

THE POLITICAL ORIGINS AND LEADERSHIP OF THE "NEW COMMUNIST MOVEMENT" AND ITS POLITICAL GOALS.

I. Political Origins:

Earlier in this pamphlet we discussed the fact that the class and national composition of the "new communist movement" comes largely out of the petty bourgeoisie of the chief oppressor nation in the world, the US (north). We also pointed out that this privileged class of a privileged nation grew up precisely on the basis of the tremendous expansion and the intensification of US imperialist domination of the "capitalist world", especially in the oppressed nations of Asia, Africa, Arabia, Latin America and Afro-America in the post WWII period.

By the end of the 1950's the anti-communist hysteria associated with President Truman's cold war witch hunt of the US government in the late 40's, the Korean War and McCarthyite hysteria of the 50's, had for the most part succeeded, in combination with a developing economic prosperity in the US (north), in crushing whatever revolutionary content and potential had remained in the old CPUSA. The history of militant working class struggle manifested in the C.I.O. was broken down completely as can be seen from the rightward turn of the CIO in the early 50's which by 1955 culminated in the CIO merger with the AFL on the AFL's anti-communist and counter-revolutionary pro-US imperialist terms. The history of the Black Liberation Movement with its National Negro Congress, Negro Labor Groups, etc., was broken with as well.

Unquestionably at center stage of US imperialist society was US monopoly capital, which, in spite of its "loss" of China, and a partial defeat in Korea, was now lord and master of almost all the capitalist world. Yet strangely, (at least on the surface) a "new left" which based itself *not* on the rich history of the US labor movement, nor on the rich history of the Afro-American Struggle, nor even on the history of "populism" in the USA, began to emerge, precisely in the period when US imperialist expansion and hegemony was at its height!

At this beginning point in the late 50's there is no doubt that the CPUSA representing by this time the Khrushchevite revisionist policy of collaboration with US imperialism on the one hand, and the policy of US imperialist collaboration with the USSR on the other, formed a bridge between US imperialism and its new political bed-fellows, the Soviet revisionists in power. The earliest new left organizations were social pacifist in content and mainly formed

around the student Peace Unions which sprang up on the university campuses of the north with some CPUSA backing.

This US new left told the Soviet leadership in essence, that US imperialism was a reasonable force, and a force for peace in the world, and their social pacifism spread all sorts of bourgeois democratic illusions about the nature of US imperialist society to the Soviet leadership and peoples. At the same time, the "new left" pleaded with "its own" imperialists to make "peace" with the USSR in order that US imperialism would have a free hand to continue to intensify and expand its control over the oppressed peoples, and so that consequently the petty bourgeois class from which the new left had arisen could become a more and more prosperous and numerous class. To the US petty bourgeois new left, "peace" with the USSR as a base from which to carry out wars of occupation in the oppressed nations, was good business for everybody.*

Soon after this, in the first few years of the early 1960's, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) was formed. On the basis of revolutionary gains made by national independence movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America during the post WWII period, some significant nationalist stirrings of the Afro-American people took place, especially in their Black Belt homeland, around the Woolworth sit-ins, bus boycotts, etc. SDS, a domestically oriented new left group, was formed to preach social pacifism and class harmony to the Black masses, to the poor in Appalachia, and (to a lesser extent) to the multi-national working class in general, in this period. In conformity with the still growing power of US imperialism, the SDS included an "anti-communist" requirement for membership!

As the Afro-American national liberation movement centered in the Black Belt began to emerge more decisively against US imperialism, the new left, SDS, SPU forces were organized, were trained and were transported right into the heart of the Black nation to preach their social pacifism and class and national ("racial") harmony line to the aroused and armed Black people in the Black Belt. In 1964, The Mississippi Summer Project brought hundreds of privileged petty bourgeois (white) youth from the US (north) oppressor nation into Greenwood, Miss., the center of liberation movement activity and the key city in the Mississippi Delta, precisely in order to help disarm the Afro-American masses in the face of US imperialism and its Planter-Klan forces of bloody reaction.

At this same time, the Vietnamese liberation forces in Asia were on the verge of victory over the US imperialist puppet army, and by early 1965, in order to avoid total defeat. US imperialism

*Today, almost 20 years later the CPUSA in this 1976 Presidential Election Campaign through its chairman and Presidential Candidate Gus Hall, is openly pushing this same social pacifist and social chauvinist line, now called "detente", onto the people of the USA!

was compelled to send in its own imperialist army in an attempt to crush the national revolutionary struggle of the Vietnamese people. Simultaneously, with the open invasion of south Vietnam and the bombings of north Vietnam, US imperialism helped create a "mass" movement made up almost entirely of the extremely privileged petty bourgeois students at elite northern US colleges and universities. Just as in the Black Liberation Struggle, then in the Vietnamese Liberation Struggle, US imperialism's new left organizations preached social pacifism and class and national harmony to the heroic Vietnamese people who were being forced to deal with the barbaric US imperialist army of invasion and its cold blooded elite air force bombardiers.

It is instructive to note that the first group of US representatives of the "anti-war movement" to be invited to Hanoi after the US bombings of north Vietnam had begun was made up of Tom Hayden, Staughton Lynd, and Herbert Aptheker.

Aptheker is a petty bourgeois intellectual who has been the main theoretician of the CPUSA during its openly reformist period of activity as a bridge over which the US-USSR "Detente" for world domination has taken place. Hayden, was the key founder of the anti-communist SDS and most recently has run for the Democratic Party nomination for the US Senate from California. (Remember this is the same Democratic Party which was the political party in power during the bloodiest US imperialist fighting in Vietnam). Staughton Lynd had been the educational director of the Mississippi Summer Project in 1964 and boasted of how he suppressed all discussion of "international problems" (including the need for Afro-American-Vietnamese unity) while director of the "Freedom Schools" there.

As Stalinist Workers Group pointed out in early 1970,

"In late 1965, US imperialism sent its "New Left" emissaries, Hayden, Aptheker and Lynd to Hanoi to mislead the heroic south Vietnamese people into relying on the "New Left" as allies instead of mobilizing their brothers and sisters in the DRV and throughout the oppressed nations of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Afro-America for national liberation struggles in coordination with the south Vietnamese national liberation struggle.

"Aptheker and the Krushchevite CPUSA have concentrated their efforts recently on linking the Black Panther Party with the "great American people." US imperialism did not assassinate the Panthers for fear of reprisals from the Afro-American masses *until* it sent in the "New Left" Peace and Freedom Party to split the Panthers from their people. Following the establishment of the Aptheker-CPUSA and Panther United Front Against Fascism coalition, US imperialism has stepped up its attack on the Panthers to intimidate and terrorize the Afro-American people and further tie them to the fascistic 'great American people.'" (p. 14-15 *Towards Victorious Afro-American National Liberation*)

When the economic crisis hit home in the form of the Nixon Wage Freeze in August, 1971, the New Left was prepared for the

task of preaching class harmony to the increasingly restless and reawakening US working class. Lynd helped lead in the creation of the New American Movement (NAM) made up largely of the same privileged petty bourgeois intelligentsia who had been students in the 60's and by now were petty bourgeois teachers, lawyers, professors, etc. NAM with its classic social-democratic (Second International) content, pushes social pacifism in the name of socialism and has exerted a real influence in the important rank and file initiatives that have taken place in the Steelworkers Union.

The SDS meanwhile had become "transformed" from an anti-communist into an avowedly "communist" organization. This was in response to the developing Black Liberation Movement, which in its Black power movement phase in the mid and late 60's, had kicked the openly petty bourgeois white *liberals* out of their liberation movement. SDS' "transformation" into a "communist" organization was also in response to the deepening, bitter and protracted struggle that had developed in Vietnam and all Indochina against US imperialism, which fact tended to expose the liberal pro-imperialist character of the "non-communist" anti-war movement to the Vietnamese and other Indo-Chinese people.

As the economic crisis hit the USA, in 1971, SDS was already prepared to preach its social pacifism behind a smokescreen of illusion that SDS was part of the noble, militant, and time-tested theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism and the Communist revolution.* By this point, a division of labor was established. The Progressive Labor Party wing of SDS had been broken off from the rest. PLP pushed social chauvinism (i.e. "all national struggle is reactionary") helping to keep the white workers from linking up with the more militant Black workers and other national minority workers in the north as the economic crisis developed. The revolutionary youth movement ("RYM"), the other wing of SDS, was itself broken up into two. RYM I or the Weathermen, became the well known "individual terrorists" who helped alienate the workers and especially the white workers from "radical activity", picketing, etc. during this period. RYM II was the embryo of most of the present "new communist movement". Most of the leadership cadre of the OL and RCP came right out of this faction (as well as much of the CLP, etc.). Eventually these RYM II elements went into the working class and have practiced their left infantile "mass" line (and the CLP, its tailist line) over the past several years, while the working class has become more dissatisfied with the present system and more concerned to find a way out. Their divi-

* In the same period, the *Guardian* which had been born as the organ of the Progressive Party—the liberal bourgeois and petty bourgeois-composed party which in 1948 ran former Vice President Henry Wallace for President of the USA— "magically," became "transformed" from a petty bourgeois liberal organ, into a self-proclaimed "proletarian revolutionary" organ without an ounce of self-criticism passing through its pages!

sive practice in the name of Marxism-Leninism, as we pointed out above, has objectively alienated the growing number of advanced elements of the working class from pursuing the proletarian revolutionary alternative.

Hence, given all the above history of the political origin and development of the main class and national force in the "new communist movement", we are able to draw certain conclusions. 1) To a certain extent, the petty bourgeois "new left" forces who ultimately entered the ranks of the working class, now have some material basis from which to draw anti-imperialist strength. But this requires them to be ruthlessly self critical concerning how they came to their present position. 2) Primarily, the objective historical role of the US New Left and the "new communist movement" has consistently been as a pro-imperialist "fifth column" force within the Afro-American and Vietnamese national independence movements and within the embryonic working class movement for socialism in the US (north). This has been due to their relationship to the means of production, the fact that they are from a privileged class in a privileged nation (the chief oppressor nation in the world) where the unprivileged *mass* of the populace *itself* had been relatively passive and docile in relation to US imperialism.

This conclusion concerning the essentially pro-imperialist character of the political origins of the "new communist movement", shocking as it may be to the honest working class reader, becomes clearly appropriate when we examine the situation as Comrade Stalin teaches us, i.e. from the standpoint of the international working class as a *whole*. In his authoritative work, *Foundations of Leninism*, Stalin says,

"Formerly, the analysis of the conditions for the proletarian revolution was usually approached from the point of view of the economic state of individual countries. Now, this approach is no longer adequate. Now the matter must be approached from the point of view of the economic state of all or of the majority of countries, from the point of view of the state of world economy; for individual countries and individual national economies have ceased to be self-sufficient units, have become links in a single chain called world economy; for the old "cultured" capitalism has evolved into imperialism, and imperialism is a world system of financial enslavement and colonial oppression of the vast majority of the population of the earth by a handful of "advanced" countries.

"Formerly, it was the accepted thing to speak of the existence or absence of objective conditions for the proletarian revolution in individual countries, or, to be more precise, in one or another developed country. Now this point of view is no longer adequate. Now we must speak of the existence of objective conditions for the revolution in the entire system of world imperialist economy as an integral unit....

"Formerly it was the accepted thing to speak of the proletarian revolution in one or another developed country as of something separate and self

sufficient facing a separate national front of capital as its opposite. Now this point of view is no longer adequate. Now we must speak of the world proletarian revolution; for the separate national fronts of capital have become links in a single chain called the world front of imperialism, which must be opposed by a common front of the revolutionary movement in all countries.

"Formerly, the proletarian revolution was regarded exclusively as the result of the internal development of a given country. Now this point of view is no longer adequate. Now the proletarian revolution must be regarded primarily as the result of the development of the contradictions within the world system of imperialism, as the result of the snapping of the chain of the imperialist world front in one country or another."
(*Foundations of Leninism*, pp. 34, 35, 36)

Hence the general conclusion of Section I "Political Origins": In order to help establish a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party in the USA, those from privileged backgrounds have to come to grips with their background from the standpoint of principled proletarian politics. They have to be willing to examine their past mass work from the point of view of the *international* proletariat; they have to ruthlessly criticize their past objectively counter-revolutionary practice (of which they have been so proud!). In short, they have to be willing to break with their privilege and link their destiny with the working class, and *its* creative initiative and historic mission.

Such a ruthless self-criticism will be based on and will help generate a materialist conception of history among these forces. For what lies at the root of the unanimity of these organizations around their anti-Marxist proposition of the idealist conception of history, is their own concrete, material history, (including, as few of them realize, their *political* history) and that is a history of defending privilege.

Precisely because of the deep social roots of this problem, relatively few of the privileged petty bourgeois elements of the majority (white) people of the oppressor nation will be able to make such a decisive break with their past and develop into Marxist-Leninists even though the working class movement is finally beginning again to move against capital. However, much larger numbers of the petty bourgeois elements from among the national minority communities of the US (north) will be able to make such a decisive break with imperialism and their own much more restricted class and national privileges. A much greater percentage of the relatively few white workers in the US north and poor whites in Appalachia, the Black Belt, etc., who have come under the influence of the "new communist movement" will also be able to make such a break. Such a principled break with their opportunist past will be even more likely among many forces of the Afro-American, Chicano and Puerto Rican people in their respective national territories

who have come under the influence of the "new communist movement". This will occur, provided that such forces, ruthlessly examine the history of the New Left and the "new communist movement" from the proletarian internationalist standpoint as taught by Comrade Stalin.

Yet this is not all that must be broken with on a principled, proletarian basis. For —(we must ask)— what has been the political leadership that has exerted the greatest influence on the US New Left and "new communist movement", that has allowed and fostered the idealist conception of history of this movement and its objectively counter-revolutionary practice?

II. Political Leadership:

Lenin taught that "...a bourgeois state which is exercising the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie through a democratic republic, cannot confess to the people that it is serving the bourgeoisie; it cannot tell the truth and is compelled to be hypocritical."
(p. 81, *The Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky*, Lenin)

In the early 1960's, the Chinese Communist Party played an outstanding leading role in the international communist movement. The Chinese CP polemics against the Khrushchevite revisionist leadership in the USSR, and especially against its line of peaceful transition to socialism, provided a tremendous source of inspiration and insight especially to the hundreds of millions of colonial and dependent peoples of the world in their struggles against imperialism, headed by US Imperialism. During the early 1960's, armed struggle was the revolutionary path embarked upon by new and old organizations in many of the oppressed nations under Chinese Communist Party political leadership. From South Yemen to the Dominican Republic, from Guinea-Bissau to Indo-China, the peoples rose up in mighty wars for national liberation from imperialism.

The "Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement" produced by the Central Committee of the CPC in 1963, the polemics against Togliatti, and a number of other documents produced by the CPC and distributed in the international working class movement in the years between 1961 and 1966 are a reflection of the effective international leadership which the CPC was giving the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples at the time. (We encourage the reader to refer to those outstanding polemics waged by the CPC against Russian Revisionism during that period.)

With the beginning of the so-called "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" in mid-1966, all these strategically important anti-

revisionist, anti-imperialist polemics of the CPC were ceased.* The "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" was in essence almost from the very beginning an ultra-"left", "ultra-democratic" movement led by "petty bourgeois anarchists" which set the initiative of the "masses" *against* the authority of the Party and its leadership of the working class and the masses. This "ultra left" effort led by Chiang Ching, Chen Po-ta and others (which as always with ultra-left errors was "right" in essence) paved the way for the openly right, "moderate" wing of the CPC and government apparatus (led by Chou En-lai), representing the interests of the national bourgeoisie, to emerge victorious in the power struggle.

The process by which the right wing national bourgeois forces gained victory over the petty bourgeois "left" anarchist forces was by restoring "order" out of the anarchist chaos and by replacing the ultra-left conception of the domination by the "masses" over the Party and the class, with the domination by the Party and government *leaders* over the class and the masses. This general process has been repeated at least twice since the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution", because the national bourgeois forces could not come to power in China all at once. Is this same process not present both in the ouster and execution of Lin Piao in 1971, and in the present period in the ouster of Chiang Ching et al?***

In *Left Wing Communism*, Comrade Lenin had warned that, "Whoever weakens ever so little the iron discipline of the party of the proletariat (especially during the time of its dictatorship) actually aids the bourgeoisie against the proletariat." (p. 29) Yet without attempting to explain either what concrete historical development had rendered Comrade Lenin's proposition outmoded, or that Lenin had been wrong to begin with, the CR leadership from its very inception was clearly based on the proposition that "The main target of the present movement is those *Party* persons in pow-

*To expose the basis for the emergence and development of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" is not the purpose of the present document, which attempts to deal with the implications of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" for the present party building movement in the USA. For a valuable proof of the counter-revolutionary essence of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution", see *The Role of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the International Marxist-Leninist Movement, The October Revolution vs. The Cultural Revolution* (April, 1968) by Youth for Stalin. For a thorough discussion of the international significance of the Chinese Cultural Revolution, see *Long Live Leninism* by Stalinist Workers Group (early 1971).

*** In the past year the petty bourgeois "ultra-left" forces, Chiang Ching, et al., led an offensive against Teng Tsiao-Peng as a prelude to the petty bourgeois "leftists" being decisively suppressed by the "heirs of Chou En-lai", including Hua Kuo-feng, et al.

er taking the capitalist road." (p. 140, *Important Documents on the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China*, our emphasis) And again, "Since the Cultural Revolution is a revolution, it inevitably meets with resistance. This resistance comes chiefly from those persons in power taking the capitalist road who have wormed their way into the *Party*." (p.132, *ibid*)

In discussing "who are our enemies?" not once in the August 8, 1966 "Decision of the CC of the CPC concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" is either imperialism or the national bourgeoisie mentioned even as *part* of the target of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution"!

At the same time as the Party was specifically pointed out as the subject for attacks, it was given no leadership role whatsoever in the "Proletarian Cultural Revolution". Compare the following: "In the course of normal and full debate, the masses will affirm what is right, correct what is wrong and gradually reach unanimity!" (p. 141, *ibid*) And again, "Trust the masses, rely on them and respect their initiative. Cast out fear. Don't be afraid of disturbances...Let the masses educate themselves...and learn to distinguish between right and wrong and between correct and incorrect ways of doing things."

If we combine the Party's leading role being replaced by the masses' leading role and the Party being transformed from the source of *leadership* in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat in China into the *main enemy* of the proletarian dictatorship, we can see the ingredients for exactly what resulted—anarchy.

This anarchy was replaced by order imposed by the army. The 9th Congress of the CPC under the leadership of the Minister of Defense, Lin Piao (backed by Chou En-lai), was the fruit of the Cultural Revolution struggle. Lo and Behold! (Under the direction of Chou En-lai), the ultra democratic *mass* movement is replaced by the figure of *one man* (Mao Tse-Tung), and of his designated *heir* (Lin Piao)!

Prior to the Cultural Revolution, Chairman Mao had been considered the leading Marxist-Leninist among many outstanding Marxists in the CPC. During the period of the early 60's, when the CPC was taking great strides forward as the leading party in the international proletarian movement, Chairman Mao was actually not among the most active leaders in authority.

In 1964 or 65 when a representative of *Hammer and Steel*, the leading anti-revisionist force in the USA in that period, met with a member of the Central Committee of the CPC and raised to that Central Committee member the fact that Mao Tse-tung was the greatest living Marxist-Leninist and that the Chinese Party was the leading party in the world, that Central Committee member responded that the CPC was a great party, but so also was the CP of Japan and the CP of Indonesia! Tragically it was not until the

advent of the Chinese Cultural Revolution that the concept of Mao as the leader, and the Chinese Party as the leading Party was projected by the Chinese leadership. And with the advent of the Chinese Cultural Revolution, these propositions no longer possessed proletarian internationalist content, but actually had bourgeois nationalist content!

To substantiate this fact let us refer again to the August 8, 1966 Cultural Revolution Statement. "The minority should be protected, because sometimes the truth is with the minority. Even if the minority is wrong, they should still be allowed to argue their case and reserve their views." (p. 142, *ibid*) This is a classic formulation of *bourgeois* democracy, to protect the *individual* from the will of the *masses*, from the *will* of the *majority*!

Also, "...the cultural revolutionary groups, committees and congresses should not be temporary organizations but permanent, standing mass organizations. They are suitable not only for colleges, schools, and government and other organizations, but generally also for factories, mines, other enterprises, urban districts and villages." (p. 146, 147, *ibid*) Unlike the Soviets in Russia, which were a creation of the *working class* in the course of making the Revolution of 1905, from the above quote it is clear that the "cultural revolutionary groups" were a *creation* of the "colleges, schools, and government, and other organizations"-of the privileged strata within Chinese society.

And again, "These cultural revolutionary groups, committees and congresses are excellent new forms of organization whereby the masses educate themselves under the leadership of the Communist Party. . . . They are organs of power of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution." (p. 146) But under the dictatorship of the proletariat, what are the "organs of power" that the cultural revolutionary groups are replacing?

The August 8, 1966 statement makes very clear that the aim of the Chinese Cultural Revolution is to "promote production." But the question of what class will rule in this production is not mentioned. Only the development of the "productive forces", and not the key political question of what kind of *relations of production*—cooperative or minority dominated, socialist or capitalist relations, was addressed. The "general" promotion of national production under the international conditions that existed in 1966 (and still do today) would lead inevitably to *bourgeois* national development of the productive forces.

But in a country where the proletariat under the leadership of its vanguard party (in alliance with the peasantry) is largely in control, is in power, how does the national bourgeoisie rally the masses to drag the society backwards toward capitalism and away from the forward movement toward socialism? To put it in Marxist materialist terms: if the relations of production are in a transitional

form from those characterized by minority domination to those characterized by mass cooperation—from capitalist to socialist relations, then how can the relations of production be dragged backward, while such a vigilant force as the Marxist-Leninist Party of the proletariat is sharing power? Obviously, it *cannot* be done *openly* and *directly*.

Initially, at least, the national bourgeoisie must come onto the stage with an ultra militant mask. This is what occurred in 1966, precisely at the time when the 5% annual dividends to former capitalist owners was scheduled to be eliminated, and when therefore these national bourgeois forces had their maximum revenue as compared to the society as a whole, precisely when ongoing socialist production through time would now further and further weaken the national bourgeoisie and its unearned stockpile of dividends, relative to the Chinese society as a whole.

Since the national bourgeoisie could not *openly* fight for capitalism in China where bourgeois democratic relations were becoming transformed into socialist ones, it follows that the national bourgeoisie could not make as their starting point a materialist conception of history. They could not proceed on the basis of "the real needs of development of the material life of society" as Comrade Stalin instructs (p. 21 *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*). They had to proceed from an *idealist conception of history* in order to mask their *actual* aims behind a smokescreen of revolutionary aims which conformed with the mass sentiment and party influence in China.

Hence, the Chinese national bourgeoisie expropriated the *concept* "Mao Tse Tung Thought" which provided them with the perfect idealist conception of history for their purposes under those particular concrete conditions; they based themselves on what Comrade Stalin described as "the good wishes of 'great men.'" And when these traitors to the Chinese revolution had completed their disruption and wrecking of the Communist Party of China, they reorganized it precisely on the basis that Comrade Stalin warns us *against*! For he said, "...the practical activity of the party of the proletariat must not be based on the good wishes of 'outstanding individuals.'" (p. 19 *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*)

It is in light of the concrete aims of the Chinese national bourgeoisie that we can understand why the Chinese Cultural Revolution was launched on the basis of the idealist conception of history and resulted at the 9th Congress of Communist Party of China in the deification of Mao Tse-tung, the great individual, and the designation of an *heir*(!), the ill-fated Lin Piao.*

*This vulgar anti-Marxist "designated heir" concept did not die with Lin Piao. Today Hua Kuo-feng's main justification for his authority as the new Party chairman and head of the army is that he was designated "heir" of Mao Tse-tung, *the great individual*!

And it is only in this light that we can understand why it was an idealist conception of a cultural revolution which was implemented both theoretically and practically in China in 1966. In *On New Democracy*, Comrade Mao had written in January 1940 that, "A cultural revolution is the ideological reflection of the political and economic revolution and is in their service." (Vol II, p. 373)

About a year earlier, Comrade Stalin had written regarding the USSR that, "From the standpoint of the cultural development of the people, the period under review has been marked by a veritable cultural revolution...As a result of this immense cultural work a numerous, new Soviet intelligentsia has emerged from the ranks of the working class, peasantry, and Soviet employees, which is of the flesh and blood of our people, which has never known the yoke of exploitation, which hates exploiters, and which is ready to serve the peoples of the USSR faithfully and devotedly." "I think the rise of this new socialist intelligentsia of the people is one of the most important results of the cultural revolution in our country." (*From Socialism to Communism*, pp.32-34)

Describing this same period, the *History of the CPSU (B)* itself contains the phrase, "veritable cultural revolution," and says further, "Revolutions in the past perished because, while giving people freedom, they were unable to bring about any serious improvement in their material and cultural conditions. Therein lay their chief weakness. Our revolution...not only freed the people...but also brought about a radical improvement in the welfare and cultural condition of the people. Therein lies its strength and invincibility." (p. 341)

The Cultural Revolution leadership really stressed in the late 60's the "uniqueness" of their "cultural" revolution. In truth, the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" was a unique cultural revolution, for, unlike the Chinese Cultural Revolution which Mao discussed as an integral part of the liberation movement against imperialism in 1940, and unlike the Soviet Union's "Cultural Revolution" discussed by Comrade Stalin and the *History of the CPSU (B)* which was intimately and systematically bound up with a certain stage in the economic and political life of the USSR, the Chinese "cultural revolution" of 1966 was projected from its very beginning as being divorced from the transformation of the economic base of Chinese society.

This was cleverly but clearly presented by the Cultural Revolution revisionists in the very first point entitled "A New Stage in the Socialist Revolution" in the August 8, 1966 Statement. These petty bourgeois opportunists and representatives of the Chinese national bourgeoisie stated, "At present, our objective is to struggle against and overthrow those persons in power taking the capitalist road, to criticize and repudiate the bourgeois reactionary academic 'authorities' and the ideology of the bourgeoisie and all

other exploiting classes and to transform education, literature, and art and all other parts of the superstructure not in correspondance with the socialist economic base. . . "

The key question here is—did a "socialist economic base" which itself required *no* progressive development in that period exist? (Will such a condition ever exist for the proletarian revolutionary?)

In 1971 in an interview with William Hinton which appeared in a series in "New China Magazine", Chou En-lai revealed the following:

"But after all, these people still constitute a bourgeois class. They still exist. Furthermore their number is quite large. Their percentage in the cities might well be higher than that of the landlords in the countryside. We figure 10 million people altogether, counting in all family members." ("New China", Spring 1975 p. 13) Chou went on, "Then there is another bourgeois category—the petty bourgeoisie. For example, the upper middle peasants in the countryside...The brigades that don't have private plots are a minority and they are socially advanced. The majority still have them...we still advocate private plots...in the countryside petty bourgeois thinking still exists on a wide scale...the petty bourgeoisie are quite numerous. While at the same time, the working class, the true proletariat, is quite small...We have no more than 30 million industrial workers." (p. 13 *ibid*) "We estimate the urban population at 100 million and the rural population at 600 million." (p. 14 *ibid*)

Chou concludes, "Given the figures mentioned above, it is obvious that in terms of *ideology*, proletarian class rule is minority rule." (p. 14 *ibid*, our emphasis)

From these statistics and observations from Chou En-lai, it is clear that by violating the teachings of Mao, Stalin, and the *History of CPSU (B)*, by divorcing the cultural struggle from the economic base, the Cultural Revolution leadership was seeking to preserve bourgeois privilege (and to extend it when the time was ripe.)

Hence the need for the Chinese Cultural Revolution (as Comrade Stalin would phrase it), to replace "the practical activity of the party of the proletariat" based "on the laws of development of society and on the study of these laws" with activity based on "the good wishes of 'outstanding individuals'," i.e. "Mao Tse-Tung Thought". Hence, the need for the Chinese Cultural Revolution to substitute the idealist conception of history for the materialist conception of history in the leading party in the world, the Communist Party of China.

The bourgeois nationalist essence of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" explains the internal phenomenon in China of the late 1960's—the mania for Mao buttons, the "magical"

“Little Red Book”, Mao statues, pictures, plaques and badges, the salutations about “Long Live Mao”, “May he Live 10,000 Years,” etc., which represented a revival of the salutations used to hail or pay homage to Chinese emperors!

It also explains the cessation of Chinese offers to send troops to aid the Vietnamese people in their liberation war against US imperialism, the cessation of CPC Marxist-Leninist polemics against Russian Revisionism, and the rapprochement with US imperialism which developed in the aftermath of the Chinese Cultural Revolution.

This last point is what links the Communist Party of China most fundamentally to the “new communist movement” in the USA. Prior to the “Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution”, there were very few people in the USA who supported the Chinese Communist Party-led polemics against the Russian Revisionists and the Chinese Communist Party inspired national liberation wars against US imperialism. But with the advent of the “Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution”, hundreds of white university students of a privileged class in the chief oppressor nation, became ardent supporters of “Mao Tse Tung”, the individual, of “Mao Tse Tung Thought” and of the “Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.” In the discussion of the Political Origins of the “new communist movement” above, we showed how the “new left” (along with the CPUSA revisionists) had helped US imperialism to disarm the aroused and militant Afro-American people who were building their struggle for Land and Freedom in the South in the 1960’s, and also helped US imperialism to disarm as much as possible the Vietnamese Liberation Movement faced with bestial US imperialism and its brutal army of occupation during the 1960’s.

One of the principal means by which the “new left” had fulfilled its role on behalf of US imperialism and of its own privileged existence was by creating illusions concerning the nature of US imperialist society, the society of the chief oppressor nation, by creating illusions about the so-called “Great American People”. As the Stalinist Workers Group put it in “Long Live Leninism,”

“1) US imperialism is *not* a democratic system which can be reformed through peaceful ‘protest’ and the ballot box. US imperialism is the dictatorship of 30 billionaire families who are driven by an inexorable need to expand their super-exploitation of the proletariat of the oppressed nations and their terrorization, suppression, land and resource stealing, and oppression of the entire people of the oppressed nations; the imperialist ruling class has mobilized almost the entire population of the US (white) oppressor nation behind them. US imperialism will not negotiate its super-profits but must be driven out of the oppressed nations by the coordinated national liberation struggles of the oppressed peoples. 2) The *US imperialist* army is *not* a ‘democratic’, ‘reasonable’, ‘conscientious’ force which can be ‘unionized’ and reformed from within or harassed,

appeased and negotiated with by the oppressed peoples.” It is an organization of trained, predatory monsters (poisoned with white and great power chauvinism) who must be mercilessly combatted—the US imperialist army must be *militarily defeated*, destroyed, and driven out of the oppressed nations! 3) There is no revolutionary section of the (white) US population *today* that the oppressed peoples can rely upon. The US (white) people, and especially the extremely large percentage who are not low-paid workers, are not “humane” and “democratic”, but are the products of the last great bastion of world capitalism—US imperialism—in a period when it is in the extreme state of parasitic decay. The “great American people” are the rotten fruit of parasitic US imperialist society. 4) The (*white*) *New Left*, which is the “left wing” section of the vast and privileged petty bourgeoisie of US imperialist society (the right-wing section is increasingly fascistic and is growing larger by leaps and bounds) is not about to lead anyone in the overthrow of US imperialism. Its purpose, far from leading any anti-imperialist struggle, is to mislead the oppressed peoples (as well as the US (white) workers) as to the nature of US imperialism and its army and as to the utter degeneracy and decadence of parasitic US imperialist society. For any national liberation movement to link up with the US New Left is to ally with a treacherous fifth column of US imperialism.” (p. 50)

In order to consolidate national bourgeois power domestically in China, the Chinese national bourgeoisie wanted some international contacts, some leverage, with which to help them to blunt the actual material situation which cried out for continued CPC polemics against Russian Revisionism and continued full-fledged proletarian internationalist solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese people in their struggle against imperialism. At the same time the US imperialist world colossus of empire was being struck mighty blows from many sides (e.g. remember the US Marines landing in the Dominican Republic in 1965 at the same time that US troops were invading Vietnam en masse). And the many rising liberation movements in Asia, Africa, Arabia, Latin America, and Afro-America were all looking more and more to the “Red Star over China” which was pointing the road ahead to liberation from US imperialist domination and oppression. US imperialism desperately needed to establish a link with the Chinese leadership, to be able to proceed to establish an understanding and then a “deal” with the Chinese leadership, in some ways similar to their successful “detente” with the revisionist leadership in the Soviet Union *at the expense of the oppressed peoples.*

* * * * *

The US New Left, in the process of becoming the “new communist movement”, proved to be an important part of the link. For if hundreds and perhaps thousands of privileged US university stu-

dents are praising the “great helmsman”, then surely the mass of the American people are “good”, and the system can be reformed and modified and *dealt with* (in opposition to Comrade Lenin’s teachings on imperialism, and to Comrade Stalin’s teachings that include, as one of the “three most important contradictions”, “the contradiction between the handful of ruling ‘civilized’ nations and the hundreds of millions of the colonial and dependent peoples of the world.”) (p. 14, *Foundations of Leninism*, our emphasis)

From all the above it becomes clear why the “new communist movement” embraced the *idealist conception of history* summed up and symbolized by its fawning and crawling after the image of Mao Tse-tung, “the outstanding individual,” and bowing at the “word” provided by “Mao Tse-Tung Thought”, the “magical” ideas that because of their intrinsic “properties” would transform the world. It is clear too, why serious political leaders such as Sherman Miller of the OL would speak at the Guardian Forum on the Black Nation in April 1973, citing a quotation from Mao Tse-tung about the inevitability of Black and white workers uniting as his major concrete *proof* that such a *material development had already occurred!*

III. Political Goals:

Objectively, then, these are the fundamental reasons why the “new communist movement” adopted the idealist conception of history in general and the *particular* form of “Mao Tse-tung Thought”: 1) To bolster the efforts of the national bourgeoisie in China to gain and hold the initiative in their struggle for power within China. 2) To help bolster US imperialism’s efforts to make contact with, and develop rapprochement with the rising Chinese national bourgeois leadership at the expense of the rising oppressed peoples’ struggles against US imperialism. And (based on points number 1 and 2) point 3) To defend their own class and national position, as part of a privileged class in the US imperialist oppressor nation, the US (north).