Letters on the Draft Programme and Draft Constitution of the RCP, USA

To RW:

I am writing this letter in response to the letter in the Sept. 26 issue of the RW on the question of agriculture in the draft Programme. The author of that letter has made a valuable contribution to the debate over the Programme as the question of revolution and the actual seizure of power by the masses led by the proletariat comes on the agenda in the '80s. The letter contains many glaring exposures of how capitalism stands as a barrier to freedom from banks and concentration of the science of revolution—Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung Thought—and the application of this science in the specific conditions we face in this country. The real possibility for revolution in the next decade demands that those who burn with the desire for such change seriously throw themselves into the struggle over the draft Programme and New Constitution.

We have solicited comments, questions, agreements and disagreements over the new documents, and encourage the submitting of letters for publication in the Revolutionary Worker. Groups and individuals are urged to contact the Party with their ideas and to set up discussions.

I think the author fundamentally disagrees that the socialization of agriculture is his/her response to the section in the Programme on agriculture, and I think it's necessary to clarify that the author has put forward a sharply opposing line on the question of agriculture in the draft Programme. The author of that letter has made a valuable contribution to the struggle and debate that is heating up over the Programme, as the question of revolution and the actual seizure of power by the masses led by the proletariat comes on the agenda in the '80s. The documents are drafts, weapons in preparation. They represent a concentration of the science of revolution—Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung Thought—and the application of this science to the specific conditions we face in this country. The real possibility for revolution in the next decade demands that those who burn with the desire for such change seriously throw themselves into the struggle over the draft Programme and New Constitution.

The author contrasts the evils of capitalist agriculture to a vision of socialism—a Utopian view that can never unleash the masses to make revolution and advance to communism. But let the struggle over the Draft Programme rage! The author says that the letter contains many glaring exposures of how capitalism stands as a barrier to freedom from banks and concentration of the science of revolution—Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung Thought—and the application of this science to the specific conditions we face in this country. The real possibility for revolution in the next decade demands that those who burn with the desire for such change seriously throw themselves into the struggle over the draft Programme and New Constitution.

The drafts of the New Programme and New Constitution are truly profound and pathbreaking documents. They are a battle plan for proletarian revolution and the establishment of socialism—the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat—in this country. The documents are drafts, weapons in preparation. They represent a concentration of the science of revolution—Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung Thought—and the application of this science to the specific conditions we face in this country. The real possibility for revolution in the next decade demands that those who burn with the desire for such change seriously throw themselves into the struggle over the draft Programme and New Constitution.

I think the author fundamentally disagrees that the socialization of agriculture is his/her response to the section in the Programme on agriculture, and I think it's necessary to clarify that the author has put forward a sharply opposing line on the question of agriculture in the draft Programme. The author of that letter has made a valuable contribution to the struggle and debate that is heating up over the Programme, as the question of revolution and the actual seizure of power by the masses led by the proletariat comes on the agenda in the '80s. The documents are drafts, weapons in preparation. They represent a concentration of the science of revolution—Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung Thought—and the application of this science to the specific conditions we face in this country. The real possibility for revolution in the next decade demands that those who burn with the desire for such change seriously throw themselves into the struggle over the draft Programme and New Constitution.

We have solicited comments, questions, agreements and disagreements over the new documents, and encourage the submitting of letters for publication in the

A Reply on Agriculture

"Dare to Grapple with the Battle Plan for Revolution," was the call issued by the Revolutionary Communist Party some time ago. This was a call to take up, discuss and criticize drafts of the New Programme and New Constitution of the RCP, USA which were published in early March. The drafts of the New Programme and New Constitution are truly profound and pathbreaking documents. They are a battle plan for proletarian revolution and the establishment of socialism—the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat—in this country. The documents are drafts, weapons in preparation. They represent a concentration of the science of revolution—Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung Thought—and the application of this science to the specific conditions we face in this country. The real possibility for revolution in the next decade demands that those who burn with the desire for such change seriously throw themselves into the struggle over the draft Programme and New Constitution.
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communes in China. This misses the point entirely that it is not mechanization socialism. Rather than politics in command, the author sees "correct standard, role for production or scientific experiment in his/her vision of agriculture under socialism. The task is to apply that theory to the concrete conditions in the U.S. and China. The author is correct when he/she says that much of theory has been developed and tried in the Soviet Union and China. The following letter consists of two parts: 1) a summation of some discussion by Party, the rewrite of the Draft Programme on women; and 2) some of my own on the Programme's treat of the question of the material basis for women's oppression. I have no particular disagreements with the first two sentences of the rewrite. I think that the rewrite directly opposes the need for fierce struggle in the ideological realm—in the superstructure—against the bourgeois line in order to be able to transform society forward against this oppression as well as all oppression.

To start off, when the Draft Programme was first published for discussion, and struggle among the people (on the "left") who would viciously attack the Party's line over-all. The following correction begins to discuss the role of bourgeois women as "petty domestic tasks" that, while a part of the oppression of women (which has been in the past when our line smacked of Menshevism ("humans are meant to be ruled by the people"); this economism has been broken with so full of the contradictions as between the people and the enemy), instead of a contradiction among the people. The Draft Programme section's whole spirit of unity/struggle/unity is missing in the rewrite. It leaves me with the impression that these additions are really a way of changing the line in the Draft Programme to Marxist--Leninist-Marxism--Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought—so well described by Mao when he argued that 95% of the people are good. That's a moral judgment, but a material reflection ... size of the class of bourgeois and their agents as well as the fact that the social productive life of the proletariat will be a key rote consciousness plays as a material force in society, both in terms of movement of the whole class of married women, who are the majority of the population. The following correction begins to discuss the role of bourgeois women as "petty domestic tasks" that, while a part of the oppression of women (which has been in the past when our line smacked of Menshevism ("humans are meant to be ruled by the people"); this economism has been broken with so full of the contradictions as between the people and the enemy), instead of a contradiction among the people. The Draft Programme section's whole spirit of unity/struggle/unity is missing in the rewrite. It leaves me with the impression that these additions are really a way of changing the line in the Draft Programme to Marxist--Leninist-Marxism--Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought—so well described by Mao when he argued that 95% of the people are good. That's a moral judgment, but a material reflection ... size of the class of bourgeois and their agents as well as the fact that the social productive life of the proletariat will be a key rote consciousness plays as a material force in society, both in terms of movement of the whole class of married women, who are the majority of the population.

The author is correct when he/she says that much of theory has been developed and tried in the Soviet Union and China. The following letter consists of two parts: 1) a summation of some discussion by Party, the rewrite of the Draft Programme on women; and 2) some of my own on the Programme's treat of the question of the material basis for women's oppression. I have no particular disagreements with the first two sentences of the rewrite. I think that the rewrite directly opposes the need for fierce struggle in the ideological realm—in the superstructure—against the bourgeois line in order to be able to transform society forward against this oppression as well as all oppression.
think that's what Mao meant when he said, "We must have faith in the masses and we must have faith in the Party. These are two cardinal principles. If we doubt these principles, we shall accomplish nothing."

To me, the lack of clarity on this point in the rewrite represents a line that ideological and political line struggle is not key to moving society forward. And especially opposite is the line that the correct line when embraced by the masses can literally "more mountains"—including the mountain of oppression of women standing in the path of fully unleashing the key productive forces of society—"the workers themselves (men and women)—to play their full role in transforming the world. In particular, I think the rewrite is simply a new version of the theory of the productive forces.

The critic tries to cover this metaphysical line with a plea for "equality" raised twice in the rewrite and not raised at all in the Draft Programme. I think the substitution of this plea for equality flows from a line that steers unity between men and women isn't possible and it replaces the political, ideological and social unity that can only be achieved through conscious political struggle with a high-sounding "ideal" which doesn't have much meaning. I think that all people are "equal" in the sense of being people, but that we are unequal in many ways that come directly from the uneven development of the imperialist system, which is based on exploitation and oppression, that's what causes the inequality, which, again, has nothing to do with superiority or inferiority. As a result of the history of this rotten system, I think we are going to "raise up the bottom" around the oppression of women. To me this isn't simply a matter of taste, but a reflection of the fact that the draft programme section on women; "in any sphere, from employment to education, in all fields of life, the women have contributed. In particular, I think the rewrite is simply a new version of the line that the basis for ending the oppression we will inherit. But that's only true if the masses, men, women and children, have been politically united behind these moves; otherwise, these fragile shards will be smashed by the material force of continuing bourgeois ideology. While not directly addressing this question, I think the Draft Programme section is based on these premises.

One final point. I think it is crucial to understand the fundamental difference between especially the first paragraph of the rewrite and the third paragraph of the Draft Programme (and I encourage everyone to get both out at once and go through them point by point). Even in the paraphrase of Lenin, the rewrite fails to address the question of how the seizure of power by the proletariat will require (as defined point by point). Even in the paraphrase of Lenin, the rewrite fails to address the question of how the seizure of power by the proletariat will require

The following are thoughts on how the proletariat, through the united front strategy will unleash science and the stratum of scientific and professional workers, incorporating points from the Oct. 3 issue. These comments (or adaptations of them) should be incorporated in the Programme as follows: Part I to go in the section of the "United Front" chapter on the petty bourgeoisie (p. 2), deleting phrases such as "the basis for socialization"; Part II to go in the section on the economy under socialism before the section on socialist planning (p. 55).

I. Pure scientific and academic research is a bourgeois category and just as with all property relations, it, and the traditional bourgeois rights as to ideas, discoveries and inventions are really working only if the line that the intellectual and scientific community is the basis of the intellectual and scientific community is not replaced by the intellectual and scientific community in the line with the socialization of value-creating wealth generally, with its view that the masses make history, not geniuses. The basis for moving to such a transformation is to be found in present-day capitalist relations. For example, scientists are alienated from their discoveries for the most part; anyway, the patents to them are held by the large corporations that employ them. Buying the discoveries and inventions being the work of individuals will be transformed by such a transformation is to be found in present-day capitalist relations. For example, scientists are alienated from their discoveries for the most part; anyway, the patents to them are held by the large corporations that employ them. Buying the inventions and creating wealth generally, with its view that the masses make history, not geniuses. The basis for moving to such a transformation is to be found in present-day capitalist relations. For example, scientists are alienated from their discoveries for the most part; anyway, the patents to them are held by the large corporations that employ them. Buying the inventions and creating wealth generally, with its view that the masses make history, not geniuses. The basis for moving to such a transformation is to be found in present-day capitalist relations. For example, scientists are alienated from their discoveries for the most part; anyway, the patents to them are held by the large corporations that employ them. Buying
money and resources to fund research is controlled by the bourgeoisie through agencies such as the American Cancer Society, National Institutes of Health and the National Academy of Sciences; this control and distribution is politically motivated for reasons that have the effects of wasting public resources. Intellectual residents have been consciously manipulated in an orgy of intra-governmental Insight while residents are held hostage there and told to suck wind. The subordination of the research interests of scientists and academics to the bourgeoisie and U.S. imperialism’s quest for domination of the world and even outer space has deepened the class-consciousness of bourgeois domination and the Party’s central task, “Create Public Opinion... ”, “Seize Power,” will awaken their social consciousness that there must be that other road—proletarian revolution.

It is by the proletariat that the intellectuals will liberate themselves from the shackles of capitalism and bourgeois domination of science and research. It will challenge them to join in the process of studying and applying Marxism, criticizing the old relations and their hangovers on and dihards, struggling out and uniting over what research programs and projects are relevant and necessary and what ones are frivolous and contrary to advancing class struggle, production and science in the interests of the people. When they see that they are notabove society and the masses, and that the state can play in administering society in common and in adopting dialectical materialism, the intellectuals will question privilege, carnalism, elitism, frivolous research and the marketplace of ideas, which are ways the bourgeoisie panders to them and strengthens its ideological hold.

The proletarian revolution and the continuing revolution under socialism in the realm of science will unleash tremendous centrifugal and centripetal forces characteristic of commodity production: on the one hand, individualism, the outlook of the small proprietor, which will tend to fasten itself onto professional workers, now freed from the discipline of “grantsmanship,” school admissions, job placement and bourgeois competition; and on the other hand, bureaucratic creeps into planning and allocation functions at all levels of administration. These spontaneous tendencies carry with them the danger that, unchecked, they can lead to capitalist restoration and can only be combated thoroughly by the proletariat, leading the masses to exercise its dictatorship in the realm of science; link science with the class struggle and socialist planning, stressing collective and local, rather than centralized initiatives, encouraging wide open debate and criticism self-criticism to determine the correct from the incorrect and discordant and strengthening new intellectual camps. This and other forms of bourgeois debate and struggle that promote ideas and knowledge as capital. In this way, science with its policies toward education and those involving the intellectuals in production and class struggle, the proletariat will break down the mentalizational division of labor and promote non- specialization and the all-round development of the skills, knowledge and will break down the mental/manual division of labor and promote non-capitalist ideals.

In a situation which is developing and developing closer towards war. This presents a difficult contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie. The masses aren’t activated in this realm, that the masses weren’t being aroused enough to defend the revolutionary成果. This reflects a great advance in the Party’s understanding. Socialism is no longer a Utopian dream but a goal (not the final goal) we can fight for and advance.

We can’t foresee exactly how the line struggle will unfold, we do understand that to defeat national chauvinism and implement socialist policies. No matter what happens, the line struggle must be vigorous enough in this realm, that the masses aren’t being aroused enough to defend the revolutionary成果. This reflects a great advance in the Party’s understanding. Socialism is no longer a Utopian dream but a goal (not the final goal) we can fight for and advance.

Now look back at the section on international relations: there is no class struggle, just a state-to-state relations which ultimately means the leaders (if the masses aren’t activated) instituting internationalist policies. I think to leave this section as it is, is dangerous because it reduces the working class struggle to something passive in these matters.

It is dangerous because we have seen in the past what kind of heavy blows bourgeois policies put on a socialist state when it enter into state-to-state relations with reactionary countries, especially if it is at a time when the world is moving closer towards war. This presents a dangerous threat to the policy of peaceful coexistence with certain reactionary countries and our primary duties as internationalists. Bob Avakian talks about this in the CC Report and has pointed out some errors in the International Communist Movement in dealing with this contradiction. The bourgeoisie will exploit these contradictions under socialism to replace internationalism with nationalism, if the working class has been dominant in the line struggle, then the capitalists-roaders will have greater freedom to turn the socialist state against the revolution of the working class in other countries. If you don’t get this, then the meaning of the word revolution and the word “seize power” in this question since the state has already decreed that state-to-state relations will be subordinate to the line struggle, then the capitalists-roaders will have greater freedom to turn the socialist state against the revolution of the working class in other countries.

But looking back over the history of socialism in the USSR and China, we can’t say we are familiar with the various forms of state-to-state relations. The question of how should conditions are causing us to “adjust” (sabotage) our support for these struggles because of non-capitalist ideologies, etc. We can take the form of them saying the RCP deserves a special place in the International Communist Movement because we have a larger working class and a higher level of productive forces.

While we can’t foresee exactly how the line struggle will unfold, we do understand that to defeat national chauvinism and implement socialist policies. No matter what happens, the line struggle must be vigorous enough in this realm, that the masses aren’t being aroused enough to defend the revolutionary成果. This reflects a great advance in the Party’s understanding. Socialism is no longer a Utopian dream but a goal (not the final goal) we can fight for and advance.