

PLP Convention Bulletin # 2

Outline for Political Strategy Discussion.....	1
Comments on Fighting Racism, Nationalism, etc.....	3
" " " " " "	7
Criticisms of <u>On Contradiction</u>	10
On Challenge.....	26
Comments on Road to Revolution III Document.....	29
Criticisms of Challenge.....	31
Criticisms of Challenge.....	34
Buffalo PLP Members, View on Elections.....	37
A Criticism of the term "Marxism-Leninism" Based on PP44-46 of Road to Revolution III.....	40
Evaluation of party leadership.....	43
Discussion of Challenge by Minneapolis PL club.....	48

HAPPY NEW YEAR:

For every PL club --
Outline for Political Strategy Discussion

(Use Milt Rosen's speech in the latest PL magazine as preliminary reading.)

1. What is the main political goal of your club in the mass movement in the coming year? (i.e. Build the anti-racist struggle of SDS; build 30/40 committees in the union, etc.)

2. WHY IS THIS SOMETHING YOU WANT?

3. What is the main political point which our Party needs to make in this work? In other words, why does PL need to be in this mass movement? What is the communist contribution that will help lead this struggle in a revolutionary direction? (i.e. we have to point out that the fight against racist textbooks is basically a fight for the working class and for a worker-student alliance; or we need to warn people not to rely solely on elections to achieve reforms; or racism is the main obstacle to rank & file power; or mobilize masses of people; or ???)

4. How do you see this particular struggle as helping to lead to a workers' revolution in this country? Is it really necessary that we win people to our position (in point 3 above) in order to move this struggle towards revolution?

5. Specifically HOW does your club plan to raise this Party position with other people involved in the struggle during the coming months? (i.e. Plan private individual discussions with six or seven people on this point--if so, who & when or have an expanded club meeting on this point, and invite ???; or a forum; or write an article for Challenge on the point--if so, can we get someone in the base to help write it, or to help do an interview or a written debate?; or put out a leaflet; or ???)

In the course of raising this point, can you envision recruiting any of the people around your club to the Party or to a base group - challenge club - study group? If so, who?

* * * * *

It is hoped that the above questions will be a help to clubs and members in developing strategic thinking and proposals for the coming period. They should be considered in that spirit, and not as a mechanical agenda or "test." It will probably be worthwhile having more than one session on this question(s), and perhaps different club members can prepare something in advance on one or more of the above. Please have someone in the club get a report in to the area or regional committee on how the discussions and articles, etc. are coming along.

N.S.C. (resulting from Dec. 1972 NC meeting)

p.s. At some point in the near future, it might be good to have one or two members of each club draw up a Plan for Work of the Club for

1

2

2-2-2-2-2 N.S.C.

the Coming 6 months, and then discuss it in the club. However, this can't really be done, until the strategic outlook is discussed and thought through (above).

When the National Student Conference at Southern University was called by the National Student Govt. Association and SDS in New Orleans, many Party students and SDSers attended. Prior to the meeting no one anticipated that nationalism would be a major obstacle in building ties with the students at S.U. As it turned out nationalism was a major obstacle. Due to what we think was pressure from the Baton Rouge Campus, which is controlled by Muslims, and other nationalist types, students at S.U. who had been friendly to the Party and SDS did not become hostile, but cooled their relations with us considerably.

This meeting was attended by BSU's from different schools and the Republic of New Africa. White students in SDS and the Party were attacked for being White. It was said that they could show their respect by being absent, and play a supporting role (money contributions) and more or less do as they were told. Black students in the Party and SDS were attacked because they, according to these nationalists, were "being used" and shouldn't work with White groups anyway.

The question of building anti-racist struggles got raised (though rather timidly) and was immediately put into the background by Nationalists talking about "our people" an "African Nation" and mourning the two Black heroes that died. These leaders came right out and said that people could talk about a student strike and anti-racist struggles at some later date, but that the main thing was these two heroes. As in the past, these things were raised as an excuse for doing nothing about fighting racism coupled with the fact that these nationalists think that a "Black identity," and building an African Nation were cure-alls for racism.

A lot of SU students were confused and partially won over to this nationalist garbage. The main responsibility for this mostly falls upon the Party and SDS for not raising our ideas about fight racism more vigorously. Except for a few comrades, virtually nobody defended the Party and SDS and only one comrade along with a friend attempted to turn the attack around and raise the politics of nationalism (and that was only after the meeting was over). Because we did not defend our ideas, we objectively helped build a base for the Ruling Class by not taking nationalism head-on and trying to destroy its influence. Comrades appeared to have illusions about nationalism being a tool of the bosses. White comrades took a very liberal racist position about nationalism being only a "reaction to racism." When nationalist forces say "You are White- the struggle is ours not yours" not to attack it (both Black and White comrades) is saying "You're right. Racism is not a class question. White workers and students have no interest in fighting racism." The Party should be very clear that nationalism is not just a psychological reaction, but has its political and economic basis in capitalism. Every nationalist movement in the history of the world has talked about "our own," "our people," (the main ideas of the ruling class). The C.I. decided that the way to beat Fascism was to be better nationalists than the Fascists and unite with the more "patriotic" bosses. What happened? Fascism won in Spain causing millions of workers and peasants death and suffering. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Socialism was defeated in France and Italy-- more reprisals and exploitation for working people. The international itself was disbanded. The "independence" movements in Africa after WWI have all ended up with imperialism being in an even better position

2-2-2-2-2 Cleveland students

tion to rob and murder African workers and peasants. Marcus Garvey said "Back to Africa" and "capitalism is necessary to the progress of the world." Garvey then stole over \$1,000,000 from Black workers in the U.S. Was it an accident the Garvey's movement began to grow at the same time the CP was trying to get Black and White workers together for an organizing drive in the steel industry? What did it have to do with the big race riot in Chicago that same year? During the period of massive ghetto rebellions with Black workers fighting the cops and national guards and students joining them on campus. Why did Ford Foundation start funneling money into "Community Control" programs, bankrolling "compensatory education" programs at big universities, financing "Black Power Conferences" etc.? In Cleveland, Ford Foundation has given hug sums to the Stokes campaign, groups like the Federation of Black Nationalists, the Afro Set, Core (all of them are either organizations of either Black sops or petty gangsters & dope pushers, no workers). Ford Foundation made sure it got a lot of newspaper space for "helping Black people." At the same time the bosses media put in motion the "forgotten America" and whipped up racism among White workers--this "forgotten America" campaign got Nixon elected in 1968.

It was very clear of the bosses in the 60's and right now that manufacturing racism wasn't enough to keep Black and White students and workers apart so they began to build nationalism. They fed on the cynicism of Blacks who had had enough of liberal Whites and liberal solutions. Black workers and students not always understanding how the bosses used racism, began to blame the average White person for unemployment, poverty. The bosses had already done their homework in that they had had White workers blaming Blacks for unemployment and poverty. The groundwork was laid (mind you, I said Black workers were cynical not nationalist). The bosses then began to promote people like Stokely Carmichael, Roy Innis, Robert Williams etc, who talked about Black Power and later Black superiority over Whites (Also, it was about this time that polemics about the Black male began circulating throughout the country, that a Black woman must serve her man, and build the African nation, which means manufacture babies, and prostitute herself in the name of Blackness. We can contribute this to Ron Karenga, LeRoi Jones and Co.) Soon Black Studies were demanded by Black college students. What do Black studies consist of? A bunch of Black Kings who oppressed hundreds of people and sold millions into slavery, and by the way, practiced polygamy (which is something that nationalist groups have picked up. Is this or is this not capitalism?) We can see nationalism is built on the same ideas that capitalism is built on.

We are saying that the fight against racism must be fought simultaneously with the fight against nationalism. It is used in the very same way. More importantly, it is used as a stopgap in trying to prevent Blacks and Whites from fighting racism. Is it any accident that on campuses all over the country, Black student leaders are attacking SDS because White students along with Blacks are building fights against racism. Most Black students don't see the need to fight racism alongside White students. It is up to the Party and even SDS to

3-3-3-3 Cleveland Students

5

to point out why racism can and must be fought in a united effort of Black and White students and workers.

If we don't fight nationalism by discussion why Black and White students have to unite and attack the campus administration for its racist policies, then students who might agree that racism should be fought might not see the need for a multiracial organization. These Black students could say "okay, SDS wants to fight racism, and so does my organization, so we'll fight it our way and SDS can fight it their way." Which of course would be wrong. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~

On campuses across the country SSDS is under attack by nationalist "leaders" who would rather talk "Blackness" than fight back. The fight against racism on these campuses IS GOING TO INVITE ATTACK. The campus rulers have it set up this way! They would love to see these hand-picked "leaders" incite Black students into attacking SDS. By granting demands for Black Institutes, Cultural centers, etc., campus bosses have made ready for any serious attack on racism by a multiracial group like SDS.

At Tri-C Metro Campus in Cleveland, a white SDSer was physically attacked by BSU (Black Student Union) leaders. There was a fake fight recently between a Black mod-squader and a white mod-squader. The MUNTU DRUM (the Black student newspaper) devoted almost an entire issue to attacking SDS on the grounds that we are "an upper-middle-class white organization," and saying that "revolution will be between Black and white." It should be noted here that the person who wrote these things has been helping the Administration organize against student rebellion for two years. So we can see that it is in the Administration's interest to ~~xxx~~ whip up nationalism and cloud racist oppression on campus.

SDS should play a role in exposing these nationalists, just as they did with the CIA-run National Student Association. If SDS does not clearly see at least that white students have an interest in fighting racism, then they won't stand up in the face of these nationalist attacks. At Ohio State, a friend of PL told us that a number of SDSers had cooled off on recognizing the need to fight racism after a withering attack by Black Student Association leaders, with SDSers "hanging their heads." This is just like saying that the need for SDS to build antiracist fights on campus depends upon how hard a section of the campus ruling class attacks us, and that the need to fight racism has not been proven by hundreds of years of class struggle in this country. Again, this is a clear example of racism in SDS and illusions about nationalism. WE aren't ~~supposed~~ saying that SDS should adopt the Party's position on nationalism, or that everybody in SDS has to see that it weakens the class struggle and the fight against racism. But SDS should be won to seeing that in almost every case the top leadership of Black Student Unions have no interest in fighting racism and don't want anyone else to fight it because BSU's would lose the reason for their existence and these big-shot leaders would be out of the jobs the campus bosses ~~xxx~~ ^{have} given them to push nationalism and keep Black and White students from getting together against the Administra-

4-4-4-4 Cleveland Students

6

tion. These "leaders" often draw two and three checks from the school along with Ford Foundation grants. Wherever and whenever possible, SDS should expose this and say that these bastards are attacking SDS and Black-white unity as an excuse for not doing anything. It is RACIST to have the outlook that "all Black people are oppressed by racism, so they must know more about it than whites in SDS." Again, this idea arises from not really seeing the need for white students to fight racism. If not rooted out through struggle and discussion, these wrong ideas will destroy SDS and the Party, as well as large numbers of workers and students. IN FIGHTING RACISM, WE ARE FIGHTING FOR PROGRESSIVE LABOR'S EXISTENCE AS A COMMUNIST PARTY AND SDS'S EXISTENCE AS A STUDENT ORGANIZATION THAT FIGHTS THE BOSSES--not just for "other people." Like Milt said, people shouldn't become so "objective" and "analytical" that they somehow view themselves as watching the class struggle from behind Lenin's portrait. WE should hate the ruling class because it is trying to destroy US. We should hate racism because it will murder US, if we don't fight it. Not fighting racism and nationalism destroyed a once-powerful ^{communist} movement and condemned billions of working people to endure imperialism for many, many more years.

What we are saying throughout this report is that the view that we should launch anti-racist struggle and then raise the question of nationalism, is one-sided. To think that all we have to do is fight Kirklik or Herrnstein and people will join SDS in droves is to underestimate the time and money that the ruling class has spent to win people to no-struggle ideas. Campus rulers consciously use nationalist leaders and groups to whip up racism among whites as well as to trick minority students into believing that "white people will always be racist." The Party and SDS must smash these ideas.

Fraternally,
Student Section
Cleveland PL

P.S. We propose a lot more discussion in SDS chapters. People should understand why they are being attacked by nationalist leaders, and how they can deal with it.

7

Dear Comrades,

What we want to raise with comrades is around what we think is a disagreement on the part of comrades, especially white comrades on the question of nationalism.

~~LINE~~

Although the fight against racism has been the party's line since its inception, it is just now being put into practice in a ~~serious~~ serious and mass way, especially in the student section. Comrades see much more clearly that the fight against racism ~~is~~ is truly a life and death struggle. But we don't think that comrades, especially white comrades see the fight against nationalism as a life and death struggle. We tend to look at it and say "well a lot of Black students are nationalist as a reaction to racism," which is most definitely true. But it is a lot more than that. IT KILLS. The bosses use nationalism in the same way they use revisionism, to fool the working class, but mostly to split the anti-racist struggles and keep them predominantly Black so that white students, teachers, and workers think that Blacks are the only people who rebel and something must be wrong with them. Just like the bosses want us to think China is socialist, they want Blacks and Whites to think nationalism and some abstract Black identity, is the cure-all for racism.

With all the anti-racist struggles going on, on campuses throughout the country, one of the biggest obstacles is nationalism, especially these big nationalist leaders who use the feeling of inferiority in Blacks which incidently is common to all working class people, as well minorities, to build a "do nothing" campaign around themselves. They feed on emotion and in most cases work hand in hand with the school administration, which makes sure they don't start any anti-racist struggles on campus. Not only that, but at Tri-C Campus in Cleveland, and in the Black community, the nationalist take-over of ~~us~~ about 1965 was disastrous. Nationalist leaders were having other Blacks killed, they were the biggest dope pushers in ~~the~~ schools and in the communities. They forcefully administered heroin to little boys 9, 10, 12, years old, so the kids would do what they told them (like jump on other kids and take their money so they ~~could~~ could buy heroin for their habits, and also use guns to steal from other people mostly Black, for the "Black cause"). Not to mention the chauvinist, opportunist justifications for the unfathered babies they left all over the cities, and young 14 year old girls they had whoring and fighting and stealing for them, all in the name of Blackness and honoring the Black man. They started a reign of terror all over the major cities in this countries. And it is no different now.

In light of this, we think that attack on nationalism has to be 100% sharper. In the past, comrades have not seen nationalism as the killer it is.

White comrades seem to take a liberal attitude towards attacking nationalism. If there was a strong nationalist movement

8

in any European country we would attack it. If a movement in an Asian, Indian, or African country was nationalist we would attack it. If the Treas or the CP were building a ~~strong~~ strong revisionist movement (which they are trying to do) we would attack it sharply. Why do we have this liberal attitude around attacking nationalism in the U.S.? We think it grows out of a feeling of white comrades thinking they have to "prove themselves" as true fighters of racism. Before they can attack nationalism, when we know what an effective tool nationalism has been for the bosses. Also, when nationalists attack white students and workers for being white and of course they could't possibly know anything about racism, not to defend the party and SDS is the same thing as saying that it is not in the interest of white students and workers to fight racism and to smash anything that the bosses use as an obstacle in doing that. Not to attack nationalism out of a liberal attitude is racist. Not to attack nationalism generally is revisionist. ~~White students did not take nationalism head-on at the conference~~

White students did not take nationalism head-on at the conference in New Orleans (neither did anyone else), but white comrades seemed to feel that we have to sort of duffle out feet, and hang our heads if we wanted to be in these groups, we think this is wrong and we should struggle against feelings like this. If white comrades go to these nationalist meetings and are attacked for being white, they must say that these big nationalist leaders are doing this to get out of building anti-racist struggles, and to also take the initiative and have a plan ready to kick off an anti-racist campaign. We have to raise the politics of nationalism so that students, workers, ~~Black~~ Black and ~~White~~ White will NOT think that nationalism is progressive or that "Black people have a right to feel that way". Feeling that way is not only ~~not~~ NOT attacking racism but leads to things like Black students and workers supporting Carl B. Stokes, Shirley Chisholm, Stokely Carmichael, and a host of ~~other~~ others. It people to the illusion that somehow Black cops have softer, less deadly bullets than White cops.

White comrades can not stand back and be intimidated by big-shot nationalists leaders, and hang ~~the~~ heads and shuffle ~~the~~ feet because they are white, or be opportunist and not attack these "do nothings" because we win over their base. If we don't attack them, people will think that we agree with them (silence is consent) so what would be the point of joining SDS when they could be in a nationalist group. What would be the difference in us and them? It is up to us to point out that difference. Many Black students don't agree with nationalist dogma anyway. It is important they we raise that Blacks and Whites have to unite or they cannot win.

The Tri-C BSU (Bullshit Union) almost ~~succeeded~~ succeeded in keeping SDS from linking up the struggle at Southern U. with the one at Tri-C because they don't want to lose their Ford Foundation grants. They used nationalism and long empty eulogies to do it too. One reason they were almost able to do it is because we had illusions about them. We didn't think they would go that far. We didn't see dealing with nationalism as

9

dealing with a section of the ruling class. As a result we did not see BSU leaders as a very integral part of the campus administration. They used the fact that SDS is a multiracial organization which included white students (and they could not possibly have a stake in fighting racism) as a reason for cutting us off the agenda for the rally in support of S.U. because they knew we would tie in our anti-racist struggle with that of S.U. This should be a lesson to us.

Fighting racism and nationalism are two sides of the same coin, and the weakness in doing this is the main form revisionism is taking in our party at this time.

Cleveland Club
Student section

10

PRE-CONVENTION DISCUSSION

CRITICISMS OF ON CONTRADICTION

I used to think that every thing that Mao wrote must be perfect. It was the easy way out, the heart of revisionism to accept things without question. After RRIII it is easy to see how wrong this is, that M-L (which in itself is not really a correct term) has to be developed in a mass way, that we each have to think and question and contribute as much as we can.

There is a thread of an error which runs through Mao's philosophical writings. These errors lead to the acceptance of a united front with a section of the ruling class, the related ideas of periods of peaceful coexistence with the ruling class or sections of it, and not seeing the importance of an all out fight against racism. This is in disagreement with RRIII and shows a lack of confidence in winning masses of rank and file working people to socialism. It also shows a lack of confidence in people which is needed to unite tens of millions of people in successful rank and file united fronts.

In order to point out what is wrong with On Contradiction, On The Correct Handling of Contradictions among The People, On Practice, etc. it ^{is useful} ~~necessary~~ to give a brief review of Dialectics, ~~which is what On Contradiction is about. If we can get clarity and agreement on these points it might be useful to expand them into a PL magazine article.~~ One of the things wrong with On Contradiction is that it is too complicated, too hard to understand. If something is hard to understand, it is probably wrong. If we didn't have this attitude, we could get snowed under by confusing arguments which is also revisionism.

Dialectics is the Greek word for contradiction. Things

change because of the opposing forces within them. So ^{is} dialectics ~~has come to be known as~~ ^{like mass movement} the subject of how things change, move, grow, and develop. Since we are building a mass movement to win Socialism and intermediate movements to win 30 for 40, fight racism on campuses, etc., it is very important for us to be able to figure out how to make these movements grow. Even the idea that movements do have to grow, that they can't spring full grown out of the air is important in having a patient long term attitude and not giving way to cynism.

Everything in the universe is made up of some assembly of smaller ^{units} units. Things move and change by rearrangement of these ^{units} units or by getting rid of or including new ^{units} units.

Marx and Engels basing themselves on the work of others before them showed that how things move and change can be described in three statements:

1) Everything has pairs of opposite forces within itself that are pulling the things of which it is made into ^{opposite} opposite arrangements (aspects). One of the pair of forces dominates and mainly determines the character of the thing. That is, ~~in~~ the dominant force determines the main aspect of the thing, how the thing is arranged. The dominant force pulls towards another arrangement, the minor aspect. The major and minor aspect are both present in the thing just as both forces are present. This is called the unity of opposites.

2) For the thing to change, the two sides have to change place. The weaker force becomes the stronger and vice versa. The minor aspect becomes the main aspect and vice versa. The thing goes through a sharp rearrangement. This is called the transformation of quantity (the weak force gaining strength gradually)

leave in

into quality (the sharp rearrangement).

3) The two aspects ~~are in a constant state of~~ of the thing and the two forces within the thing will keep changing dominate positions with each other ^{oscillating} like a tug-of-war until the contradiction between them is resolved. This is called the negation of the negation

An example of all these ideas is given by water. Water can not exist without water vapor. Leave a dish of water out in a dry room and it will evaporate. Water and water vapor are opposite aspects. The opposing forces are the cohesive forces holding the water molecules together and the thermal motions which are jiggling the molecules apart. Under certain conditions water is the main aspect. Heat it and at first nothing ~~is~~ much happens. It takes a certain quantity of heat ^{leave in} before a qualitative change will take place - boiling. The heat acts to ^{gradually} strengthen one of the internal forces, the thermal jiggling motion. At boiling, the vapor becomes the main aspect, water in the form of clouds become the minor aspect. Under proper conditions the vapor will disappear and water will return in the form of rain. This cycling around ^{the two aspects oscillating back & forth} is what is meant by ~~negation of the negation~~. Notice that both aspects are always present because the forces do not act uniformly on each molecule. Or saying it another way, not all the molecules will be at the same temperature. Some of the water molecules will be hotter than the rest and join the vapor; some of the water molecules in the vapor will be colder than the rest and rejoin the water. This is due to contradictory forces within the water molecules themselves since they are also made up of smaller particles.

In society, the two aspects are the working class, and the ruling class. The opposing forces are the way capitalist society is set up under ruling class ~~rule~~ dictatorship (the relations of production) on the one hand and the increasing political awareness in the working class worldwide due partly to the efforts of our party, increasing automation ~~xxxxxxx~~ and ~~xxxxxxx~~ imperialist rivalry (the forces of production), the increasing awareness of oppression on the part of the working class. The active work of our party increases the heat, increases the forces opposed to the ruling class by bringing more and more workers together to campaign against the ruling class step by step towards workers power. Right now the ruling class is the dominate force, but with the proper strengthening of the working class forces, a sharp transformation, revolution, will take place, society will be rearranged, and the working class will rule. If the working class does not organize itself properly to eliminate classes and class contradictions continue to exist after the socialist revolution, then the capitalist class will inevitably stage a comeback ^(negation of the negation) ~~(negation of the negation)~~ as happened in Russia or China. As long as two opposite aspects exist, they will take turns being the dominant aspect. A common example is when we build a mass organization improperly and ruling class forces come in and take it over.

Another example is arithmetic. Numbers are the things to be arranged and the forces are the different math operations. There is an opposite to every math operation: addition-subtraction, multiplication-division, real-imaginary, and so on).

These concepts can only exist in pairs, one without the other is unthinkable just like the concept of up means nothing without the concept of down. Plus times minus gives plus or double negative means positive are examples in math of negation of the negation.

Another example is the muscles of the body which always occur in pairs pulling the limbs in opposing directions (different arrangements).

All things move through the tug-of-war between pairs of forces. If a body or object was being pulled by only one force it would be zipped away infinitely fast and disappear for there would be nothing to hold it back. So anything that we can observe moving must have two opposing forces in it.

This ~~is~~ tug-of-war in all things causes a graininess in all things. Everything is made up of some assembly of smaller things and there is a natural size to things. For example, water is made up of molecules, society is made of people (not one big blob of living matter), electricity is not a continuous fluid but is made of a stream of electrons. The forces that hold people together makes them attain a certain natural size. The forces that hold water together means that water droplets will be a certain size, and society can only develop so far under capitalist rule before it becomes unstable as has already happened.

External forces act to strengthen the hand of one or the other of the two internal opposing forces. Like heat adds to thermal motion in water and political work of PL adds to the working class forces. Actually there is no such thing as external in the sense of a separate type of force; there are only boundaries around things and arbitrary definitions of what is

15

internal and external.

There are no hard, unchangeable objects in the world because there are no solid, rigid, objects made of some perfectly uniform material. Society is not a hard rigid object that cannot change no matter how much the ruling class would like us to believe that, but is made up of people many of whom have already developed portions of working class ideas through their daily struggles for survival with the ruling class. There is no permanence to anything, although the ruling class would have us believe that capitalism is permanent.

Different workers see different parts of reality, of working class ideas. Because working class ideas are scattered throughout ~~the~~ the working class, it is necessary to make a concentrated, systematic effort to assemble them in opposition to the ruling class. This is why we have our communist Progressive Labor Party. Even water will not boil just because the temperature has been raised above the boiling point. It will sit there until some bit of grit comes along to trigger the process. ~~When water is heated~~

Everything in nature is connected to everything else. Thus people get their ideas from their direct experience every day either on the job or through television, papers,.... The ruling class campaigns every day for their ideas that workers are no good, spread racist lies about black and latin people, and work in a deliberate way to create the kinds of ideas they have to have people believe in order for them to rule. People's ideas come from their real experiences and people act on the basis of their ideas. That only real things exist and that ideas

16

do not spring out of the air is what we mean when we say we are materialists. Because the ruling class is pulling on all of us in a deliberate way to accept its ideas and surrender, we need a communist party working in a deliberate scientific way to campaign against these ideas. It takes a deliberate plan to build united fronts where millions of working class people can take the first steps of getting together and struggling against the ruling class. It is this deliberate, disciplined way of gathering working class ideas and coming up with systematic programs that we all go forward to put into practice that we call democratic centralism. We come up with programs, test them in practice and reevaluate them in a never ending cycle to get closer and closer to a correct understanding of nature and working class ideas.

THE UNITED FRONT

Although the party concentrates working class ideas and works towards the goal of socialism, we can not expect socialism to come about all at once any more than water can boil when first set on the stove. As water heats up, bubbles begin to form; these bubbles in capitalist society ~~are~~ are our united front.

Every working person has a mixture of working class-ruling class ideas within them, and we want to develop the working class aspect of all of us. We unite with people in the center to oppose the ruling class. Thus gradually the center is pulled to the left. The party develops in this way also with the party leadership playing the role of the left pole within the party. The party leadership works to concentrate the party's line even further and thus give

(17)

leadership to the whole party and the working class. Leadership means helping to focus political discussion on the main force holding us back so we can gain clarity, increase unity in the party and the united front, and move forward. Political clarity is the basis of unity within the party and within the united front.

Since ideas come from people's real experiences they have, we want to involve ourselves with whatever level of struggle people we are working with are willing to take. We unite with people around some common program, our mass line. We point out the next step always seeking to raise the level of struggle and unity. This is our vanguard line. Throughout all these struggles we point out the long range goal of workers' power and eventual classless society, our independent line.

We do not ever want to include any section of the ruling class (at least not in the sense that we're allied with it) in the united front because the ruling class is the opposite pole from the party. Our goal is to pull workers slowly and steadily towards the left.

On Contradiction

In On Contradiction, Mao put forward a strategy of uniting with a section of the ruling class. He does this by talking about dialectics in a somewhat correct but confusing way. Then he raises some unclear and wrong terms. He talks about the particularity of contradiction as if there might be something particularly special about certain contradictions. Particularity is emphasized (the fancy word for this is empiricism) until the particular nature of the Nationalist forces, the Chiang Kai-Shek KMT forces

(18)

is stated as something that the working class can unite with. This uniting with a section of the ruling class is related to his theory of stages discussed in New Democracy in which he talks about making a Capitalist revolution and then making a socialist revolution.

Of course every contradiction has its features just like water is different from society. But every contradiction has certain features in common and there are no contradictions that are so "particular" as to not have these features. Every thing that moves, that's developing has opposing forces and opposite aspects. There are only working class ideas and ruling class ideas. The KMT has either to be dominated by ruling class or working class ideas.

Since Chiang and the people immediately around him are really only a small number of people, the purpose of such an alliance is really to get them to bring the forces which they are leading into some sort of united front. *But a united front of this type (from above) really abandons them,* ~~With the party~~ mixed together with a section of the ruling class, the party stops playing the role of the left pole, the campaign around working class ideas ceases and working class movement comes under the influence of a stronger ruling class pole. There will always be working class ideas so there is always the basis for a left, but there will not be any systematic movement towards the left without a communist party.

Wouldn't our party now take the position that we will never make any "united fronts from above" (like Mao made with the KMT) with any section of the ruling class or their labor lieutenants? I think so.

19

This does not mean we would never work in right lead united fronts. Working ~~xxx~~ in the McGovernment campaign was correct and is not a united front from above. We are working in such a campaign to try to form a left-center coalition with McGovern workers. If the party said to McGovern, "We will support you because we're for socialism but first we want to get you elected so we'll work for you and not talk about socialism," that would be a united front from above and it would be wrong. We can have a united front in any organization whether its lead by us or by the right. It would also be a mistake to work in such a campaign and say that PL was for electing McGovern. That would be abandoning our role of left pole in the working class. We should never support any of these fakers, from McGovern to Allende.

The type of united front "from above" that Mao was in with the KMT also means that no effort is made to unite with the base lead by the KMT. It is lack of confidence in them to abandon them for the sake of the "alliance" with their misleaders.

Mao also introduces the ideas of antagonism in contradiction to justify the policy of peaceful coexistence with the ruling class or a section of it.

Everything in nature is going through change because of the struggle of opposite forces within it. The closer this struggle gets to being near a qualitative change where water boils, the sharper the struggle becomes. This is universally true. This very sharp struggle near a rearrangement change, water boiling, socialist revolution, will occur in the development of every contradiction. It is not just antagonism. Mao uses the example of a bomb. While it sits there, he calls this a non-antagonistic contradiction. The explosion is antagonistic he says. Actually while it sits

20

"quietly" what is really happening is that a struggle is going on but as is always the case one side dominates (the forces that prevent the bomb from exploding). The bomb will explode sooner or later (go through a sharp rearrangement) unless the bomb is dismantled which destroys the contradiction. Distinguishing a quiet bomb from an exploding bomb as non-antagonistic versus antagonistic is like saying that there are two different types of contradictions, those undergoing sharp change, and those not. But there are not two different ways for contradictions to develop but only contradictions in varying stages of development.

Contradictions among the people will remain non-antagonistic not if as he says they are handled "properly", but only so long as the working class aspect of the ^{people} party clearly dominates so as to stay well away of going through a change where the ruling class could regain power.

In any united front, either the working class aspects dominate or the ruling class aspects dominate. Mao's talking about special handling of the contradictions between the KMT and CPC means first of all avoiding the question of which class of ideas dominates and of course this really means that ruling class ideas dominates. What he means by avoiding antagonistic contradiction is to avoid struggle with the ruling class, to let ruling class ideas dominate the UF. This is the only way their can be "peaceful coexistence" with a section of the ruling class or a "non-antagonistic contradiction (he means alliance) with it.

(21)

Secondary Contradictions

There is such a thing as handling secondary contradictions which exist among the working class correctly. The method should be friendly discussion, criticism and self-criticism and above all campaigning against the way that the ruling class exploits some sections ~~is~~ of the working class, black and Latin workers especially hard. Again, there is no such thing as two different kinds of contradictions as Mao says in On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among The People. There are not antagonistic contradictions and non-antagonistic contradictions but only contradictions in different stages of development. Contradictions among the people are not non-antagonistic contradictions but are contradictions between ruling class ideas and working class ideas. These secondary contradictions within the working class are the result of the uneven development of the primary contradiction between the ruling class and working class as a whole.

All secondary contradictions are the result of the uneven development of primary contradictions. *For example, boiling water will be turbulent because the pot is heated unevenly.* ~~Another~~ example, the most important secondary contradiction in ~~socialist~~ capitalist society is racism which results because the ruling class oppresses Black and Latin workers harder than white. The contradiction between the black and white working class is secondary because there is no direct force ~~between~~ pulling black and white workers apart, ~~there~~ white workers are not oppressing black workers. The ruling class oppresses both although it oppresses black workers harder. The way to resolve this contradiction is to campaign against racism, against the special oppression of black and Latin workers. In all of Mao's writings there is hardly any mention of

(22)

this crucial point. No where does Mao explain how to handle secondary contradictions; the all out fight against racism and the special oppression of sections of the working class internationally.

Art and Education

Mao's line on literature and art also reflects a lack of confidence in the people. He discusses taking the kings and princes off stage and making plays tell about workers. But the important point is the content of what the workers do in these books and plays. None of the plays Mao likes show workers organizing for rank and file power. They show "hero" workers (see "Taking Tiger Mountain by Strategy" as an example) leading a basically passive rank-and-file.

This is the key question; rank-and-file workers ~~power~~ achieved through rank- and-file united fronts for real socialism where workers run everything, or pretending "communists" misleading workers into sham socialism where bosses still run everything.

The Chinese had a similar line on education. During the cultural revolution they talked about working class control of the schools. By this, they meant committees of workers running universities. Again, this is like their line in art of merely interchanging some name in the same format. They did not handle the secondary contradiction within the working class between mental and manual labor properly. What is needed is a complete change in all structures in society so that workers can in fact run everything in a rank-and-file way. All the secondary contradictions originally caused by the ruling class must be smashed. Lenin pointed out how the old capitalist state can not

be taken over by workers because it is set up to filter out any direct rank-and-file control. It must be smashed and a workers state of a new type set up. The same is true of all institutions especially schools. Education should not be allowed to continue apart from production. The ruling class has education set up in its present form to hide the interconnections between things. The schools should be closed and former teachers allowed to work in plants and join factory committees. Education becomes more like an apprenticeship where learning takes place as part of factory production and scientific research work (which should also be combined). Production, scientific development, and learning should be combined at once, thus laying the basis of rank and file control of these activities and the withering away of these secondary class differences of mental and manual labor. This corresponds to eliminating all racist pay and labor grade differentials by preferential up grading, if we hadn't won this before the revolution.

Of course our party does not wait for the revolution to resolve secondary contradictions but fights all out against racism, sexism, etc. We also seek to unite different sections of the working class through various organizations and alliances.

The key idea necessary of socialism is having rank-and-file mass organizations centered in production that eventually will run everything. If this idea seems hard to win people to we must remember we ~~have~~ are fighting the key capitalist idea head on, that bosses must run everything. We have to unite step by step with people and pull them gradually to the left with many twists and turns. The main weakness I have had in the recent past in putting these ideas into practice is fund raising. Without fighting for mass fund raising we are not having the approach of developing mass participation in our party. If there is a distribution of degree of leftness in the working class, then there must exist millions of people today who will support us financially even though they might not be won to more active struggle. By not campaigning vigorously enough for donations among my friends and the people with whom I am working politically, it is as if I am telling them that the party is my private affair which they wouldn't really have a stake in. We have to demonstrate that we have the confidence in masses of working people that we are accusing Mao of lacking.

-END-

al Strelzoff, Cleveland, 1 Jan 73

25

Appendix- Some specific notes on On Contradiction

The page numbers refer to the Chinese edition of Mao's Selected Readings.
 p.72-72. Very confusing discussion of relation between internal and external. Preoccupation with internal-external is giving too much weight to boundaries, lays the basis for nationalism. Nothing is really external to anything else, it's all an arbitrary question of where boundaries are drawn.

p.75. "...It is in the particularity of contradiction that the universality of contradiction resides." Meaningless.

p.75. "...Struggle between aspects determines the life of all things." Confuses forces and aspects.

p.79. "There are many forms of motion in nature.... All these forms are interdependent but in its essence each is different from the others." This is empiricism and wrong.

p.80. "Qualitatively different contradictions can only be resolved by qualitatively different methods." Different types of contradictions certainly exist but these are "qualitative" in the sense of quantity into quality.

26
CRITICISM OF C-D RELATING TO SEEMINGLY

Over the years there has been a persistent stream of C-D relating more to form than content. The specifics of this was that many people in and around the party complained of language, rhetoric, cliches etc. In some cases this was true, in many it was really a disagreement over politics. A particular example of this was the always present criticism of the term imperialism, and its oppressive function. It was raised that people don't know what imperialism was, and that its function-in terms of exploitation was always exaggerated by C-D. The other criticism around this question was the way in which we handled friends of the imperialists in the mass movement. Virtually, every term C-D presented to describe the opportunists was criticized as sectarian. The following terms which were hit were: "running dogs, sell-outs, mis leaders, hacks, revisionists, fakes, right-wingers" etc. The only one removed from our jargon was the term "running dog", and its other reasonable facsimiles. As the war in Vietnam expanded, and imperialism in all its manifestations became clearer much of this type of criticism fell off.

The next main stage in this type of criticism of C-D was objections to criticizing the under-exposed enemies of the mass movement. These types were the weathermen, yippies, New Left figures like resistance leaders, Tom Hayden etc. The other types were nationalist leaders in the minority movements like Newton, Chavez etc. Many people felt that that they couldn't sell the paper to their base because their base had not yet come to this understanding. There was however, a growing unity in the party to try and stop lumping together the people in the mass movements and their leaders. For an example: "Unions and their members were bad if their leaders were bad." But much of this type of objections tended to fade as the ~~same~~ disastorous role of the ^{THESE} Weathermen types became clear. After all, what could be said about forces whose heroes and acts of heroism were practised by Charles Manson and his friends.

Of late, a somewhat new trend has come forward. In the name of fighting sectarianism the following type of criticisms are raised: You can't call Jensen et al nazis, don't make Golda Meir look like Hitler, it is bad taste to joke about Lady Bird and LBJ just after he died, it doesn't look nice to have 30-40 being shoved down Nixon's throat, etc. This raises some thoughts about the question of fascism. In Germany the people didn't wake up one sunny morning and read in the press about the announcement of fascism.

(27)

At least fascism, is not an act of a few people who decide it in the cellar one evening, and put it over the next morning. Coups are not the main aspect of this political phenomena. Sometimes coups don't even take place to usher in fascism. Like all developments it reflects quantity turning into quality. The ruling class uses bourgeois democracy. When this is no longer possible they use fascism. But during the period of bourgeois democracy they prepare the ground for the development of fascism. Certain laws are passed and possibly not utilized immediately. Ideas are put forward which are not really suited to the present political situation. It took the nazis many years to put over the ideas of the master-race, but even before the nazis took power ruling class ideologists were raising ideas of the master race or genetic inferiority. So today most of the racist ideas are fascist ideas and carried to their logical conclusion would qualitatively destroy more minority people. These fascist ideas are put forward by forces who are governed by this set of ideas. Hence they are fascists. The ruling class helps these fellows along because they see the possible use of these ideas as a "final solution." Every bourgeois democratic force in the ruling class is potentially tomorrows fascist leader. So when Golda Meir pushes fascist laws, acts, etc she is guilty of acting like a Hitler. Because she is Jewish doesn't alter this one bit. Jews are as capable as any other ruling class to destroy people. They are doing a pretty good job on the Palestinians. This is a class question.

Additionally, what some of these types of criticisms indicate is a general recoiling from sharpness. Sharpness, class hatred is a foreign object. Sharpness on certain occasions can be in bad taste. But a continuing pattern of this type of criticism indicates something else. Like their predecessors these points are often linked to the ability to win one's base. My friends object to this or that, hence I can't use the paper. There is no way to make sharpness or class hatred nice or polite. We should use every means possible to win people. For an example: If LBJ dies a long article on his role as ruling class force, shorter articles on his specific anti-working class actions, many sharp short simple things to indicate our hatred and contempt and derision of him. Usually ~~this~~ ^{THIS} type of things raises eyebrows-good. This forces us into sharp discussion. And more important we train ourselves and our class ideologically. One of our

(28)

weaknesses is that we do not have enough derision, hatred, contempt of the ruling class in the party. And of course it is far from satisfactory in the mass movement. And sometimes it is at a certain moment that the time is ready to hit hard. When the bosses are all ~~xxxxxx~~ crying over leaders like Truman and LBJ who killed tens of millions-"I never lost a nites sleep over the use of the A bomb" (Harry Truman when queried about any second thoughts about his use of the bomb) With a lift of the phone this slob killed over 500,000, ~~xxxxxxx~~ maimed other thousands, and ruined unborn babies with radiation poisoning in Japan. The Viets blood was still flowing as they put ~~xxxxxx~~ Johnson in his grave. Silence or long winded articles are not sufficient in this case.

Part of our job is to help win through experience and political struggle workers and our party to class hatred. I understand that many people would object to this now. More the reason to struggle with them. Can mistakes of tactics be made. Sure! But frankly, at this moment our press suffers from too much niceness-in my opinion.

comradely,

milt.

Referring to the Soviet transition from socialism to capitalism, RRIII states "The working class held fundamental power during this period. Hence the Soviet Union played a generally positive role throughout the world for nearly four decades." (p. 15) I interpret this to mean the S.U. was under d of p for approximately 39 years (1917-1956), and I feel that this statement is merely a convenient formula for agreeing with the Chinese line that Khrushchev usurped the d of p. My brief discussions with leadership in this area showed me I was still unclear on some aspects of d of p and I will raise these questions, but first I will try to put forth my disagreements with that statement.

My understanding of d of p is that it includes an aspect of proletarian democracy, without which d of p cannot continue to exist. I believe that this idea is put forth in p. 158 "...that the d of p be seen as a system of workers' rule with party leadership, a version of Left-center coalition under new conditions." (I feel that this, and the other aspects of left-center coalition will, in the long run, be one of the major ideological contributions our party will make to the world communist movement). I haven't seen or heard of the period of Stalin's leadership being characterized by proletarian democracy. Granted, the bulk of what I've read and heard about the S.U. under Stalin has been from bourg. sources, I still recall many statements we have made that imply that the masses did not hold power in the S.U. For instance "What ~~happened~~ would have happened in Soviet Russia in 1929-30 if the masses of peasants had been armed when the Party decreed the collectivization of land and implements...Without having won them ideologically to socialism..." (Of course, The History of the CPSU (B) says that expropriations were carried out by the masses of poor peasants--What are our sources on the S.U.? One of the weaknesses of the document is that it doesn't examine the Soviet experience in the same way as the Chinese experience, i.e. detail, depth, footnotes.) What about the alleged mass murders of Latvians and Estonians--did they happen? The U.S. Army has a very difficult time getting U.S. workers to carry this stuff out in Vietnam, how was it decided for the Red Army to do it? how was it implemented? was nationalism one of the key props? On page 65 we say that nationalism, acting as a substitute for internationalism* paved the way for the S.U. to become a fascist-imperialist state. We also say (p. 178) "The most important lesson of these years ('49-'59 in China) is that the peasants can grasp M-L and fight for socialism and communism." Was this, or something analogous, the trend in the S.U. for 39 years? On pages 90-1 we say the bourg. can regain power and the transition to communism can be reversed. This doesn't mean the full political and economic structure of capitalism can be quickly restored--that requires a transition period in which the bourg. undermines and slowly dismantles the socialist base. What it does mean is that state power is now being used to move the ideological consciousness of the people away from communism and towards capitalism. That use of state power is the essential definition of d of the b and what came to prevail in China from 1960-66." Now, we have claimed that capitalism

has been restored in the S.U.--primarily since 1956? Was the main aspect of Soviet state power something other than pushing nationalism and alliances with "good" imperialists from the time of the 7th World Congress?

Is proletarian democracy an essential part of d of p? Are socialism and d of p and working-class rule all the same? How many "governmental forms" can d of p take? can some forms (assuming there are some) that aren't characterized by proletarian democracy continue to exist as d of p for any length of time? Was western Europe ever socialist? (I doubt it.)

If eastern Europe and the DPRKorea were never socialist, or didn't remain so for long, and some of the major errors in China come from following the Soviet line, how can the S.U. have been a generally positive force for nearly four decades? Was the S.U.'s struggle against fascism really a key factor enabling other revolutions to develop (particularly China's)?

Were there ever wide based "ultra-left" movements in S.U.? On p. 164 we say "the system of management used in both state and joint enterprises was known as "one-man management" and had been quite conspicuously borrowed from contemporary Soviet practice"--How did "contemporary" Soviet practice differ from the system of management that Lenin defended from the attacks of the "democratic-centralists"?

We say that the defeat of the commune movement signals the end of d of p in China. Would it be accurate to say that that point signified the end of the left-center coalition that held state power? or did that end when the masses were disarmed and the PLA turned into a standing army (the PLA was a l-c coalition at least prior to the seizure of power)? Why do we say that the CCP subverted socialism faster with a New Democracy line than the CPSU(B) with a NEP line? Is it because the CCP was already building for seizure of state power on a line of concessions?

Didn't cult of personality become one of the major aspects of the later years of Stalin's leadership?

My basic question is: How separable are d of p and proletarian democracy?

Secondly: Can d of p exist without left-center coalition?

Additionally: When did state power in the SU cease to be l-c coalition? When did state power in China cease to be l-c coalition? If these were, in fact, l-c coalitions, were they substantially different from the type of l-c coalition communists formed to fight fascism?

*(from preceding page) by WWII what happened to the internationalist outlook of the Red Army of the WWI and Intervention days?

31

CRITICISMS OF CHALLENGE

Our club had a discussion of Challenge, and the majority felt the paper is very sectarian in its approach. This was based largely on reactions to the paper we have gotten from people we are working with. The main question we asked was this: why do we always have to defend Challenge to people? The ideas of M-L are exciting, and the news we have is exciting. So shdn't it be possible to present this news in a way which turns people on, instead of provoking a critical reaction from them? People frequently say, "There's interesting stuff in the paper, but it's biased, or too much rhetoric, or it exaggerates." Then we say, "Give me an example, let's discuss a particular article you disagree with." If one gets this far, we usually can analyze the criticism away, with the motif: you really don't disagree with the style, you disagree with our line. (Altho' this may be true, it begs the point. We shd have a style palatable enough that people can be exposed to our line, and not give up right away.) Criticism of the paper by party members is often met the same way: you're not really opposed to the style, it's the line you disagree with.

What's behind the criticism of "bias, exaggeration, rhetoric?" We are constantly interpreting news from our vantage point, not from the vantage point of the people involved in the incident. We felt this accounted for most of the feelings people had abt bias, etc. For example, take the Nov. 16 Challenge. The headline says, "Farmworkers and allies battle against Prop 22, Part of Workers grand strategy to wreck the union-busters." Now: do workers have a grand strategy? Are they out to wreck the union busters? Our feeling is they do not have such a strategy, they are a long way from it. We see a certain movement developing, and we are trying to develop such a movement, but most of the people involved at this point in fighting Prop. 22, for instance, don't see themselves as part of a grand strategy to wreck the union-busters. So this is our interpretation of a certain development in the class struggle, but it is not where people consciously are at, yet. Now how does this treatment of the news affect people? They say we are using people, or we are playing on events to give people an exaggerated impression of what's happening. If Challenge is to become a paper of the masses and not just of the party, it must report things as people feel they happened when they were participating.

Another example: this criticism comes from a very active and left high school student, who read the Vietnam pamphlet and agrees with our line on revisionism in Vietnam, which is really quite advanced. The pamphlet says something to the effect of: "Millions of students demonstrated against U.S. imperialism in the 1960's in opposition to its murder of Vietnamese workers and peasants." I don't have the actual quote right here, but his remark was: students here were opposed to the war mainly because they didn't want to be drafted, and because of pacifist sentiments, not because of a class understanding of imperialism vs. the workingclass et al of Vietnam. Now our point is that people weren't pacifist abt WWII and they are abt Vietnam, so clearly people make distinctions abt wars, but that doesn't mean

the students involved in the anti-war movement consciously understood these differences. Did they see themselves as opposing US imperialism and supporting peasants and workers revolt?

Another example: in the Nov. 16 Challenge, "Goose stepping racists must be brought to heel." Re Herrnstein, et al. Also the whole treatment of Herrnstein et al as "like Hitler, Nazis." Now a lot of people we are working with are opposed to Herrnstein, but they reject out of hand that he's like Hitler. In our UF work, we don't try to win people to fight Herrnstein because he's like Hitler. But in our "independent line" we pull out all the stops. It is one thing to draw analogies to Hitler and discuss how Herrn's ideas lead to racism, etc.; then we still had a chance of convincing people. But we pour on the invective so thick as in "Goose stepping..." and the cartoons with the swastika ^{embellished} over Herrnstein that people reject it.

In our treatment of various sellouts, we frequently attribute all sorts of personal ugliness to them. In discussing union leaders, McGovern, et al we use adjectives such as "snivelling, slinking, muttering," nouns such as "gang, cabal," etc. Now this prejudices people against our articles who aren't ready to accept our analysis of the sellouts, and furthermore this is not our line. We don't say McGovern is a nasty person, we say he serves the ruling class. It's beside the point that he may be a shithead. Why build our argument on the personalistic jabs when it's unnecessary? In the latest Challenge: "McGovern stomped off muttering, 'It ought to be the other way around.'" Why not "McGovern said, 'etc.'." Or consider the "love match" between Nixon and Mao.

One answer to these criticisms might be that we are dealing with white, middle-class, liberal people, and that workers don't have these criticisms abt the paper. There are two replies to this: 1) if a major section of the party is going to be in non-public work, working with people of this type, or who are anti-communist or conservative to one degree or another, then our press shd adjust itself accordingly. 2) We don't think workers react that differently to the paper. Most people in this country have a lot of illusions, including workers.

A way of summarizing this criticism of the lit. is this: in our mass work, the party has made progress in the last year in combatting sectarianism and learning what a UF is. But we seem to view Challenge as our independent organ, and therefore not subject to the same "limitations" we face in our mass work. (How many PLers talk abt "goose stepping racists" in SDS, on the job, in the McG. campaign, etc., when they're trying to win people to oppose Jensen?) Challenge is the last vestige of the purist approach. But this is wrong. Challenge is supposed to be a MASS PAPER. That is, it has a role in building the UF. It's not something we take out of a hidden pocket after some struggle and say, "Now this is what we're really abt." There have been some improvements recently in Challenge along these lines -- notably, emphasizing support for unions instead of attacks against piecards (eg UFW).

We suggest a campaign within the party to reform Challenge. It's not enough for the critics to write articles in the appropriate style. Perhaps the leadership of the Challenge collective shd meet with other sections to discuss how the paper shd be changed. There shd be a program worked out for changing the paper, instead of just circulating criticisms. (This could involve convincing non-party members to be on an editorial board, or more precisely, people who have some disagreements with us.)

Also -- need more interviews of people with differing views -- without always feeling we must ~~xxxxxx~~ answer it in the same space. Sometimes try inviting comments for the next issue. Someone also suggested we might consider returning to the use of by-lines in some cases, the more opinionated articles.

Dear Challenge-Desafio staff,

I think one weakness in our paper is that a lot of the political content of RRlll doesn't get put forward explicitly in the pages of Challenge, including the articles we in Buffalo have written. RRlll stresses the importance of winning the working class to having Socialism as its goal, and this means promoting a tremendous amount of discussion about what socialism is and how workers rule can be maintained after the revolution instead of, as in every past revolution, reversed. I don't think Challenge articles do this enough. The "Dear Reader" articles have been good, but for the most part they haven't been about Socialism.

A lot of times, when socialism is discussed at the end of an article, its just to say that Socialism in general is the only real answer to such and such a problem. But this doesn't help the reader understand what we mean by socialism, or why socialism would solve problems that many people feel are caused by "human nature" and hence are unsolvable.

The revisionists have reduced "socialism" to meaning nothing more than nationalization of industry, the chance to be ruled by "your own" instead of "foreign" bosses, and a more productive economy -- for the "red" bourgeoisie.

We need discussion in Challenge about what Socialism really means, for instance 1) workers rule over everything, 2) production for the needs of the entire working class -- not for the "national GNP" ie for some bosses profit, 3) the ongoing struggle for an ideology, culture and morality of serving the whole working class, not serving oneself, 4) better red than expert, 5) no special privileges for anyone including experts, elected officials, and communists (professionalism among teachers could be discussed from this point of view) 6) immediate recall of any elected official or government official, 7) the entire working class is armed and not standing army or police, 8) full democracy for the workers and their allies -- elections, plenty of meetings and discussion, gov't officials

including many non-communists (unlike USSR AND China) -- d of the p is a left-center coalition. 9) Complete dictatorship over ALL bosses and exploiters -- no rights of speech, organizing or anything else. 10) Communists will struggle to move from Socialism to Communism, a classless society, from each according to his ability, to each according to his need. 11). ETC.

I think one good way to get these ideas into Challenge more regularly would be to mention them explicitly in the articles about our reform struggles. Almost any article about a struggle ~~w~~ could be used to illustrate one of the above points. (For example, "... And when we prevented the Portuguese Foreign Minister from speaking, he got a little taste of ~~ix~~ what the dictatorship of the proletariat will mean for the likes of him...") No article need mention more than one or two of those points, and some articles none; but it seems that each issue of Challenge should have at least a few articles raising some of the above ideas quite explicitly.

For instance, in the Oct 5 issue the article on page 4 ("Union Reforms Strengthen Fight on GE Bosses") talks about efforts ~~f~~ to force the union Executive Board members to work 2 days a week and to get a union rule for immediate recall of elected officials by 51% petition of the membership. The article made the good point ~~that the reforms to the fight for contract demands against GE. But the article could have also taken this opportunity to explain how the principles of immediate recall of elected officials, and having officials work like everybody else are ~~ix~~ two pillars of Socialism, and are two of the ways that workers can not only keep the union leaders in check for a 30/40 fight, but also maintain workers rule after a revolution. This way, Challenge readers, instead of just reading about some interesting union reforms that GE workers in Lynn happen to be fighting for, will learn a little bit from this struggle about what Socialism is and how workers rule can be held onto and not lost as in China.~~

Another example. In the Sept. 21 issue, Pg. 11, there's an article ("People Drive Pushers From Streets in Fight Against Chicago Dope traffic") which describes how workers armed themselves to "take

the law into their own hands." to get rid of neighborhood pushers. The article ends with "only Socialist revolution and armed power of the working class can wipe out drugs completely." We could draw a lot more about Socialism out of an article like this one. This struggle shows 1) that an armed working class CAN maintain a socialist, pro-working class, "law and order" and 2) that not only do the Chicago ~~ix~~ police protect drug pushers, but that in general only bosses and pushers and parasites on the masses can gain from having a standing, separate police force and a dis-armed working class. We don't need any standing police or army!

I think if we had more discussion of the ideas in RRlll within our clubs and with our friends, then the articles we write for C-D about ~~ix~~ our daily struggles would put these ideas forward ^{MORE} often and in more concrete terms. These ideas are what makes Challenge a communist paper, not just a reform paper, so I think we should make SURE they are developed and elaborated upon in Challenge, and in our daily work -- not just in PL magazine once in a while.

In the same vein, I think we should put forward a lot more often the need for an ARMED REVOLUTION to OVERTHROW the GOVERNMENT(S). In the HISC report on PLP the congressmen were PRIMARILY worried about whether or not we called for armed, violent, revolution. We should make sure that it is ~~ix~~ impossible to read a copy of Challenge without reading of the need for the violent overthrow of the U.S. government by armed workers with communist leadership. ~~ix~~ This idea shouldn't be limited to the little obscure box on page 2. Its not enough to say we need Socialism -- Allende and the CPUSA say the same thing.

Comradely,

John Spritzler, P.L.P.

Why PLP Should Adopt the Line: "Vote for McGovern -- As President, THIS BOSS WILL Have to Put Up or Shut Up."

The draft NC report makes very good criticisms of our past sectarian mistakes and points very correctly to the need for our party to take united front work a lot more seriously.

The two most important things we have to do are 1) "get our foot into the door" or "get our hands dirty" or in other words enter into united fronts with people who are fighting for pro-working class demands, no matter whether we agree with their leadership and strategy or not, AND 2) put forward our party's independent line within the united front as boldly and thoroughly as possible (i.e. not in such a manner as to get thrown out of the ~~ME~~ UF, which was our past mistake.) Where the people are, that's where PLP must be too.

One of the most important united fronts for us to be in -- because of its enormous size and, in some respects, its high political level, is the election campaign for McGovern -- especially the thousands of volunteers who are mainly motivated by opposition to the war and the attacks on the working class carried out by the bosses under Nixon's presidency.

In the minds of millions of people, the MAIN way to end the war, the wage freeze, high taxes, unfair welfare etc etc. is to get McG elected President. McG has support mainly because his campaign promises generally make him ~~APPEAR~~ APPEAR to be on the side of the working class when it comes to taxes, welfare the war, wages, etc. Of course, in reality, McG is no more on the side of the working class than Hitler. But if millions of people agreed with us on that point, there wouldn't be a McG campaign to talk about in the first place. We have to win millions to our position on McG. and the way to do it is to be in a UF with his campaigners and supporters, and put our independent line forward BOLDLY. But how to do this is a serious problem. Party members inside the McG campaign apparently are unable to operate OPENLY -- at best semi-openly. As it stands now, I imagine that party members in the McG campaign sell relatively few "Who Governs McGovern" pamphlets to McG organizers -- especially compared to the number that party members -- operating openly -- sell to SDS'ers etc. If this were the best we could do in forming a UF with the McG campaigners, then so be it. But I think we could do much better with a slightly different party line on McGovern -- namely to be openly, as PLP, in favor of his getting elected President. This doesn't mean changing one word in the McGovern pamphlet, or our open opinion of who he is and what he represents. But it does mean changing the way we unite with people who like McGovern, or at least want him elected.

PLP shouldn't be in favor of anything unless we think its really in the interests of the working class. Is McGovern's election as President (not McG the man, but his election as President -- there's an important difference) in the interests of the working class? I think it is. The bosses, with McG in office, would be, politically, in a much less maneuverable position than with Nixon. The reason is that McG has made a lot of pro-working class (sounding) promises. Under McG's presidency, ~~the~~ for the ruling class to maintain illusions in liberal politicians, lesser evilism, and bourgeois democracy in general, the bosses would have to either grant some of the promises McG is making, OR else suffer the consequences of greater mass dis-illusionment with elections and (if we're hopefully selling lots of McG pamphlets) greater mass respect for PLP's line on elections being a hoax (which, in spite of our past sectarianism, they still are.)

Isn't this exactly the kind of a bind that we want to put the bosses in, no matter what UF work we're doing? As long as bosses have state power, they are never really forced (physically) to grant any concessions. But politically, militant mass reform action ~~x~~ forces the ~~the~~ bosses to choose between tossing workers some crumbs, or exposing their naked dictatorship even more -- which they hate to have to do. As communists, we consciously take advantage of this fact not only to expose the bourgeois dictatorship, but also to help the reform movement to really win these "crumbs" -- which are very very important to win..

In Miami, during the Doral Hotel sit-in, we, along with sincere McG supporters, had one of the best (although temporary) UF situations going I've ever seen. Together, we were all demanding that McG do what he said he would do -- namely speak openly with his supporters and reaffirm his "anti-war" stand. To a certain extent McG was exposed by ~~not~~ coming downstairs for 7 hours. To a certain extent he got away unexposed by issuing a "re-clarification" statement. Some saw through it, others didn't. The Party could have been a lot more bold with our line, and more people would have seen through his statement. Still -- many McG supporters are now ex-McG fans. Our success was due to two facts: 1) that we were united with McG supporters around the demand that McG keep the promises he made, and 2) that we had McG in a very tight, unmanoeverable situation -- he had no excuses for not coming downstairs. He tried excuses, like "the security problem in the hotel prevented him from coming down, even though he wanted to, bla bla" etc., but he was ~~x~~ CAUGHT. Think how much more difficult his situation would be as President -- he would have virtually no excuses for attacking workers, but he'd have to attack them just the same -- for the same reasons Nixon does. McG's Presidency would help the party to win over millions of workers and students to our line -- people who won't listen to us now. Why don't we say so publically? (Many of us, I believe, think it privately.) If our line were to openly want McG ~~isses~~ instead of Nixon -- because a ruling class with promises to keep is in a tighter bind than a ruling class with an election mandate for an openly right winger like Nixon -- then we would be much more able to join w in a UF with McG campaigners as OPEN PLP'ers who -- while believing and boldly saying that McG is a boss like any other -- still sincerely want him elected. This election would make it harder for the bosses to not ~~lx~~ give these promised "crumbs."

The following quote is from Lenin's "Left Wing Communism, and Infantile Disorder" and I think it argues for the same points made above. Apparently Henderson and Snowden back then were analogous to McG (maybe more "left") and Lloyd George and Churchill were the Nixon's. (Pg 67)

"On the contrary, the fact that most British workers still follow the lead of the British Kerenskys or Scheidemanns and have not yet had experience of a government composed of these people -- an experience which was necessary in Russia and Germany so as to secure the mass transition of the workers to Communism -- undoubtedly indicates that the British Communists SHOULD participate in parliamentary action, that they should, from WITHIN parliament, help the masses of the workers see the results of a Henderson and Snowden government in practice, and that they should help the Hendersons and Snowdens defeat the united forces of Lloyd George and Churchill. To act otherwise would mean hampering the cause of the revolution, since ~~x~~ revolution is impossible without a change in the views of the majority of the working class, a change brought about by the political experience of the masses, never by propaganda alone." Lenin was wrong on some things, but I think he's right in this case.

39

At present, our line on the Presidential elections (not to mention the others, who in PL is registered to vote? ~~Who is to vote?~~) is to boycott them, even though we don't emphasize that aspect now. When someone asks us who we're voting for for President, we say nobody.

In Lenin's Left Wing Communism he discusses the boycott tactic, and I think his argument is correct. (pg. 42) "Whilst you lack the strength to do away with bourgeois parliaments and every other type of reactionary institution [and we certainly do], you MUST work within them because IT IS THERE that you will still find workers who are duped by the priests and stultified by the conditions of rural life; otherwise you risk turning into nothing but wind-bags."

40

A CRITICISM OF THE TERM "MARXISM-LENINISM" BASED ON PAGES 44-46 OF RRIII

Does this term help to advance the understanding of our revolutionary communist ideology? Where does this term come from and who does it help? What impression does it create?

1) Both Marx and Lenin lived in^a different era than we live in now. There theory and practice--there ideology was the farthest developed expression (of two individuals) that the revolutionary communists had during that era. We live in a different era and revolutionary communist ideology has developed and gone alot farther since Marx and Lenin's time. Example, GPCR. To call this Marxism-Leninism is incorrect....Is it not "dialectical materialism" or "revolutionary communism" or something along this line which we are talking about? We should try and be as clear as possible in explaining our line and the term Marxism-Leninism does not help in this effort.

2) Why make exceptions? Sure Marx and Lenin contributed a tremendous amount in the development of revolutionary communist ideology but they were not infallible they made mistakes too. Building the glorification of these individuals is anti-communism! It builds bourgeoisie ideas: that it was only Marx and Lenin who developed revolutionary communist ideology, that only an elite few can develop to the level that they did, that they are infallible etc. These rotten bourgeoisie ideas are part of the impression developed from using this term.

(Why is it that in all the revisionism countries everywhere you look are statues, pictures etc. of the Big Four Engels, Marx, Lenin, Stalin and in a few other countries Mao. The revisionist ruling classes are not dumb, they don't do these things for nothing....They call themselves Marxist-Leninists too.)

41

We live in an era of world revolution, where millions of workers, students, peasants, soldiers, etc., etc., are learning to some degree that we need revolutionary communist ideology. Our Party should have as its goal international revolutionary communism which means that thousands and millions of people and more can and will be won to the level Marx and Lenin was on and beyond.

We must continue to advance and develop our understanding of dialectical materialism and revolutionary communist ideology to a much higher level. We can do it! Our Party has shown the possibilities of going much further than any other CP in the past history of the world communist movement.

What this criticism means in practice is changing the term Marxism-Leninism to revolutionary communism, dialectical materialism or something along this line in all of our publications, etc. For example: in Challenge on page 2 in the box describing our Party and paper the word should be changed to revolutionary communism. In RRIII on page 45 the word Marxism-Leninism should be dropped. This use of the term here really shows the contradiction between the two lines.

Some people may say this is making a mountain out of a mole hill but we have a long way to go to world communism. Right? This criticism is made from that point of view.

GLORIFY THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING CLASS--THE REAL HEROES OF HISTORY--NOT A FEW INDIVIDUALS!!!!

FIGHT FOR INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNISM!!

Please pass this around and discuss this with others.

If you have time please send criticisms or whatever of the above. We gladly welcome this.

Comrade by
Mike Regan

42

RRIII:

"...The myth of leaders' infallibility has been a millstone around the neck of the communist movement for decades ...This reactionary doctrine thwarts the political development of the masses: since someone "up there" does our thinking for us, why should we bother to do it ourselves? It takes political power out of the hands of the masses. It encourages bourgeois individualism, by urging the masses to seek individual self-improvement through emulation of the "infallible one." p.44-45.

Yet the term is used on ^{the} following pages:

p4 line 9 and 15

p16 line 1 and last line

p17 line 21

p22 line 20

p27 line 7

p30 line 21

p39 line 7

p43 line 17

p44 line 2

p45 line 11

FOR DISCUSSION:

43

During the past NC meeting I submitted a report prepared by the Nsc evaluating the work of the NC and its members since the last convention. Most of the members of the NC were dissatisfied with the report because it lacked sufficient insight about the role of the NC. I indicated I would rewrite the report and submit it to the NC again so that it could be used for the pre-party convention discussion.

I have been ~~at~~ somewhat of a loss to strengthen the original report.

A part of that report was that we would have to do better. We have all heard that before, and while it is correct to do better, the more important point is how? Well during past and current discussions ~~number~~^A of points which are excellent have been made. Many of them appear in the first article of the last pre-convention bulletin. These include: How to do UF work; building a base; study of history and classics of ML etc. We have also been discussing the question of commitment to the party as related to the question of self-interest. This point was ~~reacted~~^R to favorably in discussions around the ~~country~~ country.

At this point I would like to introduce another point in the discussion. I want to point out that this point is no more or less important than many others. I just think it has been overlooked, not understood etc. ^And I think I have been the main culprit in this, and have encouraged bad attitudes.

One of the main points of ~~RRIII~~["] is the need to rely on the people. ["]This is directly related to the question of the DofP. In the last bulletin it was pointed out-somewhat-that bureaucracy was bad. Naturally, all too easily I agree. However, the tendency of all of us in the party is to view this problem in an organizational way. This evil can be dealt with by recall etc. Political leadership of any kind in the party-including the chairman-must be evaluated on its political leadership of all important questions.

2...

So one of the important matters would be how has the leadership of the party trained itself and the cadre to act on this question. WE ALL HAVE A LONG WAY TO GO.

As you know most of our activities-at least the larger ones-where we get large numbers of people to one point- have always been frenetic, at best. We have evaluated over and over again the reasons for this. Limited bases; no strategic outlook; no plan beyond the event; not using the event to build mass work etc. All of these points and others are valid. But one thing seems to be emerging more clearly to myself and others. We treat people in a bad way, whether they realize it or not. We really use people, and this is another limitation we impose on ourselves preventing us from winning others to the party. This came up graphically again in our recent "organizing" for the Inauguration march in Washington and the "planned" conference. For a long time now, we view these events as mainly getting numbers-a large body count- at a given place at a given time. As I have said we have succeeded in doing this on occasion. Then we always ask ourselves what happened to all the people we brought? Well, I indicated we have come up with some answers-in terms of our own participation-on this score. We have had this action on the books for months. But not much was done to PREPARE FOR THE CONFERENCE. Our main outlook ~~is~~^{WAS} to bring people, after that nature and god will take over. Many people think that having a conference is getting a hall (which wasn't even done for this one) and telling people to come to discuss a question. If that is what bringing many people together to think and act about an important question like racism is-then the revolution business is simple indeed.

It seems that our lack of preparation for this event so was so poor, that we never even ended up with a hall, and it was on this thin reed that the conference was postponed. But more important papers and resolutions on the question were never prepared for discussion at the conference, let alone before the conference; we didn't struggle with numbers of people around the country to develop their thinking on this vital question so that the conference

44

wouldn't result in some leaders giving forth some possibly correct platitudes, ~~which~~ hundreds of people would not have time to consider. This type of organization might look good. We would leave there even feeling the event was successful, but find ourselves in short time asking the same old question-what happened to all the people? I know in the past I went to many meetings where a spokesman appeared told me why and when to fight and adjourned the meeting after the most perfunctory discussion. I always was mad; I always felt who was this big apple to tell me what to do, when I didn't even have the chance to consider and talk over the proposals which might have been good. And I'm sure the "organizers" of those affairs figured they were good. This happened around the left and around the unions. Don't union members and others complain when they go to one of these affairs. More to the point don't union members stay home in droves because they feel they won't be allowed to contribute to the affairs of their organization?

Wouldn't a conference on racism or any other planned event be better if we worked our ass off, not just to get the hall and food, but to get as many people as possible to give their thinking and their ideas to the meeting. Wouldn't this strengthen the event if we got around the ideas and some discussion way before the event, especially if it is planned months in advance. Simply to herd people to spot to tell all good things must operate against us in the short run. How does this make us any different from the revisionists or the labor leaders, who we and others are forever criticizing them of the same thing?

This style of work-of not seriously working with the people is revisionism. It does not conform to our line in RRIII. It indicates we have few serious ties. Because if you were to treat your family and friends in such a cavalier way you would be in big trouble. Maybe many of us are in such trouble now, because we have been trained outside the party and now in the party to crap on people. In another article the question of what is the nature of socialism. Many people ask about how things would be like under socialism. Well we won't have a standing army-but lets face it-the party is an instrument of the class organization of the people. So not

4....
maintaining a standing army is valid but the nature of relations in and out of the army the party et al are crucial. You can find many ways of not relying on the people if you try hard enough. Unfortunately, bourgeois education has made masters of us all to accomplish this matter.

Late in the game the question of this particular conference was raised. It was proposed that it be called off. The reaction to this was mixed, "well gee all we need is a room. Look I'll jot down some resolutions." Calling off the conference would be a big defeat for the party. It would have been a bigger one if we had under such bad conditions. We would have herded the people again. We would have intensified our process of making "left'-wing hacks" out of some excellent people. The party leadership, especially myself have been guilty of this. After we decided to postpone the conference-with the approval of the SDS organizing committee- and preparing for a better one later on one of the party leaders who had been at the meeting proposed calling for another so soon after the march that it would have guaranteed another bad event. In other words the "cuare" lasted overnite. Another party leader out of N.Y. was correctly disturbed about the need to cancel the conference. His immediate reaction was to fire all the incompetents who had anything to do with the bungling. And for good measure proposed that a hotel ballroom could still be rented and the meeting go on. In his mind ~~it~~ was better to have anything than nothing. While his motivation was good and his critical attitude good-the fact is that, he, as all of us are reluctabt to break with bad habits. Now we know, at least superficially, that old orders, ideas, customs way, etc die hard. This can't be accomplished by punitive or administrative methods. It can be overcome by criticism and self-criticism. It can be overcome by deepening our understanding of one of our important ideas-"RELY ON THE PEOPLE." I feel I have been very weak in providing leadership on this question because I have little understanding of this concept. Practise and thinking have, and are helping me.

We have the WAM convention and May Day coming up. We still have some time. Let's really try to involve some people in preparing and thinking about these events.

5....

Let's try to have a bulletin. If necessary sit down with some workrs and help them write up their ideas and experiences. Let us make our actions richer and give ourselves more of an opportunity to learn and help workers with their problems. Even in bourgeois politics there is the concept of keeping your ear to the ground; "see what people are saying etc", naturally, this is done to help bosses screw the people. We don't want to end up as king of the trash pile of capitalis,m.

One of the spin off-s of this kind of work is that it creates the perpetuation of dishonest traits in all of us. When one works in this slip shod un-democratic way there is the tendency of self-deception. Then this encourages telling tales-oh yeah we're doing this or that, when in reality not much is happening. So it becomes incumbent on party cadre to know about the relations and attitudes our people have not only in the party, but out of the party. And th's can only be done if there is base-building ~~going~~ on.

I believe the people can discern when things have to done fast on the spot, and when they can be prepared. Sometimes things have to be acted on quickly, and not to do so is as undemocratic as the other bad style discussed. But we should always evaluate, and consult about what is the best route to go.

Comradely
Mitt

Discussion of Challenge by Minneapolis PIP Party Club meeting of Dec. 31, 1972

Challenge is the best newspaper in the USA because it lets working people know how they and other people are fighting the bosses and winning, and it also points out that to really win we need workers power - socialism. Without this perspective, news is not ultimately helpful - only interesting.

But as we seal Challenge to workers, we hear criticisms, a few of which are repeated often. So our party club decided to examine Challenge and make suggestions for improvement - it's great, but it can be even better!

We examined the January 11, 1973 issue, Vol. 9, No. 16. There was much praise for the issue, especially for the Train wreck article, the editorial on page 2 (but lots of criticism for the picture), the Harlem school boycott article, the S.F. Bay 30/40 article, the Manhattan land grab article, the Cleveland bKirklik article, to name a few.

Our criticisms fall into two categories -- political and technical. Lets take the political criticisms first.

1) Over the last two years or so, the content of Challenge has changed, reflecting our party's growing involvement in mass movements, especially the trade union movement. However, the old style, ~~xx~~ rhetoric, or whatever you call it, still hangs on in headlines and some articles from our isolated and sectarian period. Many people characterize the front page headlines as sensationalist - not giving a clear picture of the level of class struggle, but making it seem that great rebellions if not world revolution are about to break out any minute. This is also seen in lots of talk about Nazi's - yes, capitalists are potential and often actual facists, but drawing swastikas on Golda Mier is sensationalist unless a long explanation is made of the relation of bourgeois democracy to facism. Another example of this problem is the little box on the cover that points out key articles -

99

Everything the box says is true, ~~kinda~~ but the wording makes the paper sound like a scandal sheet - but class struggle is much more serious than that!

A good example of the sectarian style is the Imperiale-Jones article on page 4. No one outside of Newark-New York knows who Imperiale is - a few of us know something about Jones, but most workers don't. The article does not explain what their political lines or roles in the community were before the love match. The metaphor of love is cute and fun for those of us who hate misleaders, but even most party members could not figure out just what the arrangement was or what this means to workers in Newark. This article is a good example of a major problem in Challenge - name ~~it~~ calling instead of political explanation. The point about nationalists and how they will stick together against the every "principle" to keep workers down is key - yet it is not ~~made~~ made in this article. This happens too often - it may mean that a few articles have to be longer and a few shorter ones cut out - but we want people to get the political understanding the make revolution - not just know that lots of and lots of people are in struggle.

2) Workers have told us time and again that there is not enough on what PLP is, does, or wants. We suggest a 1/2 page on what our party believes about capitalism and the need for workers power, how to get it, what we do now as a party to achieve these ends, how to read challenge and why we write what we ~~do~~ do. This could also mention that our articles come from rank and file people, not paid journalists.

3) More political explanation in articles of bosses tools - This could be done in the articles themselves, or in a series of mini-editorials that run in each section - i.e., racism in ideology in the student section, role of trade union sellouts in the trade union section, role of nationalism, or revisionists ~~etc~~ by articles dealing with manifestations of these in the mass movement.

50 (3)

4) Number 3 goes along with a technical suggestion. Many people say they can't see any overall organization to challenge - though it is there. Perhaps we could have more well defined sections with ^{the same} mastheads on each page of a certain section. Section 5 could follow from our discussion of our party and its work in the 1/2 page explanation mentioned in point 2. We would also like to see a much more complete table of contents - I know this is an editorial hassle, but it would be worth it. Workers tell us that their minds jump from one struggle to another, and they can get caught in waves of articles about class struggle, losing the point of it all as they try to remember what some workers did or did not do here or there.

5) More articles on things masses of people are thinking about. Examples - Brennen as Secy of Labor, Pete Roselle and the football blackouts, Maybe the diplomatic moves by Sweden to censor the U.S. on Vietnam. I know this is the fault of local areas mostly, but we will try to remedy this here, and maybe the Challenge editor could prod other areas to do this as well.

6) More articles on events played up in the mass media. The major sports events are good examples of our philosophy about capitalism, as well as movies, and even bestseller books. The advantage of mass media subjects is that most of us are familiar with them, while we may not be familiar with the conditions that contribute to class struggle in a given area or plant. How about some friendly but of course critical when necessary book reviews. There are a lot of good books about class struggle, revolutionary experiences in other countries,

(51)

67) Keep up the cartoons - ~~nhhnhn~~ they're great! Also, how about a poster centerfold 3 or four times a year - certainly for our mass national demos, but maybe also a great poster from the international movement once in a while.

8) How about a box on page two or some set page that runs down the international movement - not covering revisionists happenings like the "Liberated" Guardian, but covering strikes, rebellions etc. Many people are cynical and think that things just won't happen - when they may be happening that very day in another country. It's good to have longer articles on the most progressive aspects of the international movement, but sometimes these are not printed til we can get all the facts (a few issues after its over) Whoever was assigned to get this together each issue would probably need access to the N.Y. Times - though we will send you a prototype of what we are thinking of ~~as soon~~ soon as we get it together. We would volunteer, but a ~~the~~ daily subscription to the Times is too expensive out here. This would help ~~for~~ international perspective too.

I will be acting as challenge editor of the Minnesota area - please call me for more information about this report or if you think this area could help implement any of these specific suggestions.

LUANNE NYBERG - mpls PLP
2622 CHICAGO AVE S.
MPLS MN 55407
612-336-1909
work - 8-4:30 612-348-3140

NOTE: The article which begins on page 37 of Convention Bulletin #2 entitled "Buffalo PLP Members, View on Elections" was a minority view written by one member - it is not the view of the Buffalo club. This notation was inadvertently left out.

NOTE: The article which begins on page 37 of Convention Bulletin #2 entitled "Buffalo PLP Members, View on Elections" was a minority view written by one member - it is not the view of the Buffalo club. This notation was inadvertently left out.

NOTE: The article which begins on page 37 of Convention Bulletin #2 entitled "Buffalo PLP Members, View on Elections" was a minority view written by one member - it is not the view of the Buffalo club. This notation was inadvertently left out.

NOTE: The article which begins on page 37 of Convention Bulletin #2 entitled, "Buffalo PLP Members, View on Elections" was a minority view written by one member - it is not the view of the Buffalo club. This notation was inadvertently left out.

NOTE: The article which begins on page 37 of Convention Bulletin #2 entitled "Buffalo PLP Members, View on Elections" was a minority view written by one member - it is not the view of the Buffalo club. This notation was inadvertently left out.

NOTE: The article which begins on page 37 of Convention Bulletin #2 entitled "Buffalo PLP Members, View on Elections" was a minority view written by one member - it is not the view of the Buffalo club. This notation was inadvertently left out.