

The struggle of the Communists within the CPSU with the rebirth of the party. XXVIII Congress and the direction to the market. The continuation of the Gorbachev course in the politics of opportunists after the collapse of the USSR.

Report of the RCWP representative, the secretary of the Central Committee, A. K. Cherepanov, at the European Communist Initiative forum in Istanbul on February 18, 2019.

Speaking about the bourgeois rebirth of the party and the Soviet state, they usually focus on the 28th CPSU Congress, its decisions and the struggle of the Communists there.

However, the roots of this rebirth lie much deeper. The fact is that the CPSU approached the XXVIII Congress not as an orthodox revolutionary communist party, corresponding to the Leninist definition of a new party type. By this time, by the efforts of the XX and XXII CPSU congresses, the party in theory has already abandoned such cornerstones of Marxism as the doctrine of the proletariat dictatorship, the understanding of the state as a purely class instrument of the ruling class. There was a refusal to recognize the continuation of the class struggle under socialism, and, most importantly, in the basis, in the economy, some reforms carried out led to the weakening of its character as direct social production and developing its product- market orientation. The development trend towards the elimination of commodity-market relations in the economy was replaced by the tendency of their expansion and development.

Since the time of Khrushchev, the state has been treated on a national level, and the Communist Party has been more and more understood and presented as the party of all the population. It can be said that, at the XXII Congress of the CPSU, the party under the leadership of Khrushchev handed over communist positions and switched to the rails of revisionism, while retaining the communist name and appropriate phraseology, however at the XXVIII Congress under the leadership of Gorbachev, the party was already openly adopting non-communist, social-democratic and even anti-communist theoretical positions, but at the same time also kept its communist name, hiding behind the red flag and swearing loyalty to the communist choice.

At the same time, the majority of the delegates at the XXII Party Congress were, most likely, in Leninist terms, *honest opportunists* and *involuntary revisionists*, which was due to their low Marxist literacy, but it was more or less homogeneous mass of Leninist party members. But at the XXVIII Congress of the CPSU , a peculiar ideological hodgepodge of all sorts of different politically diverse elements was already quite clearly observed : from orthodox Marxists to ardent anti-communists. No wonder, when Professor A.A. Sergeev , speaking at the XXVIII Congress from the Movement of the Communist Initiative (MCI), began his speech with a greeting: “ *Communist comrades! Legal Marxist comrades! As well as socialists, left and right social democrats and other members of our party ...* ”, - his words were met with laughter and applause in the hall. And in the report on behalf of MCI, with whom Comrade V.A. Tyulkin spoke at the Constituent Congress of the Communist Party of the RSFSR, the situation was described as following: .{“ *The members of our party are both at the head of the left-wingers and the right-wingers. And at the head of the United front of workers, and at the head of the Popular Front. Those who are for communism, and those who are against communism are all members of our party. And the one on top of this observes and says: “Good! Pluralism ! ”- this person is the main ideologue of the party.*”

Thus, if you answer the question quite briefly: why did the communist party and the Soviet state lost the game so easily? The answer might be: because the party was no longer communist and the state was not Soviet.

We often heard the opinions of our foreign comrades, and in Russia too, it was as if the XXVIII Congress and the CPSU in general were losing without a fight: they all followed Gorbachev so meekly, voted for the market, for “democratic socialism with a human face”, for perestroika and so on. This is not true. There was resistance to Gorbachev and his course in the CPSU, and it was, moreover, organized, if not from the first days of his reign, then from 1987 - definitely. First, in Leningrad, a society of scientific communism was formed, which mainly united scientists - representatives of the social sciences, then the workers' political clubs of workers "For Leninism". Then the organizations merged and expanded, formed the Leningrad, Moscow, then with the support of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, and then the All-Union United Front of Workers, and finally, in 1989, the Communist Initiative Movement was created in the CPSU, the most famous form of which was Initiative congresses of communists, the first one of which took place in April 1990 in Leningrad and which represented more than a million communists of Russian organizations.

The main issue of resistance to Gorbachev's perestroika at that stage was the struggle against the transfer of the economy to market relations. In the political report of the Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev tried to justify this transition with its so-called necessity, lack of alternatives. And taking this lack of alternatives as an axiom, Gorbachev starts to justify the ongoing political reform and the concept of parliamentarism, still preached by the comrades from the Communist Party of the Russian Federation and the Communist Party of Ukraine as "democracy". At the same time, Gorbachev emphasized the ideological kinship and continuity of perestroika with the Khrushchev's XX Congress of the CPSU. Here are his words: *“First of all, I must repeat what I have said more than once: the concept of perestroika is not a sudden insight of a certain group of people. Beginning with the 20th Congress of the CPSU , a search in the party and the society was launched. ”* These searches naturally led Gorbachev to a certain rejection of the party's proletarian character and the exit to the Khrushchev national spread: "We are the party of perestroika, and, therefore, the CPSU acts today as a nation-wide political organization.

Of course, all these theoretical ideas were quite obvious. Since the first program of the RSDLP, any more or less educated communist knows that commodity production gives rise to capitalist relations every day and every hour. Therefore, the slogans “Market economy now” and arguments like “there is no alternative to the market”, “there is no other way” met with quite serious resistance in the party and in the economist circles. A whole galaxy of Soviet economists came up with scientific, Marxist, i.e. anti-product, anti-market positions.

The participants in those economic discussions claim that the Gorbachev marketists have not won a single open theoretical discussion, have not won a single serious public economic dispute. Therefore, they were forced to act on the sly, using their huge advantage, as they say today, in the administrative resource and the media.

Having resolved the matter privately at the highest party-state level, and under the influence of representatives of international imperialism (Gorbachev had already met with Thatcher and Reagan, who had been enthusiastically optimistic about him), they would actually announce the fact of the choice already made to the party and the presented this in such a way as if the way to the market is unequivocally determined, and science, world experience and even Marxist-Leninist theory support this. And the one who did not take this course to the market, simply received the label of a retrograde, dogmatic and a backward element.

We should note that in the speeches of these supposedly backward elements at the XXVIII Congress of the CPSU and the Constituent Congress of the KP RSFSR, it was possible to hear not only constructive criticism of Gorbachev's and his team's renegation, but also the predictions of the consequences that the transition to the market would bring to the country and the people, in fact, that would be, the capitalization of society. So, the representative of DKI, Professor Sergeev A.A. in his report, again and again with the strong sense of political economics, showed that it was a question of return to capitalism.

We should note a very important point. From the point of view of orthodox Marxists (i.e, revolutionary Marxists) - both in the 80s of the last century, the representatives of the Communist Initiative Movement at the XXVIII Congress, and today the representatives of the RKWP, CPSU, by that time had already stopped to represent the interests of the working class and all the other layers of workers. That is why it was so easy to succumb to the calls of anti-Soviet, the miners of the USSR went on strike, that is why thousands of workers left the party and finally after the events of August 1991 and the ban of CPSU by Yeltsin, the working class as a whole remained almost completely indifferent to this event. It was no longer his party. The Gorbachev's CPSU stopped to be a party of the working class.

With the decisions that were dragged through at the 28th CPSU Congress, the socialist statehood was in fact replaced by bourgeois. Perestroika was not only a state system, but also the right of private ownership of any means of production, including collective farm lands.

The leaders of the party stubbornly did not want to consider a truly scientific alternative to the market and did not give such an opportunity during the ten days of work. Then came the last, the eleventh day of the congress. And it was only on that last day, that the representatives of DKI, in a viscous struggle, achieved that their delegate would nevertheless be given the floor precisely on the issue of transition to the market. V.A. Tyulkin was requested to report our position. Victor Arkadyevich presented an alternative resolution to the congress, and the meaning of it was in the fact that the communists should cancel the market direction, avoid sliding into capitalism. In this Statement, there were prophetic words based on the Marxist analysis and Marxist scientific foresight: *“Forced, contrary to objective processes, “treatment” of socialism by capitalism will entail not an increase in production and living standards, but their inevitable decline, will cause widespread social protest, will lead to severe suffering of the people”*. And further: *“The Party cannot conduct perestroika that led to severe deterioration in the life of people. As for the Communist Party, it simply will not stand this distress, and there will be no one to defend the final goals of the movement.”*

1259 delegates voted for this resolution, i.e. a third of the congress, despite the unprecedented pressure of the opportunist party leaders. We, that is, the Communist Initiative movement, took the most direct part in resisting this process of transition to a the market and we have a right to be proud of it. But we did not have the strength to stop the capitalization.

Today, this dream of Gorbachev - the movement into capitalism under the red banner - is included into the program provisions of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation and a number of foreign parties that call themselves communist. It is common that in Zyuganov's today circle and among the top leaders of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation and the UPC-CPSU there is not a single person who has somehow opposed Gorbachev and the transition to the market at the XXVIII CPSU Congress. Not even one! But among the management of new commercial structures: banks, stock exchanges, concerns and holdings, various joint-stock companies, the leaders and staff of the Gorbachev wing of the CPSU are very closely represented.

The leaders of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation believe in the theory of so-called "market socialism", clumsily referring to the experience of Lenin's NEP and taking as an example the current experience of economic construction in China under the leadership of the CPC. In the political part of their program they completely forget about the fact that Lenin's NEP was carried out under the conditions of the state of the proletariat dictatorship, and the current market communists, usually misrepresent the standard parliamentary system as democracy, bringing "*honest*" election rules to it and appealing to the conscience of those in power, they promise to use government regulation for the social orientation of the economy. The policy they pursue today is not a labor policy, but, petty-bourgeois, both theoretically and practically.

The topics of the reports at today's meeting are "October 1993 in Russia: a product of opportunism or provocation?" and "The phenomenon of Ukrainian nationalism. Maidan and the communist movement", about the well-known events in Russia and Ukraine. Without discouraging the speakers, let us say that in both cases the opportunists (KPRF and KPU) with their direct actions not only contributed to the creation of conditions for successful reaction actions, but also contributed to the fascist forces coming to power.

At the very crucial moment in Russia from the television screens Zyuganov urged the working people to sit at home and not to fight. He himself was watching the execution of the Supreme Council from the outside. And then the KPRF broke through the front of the boycott of the elections "on blood", and by participating in the elections, helped Yeltsin to create the illusion of democracy and legitimacy, promoted the presence and dragged through the anti-popular constitution (51% of positive votes out of 52% of presence).

In Ukraine, the Communist Party of Ukraine and Simonenko expelled the Communists from the party for their work in the Union of Workers of Ukraine, led ideologically and organizationally disarmed party and working people to the events of Maidan. After the coup, the Communist Party group in the Verkhovna Rada at first voted for the speaker Turchinov - thus helping the Nazi legitimization. Then the Communist Party of Ukraine made the decision to go to the presidential election in the country, realizing that there was not even the slightest chance of winning. By participating in the presidential election campaign, the Communist Party of Ukraine actually finally legitimizes Poroshenko - the head of the ruling Ukrainian junta. However, no one expected any other action from our former comrades from the KPU leaders.

Thus, opportunism, as a form of petty-bourgeois socialism, is today a brake in the communist movement. Just as in the Communist Manifesto Marx and Engels once critically characterized different types of unscientific socialism (utopian, Christian, petty-bourgeois, bourgeois, etc.), today we need to analyze and indicate the main features of the modern variety of petty-bourgeois socialism. From our point of view, such signs include:

- declaring that bourgeois parliamentarism is democracy and highlighting the tasks of the struggle for the so-called "fair" parliamentary elections and the election victories;
- the proclamation of the exhaustion of the limits for revolution;
- professing a model of market socialism in economy, supposedly based on a multi-structured model, and, in fact, on capitalist private property under the political power of the bourgeoisie.

An example and a model for most parties that adhere to this concept is the policy of the Chinese Communist Party. However, for workers of Kazakhstan, striking oil workers of

Mangistau Oblast building of socialism with private and private-capitalist property is not a socialist way at all since in 2011 the reactionary authorities and Chinese proprietors not only used the repressive means, courts, and prisons to put down the workers, but also killed the workers and their families first, after that they used the police to shoot the protestors.

However, I think, it is the same for the Chinese proletarians who came to Russia and work for Russian (and Chinese, often underground) capitalist enterprises in terrible disenfranchised conditions for beggarly wages. We comradely warn the Chinese Communists against repeating the CCP way the way Gorbachev did it, but with Chinese characteristics — *under the red banner of capitalism*.

Thus, Gorbachevism is alive in today's communist movement and, without overcoming it, it is impossible to talk about returning to the path of socialism, about the victory of the working people either in Russia or in other countries of the world. Therefore, our party is actively exposing the opportunism of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation and other modern marketers disguised as communists. We remember well what exactly was said by V.I. Lenin: "*The struggle against imperialism, if it is not inextricably linked with the struggle against opportunism, is an empty false phrase.*"

We draw the attention of comrades to the fact that in our time opportunism has significantly changed its character and its functions. If in Leninist times there were *honest* opportunists who sincerely considered themselves Marxists, now opportunism has become a controlled weapon of imperialistic policy aimed at demobilizing Marxism, its emasculation, turning into a skillful diversion of workers from revolutionary and general scientific views and positions, erosion of communist ideology and communist practice. This weapon is extremely dangerous, in no case should this risk be underestimated. It is no secret that the opportunist parties are actively supported, generously funded and promoted by bourgeois propaganda, therefore the fight against them is very difficult. We all need to direct these efforts precisely to this struggle, which threatens not only the future of our movement, but has already become one of the main threats to the present. We see that in the international communist movement opportunism has taken a leading position and is expanding its influence. This proves the necessity of a close bond between the revolutionary parties, coordination of our actions, organizational unification into the revolutionary pole and later on into the new Communist International. Real, Leninist! The 100th anniversary of which we celebrate this year.

Proletarians of all countries, unite!