

# Anti-Monopolistic Democracy or Revolution?

*\*The following article is part of the first issue of the Maoist Magazine Red Line in Denmark, which was launched on December 3<sup>rd</sup> 2024. (Communist Library)*

In the history of the international labor movement, the question of revolution versus reform has always been a dividing line where two opposing sides have repeatedly emerged. On the one hand, there are those who see revolution as the necessary path to abolish capitalism and create a socialist society, and on the other hand, there are those who argue that socialism can be achieved through gradual reforms. In all the time since Lassale, Kautsky and Khrushchev<sup>1</sup>, one would almost think that the idea of the "peaceful transition to socialism" had been abandoned by every self-proclaimed Marxist. But as we have seen countless times, there are always those who simply refuse to learn from history.

In this article we want to examine the political line that guides the revisionists in two of the self-proclaimed communist parties in Denmark, and which has had either a direct or indirect influence on the practice of a large number of organizations and circles, leading them towards complete capitulation and reconciliation with the Danish imperialist bourgeoisie.

In Denmark, the idea of the "peaceful transition" is best expressed through the theory of "Anti-Monopolistic Democracy" (AMD). The self-proclaimed Marxist-Leninists who support this theory insist that it is precisely *not* revisionist and is completely consistent with the teachings of Marx and Lenin. In that case, let's look at the content of the theory.

## I. A review of AMD

To really understand the content of the theory, it is worth looking at *the Communist Program*<sup>2</sup>, where the theory is first adopted by the Communist Party of Denmark (DKP) as a central part of their political strategy. DKP has historically had a revolutionary character, and was at one point the vanguard of the proletariat in Denmark, but unfortunately ended in revisionist decay at the end of World War II.

DKP's strategy on AMD was systematized in 1976 at the same time as the triple revisionist offensive against Marxism by Chinese revisionism, Albanian revisionism and Russian revisionism.

The principles and working methods presented in AMD had been expressed, to varying degrees, in some of the DKP's general positions and criteria since the post-war period, but it was not until 1976, at the time of the counter-revolutionary coup in China, that these ideas were officially formalized. AMD has since become the main strategy of the DKP, the "Communist

---

<sup>1</sup> Ferdinand Lassale, Karl Kautsky and Nikita Khrushchev all happened to support the idea that society could be reformed to become socialist

<sup>2</sup> The Communists' Program was the DKP's former political program, adopted at their 25th Congress in September 1976

Party" (KP) and other organizations in Denmark (such as the People's Movement against the EU) and in some organizations in the rest of Europe (such as the so-called Communist Party of Portugal<sup>3</sup>).

## New circumstances?

**"The explanation of the so-called 'new circumstances' that lead to revising the principles of Marxism is an old story dating back to the old revisionism."<sup>4</sup>**

-Chairman Gonzalo

In its 1976 program, DKP tries to justify DAMD by invoking "new circumstances":

*"The changes in the world and capitalism's transition to state monopolism create a number of new conditions for the class struggle. This raises new tasks for the labor movement in the countries of capitalism. [...]*

*The intertwining of monopoly power with state power means that all economic struggles inevitably take on a political character. The wage struggle of the working class also becomes a struggle over state measures [...]*

*The power of the monopolies is most directly aimed at the working class to force additional surplus value out of it. But in its economic, political and cultural efforts, it also targets others who, without being workers, essentially live off their own labor input. This applies to white-collar workers, technicians, intellectuals, etc. It applies to the self-employed in agriculture, crafts, trade and services [...] Dissatisfaction, resistance and protest are spreading. Forces are maturing that have a common interest in putting an end to the power of monopolies.*

*This creates new real opportunities to lead the struggle for a new society despite the increasing power of monopolies"<sup>5</sup>*

It is argued that the monopolization of capital has now (in the 1960s and 70s) reached a stage where the whole of society is dominated by the monopolies and that the bourgeois state is the state of the monopolies alone. It is said that state monopoly capitalism has primarily targeted the working class to increase its profit and exploitation, and only secondarily the petty bourgeoisie.

DKP believes that state monopolism is undemocratic and that it is the anti-monopolistic and democratic forces whose task it is to fight against the anti-democratic institutions and practices of state monopolies and secure expanded rights and freedoms for the people and working class organizations, which would then be able to exercise real control and give the working class power over big capital through anti-monopolistic democracy.

We ask: what fundamental changes have occurred in society that allow this set of 'new conditions'? Can it really be true that today we live in a society where the task of the working class is to form a popular democratic united front against a state monopolism that oppresses even the non-monopolistic bourgeoisie?

*"... It is a struggle for democracy. Every transition to socialism is achieved through the people's struggle for democratic goals growing into a struggle for socialism."*

If we take the greatest examples of proletarian revolutions, in imperialist Russia and in oppressed and divided China, it is true that these revolutions had two periods: one where the

---

<sup>3</sup> Rikke G.F. Carlsson, "Avante festival 2018 in Portugal", Kommunist, 2018, (<https://kommunist.dk/avante-festival-2018-i-portugal/>)

<sup>4</sup> Communist Party of Peru, "Interview with Chairman Gonzalo", International Politics, 1988

<sup>5</sup> Communist Party of Denmark, "The Communists' Program", I. The Transition from Capitalism to Socialism, 4. For Anti-Monopolistic Democracy, 1976 (our emphasis)

democratic tasks are carried out (Russia's February Revolution in 1917 and China's Democratic Revolution and New Democracy in 1949), and one where socialist construction takes place. But two conflicts arise when we try to compare these examples with AMD:

- 1) The reason why these two countries had such periods was precisely because they had never gone through a democratic revolution before, and therefore the proletariat had to solve the democratic tasks in each of these countries in the first place. Russia was a backward semi-feudal Tsarist state and China had been divided among the imperialists as their semi-colony, which prevented the Chinese bourgeoisie from constituting China itself as an independent nation.
- 2) The period in which the tasks of the democratic revolution were solved in China and the Soviet Union took place in the midst of a revolutionary war in which the proletariat and peasants conquered power; the old exploitative state was crushed and a new state under the dictatorship of the proletariat (in China's case, the joint dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry) was built in its place.

AMD's strategy views the period of democratic tasks as the basis for the proletariat to take power, whereas the historical experiences and victories show that it was the proletariat's violent seizure of power that solved the democratic tasks in countries where they had not yet been solved.

So clearly the two greatest examples of proletarian revolutions cannot be the "new experiences" referred to.

These "new conditions" seem to assess Danish society as if the tasks of the democratic revolution were unsolved because the tasks have been *undone by monopolism*. This is of course not the case. We clearly see how the monopolistic and non-monopolistic bourgeoisie, although there are contradictions among them, both benefit from the imperialist exploitation of the oppressed nations and the exploitation of the proletariat in Denmark. The petit bourgeoisie, as a whole class, is and remains an unreliable class in the united front of the socialist revolution, which can only be turned over in large numbers near the conquest of power throughout the country by their proletarianization (giving up their petty capital and becoming workers). Therefore, today we cannot talk about a popular democratic front-state in the revolution in Denmark, but exclusively a red revolution, a Socialist Revolution.

The fact that AMD has been a firm part of the revisionist agenda for almost 50 years because of these "new experiences" can only strike one as comical. One almost has to ask themselves how long "new experiences" can remain *new* and how the last many years of struggle based on this theory have neither achieved any positive results nor developed this theory in any sense whatsoever.

## **AMD denies the revolution**

**"Revisionism arose as a complete negation of Marxism. Modern revisionism, likewise, is always aiming to substitute bourgeois philosophy for Marxist philosophy, going against political economy, particularly denying the growing impoverishment and the inevitability of the downfall of imperialism. Revisionism strives to falsify and twist**

**scientific socialism in order to oppose the class struggle and revolution, peddling parliamentary cretinism and pacifism."**<sup>6</sup>

-Chairman Gonzalo

In connection with DKP's claim of new conditions, the new tasks that arise from this are also mentioned:

*"Experience has shown that the reformist policy, which never dared to attack capital's real positions of power, does not succeed in the anti-monopolistic struggle. Nor does it achieve anything to simply state the rottenness of capitalism. It is a question of drawing up a line of struggle that can raise and gather the forces that can initiate the transformation of society and its foundations. The ruling class will never give up its privileges and power over society of its own accord. It must be forced to do so by the popular power that the working class, together with its allies, can raise through its activity and its organized action."*<sup>7</sup>

It should come as no surprise that the DKP, at least in words, condemns reformist politics. After all, reformists today love to call themselves revolutionaries. However, special attention should be paid to their use of the words "coercion" and "force". What is meant by these terms? Hasn't the question of the use of force always been a question of the use of violence? Why is it that DKP tries to avoid mentioning the necessity of revolutionary violence - a concept that Marxist-Leninists of the past have always supported? (This is not written by accident!)

*"Anti-monopolistic democracy is not yet socialism, but a break with state monopolism and the power of big capital. It opens up a social process that can ensure decisive progress for the working people and give them self-confidence in their ability to lead society.*

*It can ensure such conditions for the political and social struggle that the transition to socialism can take place without civil war, as a result of an active democratic struggle. The crisis of Danish capitalism confronts the labor movement with the task of opening new paths through the unfolding of the anti-monopolistic struggle."*<sup>8</sup>

They say that AMD would be the first step to socialism, which could be achieved without further violence. The supporters of AMD imagine that you can get from the most reactionary imperialist society to socialism, without violence or civil war. Nor with any revolution, which is never mentioned in the program at all.

This clearly follows the revisionist pattern of denying revolutionary violence and the necessity of revolution in order to replace it with parliamentary cretinism.

## **AMD considers Denmark an oppressed nation**

The followers of AMD promise a non-violent transition to socialism. They treat the interests of the people as uniform and without internal contradictions (e.g. the proletariat and the petit bourgeoisie), they treat the population groups as their grouping first and foremost, which leads to the related questions (concerning women or youth or pensioners etc.) being treated in the program separately from classes and without relation to the proletarian movement. They also take an ambiguous and inconsistent stance on the Danish liberal-democratic regime and the bourgeois Danish state.

---

<sup>6</sup> Communist Party of Peru, "Interview with Chairman Gonzalo", Ideological Questions, 1988

<sup>7</sup> Communist Party of Denmark, "The Communists' Program", I. The Transition from Capitalism to Socialism, 4. For Anti-Monopolistic Democracy, 1976

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

The AMD theory takes a starting point where Denmark is no longer democratic, where state monopolistic capitalism has reversed the victory of the democratic revolution, and imagines the socialist revolution as a democratic revolution growing into a socialist revolution. We repeat the quote from earlier:

*"... It is a struggle for democracy. Every transition to socialism is achieved through the people's struggle for democratic goals growing into a struggle for socialism."*<sup>9</sup>

DKP again uses a number of words with very vague meanings. What is meant by "people's struggle" and "struggle for socialism"? It seems they don't dare to say the struggle of *the proletariat* and the *socialist revolution*. It is also wrong to say that the struggle for democratic goals grew into the struggle for socialism. What is obviously referred to are the historical democratic revolutions in Russia and China, but it is clear that DKP does not understand the democratic revolution and what it really means.

There is the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the old type and the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the new type. Both have the goal of breaking with feudalism.

In Russia, in the February Revolution of 1917, the result of the bourgeois revolution was the creation of a coexistence of two dictatorships; a precariously surviving provisional government at the head of a bourgeois state (the Kerensky regime), which the Bolsheviks then had to overthrow through the Socialist Revolution, and a workers' and soldiers' (peasant) Soviet power, which constituted a competing proletarian-peasant state power under construction as the CPSU(B) describes in its party history:

**"But alongside the bourgeois government there existed another power - the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The soldier deputies in the Soviet were mostly peasants who had been mobilized for the war. The Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies was an organ of the alliance of workers and peasants against the Tsarist regime, and at the same time it was an organ of their power, an organ of the dictatorship of the working class and peasantry.**

**The result was a peculiar interlocking of two powers, of two dictatorships: the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, represented by the Provisional Government, and the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, represented by the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.**

**The result was a *Dual Power*."**<sup>10</sup>

In China, a democratic revolution of new democracy, led by the proletariat, through its Communist Party, was waged in order to flow directly into the Socialist Revolution.

This is different from the understanding of the DKP because they deny that the democratic revolution happens through armed struggle, they deny the historical circumstances and they believe that the removal of bourgeois-democratic rights today necessitates a new "democratic revolution", when in reality the removal of bourgeois-democratic rights is the result of the general reactionarization and militarization of the state, which comes as a result of the general crisis of imperialism.

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Central Committee of the CPSU(B), "History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)", 1938, Forlaget Tiden 1946, 3rd Edition, p. 216-217

With all this in mind, we have to ask: What feudal elements does Denmark have to abolish? It sounds, to us, more like a justification for the strategy of uniting with the petit bourgeoisie and the so-called progressive bourgeoisie, as these classes would, in feudal circumstances, for their own class interests, support a Democratic Revolution.

If one didn't know any better, the program could lead the reader to believe that Denmark was an oppressed nation whose Communist Party was building a united front of revolutionary classes against the imperialist oppressors.

An incorrect understanding of the nature of the revolution leads to an incorrect understanding of the tasks of the revolution and a harmful handling of the united front.

Typically, one hears from revisionists about the so-called "new imperialist countries" like Brazil, Turkey and India, who claim that the nature of the revolution in these countries must be socialist, which of course is nothing but the denial of the democratic revolution and the nature of bureaucratic capitalism. But AMD, seems to turn this theory on its head and declare Denmark, an imperialist country, a now oppressed nation that must go through a *democratic process* to achieve socialism, which in reality is nothing more than a pseudo-democratic revolution.

In practice, this theory leads towards reconciliation with the exploiters because it claims that the middle and petit bourgeoisie are the allied classes of the proletariat in Denmark.

Today, the AMD strategy has run itself into the ground. The bourgeoisie and petit bourgeoisie, with whom these self-proclaimed communists unite with (for example, through the People's Movement against the EU), have taken the leading role at every point. Instead of withdrawing from this alliance, instead of breaking with the bourgeoisie, the followers of AMD dedicate themselves all the more to winning isolated issues, on behalf of large sections of the non-monopolistic bourgeoisie and even sections of the monopolistic bourgeoisie, because winning them has become synonymous with the victory of socialism. The rise of these "allies" has become synonymous with the rise of the proletariat. They have been reduced to an appendage of their own strategy, relegated to tail the masses, the petit bourgeoisie, and the bourgeoisie, taking only pacifist and reformist empty phrases and adding "...and socialism" to everything the bourgeois leadership says. And nothing shows this as much as the position of the (then) three AMD parties in the last general election, in 2022, where they all marched on tailed and supported the parliamentary campaign of the Red-Green Alliance, which ended in colossal failure.

In the end, the supporters of AMD have abandoned the proletariat's struggle for class rule and have even abandoned their own independence, not formally, but in practice. This is the road down which opportunism leads and we cannot allow ourselves to go down it.

## **AMD is economism**

**"Every class struggle is a political struggle. It is well known that the opportunists, the slaves of liberal ideas, misunderstood Marx's profound words and tried to misinterpret them. Among the opportunists were also the "economists", the elder brothers of the liquidators. The "economists" believed that every clash between classes was a political struggle. They therefore saw the struggle for a wage increase of 5 kopeks on the ruble as a "class struggle" and refused to see anything political in the higher, more developed**

national class struggle. The "economists" thus recognized the embryonic class struggle, but not the class struggle in its developed form. In other words, the "economists" recognized only what in the class struggle was most acceptable from the point of view of the liberal bourgeoisie, but refused to go farther than the liberals, refused to recognize the class struggle in the higher sense, which was unacceptable to the liberals. The "economists" thus gradually became liberal labor politicians. In doing so, they also rejected the Marxist conception of revolutionary class struggle."<sup>11</sup>

- Lenin

AMD completely buys the bourgeois lie about the general *justice* and *equality* of bourgeois democracy and that the state is above the class question. The strategy of AMD is that because *big capital* is numerically outnumbered, they can be neutralized through democratic struggle. That is, if the people of Denmark woke up tomorrow and didn't want capitalism anymore, it could be removed without further ado, and the communists' task here would simply be to enter various conflicts (wage-struggle, women's struggle, immigrant's struggle, etc.) by rhetorically fighting for that cause and then naturally adding "and socialism" to each of them so that people will associate themselves with it: "for higher wages... and socialism", "for women's liberation... and socialism", "for the nationalization of MÆRSK... and socialism" and if they are asked what they think socialism is and what it has to do with the conflict, the answer will be something along the lines that the victory of each of these conflicts would bring us closer to socialism (that the nationalization of Mærsk, for example, would be a step towards a state-planned economy and thus socialism) and that communism is only when the complete victory in each of these areas is achieved (though it should be mentioned that communism, as a final goal, is not mentioned in the program even once).

The only thing that distinguishes this understanding from the old Bernsteinian revisionism is the length of time the peaceful transition to socialism takes, that a concrete two-phase strategy of AMD between capitalism and socialism is imagined, and that AMD will be defended by people who call themselves "Leninists" using pseudo-Marxist-Leninist phrases. But these phrases have no real content, they have completely abandoned the most important question that Marxists must deal with: the question of power, which class should rule? If asked, the supporters of AMD would of course answer the proletariat, but we can see that this is not what they are fighting for.

AMD follows the same path as the economists did while Lenin was still struggling to defeat their faction within the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (RSDLP). We want to highlight this quote from the DKP's 1976 program:

*"The intertwining of monopoly power with state power means that all economic struggles inevitably take on a political character. The wage struggle of the working class also becomes a struggle over state measures"*<sup>12</sup>

The economic struggle within the trade union movement takes on a political character under the power of monopolies. The wage struggle also becomes a struggle for democracy. To "give the economic struggle a political character", even if it sounds revolutionary, is not a new phrase used by opportunists, but almost exactly the same phrase used by the economists of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party in Lenin's time:

---

<sup>11</sup> Lenin, "Liberal and Marxist Conceptions of the Class Struggle", (published in "Proveshchenya" No. 5, May 1913)

<sup>12</sup> Communist Party of Denmark, "The Communists' Program", I. The Transition from Capitalism to Socialism, 4. For Anti-Monopolistic Democracy, 1976

"Thus, the pompous phrase: 'to give the economic struggle itself a political character', which sounds so terribly profound and revolutionary, lies in reality the traditional striving to reduce the social-democratic politics to trade-unionist politics! Under the guise of correcting the one-sidedness of Iskra, which, it is alleged, puts 'revolutionizing dogmas above revolutionizing life', the struggle for economic reforms is presented to us as something new. In reality, the phrase 'giving the economic struggle itself a political character' means nothing more than the struggle for economic reforms."<sup>13</sup>

The similarity between the economists of Lenin's time and the AMD supporters today is that they both present the same old struggle for economic reform as something new and revolutionary. They do not touch the question of power and thus repeat the exploiters' propaganda about the state as something supernatural, something divine, something above classes.

### AMD denies the state's class character

What is often the case with all revisionists is their understanding of the state as if it is an entity outside the class struggle. A neutral structure that can simply be taken over and reformed.

*"When the working class and its allies realize through their activity that they can make themselves an independent power in society, they can also bring about radical social change. They can win an anti-monopolistic democracy where the people have new and expanded democratic rights and use them for measures that break the power of big capital. The anti-monopolistic struggle in the interests of the great majority of the people can bring big business into political isolation and thereby also weaken its ability to use force against social change. Anti-monopolistic democracy is not yet socialism, but a break with state monopolism and the power of big business. It opens up a social process that can ensure decisive progress for the working people and give them self-confidence in their ability to lead society."*<sup>14</sup>

We're talking about a kind of intermediate stage between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat. A stage where the working class and its allies seem to have put so much pressure on the monopolies, through the ballot box and other legal tactics, that they magically "break the power of big business". Magically, because of the workers' expanded rights, the state will lose the ability to use violence against people. In other words, the state will cease to be the apparatus of violence that it has historically always been. Lenin explained this masterfully in his lecture at Sverdlov University:

**"But nowhere [in primitive society] do we find a special category of people who are set apart to rule over others and who, in this interest, for this purpose, systematically and permanently possess a certain coercive apparatus, an apparatus of violence, which in our days, as you are all aware, appears in the form of armed forces, prisons, and other means of subjugating the will of others by force - the essence of the State"<sup>15</sup>**

The state, since its birth, has always been a coercive apparatus that uses violence against one class to protect the power of the ruling class. This has been the case throughout all the different types of class societies; slave society, feudalism, capitalism and socialism. However, the DKP

---

<sup>13</sup> Lenin, "What is to be done?", 1902, Forlaget Tiden 1979, p. 78

<sup>14</sup> Communist Party of Denmark, "The Communists' Program", I. The Transition from Capitalism to Socialism, 4. For Anti-Monopolistic Democracy, 1976

<sup>15</sup> Lenin, "The State: A Lecture Delivered at the Sverdlov University", July 11, 1919, Forlaget Tiden 1984 (our emphasis)

imagines that the imperialists in power will simply give up and demilitarize, specifically at a time - in this dream scenario - when the working class in the country is more organized than ever before. Contrary to this fantasy, reality has shown that with the general crisis of capitalism and the decay of imperialism, the ruling class in all countries is leading a further reactionarization and militarization of the state. This is especially so when the people gain greater class hatred, as we have seen, for example, with the crackdown by European states on the democratic rights of the people after the intensification of the struggle in Palestine.

But if we briefly play along with the scenario where the DKP manages to ban monopolism and paint the constitution a little more red, what do adherents of the theory think is the next step?

*"It can ensure such conditions for political and social struggle that the transition to socialism can take place without civil war, as a result of an active democratic struggle."<sup>16</sup>*

In other words, the bourgeoisie will lie down and let the proletariat take power. According to this theory, socialism will not be achieved through armed revolution, but through a long and peaceful process where bourgeois institutions are quietly reformed. The problem is that the DKP confuses the limited democratic reforms that can be achieved within capitalism with real workers' power. What the DKP actually proposes is a long and harmless adaptation to the existing system, which is precisely designed to protect the interests of the ruling class.

All this is based on the belief in the so-called "peaceful transition" to socialism, which is a utopia that arises precisely from the denial of the class nature of the state. However, there are some historical experiences that contradict this utopia. In Chile in 1973, for example, the peaceful transition model was tested when the pro-Soviet government of Salvador Allende was overthrown by a US-backed military coup. This tragedy revealed the real consequences of denying the class nature of the state and the need for proletarian military preparation. We have no illusions that Allende and his party had anything to do with socialism, but Chile's experience highlighted that the capitalist state, whatever reforms are adopted, will use its force of violence, including police, military and courts, to protect the interests of the monopolies and imperialism. AMD ignores this fundamental aspect of the state's function, namely its role as a tool to maintain the existing economic and political order through violence.

Marxism shows that revolution cannot happen without the complete destruction of the bourgeois state and that the working class must be able to mobilize both politically and militarily to protect its interests and secure the transition to socialism. The notion that socialism can be achieved through a simple legislative step is completely out of touch with reality.

## **AMD denies the nature of imperialism**

When it comes to promoting AMD, the DKP is not alone. The Communist Party (KP) is another self-declared Marxist-Leninist party in Denmark, which also believes that socialism can be achieved through the peaceful path. Of course, their theory is called "Anti-Monopolistic Strategy" to distinguish themselves from the DKP, but if one does the slightest research, it's obvious that the theories are identical in essence. However, the KP's political program goes into

---

<sup>16</sup> Communist Party of Denmark, "The Communists' Program", I. The Transition from Capitalism to Socialism, 4. For Anti-Monopolistic Democracy, 1976

a little more detail about what exactly the anti-monopolistic reforms entail. The following is a short list summarizing KP's demands :<sup>17</sup>

- Strengthening the public sector
- Expanding the basic welfare areas
- Limits to monopoly power and nationalization of the financial sector
- Tax reform, targeting the wealthiest in the country
- Developing municipal and regional self-government

We would like to know which public economy is not subject to the laws of the market economy. When people talk about limiting the power of monopolies, how does this relate to the Leninist understanding of imperialism? These ideas are very similar to the same ideas that Lenin criticized in his famous work *Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, where precisely the petit bourgeois idea of a return to pre-monopolistic capitalism is rejected:

**"Admittedly, bourgeois reformists, especially among today's Kautskyans, try to weaken the significance of such facts by referring to the fact that it would be "possible" to obtain raw materials on the free market without "costly and dangerous" colonial policy, and that it would be "possible" to increase the supply of raw materials enormously by "simply" improving the conditions of agriculture in general. But such references are only a defense of imperialism, a softening of it; for they depend on omitting the most important characteristic of modern capitalism: monopolies. The free market is becoming more and more a relic of the past, monopolistic syndicates and trusts are narrowing its scope day by day; and the "simple" improvement of agricultural conditions will require an improvement in the lot of the masses, an increase in wages and a reduction in profits. But where do trusts that are concerned with the condition of the masses instead of the conquest of colonies exist, except in the imagination of the sweet reformist politicians?"**

**"In its imperialist stage, capitalism leads close up to the most comprehensive socialization of production, it draws the capitalists, so to speak, against their will and consciousness, into a new social order that forms the transition from completely free competition to complete socialization. Production becomes social, but appropriation remains private. The social means of production remain the private property of a small number of individuals. The general framework of formally recognized free competition continues to exist, and the yoke of the few monopolists on the rest of the population becomes a hundred times heavier, more palpable, more unbearable."**

Lenin's analysis of imperialism focuses specifically on the transformation of capitalism from competitive capitalism to monopolistic capitalism. He identifies imperialism as the highest and final stage of capitalism, where the concentration of capital and production results in the domination of monopolists. The monopolization of industries and the fusion of bank capital with industrial capital leads to a situation where **"production becomes social, but appropriation remains private"** meaning that instead of the individual alone producing, the factory comes into being, a whole collection of people start working together, thus production becomes social. At the same time, it remains private in that ownership remains in the hands of individual capitalists. Capitalist companies, driven by competition, eventually concentrate through mergers and acquisitions and form monopolies. The ability of small businesses to

---

<sup>17</sup> Communist Party, Political Program, 2011, p. 8-9

compete with these giants diminishes. Furthermore, the role of the state becomes more apparent as governments increasingly serve the interests of big capital through policies such as subsidies, tax breaks and favorable regulations.

However, we must recognize that KP, to a certain extent, understands that you can't just detach yourself from "imperialist politics" when Denmark is part of a large imperialist network, including the EU. What is their solution to this problem? KP writes in their political program:

*"The Communists point out that collective welfare can be strengthened by fighting for a number of key anti-monopolistic reforms. Such reforms cannot be reconciled with Denmark's membership of the EU. Denmark must therefore be liberated from the EU."<sup>18</sup>*

Imperialism is not just a question of membership of specific international organizations like the EU, but of the fundamental dynamics of global capitalism. The large multinational corporations, financial institutions and large private banks are not bound by national borders. They operate on a global scale and aim to maximize profits across national borders, making it difficult for a single country to isolate itself from the global economy. Denmark leaving the EU would not change this global capitalist structure, where large international players still have enormous power over national economies. The nation would still be part of the global market, which is characterized by inequality, exploitation and the concentration of power in the hands of imperialist corporations. There would still be pressures from international markets, trading partners and global investors that create conditions that ultimately maintain the imperialist order.

With this fact, why does KP (and DKP) care about leaving the EU at all? Why even recognize that the EU restricts anti-monopolistic politics, when imperialism blocks anti-monopolistic politics in general - a fact that AMD parties like to ignore. It circles back to the Kautskyite idea of imperialism as a policy.

It is the nature of right-opportunism to: distort Marxist concepts, use revolutionary-sounding phrases and polemics, and avoid "controversial" Marxist language. This tendency exists among many revisionists who believe that "no-no words" like dictatorship and violence will scare the masses away from communism. It is for this reason that in the KP's political program you cannot find the concept of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat at all, and when it comes to the word "Revolution" it is never described as something concrete, but more as something abstract, an event in the future, where "the day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven"<sup>19</sup>, but one is sure that it will happen... Are we dealing with revolution, or is it a biblical story we are being told?

The KP can talk about "the revolution led by the working class", but never mentions the Party's important role in the revolution, the leading role. For us, however, it is no mystery why these words are omitted, and why there is no mention of a Socialist Revolution or talk of destroying the bourgeois Danish state: Such statements would lead to the illegalization of the KP, or at best, a withdrawal of the bourgeois media support for their newspaper, "Arbejderen".

## II. The process of AMD-parties

---

<sup>18</sup> Communist Party, Political Program, 2011, p. 8-9

<sup>19</sup> The New Testament, "The Gospel of Matthew", Chapter 24 verse 36

Today there are two AMD parties in Denmark (DKP and KP), but not long ago there were three. This changed with the reunification of DKP and the Communist Party in Denmark (KPiD) in 2023. Before this, DKP, KPiD and KP were the three modern self-proclaimed "communist parties". Their revisionist past is as rotten as their political lines.

After the fall of Soviet revisionism, the bourgeois DKP lost its center in Moscow and sought to liquidate itself into a bourgeois electoral list, Red-Green Alliance, along with the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party and the "left" bourgeois Left Socialists, with the hope of gathering "forces". Out of this process the Communist Party in Denmark (KPiD) was born, which wanted to preserve the old Gorbachevist DKP and stay out of the Red-Green Alliance. DKP, on the other hand, was liquidated into the Red-Green Alliance.

Then there is the Hoxhaist Communist Party of Denmark/Marxist-Leninist (DKP/ML), which mainly consisted of people who had rejected Mao Tsetung Thought after the counter-revolution in China. The party, having completely denied the two-line struggle as the driving force within the party, failed to prevent right-wingers from splitting their organization. A clique of opportunists based in the trade union bureaucracy was underestimated in this organization, which led to a right-opportunist coup in the leadership in 1997<sup>20</sup>. The coup led to the birth of the Hoxhaist Communist Workers' Party (APK) and simultaneously the DKP/ML would change its name to The Communist Party (KP).

The latest development happened in 2023, when the DKP and KPiD merged again. The KPiD's entire *raison d'être* of not joining the Red-Green Alliance was ultimately abandoned.

The DKP today is more like a cultural association or a pensioners' club within Red-Green Alliance than any kind of independent political organization. The KP, on the other hand, is the largest AMD party, with clear influence on several different organizations.

With this very brief outline of the organizational backgrounds of the AMD parties, we know a little about the birth of these organizations, which common to all happened in the face of liquidationism and capitulation to imperialism.

## AMD in practice

AMD distorts the two parties' perception of which classes to ally with, which in practice has led them to take directly imperialist positions.

A good example is the vote on 1 June 2022 on the removal of the opt-out from EU defense policy, where they chose a strategy of participating in the election that was more or less a formalization of the Danish bourgeoisie's decision to abolish the opt-out. Posters were put up by the People's Movement against the EU (an organization where the KP is the backbone, but the leadership and the policies are completely made up of the bourgeoisie and its principles) pointing out that Denmark got enough protection from NATO. They also express in their propaganda a desire for a "Nordic Union" as an alternative to the EU, which in practice is nothing more than a new imperialist coalition, just within a narrower range of imperialist countries.

---

<sup>20</sup> "The Struggle for the Communist Party of the Working Class - From DKP/ML to APK", 2022, p. 134-155, What really happened? Conversation with DKP/ML's former chairman Klaus Riis, *Kommunistisk Politik*, July 1998

The People's Movement against the EU tried to ally itself with the non-monopolistic bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie, and even the small part of the monopolistic bourgeoisie in the country that opposed the abolition of the defense opt-out, and in practice ended up latching onto a faction of the Danish bourgeoisie.

With the last European Parliament elections back in May 2024, the failure of the People's Movement Against the EU really came to light. The People's Movement didn't manage to collect enough voter declarations to get on the ballot, despite appealing to everyone from socialist republicans to royalists. An absolute tragedy for the reformists! With this, the AMD parties could do nothing but encourage people to either not vote or to submit a blank vote.

We see how this practice is being rejected by the masses, which can be seen in the vanishingly small importance of the People's Movement against the EU today and the generally growing rebellion of the masses.

While following AMD, all their work is done within the apparatus of the bourgeoisie: within the "residents' democracies" in the neighborhoods, at the top of the trade unions, desperately trying to get into city councils during municipal elections and otherwise supporting the Red-Green Alliance, or voting for rare individuals who are against both the EU and NATO.

These parties are based class-wise in the union bureaucracy. They do not unite with the deepest and broadest masses of the country, but instead with the bureaucracy in the neighborhoods and in the unions, which in reality are largely despised by many workers because they repeatedly sell out their struggle to the bourgeoisie.

They deny revolutionary violence in general and the real revolutionary struggles and People's Wars in Peru, Turkey, India and the Philippines - revolutionary wars led by communist parties - specifically, when the DKP for example says:

*"From the early 80s until today, there have been no new attempts to transition to socialism or the creation of new strategies for it."<sup>21</sup>*

Of course, we understand that their position is that these communists are "left-wing extremists" and "terrorists" and therefore do not count.

### III. The origins of AMD

The strategy of Anti-Monopolistic Democracy, which DKP joined in 1976, represented a capitulation of revolutionary ideals and a further rightward turn towards parliamentary reformism, which historically has always been a betrayal of the working class. This line was put forward as a response to the disappointments that followed Stalin's death and Khrushchev's crisis-ridden leadership. The Soviet Union's turn towards social-imperialism and its abandonment of proletarian internationalism opened the way for a complete right deviation in the International Communist Movement (ICM). Under the claim that "communism will soon be achieved"<sup>22</sup>, workers in the Soviet Union and the world in general were promised a peaceful transition to socialism through cooperation with bourgeois forces. These ideas were systematized

---

<sup>21</sup> Communist Party of Denmark, "Programmatic Document", Transitions to Socialism, 18. October 2003

<sup>22</sup> **Nikita Khrushchev proclaimed "Communism in 20 years!" at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1961**

during the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, what Chairman Mao later summarized as Khrushchev's "Three Peaceful" and "Two Whole". The Communist Party of Peru (PCP) explained these concepts succinctly:

**"Chairman Mao, who led the CCP, saw through the essence of the new revisionism, which was systematized as the "three peaceful" and the "two whole". Peaceful coexistence: Khrushchev distorts this thesis of Lenin, which separates the relations between states and the relations within states, and presents the general line of the International Communist Movement as "peaceful coexistence". For Khrushchev, the question was to prevent war because, according to him, nuclear weapons did not distinguish between exploiters and exploited, and human beings should interact on an equal footing to prevent the extinction of humanity. The "peaceful transition" suggests that the revolution no longer needed revolutionary violence, but that one social system could replace another through the "peaceful way", through elections, through parliamentarism. The "peaceful contest" claimed that in order for socialism to destroy the imperialist system, it was necessary to wage a contest with the imperialists and show the superiority of socialist society, and in this way the imperialists would go over to socialism. Khrushchev's revisionist thesis of the "whole people's state" tried to deny the class nature of the state and specifically aimed at the dictatorship of the proletariat. The "Party of the whole people" is another sham that denies the class character of the Party as the Party of the proletariat."<sup>23</sup>**

What the PCP shows here, in Chairman Mao's words, is that the "peaceful three" (including the "peaceful transition") is the product of Khrushchev's revisionism and directives to the International Communist Movement. In an attempt to abandon revolution as a means, excuses such as "nuclear war" (the idea that revolution is impossible as the enemy will simply be able to nuke the new socialist societies) and claims that society has changed to a point where socialist reform is possible, are made. The Soviet revisionists called on the world's revolutionaries to use milder forms of coercion and reduce revolutionary violence to an absolute minimum. In the end, countless self-proclaimed communist parties adopted this line.

In Denmark, however, this approach was expressed much earlier. As early as 1943, DKP stated that they wanted to reshape society through arguments:

*"Others, on the other hand, sought to sow suspicion and division for the benefit of the common enemy, claiming that the Communists were preparing a military coup when the Germans were crushed, because the party had already formed military groups in the winter of 1943. In response, the party issued its pamphlet: "We are fighting for a true democracy", which demonstrated that the party did not and had never planned to reshape society through minority coups, but worked to win the majority of the people for its policy by means of arguments."<sup>24</sup>*

Later, in the collaboration with the Social Democrats after World War II, the DKP naively approved their involvement in the liberation government and later began negotiations to merge with the Social Democrats in a unity party<sup>25</sup>. Instead of insisting on continuing the armed struggle, the DKP chose to lay down their arms and go the parliamentary route. This idea of an alliance with social democrats was pushed by Georgi Dimitrov and the Communist International

---

<sup>23</sup> Communist Party of Peru, "General Political Line", 1988

<sup>24</sup> Communist Party of Denmark, "Materials on the History of the Communist Party of Denmark", 1950, Postwar Programs p. 148

<sup>25</sup> Niels Wium Olesen, "Denmark's liberation in 1945 - a failed revolution?" KONTUR no. 18, 2008

(Comintern), but it is important to understand that it was the Danish communists' own application of the Popular Front that led to its failure here in Denmark.<sup>26</sup>

Yet there are those who try to distort Dimitrov and the policy of the Comintern to supposedly agree with AMD<sup>27</sup>. But this is nothing more than a petty attempt to justify their rotten revisionism, prevent the struggle for the reconstitution of the Communist International and attack the International Communist League - ICL. Dimitrov rejected the theory of the "peaceful transition" and essentially warned against a right opportunist strategy very similar to AMD:

*"The right opportunists, on the other hand, have tried to establish a special democratic intermediate stage, lying between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat, in order to delude the workers into the illusion of a peaceful parliamentary transition from one dictatorship to the other. They also called this fictitious intermediate stage transitional, and even quoted Lenin's words. But this fraud was not difficult to expose: for Lenin spoke of the form of transition and approach to the proletarian revolution, i.e. to the overthrow of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and not of a transitional form between bourgeois and proletarian dictatorship."<sup>28</sup>*

Indeed, the revisionists' attempt to use Lenin's writing on transitional forms fails completely when you consider that Lenin described these transitional periods as being of **"exceptionally embittered class struggle, with unprecedentedly sharp forms of this struggle"**<sup>29</sup>. In no way can this be understood as a peaceful transition period that quietly outlaws the monopolies. In addition to this, the Comintern program from 1928 also states:

*"The conquest of power by the proletariat does not mean peacefully "usurping" the ready-made state machine through a parliamentary majority. The bourgeoisie resorts to every form of violence and terror to consolidate and strengthen its exploitative property relations and its political domination. Like the feudal nobility of the past, the bourgeoisie cannot surrender its historical position to the new class without a desperate and feverish struggle. Therefore, the violence of the bourgeoisie can only be suppressed by the determined violence of the proletariat."<sup>30</sup>*

It should be clear to everyone that neither Dimitrov's nor the Comintern's statements can be used as an excuse to fight for the implementation of AMD.

## IV. Conclusion

Although the KP, DKP and other revisionist currents have tried to cover up social realities with rhetoric about an "anti-monopolistic democracy", it should be clear to everyone that this is nothing more than a "new reformism".

AMD's so-called "new circumstances" are either irrelevant or nowhere to be found. The adherents of the theory actively argue for pacifism and a peaceful transition to socialism. The

---

<sup>26</sup> **Note: The Communist Party of Brazil (Red Faction) has developed a masterful analysis of the VII Congress of the Comintern, but a deeper analysis of the application of the Popular Front in Denmark must also be developed**

<sup>27</sup> Lars Ulrik Thomsen, "The fight for anti-monopolistic democracy is part of the class struggle", Arbejdereren, 2023 (<https://arbejdereren.dk/debat/kampen-for-antimonopolistisk-demokrati-er-en-del-af-klassekampen/>)

<sup>28</sup> Dimitrov, "The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle of the Working Class against Fascism", 1935

<sup>29</sup> Lenin, "The State and Revolution", 1917, Forlaget Tiden 1946, p. 40

<sup>30</sup> "Program of the Communist International", Worker's Library Publishers, New York, IV. The Period of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, 1928, p. 36

very existence of the theory is based on the absurd notion that Denmark is an oppressed nation and that some kind of democratic revolution is necessary, even though Denmark broke with feudalism long ago. The AMD strategy fundamentally makes absolutely no sense without deliberately ignoring the class nature of the state and completely distorting the Marxist understanding of imperialism.

The way the AMD parties act today is not at all consistent with the Leninist understanding of a the Party of a New Type, and their strategy constantly stands in the way of their own advancement among the masses.

We have seen throughout this whole article how AMD's roots lie deep in the most rotten forms of revisionism and opportunism, and a misapplication of the Popular Front against Fascism, which was given free rein when Khrushchev usurped power in the Soviet Union. The theory can in no way be linked to Marxism.

We hope that this article has contributed to the two-line struggle in the revolutionary movement in Denmark by revealing AMD for what it really is.