

PLP CONVENTION BULLETIN # 4

Report form National Committee Meeting, March, 1973.....	1
Comments on "Evaluation of RRIII" in Convention Bulletin #1.....	11
Fighting Against the Right-Wing Trend - Are We Forgetting Socialism?.....	14
Response to Criticisms of Challenge in Bulletin #2.....	16
Discussion Piece on the Black Liberation Movement - The Period Just Ended and Now.....	18
On Inner Party and Base Group Education.....	23
The Party Must Build WAM and 30 for 40.....	29

(1)

Our party has passed several milestones in the fight against revisionism, marked by Road to Revolution I, II and III. The birth of the Progressive Labor Movement and later PLP emphasized the absolute need for a communist party in the struggle to overthrow capitalism. RR I and II went into the triumph of ruling class ideas in the CPUSA and the CPSU. RR III traced ~~the~~ revisionism in China while pointing to the ideological advance of the Cultural Revolution. Now, with the demise of the international communist movement, PLP is putting forward even more strongly the idea of internationalism among the workers of the world, trying to unite with rank-and-filers and Marxist-Leninists in the working class.

But, to build a communist base in the working class in the U.S., we mounted a campaign to fight our sectarian weaknesses and enter the mass movement, especially the trade unions, in order to spread our communist line by tying it to the immediate needs of the working class. THIS HAS BEEN AMONG THE HEALTHIEST OF DEVELOPMENTS IN OUR PARTY'S HISTORY. We have learned much about the people's deepest desires and strivings in the course of becoming a part of the mass movement, and have begun to see the life-and-death nature of the class struggle for working people, including ourselves. We have made some very good advances in our number one industrial and union as well as around the strategy of 30 for 40, concentration in auto, as some of the recent literature and activities indicate. We are slowly learning the kind of powerful vehicle for workers' advance the trade unions can be, as seen in the recent Philadelphia general strike threat, as well as similar and even more militant actions of workers in Mexico, Britain, Italy, South Africa and elsewhere.

(2)

However, in the context of fighting sectarianism and entering the mass movement, we have begun a noticeable drift to the Right, which, if not corrected, will move us into the revisionist camp of the very forces we have sharply condemned in Russia, China and Vietnam. This Rightward drift begins in the National Committee and continues on throughout the Party and its influence among our base.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE: In the evaluation of RR III which the NC submitted to the pre-convention discussion in the first Internal Bulletin, there was a noticeable absence of the relation of the Party to the prerequisites for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The "rules" set down for the D. of P. were very oversimplified and correctly criticized by a number of members. The section on the United Front has not been nearly clear enough to show how the UF is based on unity with--and struggle against--not on some abstractions, but around a line. While NC members will be writing more on this subject soon (this latest meeting of the NC was not prepared to go into a full criticism of its blanket acceptance of that evaluation),

suffice it to say now that the NC report, in effect, downgraded the role of the Party. This has helped set a tone for the rest of the Party to follow.

In addition, the Rightward drift in the NC has revealed itself in its members not fighting for the very line "agreed" to at previous NC meetings: the fight to build WAM; to carry out a needed Fund Drive; and the fight to have NC members concentrate their work and leadership directly among the basic industrial cadre of the Party, to mention a few decisions not carried out. While the National Steering Committee

(3)

has attempted to follow up somewhat these decisions, its work and check-up has been sloppy at best, allowing those who were drifting to drift still further, meaning that the NSC did not see the threat of this Rightward movement and, by not fighting it hard enough, ^{is} becoming a party to it. Whole sections of the Party did not fight for the Fund Drive--without which the Party could go under--nor build WAM, because the NC members in these areas did not place any priority on these decisions.

To win new members to the party--the number one task--means winning the present members to do more, and that means the leadership must do more.

RECRUITING: While we have been recruiting to the Party, at a slightly faster pace than members dropping out, we have not even scratched the surface of what can and must be done. **THE FIRST TASK OF EVERY LEADER AND MEMBER OF THE PARTY IS TO RECRUIT**, the most important and concrete way building the party expresses itself. Not only have we allowed classes and study/action groups to lag, but for long stretches we have failed to even raise the question of recruiting, have not set down specifically in club meetings who we intend to recruit and how, or if we have any kind of base to recruit from. We have not fought, in many cases, with people we know around the political strategy of the Party to win them closer to, and into, the Party. Especially is this true, to a large degree, of black workers who have been allowed to "hang around" the Party and then drift off, without any special efforts on our part to recruit them.

If we give up on recruiting, we have given up on the Party. The

(4)

first law of keeping any organization alive, and expanding it, is recruiting new members. This is especially true of a communist party. And the first principle of recruiting to the Party is to impress upon new members that THEIR first duty to the Party and the working class is to turn around and repeat the process from among their base. Building the Party by recruiting is something we have let slip by. It's the first revisionist trend we must reverse.

FUND DRIVE: While a few areas of the Party did well in the recent fund drive, many did not; a few did nothing. Even in those areas which did well, a big struggle had to be waged, encountering a lot of resistance. And over-all the Fund Drive did not achieve its goal. Moreover, only halting steps were made in raising money from sources other than ourselves, again reflecting the lack of a communist base. It's not just that our Party can't function without money. It's also that our lack of struggle with others to contribute to the Party, leading to their failure to do just that, means that workers and others in our base do not have their commitment to communist ideas raised qualitatively. Their giving to a fund drive based on political understanding indicates a more advanced idea of the absolute need for a party by the working class.

CHALLENGE-DESAFIO SALES: Paper sales have gone down, in most areas. In a few, sales are holding their own; in a couple (like Detroit where they have doubled based on the increased 30/40 and auto work), they have risen. But here again, the advancing of the Party's line through the literature has taken a beating while we have entered the mass movement. Yet, if our base increases in this process, it should

(5)

be reflected in paper sales growing apace. If not, it indicates we are NOT building a base for the Party's ideas. The only other conclusion is that we are building a base for reformist ideas. There is no middle ground.

One big advance that we made several years ago was turning C-D into a mass-sale paper in the working class. This was one of our Party's most significant achievements. And it helped the understanding of workers, of how to move forward around their basic needs. Yet now, when we should be in an even better position to increase sales, through our increasing contacts in the mass movement, in many cases we are neglecting to do so, in the name of either being "too busy" or in seeking "quality sales." If we're "too busy" to sell the paper--"too busy" to advance the Party's ideas far beyond the limits of talking personally with people--then we're "too busy" with the wrong things. Being active in a union or in any mass organization and not at the same time selling the paper regularly is one more reflection that we are falling into a reformist trap and merely being active for the sake of reformist ideas. Not only will we not build the Party that way; WE ALSO WILL NOT BUILD THE MASS MOVEMENT EITHER. The only way the mass movement can grow is to have it see beyond the capitalist ideology it is fed 24 hours a day. And only communist ideas can change that. Therefore, to enter the mass movement and see C-D sales go down means we are entering the mass movement to be buried in it, leaving the sellout leadership to continue to hold sway.

(6)

While we DO want quality sales, there is no reason why, if we organize our lives and time more efficiently, we cannot at the same time continue the mass sale of the paper. After all, it is from this very mass sale that we have won some of our best recruits and potential recruits. Even further, it is these mass sales that has made our ~~Party's~~ Party's presence felt among thousands of workers. We do not appear as a phantom, hidden in corners, as was true in the old CP. While we are not playing a numbers game--we seek concentration sales, organized to reach important, stable sections of the working class--to give up on the mass sale of the paper (during a period when we can still sell the paper openly) is a big step on the road to giving up on communist ideas altogether. This "quality" of the Party's presence in mass-sales situations is as important as the quality of a sale followed up and eventually recruited, because the mass presence of the Party sets the stage for the potential recruit to see the Party as a living, breathing phenomenon. This particular move Rightward--decreasing paper sales--must be reversed, organized in each club, checked up on, from the NC members on throughout the Party.

THE CONTENT OF C-D: Part of the reason sales have fallen is the lack of belief in the ideas in the paper. The Internal Bulletin #2 revealed a marked reluctance to advance the Party's ideas among the workers and others. "It's too hard" to sell the Party's ideas was a common refrain. Workers in the mass movement "don't understand" it. Or, "it's O.K. to print this or that part of our revolutionary line, but, just for the time being, don't print the part that relates

(5)

to my area, until we get a foothold." A "foothold" for what? For reformist ideology? This is not to deny the validity of constructive criticism of C-D. Much of that has been attempted to be put into practice. But much of this criticism has been a denial of communist ideas, in the name of not wanting to be "unpopular" among our base. This is giving in to a lack of readiness to struggle for the Party's ideas among our friends, a lack of confidence that they will respond (which is contradicted by virtually all of our previous experience), and therefore, a lack of building the party.

The fact is, if we gave in to all the individual sections of the Party who said "you can print the rest of the line but don't print this in our area," we would end up printing no communist ideas at all. Either we're ready to fight for the Party's line or we're not. Our paper is a communist organ, not a reform paper. We have the trade union papers and others for the latter role. If we don't print communist ideas, critical of the reformers, constructively if critical of friends, then what's the difference between us and the trade union "leaders"?

STUDY/ACTION GROUPS: While this was mentioned in the section on recruiting, it should also be singled out for special attention. Our allowing these party-building groups to drift into oblivion in most cases is the leadership's responsibility in the first place. Our first view of the people we meet in the mass movement must be which ones are main ones we must become friends with, close to, struggle with, bring into party-building groups and recruit. If we enter the mass movement, get very "busy" in "building the union," etc. and bring

8

no one into such Party groups, we are becoming just like the active reformers in the mass movement —and end up not really being able to "build the union."— The only thing that separates us from them is our communist ideas. If we do nothing to organize people around those ideas, leading to their recruitment, we come up with the same result as we did in our sectarian period. That is in being sectarian, we--and our communist ideas--are isolated from the masses. In being grossly opportunist, we--in the person of communist ideas--are also isolated from the masses. Again, two sides of the same coin.

This evidence of a drift to the Right has shown up sharply as we have entered the trade unions and the mass movement. As we continue in that movement, the dangers and pressures of a Rightward direction will intensify. But again, if we make a conscious fight for the Party and our line in the act of immersing ourselves in the mass movement, not only will the Party be built but so, too, will the mass movement be built. A clear example is in the Philadelphia teachers strike and general strike threat. There, of all the welfare centers in the union in that city, the one with the highest vote for a general strike and therefore with the highest militancy was the one in which our comrade works, ~~and~~ is a shop steward and sells C-D, where it is read more than anyplace else.

However, this opportunity to build the mass movement by building the Party and its ideas is lost much of the time. For instance, in the NYC t.u. section, where C-D sales are among the lowest in the city, little recruiting has taken place and therefore the chance to strengthen the mass movement is lost. This is true of all those

9

places where we are merely "holding our own." (This contrasts with, say, Detroit, where sales have doubled recently, where several auto workers have been brought into Party study groups, where the 30/40 line has really advanced, and therefore the mass movement strengthened. However, even there, if there were to be any tendency to "rest on our advance," this advance could easily become a momentary one and be reversed. of the dangers Another example started the is Cleveland where just one member work by himself, won people to sell the paper, advanced the Party's line, won one auto worker through the paper, who in turn advanced the line on 30/40 to build a mushrooming movement among auto workers in several locals, and so on. However, now, with the tendency NOT to recruit to the Party, ~~and~~ NOT to move workers leftward from their situation in the union to one of joining WAM--from where they can be won to the Party--with these tendencies, all the advances are endangered, all the ~~the~~ CONTENT of the work as regards what line is being advanced comes into question. In other words, unless the Party continues to recruit in this situation, the advance in the mass movement will be reversed.)

and in building the mass movement,

As we become the best fighters for the key reform issues, with 30/40 leading the way, unless we link this struggle to the Party's line, and to building the Party, we will be swallowed up exactly as the old CP was. Without raising the communist line of state power, even 30/40 will be reversed, just as the great advance of industrial unionism and the CIO was reversed because of what the CP didn't do on questions of a vanguard, communist line ~~and~~ concerning the D. of P.

To reverse this drift to the Right, the NC proposes the following:

(10)

- 1) Discussion be organized around this article and all the material published so far;
- 2) All NC members prepare something in the next few weeks around these questions for the Internal Bulletin;
- 3) A list of 50 potential Party recruits--the amounts worked out in the NC meeting--be sent to either Milt or Wally, which the NSC will then check up on;
- 4) All NC members ^{to} know the number of, and kind of problems involved in, the sales of the paper in their areas;
- 5) The t.u. section in NYC, as a leading example, sell 200 subs in the next ~~x~~ six months, as ^a way to stabilize shop sales and advance the Party;
- 6) That the New York party draw up an outline for study-action groups to use nationally.

These proposals, of course, are just minimum ones to stop the Rightward drift. The organization of study-action groups (as has begun once again in NY) is a key move to recruiting to the Party. The discussion in the clubs of the political line raised in the many struggles we are involved in in the mass movement is another. If we do these and the other things we must, we will prevent our Party from sinking into the morass that characterizes what happened in Russia and China. It doesn't mean pressing a panic button. It does mean setting a conscious plan to build the Party and thereby build the strength of the mass movement. As one friend from Mexico--where people are jailed and tortured for advancing communist ideas publicly--told our comrades in L.A. recently on witnessing our activities, we have a "golden opportunity" to build the Party openly. How long this will be true remains to be seen. Therefore, let us make the most of it!

(11)

The report "Evaluation of Road to Revolution III" in the first pre-convention discussion bulletin is basically a revisionist document, symptomatic of a rightward drift in our Party, and particularly in the NC, which issued the report. The line of the document is a backward step from Road to Revolution III, and unless criticized will only accelerate the revisionist trend.

What is wrong with this document? The basic mistake is the false notion that you can only go so far in the struggle against revisionism and that our Party has gone far enough and it is time to pull back. This idea is never stated, but clearly this is the implicit thread that runs through this document and is its basic premise.

The document begins with some international and historical examples of revisionism, all true, but omitted is even a whisper of of revisionism in our Party. The implication is that revisionism is impossible in our Party. We should have learned by now that when a Party denies the possibility of revisionism in its own ranks, that in itself is a clear sign of revisionism.

Not content to rest here, the document goes on to focus on the distortions that accompanies RTR III. Certainly there were distortions, particularly in the trade-union work, but to focus only on these ~~xxx~~ sectarian errors is reminiscent of Khrushchov's thesis that "sectarianism and dogmatism are the main enemies of the international Communist Movement, not revisionism." It was behind the banners of an "all-out fight against sectarianism and dogmatism" that the International Communist Movement was destroyed and capitalism restored in Russia and China.

The final section tries to rally the party to more revolutionary times ahead. While true, what is really needed is to rally the Party behind an all out fight against revisionism in our own ranks, and

TO BUILD THE PARTY.

(12)

"What ye sow, so y shall reap." The second pre-convention bulletin bears the fruits of these revisionist seeds we planted. The articles in the second bulletin were mainly right wing. Many called for sharp revisions in our Party's policies--all to the right. e.g. support McGovern, abandon our paper as an organ of communism, stop using the words "Marxism-Leninism," don't call Golda Meir a Nazi, etc.

This pre-convention discussion should kick off a campaign against revisionism, instead of endorsing and systematizing the revisionism that exists already in the Party. To wit:

- (1) Street sales of Challenge are declining in almost all areas.
- (2) The recent sub drive was a dismal failure.
- (3) There is a fierce resistance in the Party to raise money for the Party.
- (4) There has been a continuous barrage of criticism of Challenge for allegedly being "too sectarian."
- (5) All the articles that appeared in Challenge about the farm-workers reflected a bourgeois reactionary line--not daring to attack Chavez. We were surrendering to the cult of the individual.
- (6) An article in Challenge (March 8, 1973) endorsed the Shell boycott uncritically.
- (7) In the past year there have been several letters and an article in Challenge advocating that the Party support the reactionary movement for free abortions. This petty bourgeois movement has ~~xx~~ never been criticized editorially.

These are a few of the national signs of a serious rightward drift. In each area there are innumerable local examples. Here in Seattle, we:

- (1) haven't fought to put up the PL table on campus regularly.

- (13)
- (2) have not seriously organized classes to recruit new members
 - (3) have not fought to establish a caucus in the one union where this is possible for us.
 - (4) have taken a lackadaisical attitude toward organizing a May-Day banquet.
 - (5) have taken a liberal perfunctory attitude toward Saturday Mobilizations.

There are more.

This is evidence of revisionism in me.

This right-wing trend, particularly in the leadership, must be criticized by all members so it can be defeated, or we will end up like the C.P.U.S.A.

Jim Donn

FIGHT AGAINST THE RIGHT-WING TREND --
ARE WE FORGETTING SOCIALISM???

(14)

Why is it that the C-D sales continue to go down and stay down at the same time that more of us are getting active in unions and the mass movement? And why do the sales continue to be poor even after this has been noted and discussed repeatedly for two years? From the 17 or so PL members doing TU work in Chgo-Gary, how many papers are sold to fellow workers? How many consistently? How many subs? Everyone knows it is very few. There are cases of members not selling the paper at all. The whole literature distribution work of the Party in Cgo is disorganized to the point where the lit money isnt always collected! Yet, C-D has been proven to be one of the best ways of reaching people with the line. The present situation boils down to few workers reached by the Party's ideas, M-L, the anti-racism campaign, the need for 30-for-40... This is a big obstruction and a crime really -- so why do we tolerate it??

Let's take the trouble and time to discuss this carefully and ask ourselves whether this is part of a trend toward reformism, under-mining revolutionary base-building. Such a trend can grow like a cancer and bring death to the Party, as it has to others before us. It can also bring sterility to the mass movement which we are getting more involved in.

The National Committee recently discussed that there is a Right-wing trend of this sort existing within the NC itself and seemingly at other levels of the Party. Generally speaking, it appears as plain old reformism -- just fighting in the unions without much thought as to how our immediate work fits into the strategy of revolution. A few weeks ago I raised a criticism of the Chgo TU work -- that a lot of it was Right-wing to a degree that we simply drift with the pace of the union movement itself -- examples are failing to fight sharply against anti-strike legislation, failing to criticize leaders when needed, to have a narrow TU outlook, etc. While there was some truth in this, actually this is not the main problem holding us back. Because we could give better tactical leadership and STILL DO ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO BRING THE WORKERS A STEP CLOSER TO SOCIALIST REVOLUTION!

So I was missing the point, and this tendency to downplay the Party in its independent form is something that's come up before in my work and in Chicago generally. It's a Right-wing answer to the central question, which is: HOW CAN WE BUILD A BASE FOR REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM WITHIN THE TRADE UNIONS AND THE MASS MOVEMENT, WHILE THESE ARE REFORMIST AND NOT REVOLUTIONARY IN CHARACTER???. More militant reformism is not enough. Only workers power can ultimately break the ~~stra~~ stranglehold of capitalism and its death-producing ideas upon the people.

Every club has discussed or is planning to discuss the political strategy questions on Page one of the PreConvention Bulletin #2. That must be followed up with base-building. There is no reason why C-D sales can't be checked up on first at each club meeting. We can also take steps to improve the public presence of the Party and fight for more people to join the Party, particularly out of the industrial TU work.

(15)

For some, the first step would be to go to the WAM Convention. Certainly it's hard to see how we could recruit without serious struggle on this point. A lot of ideas how to do the independent work of the Party can be figured out if we concentrate on it.

It really shouldn't take any of us by surprise that we communists are affected by ideas in the mass movement. We don't live in ivory towers -- in fact, the outstanding thing is that PL members are integrated in the life of the people. Also, it is common now for PL members to be offered leadership in the unions or elsewhere, ~~in~~ on some levels. This is good, in that the Party brains responsible, militant, honest people -- but it can also be bad if these same people forsake revolution for reform and thus ~~join~~ join the camp ~~of~~ of the present leadership of the unions and help them lead the TUs down the capitalist road where they have strayed so long. There are only two roads.

Do we seriously believe that an alternative to the present leadership is possible? How should communists act in the mass movement? Do we feel that it's sometimes "divisive" to oppose anti-communism? Some people voted for McGovern last fall, others helped put Carey in. Shouldn't we discuss the politics of lesser evils? Even if some may have grown tired of this point? My own pragmatism may have helped prevent this somewhat. What about support for Sadlowski as Director of District 31, USW? Is that the same thing? The Party put forth no printed position on this before the election.

Of course, the Right-wing trend in the Party is also reflected in some reluctance to pursue 30-40, in some instances where we are very active

in the union. And recently, in the first discussions of perspective for the community club, I was guilty of bringing up a number of good suggestions WITHOUT EVER DISCUSSING THE URGENT NEED FOR A PUBLIC PRESENCE OF THE PARTY IN THE COMMUNITY AND THE KEY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS. Yet all the work we have done enables us to do just that, and in a much better way than ever before in Chicago -- because we have the ears of the people now, and many know the Party to be serious. What they need to know next is what makes us tick -- Marxism-Leninism, the strategy of socialism.

In some ways what we are trying to do is new, as history has shown the need to reject revisionism in the various forms it has taken to set back the workers past and present. Much of the Pre-Convention discussion material so far has come from the Right, perhaps most tellingly the desire to soften the political tone of Challenge. We have to reject this Right-wing trend so that the good steps taken recently in the TU work can advance -- so that we can seriously contemplate turning the tables on the Misleaders of the Chgo labor movement. One member said recently that socialism would be easier to get than a Left-Center leadership of the Chgo labor movement. The two may go hand in hand! Likewise all the Party work.

--Chris.

16

The criticism of Challenge in Bulletin #2 is unusually instructive. The critics say the paper is sectarian, and the question they ask is "Why do we always have to defend Challenge to people?" Their problem is that Challenge says things which most Americans do not believe. In particular, say the critics, Challenge puts forward strategy in situations where the workers involved did not have one. Thus, the critics say, "We [Challenge] are constantly interpreting news from our vantage point, not from the vantage point of the people involved in the incident. . . . 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."

I think this criticism arises from a misunderstanding of the job of communists, individually, as a party, in a communist newspaper. It is the basic idea of communists that the world of people is divided into classes, that these classes are in life-and-death struggle, and that the working classes, by justice, power, wisdom and historical situation are going to win that struggle. Thinking and acting on these ideas makes us communists, while right now, most workers and students don't see the whole thing or that connected, and are not communists.

Our job is to convince those people. We do this by discussions, but mostly by engaging and testing our ideas in the small pieces of the existing class struggle, you know, stopping wars, winning strikes, yelling at foremen.

We put forward communist ideas as clearly and sharply as possible in Challenge.

Naturally, most people do not agree. They disagree, and they say so. That's why our critical comrades, like the rest of us, have to defend Challenge to people. If we could verbally explain 100% of PL's ideas to everyone we knew, Challenge wouldn't cause a ripple. But that's silly.

The critics of Challenge zero in on the one area that is criticized most. I think they thought a lot about this, and really came up with an important point - that Challenge interprets news in a communist way, not as the people involved all thought necessarily.

Suppose we didn't do that. Suppose we put forward about whatever the spontaneous position of those involved was. That position usually doesn't go beyond the immediate struggle - people are so involved in their own fight, they don't naturally put it all together. They know we got to stop Proposition 22 - otherwise no union. But they don't think it is grand strategy - either Prop. 22 or our fighting the damn thing. Nor did anti-war students get to imperialism too quickly as the cause or object of their struggle. Both of the critics examples are good ones. Only the presence of communists and our ideas will get any grand strategy into the picture.

Suppose we didn't do that. Don't even suppose - look at what's happened where it wasn't done. Students who only opposed the draft dropped out when the calls went down. Students who opposed only killing itself are dropping out now that the exploitation is being arranged peacefully. Those students won to anti-imperialism (directly or indirectly by us) are the only ones who are still active to help the Vietnamese workers, and protect them selves from future Vietnams. Had we gone along with the average opinion-poll sentiment of the students involved, there would be damn few of the above.

-2-

17

Students wouldn't be making the critics defend Challenge. Most of them would be making the army cadre defend Challenge, I hope.

What I'm saying is that defending Challenge is pretty much defending communism, and that the process of challenging our base to accept strong ideas and fighting it out with them as we fight the bosses together - that's how we make revolution. Slicking down Challenge by obscuring any point of sharpness or analysis is suicide.

One other point here. The critics take the emphasis of support for unions (rather than attacking sellout leaders) as a "good" sign, a sign that we have compromised the line on union leaders so workers won't make us defend Challenge so much. It is nothing of the kind. If they read the first Bulletin article on trade unions, they will note a change of line - we are mentioning and praising unions by name because we now think they can be made into fighting instruments of the working class. If this involves lessening the attack on sellouts as a concession to "worker's illusions" I will eat a Chevrolet.

In seeking to make Challenge a "Mass" paper, as opposed to the communist newspaper, the critics are claiming to attack sectarianism. Actually this is a sectarian policy. There is every need for a real mass press, full of diverse ideas, including ours. Rather than muddy up Challenge, we should be out fighting yo unite with other people to build and win such a mass press where it exists now.

1. New Left Notes and WAM are possible candidates for the kind of treatment the critics want for Challenge.

2. Union newsletters and college papers are often open to contributions. In fact, this is an ideal United Front situation for a comrade to work in, joining with others to edit such a mass paper, and discussing its line on different questions.

3. National union papers, local community papers, underground newspapers, radio talk shows. This is a little harder, but these media are sometimes open to ideas and contributions. Many of their staffs are winnable or cooperative. Again, a comrade or friend could do worse than to work here.

4. Journalism schools, TV, big newspapers. This may seem like a joke, but over the long haul, these are important areas to work in. At the moment, there is considerable ferment among the writers and staffs of these monopoly media. In most cities, Journalism Reviews run articles by reporters critical of the content of their own newspapers. Union locals are demanding a voice in content. The attacks by Nixon-Agnew are not completely a diversion - they also represent an admission that the individual publishers and network execs are unable to force out enough lies - the government may have to step in directly to prevent certain truths of the class struggle from getting out.

If the critics of Challenge would take on more struggle in the existing mass press, they would be less eager to make something "nice" out of Challenge, which will continue to present communist, not mass, interpretations of the news.

Criticisms of Challenge for presenting insufficiently thorough analysis to folo.

March, 1973

for discussion of the black liberation movement- the period just ended and now.

I. the sixties

A). character and goals of the mass movement- The demands included a wide range of middle class and working class issues. Integration and separation were demanded. Struggles against prison, employment, and armed forces racism took place. Lawsuits, sit-ins, peaceful demonstrations, and armed struggle were used to achieve the goals. Most black workers and students fought for reforms in the system. Some thought the entire system was corrupt and needed changing. The liberation struggles in Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the role of PLP encouraged some to develop anti-imperialist views. "The legal structure of segregation in the South was brought down. The segregation of public schools by law was effectively ended. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 enfranchised 2 million new black voters and helped elect hundreds of southern blacks to public office, from county commissioner to congressman. Expanding economic opportunities nourished the development of a large, growing and increasingly visible black middle class- a class that, according to Harvard social psychologist Thomas Pettigrew has mushroomed from one-twentieth to one-third of all black families in 30 years". Newsweek 2-19-73.

"Blacks, who were only 10% of the work force in 1960, accounted for 12% of the growth in unemployment in that decade. At the same time, the number of blacks in white collar and skilled blue-collar jobs increased by 69%, from about 3 million in 1960 to about 5 million in 1971. In the same period, the number of blacks holding clerical jobs doubled, and the number of blacks in professional and technical occupations increased 131%. Conversely, the number of domestic workers dropped 28%, and the number of farmers and farm laborers decreased 56%. Notwithstanding the confusion and setbacks of the early 60's some headway was made in closing the gap between black and white income. Median family income relative to white income rose from 54% in 1964 to 60% (\$6400 for blacks to \$10,670 for whites) in 1971". Ebony -Dec., 1972. Most of the working class reforms came after the rebellions started in 1964.

B). organization and leadership-The NAACP and the Urban League, the most established civil rights groups, with lots of money and ruling class ties, has maintained that status. CORE, an integrated pacifist organization in the early 40's, gave leadership to the early freedom rides, grew in numbers and reputation; has since dwindled on all scores and is now a small nationalist organization. SCLC and SNCC concentrated their energies in the South leading the sit-ins, mass demonstrations, and voter registration drives. As a result, some old federal laws were enforced and new laws passed to extend voting rights to southern blacks and desegrate public places. All the civil rights organizations, especially those active in the South, got lots of liberal support until approximately 1967. The black church in the South played a key role in supporting the non-violent movement. The united front was successful in some cases during the early sixties. The major civil rights groups united with each other; plus various liberal union leaders, politicians, and religious leaders to stage the 1963 March on Washington. The Muslims began to receive publicity and interest during the 60's. They had previously been little known nationally. Malcolm X was mainly responsible for their notoriety. Most of their actual success

at recruiting took place in the prisons. They had little to do with the civil rights movement, preferring to go their own way.

Organizations of younger black people began to form during the rebellions. Black Panthers, BSUs, and US were some. Many of the members of these groups were active in the earlier civil rights movement, but became disillusioned with its results, especially regarding the conditions of working class young people. Opportunists nationalist leaders moved in to fill the void between mostly non-violent protest and revolution and mislead many of these young people for a few years. Black workers' caucuses such as DRUM were formed. Parts of their program called for black supervisors while attacking white workers as enemies. We need to find out the status of Drum (for ex.) now. Has it accomplished anything in the fight against racism?

C). Ruling class- strategy and tactics- The ruling class basically supported most of the demands of the early sit-in movement. The right to vote was won. But neither of these two rights were won without a fight; even though the ruling class didn't have to give up any profits to meet the demands. The protest and rebellions led to anti-poverty programs, Ford Foundation grants, federal protection in the South for civil rights leaders, open admissions, White House conferences on civil rights and L. Johnson's "we shall overcome speech". Black workers, led by civil rights leaders, seemed to have faith that the government was on their side. Eisenhower sent troops to Little Rock; Kennedy and Johnson to Alabama and Miss. They pushed through new laws, spent money that was supposed to end poverty and gave lots more lip service to the struggle against racism than the Nixon adminis. Showing their true class loyalty, the national-state and city administrations were responsible for the killings of hundreds of black workers by police, state troopers, and national guardsmen. Militant protest and rebellion for jobs, against racism on campus and in the prison was only allowed to go so far. The rulers know exactly when they are threatened.

Was

D). Role of the Party- PLM and later PLP objectively in a good position to play an active and more decisive role in the civil rights movement? It seems like that was the mass movement to be active in; at least until 1965. Were we in a position to be actively involved in supporting the mass movement through the unions? Some of the anti-racist work of the party was concentrated in the communities where black workers lived. Since our forces were limited, this probably helped to keep us from concentrating in the unions. We also tried to work with community "hot shots" like Leroi Jones, etc. These points may have combined to keep us from fighting racism harder and struggling for class unity. When our party was becoming more actively (WSA, etc.) involved in the student movement, nationalist ideology was on the incline- largely pushed by the ruling class with its grants and publicity given to nationalist spokesmen. We correctly realized that the new open admissions and black studies programs would not solve the problems of most black working class students under capitalism. We decided not to push these programs. Some people incorrectly interpreted the emphasis of this position and spent most of their time fighting against open admissions and ethnic studies. We were supposed to fight the ruling class for working class and anti-racist concessions, while at the same time exposing the anti-working class nature of nationalism. The line was distorted and sometimes led to sectarianism and racism. The program that the party put forward at that time was relevant and most of it is relevant now. Some distortions of the line prevented it from being completely carried out then. The main

(20)

points were: "1-Support for campus workers, preferential hiring; 2- Opposition to university expansion at the expense of working class housing; 3- Support for black workers-on and off the job; 4- Support for black rebellions; 5- Opposition to special liberal studies on how to control the ghetto; 6- Opposition to racist investments and recruiting; 7- Opposition to racist textbooks, courses and professors; 8- Attacks on racist teacher training; 9- Fighting imperialism in the university; 10-Work-in projects!"

PL mag., vol.7, #1
May, 1969

II. now

A). Character and goals of the mass movement- Its hard to say wheather any mass movement in the next few years of black workers and students will be as large and as frequent as the civil rights marches of the sixties. Laws against segregation and voter discrimination were passed. These changes didn't hurt the ruling class profits, so they gave in after some struggle. Black workers rebelled after the civil rights struggles failed to meet their real needs. Some followed nationalists leaders for a while. "Within the black liberation movement as a whole, nationalism has replaced pacifism as the main ideological weapon of the ruling class". PL, vol.7, #1 "Rulers Coopt Nationalist Demands". If this was true four years ago, is it still true today? According to Atlanta's black vice mayor, Maynard Jackson, "Politics is the civil rights movement of the 1970's". Newsweek, 2-19-73. Those who were "fired-up revolutionaries" a few years ago are actively participating in, and supporting elections of black candidates. Bobby Seale, Elaine Brown, Jesse Gray, Stokely Carmichael and Leroi Jones to name a few. The anger and militancy of the sixties was channeled into the elections of people such as Julian Bond, Ron Dellums, Richard Hatcher and Shirley Chisolm. Now there are sixteen black congressmen and approx. fifteen hundred black councilmen, akdermen, etc. The majority of black workers never really demanded a black Supreme Court justice during the last decade of struggle. Is the movement toward black elected officials coming from the rank and file of black workers or from people like Atlanta's vice mayor, the Congressional Black Caucus and Others?

"Blacks remain disproportionately poor- nearly a third live in poverty, nearly half below the bare minimum subsistence line- and the black poor have been largely left behind. The black unemployment rate runs per sistently double the rate for whites, and in the worst-off ghettos it is frozen at Depression levels- 18% in Watts, 20% in the Hunters Point slums of San Francisco, 25% in Chicago's Woodlawn district. The ghettos have grown physically worst with neglect and simple aging- a deterioration everywhere visible in weed-grown lots, abandoned tenements and burned-out businesses that never got rebuilt after the riots. The rates of crime and drug addiction and lately the resurgence of warring youth gangs, frighten blacks even more than whites because they are disproportionately the victims. The poverty programs rushed together in the 60's were imperfectly planned and inadequately funded. On some ghetto blocks, the only government programs that materially affect the conditions of life are unemployment insurance, social security and welfare". Newsweek, 2-19-73

B). Organization and Leadership- Most of the leadership of the 60's no longer exists. Some of the organizations barely exist or have folded completely. Some that fit are OAAU, US, SNCC, CORE, BSU (varies from campus to campus). Stokely Carmichael has recently returned to the country on a speech

(21)

making tour pushing Pan-Africanism (the belief in the common bond or entirety of the African people- all blacks must help in the liberation of Africa). He has gotten press coverage and hundreds to a few thousands have showed up to hear him speak on college campuses such as Laney College in Oakland, Calif. Among other things he urged black students to "get into politics". The Black Liberation Army supposedly has ties with Cleaver and conducts terriosts campaigns against the police. As far as you can tell they have nothing to relate to any kind of a working class program. Do they even exist? The RNA is a small-tight group who have a program similar to the Muslims for land in the U.S. They seem to be more active than Muslims and less religious. The Muslims are still going their own way. They will always attract members but don't seem to have any decisive affect on much in the black liberation movement. Their membership remains steady at around 7,000 and their assets are estimated at around \$75 million. Most, if not all their money is made from exploitation of black workers, their members and others. Black caucuses exist in auto, steel, hospitals, schools, phone co., etc. We need a separate report on the programs and work of black caucuses, especially those in the basic industries. Most of the organization and leadership of black workers and students seems to be coming from black elected officials or it seems headed in that direction.

C). Ruling class strategy and tactics- The ruling class is cutting back on programs that were offered as concessions after the struggles of the 60's. When mass rebellions quieted down somewhat, the ruling class started cutting back the tiny crumbs they were throwing out. Less loans to get through school and less jobs are available to black students, whe ther they got in college through open admissions or not. The rling class will step up its exploitation of all workers by using wage controls, price hikes, taking more profits for itself, etc. Since black workers are more exploited now, their conditions will get even worse. The Nixon administration still tries to push black capitalism although it has not worked out as well as they had hoped. Its not clear yet whe ther this particular administration will help the black elected officials push electoral activity as a substitute for class struggle. The administrations in the early 60's was slow responding to what some of the reform black leaders wanted. Besides, there is some petty in-fighting among most of the black elected officials, who are mostly Democrats, and this administration. "The number of blacks who look to the federal government for leadership in civil rights and minority-group improvement has shrunk from 67% in 1966 to 4% in 1972". Ebony, 2-73, p.108

We are seeing a revival of attempts to push "scholarly-scientific" racism. The ruling class is trying to add the Schockley and Jensen brand of racism to that of Wallace. Wallace isn't "scientific". They are starting now on the campuses. Eventually, they hope to push more racism than ever in the daily papers, magazines (popular), and movies. "The revival of the Klan in 1915 was closely associated with the release of the famous motion picture The Birth of a Nation. D. W. Griffin based his movie on material taken from two novels by Thomas Dixon. The Leopard's Spots, and the Klansman. At first, the Birth of a Nation was censored in some cities in the North and West for being inflammatory because of its racial attitudes. This angered many who claimed that it was, in fact, a truthful account of the Klan. Concerned by the opposition to the movie, Dixon contacted an old college friend who was then occupying the WhiteHouse. President Wilson consented to a special showing of the picture. After the WhiteHouse showing, opposition disintegrated and the movie went on to become a success. It grossed 18 million dollars". Coombs, N., Black Experience in America, Hippocrene, 1972, p. 116. The ruling class is trying to spark the kind of flames that led to the bloody fights between black and white workers during the 40's at Belle Isle in Detroit and in Harlem.

D). Role of the Party- Nationalism may not be as vocal or as organized as before in this period, but it will be around. Black communists should work with relevant nationalists groups such as black caucuses and others. Others who may not be members of such groups should establish relations with these groups and individuals in the group around working class unity and strength, 30-40, and fighting racism. We oppose nationalism because it limits the fight against racism and class solidarity and is opposed to socialism. Basically, we will win black workers to the party's trade union program, internationalism and socialism. We will win black students to the worker-student alliance, fight racism on campus and off, internationalism and socialism. Black workers will have to fight even harder during this period. We want to sharpen the class struggle. We should be active in bringing issues of racism and other working class struggles into the unions. Not only are the on the job struggles important. Suppose there is a racist police killing, we can get the union to pass a resolution against it, raise money, and send union members to participate in protests. The unions should be a base for anti-racist struggles.

The ruling class is busy setting up its racist propaganda machinery. We want to wreck their machinery. We must push the struggle beyond a defensive strategy. Yes, we should fight the racist outbacks but at the same time go on the offensive with 30-40. We should plan ways to work with individuals who will be active in electoral campaigns without ourselves spreading illusions about elections. Many black candidates will be running for office. Some will seek the grassroots support of black workers and students just as McGovern sought from white students. Tom Bradley, a black candidate for mayor in Los Angeles, already has some UCLA-BSU members working for him. Many people go into electoral campaigns because they see elections as the way to "change things". We know that very little real change happens that way, but we have to be more bold and aggressive in leading the way to working class power. Exposing the system through talk, no matter how correct, won't do a thing by itself. When we are active day to day in carrying out our party's program, we build strong bases for real revolution. Shirley Chisom, Ron Dellums, and others can only build illusions so long, if at all. Class struggle will expose them just as many of the nationalists leaders of the sixties were exposed.

On inner party and base group education

~~At our last meeting and in numerous documents down through the years, the party has stressed the importance of theory to revolutionary practice. While our discussion on party and base group study programs was brief, we agreed that two major problems handicapped our practice of study: 1) we are not asking ourselves the right kind of questions or searching enough questions about the material we study and 2) we do not organize our study sessions effectively to avoid lack of participation, boredom, beating our ideas over the heads of both party members and friends. The last meeting assigned one comrade to work up a set of questions to serve as a general guide in dealing with the material we study and another comrade to work up a set of techniques on how to organize our study sessions. The following is in fulfillment of assignment # 1. The fact that this has taken three months to carry out should not go by without critical examination.~~

The questions that follow are tentative. Practice will demonstrate whether they are the right ones. What is meant here by practice is both the practice of study and the practice in political action to which our study leads. If we get more out of our study and if our study leads to better political practice, i.e. improvement in building the mass movement and in building the party then of course the questions are to the point. If not then we need to revise and get up another set of questions. In the meantime, other party members should be encouraged to suggest the kinds of questions we need to ask ourselves of the material studied.

Two major notions underlie the questions. The first is a sense that we have been very shallow in locating the material

24

we study or understanding it in terms of the various class forces of society. To put it another way we have been very shallow in understanding that every class exists in economic and political conditions that have enormous contradictions to them and that every class is not only in contradiction with other classes, but contains many important contradictions within its own ranks. This needs to be stressed because on the level of lip service we all agree with the above description of the interrelationship of classes and the internal condition of each class. On the level of practice we treat each class as a monolithic whole. Hence we do not get out of what we study a real sense of how the material is connected to actual people and conditions and of how to work out tactics. The second notion underlying these questions is that we have a very weak sense of history. Hence, we have no sense of strategy. We are still in the bourgeois trap. We take events on a day to day basis. We work and work on people as if there is no tomorrow. Hence, we have no sense of the step by step way of building a movement, no sense of how theory and practice are based in current conditions and yet point to future developments. We have no sense of where economic and political agents are leading and no sense of how we as a party may affect where economic and political events will lead. We do not ask ourselves in what way is line and theory connected to the present economic and political conditions so that based on those real material conditions we are able to create the conditions for the intensification of the class struggle, the growth of the party, and even-

25

tually revolution.

Tentative questions:

- 1) What does whatever line or theory we are studying suggest about the particular class forces involved? Nationally? Internationally? Regionally? Industry by industry?
- 2) What do they suggest about the strengths and weaknesses of the ruling class? Economic strengths and weaknesses? Nationally, internationally, regionally, industry by industry? Those strengths and weaknesses in terms of allies in the middle class, among professionals, etc.? Political strengths and weaknesses? In the same detail?
- 3) How are the political strengths and weaknesses and the economic strengths and weaknesses related?
- 4) What are the economic and political contradictions within the ruling class? What are the international contradictions among capitalist classes? What are the international contradictions between the traditional capitalists and the revisionist capitalists?
- 5) ~~What are the conditions making for unity among capitalist classes? Among traditional capitalists and revisionist capitalists? That is the economic and political conditions.~~
- 6) How do the conditions making for unity and the contradictions among the various capitalist classes affect ruling class policy toward the working class?
- 7) What is the condition of the working class suggested by the line or theory being studied?
- 8) What economic conditions are making for unity among the workers? Are these the most immediately observable conditions or not? If they are not what is required to make them observable? What does the line or theory suggest?
- 9) What are the political conditions making for unity among the working class? Are they reform conditions? If they are, are superficial, unprincipled or are they able to be the launching pad for more vanguard reform, for increasing class consciousness, and then revolutionary consciousness?
- 10) What are the contradictions affecting the working class? What illusions both political and economic work against working-class unity? class consciousness? Revolutionary consciousness? Are these contradictions and illusions superficial, that is mainly external or have they been deeply internalized? If

26

they have been deeply internalized, how does the line or theory work to help the working class to overcome them? nationally, internationally, regionally, industry by industry, person by person?

- 11) Altogether what is the general level of the working class in political understanding, economic understanding, and class struggle suggested by the line and theory? Nationally, internationally, regionally, etc. ? Where is high? Where low? What industries? Basic, consumer, service?
- 12) How is the line or theory related to immediate political and economic issues? How to the fundamental economic and political contradictions of capitalism? Of the capitalists? Of the working class?
- 13) What are the strengths and weaknesses suggested by the line or theory of the potential middle class allies of the working class? Of the capitalist class? What are the internal contradictions?
- 14) What conditions of life (economic and political) tend to make professionals, government workers, technicians, other white collar workers veer toward the capitalists? What conditions tend to make them veer toward the working class?
- 15) How does the line or theory suggest that these vacillations be diminished?
- 16) What relationship does the line or theory suggest between the material conditions and the ideological struggle it deals with? Between practice and the ideological struggle?
- 17) What does the line or theory suggest about how to build the party? What is the relationship between building the party and the condition of the various class forces? Their strengths and weaknesses? The ability to build the party and economic conditions? Political conditions?
- 18) What does the line or theory suggest about the necessity of building the party? About the necessity to do so and the material conditions of life? The conditions of the class forces?
- 19) What does the line or theory suggest about the relationship of the material conditions, the strengths and weaknesses of the various class forces and the historical conditions from which they come?
- 20) What does the line or theory suggest about the practice required to insure the kind of future historical developments we would like to see? About short range and long range goals?

27

I think we need also to remember that we cannot approach the study of line and/or theory with a slavish, unthinking mind. We need to think critically, be concrete, examine actual conditions, require of ourselves and others evidence. "I think its right," "I feel its right," "Yeah, that's right," are unacceptable responses to the study of line and theory. Memorizing by heart (usually means loading up on a store of slogans) is unacceptable. Being mechanical or onesided (usually means using the store of slogans memorized, or having a romantic view of the working class, or a conspiracy and monolithic view of the ruling class) is unacceptable. We need to be concrete, to know the evidence, to understand the line or theory ourselves and to be able to improve our practice, and convince others. We need to understand that political and economic reform movements and revolution are complex and filled with contradictions. We can't afford to be afraid to question, to say we don't understand, to demand evidence.

Finally, we need to hate the ruling class and love the working class. But blind hatred won't do and neither will starry-eyed love. If our hatred is only blind and our love starry-eyed then we may sloganeer and exhort until doomsday and accomplish very little. But if we love the working class with deep understanding will know beyond the shadow of doubt why, up or down, low or high in political consciousness at any given moment, ultimately the working class is the class of revolution. If we hate the capitalists and capitalism with deep understanding then we will know why, whether they want to be nice or not, whether their style is charming or

(28)

not, whether they are learned or not, they are decadent and brutal and deserve to be driven from the stage of history. If we hate and love with deep understanding, then we may yet build the party and the movement to the force that can do just that. To accomplish that end, no study, no matter how sustained, can be too boring. And to accomplish that end, no comrade will beat ideas into the heads of our friends in base study groups, but will help our friends achieve political understanding and hence closer ties and recruitment to our party with, in Lenin's words, "patience and perserverance."

(29) (P.1)

PARTY MUST BUILD WAM & 30 for 40

The way I look at it the Party is in a much stronger situation today than say a year or two ago. At that time we did a lot of good work around welfare. But noone was doing anything on the job. We hardly ever discussed Trade Union organizing. Never went to union meetings. We thought putting in a grievance was kind of ~~dam~~. In actuality we put forward unions are no good. All they do is take our money. So, why should anyone join the union? Our sectarianism kept us from organizing and fighting back with people-against the bosses.

Today things are different. Things are slowly but surely changing, for the good of the party. We're organizing and righting back at the "point of production". We're going to union meetings. We're trying to build caucuses on the job (we could definitely improve on this point), we're trying to build WAM and 30 for 40 as a working class issue to unite ALL workers. And we're doing this through the unions-that is at the point of production where it really counts.

In all this there are weakness we made and are making. For example, we seem to be afraid of building caucuses on the job with the clear goal of taking control of the unions. We seem ~~to~~ afraid to put forward WAM or 30 for 40 in each local union as a contract demand. We seem to think that it's really hard to bring it up or having it pass. We seem to make it harder than it actually is, I think. Or else we're not convinced that 30 for 40 is the issue that will REBUILD the labor movement and build the party. I know that that's how I've felt.

About 2 or 3 weeks ago I talked to my chief steward (the same guy that turned me down for steward) and asked him what the correct procedure is in proposing 30 for 40. We got into a discussion and he said, "With the population increasing and with automation we NEED a shorter work week." When he said "we need a shorter work week" it made it clearer in my mind that it's not just another issue but "we need" 30 for 40.

This unclarity and fear of anti-communism held me back from bringing 30 for 40 in the union. I thought that as soon as I get up they're going to shoot me down. But talking to this chief steward defeated some of my fears. He also said that in theory he agrees with communism but ~~he~~ doesn't think it will work. I ~~always thought~~ he was really anti-communist. We also discussed why not many people come to union meetings. I suggested that if committees would be set up within the union more people would come and get more involved in union activities. He also suggested that I write an article to the union paper. Anyway, it's been ME that has held back the struggle. I think we can have 30 for 40 passed. But win or lose now-some workers who are interested may come forth and help us built for it in a bigger way next time.

On my job most people know I'm a communist. I usually sell 2 or 3 Challenges. I've put in 4 grievances within 2 months, the only 4 since I've worked there. My relationship with people is good. When something happens people always call me to tell me about it. My big weakness is that I don't have a particular person I'm talking to on the job-since Jim Daly and Joe Sheldon left. Mainly the phone workers I know are Frank M. (a steward from my union local but another office. He's white); Marvin F. (Works for Western Electric-bought 2 New Year's Eve tickets-he's black-works in a different office-different union); and Dudley D. (works for AT&T, is the chairman of the Brotherhood of the Bell and who sold 4 New Years Eve tickets-he's black, different union). But I really haven't spent that much time with any of these guys. Most of my time has been spent with Hotpoint workers.

At Hotpoint I know a lot of workers-mainly black-that we have had meetings with (the last meeting about 30 or 40 workers came). I've only got one worker signed for the WAM convention and this same worker subscribes to C-D, I'ts not that people are not interested-we just haven't done much about it.

Most of the workers I know are black. But hardly any of them are ~~and~~

involved in WAM or involved in PL discussion groups or even political && discussions at their homes-except 2 workers that I can think of. In relation to the party one of our main weaknesses, I think, is black or minority workers joining the party. Racism within the party and within myself must be fought. It seems that we should definitely concentrate on particular minority workers or students we know to spend more time and & to have more political discussions with. Plus many of the people who have left the party recently have been black-Archie, Rose, Fred. This has to improve or else minority workers, or any worker for that matter, won't take us serious about fighting racism.

That's why I think, this WAM convention could really help build not only WAM but help build the party among black and other minority workers-if we take it serious.

I would say that we really go all the way out in building WAM and this WAM convention. ~~and~~ I think that this convention could be the turning point for the labor movement. WAM is a NECESSITY, at this time, for workers to really have the power to win. Why do we say that WAM is a necessity? We say that at this time, a shorter work week is and is going to be the main issue for workers in this country and around the world. WAM must be there to carry this forward and win it. The ruling class is already trying to take leadership of the shorter work week by pushing the 4 day week-10 hours a day. If WAM and PL trying to build a left-center coalition, are not there to take leadership of the shorter work week struggle, then the same thing that happened in the anti-war movement will happen with this struggle-the bosses will be in control and we'll be "negotiatin" to retain the 8 hour day.

We say Rank and File control of unions, because we know from our own experiences and past experiences that most of the leadership in most unions are sell-outs-not all of them, though. We say that R & F caucuses must be built in every union local to take control. Without a caucus we're not going to do it.

Some people may ask why not build caucuses? Why WA,? Again we know from own experiences that caucuses, by themselves, usually don't last long and without an outlook of internationalism-that is solidarity with all caucuses, with all locals with all internationals and with all workers the struggle usually can't be won. We understand that internationalism is very important. Now who can bring workers, especially union activists from all industries together, under one roof, to advance the internationalism-workers solidarity? WAM and PL's idea of a left-center coalition can.

If we agree with these points mentioned then it seems to me the WAM convention and the need to bring workers, especially union activists, becomes clearer.

We know that national conventions are always very inspiring, where all experiences are discussed and summarized. And where it gives us an idea of where we're at and what must be done from here on?

LET'S BUILD WAM AND 30 for 40 CONVENTION-
LET'S REBUILD THE LABOR MOVEMENT-
LET'S BUILD THE PARTY

-MIKE B.