

Women and Revolution



Journal of the Women's Commission of the Spartacist League

25¢

Maoism and the Family...2



Red Guards demonstrate in Peking during "Cultural Revolution," 1966.

In China
"Women Hold
Up Half the
Sky"—and
then some

**Selma James Peddles Male Chauvinism,
Anti-Communism... 8**

Witchcraft and Statecraft... 9

The C.L.I.T. Papers—Feminism Ad Absurdum...15

Brookside Organized After 13-Month Strike...24

Maoism and the Family

Although the "socialist"-feminists, who constitute most of what remains of the women's liberation movement today, cannot bring themselves to support the elementary Leninist concept of a vanguard party to lead an international proletarian revolution, they have found less difficulty in flaunting their "socialism" by supporting Maoism—generally unserious or "marshmallow" Maoism. But recently some of the "harder" Maoist groupings are finding it easier to make organizational gains among feminists as well. Most successful of all is the right-Maoist October League (OL), which has shown the greatest capacity for opportunist adaptation, a capacity which has assisted it in outstripping the equally right-wing but somewhat less flexible Revolutionary Union (RU) in this arena.

What is the appeal of Maoism for feminists? Above all, it reflects the continuation of a current in the New Left from which the radical women's liberation movement emerged, a current of liberalism and idealism which sought to effect social change not through class struggle but through moral persuasion. Thus, the RYM faction of SDS, from which both the OL and the RU are descended, appealed to whites to give up their "white skin privilege" and to men to give up male supremacy. Correct consciousness, according to this view, was sufficient to end the historic sexual and racial divisions fostered by capitalism within the working class.

New Left Maoism initially featured a "Third Worldist" outlook, which downplayed the role of the working class and looked instead to various oppressed groups such as the peasantry of underdeveloped countries as the key to revolutionary leadership. While Maoism continues to reject the centrality of the working class to this day, workerism—the glorification of existing working-class consciousness—is becoming increasingly popular, and the more farsighted of the Maoist organizations have been quick to discern this trend and adapt to it. Thus the "socialist"-feminists, who are only now turning to workerism in large numbers, can look for leadership to the OL and the RU which made this turn earlier.

Reinforcing the new popularity of Maoism among feminists is also the appeal of China itself, where women who were surely among the most oppressed on earth have been afforded many new opportunities as a result of social revolution.

But despite this attempt at peaceful coexistence between Maoists and feminists, there are serious unresolved differences between them. That these differences have often remained suppressed is due largely to the dishonest approach of the Maoists, who take pains to conceal their politics. The most outstanding of these differences centers on the question of the family, a question on which Maoists hold a po-



Peasant meal. Today, as in pre-revolutionary times, the family is central to Chinese society.

sition which is at odds both with feminism *and* with socialism.

Maoists Defend the Family

While most feminists recognize that the family—which isolates women from society and confines them to a lifetime of what Lenin described as "the most stultifying, the most difficult work which women could do... utterly inconsequential, containing no elements that can aid in women's development"—is the principal institution for the oppression of women, Maoists of all tendencies defend the family as "the fighting unit for socialism." This reactionary position, which originated with Stalin, has nothing whatsoever in common with Marxism-Leninism, which seeks to free women from the endless drudgery and isolation imposed upon them by the family structure by creating alternative institutions which would perform collectively the work now performed privately by women in the family.

Despite their supposedly sharp differences on the woman question, both the OL and the RU engage in the glorification of the bourgeois family unit. The OL asserts that "for the working class and other progressive forces in society today, children are not a 'burden'...." The RU concurs and adds that in spite of all its admittedly negative features, the nuclear family should not be criticized because:

"...for many working people, the family provides one of life's few bright spots. Despite the many difficulties



The traditional, patriarchal Chinese family.

of raising children under capitalism, including financial hardships and real fears for their health and safety, the proletariat loves its children and does all it can to enable them to 'have a better life than I did.'

—*Revolution*, March 1974

These sentimental portraits are clearly at variance with the reality of most family relationships in capitalist society where, as the Russian Bolshevik Party correctly pointed out, "it is the street which brings up the children of the proletariat." Furthermore, the focus on "my" children and "my" children's future which the RU applauds, denotes not class consciousness but a proprietary relationship which is a *barrier* to class consciousness. It is precisely this exclusive concern with protecting the interests of one's *own* immediate family which persuades workers to avoid the risks of class struggle and which makes housewives especially vulnerable to reactionary ideologies.

Marx and Engels had harsh words for those who peddled "bourgeois claptrap about the family, and education, about the hallowed co-relation of parent and child," and the Soviet Republic under Lenin struggled to expand the very definition of the word "family" to embrace the whole of society so that one would speak no longer of "my" children or "your" children, but only of "our" children—all the children of the workers state. As Bolshevik Commissar Alexandra Kollontai wrote:

"The narrow and exclusive affection of the mother for her own children must expand until it embraces all the children of the great proletarian family. In place of the indissoluble marriage based on the servitude of women, we shall see the rise of the free union, fortified by the love and the mutual respect of the two members of the Workers' State, equal in their rights and in their obligations. In place of the individual and egotistic family, there will arise a great universal family of workers, in which all the workers, men and women, will be, above all, workers, comrades. Such will be the relation between men and women in the communist society of tomorrow."

—Alexandra Kollontai, "Communism and the Family"

The *Communist Manifesto* makes it clear that the family must be replaced as the economic and legal unit of society if women are to be free to develop their full social potential, and this is as strikingly correct today as it was one hundred years ago. Surely the OL and the RU are aware of the Marxist-Leninist position on this question. How then can these groups, which claim to be Marxist-Leninist, continue to peddle this "bourgeois claptrap"?

Why Maoists Must Deviate From Marxism

There are two fundamental reasons why Maoists must deviate from Marxism. First, as Stalinists and in particular as defenders of the Chinese bureaucracy, they are forced to defend a society in which the family unit remains the basic economic unit. The Chinese Revolution was led not by a Leninist party at the head of the Chinese working class but by a Stalinist, petty-bourgeois party at the head of a peasant-based army. Because of exceptional historical circumstances, this petty-bourgeois leadership was able to overturn capitalism in China and to establish a deformed workers state—i.e., a state not qualitatively different from

continued on next page

Women and Revolution

Journal of the Spartacist League
Central Committee Commission
for Work Among Women

Editorial Board:

D.L. Reissner (editor)
Kay Blanchard
Helene Brosius
George Foster
Liz Gordon

Production Manager: Karen Allen

Circulation Manager: Anne Kelley

Published by the Spartacist Publishing Company,
Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001.
Telephone: 925-8234.

Opinions expressed in signed articles or letters
do not necessarily express the editorial viewpoint.

Maoism...

that which issued out of the Stalinist degeneration of the Soviet Union. Trotskyists therefore call for the unconditional military defense of the gains of the Chinese Revolution—particularly nationalized property forms—against imperialist attack. At the same time, however, we call for a political revolution led by the Chinese working class to overthrow the ruling caste which undermines those gains and seeks to sell them out.

As in all degenerated and deformed workers states (including the Soviet Union, Cuba, North Vietnam and



A Chinese nursery school for peasant children.

Yugoslavia) women have been granted formal equality in many areas but have remained enslaved by domestic labor within the family. The key to an understanding of the interrelationship between the deformed workers state and the family lies precisely in the fact that while the bourgeoisie has been smashed and the means of production nationalized, the working class has been politically expropriated. The state is administered by a bureaucratic caste which, in order to maintain its undemocratic rule, must, among other things, rely upon and foster the nuclear family as one more point for reinforcing respect for authority.

The maintenance of the family also represents a capitulation to the peasantry. Unlike the working class, for whom the family plays no necessary economic role, the class interests of the peasantry are

essentially limited, to consolidating the private ownership of small plots of land, and this requires the maintenance of the family structure. It is precisely for this reason that the working class and only the working class will lead the struggle for women's emancipation.

The second and equally significant reason why Maoists *must* deviate from Marxism on the question of the family is that Maoists, despite all their rhetoric about revolution being the main trend in the world today, the future being bright and so on, have absolutely no confidence in the revolutionary capacity of the working class. And lacking this confidence, they have no real interest in raising the consciousness of the working class, but only in tailing its existing backward consciousness. Why put forward revolutionary ideas such as the replacement of the family when such ideas may "turn people off"? Some day it may be possible to *slowly* introduce these ideas—but not now.

The Trotskyist alternative is not, of course, to raise the slogan "Smash the family!" This would be absurd for, as Trotsky pointed out, "the family cannot be abolished, it has to be replaced," and there is nothing to replace it under capitalism. But without a correct analysis of the role of the family in class society, we cannot even begin to understand the dynamic of women's oppression. It is precisely this analysis, however, which Maoists *cannot* undertake, for its conclusions would expose their revolutionary pretensions as a sham.

The OL therefore avoids all discussion of the family as a source of women's oppression and insists instead that it is "wage slavery which lies at the basis of women's oppression," but since women's oppression predates capitalism by several thousand years, this cannot be a very convincing explanation, even to the members of the OL.

The RU is more orthodox in a way, first presenting its version of Engels' analysis of the family as an oppressive institution which originated with class society, and only then going on to revise it on the grounds of the greater importance of the family unit to the working class *today* and the coziness, warmth and love supposedly abounding in the contemporary proletarian home.

Even more orthodox in its approach is the Communist Labor Party (CLP), a Maoist organization which descends from the Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute the Marxist-Leninist Vanguard Party in the USA (POC), the first pro-Stalin opposition within the Communist Party. The CLP presents Engels' analysis in a more or less recognizable form, but draws from it *no* programmatic conclusions. While the CLP would like to avoid revising Engels, it cannot put forward the revolutionary implications of its book learning without threatening the very ground on which it stands. Thus in "Proletarian Morality" (*Proletariat*, Spring 1974) we find:

"The heart of the question that the comrades are asking is this: Is it anti-communist to have sexual relations with other than husband or wife, is it anti-communist to have sexual relations before marriage?"

To which CLP leader Nelson Perry discreetly replies "These questions are too personal for us to comment on." The odor of puritanism, which Perry himself

describes as "Catholic morality smeared over with Marxist phrases," is very strong.

"Homosexual Relationships Require So Much Time"

As defenders of the bourgeois family, Stalinists generally feel called upon to denounce all those whose sexual preferences are other than monogamous and heterosexual. The OL tends to ignore the subject of sexual repression altogether. Michael Klonsky, leader of the OL, explained at a panel discussion in San Diego this summer why this question had not been taken up by his organization, saying that he didn't see why so much fuss was being made about something that only took a few minutes a day. The October League did not, however, draw back from assisting in the exclusion of a group of lesbian members of the Chicago Women's Union from a trip to China.

The RU has been more outspoken in defense of "stable monogamous relationships between men and women." In a recent internal position paper on the subject, in which the RU attempts to soften its line, it is explained that while gays can be anti-imperialists (i.e., members of RU front groups), they cannot be communists (i.e., members of the RU):

"To be a Communist, we must accept and welcome struggle in all facets of our lives, personal as well as political. We cannot struggle with male supremacy in the factory and not struggle at home. We feel that the best way to struggle out such contradictions in our personal lives is in stable monogamous relationships between men and women based on mutual love and respect. Because homosexuals do not carry the struggle between men and women into their most intimate relationships they are not prepared, in principle, for the arduous task of class transformation."

It would have been more honest (although equally disgusting) of the RU to simply admit, as the Workers League does, that it takes this reactionary position because it conforms to backward attitudes prevalent in the working class. On the question of homosexuality as on the question of the family, the opportunist RU is guided above all by its determination not to "turn people off."

Certainly there are reactionary currents in the "gay liberation movement," but the RU's condemnation of homosexuality as a *disease* to which people are driven by the "mire and muck of bourgeois decadence" (as if homosexuality had come into existence only with the decay of capitalism), is so backward and untenable that even the bourgeois American Psychiatric Association last year abandoned this position. The RU caps its garbled arguments by the assertion that homosexuality is incompatible with communism because "homosexual relationships require so much time." One can only speculate upon the RU's ideal of a meaningful *heterosexual* relationship. Presumably, as the OL's Klonsky suggests, it should optimally take up "only a few minutes a day."

This puritanical morality on the part of American Maoists is entirely consistent with the attitudes encouraged and even legislated by the Chinese bureaucracy. Visitors to China, who often differ on many questions of social life there, uniformly report that

the Chinese suppress all premarital sex. Helen Snow, who as Nym Wales earned a reputation as an uncritical publicist for the Maoist regime, reports that:

"Any romantic attachment that goes the distance, outside the marriage bed, is actually a statutory offense, worth six months in jail for the overeager young man...."

—Helen Snow, *Women in Modern China*

This one report alone should stick in the throats of those American apologists for New China who never tire of crying: "Chinese Women Liberated!"

Chinese Women Unliberated!

The new opportunities afforded Chinese women are not insignificant. While we put forward our critical analysis of the Maoist regime, the Spartacist League firmly rejects the view advanced by some social democrats and feminists that the Chinese Revolution offered women little worth defending. The revolution has, among other things, given women legal equality, freedom of choice in marriage, greater access to contraception and abortion, a greater role in social production and political life and, for some, child care centers, dining halls and schools. It is indisputable that the lives of Chinese women, who in pre-revolutionary times were barely recognized as human beings, have been radically transformed and that

continued on next page

Spartacist Local Directory

- BAY AREA (415) 653-4668
Box 852, Main P.O., Berkeley, CA 94701
- BOSTON (617) 282-7587
Box 188, M.I.T. Sta., Cambridge, MA 02139
- BUFFALO (716) 834-7610
c/o SYL, Box 6, Norton Union, SUNYAB,
Buffalo, NY 14214
- CHICAGO (312) 427-0003
Box 6471, Main P.O., Chicago, IL 60680
- CLEVELAND (216) 687-1413
Box 6765, Cleveland, OH 44101
- DETROIT (313) 921-4626
Box 663A, General P.O., Detroit, MI 48232
- HOUSTON (713) 926-9944
Box 9054, Houston, TX 77011
- LOS ANGELES (213) 485-1838
Box 26282 Edendale Sta., Los Angeles, CA 90026
- MADISON
c/o SYL, Box 3334, Madison, WI 53704
- MILWAUKEE
Box 6061, Milwaukee, WI 53209
- NEW ORLEANS (504) 866-8384
Box 51634, Main P.O., New Orleans, LA 70151
- NEW YORK (212) 925-2426
Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, NY 10001
- PHILADELPHIA (215) 667-5695
Box 25601, Philadelphia, PA 19144
- SAN DIEGO
P.O. Box 2034, Chula Vista, CA 92012
- TORONTO
Canadian Committee of the International Spartacist
Tendency (416) 366-0871
Box 6867, Station A, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Maoism...

Chinese women are less oppressed in many ways than are women in bourgeois democracies.

But while we note such gains and therefore call for the unconditional military defense of China against imperialist attack, we are also aware that China has not achieved socialism—a historical stage marked, among other things, by the withering away of the state—and that the Chinese bureaucracy sabotages those measures leading toward the emancipation of women which could be undertaken by the dictatorship of the proletariat in even a poor and underdeveloped healthy workers state. Chinese women, therefore, continue to be specially oppressed. Some indications of this oppression are the following:

1. The family continues to be the primary economic unit of society, and women continue to be primarily responsible for housework and child care. As the OL's Eileen Kléhr writes in "Women Hold Up Half the Sky":

"I remember a woman factory worker who told me that all her housework was done by her children... because both parents worked. This is good education for the future generation when household work will no longer be considered 'women's department' but will be shared more equally between men and women."

Instead of *socializing* the drudgery performed by women in the family, as the Bolsheviks attempted to do, the Chinese bureaucrats content themselves with appealing to the husbands of a future generation to share it "more equally." (They are no doubt gratified to learn that President Ford makes his own breakfast.)

2. Swings in public policy since 1949 have resulted in sharp changes regarding contraception and abortion. Access to contraception and abortion is not viewed as the right of all women, but as a privilege to be proffered or rescinded according to the political requirements of the bureaucracy at any given time.

3. Divorce may be granted *only* if both parties request it, and even then the court still attempts reconciliation and has the power to deny the divorce if it is deemed not to be in the best interests of the People's Republic.

4. Puritanical attitudes toward sex prevail, and pre-marital sex is classified as a crime. There exists, as Trotsky put it when describing the Soviet Union under Stalin, "the philosophy of a priest endowed also with the powers of a gendarme."

5. Jobs are still noticeably sex-typed, and there is unequal pay for equal work, especially in the rural communes. Also, the shortage of capital means that there are not enough industrial jobs for all who would like them, and this especially affects women's participation in production.

6. Women's participation in politics is still limited to the lower echelons of the government and the Chinese Communist Party, with few exceptions. Women comprise about 10 percent of the party and about the same percentage of its Central Committee. In 1969 two women were named to the Political Bureau, although not to the Standing Committee, which is the real power. The two women were Yeh Chun, wife of Liu Shao-Chi and Chiang Ching, wife of Mao. When

Lin Piao was disposed of in September 1971, Yeh Chun was removed.

7. The facilities to socialize housework are still lacking. Child care in the countryside is inadequate, communal dining facilities are unattractive and collectivization of household tasks is not encouraged. It is, of course, true that the productive forces in China are not adequate to accomplish all this even if it



OPERATION BROOM BRIGADE. These youngsters have been assigned to keeping Canton clean.

were governmental policy, but, as Trotsky noted about the Soviet Union:

"Instead of openly saying, 'We have proven still too poor and ignorant for the creation of socialist relations among men, our children and grandchildren will realize this aim,' the leaders are forcing people to glue together again the shell of the broken family, and not only that, but to consider it, under threat of extreme penalties, the sacred nucleus of triumphant socialism."

—Trotsky, *The Revolution Betrayed*

Maoists are willing enough to acknowledge that Soviet women are not liberated, despite the enormous gains of the October Revolution, many of which were subsequently reversed. But, because of the Maoist position that the Soviet Union became capitalist and "social imperialist" sometime after the death of Stalin in 1953, any Maoist account of how this reversal occurred must be a masterpiece of distortion and omission.

Thus the Revolutionary Union, in "Soviet Women—Their Victory and Temporary Defeat" (*Red Papers 3*) explains that "a small band of traitors" managed to take over the Soviet Union within 10 years of the death of Joseph Stalin and *at that point* "the tremendous gains made by women, and by the whole working class, began to crumble." Can the RU explain why, then, abortion, which was legalized under Lenin, was abolished in 1936, despite popular opinion to the contrary (and re-instituted *after* the death of Stalin)? Why co-education was abolished by the Stalinist bureaucracy? Why the women's section of the Communist Party was liquidated? Why divorces were made increasingly difficult and expensive throughout the 1930's, until in July 1944, the fee for a divorce was set at a level which placed it out of the reach, economically, of the average worker?

Of course, since these dates are embarrassing to Stalinists, they are often ignored. The entire Maoist/Stalinist worldview would be threatened by recognizing that the degeneration of the Russian Revolution began

not in the 1950's but in the 1920's. Yet the facts are indisputable.

What Is the "Maoist" Position, Chairman Mao?

We have concerned ourselves so far with what the Maoists have in common, but it should not be assumed that there is general agreement among these groups on the woman question. There is not. In fact, it was on the woman question that the *Guardian's* unity-mongering forums of 1973 fell apart.

The OL, which has capitulated fully to petty-bourgeois feminism, insists that the RU does not see the radical women's movement as a "positive progressive thing." The RU denies this charge, which is potentially devastating to the satisfaction of its opportunist appetites, and calls for a class analysis of the women's movement. But despite the RU's leftist rhetoric, its workerism and its refusal to fight for revolutionary leadership in the working class expose it as a liberal rather than a revolutionary organization.

A serious difference among Maoist groups centers on support for the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). (For a discussion of why the Spartacist League supports the ERA, see *Women and Revolution* No. 4, Fall 1973.) The RU militantly opposes the ERA on the grounds that it would abolish protective legislation, but its arguments are contradictory. To be consistent, the RU would have to demand repeal of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 since this has been much more responsible for the repeal of protective legislation for women than the ERA would be. The point, of course, is to *fight* for the extension of protective legislation, not to seek defensively to maintain the status quo which is, in any event, under attack. The weakness of the RU on this question may have been behind its vicious physical attack on members of the Militant Action Caucus of the Communication Workers of America who were carrying signs in support of the ERA in a San Francisco demonstration this June. But while the RU does not hesitate to attack proponents of the ERA, it raised quite a hypocritical hue and cry about the refusal of the Chicago Women's Liberation Union, including members of the OL, to allow the RU to criticize the ERA in a leaflet at an International Women's Day march.

Like the RU, the Communist Labor Party initially opposed the ERA, declaring it to be a "fascist plot." But recently the CLP has done a "self-criticism" and, following a short announcement of its "mistake," an about-face of sorts was executed in the August issue of *People's Tribune*. In an exceptional display of political cowardice, the CLP refused to take a position for or against the ERA, stating only that it would engage in work "around the ERA." But whether this work will support the ERA or attack it is anyone's guess.

Regarding the question of orientation to the Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW), differences similar to the ones above also emerge. The OL went whole-hog into CLUW, taking up many bureaucratic posts and submerging any independent presence. Their sharpest criticisms have been leveled at the Spartacist League for raising a class-struggle program in CLUW, with milder criticisms of the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party, which stand slightly to the



Mother and child in the "new" China. Notice the wall poster which proclaims the joy of motherhood.

right of the OL in this arena.

Having fought for the bureaucrats and against the communists in CLUW, the OL is now slowly "discovering" that CLUW is dominated by the trade-union bureaucracy, a fact pointed out by the Spartacist League more than six months ago. The recent disaffection of many of these bureaucrats has put the OL in a temporarily stronger position within CLUW, temporary because CLUW is not likely to be a viable organization. (See "CLUW: Dead End for Working Women," *W & R* No. 6, Summer 1974.)

The RU has for the most part ignored CLUW and criticized the OL for trying to push the unions to the left. The RU's recent turn is away from trade unions altogether because while the RU is reluctant to capitulate to the trade-union bureaucrats, it is even more reluctant to fight them. However, when RU supporters came to the first Los Angeles CLUW meeting in July, they voted *with* the OL (and the SWP, IS and CP) to prevent political discussion by voting down a motion raised by a member of the Militant Caucus of AFSCME 2070 in favor of democratic debate and resolutions.

The OL, the RU and the CLP have all amply demonstrated their fundamental reformism. The polemics among them may be sharp, but none is fighting for revolutionary principles. All, too, would be quick to subordinate any struggle to the interests of the Chinese bureaucracy if it would gain them the coveted status of "official" Maoist party in the U.S. So while the Spartacist League carries forward the struggle for women's liberation through socialist revolution, the Maoists persist in their attempts to make the family the fighting unit for reformism and puritanism. ■

Selma James Peddles Male Chauvinism, Anti-Communism

Wages for housework! What housewife would refuse? And why stop there? What about wages for schoolwork, wages for riding the subway and wages for eating lunch? Selma James and the Power of Women Collective have in fact raised all these demands and more. And why not? Class struggle may be difficult, but raising demands is easy.

While *Women and Revolution* has already commented at length on the writings of Selma James, which we correctly characterized as "an explicit attack on the left and particularly the trade unions" (see "Dalla Cosa/James and the Subversion of Marxism: A Critique," *Women and Revolution* No. 5, Spring 1974), our recent encounter with James in person deserves an additional footnote.

James, a leading advocate of wages for housework, likes to style herself a Marxist, but her pamphlets, "A Woman's Place" and "Women, the Unions and Work, or What is Not to be Done," make it clear that she distorts Marx at every step in order to make his words conform to her reactionary theory that housewives play the central role in capitalist production and must therefore play the central role in a proletarian revolution.

But not even these wretched pamphlets prepared us adequately for the incredibly vicious anti-working class, anti-communist and anti-woman propaganda currently being spread by James in her personal appearances.

On November 7 in Philadelphia, James, who repeatedly referred to herself as a communist, asserted, among other things, that women are the working class and therefore need not ally with working men in struggle, that the trade unions must be smashed, that leftists are the conscious agents of capitalism and that Lenin's *What Is to Be Done?* is a fascist pamphlet because it argues for the necessity of a vanguard party to bring revolutionary consciousness to the working class. (She claimed that Lenin later repudiated this position but declined, of course, to document this absurd claim.)

When a male comrade of the Spartacist League defended Lenin's position, James attempted to male-bait him, insisting that he had no right to discuss the question of women's consciousness. Soon thereafter a "moratorium" was declared on all further comments by the Spartacist League.

The following evening James spoke in New York City where—unbelievably—she reached new depths of reactionary demagoguery with the assertion that all women who work are scabs because they take away jobs from men. Not since the glory days of the Nazi Party—which decreed that the sphere of women was bounded by the kitchen, the nursery and the church—has there been such



Selma James in New York City.

W&R PHOTO

an articulate spokesman for the male chauvinist and counterrevolutionary position that women must be removed from access to industrial power and relegated to the isolation, backwardness and interminable petty drudgery of the nuclear family. In fact, as Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky always insisted, women will *never* be liberated until they participate in general social production equally with men.

The demand of wages for housework is in itself a token but supportable reform since it would improve the material conditions of the working class. In fact, when such a measure was being considered by the Australian government recently, our comrades of the Spartacist League of Australia and New Zealand did support it in opposition to Australian feminists who opposed it almost unanimously. (See "Housewives' Wage Debate" in *Australasian Spartacist* No. 13, October 1974.) But it is not a *revolutionary* strategy! And coupled with the distortions, slanders and outright lies of this phony who dares invoke the name of Marx to lend authority to her treachery, it can only serve as another obstacle to the emancipation of women.

Marxists do not seek the emancipation of women in wages for housework but in the *abolition* of housework through the establishment of collective institutions such as free laundries and free restaurants. And we do not seek to create these institutions by begging the capitalist state for a little more money but by *smashing* the capitalist state and constructing a new society responsive not to the requirements of capital but to the requirements of human beings.

WITCHCRAFT AND STATECRAFT

A Materialist Analysis of the European Witch Persecutions

by D. L. REISSNER



"Slower Mistress." A painting of two witches by Goya (1746-1828).

Several years have elapsed since the heyday of feminist organizations with names like W.I.T.C.H. (Women's International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell) and Red Witch, but many feminists have continued to identify themselves with witches, as is attested to by several recently published articles, including "Witches, Midwives, and Nurses: A History of Women Healers" by Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English and "What Were Those Witches Really Brewing?" by Andrea Dworkin which appeared in the April issue of *Ms.* This identification rests apparently on the feminists' view of witches as early prototypes of the liberated woman, although a little research of witch practices could seriously weaken this assumption. For example, each coven (local organization) of twelve witches was presided over by a man who played the rôle of the Devil, and it was standard practice at sabbats (witches' meetings) that each witch showed her respect to him by kissing his posterior and penis; this was known as the "kiss of shame." Furthermore, no sabbat was complete until the "Devil" had engaged in sexual intercourse with all 12 witches.

It is not surprising that the history of European witchcraft and witch persecutions (the New England witch trials, which occurred on a relatively small scale and in a different social context at the very end of the European witch craze, must be considered separately) should evoke great interest among people concerned with women's liberation, because it is a segment of the history of the oppression of women which is virtually unparalleled in its scope, duration and intensity. As Marxists, however, we approach this history in a way which is different both from the approach of feminists and from that of most other bourgeois historians whose analyses tend to be psychological, anthropological or merely romantic.

The European witch craze must be viewed as one component in the complex economic, social and political dynamic which transformed European civilization in the period between the 13th and 17th centuries and which included the rise of capitalism and the emergence of Protestantism. Of particular significance to an understanding of the witch craze was the consolidation of modern territorial nation-states during this period, for, as this article will seek to show, the witch craze was in the first instance an attempt to deal with the problem of socially unassimilable peoples in the face of this national consolidation.

Witches Have Not Always Been Persecuted

Ever since the 18th century there has been a tendency to regard European history from the Renaissance onward as inevitably progressive. Yet the same era which witnessed the flowering of Renaissance culture also produced the witch craze—a mania of terror and repression unknown in the so-called "Dark" Ages. Estimates vary, but the most conservative concede that at least 30,000 persons lost their lives as witches during this time—85 percent of them women.

Now that belief in the efficacy of witchcraft has become less fashionable in this part of the world, there is a tendency to dismiss it as nothing more than a delusion of a few unbalanced minds, but witch practices

continued on next page

Witchcraft...

have existed since ancient times and among all peoples. In fact, one of the most striking aspects of witchcraft is the uniformity of its practice in widely separated countries and civilizations. In India, just as in England, the cat is believed to be the witch's familiar, and in ancient Italy the evil eye was dreaded as it is in many parts of Africa today and was guarded against by the same symbol.

When religions establish themselves in new territories, the god or gods of the old religion become the devils (the word "devil," derived from the same root as "divine," means "little god") of the new. Then fortune-telling, the special province of the witch or wise woman, which had been called prophecy when it had been done in the name of the established religion, is designated as witchcraft. And so it was when Christianity superseded the older totemic cults of Western Europe—cults which had honored female sexuality as the embodiment of the regenerative power of nature.

While the Church was formally opposed to these relics of paganism which continued to exist alongside



The burning of an Anabaptist who was not accused of witchcraft by Jan Luyken (1571).

Christianity, it found it politic, given their broad popular appeal, to accommodate itself to them in practice or even to co-opt them. In fact when in 1257 the Dominican Order, which had been established to combat the Albigensian and Vaudois heresies, uncovered witch practices in Southern France and requested that Pope Alexander IX grant it jurisdiction over witches as well as heretics, he refused. Not for another 200 years were the Dominicans to have their way unobstructed by the Catholic Church.

The Church based its position on the *Canon Episcopi*, a document dating back to the ninth century at least, which attempted to minimize the importance of witch practices not through persecution—Charlemagne had

declared the burning of witches a capital crime as early as 785 A.D.—but through denying the very existence of witches and ridiculing belief in them:

"Some wicked women, reverting to Satan, and seduced by the illusions and phantasms of demons, believe and profess that they ride at night with Diana on certain beasts, with an innumerable company of women, passing over immense distances, obeying her command as their mistress, and evoked by her on certain nights.... Therefore priests everywhere should preach that they know this to be false, and that such phantasms are sent by the Evil Spirit, who deludes them in dreams. Who is there who is not led out of himself in dreams, seeing much in sleeping that he never saw in waking? And who is such a fool that he believes that to happen in the body which is done only in the spirit?"

As late as the 12th century, John of Salisbury continued to dismiss the idea of the witches' sabbat as a fabulous dream. Yet this skeptical toleration was soon to give way to the hysteria of the witch craze, and woe to the occasional skeptic then, for he too would rapidly fall under suspicion.

The horror of the persecutions—the carefully refined tortures, the sexual degradation, the unspeakable anguish which wrung from the victims accusations against their friends, spouses and children—these are well documented and need not be elaborated here. Suffice it to say that at the height of the witch craze the intensity of the persecutions was such that in at least two villages in Germany only one woman was left alive.

Pessimism or Protestantism?

Given the fact that witchcraft had existed more or less undisturbed since ancient times, an analysis of the witch persecutions turns upon the answer to the question of why they erupted at the particular moment which they did.

The historical context in which the craze reached its height was one of unprecedented social upheaval. This was the period of the Hundred Years' War, the rise of capitalism, the consolidation of nation-states, the Black Death, the discovery of the New World, the Protestant Reformation and a series of religious wars so devastating that some historians contend that the European economy has not yet recovered from them. Such periods of social disturbance always give rise to increased superstitions and unorthodox beliefs, and several students of the witch craze, including Jules Michelet and Julio Caro Baroja, claim that it grew out of the catastrophes of the 14th century and the widespread pessimism which these catastrophes engendered.

Michelet points out that while witchcraft had been practiced for hundreds of years, certain of its aspects, including the pact with the devil, did not appear before the 14th century. The reason for this, he argues, is that before this time people had not been sufficiently desperate to conceive of such a thing, but with the coming of an age in which the peasant was for the first time required to pay quit-rents (rents paid in lieu of obligatory feudal services) and taxes in money, the concept of a pact with the devil became extremely attractive. Says Michelet:

"The pact required an age in which Hell itself appeared as a shelter, an asylum, a relief, as contrasted with the Hell of this world."

But while belief in witchcraft within primitive and modern societies alike increases as a result of social catastrophe and pessimism, this is clearly inadequate as the sole explanation for 400 years of terror. As the historian H.R. Trevor-Roper points out, the craze gathered force *before* either the Black Death or the Hundred Years' War had begun and continued for two centuries after they were over—centuries marked by



"Love Potion" by an unknown master of the Flemish school in the mid-15th century. The scrolls symbolize the sing-song of the witch's incantation.

general recovery and expansion.

Another explanation often put forward for the outbreak of witch persecutions in this period is that they were a peculiarly Protestant phenomenon and arose therefore as a result of the Protestant Reformation.

It is true that both Luther and Calvin professed belief in witches and declared that they should be burned, and it is also true that the pattern of the witch persecutions coincided closely with the course of the religious wars, both on the Continent and in Britain, but there is no more basis for linking the craze with Protestantism than with Catholicism. It was in fact a product of the conflict between them. The Protestants carried the witch craze to the countries which they conquered for the Reformation while the Catholic Jesuits introduced it equally into the countries which they reconquered for Rome, including Bavaria, the Rhineland, Flanders and Poland. Tou-

louse, the capital of the witch burners, was a great center of Catholic orthodoxy. It is also noteworthy that it was the Protestant rather than the Catholic countries which took the lead in bringing the witch craze to a halt. By 1700 England and Holland had long since abandoned the persecution of witches on a large scale while the Catholic prince-bishops of Germany were still burning them by the score.

Since Protestants supposedly rejected *all* doctrine which the corrupt papacy had added to the Bible and the writings of the early Church Fathers, they should have logically rejected the demonology of the Inquisition as well. In fact, this point was raised repeatedly by isolated Protestant critics, but without effect. Although they frequently burned Catholics as witches, the Protestant witch hunters continued to refer approvingly to the Dominican handbook of the witch craze, the *Malleus Malificarum*. Catholic inquisitors returned the compliment by citing Protestant authorities on the subject such as Erastus and Daneau. In other words, although the witch persecutions waxed and waned in direct proportion to the degree of religious conflict in each area, they were not fundamentally the product of *doctrinal* differences, but rather, as Trevor-Roper convincingly argues, of social differences and specifically of the demand for social assimilation which became acute in this period.

In those instances where there was no such demand, there were no witch persecutions. For example, at the height of the witch craze, the Swedish Lutherans discovered that the Lapps in the territory they governed were imbued with witch beliefs. The Lutheran Church took no action in this case. Since there was no desire to socially integrate the Lapp dissenters, there was likewise no compulsion to persecute them for their witch practices.

The link between the witch persecutions and the question of social assimilation is apparent from the very beginning. When the Dominicans made their discovery of witchcraft in 1257 in the "dark corners" of Europe, i.e., the Alps and the Pyrenees, they were disturbed not by the old rural superstitions *per se*, which were considered harmless enough, but by the fact that they were practiced by the people of a mountain civilization which appeared quite alien to the civilization of the plains—socially, culturally, eco-

continued on next page

SUBSCRIBE
TO

Young Spartacus

Monthly paper of the Spartacus Youth League,
youth section of the Spartacist League

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

\$2
11 ISSUES

Make payable/mail to:
Spartacus Youth Publishing Co.
Box 825, Canal St. Station
New York, New York 10013

W&R 7

Witchcraft...

nomically and probably racially. These were the people who had retreated to the hinterlands of Europe at an early period. Feudalism had never penetrated this area in more than a superficial way, and neither had Christianity. Unlike the civilization of the plains, which was based on the cultivation of the land and the institution of the manor, the civilization of the mountains was pastoral and individualistic. The discovery of witchcraft among these people must have come as no surprise to the Dominicans, yet the same practices which had been tolerated in the feudal towns and villages appeared far more ominous when viewed across an unbridgable social chasm. The Dominicans reacted in a novel and unexpected way: they attempted to persecute the witches as heretics.

As we have seen, the papacy refused to support such persecutions at this time, but as the demand for social homogeneity became more urgent, the Dominican crusade became the wave of the future.

Witchcraft and Statecraft

The medieval concept of society had been based on an ideal of universality embodied in the Roman Catholic Church and the Holy Roman Empire. Despite this ideal, however, medieval political, judicial and economic institutions, operating within the confines of an agrarian economy, were almost invariably local. During the 12th and 13th centuries, however, the economic conditions which had made such local autonomy inevitable began to disappear. The revival of commerce and the growth of cities increased the circulation of money and the expansion of trade to the point at which local autonomy became financially impractical. During the 14th and 15th centuries, the feudal suzerainties of local lords were gradually transformed into absolute monarchies. Behind this enormous change lay the power of a new social class—the growing class of capitalist entrepreneurs whose business needs had outgrown feudal social institutions and who now demanded the larger sphere of operation which only a territorial state could provide.

The welding of a nation-state—the creation of a "people" with a sense of common identity—demanded social homogeneity, including religious homogeneity. To be Spanish meant to be Catholic; to be English, Anglican. Moreover, religious homogeneity was important to emerging rulers not only because it enabled them to bind their subjects more closely and to disguise territorial aggression as holy war, but also because it enabled them to control their subjects much more effectively. The established church was in each locality an arm of the state apparatus. To the extent that there were citizens beyond its reach, they represented a threat to the newly established order.

Thus, the period of the witch craze is also the period in which the Jews and Moors were expelled from Spain, the Protestants were expelled from France, the Puritans were hounded out of England and the Inquisition was at the height of its power. The conjuncture of these persecutions is hardly coincidental. They are all, at least in part, attempts to deal

with the problem of socially unassimilable peoples during the period of the consolidation of European nation-states. The witch craze cannot be understood apart from this larger social movement of which it was an aspect. This understanding, incidentally, was not lost on the authorities of the time, who not infrequently launched campaigns of persecution against all the stereotypes of unassimilability in their particular areas; for instance, Protestants, Jews and witches in Trier.

"Most Women are Witches"

The one aspect of the witch persecutions which did distinguish them from all other persecutions of the period was that their victims were overwhelmingly women, particularly older women between 50 and 70 years of age and very often women who were unusually independent in one way or another—widows,



"Witches" by Hans Baldung Grien (1470-1522).

spinsters, midwives. Not that men were exempt from persecution, but as Jacob Sprenger, co-author of the *Malleus Malificarum*, wrote: "We should speak of the Heresy of the Sorceresses, not of the Sorcerers, for the latter are of small account."

The Judaeo-Christian tradition had long rationalized the social oppression of women by designating them as weak and sinful and easily tempted by the devil. The Jewish Talmud makes this clear by its

statement, "Women are naturally inclined to witchcraft," and "The more women there are, the more witchcraft there will be," and again, "Most women are witches."

Christianity postulated that men were protected from becoming witches not only by virtue of their superior intellect and faith, but also because Jesus Christ had died, as it said in the *Malleus*, "to preserve the male sex from so great a crime."

Women were regarded as particularly prone to diabolical temptation not merely because they were deemed intellectually and spiritually inferior to men, but also and especially because they were believed to be sexually insatiable. In the *Malleus* it is woman's carnality which is offered as the ultimate proof of her predisposition to witchcraft: "All witchcraft comes from carnal lust, which is in women insatiable."

It was only this view of women which made the endless confessions of seduction by the devil plausible, for they corroborated the popular conception of the nature of female sexuality.

But this long-standing attitude does not in itself explain the outbreak of bitter misogyny which has been observed in this period. Recently published demographic findings, as historian Erik Midelfort has noted, suggest the basis for a more substantial explanation.

The European Marriage Pattern

Demographer John Hajnal has demonstrated that one of the most profound changes that Europe has ever experienced dates roughly from the 15th or 16th centuries. This is the appearance of the "European marriage pattern"—a pattern characterized by relatively late marriage and by large proportions of people who never marry. The percentage of these single people rose in this period from about five percent of the population to 15 or 20 percent.

It was this shift toward later marriage which laid the basis for the nuclear family, since in societies where there is little control over conception the age of partners at marriage is one of the most important variables bearing upon the reproduction rate. It also facilitated the Industrial Revolution by raising the average income and making it possible for savings to be devoted to improving capital assets rather than supporting population growth. Of immediate importance was the fact that for the first time in European history there was a very large percentage of unmarried women, whose ranks were further augmented by widows created by the frequent wars, plagues and emigration. (With regard to the plague, it is noteworthy that in some areas it was fatal for up to ten times as many men as women in the population, possibly because women were more bound to the home and thus less exposed to contagion.) At the same time convents, once the sole refuge of spinsters, were being dismantled in Protestant countries, and even in Catholic countries they were on the decline.

In a society which was totally patriarchal and family-centered and which provided no social role for women outside the family, the growing numbers of single women were regarded as at least peculiar and possibly seditious, especially after the death of

their fathers removed them from patriarchal control entirely. And in fact widows and spinsters were accused of witchcraft in numbers far out of proportion to their representation in society. Of course, the fact that these women were unprotected made them more vulnerable to attack, but the essential point to be made is that it was the unprecedented existence of large



"Four Witches" by Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528).

numbers of women outside the protection of the family which brought them under suspicion in the first place.

Aside from spinsters and widows, the women who came under attack for witchcraft most often were lay medical practitioners of one sort or another, particularly midwives. As the *Malleus* says:

"...as penitent witches have often told to us and to others, saying: No one does more harm to the Catholic Faith than midwives. For when they do not kill children, as if for some other purpose they take them out of the room and, raising them up in the air, offer them to devils."

Country medicine, the medicine of the poor, was often, although by no means exclusively, practiced by women, and witches were often "accused" of having the power to heal. In fact, they did develop herbal remedies, some of which are still in use. It has also been discovered that the ointment with which they anointed themselves before "flying" to the sabbats

continued on next page

Witchcraft...

contained hallucinogenic properties such that the feeling of flying might indeed ensue.

Feminists Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English have made the interesting point that the rising European medical profession played an active role in suppressing all lay competition during this period, including the medicine of the "white" (good) witches, although to consider this the fundamental basis of the European witch craze is superficial, and to assert, as they do, that male and female healers were on opposite sides of a class struggle because women served the "people" while men served the ruling class is crude and inaccurate.

The Witch Craze Burns Out

In his *Dictionnaire Philosophique* written in 1764, Voltaire quipped:

"It is a great pity that there are no longer any persons possessed by the Devil, or magicians, or astrologers, or genii. One cannot conceive how useful all these mysteries were a hundred years ago. In those days, the nobility lived in castles. The winter evenings were long and everyone would have died of boredom if these noble entertainments had not been available. . . . Every village had its own sorcerer and witch; every prince his astrologer; all the ladies had their fortunes told; those possessed by the Devil wandered all over the place; everyone wanted to know who had seen the Devil or who was going to see him; and all this provided an endless topic of conversation which kept everyone in suspense. Nowadays we play insipid card-games and have lost a lot by losing our illusions."

Voltaire could afford to joke for he had the good fortune to live at a time when such jokes no longer led inescapably to the Inquisition and the stake. The witch craze, along with other mass forms of fanatical religious persecution, began to dissolve in both Pro-



"Witches Bringing a Shower of Rain" by Ulrich Molitor.

testant and Catholic countries in Western Europe in the mid-17th century. By this time, the wars of religion were coming to an end, territorial nation-states were more securely consolidated and the "alien" social groups within them had been for the most part either assimilated, exterminated or expelled.

Furthermore, witch beliefs seemed far less credible, among certain groups at least, during the age of science and skepticism which the commercial revolution had ushered in. The assumption that a neighbor's malice could cause physical harm had seemed more likely in a subsistence-level village where social cooperation was a vital necessity than it did in the 17th century when increased economic individualism and greater social mobility were severing the older collective ties.

Although occasional witch persecutions continued until the 1850's, and although witchcraft long remained a criminal offense in many countries, including England where it was not removed from the statute books until 22 June 1951, by the beginning of the 18th century the witch craze was unmistakably dead. It would be some time, however, before cosmopolitan wits such as Voltaire began to consider the subject amusing. ■

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baroja, Julio Caro. *The World of the Witches*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1961.
- Briggs, K.M. *Pale Hecate's Team*. New York: The Humanities Press, 1962.
- Dworkin, Andrea, "What Were Those Witches Really Brewing?", *Ms.*, April 1974.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara and Deirdre English. *Witches, Midwives, and Nurses: A History of Women Healers*. Old Westbury: The Feminist Press, 1973.
- Hajnal, John. "European Marriage Patterns in Perspective," *Population in History* (ed. D.V. Glass and D.E.C. Eversley). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965, pp. 101-143.
- Macfarlane, Alan. *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Maple, Eric. *The Dark World of Witches*. New York: Pegasus, 1962.
- Michelet, Jules. *Satanism and Witchcraft: A Study in Medieval Superstition*. New York: The Citadel Press, c. 1939.
- Midelfort, H.C. Erik. *Witch Hunting in Southwestern Germany, 1562-1684*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972.
- Rosen, Barbara (ed.). *Witchcraft*. New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1969.
- Sergeant, Philip W. *Witches and Warlocks*. New York: Benjamin Blom, Inc., 1972.
- Seth, Ronald. *Witches and Their Craft*. London: Odhams Books, 1967.
- Spengler, Joseph J. "Demographic Factors and Early Modern Economic Development," *Daedalus*, 97 (1968): pp. 433-46.
- Summers, Montague. *The History of Witchcraft*. New Hyde Park: University Books, 1956. Foreword by Felix Morrow.
- Summers, Rev. Montague (ed.). *Malleus Maleficarum*. New York: Benjamin Blom, Inc. 1928.
- Trevor-Roper, H.R. *The European Witch-Craze of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and Other Essays*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1956.
- Van de Walle, Etienne. "Marriage and Marital Fertility," *Daedalus*, 97 (1968): pp. 486-501.
- Wrigley, E.A. "Family Limitation in Pre-Industrial England," *Economic History Review*, 19 (1966): pp. 82-109.

The C.L.I.T. Papers— Feminism Ad Absurdum

The feminist journal *off our backs* (*oob*) has recently published a series of articles written by the Collective Lesbian International Terrors (C.L.I.T.). These articles, which *off our backs* deemed "important enough to all women relating to other women and concerned about the state and future of the women's movement to warrant *oob's* printing," assert, among other things, that "men are dull," "straight women are our enemies" and "the only difference between straight women and drag faggots is that faggots are real men." The articles advise women to liberate themselves through lesbianism and isolation from men.

In itself, this impotent "collective" on the lunatic fringe of the women's movement hardly merits more attention than it takes to note that it may indicate the growth of a reactionary trend in the movement as a whole and on the editorial board of *oob*, which has generally held left-liberal positions in the past. It certainly poses no threat—to men, to the ruling class or to the Marxist movement—and will undoubtedly disappear in the not too distant future.

But if this group is insignificant, its ideas are not. They are not new. They are in fact—in an extremely grotesque form to be sure—the logical extension of that mainstream feminism which over the years has led innumerable women down a blind alley and, more often than not, out of politics.

What is the logical and inescapable extension of the basic feminist positions that the fundamental social division is one of sex, that the oppression of women stems from male supremacy, that all women are "sisters," if it is not that women should place themselves on the opposite side of the barricades from their oppressors—from men? And, furthermore, should they not also isolate themselves from those "sex traitors" who consort with their oppressors and render them aid and comfort—heterosexual women?

The logic of feminism is sex war just as surely as the logic of Marxism is class war! The members of C.L.I.T. must therefore be admired for their consistency, if for nothing else, for few feminists have had the fortitude to follow their own ideas to their logical conclusions.

The Marxist criticism of the C.L.I.T. papers is the very same criticism we have raised again and again with regard to the rest of the feminist movement—feminism is fundamentally counterposed to Marxism and therefore to the liberation of women.

The continuing oppression of women, which is rooted *not* in the male sex but in class society, is the result of a failure of political leadership. We have yet to create a political party capable of leading a working-

class revolution to smash class society and lay the only possible basis for the full freedom and equality of women.

The task of building such a party is, of course, very difficult, and among the most difficult obstacles which revolutionaries must overcome are the divisions within the working class itself—divisions based on race, nationality and sex—divisions which serve the needs of the capitalist class. Only when, in the course of struggle, these artificial divisions are superseded by proletarian class consciousness will the working class be welded into a fighting unit capable of winning state power and establishing a workers state.

While sexual orientation should be a matter of personal preference, the class collaboration and total separation of women from men which the C.L.I.T. papers call for in an extreme form—but which underlie all feminist ideology—perpetuate the divisions which keep the working class weak and thus postpone the emancipation of women.

The Socialist Workers Party is *wrong* when it asserts that the most consistent feminist is a socialist! The most consistent feminist is a "Collective Lesbian International Terror": ■

Jane Alpert:

TURNCOAT FINDS REFUGE IN FEMINISM

Despite the recent proliferation of so-called "socialist-feminist" organizations, the fact is (as the Spartacist League has continually asserted) Marxism and feminism are contradictory and mutually exclusive world views. That feminism often takes the form in practice of anti-communism is attested to by the frequent expulsion of communists from meetings of these "socialist-feminists" when class-struggle politics threaten to "alienate" any of the "sisters."

The potential of feminism as a cover for reaction was dramatically highlighted recently when Jane Alpert, an ex-radical who in 1969 was arrested with her boyfriend, Sam Melville, and two others for the bombing of eight government and corporate buildings, turned herself in. It was, she said, her newly-found conviction that "the left as I knew it had been destructive to women" which had persuaded her to surrender. According to the *New York Times* (15 November) Alpert has "cooperated fully with Federal investigators in providing details of her years as a fugitive...."

Melville, who was sentenced to 18 years' imprisonment for his role in the bombings, was killed during the bloody massacre at Attica prison in 1971. While the Spartacist League opposes the ineffective and self-destructive adventurist tactics which Melville had allegedly pursued before his arrest, we nevertheless call for the unconditional defense of those facing repression by the bourgeoisie for their leftist views and actions directed against the class enemy.

Not so Ms. Alpert. Seeking refuge in the bosom of feminism, this turncoat has said of the Attica martyrs who took a heroic stand for justice against overwhelming odds: "I will mourn the loss of 42 male supremacists no longer." The feminist journal *off our backs* has reprinted Alpert's disgusting reactionary comments without a single word of criticism. (After all, that would be insistently.) Apparently Jane Alpert has found a home.

Letters

27 September 1974
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Comrades,

Although the article, "Women, Culture and Class Society" by Helen Cantor (*Women and Revolution* No. 6, Summer 1974) does not discuss surrealism, the caption to the illustration of a painting by Leonor Fini on page 7 includes a sentence that severely distorts the surrealist point of view. I hope you will permit a correction of this error in your publication.

First, Leonor Fini is not a surrealist but only a "surrealist-influenced" painter. Her work is related to surrealism the same way the work of a "Marxist-influenced" bourgeois economist is related to revolutionary Marxism. In the catalog of the International Surrealist Exhibition held in Milan in 1961, for example, Fini is described as an *ersatz* surrealist, one of many perpetrators of cheap imitations that have long dominated the "surrealism" collections of galleries and museums. (The best known of the *ersatz* surrealists, of course, is the ex-surrealist Salvador Dali, whose commercial antics and reactionary charlatanry have confused people about surrealism in much the same way that the monstrous bureaucratism and counter-revolutionary policies of Stalinism have confused people about Marxism.)

Using the work of a pseudo-surrealist as "evidence" makes it all the easier to misrepresent the actual surrealist position. The caption beneath the Fini picture, referring to "the surrealists' glorification of mysterious, child-like and irrational aspects of the human personality," is completely false, attributing to the surrealists a view that has nothing to do with surrealism. Such vulgarization, typical of the bourgeois and Stalinist press, does not belong in a publication ostensibly inspired by Marxism and devoted to intellectual clarity.

Surrealism does not at all aim at the "glorification" of the "mysterious" or the "irrational," but, on the contrary, at their *conquest*. To undermine and overcome the irrational mystifications embodied in the ideological superstructures of capitalism, it is necessary first to locate them, to externalize them, to grasp their roots, their dynamism, their real content. The expression of the submerged fears and longings—the concrete representation of desire—is an essential step toward a fuller consciousness, and a fuller consciousness, of course, is an essential step toward proletarian revolution. The *repression* of unconscious phenomena, however—and an aimless "glorification" of the "irrational" can be considered only a variety of repression—leads inevitably to the anchoring of the individual's innermost impulses in the illusions and deceptions of the prevailing (i.e. bourgeois) ideology.

Finally, the fact that the article relegates surrealism to a caption is itself a disturbing symptom. Is it really possible, in a revolutionary publication, in 1974, to write about women, culture and class society without taking into account the contributions of surrealists,

and especially of surrealist women, to the critique of existing institutions and to the elaboration of revolutionary perspectives? Succumbing to an essentially mechanistic methodology, Helen Cantor does not seem to appreciate the dialectical *totality* of the struggle for human emancipation. Her one-sidedness leads her to emphasize the collective at the expense of the individual, the social at the expense of the psychological, the conscious at the expense of the unconscious. But the aim of communist revolution is precisely to *resolve* these contradictions, to create a situation in which the human personality, emancipated from the inhibitions of class society, can attain an ever higher development. Poetry and painting in which the imagination leaps ahead of existing relations contribute indispensably to creating this situation. But no advance can be expected from those who recoil in horror from unveiling the "mysterious" and the "irrational." As Trotsky wrote in *Literature and Revolution*, human nature is "hidden in the deepest and darkest corner of the unconscious.... Is it not self-evident that the greatest efforts of investigative thought and creative initiative will be in that direction?" (University of Michigan edition, page 255).

This, in fact, is the point of departure of the surrealist project. Dreams, the unconscious, love, humor, exploration of the "irrational" cannot be surrendered to the enemy. Surrealism has demonstrated already that, when correctly understood, in the light of materialist dialectics, these "mysterious" forces can be situated in the service of the revolution.

with surrealist greetings,

Penelope Rosemont

Arsenal/Surrealist Subversion

W&R replies:

"Women, Culture and Class Society" was not intended as art history, still less as a Marxist analysis of political art or politico-aesthetic movements. We are, however, not uninterested in the surrealist movement. As revolutionary Trotskyists we are drawn with particular interest toward the study of a movement which so firmly identified itself with the principles of the Russian Revolution and which (at least one wing of the movement) refused to identify those principles with Stalin.

Helen Cantor's article was written to address two mistaken explanations for the lack of participation by women in the development of human culture: (1) that there is some "special women's culture" to be discovered or created, and (2) that women's cultural contributions have been equal to (or greater than) men's, but simply have been neglected by sex-biased historians. Cantor's article demonstrates that both of these feminist notions implicitly deny the historical oppression of women.

Cantor argued that women no less than men were inevitably subject to the accumulated cultural influences of their epoch. The "autonomy of art" notwithstanding, the image of women in art reflects in part the special oppression of women and not the sex of the artist. It was in this regard that the paint-

ing by Leonor Fini was selected for publication by *Women and Revolution*.

Regarding Fini's credentials as a surrealist, we leave it to the highly articulate several factions of surrealism to determine for themselves who is and is not an orthodox representative of the surrealist movement. It is true that Leonor Fini did not belong to the central core of the surrealist movement with Breton, Eluard, Aragon, Péret, and pictorially with Ernst and Masson, but she was indeed influenced by the surrealist "point of view" and exhibited with the surrealists.

The point nevertheless remains that like Fini the surrealists did not transcend, "leap ahead" or demystify the image of the mythic woman. On the contrary, they contributed powerfully to that myth.

Are we to believe that because the surrealists were preoccupied with dream, chance, automatism and laughter, they "externalized" the mysterious contents of the unconscious while only "ersatz surrealists" and other artists glorified it? In fact, all art is deeply immersed in the processes of the unconscious. But even if one is to credit to some extent the surrealists' special claim to the unconscious mind, it does not follow that they therefore are not subject to the same historically developed tendencies which affect other artists.

What is implied in the letter is that the unconscious is not just "marvelous" but is also in some way eternal and ahistorical. One need merely question the source of repressed material or read Freud to put a quick end to the serious consideration of such implications.

While the imagination may "leap ahead" it is by no means given that it *must* leap ahead. Indeed, the world has already witnessed some rather grotesque "leaps behind." The assumption that *any* "expression of submerged longings," etc., will necessarily be progressive is profoundly petty-bourgeois. It is the petty-bourgeoisie, lacking a social base capable of changing society and politically hostile to "great social forces," whose world view centers on the individual and his self-development. The feeling that "great social forces" are crushing and smothering the individual is typical of the radical petty-bourgeois as well as the fascist petty-bourgeois who drinks intoxicatingly from the same fount. While it is true that capitalism strangles individual potential development and that socialism will liberate that potential, Marxists distinguish themselves from these "thinkers" by the understanding that social, collective existence determines the individual being and not the other way around.

If it is unfair to the *intentions* of the surrealists to say that they "glorify the mysterious, the child-like and irrational aspects of the human personality," it is remarkably naive to imagine that their intention to conquer such *daemons* can be realized in class society. This was precisely the surrealist dilemma: it became increasingly clear to them that surreality was not some psychological state or metaphysical point where the individual unconscious might become conscious. That point was necessarily historical and possible only in classless society.

The surrealists were fertilized and nourished by the living revolutionary movement. In the 1920's the Communist Party received their support, and be-

ginning with Naville important surrealists began to join the party. The surrealist movement existed in the twenties and early thirties as an artistic analogue of the great social upheavals of that period.

With the consolidation of Stalinism in the mid-thirties, however, surrealism *as a movement* was foreclosed. The Stalinist bureaucrats were hostile to any subversive gesture, including surrealism. Breton's collaboration with Trotsky against Stalinism was in the interest of freedom for all artistic activity and not specifically for the revival of surrealism.

It must be said then to the contemporary curators of the surrealist museum that the next wave of international revolution will stir up its own turbulent currents of art and politics. The revolution will once again create its artistic analogue which will dig deep into the unconscious for the imaginative material connected to the living struggle.

But today the revolution is dammed up by the crisis of revolutionary leadership. And no amount of talk about making the unconscious conscious or about the glorious mobilization against repression can make it happen. Such verbal wish-dreams are closer to the world view of Walt Disney than Karl Marx.

We do not take positions on aesthetic matters. We oppose the Soviet Union's official "socialist realism" because it restricts artistic activity and is used to strangle criticism of the Stalinist bureaucracy, and not because many of our members may find official Soviet art aesthetically debased.

We can, however, appropriately expose flamboyant intellectualism posing as revolutionary action. For instance, it is only a symptom of the weakness of the U.S. left that the *Arsenal* group can be taken seriously when it suggests to subjective revolutionaries that they make it their life's work to be the pompous guardians of surrealist purity.

The necessity for the immediate construction of the vanguard party as a living organism overwhelms the neat schema shot from the pop-gun of the *Arsenal*. The article by Cantor clarifies important questions on the left, part of the process of building such a party. The Rosemont letter sees the article through a lens precisely ground to keep a high focus on the parochial aesthetic interests of petty-bourgeois intellectuals.

Finally as you surrealists know, there is a world to win. So get out of the publishing business, leave the classrooms, leave Marcuse, leave the *Telos* conferences! Until the problem of hunger (i.e., of the oppression and exploitation of mankind by capitalism), is resolved by the destruction of the capitalist system, the liberation of mankind from psychological and sexual repression is impossible. ■

Kommunistische Korrespondenz

Bestellungen und Überweisungen an:

Postlagerkarte A 051 429

Berlin (West), 120, Germany

Postscheckkonto:

Berlin West 503 57-107

(Wolfgang Hohmann)

US \$4

6 Nummern

continued from page 24

Brookside...

contract which has covered UMWA's mines since 1971 when it was negotiated by Tony Boyle. Limited as the benefits provided by this agreement were, it was too much for Duke Power, the largest electric power company in the Southeast and third largest coal consumer in the country with assets of \$2.5 billion and posted 1973 profits of \$90 million.

During negotiations the company insisted that any contract it signed had to contain a no-strike provision. Furthermore it demanded deletion of the fundamental contract clause that all mining and coal preparation was to be performed by UMWA miners. Promotion was to be based on "ability" as opposed to seniority,



Brookside women in Harlan jail. UNITED MINeworkers JOURNAL

and a 50 cents per ton royalty to the welfare and retirement fund, as opposed to 75 cents then provided by UMWA contract, was more than enough for miners, in the company's opinion.

Duke Power refused to budge, and at the end of July the Brookside miners struck. Judge Byrd Hogg of Letcher County, a former coal operator, issued an injunction limiting the number of picketers at any mine entrance to three. Brookside women speak bitterly of the experiences of their husbands on picket duty. Scabs had a heyday crossing the picket line, cursing and spitting on the picketers and waving their paychecks in their faces. Finally, as one woman put it, "After him working so hard in that mine for so little, watch-

ing some scab come in to take his job when he fought for something better was more than I could take."

One day the Brookside women decided to go from a demonstration in Harlan to the scene of the action where they could be most effective. From then on they manned picket lines at Brookside. They organized themselves into the Brookside Women's Club to act primarily as a strike support committee. Though such activities by women are not unprecedented, this is probably the first time women have undertaken such initiative in the mining industry.

There is little press coverage of the Brookside strike that fails to mention the Brookside Women's Club. The effectiveness of the efforts of the women on the picket line earned them a well-deserved reputation for courage and militancy. Brookside was shut down by their numbers, "persuasiveness" and untiring perseverance. They threw themselves in front of the cars of the scabs to stop them. They beat them with one-inch tree branches. At least one state trooper numbers among their casualties. The stories of their encounters with scabs, operators and the companies' "law enforcers" and thugs have become part of the folklore of the region.

Norman Yarborough's name has become a dirty word in the Harlan County mining community and beyond over the course of 13 long months. Duke Power understandably came to represent more than a giant absentee monopoly-capitalist corporation—an impersonal force somehow coldly and imperiously determining the course and quality of their lives from distant urban offices. The policies of Duke Power and Eastover Mining were determined and implemented by human beings whose greed, dishonesty and contempt for working people could be observed firsthand, most directly in the person of Norman Yarborough. One of the women who spent a night in the Harlan jail where "Yardbird" had strikers sent described how she stayed up all night rather than sleep among the cockroaches, which she "hates almost as much as Norman Yarborough."

The Eastover president entered his office each day under heavy guard. To occupy the time on the picket line the women plotted various means of "getting their hands on him to knock some sense into his head." At one point they taunted him to come outside in order to discuss the possibility of their employment at the Brookside mine as soon as the UMWA contract was signed. As Yarborough cautiously peeked around the door of his office, each in turn made her pitch as to her qualifications and abilities—her physical strength, experience and knowledge of machinery and mining methods. Needless to say he was far from enticed by their modest proposal. He was later horrified to discover that the women "forever milling around and acting crazy out there," were not totally unserious in their ambition; with the end of the strike several familiar female faces appeared in his office to request employment applications. According to reports, though he appeared relieved to discover their business, a certain exasperation was apparent in his expression.

The Duke Power Company has notoriously discriminatory employment practices, victimizing blacks as well as women, and has lost several law suits in this regard. The coal industry has hired women as underground miners since December 1973, when the first



Brookside mine

WV PHOTO

two went to work in Jenkins, Kentucky. Since then several dozen have been hired in Kentucky, Pennsylvania and Ohio. The reaction to women in the mines, as well as to women on the picket lines has been mixed. The argument that "the mines are too dangerous for women" tends to be put forward infrequently and sometimes sheepishly, given the obvious fact that danger doesn't discriminate. More commonly, opposition to women in the mines comes from miners' wives concerned to "prevent hanky panky in the mines."

Increasing integration of women in the industrial work force tends to allay such fears. The real interests of women and all workers are promoted by such integration. Not only are women thus able to make a better living, but working outside the home in social production increases social and political consciousness. Women have significantly contributed to labor's struggles historically, having been in the forefront of many class battles. The unity of the labor movement and thus its strength is greatly enhanced by breaking down the divisions created by women's forced exclusion from many areas of productive labor. Equal pay for equal work and equal access to training programs and all job categories are a fundamental democratic right of all workers, regardless of sex or race.

Companies Use Terror Tactics

The women involved in the Brookside strike laugh as they recount their experiences, but they also point out that many events they laugh over now were far from funny at the time. The strike was a grueling experience, won at great expense. It was not simply

a matter of long and late hours on the picket line, foul weather or the fatigue of the pace of fund raising efforts, but of fending off attacks of the companies which ranged from harassment, arrest and prosecution to the most brutal terrorization of strikers and their families by hired gun thugs.

Strike supporters were repeatedly and arbitrarily arrested during the course of the strike. In October 1973 sixteen picketers were arrested following an incident on the picket line on charges of violating the court order limiting the number of picketers. In a stupid attempt at intimidation seven women were arbitrarily held for two days in the filthy vermin- and roach-infested Harlan jail. Several had to bring their children with them for lack of child care.

At one point the women were informed that proceedings were being initiated to put their children into foster homes on the grounds that they were unfit mothers. They replied that "Bloody Harlan" would be an understatement if this threat were executed. Rather than intimidating the miners, this crass maneuver further solidarized them and won them greater sympathy, even among the petty-bourgeois professionals of Harlan proper, many of whom have a contemptuous attitude toward the miners.

The other event that most effectively exposed the cynical duplicity of the company and revealed the character of the SLU was their attempt to bribe two UMWA strikers to lead a back-to-work movement. The strikers reported the offer to UMWA officials and played along with the SLU officials in order to entrap them and definitively document the dirty deal. On two occa-

continued on next page

Brookside...

sions Carl Noe and Ron Curtis received partial payment from SLU officials near the Harlan airport. They were wired to record the transaction, and a photographic record was shot by a hidden photographer, proving beyond any reasonable doubt company/SLU collusion. To the dismay of many strikers, the provisions of the settlement negotiated by the UMWA national leadership to end the strike included the concession that the charges before the NLRB against Duke Power and the SLU would be dropped in return for company amnesty for fired strikers.

The Brookside mine stayed closed for eleven months. Last July the center of activity moved to Duke Power's nearby Highsplint mine. Given the unreliable sympathies of some local police, state troopers were sent in by Governor Wendell Ford to herd scabs through the picket lines. Though the supply of coal to Duke Power was not cut off, the normal three shifts per day were reduced to one. A machine gun was stationed in the company office, and on at least one occasion the picketers were forced to dive for cover as machine gun fire flew over their heads for fifteen minutes.

The strategic situation at Highsplint made the mass picketing tactic difficult, and few of the women who had closed down Brookside participated. Between the gun thugs and state troopers, who escorted the scabs into the mine with drawn guns, strikers picketed under constant extreme physical danger. Several picketers were shot, beaten and arrested. One of them, 66-year-

old Minard Turner, returned to the picket line after two days, despite the bullet still lodged in his chest.

The strikers were enraged over Governor Ford's use of state troopers. Arnold Miller, who doles out support from the union's political action fund (COMPAC) to Democratic "friends of labor," suggested that Ford, who ran this fall for U.S. Senator against Marlowe Cook, was behaving in an "unfriendly" manner by strikebreaking. Miller met with Ford and, lo and behold, the strikebreaking turned out to be all a "mistake"—the result of a "misunderstanding"—and the state troopers were for the moment called off.

But Wendell Ford had not had a change of heart; the "mistake" was merely that the timing was momentarily inopportune for such blatant strikebreaking. As a capitalist politician he is by definition a strikebreaker. Arnold Miller's support to Democratic "friends of labor" puts him in a political alliance with these strikebreakers and their capitalist bosses who control both the Democratic and Republican parties, lock, stock and barrel. Workers need their own political party. The UMWA, like other unions, needs leaders that will fight for the political independence of the working class and build a labor party based on the trade unions to fight for a workers government.

Finally, Highsplint foreman Billy Carroll Bruner shot and killed 23-year-old Lawrence Jones. Even as he lay dying in the hospital four days after he was shot, the strike settlement was being drawn up in special negotiating sessions. A combination of factors had made any other course but surrender suicidal for Duke Power. Not least among these was the fact that



"Memorial period" march in Harlan County.

a number of strikers had taken all the abuse they were going to take. It was to grim and angry miners, prepared to defend their numbers with any force necessary—to answer kind with kind—that the settlement announcement arrived in the pre-dawn hours.

The women, too, had had enough. Many families had been forced to sleep on the floor for some time in or-



Arnold Miller and Brookside Women's Club representative at July 21 rally.

der to avoid bullets fired into their homes by cruising night riders; the home of UMWA local president Mickey Messer was riddled with more than 100 rounds of ammunition on August 8. Norman Yarborough had framed up picketers in court; the miners' children had been harassed by anti-union elements, and their teachers had ripped UMWA buttons off students wearing them and had penalized them grade-wise.

Several families living in company housing had fought off eviction attempts by Eastover by mobilizing supporters to carry their belongings back in as the company carried them out. Most of the families, forced to live in company housing by a serious housing shortage in the area, as well as by their financial circumstances, lack indoor plumbing, and the water which they fetch from outdoors is infected with fecal bacteria six times the "safe" level. The water tastes bad and makes their children sick.

UMWA Shuts Down the Mines

The decisive step that finally brought the company to terms after 13 months was the national UMWA leadership's mobilization of the entire 120,000 members of the union to shut down its approximately 1200 mines nationally in a five-day "memorial period" beginning August 18. UMWA mines produce about 70 percent of the nation's total.

After a great deal of expense and adverse publicity, including that resulting from the UMWA's participation in campaigns to defeat Duke Power's requested rate increases in North and South Carolina and to undermine its capital availability among stockholders, Duke Power settled for terms offered it 13 months before. The UMWA leadership could have won the strike in

short order and organized all non-union mines in the process by immediately mobilizing the union's ranks to shut down the entire coal industry in a national strike.

Miller and other national officers made several trips to Harlan during the course of the strike. Hearings were held in March by a panel of "investigators" headed by Willard Wirtz to weigh the relative merits of the two sides in the controversy. Trips to Washington were organized whereby supporters of the miners could implore their Congressmen to do something about the situation. Not surprisingly, as one enlightened participant put it, "they ran out the back door as we walked in the front."

Much of the UMWA national leadership's rhetoric was devoted to its determination to organize the unorganized—specifically to bring the UMWA back to eastern Kentucky. Harlan County was to be the first step in this process. This impressed the miners of Harlan County, as well as did the strike benefits provided, which seemed fantastic by comparison with UMWA standards under the Boyle regime. The new "democratic," "militant" UMWA leadership has, however, demonstrated that, though (so far) less venal and perhaps less inclined to resolve internal power struggles by murdering its opposition, its policies will not ultimately protect the miners' interests any better than its predecessors' did.

The reason is simple. The needs of miners, notably safety and job security, can be secured only through class struggle not limited to the confines of capitalism and capitalist "law and order." Just as the CIO's "illegal" organizing battles during the 1930's involved immense social struggles, so will organizing the unorganized today. It cannot be done piecemeal, isolated area by isolated area, but only by united action of the entire labor movement. The fact that even in the wake of the Brookside victory the company/SLU was recently able to win the Highsprint election illustrates the point. Not only do many miners report that the

continued on next page

SUBSCRIBE

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

W&R7

\$1
4 issues

Make checks payable/mail to:
SPARTACIST PUBLISHING CO.
Box 1377, GPO
New York, N. Y. 10001

Women and Revolution

Brookside . . .

company/SLU paid for its votes, but management voted in the election. Regardless of whether and when a new election is held, such tactics of the bosses can undermine and, and if allowed to continue, defeat an organizing drive.

Arnold Miller Contains the Struggle

Despite his democratic "innovations" like local election of officers as opposed to their appointment by the national office; contract ratification by the membership; and an end to voting rights for pensioners, Arnold Miller's program is not one of class struggle, but of maintaining capitalism. He was not ushered into power in the UMWA by Nixon's Labor Department in 1972 in order to fight the bosses and capitalism; but to keep the lid on struggle. Though he claims to favor the right to strike over safety and local grievances he has campaigned against the numerous wildcats that have taken place in the last couple of years (more than in any other industry) insisting that Boyle's rotten contract, which authorized the continued endangerment of miners, was more sacrosanct than workers' lives.

A loyal Democrat who has run for office in his home state of West Virginia, Arnold Miller became the candidate of the "Miners for Democracy" (MFD) for UMWA president after Jock Yablonski, a former Boyle lieutenant, was murdered on orders from Tony Boyle. He was elected in a Labor Department-administered election re-run in 1972. (See "Labor Department Wins Mine Workers' Election," *Workers Vanguard* No. 17, March 1973.)

The issues which led to the MFD opposition and the events by which Boyle brought about his own downfall were health and safety, the goal of the miners being mine safety legislation and compensation for the chronic occupational disease of miners which claims the lives of 3,000-4,000 per year—black lung disease.

Though many miners have not forgotten the lessons of past experiences with the federal government, its courts and its troops, and therefore know that all are tools of the companies, Arnold Miller—instead of attempting to reform the union from within, to oust the corrupt Boyle machine by mobilizing the rank and file to take the union into their own hands in order to fight for their interests against the companies—sued the union and brought the government into its internal affairs. The UMWA was put into virtual receivership by the Labor Department during its "investigation."

The government's real concern is not to "cleanup" the unions, but to wreck them in order that the capitalists it serves are freed to increase their exploitation of the workers. The notion that Nixon or Ford is concerned about democracy and corruption is ludicrous. Miners organized to do so are perfectly capable of getting rid of rotten union bureaucrats without any help from the bosses' government, as the history of the UMWA demonstrates. The question is whether their lot will be any better if they do. If one labor faker simply replaces another not much has changed.

Though when compared to Tony Boyle, Miller may look like the epitome of reform, and regardless of per-



WV PHOTO

UMWA local president Mickey Messer points out where bullet fired by Highsplint thug hit his truck.



WV PHOTO

Norman Yarborough, "Union Man's Enemy."

sonal character or intent, the disservice he has done the trade-union movement in opening wider the door to government intervention in the unions is enormous. The principle of the independence of the trade unions from the state is fundamental, and every attempt to undermine it and establish a precedent to the contrary is a dangerous betrayal.

As *W&R* goes to press Miller is in the process of negotiating a new national UMWA contract, the first since he has been in office. The old contract expires November 12 and the miners' "no-contract-no-work" tradition makes at least a short token strike inevitable. The provisions of the settlement of the Brookside strike against Duke Power included the exemption of Brookside from participation in a national miners' strike with expiration of the contract. Though weary from their thirteen months' battle, the mining population around Brookside appears disinclined to continue producing coal while fellow workers are on strike. Miller may well find his "compromise" with Duke Power meaningless if even one miner from anywhere decides to picket at Brookside. Crossing picket lines is correctly considered scabbing there.

Decline of the Brookside Women's Club

The Brookside Women's Club, though formally resurrected under "new leadership," in fact ceased to exist as originally constituted some time after Brookside was closed down. The original core of Brookside women walked out, with the Maoist October League (OL) asserting in the *Call* that a split had developed between those who felt that the club should concern itself only with Brookside and those who sought to broaden its sphere of political struggle. The facts remain in dispute. When Brookside representatives did seek to involve themselves in the larger labor movement, however, by addressing the first national conference of the Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW), they were denied entry on the grounds that they were not union members! And the opportunist OL, which could not risk alienating the labor bureaucrats who comprise the

central leadership of CLUW, kept silent.

Some of the Brookside Women speak with a hint of nostalgia of their days on the picket line. They regret the demise of their club and would like to reconstruct an on-going organization to do strike-support work where needed and to generally aid the UMWA organizing drive in eastern Kentucky. They would like to maintain the solidarity and community with their fellow workers, the broadened horizons, bred of their collective effort for a cause they strongly believe in—trade unionism, a decent life for working people—



State troopers at Highsplint.

WV PHOTO

WORKERS VANGUARD

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

W&R 7

- Enclosed is \$5 for 24 issues
- Enclosed is \$1 for 6 introductory issues

includes SPARTACIST

order from/pay to: Spartacist Publishing Co.
Box 1377, GPO/NY, NY 10001

the source of the dignity and respect to which "those who make society's wheels turn" are entitled.

But despite its members' dedication to trade unionism and their personal heroism, an organization like the Brookside Women's Club is necessarily limited from the outset. While it was able to organize short-term strike support, without a revolutionary program and the political leadership of a Leninist party it could go no further toward the achievement of the broader social goals necessary for lasting victory.

Such a victory for the miners of "Bloody Harlan" will require a struggle which will begin with the formation of opposition caucuses in the UMWA to oust the traitorous bureaucrats who control the union and replace them with a class-struggle leadership dedicated to fight for a workers government; it will culminate in the uprising of all sectors of the working class solidly united under the revolutionary leadership of a disciplined vanguard party to smash the rule of capital and begin the construction of a socialist society. Such a struggle cannot succeed without the active intervention of masses of working women and the wives of working men. We have every confidence that this fighting proletariat will include within its ranks women who are veterans of the Harlan County battles. ■

Women Fight for UMWA in Harlan County

Brookside Organized After 13-Month Strike

HARLAN, November 8—After thirteen months on strike the miners of Brookside, Kentucky, scored a victory when Duke Power Company and its subsidiary, Eastover Mining Company, agreed to accept the national contract of the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) on August 29. A long and tough class battle has been fought to bring the UMWA back to Harlan County, and the job is only begun. One thing everyone involved agrees on, including Norman Yarborough, president of Eastover, is that the women of Brookside were key to the miners' victory.

Union-busting is a tradition in this southeast corner of Kentucky. Harlan County earned the byname it carries to this day—"Bloody Harlan"—in the organizing battles of 1931-32 during which three thousand men were blacklisted in the area. On 5 May 1931 the Battle of Evarts took place in which an undetermined number of men, including three deputies, died. As a result 34 miners were charged with murder, and 100 more were arrested on charges of "criminal syndicalism."

Among the numerous pensioners who reside in Evarts, just a few miles up from Brookside on Highway 38, and the other mining villages in the hollows along the Cumberland River, many vividly remember these battles and are more than willing to recount the events in dramatic and articulate detail. They remember well because then, perhaps even more than now, the issue was one of survival.

The headaches of Norman Yarborough and Carl Horn, president of Duke Power Company, based in Charlotte, North Carolina, began at the end of June 1973 when miners at Eastover's Brookside and Bailey's Creek mines voted to recognize the UMWA as their bargaining representative by a vote of 113-55. For three years, since Duke Power had bought the mines, they had involuntarily been represented by the company-created Southern Labor Union (SLU), whose "sweetheart" contract had expired. The entire purpose of this "union" is to prevent unionization of the mines in the area. Workers were fired according to company whim under the SLU contract.

Safety conditions were abominable. In 1971 the Brookside mine had a disabling injury rate three times the national average; in 1972 its rate was twice the national average. Welfare and retirement benefits, as important to the miners and their families as wages, were virtually non-existent.

The Brookside women all tell the same story of doctors, clinics and hospitals rejecting the SLU medical card as a scrap of paper from which they would never collect their fees. On occasion, when the medical cards were accepted, the women who had used them found themselves pursued by collection agencies.



WV PHOTO

Even now in Harlan the campaign waged by the companies against the UMWA retains crusade proportions. Every few minutes the local radio station broadcasts spot announcements sponsored by the company front, "KIN, Inc." (Keep Informed Neighbor), denouncing the UMWA as an enemy of working people. In response to KIN, Inc.'s broadcasts and newspaper ads the president of the local Boosters Club has offered a \$5,000 reward to anyone who can produce three miners on SLU pension; A safe bet.

Duke Power Refuses to Negotiate

In provocative defiance of the workers' vote Duke Power refused to sign the standard national UMWA

continued on page 18