THROW THE BUM OUT, ORGANIZE TO FIGHT!

The Secretariat, on the basis of discussion and consultation with wider sections of leadership, has decided that we must mobilize our own organization, and all others we can unite with, to carry out an active political campaign around the demands to oust Nixon from office. We believe that this campaign should be waged under the general slogan "Throw the Bum Out, Organize to Fight!" and must be combined with agitation around other demands of the masses that strike against the fascist moves of the ruling class as a whole—demands such as Abolish Wage Controls, Defend the Right to Strike, Stop Police Nudity and Repression, Support the Attica Brothers, and other important demands (more on this later).

The ruling class is in trouble and turmoil. The Sec. believes that a campaign to oust Nixon at this time can play an important part in weakening the ruling class and building the struggle of the working class and its allies. But we must be clear on why we must do it and how to do it. The Sec. discussions touched on a number of important questions that we feel is crucial for the whole organization to discuss as the basis for carrying out this policy with a correct line and opposing and exposing the revisionists and other opportunists, who are desperately trying to confuse the people and keep the mass outrage at the exposure of ruling class corruption within bourgeois bounds.

First off, we raise the demand, "Throw the Bum Out," combined with the call to "Organize to fight," and with agitation around demands that represent the struggle of the masses of people against the whole ruling class. This is important, because we are making a demand on the bourgeoisie, and we are saying, we don't care how you do it, we're not going to get tricked into bourgeois "legalistic" arguments about whether Nixon has committed "impeachable offenses," or bourgeois politicking about who could and "should" replace him. We want him out and we don't care how, or who replaces him. And we must mobilize mass struggle around this demand—including demonstrations and other militant actions--rather than getting drawn into letter writing to our Congressmen, etc.

But more importantly, overall, we must put forward to the masses what is really going on. What Watergate and related events are really all about. We must show that Nixon is a representative of the monopoly capitalist class, and imperialists. That U.S. imperialism is in decline and crisis, and is moving toward fascist; and that the whole façade and back of this fascistation, but various sections contend for top position as this process develops.

We must combat the revisionist line of "good" imperialists and "bad" imperialists—"liberals" and the "ultra-right," the "depopilers of democracy," and the "defenders of democracy." And we must combat the Trotskyite line that there are no real differences or struggles within the ruling class, and therefore the people cannot make use of these conflicts and contradictions. To do this, we must show how the struggles that are going on, and are very intense within the ruling class, are about how to "save" U.S. imperialism, how to move toward fascism, and who will be in the drivers' seat in doing this.

We must show how recent events reflect this kind of contention within the ruling class. For example, Rockefeller forces were pretty clearly behind the ouster of Agnew; Richardson is pretty solidly a Rockefeller; and the Maryland prosecutor who conducted the grand jury investigations against Agnew-George Beall—is a Rockefeller man (he supported Nelson Rockefeller at the 1968 Republican convention, for example) Since '68, Nixon and the ruling class forces he is most closely tied in with have had to allow more and more Rockefeller influence in the Administration—Kissinger's role in a prime example. Obviously, Rockefeller, the butcher of Attica, and the oppressor of millions throughout the world—together with his family and their allied interest—is a whole not to be a "friend of the people" and "defender of democracy."

The Appointment of Cox as an "independent prosecutor" on Watergate—was also a concession to rival ruling class forces, particularly the Kennedy group. Cox was pretty clearly a Kennedy man. And Kennedy, who is openly courting Wallace and proclaiming him as a standard bearer of the democratic rights of the people. Kennedy, a solid supporter of Zionist aggression and imperialist plunder throughout the world, is no "emancipator of the poor," or opponent of fascism.

Because of his vulnerable position over Watergate, as it became more and more exposed, Nixon was forced to set up an "independent" prosecutor, and to name a Kennedy man like Cox. "Independent," of course, does not mean independent of the ruling class, but independent of Nixon and the sections of the ruling class he most directly represents.

So, it seems that with his "compromise candidate" to replace Agnew (Ford), and with the "crisis" brought on by the Watergate, Nixon felt he could gut away with dumping Cox, and bring the Watergate investigation back under his control—where it could be given a proper burial. The topes were a decay in this process. Nixon's decision on the fact that he could "tough out" any mass anger over the firing of Cox and the general flaunting of bourgeois "legality," and that rival sections of the ruling class, while they may threaten impeachment, would not really go that far. And, as far as the rival ruling class forces go, it is generally true that, while they may threaten impeachment, and may take steps toconfigure Cox, they do not, in fact, wish to impeach him, but only to use the charges to bolster their own position in the existing...
If this is the case, and if it is true that the whole ruling class is moving toward fascism, and different sections are only fighting about how to do it and who will preside over it, why organize struggle to oust Nixon? Because Nixon is gambling that the people will not rise up to resist his blatant flaunting of even bourgeois "legality." And if he gets away with it, it aids the ruling class as a whole in moving toward fascism.

Forcing the ouster of Nixon, and even mobilizing mass struggle around this demand, can strike a blow at the whole bourgeoisie and its move toward fascism. Not because knocking out Nixon will bring any basic change in the policies of the ruling class; it certainly will not change the nature of the system and the state—which we must make absolutely clear—and will not and cannot reverse the deepening crisis of U.S. imperialism, but it can strike a blow against the ruling class, create further turmoil within its ranks, hit at its fascination of the state, while strengthening the forces of the working class and its allies.

Normally, communists don't raise the demand for the ouster of a particular bourgeois politician. But this situation is not "normal." The crisis of U.S. imperialism has intensified, struggle within the ruling class has forced much of this struggle into the open. The degree of open in-fighting within the ruling class and the degree of corruption it has brought into public light, is unprecedented in this country, at least since the Civil War. And, unlike the period of the Civil War, the U.S. bourgeoisie today is completely parasitic, decaying, and on the decline. To put it simply, the old cogwheel of U.S. imperialism just can't what it used to be.

Our understanding of this is not nearly as developed as it should be, and our organization, together with other communist forces, must concentrate much more effort on investigating the particular aspects of the developing crisis of U.S. imperialism and how they inter-relate. In broad terms, the decline of the dollar, and the general decline of the U.S. bourgeoisie, the economic centers of the world; the defeat of U.S. aggression in Indochina, and the general decline of the military superiority of U.S. imperialism—these are two factors which are key parts of the deepening crisis. But we must learn more about how this inter-relates with the general economic situation within the U.S. and the position of U.S. imperialism internationally, including its contention and collusion with Soviet social-imperialism.

The accelerating crisis of U.S. imperialism, and the exposures of corruption and internal ruling class upheavals that have been its by-products, comes to the top of a decade of mass struggle, particularly the civil rights movement and Black liberation struggle, and the anti-war movement. These movements, which have shaken the position of the U.S. imperialists, actively involved millions of people and led to widespread alienation from the bourgeois order and a great decline in the authority of the political spokesmen and representatives of the ruling class. The anger of the masses of people over the Watergate and Agnew affairs, and other revelations of ruling class corruption is a cumulative effect of the exposure of the rotten nature of the ruling class, which has been brought about as the result of struggle against U.S. imperialism, not only by the American people, but by the people of the world, most sharply in Indochina.

This is why the recent actions of Nixon—the firing of the "special prosecutor" Cox—has been a kind of "straw that broke the camel's back." It has touched off widespread sentiment, in the working class, as well as among the petty bourgeoisie, to this bastard has got to go—despite his maneuver of agreeing to turn over the tapes to the court. The point is that, it is not any one particular act of Nixon that has led to this mass sentiment, but the combination of a number of things that have convinced people that he and the people around him are a bunch of crooks and can't be trusted.

This attitude of the masses, of course, has two aspects. On the one hand, it reflects a growing understanding of the criminal nature of the rulers of this country and the fact that "they're out for themselves, not for the people." On the other hand, it reflects certain bourgeois illusions and prejudices, such as the idea that Nixon is not representing the people, but only himself and his friends, that he is trying to see himself up as a personal dictator and is refusing to "share power with Congress," that he personally is responsible for the problems that people face, and that, if he could become the "unconstrained" president, and so on. These incorrect ideas are to be expected as "spontaneous" race riots. Like all "spontaneous" ideas, they are promoted by bourgeois forces, including Nixon's ruling class rivals, George Meany, the CP and others, as well as by bourgeois ideology in general. It is our job as communists to concentrate the correct ideas of the masses, and translate them into policies for action that can enable their consciousness of the nature of the system and lead them in the direction of revolution.

If we don't do that, we leave the field wide open to the revisionists, and to the open reactionaries. This is particularly sharp around the question of the ability of the ruling class to rule, to "keep order." One of the things that causes the people to lose faith in the old system and the old ruling class, is its growing inability to keep order, to keep things functioning. As the economic crisis grows, more and more people are thrown out of work and the anarchy of capitalism becomes clearer, masses of people lose faith in the ability of the capitalists to rule.

But already today, before the economic situation has reached spending Depression
revelations of corruption to spread wider and wider—all this has undermined the ability of the ruling class to present itself as a stable force capable of keeping order. And the exploding of the image of Nixon, Agnew and others as pillars of "law and order" has further undermined some of the foundation the ruling class is laying for fascism.

But, as with all things, the ruling class will try to turn this to its advantage. It will come up with newer, "cleaner" politicians, who will push even harder for law and order and will use the slogan of "cleaning out corruption" and "returning to the rule of law," and the principles that have made this country great and powerful," to justify further and faster moves toward fascism. "Big government" "big bureaucracies," etc., which the fascists will identify with "communism" will be blamed for the whole mess. This line will have influence particularly among sections of the petty bourgeoisie, which are getting more and more panicked by their own crumbling position and the growing inability of the ruling class to keep things "in order" through the "normal channels." Only with a correct line and mass struggle guided by this line can we win these sections away from supporting fascism.

How do we convey the correct ideas of the masses—especially of the workers who are much more pissed off than panicked—and, in particular, how do we develop struggle around the demand to get Nixon as a by-product of the struggle for revolution? How do we make it a part of the process of raising anti-imperialist consciousness among the masses?

The attitude of many workers is to be very cynical about Nixon and the whole exposure of bourgeois political corruption. This attitude, too, has two aspects. On the one hand it represents a growing awareness of the fact that the whole bunch of bums who run this country are nothing but crooks, and that getting rid of one just means you get another. This is an important part of recognizing the rotten nature of the whole system. But, on the other hand, it reflects a certain feeling of weakness, that, after all, what can we do about it?

We have to build on the anger and feelings of revulsion against Nixon and other bourgeois politicians, but we have to combat feelings of defeatism and passiveness politically. We have to mobilize masses in struggle and help them to grasp their own power, and in the final analysis decisive, role in affecting political developments.

We can't simply sit back and put our propaganda about the need for revolution, and how the revelations of corruption show clearly the need to overthrow the whole system and build socialism. This, of course, is very important, and we must combine this kind of propaganda, conducted in a lively down-to-earth style, with agitation and mass struggle. But part of raising the consciousness of the masses and developing their revolutionary role is, as we say in RED PAPERS 1, enabling the masses to "have a consciousness of their own power to be the decisive force in the defeat of their class enemy, the monopoly capitalist ruling class." And this understanding does not come out of the blue sky. It is built through mass struggle, to build up the forces of the working class and its allies, ideologically, politically and organizationally, win victories where possible, minimize defections and advance toward the goal of revolution.

At this point, outing an administration, or at least waging struggle to throw further disorder and difficulties into the camp of the class enemy, is an important part of building the struggle and consciousness to eventually overthrow the state and the whole system of imperialism.

And mobilizing people, especially working people, in this struggle in a "more widely applicable" means of raising political consciousness than struggles on the shop floor and other day-to-day economic and trade union struggles. This, of course, does not mean that we should abandon these struggles. But in the minds of many workers, and not only the most advanced, the political crisis of corruption is a very pressing question, and of immediate concern. It is our duty to put forward agitation and build organized struggle around this question, linking it with agitation around other demands that are focused on struggle against the whole system—right to strike, against wage controls, police murder, etc.—and combining this with communist propaganda that points to the inevitable need for revolution. In this way, we can influence the struggle to "throw the bun out" in an anti-imperialist direction. If we stand to the side and refuse to take part, because bourgeois forces here have raised the question of impeaching Nixon, we will leave the masses at their mercy, and guarantee that the spontaneous anger and struggle around this will remain under bourgeois leadership.

One question that comes up in relation to this, that must be addressed, is how does this differ from the idea of supporting Ms. Govern or "defeat Nixon" in last year's election, which our organization and other communist forces correctly opposed. First off, "defeat Nixon" could only mean, in practical terms, support (or vote for) Ms. Govern. In the context of an election, there is no other way to "defeat" a candidate.

Raising the demand to "throw the bun out" does not mean support for any other politician or representative of the ruling class. True enough, if he is thrown out, another bourgeois politician will take his place. But we do not support whoever wins the presidency. We support the movement to get Nixon out.
blow in opposition to the whole ruling class and its move toward fascism. It is a slap
in their face. This is the way we must put it forward, and make this analysis very clear.

Finally, an election and the ouster of a President are two basically different things. An
election in bourgeois society is a regular procedure which helps the bourgeoisie to "legitimize" its rule, to further the illusion of "Democracy" to such sections of the mass movement toward a bourgeois arena. and, on the other hand, does more to "demystify" the ruling class, to undermine the authority of the whole class and its political representatives, than it does to "legitimize."

True enough, if the bourgeoisie is forced to throw out its own "chief executive"—
anything it has never yet been forced to do in this country—it will try to turn things
around and say that this shows "the great strength of America," and the lamentable
"decadence and "dictatorship" through its own procedures. This kind of stuff has been already tried around the Watergate
hearings, but not with very great success. And while this kind of argument does have some
limited effect, and would have even if the bourgeoisie was forced to dump a President,
it would be very weak compared to the loss of political authority that the whole ruling
class would suffer, and the awareness of their own political strength that the masses
would gain, and will gain, simply by mobilizing to demand Nixon's ouster.

Undoubtedly, some bourgeois illusions and prejudices will arise in the course of
this kind of struggle. Bourgeois illusions and prejudices among the masses will exist
for a long time (and among the communists, too), even after the seizure of state power.
The question at every point is: on the whole does a policy help to expose the system to
mobilize the people to struggle against it, or does it add to covering up the nature
of the system and kill struggle against it? The Sec. firmly believes that, if the
communists approach it correctly, uniting all who can be united, while maintaining an
independent communist line, organizing mass struggle around the slogan, "Throw the Bus
Out, organize to fight!" will contribute to anti-imperialist consciousness and struggle,
and will be a by-product of the overall struggle for revolution.

The slogan, "Throw the Bus Out, Organize to Fight!" is not a gimmick. It must be
a real call to action that mobilizes our own cadres, other revolutionaries and masses of
people. We cannot take this up as a real political campaign, and, as we said earlier,
link it with other demands and struggles of the masses.

In doing this, however, we must avoid errors, particularly right errors. For
example, in continuing to build support for the Farm strikers and farm workers, we must
not fall into the error of anying, for example, "the way to help the farm workers to win
is to oust Nixon." This kind of bourgeois line is already being put out by the CP, by
the UFW lead abash and AFL-CIO hawks. We must present the fight to "throw the bus out"
as part of the struggle against the whole class of monopoly capitalists—including Ken-
nedy, Rockefeller, etc. And we must present the farmworkers struggle in this same light.

Similarly, in trade union work, generally, we must win people away from the line of
Heaney & Co.—that Nixon should resign or be impeached, because he is screwing up the
functioning of the system. Heaney, for example, was quoted recently to the effect that
the "free enterprise" economy would work fine if Nixon would just let it. Heaney's
opposition to Nixon—a switch from his earlier stand of expressed "neutrality"—
comes down to his belief that U.S. imperialism can't protect its ass with Nixon in the
saddle, because he is no opponent and "Compromised," his economic policies aren't "work-
ing"—they can't be "sold" to union members, etc.

In the trade unions and among workers generally, we must mobilize workers in
demonstrations, form ad hoc committees and develop other means to organize mass struggle
around the demand to oust Nixon. And we must connect this up with key struggles and
demands such as those referred to before—abolish wage controls, defend the right to
strike, work with no strike agreements, support the Farm workers and farm workers,
stop police murder and repression, support the Attica Brothers and indict the underer
Rockefeller, etc.

Here we must also avoid "left" errors. We should bring forward these demands in
relation to the demand to "throw the bus out," and we should struggle to win as many
people as possible to these demands. But we should not refuse to unite with people
around the demand to oust Nixon, if they are not yet prepared to support all of the
above (and other similar) demands.

Wherever possible, we should unite workers' advanced forces around these demands,
within the broader struggle around the demand to "throw the bus out," And, again, we
must consistently find the ways to bring forward our independent communist line,
explaining the nature of the state, the role of bourgeois politicians (exposing people
like Kennedy, Percy, Rockefeller, in particular), the real meaning of the in-fighting
within the ruling class, the crisis of the system and the move of the whole ruling
class toward fascism, and why struggling to oust Nixon is a tactical blow against our
class enemy, and part of the long-range struggle for socialist revolution. If we fail
to bring forward this line and combine it, in a living way with the struggle, we will
Because of the importance and scope of this campaign, it must have unified direction and guidance, politically and organizationally, as far as possible. But this must be combined with initiative on the part of local leadership and all cadre in carrying out this policy. This month's REVOLUTION is carrying a banner story on "THROW THE BUM OUT," and wherever possible, our comrades working on the local anti-imperialist working class papers should struggle for the correct line on the question—though it won't be a communist line in those papers, it can and should be a line that puts the fight to out Nixon in an anti-imperialist perspective and exposes the whole ruling class and the system.

Generally, the Sec. plans to keep on top of this campaign as much as possible, and to sum it up as it develops. At the present time, the Sec. believes that it is crucial for the organization to get involved in spontaneous movements that are developing around this question. And to begin organizing struggle, among students and also among working people, wherever possible, bringing forward our line on the question, while uniting all who can be united around the demand to "throw the bum out!"

The Sec. is also planning, in consultation with regional and other leadership bodies, to investigate the possibility of nationwide demonstrations around this demand—on the same day, within the near future—as well as other nationally coordinated actions in the future.

The enemy is vulnerable, the people are angry and want to hit back. Let's dare to strengthen their blow and direct it toward revolution!