is, in the nature of capitalist society, the decisive opponent of capital. The attempt of the capitalist class to undermine ideologically the idea of class struggle is reinforced by the 'Leftist' view that "struggles for economic demands are 'opportunism'" (39). The fact is, on the contrary, as the resolution says, that these "struggles for economic demands ... are the cornerstone of the entire class struggle" (39). This 'Leftist' view is, thus, a 'Left' egress (to borrow a phrase from P. T. Barnum) from the class struggle. The petty-bourgeois invitation to the working class to come around "when the revolution is on the order of the day" (37-38) -- to the barricades even -- would exclude the working class from the present struggle, from that struggle in which alone it can win the leadership of all the people for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism.

The "first step, ideologically" toward subverting the youth, derives from the central ideological issue, the historic position of the working class. This first step is the attempt to divert the youth "from a class position by downgrading the role of the working class," by convincing the youth that the class struggle is "outmoded and old hat." The concept of "classlessness is an essential instrument" for "intercepting the youth and diverting them from the path that leads to the acceptance of socialism" (55). The central role of the working class in capitalist society means that, among the youth, the "young workers are the decisive base" (50).

Only the understanding of the role of the working class alone makes possible the recognition of the "decisive" role of the Negro workers "in the leadership, program, strategy and tactics of the black people's liberation movement" (41). "The black workers, concentrated as they are in the pivotal centers of the production process of the capitalist economy" are, "in unity with their white brothers," as the resolution says, the "potential power to compel real relief" from "racist oppression," from a "racist system," and to "effect strategic changes in the social system itself" (40).

Working class independence is the key to defeating capitalism on the issues of the day, and to victory in the struggle for socialism. The task confronting the party, therefore, is to "seek out and elaborate those forms and tactics whereby the working class can develop its class independence in the economic, political-electoral, and ideological spheres" (39-40).

The working class can effect its historic role as the leader of the people against capital, for the overthrow of capitalism, and its replacement by socialism, only if it is led by a Marxist, working class party. Revisionism, however, "denies the need for a Marxist-Leninist" party (62). Revisionism seeks to disintegrate the Marxist movement organizationally, politically, and ideologically. The Communist Party has "class relevance" (65) as the vanguard of the working class, the representative of that class, advancing the immediate and historic interests of that class. Essential in its vanguard task is the struggle "for a class point of view," "for the injection of that point of view into all struggles"; for a "working class policy"; to "strive at all times to build class consciousness, anti-imperialist consciousness and socialist consciousness within the working class" (59, 63); and to educate the workers in the possibility and in the "historic necessity . . . of taking power from the monopolists in the interests of the nation and social progress" (64). Since the class struggle is the "cornerstone" of the party's existence, "the party must be built on the basis of the class struggle, as an instrument of that struggle" (62).

The "process of radicalization taking place among the American people," the "mass popular upsurge (is) the most important development since the Civil War," the resolution points out. It "is the central factor remolding our future," it is "remaking America" (51). However, to be effective, this radicalization requires a "class base and class understanding" (56). Since the working class is the essential base of the party's existence; the present "radicalization in the ranks of the working class" is "the key to our work." This radicalization is the "key to developing and unifying the radicalization in other social sectors." It provides the channel for "injecting a /working/ class essence" into a unified militant movement, and for "giving the whole process a revolutionary direction" (54). The Communist Party has meaning only as it is "a product of the class struggle," as the "political instrument of the working class," embracing the "most advanced, conscious elements" (60) of the class. The party must, therefore, win the "confidence" and the "adherence" of the "best of the natural leaders of the working class, black and white" (64).

As history has demonstrated, the action of the workers, as a class, is essential to the attainment of socialism. The replacement of capitalism by socialism means the replacement of capitalist rule by "working class rule" (62), capitalist state power by the "state power of the working class" (50).

The organizational conclusion for the party, of the Marxist understanding of the class nature of capitalist society, is a policy of "top priority" for "concentration on the working class" (5, 38).

The working class-capitalist class contradiction is, as the resolution points out, the "central contradiction of our time" (38). Equally, no other contradiction is the "central contradiction of our time," nor are all other contradictions, together, the "central contradiction of our time." The working class is the class whose exploitation is uniquely the essence of capitalist society, and whose manifest destiny is the abolition of exploitation through the overthrow of capitalist rule.

* * *

ON CZECHOSLOVAKIA

D.E.

I have been in disagreement with our Party's position on Czechoslovakia since last August. I am taking this opportunity to express my disagreement by way of some comments on Herbert Aptheker's articles in the November and December Political Affairs.

While Aptheker does raise some valid questions that need further discussion and probing, I find a number of matters in the articles that tend to vitiate, for me at least, what he is trying to say. Does a Nation article (September 9, 1968) quoted at some length by Aptheker about the findings of an American who had studied for three years at Charles University in Prague really carry any weight when it quotes, among other things: "Give us another five or six years and we'll have most of the industry back in private hands (Economics Student) . . . and, Not just small shops but big industry and banking, and maybe even things like medicine should be privately controlled (Medical Student). . . (Dec. 1968 PA p. 25)

Or is Kurt Fishoff, in the newsletter, William Winter Comments (again quoted at length by Aptheker) another reliable source of information when he writes: "After one of the meetings I invited a Czech couple to have coffee with me. I again posed the same question as to what they wanted, and they said 75% wanted free enterprise." (Dec. 1968 PA p.29)

I question the accuracy of both sources. I call in as evidence the findings of the Institute for Public Opinion of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. The Institute questioned 1476 persons in an opinion poll in the late spring of 1968. Among a series of questions, it asked for opinions on the restoration of private enterprise. One and one half percent of those questioned thought that political conditions would be improved by a restoration of private enterprise. One and one half percent. I consequently do not accept the sources quoted by Aptheker. I believe they are misleading. At best they reflect random individual opinions and do not give a true picture of the situation in the country as a whole. (The Poll results given above were published in The Canadian Tribune, May 29, 1968).

If later evidence is required one can find it in the November 1968 Resolution of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Party. It declared unequivocally: "The overwhelming majority of the people stood and stand for socialism, for the honorable and honest efforts of the Communists, not only to rectify the wrongs of the past but also to seek positive ways out for further development of socialism in Czechoslovakia." Excerpts of Resolution The Canadian Tribune, December 18, 1968.

Since Nation articles have been quoted, I am of the opinion that some more recent articles in that periodical (published since the Aptheker articles) do deserve critical evaluation in P.A. I am referring to Alexander Werth's piece in the December 30, 1968 Nation, and the long article by C. P. Snow in the December 9, 1968 issue.

Space will not permit critical comments either on my agreements or disagreements with these provocative articles. But I do want to quote from an article in The Catholic Worker (October 1968) on the question of the role of the Party. Beyond giving the views of a prominent personality in Czechoslovak life I claim nothing else for it.

"Dr. Josef Hromadka, leading Czechoslovakian Protestant theologian and Lenin Prize-winner for international friendship and peace, said, in a letter to the Soviet ambassador in Prague: . . . 'The process of renewal (of our socialist society) which began in January 1968 was an impressive attempt to strengthen the authority of the Communist Party, to awaken responsibility to our people for the building of socialism. . . and to give dynamic power internationally to the cause of socialism.' " In an attempt to establish the allegation that the Czechoslovak Party had rejected the concept of the leading role of the Party, Aptheker says: "Matters reached the point within the Party that the April 1968 Program affirmed not the basic Leninist concept - 'The Party is the directly ruling vanguard of the proletariat: it is the leader', " but rather denounced what it called the 'false thesis that the Party is the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat' " (Dec 1968 P.A. p 25)

The context, including this sentence in context, does affirm the leading role of the Party. The resolution reads: "The Party cannot enforce its authority but this must be won again and again by Party activity. It cannot force its line through directives but by the work of its members, by the veracity of its ideals.

"In the past the leading role of the Party was often conceived as a monopolistic concentration of power in the hands of Party bodies. This corresponded to the false thesis that the Party is the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This harmful conception weakened the authority and responsibility of the State, economic and social institutions and damaged the Party's authority, and prevented it from carrying out its real functions" (From extracts of Action Program in Marxism Today, July 1968, p. 205)

Furthermore, the above and more (too lengthy to quote) is all under the Program's subject head of "The Leading Role of the Party - A Guarantee of Socialist Progress." (My emphasis D.E.) Immediately under this sub-head we read:

"At present it is most important that the Party practices a policy fully justifying its leading role in society. We believe that at present this is a condition for the socialist development of the country.

"The Communist Party, as a party of the working-class, won the struggle with capitalism and the struggle to carry out revolutionary class changes; with the victory of socialism it becomes the vanguard of the entire socialist society. Especially at the present time the Party has proved its ability to lead this society; on its own initiative it has launched the process of democratization and ensured its socialist character. . .

"The Communist Party enjoys the voluntary support of the people; it does not practice its leading role by ruling society but by most devotedly serving its free, progressive socialist development."

Is there still doubt in anyone's mind that the Action Program of the C.P. of Czechoslovakia did not affirm the Leninist concept of the leading role of the Party?

May I also indicate my approach to Herman Kahn's article in Fortune magazine, November 1968. It would be naive to believe that the CIA and other spying agencies and the various bourgeois academic specialists on the socialist world are not working day and night through ideological subversion and through more concrete means to undermine and destroy the socialist countries one by one. On the other hand, it would be equally naive to accept their very prediction and plan as gospel truth. How frequently have their plans gone awry? How often have their estimates been wrong? When is their accuracy in question and when not? They were one hundred percent off in their opinion on the First Five Year Plan, and they were totally wrong in their estimate of the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941.

The Fortune magazine article is a highly sophisticated summary of the plans and dreams of American imperialism as seen through the eyes of one such bourgeois analyst. I accept it for what it is, but do not bow to it as irrefutable proof of anything.

May I quote from a letter in People's World (January 4, 1969) on this question: "Since Kahn is a top-drawer planner and analyst. . . what he writes has to be taken seriously - as an important indication of capitalist estimates, intentions and hopes. But not as historic truth.

"Look at the record of such bourgeois experts. In the post-1917 years almost all of them were certain that the 'Soviet Experiment' would quickly collapse. . . Look at the Central Intelligence Agency's fiasco at the Bay of Pigs in 1961.

"In the light of this record how can one accept Kahn as the infallible analyst and prophet in relation to socialist Czechoslovakia?"

Among the questions of theory and principle that I find inadequately discussed in our press and publications - and in the Aptheker articles - are: (1) the principles of the sovereignty and autonomy of all socialist countries and of the independence and equality of all Communist Parties; (2) a theoretical probing into the question of democracy and socialism; (3) the concept of the leading role of the Party; (4) on attitude to and relations with the Soviet Union; and (5) on internationalism and solidarity against imperialism, in particular, American imperialism. (This latter question is discussed by Aptheker.)

Since this is a question of differences within the world Communist movement I would welcome discussion that confronts the arguments of the French, Italian, English, Spanish, etc. parties as a means of clarifying, if not resolving, the issues of principle involved.

I wish to add some critical remarks on the manner in which Political Affairs has treated this controversy.

During the first eight months of 1968 PA published nothing on developments in that country. Not one of such basic documents as Alexander Dubcek's speech to the CC of CP Cz., April 1, 1968; the Action Program of the CPCz adopted April 5, 1968; the Resolution on the Present Situation and the Further Action of the Party, adopted at May 29-June 1, 1968 Plenum, and the answer of the Presidium of the Party to the 5-Party Letter, July 18, 1968, was printed in the periodical.

Since September no less than seven articles have been published in PA - all presenting one viewpoint in support of the Party's position.

How can the comrades judge the Czechoslovak Party after the historic January 1968 change, when none of the documentary material mentioned earlier was published in our press or publications? Is our Party properly informed when it reads only one side of a controversy within the international Communist movement? How does one decide between conflicting interpretations of Marxism when only one set of views is presented? Why didn't PA at least reprint some of the documents - or extracts from them - which appeared in the World Marxist Review, in WMR Bulletins, in the Canadian and English Party press and publications, not to mention the French, Italian, etc. etc. before August. In fact, PA has on more than occasion reproduced articles particularly from the WMR in order to keep its readers informed on some important development. Why didn't it do this for the momentous events in Czechoslovakia?

Would it not have been proper, as a minimum, in order to initiate a full, free and informed discussion to have published since September at least two additional full-length articles? One might have presented the viewpoint of a National Committee member who did not agree with the majority decision. And another might have given us the position in detail as adopted by a Western European party not in agreement with ours.

To say that these parties opposed the military intervention of the Warsaw Pact countries without giving the reasons for their opposition - and where possible in their own words - is to back away from a discussion even before it gets started.

Unless we give much more thought to the handling of such controversies - and there are differences in the international Communist movement on Soviet, Cuban, Chinese, Rumanian, Yugoslav, in addition to Czechoslovakian, developments - we will repeat the tendency either to close our eyes to a disturbing aspect of reality, or to treat other Communist parties with whom we are in disagreement as pariahs, whose material on specific issues is verboten in our publications.

The Communist Party of Spain with profound insight has declared: "The experiences of recent years has placed before Communists an infinity of problems that we didn't even suspect existed thirty years ago... Before the disappearance of the fundamental contradiction of today, irreconcilable and antagonistic as it is, between socialism and imperialism, we find ourselves already affected by our own contradictions" (the contradictions of socialism - D.E.). (Translated from September 1968 Mundo Obrero).

The cadre of our Party will grow and Marxism-Leninism as a science will thrive when there is a responsible confrontation of opposing views on critical questions that affect the whole Communist movement. And the leadership has a role to play in advancing its views and fighting for them. But an informed membership creatively guided is also a basic prerequisite.

In a separate article I plan to present the viewpoints of a number of Communist Parties - who disagreed with the military intervention - on the five questions of theory and principle referred to earlier in this article.

It should only be noted now, in closing, that I identify with these Parties - and, of course, with our Party - and the other Communist and Workers' Parties of the World in the call for maximum unity, in spite of differences, to check the aggressive designs of American imperialism and to advance the struggle for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

* * *

CLASS-CONSCIOUSNESS: PRELUDE TO OR PRODUCT OF STRUGGLE?

Robert Heisler

Bob Duggan's article in the February 21st issue of Party Affairs-Notes on the Resolution for a YCL, expresses a wrong view on the question of consciousness, how consciousness develops and its role in the class struggle. While there is much I disagree with in Duggan's article I want to deal only with this aspect of his piece which is really his main thought. His views reflect differences, I believe, with some of the basic philosophical premises of Marxist thought-differences which I think are reflective of philosophical challenges from the New Left generally. While the main weakness in the Party as a whole is timidity in the struggle for ideas and yielding to spontaneity, among our student cadre it is in the other direction-the acceptance (in part or toto) of a lifeless, idealist conception of the struggle for consciousness.

Below are three representative quotes from Duggan's piece:

"Its (YCL-RH) strategic goal (should be--RH) the deepening of the anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist consciousness and organization of the movement for socialism... That in the participation and creation of democratic movements it relate to such movements in order to ensure the deepening of class consciousness."

"The working class prior to fighting for State power must fight for lesser goals. The problem of the revolutionary is how to relate the lesser goal to the fight for State power."

"We must take up the political education of the working class, the deepening of its consciousness, as the principal form of activity (my emphasis--RH) of the Party."

Is the role of the Party in relation to the class struggle placed properly?

Does Duggan present a materialist conception of the matter of consciousness?

The materialist conception holds that ideas are a mental reflection of the real world and not vice versa. Scientific socialism itself becomes a coherent world outlook just at that point in history when a real working class movement emerges on the stage of history. Utopian communism goes back hundreds of years. But Karl Marx, armed with a critique of the mechanical materialism of Feuerback and the idealism of the Young Hegelians and familiar with the best of the utopian socialists, merges his philosophical criticism and French political theory with his reflection upon the real, actual, English Chartist movement, to produce scientific socialist thought. Despite Marx's genius, had he lived a hundred years earlier he would not have been a Marxist!

Bourgeois ideology arises as a reflection of the emergence of bourgeois property. Feudalism in Europe had effectively been overthrown

by bourgeois production relations before the seizure of State power by the bourgeoisie. 1799 marked the completion in the political sphere of the already unleashed process in the sphere of material production. The socialist revolution is unlike all previous revolutions in that socialist production relations and socialist property do not emerge "in the womb of capitalism" but is created by the seizure of State power by the working class. What then is the material basis upon which the ideas of socialism, (workers' State power and the abolition of private property) rest? It is upon the real situation, real movement, actions program and preparedness to rule of a real working class. Socialism remains a utopian scheme and the "idea" of workers' power will receive no widespread acceptance among the workers themselves, until the working class in the process of the class struggle transforms itself from a divided, exploited mass, into an organized, united, independent conscious force, capable of organizing society on an entirely new basis.

It is this understanding that separates the Communists from the left sects who view the question of consciousness idealistically, as one of convincing the worker of the need for socialism, through the soundness and "Logic" of Argumentation itself. Communists participate in the day to day struggles of the class not just "to bring consciousness" to the participants in reform struggles but to consciously help lay the material basis for the spread and acceptance of socialist consciousness, to help transform the class, to prepare it for its tasks and to turn it into a force that is in fact a material alternative to capitalism. A demoralized divided, confused working class cannot reach socialist consciousness no matter how deep its disillusionment with the bourgeois status quo, or how effective is our exposure and propaganda. There is no material basis for the emergence of such consciousness under these conditions. Socialist consciousness takes root in a class that is confident of itself as a class, aware of its power in life, confident of its fighting capacity and unity. Simply put, the class must become conscious of itself (that it is in fact a class, that it stands in contradiction to another class, that it stands in definite relation to various intermediate strata, etc.) before it can become conscious for itself (that it has the historic task of overthrowing capitalism and establishing socialism).

Concretely, the meaning of all this for our struggle in America can be seen for example in the question of racism and class consciousness. Can the American working class become a class conscious force until racist ideology is dealt a severe blow among the white workers? Certainly not. A class divided within itself along color lines can not come to know itself as an independent, revolutionary force. Thus we place the question of the struggle against racism as a central matter and we chart the practical experiences and struggles that our class must go through in order for it to come to understand the poisonous effects of racist ideology and practice in the working class movement. This involves the building of joint struggles of Black and White around mutual self-interest- the involvement of the trade unions in the demands of the Black community and in the struggle against racism and discrimination in the trade union and in the shops..

Duggan, as does the new left generally, places the question on its head:

"Unity of the class will develop only as the class becomes conscious of its historical potential."

Thus the vanguard strives to instill class consciousness among white workers on the one hand and among Black workers on the other. As each section is won to class consciousness (becomes conscious of their historic potential) they shed their mistrust and join hands as class brothers. (In passing, this is the origin of the idea of "white demands" and "white revolutionary movements" that have currency in the New Left). But we will never live to see such developments in real life. Things like this only take place as mental connections of abstract thought. There is no material basis for a white worker or a Black worker to become class conscious when there is now real, actual, practical life experience of Black and white in common struggle. (Ideas reflect real life, not vice versa).

What is the recent experience. DRUM, FRUM and ELRUM activists view questions mainly along the lines of color. Why? Because so far that has been their real, practical experience in the shops—bucking the boss and bucking racism among fellow white workers. No amount of propoganda among these Black workers for socialist consciousness will have the same affect as just some small, tangible break by the white workers and an active show of support by whites for their just, demands. And what is the basis for winning whites in these shops? Is it through convincing them to be revolutionaries and eventually support Black workers on the basis of unity in the struggle for revolutionary transformation? Hardly. It will be, at this stage, on the basis of trade union unity and joint struggle against the company. There is no other, real (material, not intellectual) basis for unity today. Cementing unity on this level of consciousness creates the material basis for more advanced consciousness to take root.

Are our tasks in this situation adequately defined by Duggan:

"OUR strategic aim must be to deepen the revolutionary class consciousness of movements that see as their aim, resolution of immediate needs or demands . . . To abandon the struggle for the education of such democratic movements as to the class character of society and need for its transformation is to accept these movements as ends in themselves."

But this tells us nothing of what we are really to do in this situation. In fact it obscures a recognition of the real nature of our tasks. Would Duggan say it was revisionism if I were to assert that the main (absolutely central, primary, foremost) task of Communists in the auto shops today is to win support among white workers for the national, democratic demands of the Black workers on the basis of trade union consciousness and to struggle to win those demands through united workers' struggle? I emphasize win here

because I want to deal with the question of "accepting these movements as ends in themselves." Is there not an aspect of "end in itself" in this (as well as all) democratic struggles? The winning of these demands may signal "the end" of the particular democratic struggle around particular demands on the basis of the way the organizers first envisioned it. In this sense there is the aspect of "end in itself." We dare not overlook this aspect however, or we will never be able to give real leadership to real struggles for the solution of immediate (and not so immediate,) democratic demands: We will make opportunist errors the way PL and SWP does- participating in movements solely to recruit and exhort. The other main aspect of these struggles of course is that they lay the material basis for the development of class consciousness and class struggle on the highest levels.

A corrolary error Duggan makes here is in the view that all levels of consciousness and class action short of class (socialist) consciousness and revolutionary action, are spontaneously arrived at and require no conscious intervention by the vanguard. This is a fundamental error. Lenin viewed spontaneous actions as a reflection of a specific level of consciousness. Today, with a sophisticated ruling class which confronts the workers with terribly complex problems (automation, conglomerates, racism, etc.) there is no level of consciousness and struggle that we can assign to the category of "spontaneous" or automatic. Take even the simplest level of trade union consciousness- the organization of workers on the job. Since the expulsion of the Communists from the labor movement has organization of the unorganized gone ahead automatically? It has not. (Cite figures of AFL-CIO). Today the working class needs the help of the class conscious workers to solve even the simplest of tasks. If we do not consciously intervene, surely the ruling class will. This is an expression of the intensity (however hidden) that the class struggle has reached during the period of the capitalism's general crisis.

Once you understand that the material basis for the spread of socialist consciousness must be consciously laid you understand that we relate to the reform struggles to do much more than "bring consciousness". We relate in order to insure that real things happen in these movements: that struggle is conducted vigorously and not faintheartedly; that struggle is conducted in a way that involves the independent action of the masses and not just the humble entreaties of representatives or the small scale provo actions of the few. That organization and lasting unity is built. That win, lose or draw confidence and a fighting spirit is instilled. These are the ingredients of the material pre-requisites to building consciousness.

Marxists view the movements for reform as the school of practical experience through which the working class transforms itself, becomes conscious of itself and prepares itself to challenge for power. Duggan's formulation on this accepts the thinking of the utopian left (present in the new and ultra-left) with regard to reform struggles:

"Workers will understand this (the necessity for capitalism's transformation -RH) only if spontaneous aspirations for better wages and improvement of their condition is subordinated (MY EMPHASIS, RH) to making the class conscious of itself and its historical role in the transformation of society."

Thus in Duggan's view you have the working class struggling to improve its conditions under capitalism because it labors under false consciousness. We must convince it to leave aside (subordinate) its struggle to improve its condition and get to the business of revolution.

There is so much that should be said about this sentence but I will only comment on two things. First, the revolutionary struggle does not mean a break with the workers' concern for improvement of their condition. Just the opposite. The revolution is the action of the working class of elevating the struggle for the improvement of their condition to the level of fundamental solution. Second, a real worker, or group of workers or a whole class, laboring under real, given conditions tries to solve its problems within a given set of material possibilities. These possibilities are defined by the actual status of the class, its level of organization, experience and consciousness and the actual relations of class forces in the given situation.

Workers in the early days of capitalism combined into unions to fight the boss. Before this individual worker sabotaged machinery. No amount of propaganda by advanced vanguards could have gotten the workers to "skip all that baloney" and seize State power. There was no material possibility for such consciousness and action given the real, primitive condition of the workers. No amount of propaganda today will move the American working class to launch a general strike for some political objective say, when its trade unions remain appendages to the two major parties and it lacks even the independent instrumentalities through which such action could realistically be undertaken. Thus the question of the workers' actions is not just a simple question of "consciousness" in an abstract sense. "If they were class conscious they would do such and so. Since they are not class conscious they do not do such and so."

You must also reckon with the actual situation of the class its organization, experiences.

Workers struggle for reforms in the system not just because they are "reformists" (surely American workers today are that) but also because short of a revolutionary situation how else can you expect workers to defend their interests. Revolutionary workers also struggle for reforms within capitalism. Capitalist production relations are a material reality that cannot be wished away. And, as Lenin explained, there are factors that go into creating a revolutionary situation that are beyond the control of the revolutionary Party (e.g. the situation of the ruling class). The implied statement in Duggan's piece (and explicitly stated by New Left people) is that struggle for reform within capitalism is simply a matter of choice:

"The Strategic goal of the Youth resolution (Duggan here refers to the NC resolution of Jan. '69-RH) is the building of a mass based democratic movement opposed to monopoly with an anti-capitalist component within it. That is, it subordinates the class struggle to the democratic struggle. You cannot have two equally important strategies. One must predominate over the other. It is our view that an anti-cap-

italist strategy must predominate".

As if we, by our free choice, could determine which shall predominate—the struggle for reforms or the struggle for revolutionary overthrow of capitalism.

"There can be no such thing as exaggeration of the conscious role of the revolutionary Party", writes Duggan. I'm afraid Duggan disproves himself.

This is the whole meaning of the Party's projection of an anti-monopoly strategy. It is the charting of the real path and line of experiences along which the working class must travel, in the course of which it fashions itself into a leading, material force for social change, transforming itself and preparing itself to challenges for power. From this, for example, flows the centrality of winning the class to a new party of labor. Through such a party the class gains the necessary experience in class independence in the political arena. Without such experiences it cannot know itself, become more fully conscious of itself, its allies, its real primary and secondary enemies. From these concepts flow all the policies of the Party.

We must grasp the dialectical interconnection between the building of socialist consciousness and the building of the material pre-requisites to socialist consciousness. You do not build the latter and then the former or vice versa. They develop together, feeding each other, re-enforcing each other, mutually interdependent. The conscious revolutionary elements strengthen the immediate and longer range, reform struggles (the way they are conducted, the lessons that are learned). The struggles themselves prepare the ground for consciousness to take root. Thus propagation of revolutionary ideas must be always present, reaching the more advanced, constantly building the vanguard and support for the vanguard. The independent role of the Party is not for some far off future when all the pre-requisites for our public entrance on the stage of history will have been set. Such views are the source of deadening, rightist errors. On the other hand, reducing the role of the Party to propaganda alone will insure that our propaganda will fall on deaf ears.

Duggan's anti-capitalist strategy reduces Party tasks to propaganda alone. It says nothing, and can say nothing about practical tasks and the real problems of building a revolutionary working class movement. The problem of revolution is much, much richer by far than the question of finding the way in which to convince the working class of the need for socialism. And the problem of convincing the workers of the need for revolution is far richer than the question of Party agitation.

* * *

Changes in Chapter I - - State Monopoly Capitalism

by Jack Kurzweil

At the Special Convention of the Communist Party in June, 1968 it was agreed that Chapter I of the Draft Program did not adequately define and analyze the laws of motion of state monopoly capitalism in the United States today. Therefore, the chapter did not provide an adequate framework for developing a revolutionary strategy for our Party.

What follows are suggested additions and changes in Chapter I of the Program of the Communist Party issued in January, 1969.

- p. 4, Line 16 add: This struggle, which is at the heart of the class struggle, is a spontaneous, natural outgrowth of capitalist exploitation itself.

- p. 5 Line 13 (after the word "workers") insert: Hence there is greater insecurity for all workers. In particular, there is the growth of a stratum of the working class, disproportionately black, which is either permanently unemployed or marginally employed.

- p. 7. Line 22 add: Moreover, the regulatory measures themselves have produced long term trends that threaten the stability of the economy. The growing tendency toward increased unemployment exists side by side with spiraling inflation.

- p. 13 Line 3 add: Central and decisive is the struggle of wage-labor against capital at a monopoly-dominated point of production, But the struggle against monopoly goes far beyond this; it extends to every corner of American life. It is the struggle:

- to rebuild the cities as fit places for people to live
- to end pollution of the air, water, and desecration of the land
- to improve the quality of education and increase access to it
- to develop a culture which is both human and mass
- to stem the flood of violence and war
- to end the fetishism that is increasingly associated with shabbily constructed commodities
- to insure adequate health care for all
- to end the reign of police terror
- to eliminate governmental bureaucracies that computerize and degrade people
- for jobs
- and many more of similar character

These democratic struggles are the reflex action of a people oppressed by monopoly.

- p. 13 Line 5 through p. 14 line 16 to be stricken and replaced with the following:

Monopoly and Government: The Rise of State Monopoly Capitalism

In this struggle the people encounter not only the economic might of monopoly capital, but its political power, a power wielded through its control of the machinery of government and the two-party electoral apparatus.

As the economic power of monopoly capital has grown, as its domination of the economy has increased, as the socialization of the means of production has accelerated, so also have crises and potential crises of capitalism as a whole deepened. The great depression of 1929 was a historical watershed for American capitalism, for it marks the beginning of a new development in the relationship between monopoly capital and government--the transition from monopoly capitalism to state monopoly capitalism.

In an ever more intricately intertwined relationship with the top ranks of monopoly capital, government has undertaken innumerable new tasks which, taken all together, have created a society in which the power of monopoly capital is extended well beyond its domination of the productive process. State monopoly capitalism is a system in which old governmental institutions are changed, given new content, new institutions, governmental and quasi-governmental, are developed all for the greater profit of monopoly capital and the preservation of capitalism.

This development is not a sign of strength. On the contrary, when capitalism was young and healthy its slogan was "that government governs best which governs least". What capitalists meant of course, was that in their view the only legitimate function of government was the protection of capitalist property from the propertyless. A second aspect of the slogan was the contention that the capitalist, operating in a free economy, neither needed nor desired any favors from government, except to be left alone. To be sure, this principle was often honored in the breach, but its existence characterized a young, growing, and vital capitalism.

For monopoly capital today, even the principle has become outmoded.

- Socialization of production has reached such proportions that the new space age enterprises more and more require investment and operation on a scale exceeding the capacities of even the most gigantic corporations. They develop practices, which in more naive times would be called corruption, of joint monopoly - government enterprises in which government foots the bill. Witness Telestar and the development of commercial aircraft.

- Overproduction (that which cannot be sold, as opposed to that which cannot be consumed), based on fantastically developing technology, has become so acute that the government must buy surplus goods at premium prices. A vast government-backed consumer credit system backed by a psychologically manipulative advertising system has played a role in absorbing socially useless production.

- The free market economy under monopoly capitalism reached the end of its tether in 1929. Since then an enormous machinery has been set up by the government to attempt to regulate the market and counter-act the drive toward crisis inherent in monopoly capitalism. These measures include the regulation of money and credit, of interest rates and stock transactions.

- As a result of a complex of historical and economic reasons: to fight socialism, to protect foreign investments, to prevent colonial revolution, to secure the domestic economy, there has developed the military-industrial complex which is responsible for the spending of \$60 to \$80 billion a year, most of which ends up in the hands of monopoly capital.

- The public debt, risen to over \$500 billion, has become a haven for monopoly's surplus capital; bonds pay a tax-free 5% per year, another drain on the government.

- The government subsidizes the auto and oil industries by massive highway construction; the insurance company controlled real-estate industry and agribusiness by water projects and federal loans, urban renewal projects, etc. Not only do these and others cost the taxpayer money, they rape the land and dehumanize the quality of life.

- The changing character of production requires increasing numbers of workers with advanced education and technical training. The cost of this training is not, however, borne by the giant corporations who could not meet these costs and still maintain adequate profit. So these costs have been socialized. This is the basic reason for the fantastic expansion of government financed higher education, from junior colleges to universities, and goes a long way toward explaining the content of that education.

Higher education, controlled by monopoly, is itself a big business and the partner of big business in real estate deals, government-sponsored research and financial manipulations.

Higher education, operating for the first time on a mass scale, is the leading propagandist for racism, imperialism, capitalism, and counter-revolution.

- The government has developed institutions such as Peace Corps, Job Corps, Vista, War on Poverty, designed to channel and control the struggles of people against the system. That these schemes often backfire is a tribute

to the wisdom of the masses in struggle and also a result of the increasing bankruptcy of the system.

On all levels of government, from local to national, and on all issues of national importance, from education and housing to armaments and foreign policy, formidable legal and bureaucratic barriers have been erected to prevent the masses from engaging in the decision-making process while the role of monopoly in the process has been greatly increased.

The Federal and State regulatory agencies, originally designed to regulate the monopolies, are staffed by direct representatives of those very corporations. The executive branch is now the home of the corporate elite. The State department is a Rockefeller domain. The Secretary of Defense alternates between General Motors and Ford. The first and second rank cabinet officers directly represent the financial empires of American capitalism.

The development of state-monopoly capitalism is not simply a consequence of the tendency toward economic crisis inherent in capitalism, but also reflects the general political crisis of capitalism as a system. It was not only the depression of 1929 but also the completion of the first five-year plan in the Soviet Union in 1932 that brought state monopoly capitalism from the right to Germany as Nazism, and to the U.S., from the "left" as the New Deal. Of course the difference between the two is of enormous consequence to the masses of people, but the point is that both emerge from the decay of capitalism in the face of a rising socialism. Thus, state monopoly capitalism is capitalism in the era of wars and revolutions, in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism.

The most sinister offspring of American state monopoly capitalism is popularly known as the military-industrial complex. This complex is a combination of those sectors of monopoly with the biggest stake in militarism and foreign conquest and the military brass, whose power, privilege and prestige grows in proportion to the size of the military establishment it commands.

p. 16 line 19 - 24 delete and substitute the following:

Working people suffer the greatest impact of the burden in both financial and social ways. Workers pay more taxes than others, and get less for it. Workers suffer most from the deterioration of education, health, transit, recreation, and social welfare. Workers are the most cheated by shoddy consumer goods, credit thieves, insurance companies, and jim-cracky, sterile, isolated housing tracts.

And, of course, the oppression of the black and brown components of the working class is even more acute than that of the class as a whole.

Thus, the struggle between workers and state monopoly capitalism takes place on many fronts simultaneously.

Historically, the class struggle has been focused at the point of production. The main political struggles of the working class were the right to organize and strike, the defence and extension of the Bill of Rights.

With the development of state monopoly capitalism, exploitation at the point of production has not disappeared; as some establishment and "left" critics proclaim. On the contrary, it has increased in intensity. Nor has the political struggle around the rights of labor to organize and strike decreased. The fight against Taft-Hartley and other restrictive laws is ongoing. The question of the right to organize is paramount in the south and in such "benevolent" despotisms as IBM and Metropolitan Life in the north. Struggle in defense of and in extension of the Bill of Rights are intensifying.

However, state monopoly capitalism does not confine its exploitation of workers to the point of production. Using the tax power of the monopoly state, monopoly capital is able to extract from the working class and other non-monopoly strata a vast portion of the social wealth of the nation over and above what it gets in profits from the productive process itself. The overall tax burden has dramatically increased; it costs the average worker class family over 25% of its income. Moreover, this new level of taxation is fundamental to state monopoly capitalism--it fuels the mechanism, it is the loot that the monopolies are fighting over.

Thus the question of taxation and the multitudinous social and economic questions surrounding it have, as never before, become a focus of class struggle.

Political struggle, for the working class, had taken on a new dimension over and above the struggles for the rights of labor. The contest for political power, for control of the government apparatus, has become a struggle between workers and monopoly capital for the division of the social wealth of the nation. State monopoly capitalism compels workers to engage in such a contest for power for the same reasons that capitalism production compels class struggle as the point of production.

One result of this multifront character of the class struggle is that the point of production, although fundamental to capitalism exploitation may not, at some particular time, be the arena in which the sharpest struggle is taking place. The link that moves the chain may, at one time or another, be education, housing, police brutality, taxation, etc. as well as traditional trade union struggles.

Another result is that each of these struggles, whether inside or out of the shop, increasingly confronts the centralized power of monopoly and the monopoly dominated state. As a consequence the gap between economic and democratic struggles, on the one hand, and the struggle for political power on the other hand, is increasingly narrowed; it is increasingly difficult to achieve success without also contesting for political power. The trade unions are increasingly compelled to take up questions involving the class as a whole.

Engels, writing in Socialism, Utopian and Scientific (International Publishers, New York, 1935 pp.65 - 69) foresaw this process. He shows that "the form of socialization" by means of the "joint-stock company" becomes insufficient at a certain degree of development. It now passes on to the "trust", he says, and then from the trust to "state property". He states specifically: "In the trusts, freedom of competition changes into its very opposite -- into monopoly . . . In any case, with trusts or without, the official representative of capitalist society -- the state -- will ultimately have to undertake the

direction of production. This necessity of conversion into state property is felt first in the great institutions for intercourse and communications. . . . " He adds: "For only when . . . the taking over by the state has become economically inevitable, only then -- even if it is the state of today that effects this -- is there an economic advance, the attainment of another step preliminary to the taking over of all productive forces by society itself." And more: "The workers remain wage workers -- proletarians. The capitalist relation is not done away with. It is rather brought to a head. But, brought to a head, it topples over. State ownership of the productive forces is not the solution of the conflict, but concealed within it are the technical conditions that form the elements of the solution." Finally: "The capitalist mode of production . . . shows itself the way . . . The proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production into state property."

Thus, especially under state monopoly capitalism, the capitalist system fashions, in the working class, the tool of its own destruction.

It is the industrial working class that is exploited at the heart of the productive process and thus has the power to effect the national economy. The events of 1968 in France amply illustrate the massive power of the industrial working class disciplined by the very large scale and intricate social production that can thus move as a class. It is the industrial working class, through its trade unions, that can be the most effective and well organized enemy of monopoly and the monopoly state on all fronts of the class struggle.

Alongside the industrial working class is the growing mass of white collar workers, teachers, technical workers, government workers, etc. The very process of socialization of production is imparting to more and more of these jobs an industrial character. The realization in struggle of this process is the enormous growth of trade unions in white collar trades.

Thus, it is the working class that is the decisive force for socialism, for revolution.

But the working class is not the only section of the population that is oppressed by state-monopoly capitalism. To be sure, only workers are exploited at the point of production, but all non-monopoly sectors of the population suffer from high taxes, the deterioration of the quality of life, the militarization of the society, and the economic weight of monopoly capital. Thus all young people, intellectuals and professionals, small farmers and businessmen are oppressed and constricted by state monopoly capitalism. There is no future for them under this system.

Then there is the special oppression of all black people.

American Capitalism - A Racist System (This would be a new section. I am only offering some of the points that it should make)

1. The superexploitation of blacks as slaves was the primary method of primitive accumulation of capital here. Thus the growth of capitalism relied on slavery and racism:

2. At the same time, the political powerlessness of black people (3/5 rule) permitted control of government by Bourbons.

3. After Civil War, superexploited black labor became a major source of northern monopoly superprofits; it allowed all wages to be depressed by maintaining a black-white, north-south differential; created divisions in working class, retarded trade unionism , conditions which still persist.
4. The Dixiecrat system, based on effective disenfranchisement of blacks in the south, was and is a major weapon of political control by monopoly capital.
5. The development of state monopoly capitalism (including automation) creates an increasing, disproportionately black, section of the working class which is permanently unemployed or marginally employed.
6. Deterioration of cities and of social services falls most heavily on black people.
7. A new social demagogy has arisen which, to a great extent, blames the rise in taxes on freeloading by black people on welfare and similar arguments. Not only does this mask the facts of monopoly looting of public funds, but it also serves as a basis for racism. Increasingly, racist demagogy is blaming the very decay of American society caused by the rise of state monopoly capitalism on the black liberation movement.
8. In particular, the rise of the ultra-right, of the fascist danger, is interwoven with the rise of racism and its social demagogy. "Law and Order" erodes democratic liberties for all by attacking those of black people. Of special importance, is the rise of and intensity of police brutality in the black community.
9. Some indication of the racist structure of all American institutions should be given to show the depth of racism in American society.

These are among the points that should be made in this section.

American Imperialism

1. This section (p. 17 line 19 through p. 19, line 9) belongs here. It is an integral part of the description of US capitalism.
2. It should point out that the Jim Crow system was the first expression of US imperialism.
3. It should note that because US capitalism is internationalized, the struggle against it is international; that is, many working classes in many capitalist, colonial and neocolonial nations are moving into struggle against US capitalism (e.g. the trend toward international bargaining for auto workers.)

4. It should conclude that US imperialism has thus generated yet another force for its own destruction.

p. 17 line 1 through line 11, delete and replace with:

To sum up: the exploitation of wage labor by capital leads to a struggle by the working class whose victory can only come about by abolishing exploitation of man by man through the establishment of socialism. While exploitation and oppression of workers by capitalists was never limited to the point of production, the rise of monopoly capitalism and state monopoly capitalism adds to and intensifies the ways in which workers are exploited and oppressed.

The other side of the coin is that the variety of weapons of struggle which the working class has at its disposal has also increased.

Moreover, as the weight of state monopoly capitalism is felt by all non-monopoly sections of the population, the working class is increasingly able to find allies in struggles against an increasing number and variety of policies and practices of monopoly.

In particular, the most powerful potential ally of the working class is the Afro-American people who, in addition to being overwhelmingly working class, are, as a people, oppressed by the American capitalist system. So central is this super-oppression to the maintenance of the system, that at the very core of the struggle against monopoly is the struggle for black liberation.

The diverse democratic struggles developing today, alongside of and intertwined with the class struggle as such, are objectively struggles against a common enemy: monopoly capital. Hence, as awareness of this grows, they tend to merge into a common stream of struggle--into a coalition of all democratic forces against the power of monopoly. It is within this framework that the strategy and tactics of the fight for socialism must take place.

* * *

THE ANTI-MONOPOLY CONCEPT--comments and criticism

By R.S., New England District

State-monopoly capitalism

In all advanced capitalist countries and particularly in the United States, 'increasing socialization of the means of production has led to concentration of industry in fewer and fewer hands and has resulted in the emergence of a monopoly sector of the capitalist class which has a decisive influence and control over the capitalist economy. Monopolization of industry leads to monopolization of capital and the formation of a financial oligarchy (a sort of monopoly sector of finance capital) which merges with the industrial monopoly capitalists. At a later stage, (after the second world war in this country) the state which formerly protected the interests of the capitalist class as a whole merges with the monopoly sector of the capitalist class and protects its interests against all competitors, including the non-monopoly capitalists. Monopoly, allied with the state, faces the American people as the major source of exploitation and misery. It faces the world as US imperialism. The state never ceases to be a capitalist state, however. In times of stress and upheaval it defends the entire capitalist class against the common enemy-- the working class and its allies.

Contradictions in capitalism

The primary contradiction in capitalism is the property question, the contradiction between social production and private appropriation. The main expression of this contradiction is the class contradiction between bourgeoisie (capitalists) and proletariat (workers).

However, there also exist many contradictions in capitalist society which are secondary expressions of the main contradiction which can only be resolved by the destruction of capitalism and its replacement by socialism. Leading among these is the exploitation of black people. Others are oppression of women, youth, other national minorities etc. The existence of these secondary contradictions makes it possible (if not necessary) to organize on other than strictly class lines since the source of oppression of all these groups is the same, i.e. monopoly capital and capitalism in general. Also, working with these broader groups increases the potential for allies of the working class which ultimately strengthens working class and revolutionary forces at the time of a revolution.

Democratic (reform) struggle vs. Socialist (revolutionary) struggle

If we are to accept the premise that direct struggle for socialism is not possible at the present moment due to the non-existence of a mass movement led by the working class, then we must conclude that the nature of many struggles that we are planning to lead will be broad and democratic

in nature. Our program must therefore project an intermediate strategy. Generally this strategy is one of anti-monopoly struggles since the monopoly group has decisive control in the government in the ruling class as a whole and in the American economy. It faces the American people and workers as the de-facto enemy in most of today's struggles.

criticism "The Communists fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of the future of that movement" - Karl Marx, Communist Manifesto. Communists definitely initiate reform struggles for immediate issues, but they also should have a definite idea what they want these struggles to lead to. I want here to consider some tendencies in the Party today which seem to imply that some sort of "democratic stage" has to occur before we can start to talk about a "revolutionary stage", that this "democratic stage" is what we should be working toward and that we cannot start to raise socialist consciousness before we reach this stage.

Our draft program states: "all serious politics is a contest for power". What are the roots of power in present day society? Power, in the institutions of American society and in the state, is in the hands of the capitalist class. As Communists we see the necessity to work for working class state power and revolutionary worker's control over society's institutions as the only fundamental alternative to capitalist power. The concept of democracy is very closely tied up with the definition of power since democracy is a class conception, so therefore the class that has power in society is the one which enjoys freedom. But "democracy" in general is not something that can ever be attained under capitalism. We want to lead democratic reform struggles but not with the idea or purpose of instituting "democracy" as a prelude to revolution. Our draft main political resolution states that "the roots of revisionism lie in the refusal to accept the class struggle as the point of reference in the struggle for social progress". The class struggle is the primary component of every reform struggle in the period of capitalism. Non-working class elements can only free themselves from capitalist domination when they join the class struggle on the side of the working class. Any conception of democracy and power other than a class one is misleading and revisionist by definition.

The struggle for "more" democracy is waged by Communists in a capitalist society in the context of creating favorable conditions for the formation of a mass movement led by the working class. For example, the demand to end all "right to work" laws and compulsory arbitration is not made in a vacuum--it is made because the existence of such laws hinder and thwart attempts at organizing workers. Also fighting for democratic rights can help show workers the need for replacing bourgeois "democracy" with proletarian democracy, since the ruling class is currently trampling on many of the freedoms that it originally rallied

people behind. So in this current and historical perspective a democratic demand is part of the class struggle if a success on the issue will facilitate building organization and raising class consciousness. But the idea that "democracy" is attainable in the present period and that it must be obtained before socialist struggle can begin obscures the class nature of struggle, wants to postpone the class struggle and obscures the role of the Party as the vanguard of the working class.

This notion finds programmatic expression in the misplacement of emphasis in the draft program on electoral struggle of the "anti-monopoly people's party". It is utopian to think that working class state power can be won by the ballot in this country, the homeground of world imperialism and reaction, it is equally utopian to think that mass consciousness can be raised by a primarily electoral struggle. Any prospect for revolution will be endlessly frustrated unless most of our emphasis is placed on the building of a mass revolutionary social base. It is our duty as Communists to organize workers, not precinct captains. If we don't have a mass base, when the time comes that the government brings out their army against us, we will be crushed.

Two qualifications on this, however. This does not mean that I am advocating an abstentionist view toward electoral politics. The electoral arena provides a certain amount of latitude for us to organize and raise consciousness and as long as people are forced to define themselves politically every four years, we will have to relate to them. Also I am not suggesting that we not make use of a "peaceful transition" to socialism if the possibility for one ever occurs. My point is that at the present time it is quite utopian to think in terms of a peaceful transition and that our projected program should reflect this realization. Another point--We will never, never be able to rely on the government to enforce demands that we "win" in the electoral arena--we must be in the position to enforce our demands whenever we can. Building tenants' unions instead of relying on a referendum to pass rent control is an example of this dichotomy.

Concrete application of "democracy" and "class"

The fact that democracy is viewed in other than class terms leads to confusion and certain mistakes about what kind of struggles we should lead. Unless we are clear about the class content of demands, we could find ourselves leading what are essentially anti-working class struggles. For instance, Comrade Betty Gannett implies that we should fight for "student power" in her article "Democracy and Socialism" (Political Affairs, Dec. 1968, p.19). Well, what kind of student power do we want to support? As Communists we see the necessity for the working class to control and benefit from the institutions of society. If "student power" means anti-racist student control of Black studies (as opposed to administration control) then we should definitely support it. If however "student power" does not lead to universities becoming centers of the working

class and of working class ideology, we should oppose it. In other words, it is my opinion that we should support student struggles which are objectively pro-working class and oppose those which are objectively anti-working class. But this qualification is not at all clear if we insist that any "student power" struggle leads to more democracy in general, because it gives students a greater say in what goes on in the university. As a side comment--as a long term goal, when there is a mass conscious working class movement and a pro-working class student we can propose community-student control of the university as a "counter hegemonic" demand.

Working class and anti-monopoly coalition

In order to build the most powerful force to oppose the capitalists at the time of revolution, we seek to involve other than working class elements. However, we must ensure that this movement is lead by and in the interest of the working class. We must try to win these other groups to a pro-working class position as the only way to really defend their own class interests. Working class state power is at once in the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population. If we do not place emphasis on the leadership and decisiveness of the working class in the anti-monopoly movement we in effect subordinate the movement to the interests of the petty-bourgeoisie. Under conditions of state-monopoly capitalism this quickly degenerates into a fascist-type struggle which is profoundly anti-working class.

A further point on this. We must not loose sight of the fact that the petty-bourgeoisie is always a very unstable and vacillating class in capitalist society and unless it is won to a clear pro-working class position it must be regarded as a potential enemy in the future. I cite part of the passage from Lenin that Comrade Gannett included in her article:

Why are the conditions for the democratic struggle not the same as those for the socialist struggle? Because the workers will certainly have different allies in each of these two struggles. The democratic struggle is waged by the workers with a section of the bourgeoisie, especially the petty-bourgeoisie. On the other hand, the socialist struggle is waged by the workers against the whole of the bourgeoisie . . .

Keeping in mind that the U.S. of 1969 is not Russia of 1905 or thereabouts, the quotation points out the fact that the petty bourgeoisie will be on one side or the other of the class struggle and that in the final analysis large sections of it tend to fight with the capitalists. This points to the importance of actively working in the anti-monopoly movement to make the petty bourgeoisie an ally of the working class.

Role of this Party in anti-monopolist, anti-capitalist struggles

As working class revolutionaries, we see the working class as the only class capable of destroying the old exploitive system and building a new

social system not based on exploitation. Marx says that Communists "have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole", and hopefully we will strive to become the vanguard section of the proletariat in actual fact and not just in words. If we accept the proposition that consciousness does not arise by itself in struggle but must be brought to the struggle by a conscious element, then we must accept the duty of fulfilling that task. We propose an anti-monopoly coalition, but it is our duty as Communists to insure that large sectors of that coalition and eventually the majority and large majority begin to develop a clear anti-capitalist consciousness. It is our job to bring anti-capitalist consciousness to the anti-monopoly movement. Otherwise we will get stuck with a mixture of populist-antimonopoly consciousness which is reformist in nature. To quote Marx: ". . . But (the Communists) never cease, for a single instant, to instil into the working class the clearest possible recognition of the hostile antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat . . ."

The draft Program states: "the anti-monopoly alliance will be compelled to face the fundamental issue: either it destroys monopoly or monopoly destroys it". We should ensure that the leading sector in anti-monopoly struggles, ourselves and the advanced working class section, are aware that the primary objective is the destruction of monopoly. In state monopoly capitalism the destruction of monopoly in a progressive and revolutionary way can only mean one thing--the end of capitalism. We are Marxist-Leninists, and as Marxist-Leninists we see our duty as building revolutionary consciousness among the masses. We are not an anti-monopolist party, we are an anti-capitalist party whose task is always the building and strengthening of class consciousness and socialist consciousness. Again, to quote Marx:

"In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things. In all these movements they bring to the front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time."

Indeed, in the class struggle, the property question is always the leading one; it is the base upon which class and revolutionary consciousness are built.

Also, we must fight for a clear anti-imperialist line in any anti-monopoly struggle, as well as for a class line. E. Varga says in Politico-Economic Problems of Capitalism that the U.S. industrial proletariat except for its black and brown elements comprise a labor aristocracy of the world working class as a whole. To counteract the tendency toward opportunism in the working class movement it is vital that we especially emphasize proletarian internationalism. Showing American workers that their struggle is the same as the struggle of the Vietnamese and African and Latin American people will be a tremendous boost to building class consciousness. A clear line against imperialism will help exclude elements which may want to fight monopoly but who are social reactionaries--

much of the right wing in the U.S. is overtly anti-monopoly but pro-imperialist. This concentration on proletarian internationalism and anti-imperialism further helps insure that our primary emphasis will be on the working class.

Communists must never lose sight of the fact that the class struggle never ceases, that worker and capitalist are engaged in a never ending struggle. The class enemy is not only the monopoly capitalists but all capitalists and their stooges. If we are really working for "the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions", we must always fight for anti-capitalist consciousness and never be satisfied with anti-monopoly consciousness. We must always be aware of the dialectical interconnections of anti-monopoly and anti-capitalist consciousness and work always to transform the former into the latter.

ON ELECTORAL STRATEGY AND TACTICS

By Jack King

(The following is based on remarks made in a discussion of the draft resolution in the Illinois State Committee.)

I agree with the main thrust of the resolution on all questions, but I also feel that within that framework there is room for improvement. I should like to concentrate on one aspect of the resolution: its position on electoral activities, political action and legislative work, and some of our experiences in these fields.

The Party's estimate and evaluation are sometimes under critical attack from sections of the New Left. Aspects of the resolution on this front are also being questioned by some comrades, including some leading comrades.

Some claim that our Party has no strategical outlook in the field of political action. But this is not the case. As I understand it, the main strategical aim of our Party is to work for and cooperate with others in building a new, independent, mass political party, having its main roots in the ranks of the working class and the black people. Such an outlook is based on the theory that the working class and its allies need such a new party, for there can be no outlook of reforming either of the major political parties--and this means also the Democratic Party--into a party representing the best interests of the common people. It is on the basis of this line that the Party has formulated a tactical approach.

We have spoken about a three-pronged tactical approach. The resolution speaks not of three prongs but of three levels. Some comrades don't like either term. I am not stuck on a term; I am more concerned about the concept.

If a better term can be found, I would not hesitate to use it, as long as we are clear on the concept.

What do I understand to be the concept of the three levels?

1. The independent work inside the major political parties, in the first place the Democratic Party.
2. The independent work outside the major parties.
3. The independent role of the Communist Party.

These three levels of activity are projected as an urgent necessity in order to achieve our strategical goal. The three-level concept is valid nationally, in every city and state. Its scope, the form it will take, the tempo of its development will vary in different areas; in fact, even within a given area the different levels of activity may vary at different times.

How is this reflected in our state? I would say first of all in the very important movement and struggle within the Democratic Party (Clark, Stevenson, Simon, Mikva and others). I will not spend much time on this, as I want to concentrate on some other matters. However, I want to raise some ideological questions relating to this development.

The struggle within the Democratic Party takes place on many fronts and in many forms. We had the McCarthy movement; we had independent Democrats running in the congressional elections; we had independent peace candidates running in many areas as delegates to the Democratic Party Convention. In the black community the sharpest expression of political independence, though not the only one, has been through the Democratic Party. This was seen in the aldermanic elections, where certain positive results were registered. These included the election of two new independent members of the city council, the election of additional black members to the state legislature, and others.

Some ask: how do we relate this movement inside the Democratic Party with our strategical aim? It is true that most of the forces participating in this independent struggle do so for reasons different from our own. Most feel that they will be able to reform the Democratic Party. That is the position of Clark, Stevenson, Mikva and others. But that is not our position. We support this movement because we feel it will sharpen relationships between independent forces and the machine. In the process of such a struggle many will become disillusioned with the Democratic Party and that will help speed the process of breakaway. Therefore the struggle taking place within the major parties is extremely important.

Consider, for instance, the independent movement in the black community. It is important to support the struggle within the major parties to run black candidates for governor or lieutenant governor, for U. S. Senate and for top positions in the city council. If such demands are pushed, will this not stimulate the raising of additional demands? Will it not sharpen the struggles within the two parties?

In our discussions, we should be open and honest as to our strategical aim. To these forces we should say that we don't have confidence in the Democratic Party, that we are convinced that ultimately a break will have to take place and a new people's party will have to be formed. We must tell them: We know you may not agree with us. But we do support your struggle. In the process of such a struggle many of these forces will become disillusioned with the Democratic Party. There are, of course, also some non-Communist individuals participating in this struggle who feel as we do.

A key question for these movements, even where advanced people participate, is the kind of grass-roots movements that are developed in the wards and communities, the kinds of issues that are formulated (taxes, housing, anti-ballistic missiles, etc.) and the kinds of actions that are developed. We must also understand that in the course of these activities we cannot rely only on relations with this or that individual on top, for even the healthiest of these need the pressure of the mass movement from below.

So much for the first level. On the second level, the form of struggle in Chicago developed differently than we had envisioned. For more than two years progressive forces, including our Party, have been concerned with challenging the reactionary state election laws. These require that to run for state or federal office one must collect no less than 25,000 signatures, of which no less than 200 signatures must come from each of 50 different counties. Some attorneys contended that this requirement could be licked in the Supreme Court, and for more than two years efforts have been made to find a suitable candidate to run and make the challenge.

Finally, at a meeting attended by both progressive whites and black forces, it was suggested that Rev. Hargraves, a distinguished civil rights leader who was present, be selected as the candidate to challenge the constitutionality of the law. Rev. Hargraves indicated that while he would like to run, he wanted first to consult with the Black Consortium. Those present agreed that if he should run, the whole movement would actively support his candidacy.

A committee was set up to meet with the Consortium, but weeks elapsed with no agreement. Finally the lawyer who had agreed to handle the legal struggle called a meeting. Here Rev. Hargraves indicated that he could not run since there was division in the Consortium. But after an animated discussion and after listening to the various arguments he decided to run despite the absence of unity in the Consortium.

However, a few weeks later, supporters of Rev. Hargraves indicated that they were running into new difficulties--that they were facing objections from "good" people, those from whom they had expected support. Some urged him to withdraw on the grounds that if he ran as an independent he would jeopardize his status in the Democratic Party, etc.

My own feeling is that such advice, which reflects certain differences among some Communists, was wrong. Rev. Hargraves obtained only 20,000 signatures instead of the 25,000 needed. Had there been full unity on the matter, I believe he could have obtained more than 25,000. The law is now being challenged in the Supreme Court by the electors who collected the signatures and not via the Hargraves candidacy. If it could have been challenged through his candidacy, it would have enhanced the prestige of the entire black community and he himself would have emerged as the symbol of challenge and defeat of this reactionary law. More, this would have helped influence the independent struggle within the Democratic Party itself.

With regard to the third level, I can present just a few main thoughts. We decided to run two Communist candidates as independents and to challenge the law also through these candidacies. The candidates were to be a black comrade on the South Side and myself. There was also the Charlene Mitchell and Mike Zagarell campaign. The candidacy of the black comrade unfortunately did not materialize, but I ran and more than 100 Party and non-Party forces helped in the campaign. We should examine why the entire party did not fully appreciate the importance of this campaign. However, more than 30,000 people were visited in the community and more than 4,000 signatures were collected.

The Mitchell-Zagarell campaign was a big plus for our Party and something we can be proud of. Charlene Mitchell spoke to more people in our city than any other public Communist figure had for many years. She spoke not only on the Kupcinet radio program but also at Breadbasket with Clark, the Democratic candidate for U.S. Senate, sitting on the platform. She spoke on three college campuses including the Catholic institution, Mundelein. She had an important meeting with 15 leaders of the New Left. Three of the four daily newspapers printed a half-page story on her candidacy. We distributed several thousand copies of the Daily World and many thousands of leaflets.

The campaign also revealed serious weaknesses. Despite the positive experiences, a big section of the Party did not participate, including some of the leading comrades. I feel that if we had had more clarity and agreement on many of these questions, and greater determination on the part of the entire leadership to carry through our line, we could have made many more advances.

* * *