

The RCP, USA and its New Synthesis (Part-1)

 web.archive.org/web/20111116043415/http://www.wprmbritain.org



- Fahad Zaki

"Freedom is won by the people through struggle; it is not bestowed by anyone as a favour."

(Mao, On Coalition Government, Selected Works, Vol. 3, p. 243)

Since the defeat of the proletarian revolution in China in 1976, there has been continuous struggle of workers with numerous sacrifices of the masses and communists around the world. During the last decade, powerful revolutionary movements under the leadership of the Unified Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) (please check www.cpnmintl.org) and The Communist Party of India (Maoist) (www.bannedthought.net) have advanced and the Revolutionary Communist Party, Canada (www.pcr-rcp.ca), the Maoist Communist Party of Italy (www.prolcom.altervista.org), the Communist Party of France (Maoist) and the Communist Party of Bhutan (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist) have been established.



Building a revolutionary movement is a very complicated task and takes a long time. Indeed, such a tortuous process can only develop when practice is guided by a correct theory. However, there is no evidence that the majority of genuine communist parties and organisations which were established during the 1970s and 80s have been able to build and develop an effective movement, especially in the imperialist countries. What is clearly evident is that the proletariat has not been able to lead the masses to carry out a successful revolution and seize power in any country.

The last 34 years has been the longest period of relative stagnation of the world proletarian revolution. The stagnation of the revolutionary movement in different countries requires analysis of the objective and subjective conditions in each country. With the exception of few, none of the communist parties either in the oppressed nations or in the imperialist countries have made major breakthroughs, let alone achieved their strategic goals. The majority of the experienced parties have not been able to build a significant movement and more new parties have not been established. In addition to many other factors, the stagnation indicates that practices overall have not been guided by a correct theory.

Despite favourable objective conditions and many opportunities, communist parties have not adequately advanced to lead the masses to rise in revolution. Indeed, there is a dialectical relationship between practice and theory: practice-theory-practice. Synthesis of practice develops to theory, then practice in turn is guided by theory, and most importantly, theory is grasped and developed through practice. What then is the main reason for the general stagnation of the world proletarian revolution?

The RCP and revolution in the US

During the last three decades the world has considerably changed, but the monopoly capitalist relations of production still dominate the world. Consequently, the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions is not over. Among communists, one answer to the above question is that Maoism as the third stage of the development of Marxism, that is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, has not been grasped. Particularly, the lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China have not been correctly synthesised and applied to develop parties and mass movements in the objective conditions of different countries.

However, the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA , RCP, believes that it has correctly synthesised Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. For them, the reason for the stagnation is that the foundations of the communist ideology have not been made on a fully scientific basis. Now, Bob Avakian, the RCP's Chairman, in his New Synthesis, has fulfilled this task. Accordingly, Bob Avakian's New Synthesis is universally applicable and should be grasped by all communists around the world and implemented in all countries.

This is the first of a series of articles discussing some important ideas put forward in the text of a speech entitled: "*Re-envisioning revolution and communism: what is Bob Avakian's new synthesis?*" (www.rwor.org, Revolution #129, May 18, 2008). The speech was delivered by the RCP in various locations around the US in 2008. For more than three decades, the RCP participated in the class struggle in the US and defended many struggles around the world. This party played a significant role in building the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM), especially affecting those organisations which joined or supported the RIM.

Certainly, **the central task** of the communists in the US is to apply Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to the concrete conditions of the country and develop a powerful revolutionary movement for the working class and the masses to seize power. From this point of view, the practice and theory of the RCP need to be analysed and synthesised. Communists need to find answers to the question to why this party after decades of political activity has remained an extremely marginalised force incapable of influencing the class struggle in the US . There are already valuable struggles going on along this line; Kasama (www.mikeely.wordpress.com) and Mass line (www.massline.org) are cases in point.

This is also an important struggle for communists in other countries, because today the US imperialist ruling class is the main enemy of the working class and the masses in the world. It is true that the US Empire is in decline, but still through the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organisation, the United Nations, and many other institutions, it exercises considerable control over the world economy and politics. Furthermore, the US has a direct military presence in 132 countries and its intelligence services operate all over the world. Moreover, the ideological, social, cultural, political and other capabilities of this global reactionary force are pivotal for all imperialist and reactionary states to suppress the struggle of the masses to sustain their power.

In addition to these factors, building a revolutionary movement in the US would accelerate forming similar movements in other countries, and undoubtedly a successful proletarian revolution in the US would shake the foundation of the whole imperialist system in the world serving many other proletarian revolutions to defeat the imperialist system. In this light, the development of a powerful movement in the US could have a tremendous historical implication for revolutions in all other countries.

The purpose of these articles is to analyse the latest ideological development of the RCP presented as Bob Avakian's New Synthesis, and you are invited to participate in this important debate.

Who are the makers of history?

The speech on the New Synthesis includes five major parts:

Part 1: Humanity needs revolution and communism.

Part 2: A philosophy to understand-and change-the world.

Part 3: The new synthesis: political implications-the international dimension.

Part 4: The new synthesis: political implications-dictatorship and democracy.

Part 5: Strategic implications-making revolution.

In part 1 the speaker representing the RCP states, "... *what I hope to do is to give you a sense of **a whole new way** of approaching human emancipation and fundamental change, building on the best of what's gone before but taking it to **a new level.***" (Emphases mine)

The RCP claims that its understanding of socialist revolution has developed beyond Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and has reached **a new level**. The RCP correctly believes that the International Communist Movement is in crisis. However, it excludes itself from the crisis and claims that the party is chartering **a whole new way** of thinking, which has a vital universal value. Thus, the RCP believes that the fate of socialist revolution and humanity is hanging by a thread. And that thread is Bob Avakian!

Here, we can observe a serious ideological deviation from the principle that "*the people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history.*" (Mao, On Coalition Government, Selected Works, Vol. 3, p. 257, Emphases mine) There is a fundamental ideological principle that the working class and the masses are the makers of socialism and communism and not the communists. It is true that without a communist party armed with Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory and method it is impossible for the people to defeat imperialism and build socialism.

It is also true that communists are the most advanced section of the working class. But most certainly, it is not true that communists are above the masses. Communists need to learn from and utilise the boundless creative power of the masses and on this basis lead and help to organise themselves and fight consciously for their class interests. Communists cannot make revolution on behalf of the masses; rather they lead them to build a revolutionary movement preparing to seize power.

After overthrowing the old state, communists should not rule on behalf of the masses. Instead, they lead them to rule the socialist society by continuing to fight for the working class interest against the new bourgeoisie. However, the essence of the New Synthesis shows a serious deviation from these principles; deviation from the fact that defeating imperialism and building socialism primarily depends on the working class and the conscious and organised struggle of the masses. Most certainly, these are not bestowed upon them by any 'great saviour' of humanity. We should bear in mind the famous line of the *Internationale*:

"We want no condescending saviours to rule us from a judgment hall.."

Having faith in the vanguard party is essential, but not enough. Communists must also have faith in the masses. The RCP's New Synthesis shows that this party overvalues its faith in the Party, and especially its chairman, while not having enough faith in the masses.

The New Synthesis pays all its attention to the experience of the International Communist Movement before 1976. But it does not pay any attention to the struggle of the masses in the US. What knowledge has been gained from the history of the class struggle in the US? What has the Party grasped about questions relating to building a revolutionary movement in the USA? The fact is that every time the RCP has been put to the test of class struggle, it has failed. Instead of marching at the head of different movements in the US, it has in actuality trailed behind them, and in many cases gesticulating at and criticising the masses.

Is the New Synthesis a real rupture?

The New Synthesis correctly states that *"this whole first stage of the communist revolution [the Paris commune in 1871, the 1917 Socialist Revolution in Russia, the 1949 New Democratic Revolution in China, and the 1966-76 Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China] came to an end in 1976... Today there are no genuine socialist countries in the world. And people all over the world feel, and struggle with, that weight every day- whether they know it or not."*

But, it also states, *"so, how do we go forward in the face of that? **How do we embark on a new stage of revolution?"***

*"In this situation, Bob Avakian **has led** in defending, upholding, **and building** on the monumental achievements of those revolutions and the illuminating insights of its greatest thinkers and leaders. But **he has also deeply analysed the mistakes, and the shortcomings in conception and method that led to those mistakes.** And on that basis, **he forged a coherent, comprehensive and overarching theoretical framework-** that is synthesis. While this definitely comes out of and builds on what has gone before, this advance has also involved **real ruptures with the past understanding and experience** as a crucial element, which is why we call it the **new synthesis.**"* (Emphases mine)

The RCP was established in 1975, and its literature shows that from 1976 the Party had already realised that *"people all over the world feel, and struggle with, that weight every day"* because *"there are no genuine socialist countries in the world"*. So, why did the RCP *"embark on the new stage of revolution"* 33 years later, in 2008?! Why did the RCP not *"go forward in the face of that"* many years earlier?

Embarking on revolution means establishing a communist party and mobilising the working class and the masses to build a revolutionary movement. So, why does the RCP not deal with this fundamental question and synthesise its failure? The RCP states that Bob Avakian has led the RCP in defending the previous socialist revolutions. But has the party been able to go further and transform its understanding of socialist revolution into a considerable material force in the US?

The New Synthesis claims that Bob Avakian *"has also deeply analysed the mistakes, and the shortcomings in conception and method that led to those mistakes."* But if the RCP has deeply analysed and overcome those mistakes, has it been able to apply them to develop the class struggle in the US? The New Synthesis claims that Bob Avakian has *"forged a coherent, comprehensive and overarching theoretical framework"*. If during the last three decades any aspect of this 'universal theory' has been tested in practice and proven to be correct, where are the examples?

"A real rupture with the past understanding and experience" of the International Communist Movement requires a major two-line struggle within each communist party as well as the existing International Communist Movement. But, has such a major two-line struggle

taken place? In fact, there is no evidence that the leadership of the RCP has allowed any major inner-party two-line struggle to be carried out at all.. Furthermore, the RCP has not produced any serious self-criticism nor rectification campaign.

Not executing any major two-line struggle shows that the RCP has not grasped the fact that, *"opposition and struggle between ideas of different kinds constantly occur within the Party; this is a reflection within the Party of **contradiction between classes** and **between the new and the old** in society. If there were no contradictions in the party and **no ideological struggles** to resolve them, **the Party's life would come to an end.**"* (Mao, On Contradiction, Selected Works, Vol. 1, p. 317, Emphases mine)

Ideological struggles within a communist party are inevitable. When there is a major ideological struggle within a communist party, it should not be kept as a secret. Ideological struggle between classes within the Party is an important aspect of the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie, and therefore, assists the international proletariat. Also, the struggle between the new and the old within the Party helps the masses to transform their outlook. This is one of the most important lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Thus, not only should major two-line struggles within communist parties **openly involve** the working class and the masses nationally, but also internationally.

However, without going through a major two-line struggle, the RCP claims that it has reached a new ideological height. This declaration shows that the RCP does not have a correct grasp of the method of two-line struggle. Not involving the working class and the masses in the US as well as the international proletariat, shows that the RCP has not understood the method of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. It also shows that the RCP considers itself above two-line struggle, the International Communist Movement and the masses.

Moreover, without building a revolutionary movement and advancing class struggle in the US, the RCP claims that Bob Avakian's New Synthesis has advanced communist theory. This claim shows that the Party does not have a correct understanding about dialectical relations between revolutionary theory and practice. It also illustrates that the RCP considers itself above practice.

Philosophical foundations of Marxism

Part 2 of the presentation of the New Synthesis starts with a simple definition of philosophy and correctly explains why everyone has a philosophy and the role of philosophy in everyone's actions. However, it states, *"Well, communism also encompasses a philosophy. And at the very heart of the new synthesis has been Bob Avakian's work to critically interrogate, or analyze, the **philosophical foundations** of communism- and to put those **foundations** on a more fully scientific basis."* (Emphases mine).

It is true that scientific laws are prone to change, and they are further refined by creative application of these laws to the objective reality. Human knowledge advances through a spiral of practice-theory-practice, where putting theory into practice is the principal aspect in the whole process. Proletarian revolutions in Russia and China have proven that the science of revolution also advances by the conscious struggle of the masses.

The knowledge of class struggle mainly improves through a process of advancing the class struggle, and not just thinking and talking about it. Development of the science of revolution depends highly on building a movement, where theories are continuously tested in practice. And a successful revolution is the ultimate proof of these theories. Marx wrote that *"the question whether objective truth can be attributed to human thinking is **not** a question of theory, but is a practical question."* (Theses on Feuerbach, Marx & Engels collected works, Vol. 5, p.6, Emphasis mine)

The RCP claims that the philosophical foundations of Marxism, i.e., dialectical materialism, have not been adequately scientific and Bob Avakian's New Synthesis has put those **foundations** on a more fully scientific basis. But the content of the New Synthesis, particularly on philosophy, shows that the RCP has not grasped the **kernel of dialectical materialism** - *"The principal contradiction and the principal aspect of a contradiction"* developed by Mao. Without understanding the kernel of dialectical materialism it is not possible to apply the Marxist philosophy, let alone develop it.

Does the RCP's practice show that Bob Avakian and his New Synthesis have put the foundations of dialectical and historical materialism on a more scientific basis? It is true that the RCP has persistently defended Marx, Lenin, Mao, and particularly Mao, against the revisionist line of the Communist Party of China led by Deng Xiaoping.

However, since its formation, the RCP has not been able to apply the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and particularly the lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, to the concrete conditions of the United States. Where is the RCP's scientific class analysis of US society? Obviously, a communist party cannot build a revolutionary movement and advance without having a Marxist class analysis.

If the RCP had grasped Marxist philosophy properly, it could have discovered the particularities of the class struggle in the US. It would have been able to carry out a scientific class analysis of the US society and identify the most advanced section of the working class, the motive force of revolution in the country. On the same basis, the party would have been able to identify the main strategic ally of the proletariat as well as its secondary class allies. The questions of identifying our friends and enemies are fundamental for making revolution in any country. Despite producing tons of literature, the RCP does not have any proper answers to these questions.

Without a revolutionary movement there can be no revolution.

The RCP actively participated and even led international campaigns through the RIM to defend real communism against the phoney communism of Soviet social imperialism, especially during and after the collapse of the Soviet Empire. But it has not been able to mobilise workers and the masses in a qualitatively and quantitatively developing revolutionary movement in the US, which is its **central task**.

The silence of the New Synthesis on the role of the working class in revolution reveals the RCP's orientation. In fact, for the following questions:

- What is the role of the working class, particularly industrial workers, in the class struggle in the US?
- Has any section of the tens of millions of workers in the numerous and massive industries been organised under the leadership of the party?
- Has the RCP been able to mobilise workers in the working class towns and cities such as Detroit, the heartland of the car industry?
- Does the RCP have any influence among the industrial workers at all?

One would not find any answers. Therefore, it is not clear at all, how a socialist revolution can be carried out in the most advanced industrial country in the world without the participation of the industrial workers. It is important to note that any reference to workers, industrial workers and the working class has nearly vanished from the RCP's literature, including the New Synthesis.

Exposing the US ruling class and insisting that it should be overthrown is essential, but not enough. What is also needed is a clear revolutionary strategy. A communist party, on the basis of the concrete conditions and particularities of the class struggle in the US, should develop a strategy for the masses to seize power. The RCP has neither been able to develop a clear strategy to solve the fundamental contradiction between the working class and the ruling class, nor has it been able to analyse different objective situations at various times to identify the principal contradiction at each stage, and find correct tactics to serve the strategy.

It is true that developing a powerful revolutionary movement takes a long time. In fact, successful proletarian revolutions in Russia and China took 23 years, from 1894 to 1917, and 28 years, from 1921 to 1949 respectively. However, communist parties in these two very different countries and world situations were able to grasp Marxism and build a successful revolutionary movement. They were able to analyse their concrete conditions, carry out major two-line struggles and develop an independent ideological-political line and a correct strategy.

On these bases, communist parties in Russia and China were able to recognise and respond properly to various demands of the working class and the masses. They identified and relied on the advanced section of the masses to mobilise other sections. At each stage, these parties identified the principal contradiction and worked out suitable

tactics to unite the people and divide the enemies of the people to advance the revolution. These successful revolutions proved that **without a revolutionary movement there can be no revolution.**

Indeed, these parties understood their central task and the particularities of their societies, without which they would have not been able to develop a powerful revolutionary movement to smash the old state and build a new society. It is true that US society is very different to Russia and China in those periods, and also that the world situation has considerably changed. However, after 34 years of political activities, the RCP is still stuck in the first bend of a long and tortuous road, and yet is still negligent of the fact that it cannot play any tangible role in the class struggle in the US society.

Proletarian revolution in the most powerful imperialist country in the world is undeniably very complicated. It is true that the RCP has been able to sustain its organisation and political struggle, and train many valuable communists. Furthermore, the party has been able to initiate or participate in many struggles against the oppression of women and national minorities, opposing Christian fascists and supporting science against obscurantism.

Indeed, this is an experienced party, but it has not been able to integrate itself with workers and the masses, identify their just demands, and develop a correct mass line. It has not been able to identify and mobilise the most advanced sections of US society, and on this basis mobilise others in a broad united front against the ruling class. A communist party is a unity of opposites: a vanguard aspect and a mass aspect. Generally, the vanguard aspect is the principal aspect. But the mass aspect is absolutely necessary. The vanguard is like the sharp cutting edge of an axe, while the heavy rear side represents the mass aspect, both essential to split the firewood. However, with the RCP's blunt edge and a very light rear side, splitting and defeating the working class enemies in the US even tactically has not been possible.

Mass movements and lost opportunities

In 1992, at the time of the mass rebellions due to Rodney King's beating by the police, the RCP had 17 years of experience. But it was not able to mobilise a considerable number of African-Americans and Hispanics as well as progressive white workers against the white-supremacist ruling class. What about since then? Has the party in any effective way been able to influence struggles of the national minority workers and the masses against the racist state?

The restoration of capitalism in China, the demise of the Soviet Empire and the economic crisis in Japan were some important factors creating a huge opening for the circulation of western monopoly capitals and its global expansion. These capitals, particularly from the US, penetrated, restructured and subjugated the oppressed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America at unprecedented levels. Globalisation under

the leadership of the US, not only intensified the super-exploitation of billions of workers and peasants around the world, but severely accelerated the rate of destruction of the environment at a global scale.

These factors created massive anti-globalisation, anti-capitalist and anti-environmental destruction movements. These movements correctly targeted the heads of the most powerful imperialist states, wherever they gathered. In 1998 in Seattle, hundreds of thousands of people, especially working class youth and students, staged a massive show of force. They acted with rage against the G7, super-exploitation of workers and peasants in the oppressed countries and destruction of the environment. These movements have overall shown a marked level of anti-capitalist as well as internationalist spirit. But has the RCP been able to influence any section of these huge movements and unite with them?

In 2005, Hurricane Katrina hit New Orleans, where more than 70% of the population is African-American. The hurricane destroyed the city, especially the run-down working class areas. Hundreds of thousands of people, particularly African-American workers, lost their homes and did not even have access to clean drinking water, food, sanitation and electricity. At first, the US rulers concealed the scale of the disaster. However, opposition and resistance grew very rapidly. Many people stormed the supermarkets, and some people had taken up arms to fight the armed police who were guarding the supermarkets and preventing people from getting food and water.

At this stage, George W Bush ordered the National Guard to move into the area, crush the resistance and protect private property. And today, thousands of these workers are still homeless and live in caravans. Where was the RCP at that time? Why after three decades of its existence did the RCP not even operate in a city with such a large working class population?

The US war on Iraq

In 2001, US imperialism, with the most powerful army and economy, initiated its strategic offensive to establish an undisputed empire for the 21st century. However, even before the occupation of Iraq, millions of workers and the masses poured into the streets opposing the US ruling class preparation to attack the oppressed nation of Iraq . Yet the RCP's concept of "Crusading McWorld versus Reactionary Jihad", which will be discussed in part two, clearly undermined the role of the Iraqi people in the conflict, and served to equate the two sides (US imperialism and the resistance of the oppressed nation against it) as mutually reinforcing.

Hence, after a few years of confusion and failing to identify US imperialism as the principal enemy, the RCP eventually launched a campaign to "Drive Out the Bush Regime". This campaign aimed at putting pressure from below on the US ruling class, especially on the Democratic Party to impeach Bush.. *"The organized mass upsurge to drive out the regime, along with the still unorganized but widespread and increasingly intense mass*

anger against **Bush** and the yearning to see **him** go, has been another important factor **forcing the hand of Democratic Party leaders.**" (The "I" Word Surfaces: New Openings and New Challenges, Revolution #30, January 15, 2006, Emphases mine)

Despite a massive anti-war movement and surge of political activities among all sections of the masses, particularly the advanced, all the party could do was to aim at mobilising the **backward sections** around the question of **regime change.** *"Besides the conflict at the top, there has also been a movement from below forcing the question of "regime change."* (Ibid, Emphases mine)

In the section of *"Waiting for November [Presidential Elections in November 2006] Won't Do!"* of the same article, the RCP emphasises impeaching Bush as an urgent and a determining factor to build a mass movement, and states, *"Look: there will be no impeachment **without mass upsurge.** Even if you pin your hopes on the top Democrats for this, you have to recognise that they will not act unless and until they fear that their base is getting beyond their control."* (Emphases RCP's)

Well, which section of the masses pins their hopes **on the top Democrats?** Obviously, the backward. The RCP urges these sections of the masses, particularly the supporters of the Democrat Party, to **put pressure** on their leaders. The RCP hopes that the leaders of the Democrat Party can be persuaded to impeach Bush only if they are pushed far enough. Frankly, this is creating an illusion among the masses that tailing one faction of the reactionaries against another is for the benefit of revolution.

Tailing one faction of reactionaries under the pretext of using contradictions among different factions of the ruling class is old reformist politics. However, this time it is theorised by the RCP like this: *"So it may not be bad when thieves fall out, not bad at all ... **if their victims seize on it to do something good.**"* (Ibid, Emphasis RCP's) Historically, such a dependent line has been the main cause of the failure of mass movements.

Even when powerful working class and mass movements were under the leadership of communists, e.g., in France, Italy, Greece, Iraq, Iran, Indonesia, etc., they failed because communists could not develop an independent ideological-political line... Consequently, the whole movement became futile, and in many cases a large number of communists and people were slaughtered. In the imperialist countries such as the US, the source as well as the content of the line of labour aristocracy and this line are the same, where both strive to limit the struggles of working class and the masses within the framework of the existing system.

In this case, instead of drawing a clear anti-imperialist line against the whole ruling class and its reactionary war on the oppressed nation of Iraq, the RCP's campaign strived to mobilise the backward sections of the masses to unite with some factions of the ruling class who were opposing Bush. Here, the RCP's political stance shows that the party did not recognise that the antagonistic contradiction between US imperialism and the Iraqi

nation was shaping the class struggle in the US society. Therefore, the working class and the masses in the country should be mobilised to support the Iraqi nation and its armed resistance against the US.

The RCP states, "***The White House and Congress*** need to look out and see that country is overwhelmingly polarized against them and they need to seriously fear that ***if they don't*** put a stop to this whole direction that they are going to ***lose the allegiance*** of millions of people." (Daring to Change Minds and Move Millions: The Case for Impeachment Now, Revolution #75, January 7, 2007, Emphases mine)

The RCP states that the "*country is overwhelmingly polarized*" against the ruling class, but instead of putting forward a revolutionary political line to overthrow the imperialist state, the RCP **warns the ruling class** that they would lose people's support if they do not change their direction. This is certainly not the way to raise the masses political consciousness, who were overwhelmingly and in colossal numbers defying the ruling class. Hence, with such a **reformist** line, the RCP was unable to mobilise the advanced section of the people to build a revolutionary movement.

Moreover, after the occupation of Iraq, the vast majority of the working class and the masses continued to actively oppose the Bush regime's atrocities in Iraq. Even many people, who used to hang the US flag outside their homes, openly declared that they were ashamed of being American. Instead of mobilising these people in the US to support the just struggle of the Iraqi nation, the RCP condemned the Iraqi people's resistance movement against the occupation of their country by the US forces. Clearly, such a political line was not anti-imperialist, and therefore could not mobilise the advanced section of workers and the masses in the US.

During the last two years of the discredited Bush regime, a huge political crisis developed within the ruling class. In this favourable situation, due to the absence of a thoroughgoing anti-imperialist line, communists were marginalised and the revolutionary alternative remained extremely weak. Therefore, the ruling class was able to create its own alternative **without having any serious opposition**. This is one of the reasons that even after years of political legitimacy crisis during the Bush regime, the ruling system in the US could mobilise large sections of the working class and the masses behind Obama.

Conclusion

Alas, once again, the RCP **failed the test** of class struggle and history. It is ironic that the Party did not criticise its line and the campaign at all. Perhaps because Bush was driven out by the Democrats after all! In any case, the RCP did not analyse its serious shortcomings in using such a great opportunity. Instead, Bob Avakian criticised the masses who voted for Obama for not having a scientific understanding of racism! (On Obama, Redemption and the Need for a Scientific Understanding, Revolution #148, November 2008)

Is this the role of the Party, or should the masses themselves develop a scientific understanding of this complex phenomena? Well, with this kind of spontaneous thinking, encouraging the masses to tail a faction of the ruling class and practically having nearly no effect on the class struggle even during a period of intense polarisation of the society, can anyone accept that the New Synthesis has put the foundations of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on a more fully scientific basis?!

The practice and theory of the RCP and the content of Bob Avakian's New Synthesis show that they are based on serious deviations from the science of revolution. Now, the main question is: is the ideology guiding the RCP's political practice still Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, MLM? Some communists point out that the party is in the process of dropping MLM. Others say that the RCP has already abandoned MLM. And the RCP and its New Synthesis imply that the proletarian ideology has "advanced" to Avakianism!