

PLP CONVENTION BULLETIN #10

Make the Party Primary.....	1
Is Racism in the Party the Obstacle in Carrying out the Campaign to Fight Racism?.....	5
Why We Need Challenge.....	8
Summary of an the Struggle at Northeastern.....	13
Report on the Cal. Fed. of Teachers Conference.....	18
Anti-Racism & Preferential Hiring and its Relationship to the 30 for 40 Movement.....	21
The role of the Party in the Field of Culture.....	23
Fighting Male Chauvinism on the Job.....	32
Criticism of the Challenge article on Angola.....	34
Some Comments on the articles on Culture in Bulletin #5.....	36
Comment on the POWs.....	38
PLP Members: Don't Vote for McGovern or <u>Any</u> Bosses, Organize to Throw Them Out!!.....	40
The Need of Proletarian Internationalism.....	42
Potential Party Members Group - Guide for Discussions of Individual Work.....	45
Party Leadership Group.....	46
S.F. Challenge Discussion	
Student Section.....	47
30 for 40 Section.....	48
TU Section.....	49
What Are the Key Demands in the Schools?.....	51
Proposal for Organizing Work Among Intellectuals.....	57
Comments on the World Economy.....	59
Criticisms of the "Watergate" Line.....	62
On the Movement for Free Abortions.....	64
Report of a Club Discussion on Challenge.....	72
Restore Educationals in Our Party.....	75

(1)

I helped to organize a small independent union in an auto-accessories factory and eventually became an officer. All through the drive there was mainly a lot of enthusiasm, militancy and a certain amount of clarity about the role of the boss, the role of a particular sellout union which tried to muscle in on us from a factory that was owned by the same boss; the role of company men and of the NLRB. Because of this we managed to win a fairly decent contract.

I think the clarity came from discussions that I and others who agreed with me had with people about each individual situation as it arose. For instance, a few weeks after we started to sign people up on authorization cards, another union (which hadn't organized any one in the area for 35 years) tried to butt in. The NLRB requires a first union to sign up 1/3 of the workers in a particular plant for a certification election. But a second union needs only two or three cards to get on that same ballot. Many people were clear on the nature of the other union (i.e., sellout through and through) but some people thought that they were innocently organizing us with good intentions when they had seen the interest and the opportunity. I, as a party member, and others helped to win the organizing committee to attack them very sharply which we did. It helped us win since it showed the other workers that we were not like this other union in that we wanted to fight and wouldn't sell out.

when the boss played Mr. Nice guy during the drive and during negotiations, some people were fooled, but most were also won to seeing through all this and continuing to fight.

this all sounds very nice but the main weakness through all this was not raising the party and its line on unions and its line in general. the weakness was not winning people closer so that I ended up being practically the only person with these politics operating within the union to help guide the union correctly.

This is an impossible situation in a union of about 500 people in it. one or two people cannot play this role forever. Since the signing of the contract this has become clearer and clearer, with the struggle for a good contract ostensibly over, most people are not doing much in the union, hence a weaker union. THIS IS BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT BEEN WON TO A PROTRACTED VIEW OF THE STRUGGLE: A DAY TO DAY FIGHT AGAINST THE BOSSES' ATTACKS TO TAKE BACK WHAT WE HAVE. THIS IS BECAUSE VIRTUALLY NO COMMUNIST POLITICS HAVE BEEN RAISED AND VIRTUALLY NO ONE HAS BEEN WON TO PL. (There have been some changes in this recently).

without the party, no matter how militant and honest you are at the start, all organizations are going to fail sooner or later in serving the people. This is because success depends on politics.

2

Many of the biggest sellouts in the labor movement today were very militant when they started. It was mainly these bad politics which led them astray.

Another point. Even if you do have good politics and are a leader -- you ain't gonna succeed in fighting the bosses well unless you win others to it. You can't be the only one to put forward "correct" positions. Our politics must become the property of all the people or we ~~it~~ will fail. After a while, people won't even see the need to do simple tasks like mimeographing a flyer or cleaning up the union office. They'll begin to say, "Well, Joe, the party member, is committed, he can do it." And believe me, you will eventually be ~~go~~ doing it all.

This situation has been changed in the last couple of months. I now have a PL study group with seven people in it. These people like the party, are beginning to understand it, and are consequently understanding the need to do more in the union in order to strengthen it against attacks from the boss.

The point is -- nothing works ultimately unless you make the party primary.

3

Two things have happened since the report was written that are worthwhile including for the discussion.

The first thing is a further example of the many meetings and activities we have open for us when we work within the union structure. This past weekend District 11 had an executive board meeting, where all the locals sent representatives to a meeting in Oklahoma City. District 11 is all locals west of the Mississippi. Our representative was a caucus member, the v.p., who has been getting strengthened through our activities. He went and put forward somewhat, the blatant disregard for even the most elementary forms of union democracy, that the IUE leadership has shown during these negotiations. Although he didn't aggressively fight for a position on union democracy at this meeting, he came back to our local meeting and helped push a telegram criticizing the negotiators. Also, we were able to learn that the secrecy around the bargaining is a very big issue in all the locals, the rank and file is pissed, and ~~because we didn't attend the meeting~~ ^{so} we were able to make the lead story for the WAM-GE flyer about the secrecy and impending sell-out. Without attending the meeting, and being active in the union enabled us to go, we could not have found out about the real situation. Also, had we planned more for the meeting, which is discouraged because you get the agenda 1 day before the meeting, we could have had something positive to put forward to the locals to change the situation.

The other point is that it is vital to try to make politics very big in the union, at meetings and between meeting. As was mentioned before, union meetings are primarily business, with little if any political discussion. That is one thing at least we can guarantee. Getting the union, the caucus, WAM, PLP etc. to put out leaflets about what is happening as the situation warrants it will

(4)

help the union tremendously, help the membership, and help to make sure that a point we want to make will be seen by most of the people in the shop. Often a point can't be discussed at a regular union meeting, either because of lack of time or the leadership stops it, so the leaflet needs to be used. The major effect is to rally alot of support because the rank and file are looking for a plan of how to fight back, and a political analysis of why it's happening.

This is very important. It's hard to be involved in a struggle all the time, yet it is necessary to keep people in the plant thinking politically and involved in some activity. Putting out a leaflet about the last union meeting, about one that is coming up, something to build a struggle that we want to develop, the caucus', WAM's, or PL's analysis of a situation will all help to build the union. Without some constructive activity to keep pushing the company back, union members can become discouraged. Last week since nothing was going on, and the national negotiators were keeping secrets, things were really slowing down. We put out a leaflet about our own local demands, ~~and~~ ^{It had} what we were going to do to get them, ^{and} asking for suggestions, ~~and~~ ^{This} helped fight the discouragement, ~~and~~ sparked interest in the local demands, and generated talk in the shop, ^{which} ^{help} will put pressure on the company to settle.

for N.C. Discussion and Bulletin - SF
(5) internal Bulletin
IS RACISM IN THE PARTY THE OBSTACLE IN CARRYING OUT THE CAMPAIGN TO FIGHT RACISM?

In the relatively few articles that have appeared in the convention bulletins about the anti-racism campaign, only one as I recall, dealt with the question of racism in the Party (bulletin #3, p.7) as a stumbling block to the campaign. Other reports have stated that Black Nationalism is a major obstacle. A couple reports felt that not building concrete struggles against racism on the campus was the main weakness. One report said that not having a clear Party program (Black Liberation Pamphlet out of date) is what is key in holding this work back.

I feel that racism in the Party is the key political weakness that we face in carrying out this campaign. It stems from not grasping the point that FIGHTING RACISM MEANS BUILDING A POLITICAL BASE TO DO IT. AND THAT THE POLITICAL BASE MUST REFLECT THE FIGHT ITSELF. In other words, fighting racism = building a multi-racial organization (SDS, PL) that attacks and fights the racism of the ruling class. In the past when the anti-war movement was going full steam and there were many students involved the question of a multi-racial organization didn't seem as crucial (though it probably was). Though the question of racism was raised quite sharply by the Party in the anti-war movement, Party members could still be involved in a mass movement without having to build a political base that reflected the fight against racism.

Is Nationalism A Main Obstacle?

Nationalism is a reactionary ideology. Its influence in the mass movement is generated mainly by the presence of racism. Nothing will let the air out of Nationalism like a multi-racial struggle. The question isn't whether or not we should attack nationalism, of course we should. The point is that in the long run nationalism will only be defeated by the existence of a multi-racial, pro-working class organization. The basis for nationalism will be defeated in the movement by the combination of fighting the ruling class harder and building the organizational form that tells people, "yes its possible for workers and students of various races and nationalities to fight together as one".

Building Struggles On The Campuses

"If were not fighting the ruling class it doesn't make a damn bit of difference if sds or the Party is multi-racial or not". This statement which someone made to me recently is partially true. We have to be building the fight against Jensen and Herrnstein on campus, we have to be developing concrete struggles on all of the campuses. This is important. But unchecked racism (within the organizational form) holds back any struggle from really developing. Let me give one example. At Berkeley, where Jensen hides out, the PL student club has no non-white students involved in the Jensen campaign. There are also few, if any, real personal ties by the club with non-white students. The campaign against Jensen was very slow in beginning and is very slow in developing. I think it will be very hard, if not impossible, for the student club at Berkeley to carry out any kind of lasting campaign against Jensen unless Black and other minority students are brought into the campaign.

At S.F. State, where I go to school, SDS was able to wage a successful campaign in getting an anti-Jensen, Herrnstein resolution signed by 40 teachers and published in the school newspaper (full page ad, payed for by the teachers). The SDS committee that was mainly responsible for this ad was made up of 9 students (4 white and 5 black students). It took us three months to get it done.

6

One of the main reasons we stuck with this project was because it helped to build a stronger organizational form for SDS. It allowed for a great deal of political discussions and stronger personal ties were made. At the same time we were advancing the fight against racism on the campus. Not that we don't have any problems of building a stronger and broader sds chapter at state, we do, but one thing that helps us is that we are becoming more conscious of the organizational form of the struggle. We have a long ways to go in building better political and personal ties of a multi-racial character. *But this question is key.*

Does Not Having A Clear Party Program Hold Us Back ?

If we had been operating under the guidance of the "Black Liberation" program one could say that it is an obstacle. But we haven't. That's not our line. We haven't been operating under it. I think that it should be updated to express our position. That would be good. As far as more study, both in sds and in the Party, on the questions of racism; how it relates to workers, teachers, 30 for 40, etc. I think most of us agree that more detailed research is needed on these areas, but it will not, by itself, build our base. Only when these discussions are tied to building a multi-racial Party and sds do they become important.

There are some examples of racism in the Party that I would like to point out. One example was the focus of the Jan. 20 demonstration in Wash. D.C. As stated in the Student Collective letter of 1-25-73, "We did not win those people to come to our demonstration around our line of fighting racism". Nothing in this report dealt with the political and personal ties necessary to build a multi-racial sds and PL. In Bulletin #8 there was a criticism of the Black Liberation Pamphlet written which only on the last paragraph of the seven page report (p.24) was a self criticism of base building made:

"Self-critically, my own relative lack of clarity on the question of racism is shown by the very few Black and Spanish people I am acquainted with (none in my base), and, even more clearly, by the fact that the same is the case for the whole club of which I am chairman."

This as can be seen is a very serious criticism, but will the updating of the Black Liberation Pamphlet change this ? In bulletin #7 (p.7) a white comrade discusses his own personal and political weaknesses in his relationship with black students:

"although I had been intellectually convinced that fighting racism was extremely important, I still had something of a contemptuous attitude towards black students. This was reflected in my knowing no black students personally, and in having a condescending attitude towards black workers and welfare recipients whom I worked with. My senior year I finally managed to talk to black students in my dorm, visit them in their rooms, etc. By doing this I discovered that most of the politically active black students thought the nationalist--i.e. those who attacked vigorously whites for being white--were full of shit and they felt embarrassed by them. Unfortunately, I had not overcome my racist attitudes enough to become really tight with any of them...."

Another example was in a recent discussion I had with a comrade at Berkeley. This person told me the reason that black students weren't involved in the anti-Jensen campaign was because "black students at Berkeley don't take Jensen seriously". This racist statement seems to reveal quite blatantly the lack of a political and personal base among black students at U.C. Berkeley. These are just some examples. I'm sure if we all thought about it more we would find many others.

7

How Are We To Change ?

I think we mainly have to attack this problem head on. Every Party club should discuss the weakness of their personal and political ties of a multi-racial nature. Each campaign, forum, challenge selling, demonstration, friends, etc. should be discussed from this vantage point. Every club should systematically evaluate their progress in this area. As I said before, it is not mean't that we should stop building concrete struggles on the campus, or that we shouldn't have serious study to coincide. We should do all three and become serious students in the class room as well. The point is that the main indicator of our success in fighting racism has to be in the growth of a multi-racial sds and PL. Like the old saying, "the proof is in the pudding".

One other point about this revisionist trend in the party's anti-racist work is the question of leadership. Starting with myself I'd like to say that I've been very slow in even writing up this report about my feelings. I have tended not to think about the progress of the Party's work, how it could be better etc. I tend to relegate the thinking to people "higher up". "Say your prayers and all will be well". "If I don't think about it, someone else will". It is a extremeley bad attitude which has dominated me and most members of the Party. It reflects on my part a very non-collective spirit and approach to the work. After all this report may be all wet. That doesn't mean I shouldn't contribute it. Everyone in the Party has something to contribute. How wise are we to arrive on a correct line and build the work ??? I also feel that the National Student Collective has to be more collective in giving leadership to "the anti-racist struggle". In a practical way it doesn't really exist. My efforts (or lack of effort) has only helped to undermine the question of leadership.

(how come self-criticisms are always written at the very end????)

Member of S.F. State Student Club

Member S.F. State Club

(8)

Why We Need Challenge.

Taking an overall look at the Convention Bulletins #1 thru 7, it is apparent that the struggle around Challenge is the number one issue in the party today. Why? Why should this of all the possible questions, have turned out to be the main issue facing us now as we prepare for the first party convention in 5 years?

The main difference about NOW as opposed to the past is that we have finally corrected somewhat our past sectarianism and have energetically jumped into the mass movements. This is good but having done this we now confront the contradiction of being in the mass movement- namely keeping the independent line. The debate about C-D reflects the political question of whether we will keep or forsake our independent communist line as we make progress in becoming part of, and even leading, the trade unions and the mass reform movement.

In many ways selling CD now that we are less sectarian is harder than before because:

- 1) We are doing more other things- participating in the mass movement, working and studying seriously, raising families, etc.
- 2) As we exert more of a Left force on the people around us in the movement, we receive more of a Right force back from these people (you can't have one without the other). Also, taking our jobs and studies more seriously has a price in that it reinforces our own internal Right wing aspirations of successful careers, ~~xxx~~ secure jobs, etc.
- 3) We are in a difficult period. Many of us have been selling CD for some time now and the results have not been that spectacular in terms of people we sell to rushing to buy subs and work with the party. This is just a temporary phase.

(9)

These are some of the reasons why understanding the political necessity for mass CD sales while recognizing the difficulties and dealing with them constructively has become the party's biggest issue in this pre-convention period.

A lot of the suggestions about improving CD are valid and even more could be made. In fact the paper is accepting a lot of these suggestions and is steadily improving. For instance I think that most people would agree that the last two issues "Watergate" and "Workers Action" are very, very good. However I believe that the concrete suggestions about CD are important but SECONDARY. All the debate about Golda's moustache is really a skirting of the main issue which many of us are unfortunately arguing with our feet- SHOULD WE HAVE CD OR NOT? No one has explicitly written in the ConvBull that we shouldn't have CD, but how many of us are "saying" it with our actions and attitudes when it comes to selling and circulating and writing for CD? Isn't that the logical political position behind not building the circulation? Let's deal with this basic question directly.

I feel very strongly that we do need Challenge. I think it is essential for building the R^evolution. CD serves three main purposes which are indispensable.

- ① In RRIII we expressed that the key way to avoid Revisionism is to have faith in the MASSES accepting communist ideology and becoming communists. In the US, masses means millions. CD is our vehicle for our RRIII line. It is a historic development in the US. With our efforts so far we have gotten CD into the "MASSES" ballpark. ^{CD, even with its faults, expresses our Party's Communist Line + Practice.} The constant struggle for each of us to sell regularly- even if we only average 100 papers a month- means a half a Million people getting CD per year-- several Million over a period of a few years! Is this something we want to give up?

10

Besides the numbers, look at how many people in and around the party have been met via CD. Quantity of sales will eventually transform into qualitative changes in the class struggle, but in the meantime quantity must be worked for, and kept at a certain level. (Diminishing quantity also leads to qualitative change!)

② Selling CD publicly and to friends and co-workers is very important for the political development of our members. The 'communist' parties ~~that~~ went revisionist are composed of people who are revisionists. Just selling CD is no absolute guarantee that you are not revisionist but it very definitely helps!

③ Does point (1) and (2) require a national newspaper? Couldn't both be accomplished by frequent mass local leaflets? Yes. BUT- one thing that local leaflets can't ~~possibly~~ provide is the concept and the reality of National, Centralized, organization. We are not just after local reforms, but State Power, - control of the entire United States. Even now we have nationwide focuses like the fight against racism, and the 30/40. CD being a nationwide paper is not just a form, but it expresses this organizational content.

Maybe everyone agrees with these points, but it helps to go over the fundamentals. But even if we all agree, there are some other problems still there in carrying it out and we should cope with these as constructively, patiently and creatively as we can. I just have a few suggestions: 1) Editors should continue welcoming suggestions and improving the style, format, readability, etc.

2) Contentwise, I feel the greatest lack in CD is something that was pointed out in the Culture articles in CB#5. We ~~are~~ are good at ~~knocking~~ knocking the bad bourgeoisie culture, but weaker at

developing good working class culture. Similarly, CD stresses the Negative a lot, but is less successful at presenting our positive Vision or whatever you want to call it. We should not only develop and reinforce peoples hatred for the present system but should inspire them with the positive vision of what things can be like. We used to point to China, but we don't have that easy way now. I think that more and more we will have to use our own party itself and its practice as the model for how things can be better than under capitalism. We and the mass organizations we are influential in should be the glimpse of the future society- eliminating Racism, sexism, functioning democratically and centrally, being capable of doing many things (manual, mental, and political work) instead of being specialized freaks, etc. We should strive for this more in our practice and ~~publicize~~ publicize it more in our ~~at~~ Challenge articles.

3) Give the paper away more. I don't want to undermine the struggle to boost selling CD, but if we want to get the paper to lots more people we should be a little freer about giving it away. Two specific places to do this are: a) Concentration places like the auto plants where we want to develop sales. It will get the paper to a lot of people who might not buy it because of prejudice or other reasons, and it would educate them as to what we are about and could turn some of them on to wanting more. b) Places where we work! Why not have a distribution to reach our immediate ~~w~~ co-workers. People outside your club could do the distributing if you are not ready to be that identified with it. The advantage is that you see peoples reactions and learn a lot about their politics, and it paves the way to discuss PL since CD will have given people some idea about us. It would also be a motivation to write something relevant to your co-workers.

(12)

I suggest that this proposal be taken up in the club.

(To make up for the lost dimes, I think we could fund raise from friends and supporters- ask for \$10 so that 100 papers ~~can~~ can be given out at your job or at the local auto plant.)

One final observation, A couple of years ago during the initial rectification, we met a lot of people who liked CD a lot and asked, "What do you do besides selling the paper and organizing marches?" We never had a very good answer and so we couldn't involve a lot of people we met. Now we have much more of an answer. Besides selling the paper, WE ARE ACTIVELY WORKING TO TAKE OVER THE TRADE UNIONS! With this improved practice we have much more potential to win serious people we meet with CD than ever before.

(13)

This little article is about the struggle at Northeastern this year from about February. It is not going to be just a rundown of "we did this" and then "we did that". Hopefully, it will go more into more what kind of real errors we made and the club leader made (me) -- errors that other clubs probably make to one extend or the other too.

Let me give you a brief background: ~~Our~~ Our tactical plan was to build a fight against Banfield's book, The Unheavenly City and its ideas being taught by a racist sociology professor Lee at Northeastern. From Sept. til Feb. or so the club had done some agitational leaflets on the book, sold papers and lit, and set up a barely functioning study group that however, had some good discussion about Unheavenly. Also, two comrades took the course but merely "raised points" in class. Our situation needed a change. We didn't really have even a tactical plan.

About this time there was sharp discussion in the party about our failure to initiate in any serious way, anti-racist struggles on a campus. We also had, at this time, alot more discussion about party-building in general. We went about trying to change the situation. We had the perspective to :

- 1) Build an anti-racist struggle and within that,
- 2) Build the Party.

Here's exactly what we did, give or take a few things I've forgotten:

- 1) A comrade (me) took the class and we won three other friends to take the class. We raised good and true points in the class about Banfield and racism. We leafletted the class three or four times. We sold Challenge in an organized way twice in the class. We had a confrontation with the professor in the class that involved about seven or eight people yelling at Lee to debate with SDS (The class responded to this in a more than postive way.)
- 2) We set up an SDS table (this was our main activity) nearly

14
every day that had a Banfield petition on it and worked hard with SDSers we had met (we met them thru mainly selling Cahllenge) to get signatures.

3) We wrote a guest editorial for the school paper on Banfield and Lee and racism. This prompted a reply by a student who didn't entirely agree with us but wasn't hostile. We wrote a reply back. Someone else wrote a letter in response to our answer and this went back and forth for each issue. However, it was always someone in SDS or PL who wrote the letters of response.

5) We had two other confrontations that involved about 10-15 people each with the dean of Liberal Arts and the Chairman of the Sociology Department.

5) We involved about 10 people over the semester in writing leaflets, preparing the workshop on Banfield for the SDS Conference, doing a Banfield poster, etc

6) Numerous SDS meetings. There are about 10 people who consider themselves members.

7) We talked to and got to know the TA's in Lee's course who had previously helped write the Banfield pamphlet

8) Two faculty members (not in PL) wrote a statement against racism in courses and specifically Banfield and circulated it.

9) One TA comrade in psychology got together a group of psychologists who gave a forum on I Q. and Racism that 60 people attended. (they were largely from Northeastern.)

10) We've just set up a Challenge Club of recruitable in the future people (4) that has met once.

11) Our paper sales have gone up a little

12) We heard a lot of individual ~~xxxx~~ conversations around campus of people talking about Banfield and Lee and the campaign

13) Last week the department chairman, and a woman professor met with Lee and told him they were dropping his course totally and making

(15)
it retroactively not required.

Next semester there will be no Banfield being taught at Northeastern that we know now of. A victory, at first glance.

Point 1 -- Politically we weren't very profound. We didn't see our overall strategy to be building a mass movement against racism. At a meeting a couple of weeks ago, someone at it asked me what, in one sentence, were we trying to accomplish at N U. I said we were trying to get Banfield banned. I didn't say we were trying to put PL's line into practice at N.U. by building a mass movement against racism because that wasn't what we were trying to do and I wasn't seeing that as the main thing in my mind

We talk in the Party about destroying the universities, and that a step towards being able to do that is building mass anti-racist student movements. We aren't fooling around. We're organizers who fight for revolution. We have a strategy to someday accomplish this. We say revolution is inevitable but aht PL and(that means us too) can profoundly effect the making of that revolution. This whole thing is not a little job you got to get done. It's the big deal. It's our lives and millions of others too.

On a student level, we say that at this time we want to win masses of students and faculty to grapple with racism on as many & different levels of militancy and in as many different forms as possible.xx We say we want to dig and root ourselves into the school's innards to best accomplish this.

Well, that's certainly not where we were at this semester at N.U. I don't want to ~~x~~ make it sound like we totally fucked up at N.U. and what we did was lousy. A lot of the work that was done was very good and we won 4 or 5 people to SDS all of whom are minority students and have good possibilities to recruit a couple of these people. But, our club didn't have a strategy for building a massive movement against racism at that school

(16)

If we had that perspective we would have done things differently For instance:

1) Classroom work -- We would see this as the essence of our fight against racism. We would have made concrete plans for developing a group inside Lee's class (there are 150 people in it) for agitating in the class. We ~~we~~ would have made plans for our other classes too. We ~~we~~ would have organized professors and students to speak in sympathetic professor's classes about racism, what SDS and PL were doing, etc. They did this at Brooklyn College and got 300 to a forum on racism.

Instead of standing around passing out long involved leaflets, (we must have passed out literally 25,000 or more this semester at N.U. alone) we would have been using the classrooms as our organizaing springboards.

2) The shcool paper -- Instead of having a debate between us (usually a comrade too) and them, we could have organized a hell of alot of other people, faculty and students we knew to write letters to the school paper. (I know this campus worker who hate Lee, mainly because he bitches at hin all the time. He would probably contribute a letter to that effect to the paper.)

3) Besides having confrontations with deans, etc. we could have also had a forum or teach-in on racism, with fa lty and students ~~speaking~~ and disussion and paln=making

4) We could have organized the TA's to have SDSerw speak in their Lee sections meetings.

5) We did virtually zero in the dorms around dorm discussion groups, etc.

We recently made a list of faculty and TA's who are our friends. (It was 37 people) at least). I bet we could've gotten nearly all to do something in their classes to patticipate in discussion and more around racism, Banfield and Lee. Some, I know, whould have given us entire class periods to lead discussion on racism. At the ~~Psych~~ Psychology forum on I.W. we raised points

(17)

about racism, etc. but we could have proposed the group meet agins, or e we have another forum on cultural theories of inferiority or a dozen other things that would have gotten the people involved in doing something against racism and working with PL

There are hundreds of other ideas we could have formulated tha would have built a much bigger base for anti-racist ideas and struggles.

Minus a club strategy, and a sectarian, "not seeing the forest (building a anti-racist movement that's mass) through the trees (get that leaflet out! approach) hurt our work.

Here are some other random points:

- 1) Not having a strategy often led us to ~~resting~~ resting on skimpy laurels. Like for instance, we'd have a good confrontation and not do too much for the next few days following.
- 2) As club leader, not thinging strategically, I'd often call up people in the club and say "Did you do this, did you do that, ~~why~~ why didn't you do this, why didn't you do that, Goodby" Needless to say this doesn't help at all, and everybody gets cynical.

Here are some questions to think about:

- 1) Does the club you're in have a clearly worked out, political strategy for building a mass anti-racist movement on your campus.
- 2) Does the strategy have a goal and clear cut, multi-faceted responsibilities for each comrade?
- 3) Is their continuous struggle in the club about why fight raciwm.?
- 4) Does your club integrate the struggle wlth concrete plans to build PL and recruit?

Martie Riefe

(18)

May 31, 1973

Six members of the Teachers Action Caucus attended the California Federation of Teachers meeting in Los Angeles as delegates. This is a caucus which is not led by the Party but has a program of allying with parents, fighting for educational demands and union democracy.

We made some ~~almost~~ ^{great} ~~unbelievable~~ advances during this three day convention. We arrived in L.A. not ~~knowing~~ knowing a soul outside our own delegation, and we left having made some incredible gains.

Perhaps the most significant victory of the convention is the least easily measurable or describable. There was a mood and atmosphere in the convention in which everything we did and said was supported, and people flocked to parties and meetings held in opposition to the State leadership. People we had never seen before would run up to hug us or shake our hands after we had spoken or been attacked by our local leadership. There was just a tremendous feeling of fraternity with anyone who opposed the manipulation and policies of the state leadership. The existence of TAC, our differences with Ballard (S.F. Pres.) and our policies were one of the major topics of discussion throughout the convention. ~~XXXXXX~~ One long-time union member who attended the convention as a TAC delegate began the convention as a pessimist thinking he would meet no one and the convention was sewed up. He returned to S.F. absolutely elated, and positive that we can win.

More tangible among our gains were the following:

1) We got names and addresses of 50 people around the state who want to keep in touch and run a slate of statewide officers next election.

2) We decided to run 2 people for State Vice President and one of those for the Women in Education, just so we would have the chance to make a speech about TAC. (These are the only two positions which it is possible to run for - there are no other offices except President) We got 300 and 200 votes respectively for Vice President ~~XXXX~~ (400 needed to elect) And we won a seat on the Women in

(19)

Education Committee (which means opportunity to travel around the state organizing)

4) We distributed a great deal of TAC literature (attached).

5) The Party passed out a copy of the Philadelphia strike pamphlet to almost all the delegates.

* 6) * We scared the pants off Jim Ballard. ^(S.F. local Pres.) Every single attack he attempted backfired in his face. People thought he looked weak, inept, and cowardly.

There were two types of political questions raised in the convention. One set of issues existed without us - the manipulation and lack of democracy of the State leadership, and the lack of representation for small locals throughout the State. Large numbers of delegates were angry about these issues before we arrived, and came around to discuss them with us because we looked like an organized group that might be able to do something about it.

The second set of issues were things which we succeeded in raising rather effectively. Mostly we brought up these points in election speeches and individual discussions and somewhat in the discussions of the ~~XXXXX~~ resolutions. These were:

1) the necessity for community and rank and file involvement if we want to win anything from the Boards of Education and 2) the idea that ^(real) unity (merger with the CTA, etc.) will not come about through moving to the right (as the State Pres. proposed in his opening speech) but by organizing more effectively all those who have the most grievances against the school system - minority teachers, substitutes, elementary teachers, women, children's center teachers, etc. Both points were well-received.

^{this means getting} The lessons which I drew from this convention were the following:

1) AFT union leaders are paper tigers, in a much more profound sense than I have ever realized. They are extremely weak, and it is neither rhetoric nor dreamy idealism to say that we can win.

2) At least in California, most of the locals, even the leadership, are much to the left of the Shanker-Ballard team.

3) There is a lot of support for the idea of organizing those who mostly outside the union, especially elementary teachers, and I think this is part of the road to victory in the Union (Needs most discussion)

(20)

It is probably ~~ixm~~ important to note that all the good things that happened do not necessarily indicate complete support for TAC's program. We don't know how much TAC can convince people ~~ym~~ to involve parents, ^{or fight racism} for example. But what is clear is that many people have quite a good understanding of what a union should be, and they know this isn't it.

Power to the Workers!

K.K.

S.F.

approval of the Knox bill, now pending before the Legislature.

va. cation new care

at alt. reported nose gear malfunction.

FBI Denies Pillaging Home

The FBI has denied an allegation that agents entered and ransacked last week the home of a woman campaigner for the Shorter Work Week Coalition here.

"We've looked into it," Thomas P. Druken, an assistant agent in charge here, said. "There is no basis in fact for the allegation. No agents were at Mrs. Presti's home."

Mrs. Karen Presti lives at apartment No. 2, 1225 Oak St.

At an unusual news conference held yesterday in the FBI's reception room,

coalition workers said Mrs. Presti and four other women had been contacted by the FBI.

The campaigners are seeking 38,000 signatures on a petition to get on the City's November ballot a measure providing for 30 hours work for 40 hours pay.

Conference spokesmen included coalition worker, Hari Dillon, a steering committee member and admitted member of the Progressive Labor Party.

The PLP is an avowed revolutionary communist

party active in the "30 for 40" movement.

Druken declined comment as to whether campaigners other than Mrs. Presti had been contacted by agents but pointed out that the FBI is charged under law with protecting the nation's internal security.

The coalition spokesmen included Wendy Parker, 31, a former telephone company employe, who claimed:

"The harassment from the FBI is a crude anti-communist tactic to scare people away from the campaign because of the presence of communists."

(21)

In many industries such as construction especially, you can get a job when there is an opening if you know somebody such as the Business Agent or even a friend who is a member of the rank and file. I've heard many people say how they expected to "get into the union" and get a job because they knew so and so. It's true with the Teamsters, and every other union.

But because most of these jobs are filled by white workers ^{because} of racism then won't the same racist ^{favoritism} occur even if the job market is opened up? Even if it is opened up through a movement like 30 for 40? there are many white workers unemployed, not just black workers. Won't that allow racism to bring just white workers into the jobs that open up and leave black workers out in the cold unless racism is dealt with specifically and fought within the movement for a shorter work week?

What I'm saying is that anti-racism and preferential hiring should be an integral part of the movement for 30 for 40. (Anyway, I wonder how far it would get without anti-racist politics). Because unless racism is dealt with it will not disappear. In fact, as conditions worsen in this country, and the ruling class spews forth more racist garbage to oppress blacks and whites, and fool whites, racism will grow in all organizations unless it is fought. Given that this is the main way the bosses split us up and destroy our fights, what is to prevent WAM and 30 for 40 from becoming a racist movement or a movement allied with fascism?

I think that it is really opportunist and ultimately fatal to exclude preferential hiring from WAM and 30 for 40 on the grounds that white whorkers won't join. And in the hope of eventually bringing

(22)

it up in the future ^{now} we have a lot of people there or in hopes that the Party can bring it up independently and that WAM not make it as an official position. If blacks and whites can ally in a union on center issues, why not in WAM? in fact, most white workers, when thinking in terms of unions, expect it to take a somewhat anti-racist stand. So why not WAM?

If racism and the oppression and exploitation which the ruling class likes it for is not fought, it will eventually spell our doom. Because it will be used against us the way it is used in every situation, to split up and misdirect.

As far as including the specific and explicit demand for preferential hiring of black workers over white, I think it is possible to show white workers that this is in their short and long term interests.

- 1) They have the benefit of militant class fighter both on the job and in WAM.
- 2) They have more people in the shorter work week movement.
- 3) They will help to overcome racism which can be shown for the vicious tool it is on the job.

Therefore I suggest that all literature and campaigns explicitly state preferential hiring as an important ^{aspect} of the shorter work week movement.

30 FOR 40

A BIG PAY BOOST

PREFERENTIAL HIRING FOR MINORITIES AS THE JOBS OPEN UP

(23)

What role can a revolutionary communist party now play in the field of culture? Here I will restrict culture to mean ~~x~~ art and literature, the movies and music, etc. Of course culture might be defined to include laws, ~~ix~~ politics, child-rearing practices, etc. But such topics can be dealt with elsewhere.

It is convenient to distinguish two main forms of culture as I have defined it: that designed for consumption by the masses, including workers, the broad middle classes and the unemployed; and that culture aimed at intellectuals. This second form is called "high brow" culture, encompassing "classical" music, art ~~masterpieces~~ "masterpieces" and books like War and Peace. So-called mass culture is the stuff ~~x~~ that appears on t.v. and AM radio.

Mass culture, with some exceptions, corresponds to the tactical needs of the ruling class. It glorifies the police, pushes drugs, immediate escape in love or sex, etc. It is less topical than the "news" but does not have the "depth" (long-range capability) of "great" art. In short, mass culture fills the need of the ruling class to affect the masses of people on issues of relatively immediate and relatively pressing urgency. Only the so-called news functions as a more immediate and entirely tactical device, shaping or trying to shape opinion on the most specific questions for exceptionally brief periods, sometimes lasting only a day. T.v. serials, however, can last for months or even years.

But "great" art lasts for decades and decades or for hundreds or even thousands of years. The works that fall under this category are generally intended to indoctrinate cultural producers (writers, directors, painters) and cultural intermediaries (teachers, admen, technicians) to long range commitments. ~~ix~~ These commitments are to bourgeois values, i.e., those values which serve the longest range needs of the bourgeoisie. "Order" is the ideal social state, as in Shakespeare, race is the determinant of character, as in Faulkner, the

24

world is best viewed subjectively, as in the impressionists, modernists, etc. — all these views are popular in unpopular art.

The development of bourgeois art is essentially technical. That is, the ideological content of bourgeois art has remained basically unchanged since the bourgeoisie first seized society. But since resistance to bourgeois ideology has also developed, it has become necessary to use the most ingenious methods to persuade us to commit our lives to the propagation of this class. Thus technical development is basically tactical development.

Gradually, "avant-garde" artistic techniques as well as other technical developments (paper back books, vacuum tubes, transistors) are applied to the mass culture. In this way, technically slick bourgeois culture can be produced ~~via~~ using assembly line methods.

On the other hand, mass culture helps generate that degree of inertia and passivity among workers and others which allows the "higher" forms of bourgeois culture to be produced. The university and college system, e.g., hotbeds of reactionary cultural production and transmission, are dependant on the labor of workers which provide the ~~XXXXXX~~ necessary leisure, leisure which is used, of course, to cultivate the most swinish disregard for the working class.

The kind of attack we wish to make on both forms of bourgeois culture depends on the strength of the left and the ~~XXXX~~ over-all ~~XXX~~ situation. In the midst of a general upheaval, when the left has considerable support in all industries, the "entertainment" industry is also vulnerable. In France during 1968 many technicians refused to collaborate with the government, and some television stations didn't help the bourgeoisie. Stopping mass culture is basically a trade union problem.

Organizing among teachers, creating unions capable of influencing course content would be another example of interfering with bourgeois mass culture. Teaching anti-racist material on a large scale would do irreparable harm to world capitalism. Objecting to ruling class history, exposing the racist

25

imagery of every important work in American literature, are all political actions which make it more difficult for the ruling class to dominate workers.

The destruction of ruling class culture means the destruction of the ruling class.

But what makes it possible for the ruling class to own culture is its ownership of production. A fight against ruling class culture is only possible when we develop a genuine threat to their material ownership. (In the U.S., a left wing movement in culture only developed in the late 1920's and early 1930's when the CP as a whole was developing and growing in the working class.)

Without a communist party, no criticism of any kind can effectively challenge bourgeois culture. Indeed, American culture has been stagnating since the 1930's; and one argument for a communist line is that such a line is necessary for any sort of ^{decent, non-pornographic} advance in culture ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ and is a precondition for ^{that} cultural excitement, ^{with us on many political points.} almost all artists enjoy, even if they disagree.

The effectiveness of the attack on bourgeois culture is entirely a function of the line of the party. Despite the fact that there was considerable ~~x~~ resistance to revisionism among the ~~x~~ cultural workers of the CP in the ~~thirties~~ thirties, and even in the leadership of that work, ultimately they were not able to maintain a revolutionary ("proletarian") line independent of the party.

The sharper and more consistent the attacks on bourgeois culture, the more left wing cultural work will grow. During times when ~~attacks~~ large scale attacks on mass culture are not possible, criticisms and reviews of bourgeois culture are still possible and necessary. For instance, an article by Mike Gold in the New Republic in 1930 in which he ridicules the absurdly reactionary poses of Thornton Wilder is considered the "opening salvo" of the "literary class war" of the thirties. But Gold's article was only possible because he and his friends had been writing attacks like it throughout the twenties when it looked as if

(26)

CULTURE 4

booming
~~was~~ U.S. capitalism was invincible.

As for literary work, a tremendous potential base ~~for~~ for left wing work exists among younger, unpublished writers. ~~and~~ Rather than cultivating those performers with big reputations, and developing a "star" system as the CP did when it swung into revisionism, it's best to build a solid movement based on the growth of pro-working class artists who want their stuff to help people. When the line of the CP changed in the early thirties, the base they had developed among these writers ~~is~~ was abandoned, a politically suicidal ~~for~~ act for a revolutionary organization. But they were abandoning revolution then.

How does one attack bourgeois culture? ~~Not~~ It is not enough to indicate, as other articles in these discussion bulletins have done, that "it must be attacked." Of course it must be attacked, but the question is how to win. By winning I mean that we are able to say things about bourgeois cultural works that cut the heart out of them and reduce their effectiveness on people both in the short and long run.

None of the movie reviews in Challenge have done this successfully. The key to defeating bourgeois art is turning it around. That is the political essence of the matter. Every work of bourgeois culture, whatever its intended audience, outside the ruling class itself, is an attack. Poems, movies, songs, etc., they all attack. As in other spheres, an attack can be a good thing if it is reversed.

Reversing the attack does not mean "understanding" the work in the way we usually use that word. When the ruling class attacks us or one of our ~~for~~ friends, we may not understand all of the various forces that are behind it. Furthermore, we can't wait until we understand it in that fashion. Understanding it isn't the point, in fact; turning it around is the point.

What a given work, like a movie, is "trying to say" is not the content of the work. To say that a movie pushes the Mafia, racism, nationalism,

(27)

CULTURE 5

may be accurate but it usually only sets the stage for a drawn out argument about whether the movie may also be "saying something else" or whether it is "ambiguous," etc., etc. Such discussions, in fact, gladden the hearts of bourgeois culture producers because they mean that the audience is "involved." "Political" discussions and "exposures" can actually increase audience "involvement." This is the opposite of what we want. This is like organizing to begin a research and discussion project on the DA's office after a friend has been arrested. It not only takes people out of the struggle, but ends up building the DA.

Instead of trying to "get into" the movie to "understand what it's really saying" — which is the more difficult as the movie is more technically accomplished (this also holds for literature, Kafka being a super example), ask yourself or your friend how you felt after it was over. Typical responses include "I'm tired," "It made me depressed," "I couldn't understand it," "I don't know," "It's bullshit," etc. If you start with the effect of the movie ^{Does the movie make you feel like fighting back?} you can immediately ~~g~~ tell its class orientation. When so-called radical movies leave you feeling depressed, you know something is wrong.

Try to figure out how the people who designed the movie engineered that response. Perhaps you ~~were~~ were tricked into feeling sympathy for one pig because the designer of the movie made another pig look even worse. X ("The Godfather" used that one.) Maybe one reason you felt depressed after the movie was because all the rooms were dark and low-ceilinged and everything in the movie was in a state of perpetual gloom. (Ingemar Bergman) Or maybe sexual feelings or feelings of loneliness are used to trick you into feeling ~~alone~~ alone and into thinking that everyone is always alone ("Last Tango.")

We said that technical developments are necessary tactical developments for the bourgeoisie. Watch a t.v. show from the 1950's some time. These shows appear to be "crude" and "contrived." The message hasn't changed basically in twenty years nor, with the exception of color, has the medium. But newer shows are faster paced to increase the suspense and the number of

pre-commercial climaxes. Viewer sympathy with characters has been intensified by making the leads slightly more complex than in the old days. Finally, there is a more of a conscious attempt to exploit life-style differences among the people to foster reactionary sympathies (as in "Mod Squad.")

~~Imagine~~ Imagine how disconcerting it would be to sit next to someone watching the t.v. serial "Ironsides" with an expert in camera techniques. Every time there is a "pan" or "stock" shot, he elbows you, interrupting everything, to tell you about it. The program is "ruined" because it has been exposed as wholly artificial. The show is no longer able to involve us. It has been turned into an object. Every scene has been designed to fool us. The arrangement of scenes, their order and even their length, are designed to create a feeling in us.

This brings us to the power of art and the source of its energy. An editorial or polemic can be defeated on the basis of its ideas and assumptions. But a work of art is not "open" in the same way. Refuting its intellectual message will not alter its emotional effect. Even the most complex works have very few "ideas" as such. That's why "exposing" the ideas of a movie or song is rarely convincing. To win, we must first address first of all the feeling created by the work.

Once we connect ~~our~~ ^{our} feeling to the contrived thing we have just seen, read or heard, the feeling changes. We (rightly) sense that we have been manipulated and tricked. From depression, confusion, sluggishness grows anger. We are angry at the art and, by association, we ~~are~~ ^{can become} angry with all those works which tricked us in the past.

This approach succeeds in reversing the attack of bourgeois culture for several reasons, I think. First, it concentrates on the audience not the ~~artistic~~ artifact. It emphasizes the conscious element of the attack and thus defeats the aura of "naturalism" with which every artist hopes to surround his work. As man-made, culture can no longer be characterized as semi-

semi-religious. Further, this approach uses the attack itself to generate its opposite. Instead of constructing an elaborate critical theory about the "nature of art," etc., it gives access to the effective content (what it does to us) of the ~~work~~ work, using that effective content as a basis for exposing bourgeois art. By making art works into tricky objects, like elaborate reactionary "magic" shows, the works (and their cultural context) cease being part of "our" culture. This shit belongs to them, helps them.

It is very similar to what PL does in practice on other matters. What is the political essence of, say, inflation? This essence can be summed up in the results of inflation on workers. If it screws workers, we know what it does for the ruling class. Using this approach means showing the class content of art and reversing it (as Challenge does for other kinds of attacks on the working class), instead of lingering over the personalities or abstract motives of the ruling class.

Does this approach emphasize form over content? There is no room here to unravel the history of the form/content discussion in Marxist criticism. Suffice it to say for now that works of art have two kinds of content: what they say and what they do. Without "art" (formal techniques), art can "do" nothing. Our approach ~~begins~~ begins with the second type of content and relates it to form. A good bit of ~~more~~ dogmatic and revisionist nonsense has been written on the form/content issue, claiming one or another is "primary," etc. The question is much like this one: which is more important, the effects of racism or the tricks and lies used to justify and perpetuate it? Of course the effective content is "more important," but we'll never fight racism effectively without exposing at every step the gimmicks used to push it.

Second, how does this approach relate to the ~~structure~~ structure of bourgeois culture? I.e., if there are actually two main types of this culture, how can we most effectively neutralize the effects of both?

On a mass level, the more organized the attacks on so-called

popular art, especially in Challenge, the sooner will this x culture lose its ~~grip~~ effectiveness on us and our friends. Bourgeois culture, actualyy, has a pretty small bag of tricks; and once a lot of people learn to recognize them, the grip of that culture will begin to loosen.

The stuff aimed at intellectuals (like writers and x teachers) is more xdifficult to fight. This difficulty grows from the semi-religious atmosphere in which the stuff is read or seen and from the cleverness of the "art." If the tricks were not x of a pretty high quality, the stuff wouldn't have lasted. I have had best results in breaking^{up} these works ~~up~~ into very small parts and scrutinizing x individual scenes, speeches, paragraphs or stanzas. By exposing the devices in a small portion of the work, ppeople are generally made conscious of the whole in a way that cannot be done when the work is considered as a whole. The almost unaxnimous response to such analysis (after a brief discussion beginning with the question "how did ~~this~~ you feel when you finished this?") is that the discussion "ruined the enjoyment" of the ~~work~~ work. This approach has ~~work~~ worked very well in the classroom and could also work in reviews for PL Mag, etc. and Challenge (which is also read by teachers, etc.)

Finally, we may briefly consider the long term consequences of this kind of attack on bourgeois culture. In the twenties and thirties, proletarian literature (literature written from a revolutionary, working class viewpoint) did not arise out of thin air. It grew up in an atmosphere in which sustained attacks had been launched against key figures in bourgeois literature. Proletarian literature, it can be shown, is the beginning of the creation of a working class culture; and, like a working class government, and a working class party, it begins not with a few ~~people~~ people deciding to "create" it, but in the midst of attacks on the old order. Working class culture, in fact, is the negation of bourgeois culture.

There are some, of course, who view the creation of this culture as an impossibility. (Trotsky, c.g., in Literature and Revolution.)

There are others who view a "peoples'" culture as the natural result of deep-set nationalist feelings. (The revisionistsx.)

The fact is, however, that a revolutionary working class culture can be created and has been started in many places, including the U.S.

Lastly, we may remark that beginning ~~this~~ work does not depend on exhorting ourselves and our friends to begin it. Without showing a way to win, we can hardly expect anyone to jump into it feet first. It is also important to stress that this beginning is ~~the~~ only the first step in a very long struggle which, as we have seen from numerous examples, lasts a long time past the x working class revolution.

Fighting Male Chauvinism on the Job

The article "Political Economy of Male Chauvinism" in the Feb. '71 PL mag correctly described how the ideology of chauvinism is used to maintain the super-exploited position of women workers, and women who work in the home but receive no wages for their labor. Our party has used the figure of \$22 billion as the difference between wages earned by black and white workers to illustrate the concrete economic gains of the bosses due to racism. The Feb. '71 article points out that the bosses steal \$91.2 billion due to male-female wage differentials (these figures gained from not very accurate govt. statistics, so the reality is much worse). But yet, on the whole, our party has done little to specifically fight the oppression of women workers. I am not equating racism with male chauvinism. The ruling class may be able to foment physical fighting between working people of different races and nationalities. This is not the way they will continue to use male chauvinism. Nonetheless, I agree with the comment in bulletin #3: the fight against the oppression of women is absolutely necessary to win the fight for socialism.

We need to have much more discussion within the party and with study groups of non-party people of why it is necessary to defeat chauvinism. Obviously our lack of action in this area reflects that we are not won to it ideologically. We are usually quite conscious of the need to raise anti-racist ideas in all our struggles: we should make the same effort to raise anti-chauvinist ideas. We are depriving our party and all fighting organizations of working people of a great many more fighters and leaders by not taking the problem of male chauvinism with the seriousness it merits.

Specifically we should:

1. Launch fights on the job to improve the conditions of women workers - equal pay for equal work, preferential hiring and upgrading of womenworkers, paid maternity leaves

2. More involvement with working class women around such issues as cutting of federal funds for child care centers, closing of maternity wards at many hospitals

3. In all of our work, 30 for 40 campaign, etc., clearly and consistently point out the need for women to join the fight in order to win and the need to defeat all forms of male chauvinism.

4. All study groups should include discussions of male chauvinism - perhaps raising such questions as what has been the attempt and/or successes in fight chauvinism in major working class struggles, revolutions, other M/L parties? What role have women played in labor history?

5. Struggle, by example, against some of the gross chauvinism that goes on in many job situations (pornographic mags, pictures that get passed around on the job,; chauvinist jokes; chauvinist remarks made to women workers). On this point men comrades (and women) have said - "well, you can't be square about everything. I'll just end up totally isolated if I oppose every little remark that gets made." In answer I say - 1) is male chauvinism just some "little" problem, or is it a major obstacle to defeat in order to win socialism? 2) You don't have to give a lecture on the subject every time a remark is made, but you do need to have serious discussions about chauvinism with fellow workers. Mainly, they will come to see what we mean by our examples. We would not allow "little" racist remarks to continue without criticism.

6. More struggle to involve spouses of workers we meet on the job. Win our fellow workers to fighting aspects of male chauvinism in their personal relationships (and ourselves, too!)

I think too often when we do discuss male chauvinism in terms of our work on the job, we limit the discussion to the economic oppression of women. Of course, this aspect is the key way the ruling class profits from female-male division. But it is very important to discuss the entire range of chauvinist ideology with fellow workers. Especially that chauvinism hurts men, too - not just by keeping wages down for the entire working class, but by the tremendous pressures working class men have to live under. They are expected to be "strong", be the decision makers, be totally responsible for the economic condition of their family, be in control, the authoritative figure. Men and women are thus kept from being true partners in their relationships. They cannot share their responsibilities, hopes, ideas, and experiences. They are kept from fulfilling each other's emotional needs and are put in the position of being only a compliment to each other rather than true comrades. Parent-child relationships are also stunted.

Holly Wenger,
Los Angeles

34

1204 Burnett Ave.
Ames, Iowa 50010
May 20, 1973

Dear Challenge:

I was sorry to see Challenge uncritically reprint material from UNITA about the struggle against Portuguese imperialism in Angola (Challenge, May 17).

UNITA is correct when it says that only people's war under revolutionary leadership will defeat Portugal. But is UNITA really carrying out this line?

UNITA's claim to have liberated 1,000,000 Angolans is a success that lives only in UNITA press bulletins. Though UNITA does have small guerilla zones, its influence is small compared with the MPLA, whose liberated zones in eastern Angola have a population of several hundred thousand. (There are a number of books out now of first-hand accounts by American and European radicals of journeys through MPLA-liberated territory which verify MPLA's claims.)

The other side of UNITA's wild claims of success is its systematic distortion of MPLA's position. Far from wanting to "reform colonialism," or "reach a negotiated settlement," MPLA takes the position that only protracted war will defeat imperialism.

The real situation of UNITA is more likely this: having failed politically and militarily inside Angola in 1966-68, UNITA has increasingly adopted a Chinese-style rhetoric to cover up its failure, and to give itself some reason for continued existence as an organization. This rhetoric, despite some Chinese aid, has not been matched by much real achievement.

What should be our attitude towards MPLA if UNITA's charges are false? Though MPLA is carrying out a determined struggle against the Portuguese, we cannot ignore MPLA's weaknesses any more than UNITA's (or our own). (This point needs to be emphasized because many in the American left have tried to treat third world revolutionary organizations, especially those engaged in war, as though they could do no wrong.) First, MPLA is only slowly becoming an explicitly revolutionary socialist movement; MPLA began as a united front against the Portuguese. Its ideas about what kind of free Angola it wanted to build were vague at first. But its development of a Marxist outlook has been steady. Its leader, Agostinho Neto, has been quoted as saying that Angola must become socialist, and that a party is being developed to carry on political struggle.

Second, MPLA's connections with the USSR may be dangerous. MPLA receives aid from the USSR and China, and we know through experience that this may be used as leverage to force the MPLA to some settlement which happens to suit Soviet foreign policy.

35

Clearly, MPLA must retain an independent communist outlook and base of support in order to continue its own political development, to defeat Portugal, and to build socialism in Angola. We can help MPLA do this by giving it our support.

We in the United States can help materially by opposing U.S./NATO aid to Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia; and by supporting the boycott of Gulf Oil (a big economic proposition of Portugal and South Africa).

Steven Hitt

To the PLP Pre-Convention Bulletin: Some comments on the articles on Culture in Bulletin #5.

Recently I received a copy of Bulletin #5 from Eric Johnson. I found the Johnson & Brill article, "For Launching Cultural Work," PP. 2-8, an excellent history, analysis, and finally proposal for carrying out cultural work. It's concrete, accurate, and bold. Especially important, I think, is the point J.& B. make about the necessity and inevitability of art: "Crystallizing essence, expressing on many planes, reaching the wellsprings of the species, giving back to us the meanings of our lives. What meanings? In whose service? That is the line of battle. Tear down the insidious exploitation of art by the ruling class, and fight for the creation of an art that gives back TRUE meanings, the reality of class struggle, to the people." (PP. 3&4).

Now, I've been out of the party for a year and a half. I assume, going by what J.&B. are saying, that while, for example, members and friends in scientific circles are winning support for anti-Shockley resolutions, or that while student members and friends, as at UCLA, produce a reasonable and convincing attack on psycho-surgery, that "pragmatic tolerance" is still the "un-stated line or bias" within the party, ~~XXXXXX~~ toward cultural work. If so, this is bad.

I was more shocked to read now, than at the time it happened, of the desire of some people to burn copies of WEAPON magazine that had been sent to the west coast. I more or less gave up writing poetry and other literary pursuits after that dreary episode, described accurately by J&B, for many of the reasons they outline. As with others, I'm sure this was a real waste of some big assets we had. Many did become superworkers of one kind or another because it was seen as a higher form of production than one's writing, painting or whatever. But I can see now that my quitting poetry (1965-1972) was an utter drawback, particularly during my three years at Columbia Univ. We helped spark a major student rebellion there and I recorded nothing of it. Likewise, during sixty days in jail two years ago in LA, during Attica. Poems came and went; my rationalization as "organizer" prevailed. What foolishness! I'm finally back to writing again, and hope to be published not to become a moneybags from it but because I think the various experiences of our class should be as widely exposed as possible. I'm distributing TRA (Toward Revolutionary Art), a left literary magazine, because I think it's positive and necessary, an attempt at least to organize and expose the work of pro-working class artists (poets, fiction writers, critics, muralists, singing groups, etc.). Hopefully it will last, ~~grow~~ grow, and become an influence on up and coming artists.

J&B's point about ex-Catholics hating the church the most is ~~qx~~ quite true. In my case, I either gave away or left behind at various vacated apartments a small but excellent library of my main ~~interest~~ literary interest, contemporary U.S. poetry. In effect, I did the same thing some of the west coast members had wanted to do to WEAPON mag in 1965, to my own library, two years later. Right now, when I'm planning a series of brief essays, working class analyses of various U.S. poets, I'll have to rely on what I can get at the LA public library. Not disastrous, but ridiculous when you think about it. Another example of this attitude was when a poet friend in NYC asked me to give a reading with him as part of a cultural series at St. Mark's Church on the Lower East Side. This was

while I was at Columbia, in '69. I consented mostly out of loyalty to my friend. The reading drew 30 or so people, we read somewhat political stuff, and felt from the response that it had been a modest success. So, we planned to do one at Columbia. The date we picked turned out to fall right during an SDS National Council meeting, which I was obliged to attend, and the reading was dropped. Now, I felt then and still feel that the victory of pro-working class and anti-racist politics over anarchism and madness within SDS was some of the best work PL has done. But my point is that surely there was a more balanced approach.

I feel that the article in #5 which follows J&B's, "Class struggle in Culture: Develop the Line, Enter the Battle," actually runs counter to the J&B article. The titles and general goals appear to be similar, but I feel this article (P.9), without intending to, becomes a positive roadblock to getting this work going. ~~Its~~ Its list of questions for study, while rigorously scientific, broad, many-sided, etc., is without meaning and in fact intimidating if there is no working context in various cultural fields. It's like a list of questions for a course in school. It's intimidating in that if you feel we've got to study all these questions, and then see where we're at and chart a course of action, you miss the importance of plunging in now. If people followed this curriculum, we would all die of either boredom or old age by the time we worked it all out. J&B propose clubs, actual forces to dig in and begin, with whatever is at hand. In Frisco, 1500 people coming to a poetry reading (Bach Mai benefit) is a stunning "whatever"! ~~Points~~ Points 4,6, and 7 in J&B's article, P.8, form the core of a bold program PL ought to adopt. The second article doesn't pick up on the urgency. A PL songbook and articles on cultural questions in PL mag are not nearly what is called for.

I think the situation the J&B paper is aiming to rectify is a little like the ideal socialist country, at least potentially. I see an analogy. The country is ruled by workers, led by an ML party; the masses are armed; politics is the guide, the economy is subject to workers' needs and not a privately accumulated surplus; etc. etc.; except that it trades with South Africa. PL is going ahead in TU work with the great 30 for 40 campaign, attacking racism and its mouth-pieces on campuses, redeploying concretely and intelligently. But it maintains, at best, "pragmatic tolerance" to cultural work. Since one side always wins a fight, the good (the main aspects of PL's work) ~~things~~ things will either swamp this bad thing, or the underlying causes of the bad thing will ~~grow~~ grow like a cancer and kill the good. This is why the Johnson & Brill position should be widely read, discussed, and in my opinion, adopted.

Sincerely, and with best wishes to the convention!

Roger Taus

PS. AS I said, I'm writing poems again, hopefully good working class poetry. If anyone is interested in reading a sample of six or so poems from the book I'm getting together, please let me know at 1739 Lucretia Ave., LA, Calif., 90026, including your address and an 8 cent stamp. After reading them, any ~~comebacks~~ comebacks, criticism, enjoyments, advice, questions, etc. would also be welcome.

Dear C-D,

38

All during the Vietnam war, there was much talk and sympathy for the POW's. Nixon cited them as one of his reasons for continuing the war, and the release of the American prisoners was supposedly a relief for the American people, because they were American servicemen coming home. Recently, they have released stories of torture and cruelty in an effort to gain public sympathy. How should workers and students react? I think we should take a very strong stand against these creeps. Almost all of the POW's are ~~effe~~ officers; they are not draftees, they are career people who wanted to be in the military and had to work hard to become and stay pilots. Most important of all, why were these men captured? They were flying bombing missions over Vietnam. Nixon et al ordered the bombing, and these bastards carried it out. They are mass murderers, flying fascists, the Luftwaffe. These guys have slaughtered thousands and have defoliated hundreds of acres of land. Should we pity them? Hell no! They should have been shot!

They complain about "torture". What about the suffering they inflicted on Vietnamese peasants and workers? The only reason the POW's were kept alive was so that Hanoi could have a bargaining tool with which to sell out the workers fight to throw ~~o~~ US imperialism out of SE Asia. And for all those pilots and associated ^{racist} murderers who were killed in prison camps or in the skies, I say that the internat'l working class is all the better for it.

Why is it then that some people feel we should support the POW's? It is a question of racism. The govt is saying that the lives of this elite corps is worth more than ~~than~~ the lives of the murdered Vietnamese. ~~They~~ This racist garbage explains some people's concern with American lives and lack of concern with Vietnamese lives. ~~We have to fight these bourgeois ideas~~ ^{racist ideas} ~~because~~ These ~~are~~ ^{are} the ~~same~~ ^{same} ~~ideas~~ ^{ideas} that justify the racist employment and racist unemployment in the US. The govt pushed racism in order to divide American/Vietnamese workers and black and

white American workers. We ^{all} have to unite against these racist bosses ~~in~~ order to put an end to their racist killings.

39

(40)

PLP MEMBERS: DON'T VOTE FOR MCGOVERN OR ANY BOSSES,
ORGANIZE TO THROW THEM OUT!!

The bulletin # 2 article calling for the party to adopt the line "Vote for McGovern", smacks of revisionism., Let's look at the evidence.

Although the article points out that the party should put forward its line BOLDLY in united fronts, specifically the McGovern campaign, it then states that we should do this by changing our line to "Vote for McGovern". With this approach, we'll never make a revolution!

First, this is absolutely contradictory to the party line. How can we win people over to destroy the bosses, including rat McGovern when we put forward voting for them? That suggests that if we change our politics, people will like us better and we'll win them over easier. To what? Not to revolution! The only way our party has ever won anyone over is through struggle. Changing our partyline is an excuse for ~~not~~ not struggling with people and avoids the key task of the party - building a mass revolutionary movement in this country.

Voting for McGovern is not in the interests of the working class.. It is probably true that if McGovern had been elected the objective situation in this country may have been somewhat different, but our politics ~~is~~ would have been the same. That's becuz at McGovern's hands workers would still suffer and the only way to end it, is by ~~our party's ideas~~ putting our party's ideas into ACTION. Also, even though McGovern wasn't elected, illusions people have about him are being smashed by his actions(ie. Wounded Knee, Nixon-Watergate, etc). Furthermore, encouraging people ~~to~~ to vote for him would only

(41)

22222 Dont vote for McGovern cnt.

build more illusions about how to get things won in this country.

What is our aim- to put bosses in a bind, so they'll be forced to give working people "crumbs"? OR...to make a revolution and wipe them out(put them in a permanent bind)? As communists ~~at~~ right now, we've been involved in many mass reform struggles and won ~~crumbs~~ ^{Some things} by forcing the bosses to make concessions. Our goal reaches far beyond this, so why not struggle with people and win them to revolution, rather than fight for crumbs ~~alone~~ ^{that will be taken away as long as the bosses are in power.}

The article states that "McGovern's presidency would ~~help~~ the party to win over millions of workers and students to our line- people who won't listen to us now", and then offers a quote from Lenin's Left Wing Communism and Infantile Disorder to support this idea. They're both wrong and so was Mao when he proposed "land to the Tiäner". It's like saying that before the people can see a need for revolution they have to see McGovern for what he really is- Nixon's twin, OR that the people are too stupid to understand revolution, so they need various forms of capitalism first in order to grasp these ideas. This represents contempt for the people and an unwillingness on our part to struggle with them. The working class is getting attacked more sharply by the day, and they know who the culprits are - the bosses.

What the working class really need is a communist party- PLP, not an organized drive to elect McGovern(or any boss) for president. This is the real weapon they can use to fight these rotten guys until they're in their graves and the dictatorship of the proletariat exists!

42

The international relations of "Red" China are a reflection of that country's internal class struggle. When the left forces are actively leading masses of people, the right forces become "left". The opportunism of the right should be seen a short time after the left advances.

A factor that points the above out even more clearly is that China is basically a self-sufficient country. It can survive without making deals with the capitalists. This may not be true for some countries, such as Cuba. The people in China led by the left forces improved the general standard of living and health, built up the economy, and took the concepts of socialism to a social reality as yet to be surpassed. This was all accomplished in isolation from the U.S. and its allies, also while expelling Soviet technicians and in ideological dispute with the USSR.

The periods in which class struggle was intense were 1947-50, 55-56, 58-59, 66-68. PL magazine vol.8 no.3 goes into detail as to the form that those struggle took. Generally speaking the right forces defended alliances with the bourgeoisie and their ideas, while the left tried to expropriate the bourgeoisie and smash their ideas.

1947-50

It was during this period that China defeated the Nationalists and drove the American armies from the Yalu.

1951-55

In this period armistice negotiations were opened with the U.N. Co-existence signed with India. China attended the sellout of the Vietnamese in Geneva. Chou En-Lai attends the Bandung Conference of "third world" nations in which he asks for co-existence with U.S.

1955-57

China rejects U.S. proposals on Taiwan. China proposes U.S. cultural exchange. I don't think that the Collectivization struggle was as sharp as that of Land Reform, The Great Leap, or The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. In the 1955-56 period the foreign relations of China were ambivalent and the right showed pretty much of a free hand.

43

1958-60

During the time of the Great Leap Forward ambassadorial talks with the U.S. were suspended. Quemoy Islands shelled. There were border incidents with India. The USSR and US form an entente against China at Camp David. Soviet Technicians were withdrawn from China.

1961-65

In these years the dispute with the Soviet Union grew more intense. There was a border conflict with India. The key to this period is the fact that China said little and did nothing, while Vietnam was invaded by the U.S.

1966-68

Rejected 1954 treaty on Vietnam. Condemns U.S. Imperialism and Soviet Revisionism. Recalled all its ambassadors and had practically no foreign relations during the height of the GPCR. The lack of foreign relations is proof of the intensity of the class struggle. During the height of the American class struggle in the '60's the ruling class was forced to keep at home parts of its overseas armies, ex. the Detroit rebellion. The left rejected dealings with the capitalists countries, the right was forced to reply in order to save their necks. The right used the PLA not in Vietnam, but against the Red Guard.

The party is now paying more attention to international work and this work is to be one of the main concerns of the upcoming convention. I feel that we should do several things.

I. Follow the example set by the left in China, Have no dealings with governments and offer comradely criticism of communist movements and their mass work.

The left reject the concept of "socialist Diplomacy" but called for revolutionary communism. The more intense the struggle the less possibility for diplomacy. The left in China gave criticism to the Vietnamese communists and their mass work. This does not mean any one calling themselves a communist we should devote time to.

(44)

2. Asks our comrades in Canada and Puerto Rico to drop the names of their nations from the title of their organizations.
Canadian Party of Labor Puerto Rican Socialist League
3. Form Closer relations with the Canadian Party of Labor and the Puerto Rican Socialist League with the view of forming an International .
4. Continue to make contacts with mass movements overseas. More importantly to relate to and receive from communist organization experience and advice in aiding mass work.

We in the U.S. can not organize overseas, apparently we had trouble just contacting workers in Britain. If there is to be communist leadership given it must be based in that country. I feel we should contact communists in order for them to help us and us them to become a mass organization.

Self-Criticism

1. The paper is general and vague.
2. Application to our situation is sparse.
3. The proposals may be left sectarian
4. The proposals were written without detailed study of the existing international situation of the communist movement.

(45)

San Francisco, 1973

Potential party members group

Guide for discussions of individual work

1. How are you working with the party now? Why is this work something you want to do? if not this, then what do you see yourself doing politically?

2. Do you help build the struggle you are in? How? Do you help build the party? How?

3. What do the people you are working with think of your politics? What do they think of the party? What do family and friends you are not working with in a political struggle think of your involvement with the party and the party's line?

4. How do you use Challenge and other party lit? How do you think improvements can be made regarding the lit and your use /selling of it? How do you support the party's work financially? Do you have any ideas for raising more money?

5. What is the main thing you should improve or work on such as your understanding of the party's line, commitment, basebuilding, boldness, timidity, individualism, racism, anti-communism, or whatever before making a commitment to join the party?

(46)

SF....1973

Party leadership group

Guide for discussions of individual cadre

1. Why should you be in this group?

2. How do you feel about the perspective you have now? What about any longer range perspective? Do these perspectives enable you to best carry out the line of the party as far as you are willing to do and capable of doing?

3. Do you feel you are doing as much as you can? If not, what is the main obstacle?

4. Is there a conflict between the so-called personal life such as school, family, non-active friends, striving for success, etc. and giving more leadership to the mass work and therefore the party? If so, how is it resolved?

5. How do you use Challenge and other party lit? What improvements can be made regarding the lit and your use/selling of it? How do you support the party's work financially? Do you have any ideas for raising more money?

6. Have you helped to win anyone to the work of the party or to the party itself? Why or why not?

7. In relation to #1, what specifically do you think you can give more leadership to in the next few months?..a study-action group, mass work, club, C-D, (selling, articles, \$\$), or something else?

47' section S.F. Student Discussion #1 Challenge-Desafio

May 22 pre-conv discussion-

1. Most criticisms of the rhetoric stem from political disagreements with the line being put forward. Do we overcome this by toning down the line (which is essentially meant by "rhetoric")? People will only be "turned-off" with the line if we don't discuss it with them. Sometimes this may take the form of getting a PL mag and discussing the issue in greater depth than the C-D article does. Most political differences won't disappear with one talk... at least we know more about the line ourselves and especially the ideas of our friend who has a political disagreement.

2. The SF State student club hasn't seen the need to write any articles in a while. Why is this? We're not looking at our work in the perspective we should be. How is the anti-racist movement going to grow if we don't write and analyze the strengths and weaknesses of our ad campaign. I'm sure an article on this successful struggle would be an encouragement to other SDS chapters. This is just one action, there has been others which articles should have been written for. More discussion on the role of a communist newspaper, especially at this particular time, seems in order. The UC club has contributed articles, but has not used these articles as an organizing tool for building SDS and the work in general. Again, this stems, it seems, from looking at the paper in a non-political way.

Writing articles would force us to look at our work in a more political way. We would have to sit down and think about the issue involved in a critical manner, it should help the work.

3. Why aren't we getting contacts from the paper? about two-thirds of the clubs are selling between 40-50 C-D's an issue. We can be fairly mass about the paper but we haven't seen the need to improve the quality of our sales. This would mean making political contacts for the party. ~~and communist ideas~~ Putting leaflets inside the paper when an event is coming up, either SDS or the party, might be a step in the right direction. We seem to be afraid of the line of the paper, its more advanced than ours on some issues, or we may disagree with an article, etc., but the main reason we ~~felt~~ holding us back from discussing the issue in more depth, hence, possibly making contacts, was our internal lack of discussion on issues raised in C-D. This weakness could be overcome in club meetings and would make our approach less ~~mechanical~~ mechanical when we sell.

4. We could get rid of an old issues by having a once-a-week- or twice- a-month stale paper day, where we could give away the previous weeks edition. This would not only unclutter our homes and cars, but would get every issue out to people we normally wouldn't reach.

5. We felt there was a lack of discussion at the club meetings around our base, in relation to what they felt about C-D and communist ideas in general. We felt it was necessary to sit down, hopefully once an issue, with people were trying to win to the party (which we haven't been doing) and discuss an article with them we feel would be of most interest to them. At future club meetings this would give us concrete feedback as to how our ideas are being received and what the political questions our base has about our line. Club leaders should insure this type of discussion be carried out. This should begin to improve the quality of the clubs base building, etc. Club meeting should also discuss why so and so hasn't got a sub yet...this we would at least have an idea about since we would have been taking to them about Challenge in a consistent way. Perhaps a club affair centered around "Watergate" or the death sentence for killer cops, etc. would focus on C-D in a more political way.

6. In general, we all liked C-D the way it was. Perhaps more in depth articles giving an analysis on the genesis of fascism, such as was done with Watergate, would make the criticisms of the paper or article more political and would reduce the "rhetoric comments." Most of those who were selling less attributed it to their fear of people than the layout of a particular issue.

(48)

Summary of Challenge Discussion of 30 Apr 40 section meeting May 22

Culture Club Pre-conv.

1. Accuracy as political question - Much discussion centered around the current issue, particularly the Met Life article, where the events were reported wrong. 200 workers didn't attend the meeting, and walk off their jobs. In short it ^{written} seemed the article had been changed to sound more militant. ^{wasn't the main question - the article factually was wrong.} Many questions arose. Isn't this the role of Challenge - to make articles as militant as possible? Sure, but does that mean you exaggerate? Isn't the reality of the class struggle, with a communist line, enough? Do we have too many articles with a "rah rah rah" approach? Is the "rah rah" approach what we mean by ^{the} paper is a agitational tool? This discussion wasn't really resolved.

2. Challenge presents a vanguard line - already pointed out in bulletins, but at our meeting there was an addition - Challenge often presents vanguard line even for people in the party.

3. Involvement in production of Challenge - we discussed the need to see Challenge more in terms of building the party - using it more on jobs, to meet people, to involve others and ourselves in writing and helping to think about the paper's content.

4. Debate around cartoons - they don't say enough, the captions are too short. Criticism of the Mao-K. singer cartoons - do they really win people to our line on RR III, or do they not really point out how Mao is revisionist, or how China has sold out.

The main discussion, was the first point. People pointed out that wrong facts in an article can hurt the work, both of the Party, and the mass movement. It seems agitation is viewed incorrectly as exaggerating rather than putting forward bold communist line with a lot of class-hatred. One comrade mentioned that if the Met article had just pointed out that lunchtime was in general a good time to reach masses of other workers, this would be useful and helpful to readers of Challenge elsewhere who are trying to organize on the job.

One of the main arguments was - use reality with a communist analysis - it's the bosses who have to lie and twist the facts, and exaggerate, not that we do this intentionally.

To sum it up, there were a lot of questions. Few answers. Many tactical suggestions for improvement of the paper (better layout, clearer, more stuff like the Watergate expose etc) These could be written up too.

Eddie Brill

Bay Area TU Section (49) May 22 - pre-conv.

Challenge has both Analytical and struggle-reporting articles.

a) Do the TU struggle articles belong in Challenge?

Could be in a Union Paper because do not tie directly into the fight for socialism. However, we do not have that kind of influence in Union papers now, so actual reportage of a struggle is an important part of Challenge.

b) Are in the WAM paper. Is the WAM paper different from Challenge? As Wam grows party will not necessarily guarantee the politics in the paper, but we can determine the politics of Challenge. Any organization needs a newsletter or similar written paper to reach out to new people and present the organization.

c) The reportage struggle articles will change as our influence in the class struggle changes and as we improve in ability to relate our analysis to specific struggles. The way challenge is written reflects members weaknesses in presenting our ideological outlook.

What is in these reportage articles and how could they be better?

a) analysis of strengths and weaknesses, self-criticism ie XRAY Tech article in this issue.

a) a communist viewpoint? some discussion of what this is.

c) raises the level of struggle no matter what level it is at.

d) show how socialism connects to day to day struggle. Reflect the ideas in RR III. This does not mean a formula paragraph at the end of the article saying we need the d of p.

Some specific criticisms.

a) articles combine to be a service or information such as article about the Emergency Room ie how to do it under capitalism but do not contain ideas for a collective struggle for changing medical conditions.

b) articles get changed. negative aspects of the struggle get removed by the editorial staff. strength of the struggle get exaggerated. facts get changed. People felt that some of this was a result of understaffing and rush with late articles (things we could change out here. BUT people also felt that some of it was a result of editorial policy in NYC ed board.

c) more international news.

d) style - while some of readers objections to style are based in political disagreements, some of it is accurate criticism of the use of rhetoric without explanation.

people felt more care and collective discussion had to go into writing article to take care of this.

Role of Challenge

a) it is a package which presents the party to people. Thus can't just take one article and say the balance of reportage and analysis is misleading.

b) present struggles around the country to defeat isolation

c) present party's analysis to people who are not in personal contact with the party. this should increase as party grows in influence.

d) effect the mass movement. this is why it is a mass communist paper.

e) reflects ideas in RR III because it is put out by the whole party, not just by a professional staff.

(50) TU section (cont.)

Proposals:

- a) -sell on the job. follow up in clubs. this will make people come concerned about what is in the paper because they will have to defend it on a daily basis. will help to increase party participation in writing for the paper and increase influence of paper among workers/
- b) proposal by editorial board
 - 1) leadership write more and be responsible by example and by ~~spending~~ spending time for increasing the seriousness in attitude towards writing for challenge. ~~articles~~ preparing content of challenge should be of higher political importance.
 - 2) clubs discuss articles, then a couple of people write them. talk about articles in between club meetings.
 - 3) people with special interests or special areas of knowledge be encouraged to write regularly for the paper. this is not professionalism but rather giving the paper priority.
 - 4) editorial board of the Area be more political and not just a transmission belt to NYC. More discussion with these who wrote the article

All summaries were written by 1 or 2 people from each section meeting - other struggles and comments are encouraged -

(51)

WHAT ARE THE KEY DEMANDS IN THE SCHOOLS?

Many in the teachers workshop at the WAM convention argued that 30/40 is the key demand for teachers, and should be the focus of our work in the schools. Specifically, we would, according to their argument, demand a four period day plus two preparation periods. We would continue to fight for smaller classes and other issues but the four period day would be our main demand and focus. I think this is incorrect for the following reasons.

30/40 as the #1 demand for teachers is economist: In almost every other industry 30/40 is clearly the answer to the most pressing needs of the workers in that job. In auto, hospitals, grocery stores, the big problems are accidents, speed-up, ineffective unions, racism toward minority workers - all point directly to a shorter working day. And in all these situations the fight against racism is an implicit result of the campaign for 30/40 - one which is inherent in the campaign, but which the party must point out consciously. In all these cases 30/40 is, in fact, the most unifying demand because it brings together employed and unemployed and all races. The political lessons are there for the Party to point out.

In the schools this is not the case. A shorter day for teachers will not attack the key problem in the schools which is racism - not toward the teachers, but toward the students. Think about it - what's the most horrible thing about the schools. Teachers are overworked, of course, but the big, brutal thing is racism - in curriculum discipline, overcrowding, lack of skills being taught - everything.

Up to now our strategy in the schools has been a paren-teacher alliance to fight racism. We are pursuing that strategy in the AFT leading toward rank and file control of the union.

(52)

Making 30/40 for teachers the primary demand represents an abandonment of that strategy. Even if parents are concerned that teachers are overworked, they are not as likely to get involved in a campaign for a shorter day for teachers as they will in something which will also help their kids directly. And we had better not forget that if we don't organize parents, the ruling class will (remember Canarsie).

Of course, some may argue that there is no necessary contradiction between 30/40 for teachers and fighting racism in the schools. This is true - but as a party we will focus on one or the other. In auto we focus on 30/40 and also fight racism. In universities we focus on racism and also raise 30/40. So what's it going to be in the schools?

There can only be two possible reasons for abandoning the parent-teacher alliance and the fight against racism as our main strategy. One is the opportunist argument that it won't work and we can't win anti-racist demands, and the other is the sectarian argument that education can't be improved under capitalism, so we might as well demand things that are good for teachers as workers and forget the kids. In case these arguments are not clearly wrong, let me take them apart.

Some Arguments for 30/40 as the #1 demand for teachers are opportunist: Some people in the workshop argued that we have not succeeded in winning demands for lower class-size or in forging a parent-teacher alliance; therefore, our current strategy is incorrect. This is not true. In East Harlem, this year, a parent-teacher boycott won anti-racist demands. In S.F. a group of 100 parents and teachers at one Junior High won some demands and laid the basis for the existing union caucus. And obviously some of our brothers and sisters at sometime won smaller class size, because we don't have 70 kids in each class anymore which was the situation at the turn of the century.

Some Arguments for 30/40 as the #1 demand for teachers are sectarian: Other people argued that teachers are workers, and we can't be good teachers under capitalism, so if we don't demand 30/40 we are being missionaries fighting for other

(53)

people instead of ourselves. Since when is fighting racism a missionary thing? We want kids to learn basic skills and that is possible under capitalism. That's the reason workers demanded public schools in the first place. We want workers' children (including our own) to learn to read and so do most teachers.

Where does that leave us? Does that mean we must either make missionary demands for children or economist demands for teachers? Of course not. There actually are demands which help both teachers and students materially. Primary among these are lower class size, bilingual programs and reading programs, because they create more jobs, fight racism, help kids learn skills, and decrease the work load (hence the hours) for employed teachers.

A four period day is also a good demand. But it's not the best or primary demand to make.

S.F. Experience: I would like to cite some of our experiences in S.F. over the past year as evidence that the "Fight racism - ally with parents - take over the union" strategy can work. A caucus in San Francisco which is not led by the Party, but has one party person as a member has the following program: 1) Fight more vigorously, throughout the year, for trade-union issues, 2) Fight for educational demands, such as reading programs, 3) Ally with parents, 4) Union democracy. They brought up their program in various resolutions throughout the year, suggesting community meetings, rank and file strike preparations, specific additions to the Master Contract which would fight racism, etc. They were opposed by the union leadership consistently. When negotiations time came, the teachers of S.F. voted against a strike. The caucus supported the pro-strike resolution critically, saying we should strike against the board, but neither the rank and file nor the community had been sufficiently involved in preparation. Position papers and speeches made by the caucus received tremendous support and in the union elections which followed the next week members of the caucus were elected to 4 executive board seats, 2 labor council seats and various convention delegate positions. This is a very respectable history for an 8-month old caucus, and its program is not inconsistent with the Party's strategy.

54

Two other Party members helped organize a Substitute Caucus, which is separate from but cooperates with the caucus of regular teachers mentioned above. The Substitute Caucus ran its candidates on four issues: smaller classes to improve education and create jobs; minority hiring (new minority teachers to be hired in proportion to the number of minority students in the school system- about 65%); fewer teaching periods (4 period day); and salary parity for substitutes. We emphasized the first two issues - class size to create jobs and minority hiring-in all our campaign literature and issued a pamphlet explaining these issues. On the basis of this campaign there are 25-30 substitutes active in the caucus and 50-75 who came out to vote for our candidates (This is out of a total vote - subs and regular teachers- of 400). Those in the substitute caucus have been involved in several discussions of minority hiring and a parent-teacher alliance, and most are prepared to fight for these issues in union meetings and committee meetings. The existence of a large group of mostly white substitutes, who want jobs and see minority hiring and class size as unifying demands, is a political advance over what the situation would have been if we had primarily raised the demand for less teaching periods. People agreed with this demand, but they would have advanced very little in their political understanding of racism or the need for demands which unify us with parents. Regular teachers also seemed to agree with this platform and several ^{sub caucuses} candidates were elected to convention delegate positions on the basis of it. One of the successful factors in this caucus, I believe, was a flexible attitude. We did not make any issue a do-or-die question. If people had rejected the minority hiring demand we would have remained in the caucus, and would have raised it as an independent Party position, but we did focus quite a bit of attention on the anti-racism discussion.

55

Also, the historic development of most unions has been around the shorter week. This is not true of the teacher's union - the C.P. won control of the N.Y. teacher's union on the issues of class-size and unemployed teachers, and the Chicago union was organized to fight for wages & class-size

^(as the #1 demand)
30/40 for teachers is mechanical: In addition to all the political arguments given above, there is one remaining argument against making 30/40 the focus in the schools. It seem to me that the argument for 30/40 for teachers arose more out of an effort to make the work in the schools "fit in" with the rest of the T.U. strategy than out of an analysis of the real situation in the schools.

There is a substantial question in my mind as to whether a four period day is actually the equivalent of 30/40. The proponents of this position have said that less teaching periods equals 30/40 while smaller class size is a demand against speed-up. I'm not sure this is true - a 4 period day means 45 minutes less time in the classroom, but 20 students per class might mean even more in terms of hours spent on bookwork. In addition all sorts of questions arise, such as how do you fit a paid summer vacation into the 30/40 formulation? In San Francisco secondary teachers now work 4 hours per day (5 forty-five minute periods and one fifteen minute homeroom) in the classroom. So what is 30/40 exactly?

In summary, I think we should maintain the "Fight racism - parent-teacher alliance" strategy, and that we should work much harder on pursuing this strategy through developing caucuses in the AFT, working on union committees where no caucus can be developed immediately, initiating struggles in individual schools, and pointing our efforts toward the goal of rank-and-file control of the AFT in the not-too-far-away future. I think we should relate to the national 30/40 strategy in the following ways.

1. In left-center groups where we are active (caucuses, union committees) we should encourage making priority demands of those issues which both fight racism and parallel the 30/40 strategy in effect but not in name (creating more jobs and reducing work-time.) That means that in TAC, ACT or whatever we would say "Let's focus on smaller class-size in the upcoming negotiations." We would not say "Let's have 30/40 for teachers."

56

2. ^{act.} WAM or the Party might issue leaflets or pamphlets demonstrating that teachers actually work 40 or more hours per week, showing how the demands in question (class size, etc.) would reduce these hours, discussing the demands of other workers in the city for a shorter week, and encouraging solidarity on the basis that the effect of both are the same - to fight racism and decrease the amount of work.

3. At the national AFT convention we should make an all-out fight for class-size and other anti-racist demands to be the primary negotiating demands.

4. We should be flexible - and sensitive to the development of mass demands which are consistent with our general strategy.

^{Three} ~~two~~ other discussions need to be carried on in these bulletins - relationship of WAM to teachers, ^{more concrete steps} and how to organize caucuses. ^{or fighting racism,} we will try to contribute to these discussions and hope others will also.

We want to develop a pamphlet on teacher organizing. Please send ideas, materials, etc. to S.F. PLP Please!!!!

K.K.
San Francisco

P.S. None of the above is inconsistent with building WAM, but the concrete steps, and the relationship between this and caucuses should be discussed more specifically, and is the subject for a whole article, by itself.

57

Previous Bulletin articles have stressed the importance of the party taking a serious, long-term approach towards work among intellectuals. This is a step forward. Formerly, this area seems to have been lumped with student work, and as a result people's efforts have been taken up largely with short-term, agitational activity. There has been no real strategy for intellectual work, and this has hurt us.

The work of the intellectuals club in NYC has shown the negative results of this lack of direction. Members of this club have divided their time between (1) supporting SDS activities, convention, etc. and (2) rather directionless activity in various radical caucuses of academics like URPE, Radical Historians etc. We are active on a pragmatic basis, moving from one thing to the next. But the truth is we don't really know what we're doing, and we haven't gotten much leadership on this either.

This leads to several bad developments. First, members of the club have either a very limited base, or else their base is not relevant to party activity. (E.g. although we have raised the anti-racist line in academic caucuses we have no strategy for building the party in these groups.) Second, Challenge sales in the club have fallen to an abysmally low level. And when we do sell, it is usually at party mobilizations, etc., rather than at our schools. Third, though we have set up various study groups we find it difficult to recruit people we are working with. Intellectuals who are friendly to us nevertheless don't see the party as crucially relevant to them.

Here are some suggestions to improve the situation.

(1) Party work among intellectuals and faculty should concentrate on the activities which are in fact crucial to their professional lives. These are principally teaching and research. If we can't offer people some good leadership in these areas they will continue to look on the party as not really relevant to them. They may regard us as friends, but they won't join us. Of course we should continue with our petition campaigns, forums, demonstrations, etc. But it should be obvious by now that these by themselves won't do the trick.

As a very small beginning, we have set up a study group in NYC to do research around such topics as:

- Current Impact of Racist Policies
- Racism in Urban Economic Structure
- History of Intelligence Testing
- Eugenics and Anti-Racist Movements
- Use of Racism in Literature

Our aim is to make this group as broad as possible. If this is successful we would be in a better position for, e.g., the national URPE conference in August. Members of the group could give several presentations in workshops there, and make a proposal for further research centered on anti-racism. Of course, this could be linked to other tactics such as petitions, teach-ins.

58

(2) To give direction to this work we need a national, or at least East and West coast leadership collectives. This work is distinct from the student work and has suffered from being lumped in with it. The leadership collective wouldn't have to meet very frequently, but its existence would make a qualitative difference. In the past, we have done much good intellectual and research work -- in bits and pieces. A reorganization of leadership could make our work much more effective. We could ensure that party members worked seriously in their academic field, rather than becoming political hacks. We could impel many others who may not even know about the party now, to direct their teaching and research towards serving the people.

We can see several examples of the potential influence of the party in this area. At Princeton Prof. Kamin wrote a refutation of Jensen at least partly due to our activity, although he has no organizational ties with us. At Queens a sociology teacher organized an anti-racist teach-in. He doesn't think of himself as a friend of PL -- but again our influence was a factor. To reach and consolidate people like these, we must have a clearer strategic perspective and better leadership.

to the NC

59

June 1, 1973

Comments on the World Economy

In some of its recent literature, the Party appears to be projecting the decline of U.S. imperialism as a continuing process into the future. The word crisis is freely used and the conclusion is reached that the intensification of imperialist rivalry in the coming period must necessarily see the U.S. bosses coming up with the short end of the stick. I believe that this conclusion is incorrect; that the forces and tendencies which brought about the destruction of U.S. hegemony in the world economy also contained the seeds of their own reversal; and, in particular, that the last 2-3 years represent a turning point in this rivalry, i.e., that we have reached a point of relative stabilization in the strengths of the major powers and that in the new period of rivalry now opening, there is no good reason to think that the U.S. is at a fundamental structural disadvantage which would lead to its continuing decline.

The decline up till now in the U.S. share of world markets was the inevitable result of the growth of its rivals from a position of war-time destruction, with all the advantages of the late-comer: the ability to introduce the latest technology, ample supplies of cheap labor, the aftermath of the weakening of the working-class movement, etc. The U.S. share could not fail to decline under these conditions. But it is interesting that its decline was faster, in relative terms, in the 1950s than in the 1960s and that the decline in market shares has now been stopped:

The OECD, in its publication Economic Outlook, Dec. 1972, calculates the degree to which countries have gained or lost in exports as a share of the markets in which they sell. It shows for the U.S. : a decline of 1.8% per year over the period 1960-71, a decline of only 3/4% for 1972, and projects a rise of 2% for 1973, the first such rise in over twenty years. For Germany, it projects no change at all for '73 and for Japan it shows a decline of 1% for 72 and a further decline of 1% for 73. What this means is that the decline of U.S. export performance is at an end. What are the causes of this reversal:

1) one important element has been the rapid inflation in all the developed countries, an inflation which has, on the average, been more serious in Europe and Japan than in the U.S. With 1963= 100, an index of wage cost per unit of output, incorporating the effects both of wage changes and productivity increases, shows for 1971: the U.S. at 111; Japan at 121, Germany at 124, France at 117 and Britain at 142. Accordingly, export prices also show that in recent years the U.S. has held its own with respect to price competitiveness. With 1963 again = 100, an index of consumer prices shows the following for the 3rd quarter of 1972: U.S. 137, Japan 161, France 147 and Germany 135. Over the last two or three years, wages and prices have been rising much faster in Europe and Japan. The main factor here has been the disappearance of some of the highly favorable features (for the bosses) fueling growth in these areas: the drying up of the cheap labor drawn in the Japanese case from agriculture and in the European case from Southern and Eastern Europe (as industrial development accelerates in Spain, Greece, Italy, Yugoslavia, etc., the supply of migrant labor is being reduced), the revitalization of the trade-union movement and the resulting strike waves in countries which had had labor peace since the war, the tremendous pressures from the workers for housing, health care, control of pollution, etc. The German and Japanese "miracles" have dissolved in a storm of inflation.

2) the second important influence on export market shares is the devaluation of the dollar. It is of course true that the devaluation is part of the crisis of the international monetary system created when American hegemony is absolute and, in that sense, it is a symptom of the destruction of that position. But that is only one side of the story. The problem was the elimination of the chronic U.S. balance-of-payments, caused by the combination of the decline of U.S. export surpluses and the continued expansion of U.S. foreign investment and overseas military operations. Europe and Japan wanted a re-trenchment of U.S. investment, not a restoration of the U.S. export surplus through a cheapening of our goods. They resisted devaluation (which was, after all, the same thing as an up-valuation of their currencies) for several years. The devaluation is at one and the same time a symptom of the decline of the U.S. and a use of the continuing power of the U.S. in order to reverse that decline. Its effects are only now starting to be

(60)
felt in world markets. For example, the U.S. balance of merchandise trade was almost in balance in March of this year and most economists expect it once again to swing into surplus as the year proceeds.

But why the concern over exports? After all, as Lenin pointed out, the essence of imperialism is not the export of goods but the export of capital. And in the export of capital, U.S. bosses are still pre-eminent. U.S. direct investments abroad are now approaching \$100 billion in book value. They have been growing steadily since 1960 at a rate of 10% per annum. None of the monetary difficulties of the last few years have slowed that growth. Almost half of the addition to foreign-held assets in any recent year comes from re-investment of earnings and, as a result, puts no pressure at all on the balance-of-payments. Much of the new investment by U.S. foreign affiliates is financed by borrowings from foreign holders of dollars and not by new outflows from the U.S. Between 1966 and 1970 sales of majority-held foreign affiliates of U.S. companies grew by over 60%, while domestic sales of the parent companies rose 32%. GM's OPEL is the largest selling car in Germany. U.S. companies dominate computers in Europe, etc., etc. (All data from various issues of Survey of Current Business)

How does a country finance long-term foreign investments? There are three ways: 1) re-investment of earnings from foreign operations already functioning, 2) net addition to foreign currency holdings through an export surplus and 3) borrowing abroad. The U.S., because it could shape the international monetary system in its own interests after WW II, was able to create a situation in which foreign governments were forced to lend large sums to the U.S. (because they held U.S. dollar bank balances and Treasury securities as their international reserves) which U.S. government and private companies could turn around and use to extend their foreign operations. With the collapse of that system in August 1971, however, it is clear that no country from here on in is going to be able to use that same neat device. Therefore, any country which wants to increase its foreign assets faster than simply by re-investing its earnings (and the U.S. is the only country with high earnings from existing assets) must generate an export surplus. Hence the export of goods is a key expediter of the export of capital. The devaluation of the dollar not only cheapens U.S. exports relative to other countries but raises the dollar value of the foreign-currency receipts of U.S. foreign affiliates, thus offsetting that rise in the dollar cost of foreign assets.

It is necessary, therefore, to examine the likely prospects for the major countries costs and competitiveness. Here, two elements are very important for the coming period: Oil and Food. U.S. dependence on imported fuel will rise substantially over the next decade, putting great pressure on the balance of trade. But Europe and Japan are in the same position (in fact, they are relatively more dependent on imports, despite the North Sea). Moreover, rising incomes and working-class militancy are leading to a tremendous demand for meat in these areas, a demand that can only be met by a substantial increase in imports of meat and feed grains, such as soybeans and corn. Only the U.S. has the agricultural technology and capacity to meet that demand, at steadily rising prices. Thus, while the U.S. balance of trade will be under pressure from the oil problem, Europe and Japan will be under pressure both from oil and from food; and there is good reason to doubt, given that manufactured goods from these countries will have to compete with cheap-labor areas in Asia and Latin America, whether they will be able to generate the kind of export surpluses which will finance massive foreign investment, once they have depleted their existing dollar reserves. (It should also be pointed out that the devaluation wiped out part of the value of the large dollar holdings abroad and therefore liquidated part of the U.S. indebtedness). Just in the last year, U.S. agricultural exports have almost doubled and there is no limit on demand, especially when Russia and China are thrown into the scales, with their growing demands for protein.

A few words about gold. The article on p. 3 of the latest Challenge, argues that the rise in the price of gold on the private market is a significant sign of U.S. weakness. This is not correct. Gold is held and traded not by the major companies but by a small and not very powerful group of middle Eastern sheikhs, etc. The large corporations shift their funds between currencies to hedge against changes in value, not into gold. Most economists expect that the official price of gold (about \$42/ounce) will soon be raised to about the market price, thus ending the split market for gold which has existed since 1968. (This would be a great windfall for the U.S., whose international reserves are held mainly in the form of gold.)

(61)
What counts for inter-imperialist rivalry is the relative values of currencies, not the nominal value of gold, which shifts with respect to all currencies equally. Challenge should not perpetuate any "fetishism" of gold.

What are the fundamental underlying strengths and weaknesses of the major powers? The U.S. still retains a commanding lead in technology in certain key areas. Computer technology is almost a U.S. monopoly and the Japanese are presently buying in to small U.S. computer firms in an attempt to catch up. Space technology gives the U.S. a lead in related areas. (The European nations have just now wound up their space satellite program after 10 years of failure.) International satellite communications is a U.S. monopoly. Recently, General Electric was awarded the contract by the French government to build France's first major nuclear power plant. Increasingly, because of the risks of expropriation of tangible assets, imperialists are going to use new techniques, such as management and technical assistance contracts, royalties, license fees etc. to extract their profits. And it is in these areas that the U.S. has the most decisive advantages.

But what of the revisionist countries. Clearly, the Soviet Union is the major rival to the U.S. for world hegemony and has great ideological and political advantages because of the illusions based on revisionist ideas. (In India, its power rests much more on ideological credibility than on the size of its investments). But the SU will probably be a net capital importer for the coming period, in order to develop its raw materials to the point where it can export to hard-currency areas. In this wide-open area of enormous potential profits, the U.S. bosses have a commanding lead in providing the technology and loans the Russians want. The tremendous size of the international U.S. banking network (which still dwarfs its rivals) enables U.S. finance capitalists to put together massive loans at lower rates of interest than their rivals can achieve. Given the scale of the capital required to develop Soviet oil and gas reserves, the U.S. seems to have a headstart. The large profits which U.S. bosses will earn in Russia (and in China to a lesser extent) will fuel the expansion of their empire everywhere.

I have, of course, emphasized the other side of the phenomena mentioned in Challenge. U.S. bosses do face serious problems of their own, but a treatment which looks only at one participant in the struggle, without examining the position of its rivals, as the Challenge article does, can be seriously mis-leading. I believe that the evidence shows that the decline of the U.S. empire was a transitional phenomenon, resulting from the particular conditions of the post-war world, and that it is wrong, and un-dialectical, to project it into the future in a linear way. Competition will intensify, and the rulers of each and every country will constantly try to suppress the workers attempts to wrest away some of their profits, but we would be mis-leading ourselves and the working-class to anticipate that U.S. bosses must lose in that competition.

In particular, the years of the Nixon administration have seen not a deepening of the crisis but the beginnings of its reversal. His economic policy has been, in my opinion, a great success for the ruling class. (Witness the rise in corporate return to capital since 1970, after 5 years of decline, as shown in the May issue of Fortune). Moreover, I don't feel that economic policy and the state of the Empire provide the key to Watergate, but that is a discussion for another paper.

Comradely,

David Levey

(62)

CRITICISMS OF "WATERGATE" LINE

The analysis of Watergate ~~was~~ made by the Challenge editorial is revisionist. It follows a long line of revisionist "two-center" theories of the state. Although the conclusion drawn in the editorial is correct, the analysis tends to contradict rather than support the conclusion. While the article states that "all bosses are equally bad", the emphasis on "two centers" paves the way for a theory of greater and lesser evil imperialists, on the Chinese model.

The emphasis on "two centers" appears reasonable not because it is strongly supported by the facts (it isn't) but because it appeals to ideas popularized by liberals and revisionists. As we pointed out in RR III, revisionists always overestimate the mechanistic, "purely economic" side of history and underestimate the political. Hence they are given to elaborate theories of splits in the ruling class, secondary contradictions, the "ultra right" etc. They fail to see the importance of ideology -- and the ideological point is precisely that the ruling class needs and encourages the "two centers" approach to maintain the facade of democracy.

This particular theory is borrowed from Kirkpatrick Sale's article in N.Y. Review of Books. Sale is a liberal/revisionist in the Carl Ogelsby tradition. He has just published a book on SDS which argues that an originally promising organization was destroyed by the "parasitic" PLP. The book was glowingly reviewed in UR by Steve Halliwell, another long-time anti-communist. The most overtly revisionist parts of Sale's analysis were trimmed off to give the version which appeared in Challenge. For example, Sale argues that the "old money" was opposed to the war in Vietnam, and was planning to withdraw in 1963 when JFK was shot. LBJ, representing "new money", took over and began the war. This of course is poppycock. But so is the rest of it.

The theory makes no economic sense. As Who Rules America points out, the supposed "hawk" and "dove" or "new" and "old" corporations are controlled by the same banks. The "independent" corporations can't hold a candle to Rockefeller et al, let alone steal their government from them. The "new" and "old" money are interdependent. They have the same interests in imperialism, wage controls, racism. Why should they differ on policy?

In fact, there are no significant policy differences. Neither Sale's article nor Challenge pointed to any which bear scrutiny. Detente with China? Nixon approves. Wage controls? Nixon used them before and will use them again -- it's not a principled division among the rulers. Racism? Nixon provides the crude version while Harvard's liberals work to put a gloss on it. Cambodia? The Senate is engaging in shadow-boxing just like it did over Vietnam, never really forcing the issue. Where is the major difference to justify such a titanic power struggle? Goldwater said bomb Vietnam, LBJ did it. McGovern said end the war in 90 days, Nixon did it. And so it goes.

The personnel lineup makes no sense either. Goldwater is supposedly a new money man. Yet he has been quoted repeatedly as very unfriendly to Nixon, even suggesting impeachment. Connally is a new money man. Yet Connally favors controls which are supposed to be an "old" money policy. Mitchell is named as a "wall Street lawyer" yet he is at the very heart of the "new money" plot to seize control.

(63)

If the "new money" really backs Nixon, where is it now in his hour of crisis? He can't even get people to come to his fundraising dinners. Virtually nobody speaks up in his defense. This time last year he was rolling in money and endorsements. Now he has become a political leper. Old and new money alike are scrambling to dissociate themselves.

On the other hand, if "old money" opposes Nixon, why didn't they lift a finger to defeat him last year? (Through elections -- its the American way). Rockefeller et al looked on calmly while McGovern was demolished. Obviously, the facts suggest a quite different theory from the "two centers" idea. In fact THE SAME PEOPLE who put Nixon in power in '72 are destroying him in '73. The newspapers are a clear indication of this. Last year the majority endorsed Nixon. Yet now it is the "free press" who are most sharply attacking him.

I think a better theory would run somewhat as follows. The ruling class generally favored Nixon in '72. There are lots of advantages to a two-term president -- stability, continuity, etc. But they miscalculated. Nixon's landslide and subsequent arrogant, dictatorial approach created vast numbers of bitterly disaffected people. The ruling class realized that this posed a real threat to the credibility of the system. They saw a need to re-establish faith in the balance of power. This is the real purpose of Watergate. They aren't worried about political favors to Bebe Rebozo or ITT. (ITT is "Eastern" money anyway). That's peanuts. The problem is Nixon and his thugs lack vision, "statesmanship" -- they're giving the ruling class a bad name. Abusing the CIA etc. Horrors. So -- after he has done their dirty work for them -- they are unceremoniously dumping him. He will be a scapegoat -- just as they jettisoned other faithful servants like Joe McCarthy, General Lavelle, etc. Nixon will be crucified for the sins of the ruling class, and they will be redeemed. Faith will be restored in the free press, the independent judiciary, the balance of power, Mom, and apple pie. The whole ruling class, not just one section of it, will be the gainers.

Of course it's true that there are many ramifications, tactical conflicts within the ruling class, and so forth. We need to study these. But picking up secondhand revisionist theories won't do the trick.

Jon Harris, N.Y.C.

(64)

- - - - ON THE MOVEMENT FOR FREE ABORTIONS

After a recent W. Coast PLP leadership meeting, a heated discussion took place on the question on building a movement for free abortion. Those few of us who opposed such a move were later criticized for not making our position clear. This paper is an attempt to outline our views. While abortion is not one of the most important question facing our Party the emotion generated at every discussion of the subject indicates that it deserves more examination.

I. SHOULD WE BUILD THIS MOVEMENT?

We recognize that under capitalism all laws are used to oppress the workers. Especially were abortion laws used as a tool to oppress working class women. The Party shouldn't oppose the legalization of abortions, but to build a movement around this issue is something else; for we must always ask where such a movement leads, what attitudes does it encourage. For example, the movement to legalize marijuana is not just a movement to revise a series of laws that are selectively and oppressively enforced, but it leads to the encouragement of taking pot as a social benefit. This is inevitable; similarly a movement to ~~ig~~ legalize abortions leads to encouraging abortions likewise as a social benefit. The question is not whether ~~an~~ abortion should be made legal or not, but where the movement leads. Since the Supreme Court has already resolved this issue on behalf of the ruling class, we can see that the bosses are only too ready to legalize abortions. Now the movement focuses on free abortions, a demand we characterize not as a reform, but as a thoroughly reactionary demand. Why is this?

II. "FREE" ABORTION IS EQUIVALENT TO FORCED ABORTION OF MILLIONS OF WORKING CLASS KIDS---

If the police were to march into a working class community, take away the pregnant women to a hospital and force them to undergo an abortion,

(65)

we would be up in arms over this outrage. Yet when the ruling class sets things up economically to have the same effect, we are silent and some of us even encourage this outrage. Marxists have always recognized that the economics of capitalism is the major ~~fx~~ force oppressing the working class; the police and military power is only secondary. The economics of capitalism right now is forcing millions of working class families to undergo abortions to exterminate their ~~fxrx~~ future offspring. Far from a step toward the liberation of women, this is another horrible oppressive chain around our necks. How does this work? Let's spell it out so there is no doubt.

(1) Very few health plans for workers pay for all maternity benefits. Many make no payment at all for childbirth. The welfare departments are particularly nasty about not paying welfare recipients' maternity bills. Today, in a hospital, it costs anywhere from \$400 to \$1000 to have a baby. Payment is almost always demanded in advance, even in a clinic. This means for most workers an out of the pocket cash outlay of at least \$300. Abortions are cheaper.

(2) But the hospital costs are just the beginning; a working class family needs almost immediately: diapers, a crib, an infant seat, a stroller or carriage, clothes, ~~rx~~ etc. Generally few families get away with as little as \$200 immediate further expenses.

(3) But this is just the start; in the first year, the child will cost at least \$350 in increased food bills, \$200 for clothes, \$250 for doctor bills, perhaps a bigger apartment or house will be needed, maybe the health insurance will go up. Rare is the working class family that can get away with less than ~~rx~~ \$1000. But the first year is the cheapest.

(4) If the mother-to-be has a job, there will be some loss of income,

(66)

not to speak of child care costs. This can run into tens of thousands of dollars before the kid is six.

Add it up for working class families, especially those on welfare, having another child under capitalism can be a financial catastrophe. When the ruling class makes abortion easy and cheap, relative to child-birth, what do we have--forced abortion. Free abortion is nothing less than the planned extermination of much of our future class. Under these conditions abortion is no ~~more~~ more voluntary than working in an unsafe auto plant is voluntary.

Instead of fighting for conditions that make it easier for working class families to have kids, the abortionists play into the hands of the ruling class that wants to limit our offspring at this ~~max~~ point in history. (Why? we will examine below.) Some reforms that would really liberate women and make family life easier are:

- (1) 30 for 40: more money, more time for families to spend together, less outlay for child care; more time to do housework.
- (2) Equal pay for women workers, an end to discrimination in hiring.
- (3) Free child care for all working mothers including infant care.
- (4) Fully paid maternity benefits in all health plans and for all welfare recipients that would also include a cash stipend to cover non-hospital expenses of having a baby.
- (5) Multiply the income tax deduction for each child to closely reflect the actual cost of raising a child.
- (6) Fully paid maternity leave for all mothers that would include a long enough period after birth so that those women who choose to breast feed their babies could do so.
- (7) All these benefits be available to single mothers as well with an educational campaign to eliminate the "stigma."

(67)

(8) Multiply welfare benefits so that they closely reflect the actual cost of rearing a family in the 1970's.

If we won these reforms (most likely the overthrow of the capitalist system would be necessary to win them fully and finally), then free abortions would no longer be forced abortions, for those few women who needed abortions for social or psychological reasons not caused by capitalism's economics. The question is: where our energies will be spent: to make it easier for the ruling class to liquidate future working class fighters or to fight for the above real reforms.

III. THE QUESTION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND HOW THE RULING CLASS'S POSITION HAS CHANGED HISTORICALLY ON THIS QUESTION

"But your position is the same as the Catholic Church", the abortionists tell us as if making a telling point. As a rhetorical trick to avoid serious discussion, this canard may be useful, but it only reveals abysmal ignorance of the actual state of affairs. Let's examine the question of the Catholic Church for there are some lessons to be learned here.

In Western Europe during the feudal era, the Church played the role of a modern state apparatus. It was the Church that enforced the feudal laws, oppressed the peasants, and settled the squabbles among the nobility. The Church developed a position on abortion that corresponded to the needs of feudalism. Since each child of a serf owed so much labor to the lord, the more children a serf had, the more labor due the lord. Thus the Church outlawed abortion. During the capitalist revolutions and the Reformation, this tenet of Catholicism was never questioned. The reason was that in the early period of capitalism, the capitalists

(68)

had great difficulty in enticing the peasants off the land to work in their lovely urban sweatshops, thus there appeared often enough severe labor shortages. (See Marx, Capital, "Primitive Accumulation of Capital"). Thus the capitalists passed laws codifying the old canon laws, outlawing abortion.

Yet today a different situation obtains; modern decadent capitalism is faced with an ever increasing army of unemployed. Even in a "boom" year like 1973 there are officially 5% unemployed in the U.S. (actually more like 20% - 15% who would work if jobs could be found). ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Moreover, this situation gets worse with every turn of the capitalist cycle. (1974-1975 will be a "recession" year; unemployment will reach at least an official 8-9%) Few modern capitalist societies have labor shortages any more. Rather the question the ruling class faces is what to do with the millions on welfare and unemployed ~~xxxxxxx~~ to limit, at least, their offspring.

Thus, the pill ~~xxxxxx~~ and a variety of birth control methods were "discovered" in the sixties. What a fine "coincidence" for the capitalists. And the ruling class press began a carefully orchestrated cry to legalize abortions, ~~xxxxxxx~~ starting with the "Thalidomide Scandals" around 1960. After the Harlem Rebellion showed the ruling class they better move quickly on this question, Rockefeller signed a legalized abortions bill for New York State. In the wake of Watt and the Bay Area Student Rebellions, Ronald Reagan signed a ~~xxxxx~~ similar bill for California. Other states followed suit. (Washington State even provides free abortions to welfare recipients--"coincidentally," Washington has the highest unemployment rate in the nation.) Finally in 1972 the ruling class ordered the Supreme Court to legalize abortions nationally, thus taking those still recalcitrant state legislators off the hook. Meanwhile, the Committee for Economic

(69)

Development, the highest ranking planning agency for the ruling class (See "Who Rules America II" for a list of its members.) has declared for a policy of free abortions nationally, at least for welfare recipients.

As for the Catholic Church, the hierarchy in Rome continues to keep one foot in the feudal era, but big-city Cardinals in a number of capitalist countries have broken in practice with Rome on this question. The once-powerful Catholic anti-abortion propaganda machine in the U.S. has in the last few years let out barely a whimper as the bosses move to institute a policy of legal and free abortions nationwide. In Holland the Catholic hierarchy has come out openly for abortions. Probably the next Pope will get a "revelation" on this subject bringing Church policy officially in line with the needs and desires of the capitalist ruling classes.

IV. IS IT POSSIBLE FOR "WOMEN TO CONTROL THEIR OWN BODIES" UNDER CAPITALISM?

"A women's right to control her own body is the essence of the abortion movement" a PLP member told us in San Francisco. This ridiculous statement also appeared in a letter to C-D, unrefuted editorially. Now the question of control of one's body is not a sex question, but a class question. Capitalist men and women control their own bodies; working men and women sell their bodies to the capitalists for a specified period of time. The ability to obtain an abortion has nothing to do with this. This is elementary Marxism. Yet so pervasive has been the pro-abortion propaganda and so laggard has the Party been in combatting it that such arrant nonsense as "The Party should support the movement for free abortions so that women can control their own bodies" becomes a generally accepted truism in some Party circles.

This "control" that the Supreme Court has now bestowed on women is really a tragedy for many working class families, and a great tragedy

(70)

for the working class ~~as a whole~~ as a whole to be deprived of so many successors to the revolutionary cause. But there are some who take a light-hearted view. ~~X~~ One couple, close friends of the Party in San Francisco, told us that since they have two girls and want a boy, what the woman will do after getting pregnant is take one of those tests to see what ~~sex~~ the fetus is, then if it is a girl she will have an abortion and try again. And we, of course, will be called male chauvanists for not approving of this exercise in a "woman's right to control her own body."

V. TOWARD A COMMUNIST ATTITUDE TOWARD CHILDREN

The abortionists don't all necessarily dislike children, but the idea that raising children is a diversion or at best incidental to revolutionary life is part of the attitude. No serious thought or discussion is devoted to how to raise children to be young revolutionaries. We all know how the CP failed miserable in this regard. How many sons and daughters of CP members turned out to be anarchists, liberals, potheads, and even out and out reactionaries? Winning our own children to the Party is an opportunity and a duty and is part of being a communist ~~X~~ 24 hours a day. Naturally, we should also try to win our children's friends and schoolmates too, but all too often we don't even try with our own.

We should ~~to~~ gather whatever experience, and there is some in the Party, positive and negative, is available on this matter and make it collectively available. And eventually it seems the Party could publish readers and comic books aimed at kids to combat the racist and bourgeois lies they are exposed to in school, to explain some of the Party's programs and struggles and to expose kids, even six and seven year olds, to the ideals and goals of communism.

VI. REFUTE THE ZPG'S

We made a start in 1970 towards combatting the extremely reactionary Zero Population Growth (ZPG) Movement. Free abortions is one of the main

(71)

tenets of ZPG. Marx long ago refuted Malthus, the godfather of ZPG, but the capitalists continue to spew this racist filth. Much more must be done to bury this reactionary philosophy. Now more than ever the ruling class claims there are too many people. We say there are too many capitalists but by no means enough workers. Even after the Revolution, our class should continue to grow; each succeeding generation should be larger and more vigorous, ready and able to change what it does not like about the old world. Population stagnation, like in Hungary where abortions today outnumber live births ~~XX~~ 1.3 to 1, will lead to decadence and capitalist restoration.

Our class has a great future; each young worker will add something precious toward building that future. There will never be enough workers.

(72)

Report of a Club Discussion on Challenge

This is a summary from a club in SF. We have had several discussions of our views of the paper, in an effort to build sales and deepen our politics over the last six months. This summary is of a meeting based on the internal bulletins 1-4. We prepared by reading the last chapters of What Is To Be Done?. We offer these quotes for general view, and urge everyone to read this work to get our debate over Challenge up to a better level. (Taken from Sel Wks, Int Pub.)

"You gentlemen, who are so much concerned about the "average worker" as a matter of fact, rather insult the workers by your desire to ~~talk~~ talk down to them when discussing labor politics and labor organization. Talk about serious things in a serious manner.." p.145

"Local factory exposures have always been and should always continue to be made through the medium of leaflets, but we must raise the level of the newspaper, and not degrade it to the level of a factory leaflet. We do not require "petty" exposures for our "news-paper". We require exposures of the important, typical evils of factory life, exposures ~~next~~ based on the most striking facts and capable of interesting all workers and all leaders of the movement, capable of really enriching their knowledge, widening their outlook, and of rousing new districts and professional strata of the workers." p. 162

"In order to be able to write in newspapers(not in popular pamphlets) about municipal and state affairs, one must have fresh and multifarious material collected and worked up by able journalists. And in order to be able to collect and work up such material, we must have something more than the "primitive democracy" of a primitive circle, in which everybody does everything and all entertain one another by playing at referendums. For this it is necessary to have a staff of expert writers, expert correspondents, an army of Social-Democratic reporters that has established contacts far and wide,.....Search our Social-Democratic press for lively and interesting articles, correspondences, and exposures of our diplomatic, military, ecclesiastical, municipal, financial, etcetc, affairs and malpractices! You will find almost nothing, or very little, about these things. p. 164

"Hardly anyone will doubt the necessity for every S-D newspaper having a special section devoted to the trade union(economic) struggle.. Form of trade union press.suit the conditions of illegal work...is the trade union pamphlet.....Such pamphlets would, in the first place, relieve our Social-Democratic press of a mass of trade details that interest only the workers employed in the given trade.." p.166-7

"Moreover the masses will never learn to conduct the political struggle until we help to train leaders for this struggle, both from among the intelligent workers and from among the intellectuals; and such leaders can be trained solely by systematic and everyday appreciation of all aspects of our political life, of all attempts at protest and struggle on the part of various classes and on various grounds." p. 172

73

"..country life..increase the number of our contributors in this field and will train us all at least to select the really most outstanding facts.." p177
"a common newspaper...which will summarise the results of all the diverse forms of activity and therefore stimulate our people to march forward untiringly along all the innumerable paths which lead to revolution.." p. 178

"political and economic exposures gathered from all over Russia would provide mental food for the workers of all trades and in all stages of development, would provide material and occasion for talks and readings on the most diverse subjects..." p.179

All underlinings are italics in Lenin' text.

In the club discussion, we felt that whereas the original criticisms in Bulletin #2 ~~xxxx~~ did contain a tendency to answer Challenge's weaknesses thru a move towards a more palatable line, a possible revisionist solution, the reaction from the NC in #4 (and in others) was quite a bit too defensive. All of us have had ourselves and have heard from the base around us much criticism of the paper that can be solved from the left. We feel that so far the debate is simplistic and that there is a certain intimidation, nearly a tradition as regards the press, from the leadership that any sharp dissatisfaction with Challenge is simply unwillingness to fight for communism. "How many are you selling?" We must get beyond this impasse. There is a strong feeling for change in the paper. ~~It~~ The majority does not come from people whose loyalty is slipping or whose commitment is the "underlying" reason to criticise.

From Lenin and from our own feelings, we think the paper makes economist errors in its conception. It has a view of the workers that is condescending. The format, writing style, some of the headings, seem to visualise the "average" worker the way the Daily News does. If we are to train and organise thru the paper, our members and the workers and students who read us must be exposed to our best articulation of Marxism-Leninism and current politics etc.

It was felt that there is still an overemphasis on TH struggles, and ~~xxxxxx~~ not enough ways of relating our POLITICAL line. Some felt we should revive polemical style articles against other tendencies in the left and reform movements as away of sharpening our line.

It was suggested that what ~~is wrong~~ has made "Golds-Nazi" a debate is the superficiality of Challenge's approach, not the line. People are arguing that it was "left-sectarian" to have those cartoons, and thus thinking the line was wrong. Rather it seems that the fault is in the paper's flippant "mass-language" for talking to workers. The conception of the paper seems still to have a revisionist kernel, linked somewhat to the views Lenin was attacking-a double standard towards the workingclass (what we read and are trained as revolutionaries on, is not suitable for the masses).

The direction we tended to favor would be to revamp Challenge with a professional ~~xxx~~ attitude. Develop a nationwide system of regular skilled contributors, and build a more powerful editorial staff from the NSC. Summarise the trends in several articles, develop regular columns and features on Communist theory, movies, labor movement etc. The core of the paper should be professional, then the personal accounts from around the country could be put in better balance against the need to build a paper that trains communists from amongst the people AND the membership, a paper that is more truly representative of the best we can produce from our most forward advancement of our theory..RRR3and on.

74

Many members reported the feeling they get from regular contacts is lack of interest in reading the paper regularly. Altho one member said that a regular reader showed interest in the continuing story of struggle at GE in Lynn. Many have said Challenge is repetitive and predictable. Often sales slip way off at a new place after several issues. But the club was not happy with some of the new attempts to answer the criticisms of the paper: particularly the health articles. It seems that despite the NC feeling of rightwing tendency in the attack on Challenge, yet the changes made have really been concessions to that very argument to make the paper more "palatable". The "skin" article and the "apple" article only increased the revisionist tendency in Challenge to talk down to workers. Also the inclusion of the photo and story on "African slave trade" seems a very serious step in this same direction. Printing something sensationalist from the "Midnight Enquirer" (?) to shock the "average" worker into realizing there is "bad treatment of blacks". More on this was written up separately as a letter to the paper.

In short the club had many suggestions of particular types of articles they would like to see; but overall, it would seem everyone would be greatly excited to see us solve the weakness of the paper from a ~~revolutionary~~ revolutionary standpoint, daring to get more political, more explicit with our RRR3 line, and more professional. One member voiced concern over the convention turning into a brawl over Challenge, with the party fiercely "holding the line" against the threat of change. ~~Thisxxxx~~ The argument should not be whether the paper is militant-sounding enough, but ~~xxxxxxx~~ how to make it the best scaffolding for revolutionary communism we possibly can. Lenin cannot be taken verbatim, but there are certain basic arguments against amateurism, economism, etc in his discussion of the newspaper that seem like powerful advice for us.

Just to make it clear: this club is striving to sell the paper well. We are not the best, and SF is having trouble in general. But between the five of us there is twenty-five member-years of consistent selling, mostly to workers, and we tried to view our actual experiences rather than abstractions. These include many good things, and all of us are aware of a general trend toward improvement, tho slow, over the years in Challenge. And we feel no disagreement is an excuse not to sell what is ~~the~~ the main organ of the best hope for communism in our time.

Addendum; Members were concerned that the phrase "professional" not be misunderstood to mean a paper run by a few paid journalists in headquarters. Rather we meant professional in Lenin's sense, a fight against amateurist, spontaneous political work. We mean there are people all over the country, in and out of PL, who have some specific skills the paper should be using to the hilt. And that the whole process of editing, directing, planning the content should be greatly elevated in political importance in EVERY AREA.

May 3

RESTORE EDUCATIONALS IN OUR PARTY

75

As the failure of communism and the role of revisionism in the Soviet Union and China become even more clearcut, to the world, there has grown a certain headiness in our party. Not satisfied with our modest contribution in being among the first to expose revisionism we have become self-conscious about our responsibility to the international working class to make further theoretical contributions. And it is in our fervor and haste that we sometimes make not contributions, but political errors which affect not only our international position, but hinder rapid growth of our party.

Thus we give exactly the wrong example to explain the "tendency of the rate of profit to fall, and rewrite economic theory. Thus we state categorically that peasants are worker, that feudalism is capitalism, ignore and obscure precisely those differences which do exist, and fail even to investigate if there were other conditions which did indeed signify, ultimately the failure of Lenin and the Russian communists.

Indeed in our preconvention bulletins we jump on the bandwagon and assert that Mao's "On Contradiction" is wrong since it is too difficult to understand!

Further, in our desire to turn the party toward the working class our line of 30 for 40 was pushed through the party after rather abbreviated discussion. In a period which saw our party shun educationals, the new mass line 30 for 40 becomes both a strategy and a tactic, obscures the independent role of the party, increases our sectarianism, and submerges all other mass lines of the party, such as the fight against racism.

But M-L is a science, which is based upon the laws of society, and if we fail to attract large numbers of workers to our party and hold them, then maybe we are doing something wrong. Maybe that something is not ineffective leadership and a drift to the right alone. It could be our line!!!

For example:

76 (2)

1) In RRIII the correct statement is made that the rate of profit will not tend to fall if the workers allow the capitalists to increase their exploitation. An example is given of Bell Tel trying to automate thousands out of jobs. But it is precisely that automation, that tends to lower the rate of profit. The rate of profit is defined by the ratio $p = \frac{s}{c+v}$, where p is the rate of profit, c is the capital investment, v is the wages the boss pays the workers, and s is the surplus value created by the workers or the profit.

If we assume a constant rate of surplus value per worker s/v then clearly the more the boss invests the less his rate of profit, though his total profit may still go up.

But the economic facts of life are that the bosses rate of profit did not go down during the past 30 years, precisely while automation was increasing. That means that s/v was not constant. That is the bosses were getting more and more profit from their exploitation of the workers. How is this done? Classically the bosses increase exploitation by three methods. Namely speedup, longer hours (overtime) or the use of the money fixed in the plant.

Layoffs raise the rate of exploitation and raise the bosses profits only in the event that other workers left on the job produce more with the same machines and not due to automation which is a whole new ballgame.

It is clear that our party is very concerned about the failure of socialism in China. For, coming soon after the fall of the Soviet Union to the revisionists it is indeed a bitter blow to the entire international working class. (77) (3)

In trying to analyze the reasons behind this fall, I believe we make 2 great mistakes -- namely, we say peasants are workers and feudalism is capitalism. This idealist-type mistake is partly due to the report being theoretical and not including more practice. There is a danger too in saying that virtually all the world's peasants and oppressed people are proletarianized. And if we can include peasants why not petty-bourgeois shopkeepers too? Indeed why not the Khrushchev, "party of the whole," concept? Indeed maybe peasants are workers, as the report contends, but it does not even come close to proving it, and I think if we are going to depart radically from Marx, Engels, and Lenin, then we should be a little more careful in our proof.

But holding our assumptions about peasants for the time being what were the alternatives open to the CCP and CPSU, according to the report?

1) Work among all sections of the people advocating socialism, but placing primary reliance on the working class, while recognizing class differences, calling for a united front against imperialism and their comprador Ruling Classes.

2) Work among all sections of the people advocating socialism but not

78
recognizing any class differences between workers and peasants.

The first course, is the road followed by Lenin, and Mao. The second is the road advocated by ~~the report~~ ^{OUR PARTY}. The first one succeeded for a little while, attempted to establish socialism and lost out to revisionism. The second hypothetical road bears some investigation.

For one thing, it is not at all clear that the Bolsheviks or CCP would have been able to even mount such a large struggle, let alone succeed without the call of "Land to the Tiller". There is not one example of masses of peasants fighting anywhere except in their own immediate self-interest of "land". They fought for land in the Soviet Union, in China and today they are still fighting for land in India, in Naxalbari. In fact, course 2 is academic since it would have meant a reversal of the policies of the CCP and CPSU whose outcome is only debatable.

Indeed the course of action which must be pursued if we say that peasants are workers, is reactionary, for it will not even allow the peasants to free themselves from the yoke of Semi-Feudal oppression, and delay the development of capitalism and the socialist revolution. That is to say the Soviet and Chinese revolutions would probably not even have taken place, let alone succeeded.

But let us return to Mao and Lenin and the revolutions they led in the name of the working class. It is incontrovertable that these failed in the goal of establishing and maintaining socialism. It is also clear that they failed because of concessions to capitalism. The report says reliance on the peasants would have secured the revolution. An interesting idea, but not substantiated. Indeed the article Whither China by a left wing communist worker Sheng-Wa-Lien calls for a "revolutionary political party capable of leading the proletariat and the revolutionary masses to victory," thus separating the proletariat from others. Further, the worker states that the cultural revolution (GPCR) was POSSIBLE BECAUSE "a new situation has arisen as a result of great class changes."

79
China had become partially transformed into a state with many more workers, and less peasants. Indeed according to the article Whither China the peasants did not support the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (one of the reasons for its failure.) It states:

"There was also the problems of the GPCR in the rural areas. If no revolutionary storm took place in the countryside, no power seizure of any kind would represent the true interests of the peasants."

Later in the same Quote he calls for the WORKERS to launch a peasant movement and says "Before the peasant movement is launched, it is empty talk to try to win complete victory for the GPCR."

So Shang-Wa-Lien then claims peasants were certainly not in the vanguard of the GPCR and had to be struggled with to join it, and fight against the "Red Bourgeoisie."

That account, and the minimizing of the role of peasants in launching let alone leading a socialist revolution jives with the role of peasants in all history elsewhere.

In fact only in ~~the~~ ^{PL} can such an assertion, glossing over class distinctions be found, and there unsupported.

The REAL alternative then, after the seizure of state power in the Soviet Union and China, was between (1) building a larger working class by rapidly building production with the aid of some of the ruling class, or (2) trying to maintain state power with a smaller working class more slowly building production, and the working class, with no concessions. I believe the second choice would have been better, although leading to a briefer period of contention for state power between capitalism and the W.C. in these countries.

For working class power takes years to establish, unlike any revolution

80

which preceded it. Until then, even if the Working class seems to hold state power a real struggle for state power still goes on.

Further it seems to me that in order to MAINTAIN STATE POWER, without making the revisionist errors of resorting to concessions to local bourgeoisie, that is the error of trying to create a national socialism(sic). It would take a highly conscious working class, already aware of the importance of internationalism. That development could only take place in countries of MATURE CAPITALISM i.e. U.S., Japan, Great Britain, Soviet Union(now) etc. That is to say the relationship of the means of production to the classes has become sharply defined. That is not the case in the so-called emergent countries of capitalism India, Indonesia etc.

only solution. It is the only class free of any illusions about capitalism. Other classes, such as petty-bourgeois shopkeepers, peasants, intellectuals, etc., suffer from illusions about the nature of capitalism, and so they vassilated in their support of socialism. If being poor and oppressed alone and not the relations to the means of production was the only criteria, the U.S. revisionist C.P. would be correct in looking to the lumpen proletariat to make a "socialist" revolution.

Class is important, basic and should not be made hazy. Building a base in the industrial working class for socialism is the most important task of our party.

Peasants may even for a time join the struggle for socialism, but it would be pie-in-the-sky thinking to depend on them to hold state power. NO! Only the working class, exercising firm dictatorship over all kinds of Bourgeois Ideology can be counted upon to hold state power, for quite frankly it is the only class in whose self-interest socialism offers the

(c)

(b)

81

Perhaps the most obvious error in our party is in its use of 30 for 40 as both our strategy and tactics. An estimate is made that this is the single most important issue to unite the working class. Great research is done on the 8 hour day struggle, a parallel is made, and presto-change there is our party leading millions of workers not only to a 30 hour week, but also to revolution. Isn't this the type of get rich scheme we used to avoid? Doesn't this have idealistic dreams of glory in it?

Now, while it was correct, even necessary, to reorient our party to the working class, our 30 for 40 struggle has not provided the answers the workers need in this period. The convention bulletins are full of examples of the shortcomings of 30 for 40, but most blame it on their work.

True, some workers have been attracted to our party through this work, but the fact is that contacts can not be sustained around a single issue. An issue that offers nothing now. Even the fight for the 8 hour day was never so singly focused on.

We no longer have the slogan serve the people(working class). We do not organize the workers for their immediate needs unless they agree with 30 for 40. Yet the most successful march (demonstration) PL has had was the march for jobs in D.C.

But somehow fighting for the day to day needs of the workers got lost in 30 for 40. The party put all its eggs in the WAM basket and I believe came up short. The party became WAM and WAM the Party. That is no way to build a revolution.

I do not say destroy WAM or undo any of the fine things done by the comrades, but there are other things which affect the workers, and we should fight for them too, whether its jobs for the unemployed, ending the sales tax which robs workers, ending speedup, fighting racism, fighting the union leaders, fighting for more money or even for 30 for 40 where thats the issue. But the bulletin was and is wrong, 30 for 40 is ~~no~~^{not} the issue which

82

unites the working class, socialism and our party is.

So we have in the recent past a schizophrenic approach to theory in our party. On the one hand we wish to make a major contribution to the international working class, and hasten to make some rather rash statements, and on the other hand we become a pragmatic party on the club level, avoiding political discussion; no time for that, got to do the work. Its almost as though this were a bureaucratic party, where theory is for leadership, and practise is for party members.

The result of all this flippant attitude toward theory and avoidance of politics in the club is: 1) a stagnating party membership, which has made some modest gains in quality and composition, in an era in which our party should be rapidly expanding, 2) diminishing sales of Challenge, 3) A poor fund drive, 4) Sectarian isolation of our party from the working class. That is, we have no real close relationships. 5) An absence of struggle against racism. 6) Submergence of the independent role of our party.

While it is a good sign that leadership is self-critical about some of this, it is unfortunate that they are, I believe, self-critical for the wrong reasons.

More checkup, better leadership in the work, beingg vigilant for the shift to the right, are meaningless abstractions in a party such as ours. What is required is all that, and increased and renewed emphasis on politics in the club.

An examination of our mass line, and an application that fights for the day to day needs of the working class (reform struggles) without fear. It is not the struggle itself, for jobs, 30 for 40, or less taxes, or a school, or whatever the real needs of the working class are, which leads to revisionism, but lack of consciously raising in the course of that part-

83

icular struggle. Nor can we robot-like apply any mass line of the party, without understanding and love of the working class, as we are doing, since this leads to sectarianism.

We cannot assume that once a person has joined our party and had a candidate class that all the political education he needs, that he then is won to our party forever. Workers, or anyone who joins our party is a politically motivated person, and failure to continue each members education, constantly struggling to win him or her from bourgoise ideology, is a revisionist error. Politics is primary in our party, and only quarenteeing the unity of theory and practise, open discussion, on the party line can reverse our direction and lead us away from the path of becoming a party of sycophants.

WE NEED A REAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IN OUR PARTY!
FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM! Full evaluation of the line of our party!

Fight for the day to day needs of the working class!

BUILD THE PARTY

Len R