

# PLP CONVENTION BULLETIN # 5

---

|   |    |
|---|----|
| PL Line on Art & Culture.....   | 1  |
| For Launching Cultural Work.....  | 2  |
| Class Struggle in Culture: Develop Our Line, Enter the Battle.....                                  | 9  |
| On Challenge. Boston. Editorial. Collective.....  | 17 |
| Summary of Seattle Club's Discussion of Challenge-Desafio.....                                      | 22 |
| More on Challenge.....  | 24 |
| On the Situation in England & Europe.....   | 26 |
| Chicago Desafio-Challenge report.....   | 35 |
| The Party Needs More Formal Procedures to Insure Democracy<br>& Struggle.....                       | 37 |
| Berkeley 30 for 40 campaign.....  | 39 |
| Against Supporting McGovern.....  | 43 |
| Party Involvement in Electoral Work. Political Lessons from the<br>Berkeley 30 for 40 Campaign..... | 46 |
| A Comment on Bulletin #4.....   | 51 |
| Comments on the proper kinds of alliances for the party.....  | 53 |
| A self-criticism (from Cleveland).....  | 55 |
| Without Revolutionary Study There Can be no Revolutionary Party..                                   | 59 |
| The Right Wing Trend in the Student Work at Berkeley.....   | 61 |
| Boston Area Leadership Report.....  | 64 |
| Criticism of Al Strelzoff's Article on Dialectics.....  | 67 |
| Report From Philadelphia.....   | 68 |
| Some Newspaper Clippings.....   | 70 |



(3)

collaborated to put it out, but it was done primarily without central party guidance. This led to ~~its~~ ~~being~~ put off for months, and finally as Roger Taus was left holding the bag, he put it out on his own with little consultation. He tried to circulate it on his own, and had some relations with another left magazine of the time, STREETS, and some various plans about what to do with it. But when it came out the party realized an anarchistic thing was going on, and sent a letter around with criticism of the whole effort. This dissociated ~~the~~ PLP with WEAPON, and left it up to comrades in the areas to whatever with it. In SF this led to an angry debate, with half the membership favoring actually burning all copies since there were bourgeois poems in it. The compromise was that it was stillborn and left a lot of bad feelings and images of bonfires. This ENDED any discussion of a possible magazine of the arts, and also discouraged the entire idea that we should have an aggressive, visionary line on the arts.

The period from 1968 to nearly 1971 passed with little debate on the subject of culture. Accurate reading of PL and Challenge might reveal occasional poems or articles, but most often the latter were devoted (and still are somewhat) to fiercely exposing the ~~bankruptcy~~ bankruptcy of some media event like a movie or TV show. Many people who were artists of one kind or another, or like other types of intellectuals in PL, were busy transforming themselves into superworkers. There is no one so fierce against the church as an ex-catholic. And that is how many creative people viewed their tainted past in the arts. An unstated line developed that actually one ~~stage~~ a HIGHER stage of evolution when one cast off the devotion to cultural production. Or to intellectual pursuit. ~~We~~ we had transcended our origin in the species and had

become capable of being anything. Viewing the arts statically, in their ~~relationship~~ ~~bourgeois-dying-empire~~ form (where we left them), we could see clearly(?) they were of no use whatsoever to the proletariat, and so for some years merely persuaded each other and others that ~~they should give~~ any such drive to create art should be thrown overboard with the rest of our bourgeois hangups. Get a job in a factory. Be like Ralph Worker and his family. Eventually lead the workers to seize the means of production.

This is old hat now. In the last two years there has been a very great struggle in the party to come down to reality. We called it the rectification or the redeployment, and it has coincided with an effort to build united struggles for reforms, end sectarianism, and rebuild the work among students and intellectuals in a serious way. Winning anti-Shockley resolutions in gatherings of scientists and recruiting indigenous workers to a program of union reform struggle seem at both ends a mark of the rightness of this overhaul in our thinking. Yet we still have no clear line on culture. This is a paradox, ~~since~~ since some things have taken place indicating a change, like the PLPLP, use of skits etc. But there is something about this work that makes it the last to be dared.

It is potent stuff. Is that the reason? That maybe it will get out of hand? People will become stars; we will recruit ~~KKKK~~ Hollywood nuts who will corrupt us all? We'll be backing a lot of fancified bullshit that will eventually lead everyone astray? And yet for all the contempt of bourgeois art and skepticism about the possibility of proletarian art, people in our movement talk of little else in their "social" moments. The latest movie, the new TV series, the songs on AF, jazz, decorations and adornments... an occasional book or two. We are all acutely aware of the bourgeoisie's efforts to win people's deepest feelings to their way of life, and sometimes we are temporarily dazzled by them. Or we see the good fragments in a movie or song. We must learn to see what the bourgeoisie has long recognized: art is an absolute necessity to the masses of

(4)

people. It is inevitable. Crystallizing, ~~reaching~~ <sup>essence,</sup> ~~reaching~~ ~~to~~ ~~an~~ ~~age~~, expressing on many planes, reaching the wellsprings of the species, giving back to us the meanings of our lives. What meanings? In whose service? That is the line of battle. Tear down the insidious exploitation of art by the ruling class, and fight for the creation of an art that gives back TRUE meanings, the reality of the class struggle, to the people. We must have the weaponry that can win people to the deepest commitment, not the ~~the~~ ruling classes. A revolutionary culture that will clear out new space in workers' minds, help them scoff at Dirty Harry & friends, and weld the profoundest emotions to the common cause of revolution and socialism. This seems almost too difficult, given the pitfalls of individualistic artistes, lousy examples from the past, theoretical confusion, and ~~having~~ having to start from scratch after the CP's work became negative many years ago. But it is no more complicated than the task of building a party of a new type, from "scratch", and we have not feared to get into this effort. Neither should we be afraid of art. We can lick him too.

#### THE TIME IS RIFE

Concretely, we are entering a period that may well give the opportunity for ~~the~~ a renaissance in proletarian art. The rebellious 60s had a deep ~~deep~~ effect on artists and writers, and many who participated & nearly spontaneously are now digesting that experience and looking for a way to change their mode of expression to more militantly reflect the struggles they lived thru. The fight against racism and the debates over cultural nationalism have produced many progressive tendencies in a whole new grouping of ~~of~~ black, Asian, Latino and other minority artists and writers. The last decade produced a new common denominator in political consciousness. The bohemian detached personal gripe political stance of ten ~~or~~ years ago is out-of-place at a poetry reading. There is a great interest in ~~at~~ a point of view that links ~~the~~ the artist with the oppressed masses of the world.

1) One sign of this is existence of cultural collectives devoting effort to "serve the people" in many cities. Many of these groups are counter-cultural, or sectarian, or revisionist. But they are evidence of a basic impulse that is progressive. Witness the evolution of the Mime Troupe in San Francisco from hip plays joking about marijuana in the early 60s, to sophisticated plays exposing the role of liberals in promoting drug addiction in Vietnam. The Chicago Mural Movement, the Red Star Singers, Towards Revolutionary Art, people involved in making political films.. there are many of these groupings.

2) An example of the eagerness for a more revolutionary culture recently was the overflow crowd of a thousand who came to hear poets read for a Bach Mai Hospital Fund Benefit in SF. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ There was a tremendous response for the more militant poets. Another: in student work, a comrade in the ~~a~~ SF State club gave a presentation on proletarian poetry to a 3-hour night class, where most of the students work fulltime and people usually leave at 10pm sharp. The class was so excited it went overtime 45 minutes-people forgot about the clock..after class 8 students and the teacher asked the party member to write up a bibliography so they could read the works themselves. The teacher of this class is now teaching Victorian Lit. using Engels to give it an historical base.

3) People are becoming more fed up with bourgeois art. This is two-sided: it still wins a lot of points. One example was the condemnation of the Archie Bunker stereotype in some union papers. Another is the reaction to movies getting more violent and degenerate. It seems you hear more and more people saying "that movie was SO sick". People can only take so much. Yet what are we doing about this? It is important to attack capitalist art, to fight movies like the Godfather, yet it is not enough. Workers and students want something positive. Our unwritten line on culture is like

(5)

our old work in the unions: ATTACK WHAT IS BAD (union leadership-bourgeois culture) --DON'T DO ANYTHING TO BUILD SOMETHING TO REPLACE IT (rank&file caucuses, on the job struggles-proletarian art and culture). ~~Some when movies like the story of the people are written back to the bourgeoisie~~ This leaves the bourgeoisie to make its OWN counterploys: nice movies or movies sort of about struggle that still lead to bourgeois ideology.

4) Revolutionary works are more available now as the bourgeoisie makes a few bucks on the greater interest in political art. Brecht, Neruda, etc. And much unearthing is being done by more politically motivated historians on the ~~xxxxxxx~~ socially committed literature of the 30s etc. There are sharper debates among critics about the importance of content.

5) Cultural workers can be more of a progressive force. We have made several mistakes in not seeing them as part of the working class, in conflict. Two years ago, the Northern Cal. Librarians condemned racist childrens books like Little Black Sambo in the libraries. Some friends of our party were in touch, but no follow up. After the PLPLP came out, a local DJ played it and praised it highly. No follow up. But recently, with changes from our sectarianism, we got the endorsement for 30 for 40 of the Broadcasters and Telecasters Union. Cultural workers like other workers are oppressed and want to fight. A recent argument over this had one member saying sarcastically "You're talking about winning Paul Newman and Faye Dunaaway?" This is no class analysis. ~~xxxxxx~~ Most actresses and actors never make it Big. They work long hours and often for short pay. They work seasonally too. They have a material interest in socialism, they are in contradiction with capital. Most artists and writers ~~and~~ do not live by what they produce- they have other jobs, as teachers maybe, or they work odd jobs. Many party comrades seem to think artists are a whole separate hippy class; this is a bourgeois notion of culture.

CULTURE AS HELPING TO BUILD THE MOVEMENT - SERVING A CLASS

Perhaps people are thinking culture is fine and fun, but look we have more important things to do. Do we? We are underestimating the impact and grip culture can achieve. After all, read the article in the latest PL Mag. part 2 of Who Rules America. The ruling class has a great deal of money and time invested in cultural control. Why? for the fun of it? Because it has the leisure time to care about such matters? Or is it because there's millions of dollars to be made, and it is the main way the ruling class distributes to millions of people its ideas and its mass line, consolidating people to racism, sexism, nationalism, anti-communism, anti-working class ideas. If culture was not crucially important to them, why did they ban Salt of the Earth, or blacklist thousands of cultural workers in the 50s? Why are progressive teachers continually harassed and fired? Bourgeois culture, say, the average week on television, can be said to be the ideological equivalent of the wage freeze, in that masses of people are being fed a line which strengthens capital. We have recognised the great importance of fighting racist ideology in the colleges but how do these ideas get taught to those who are not in school? Clearly culture is ~~the~~ material force wielded by one class at another.

Historically one can see this. Originally poetry painting dance and song all centered on how the society survived - planting crops, depending on nature, hunting game. After a certain period, culture celebrated the tribes and more the exploits of the chieftain, ~~and~~ finally as classes developed, "official" art celebrated the class in power - the kings etc. And as capital appropriated labor, so did it appropriate culture, and ~~to~~ make it a commodity. Yet there has always been an opposition art, a culture of the oppressed. Work songs are as old as the species. Even artists more directly connected to the ruling class of the time have come into sharp conflict with their "masters". Painters like Goya satirised the monarchy and were harassed and threatened. Writers like Rabelais and Swift

(6)

attacked and exposed church corruption and conditions for the people. Few of these men were revolutionaries, but they were progressive. Similarly romantic poets like Blake Shelley and Rimbaud etc, were profoundly affected by the bourgeois democratic revolutions in France and the US..yet as they did not have a ~~xxxxxxx~~ materialist view they lapsed into inaction mysticism and cynicism-just as many workers students and artists do today, without a communist outlook or presence.

There are ~~probably~~ thousands of examples of how culture can be a weapon, an emotional addition to building the class struggle. The use of songs in labor struggles, like Solidarity Forever, or the many songs from the IWW movement. The use of guerrilla theatre in China, or in the struggle of farmworkers in California recently (Taatro Campesino). During the 30s the New Masses, the Worker's Theaters and many other forms of cultural work brought to millions a proletarian culture and won thousands of artists, professionals and intellectuals to side with the proletariat. Even books like Grapes of Wrath are still playing a part in winning people to a class consciousness. Check the effect it had on the autoworker interviewed in the last PL magazine.

BEGIN THE WORK

We need a whole host of efforts and plans to do this 'cultural' work effectively. ~~at~~ Especially now we need to develop a the theory to a new level, and create a full line that can rally and persuade thousands in the arts to a class perspective. The party needs to come out with documents taking on the most current theories in bourgeois circles, including particularly those coming from the revisionist world. The debate over "socialist realism" should be taken to a higher level. Mao must be taken head-on. The counterculture must be taken head on. Nihilism. Worker-glorification and wooden propaganda-art. Perhaps PL magazine should be the place for this development of a line for the time being. But ~~eventually~~ there is a need for putting this approach more into practice, and reaching more people. Eventually we should plan to launch a united front magazine of the arts something like the New Masses of the 'twenties. This magazine was instrumental in driving the debate-over who the artist must serve-forward to the point it reached in the thirties; when the CP had a base and an influence with tens of thousands of cultural workers, ~~the~~ Such a magazine could very well be independently financed by sympathetic people, especially if the party takes up cultural work seriously around the country and begins to develop a coherent base amongst serious ~~xxxx~~ artists. It could ~~xxxxxxx~~ have an editorial board including some more published or recognised people. It could provide a place for broad polemic on aesthetics and politics; could print art produced by workers and encourage this type of development; could stimulate the creation of some truly powerful and ~~xx~~ vanguard works of art which would turn the mood around completely if printed in a national left-center magazine. Could, could, could. The form has great possibilities in a time like this and with a line like ours. Who else will do it? Build a united front around the honest class line to create a revolution in the arts..? Only us. The rest of the left is only exploiting the alienated and nationalist tendencies in culture. But we need to create, with others, a voice of this program, an organ like a magazine which centers and puts into practice the battle to overhaul culture.

The party press must begin to reflect a more positive attitude towards the arts. Each issue of PI magazine should be planned to include an article about the line on culture, a critique of some work, or a positive review. It also should solicit stories, poems, and graphic work. Either new from artists we know or old revolutionary works. In each issue. And Challenge should do the same. Format is a problem in Challenge. Where would you fit a poem or story. But then the whole question of Challenge needs some application of an approach to culture. That is, are we ~~xxxxxx~~ in any way at all, creating a newspaper which is a step forward in the art of journalism? Is Challenge ~~xxxx~~ assembled with that in mind? Couldn't we get some people who have some daring ideas on graphics, layout etc to remodel the paper? Almost every bourgeois ~~magazine~~ <sup>journal</sup> is more cleverly laid out, with features, columns, artwork, and a sense of graphics in the layout

We should be ashamed to put out a newspaper to 75000 people with ~~no~~ <sup>little</sup> attention to this factor. IT MATTERS. In content, the paper should probably have a regular feature in each issue that deals with culture. Two or three articles if we can get them. A movie review in a regular location in ~~the~~ each issue. A song or poem or story or humorous piece if we can SOLICIT them. And something on trends in media like TV, pop songs, jazz or a review of something we think is halfway good. The writing itself needs a much more critical and daring approach in STYLE. We have a profound and difficult line to win people to. It must have as good a delivery system as we can possibly give it in order to truly grab people, stop them in their tracks, and then convince them of its depth. And that they should ACT. This needs far more experimentation and risk.

The last few issues show some evidence of this, some new features, more innovative front pages etc. But it should go a lot further. We should hold onto the tough militancy in articles like those blasting LBJ & Truman just when the media was praying and crying a bunch of drivel. But in the same paper should be a longer polemic sarcastically taking apart a revisionist theory. And a patiently reasoned explanation of the basis of male chauvinism. And a vividly reported high point in a key strike, next to a movie review that reflects some real knowledge of cinema. Alongside a fictional satire, and a convincing example of our program successfully put in practice. In other words, dare to improve, dare to innovate and use a variety of weapons. Challenge ought to be the best-quality damn journal put out by anybody anywhere because we're revolutionaries, we're not hidebound by advertisers or tradition. It ought to be equal to the line it represents.

BEGIN THE WORK 2

Following are some suggestions for ~~xxxxxx~~ the form this cultural work could take. The whole argument in this paper means to say we should consider ~~this~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ to be a vital part of our work. That means we need to form party units, clubs, to carry it out. Naturally this is disturbing to some people. But like everything else following from HTR3, we are trying to put into practice now in our infancy what we can see to be failings of movements that went far beyond the mere seizure of power. The attitude towards the arts must have this same farsightedness. We cannot build an organisation to win political power that has no use ~~for~~ for artists and writers. The backfires from this attitude are deafening. What ~~xxxxxx~~ stands out? A few great russian films & books... a brief renaissance right after 1917? Mayakovsky blowing his brains out? And now the Solzhenitsyns and films that outreach Hollywood in misleadership? We must see ourselves building a revolution that liberates the arts, that carries in its wake a great renaissance of artistic creation with a materialist line

These are some of the points the clubs or base groups should carry out...

- 1) Increase attacks on bourgeois culture. Picket racist movies, leaflet events, engage in critical polemics etc..
- 2) Work with unions and other organisations of cultural workers.
- 3) Try to build coalitions of cultural groupings: unity behind a left-center program like anti-racism, anti-imperialism, pro worker... Existing groups should be urged to participate more in the class struggle.
- 4) Work towards the launching of a left-center magazine like New Masses, to enable us to forge above coalitions, or resulting from initial success in building a base.
- 5) Fight on creative arts programs on campus. Classroom work is vital.
- 6) Raise the issue of jobs for artists and writers. Something like the WPA (more investigation needed). In the late 30s, because of the great numbers of people employed by WPA painting murals, developing museums, writing histories etc, etc, the US was the number one ranking nation in the world in terms of money spent on the arts per capita. Today, the US ranks as number one-hundred and ten in the united nations for money spent on the arts. Is it this anti-culture mood that we pick up in the party?
- 7) Party members involved in building proletarian culture should be encouraged to actively produce art, especially open communist art. Historically this is a big void. Naturally there are lines being drawn here in some people's minds. The ultimate waste of the party's time, right? bad enuf that they want to form clubs to do this stuff... We insist that the party recognise the validity of artistic production. If we recruit a painter thru this work, should we then say give up your brushes, and just organise other artists? That's crazy. We want to recruit him precisely so aid in the forging of a new, workingclass art. This requires some special attention, and adjustment of time, and particularly the political attitude that what he produces IS part of the work. ~~XX~~
- 8) Spread a line on culture throughout the workingclass. Work on union educational committees to fight anti-workingclass art (Archie Bunker etc) and create a program either through the existing cultural groups or a new coalition to develop workers participation in the arts. Like theater groups, reading circles, film-making, community efforts etc. This has much in history to prove its possibilities. At the turn of the century, cigarworkers would often do one man's (piece) work for him while he read them short stories or novels. They eagerly imposed speedup on themselves to get something rich out of their workingday. The workers theaters in the 30s performed serious plays in the midst of strikes and the Teatro Campesino in the mid 60s used a cast of mostly workers from the grape vineyards....

\*\*\*\*\*  
Hopefully much more clarity of thought on what can be done will emerge if this piece is debated, and if more work along these lines is at least experimented with. What should be clear is that we need to build a workingclass art, and need to attack successfully bourgeois culture.

Couple of party members in SF  
ERNIE BRILL + ERIC JOHNSON

(9)

2.

(10)

CLASS STRUGGLE IN CULTURE: DEVELOP OUR LINE, ENTER THE BATTLE!

Introduction.

There has been a recent decline in the number of Challenge articles on TV, films, books, plays and music. There have been very few cultural articles ever in PL, and those almost all reviews -- of Marat-Sade, The Shop on Main Street, Dylan and Ochs, The Confessions of Nat Turner, Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee. There have been no longer articles on culture, like, e.g., a history of Marxist-Leninist lines of culture or a critique of notable texts like Mao's Talks at Yenan Forum; analysis of a major influential bourgeois filmmaker or musician or writer; analysis of the state of bourgeois culture at the present time or of major tendencies in that culture; historical analysis of American culture stressing its anti-working-class, racist, idealist mainstream and the feeble counter-currents of materialist and pro-working-class ideas; history of working-class art in the U.S.A. and elsewhere. Finally, through ten years of stirring struggle we have produced or influenced virtually no original art -- some agitprop drama (not collected or available), an LP, a handful of poems and stories, a documentary film.

This trend of neglecting both attacks on bourgeois culture and the nurture of a new working-class culture shows every sign of continuing in our party. What follows is an attempt to (1) argue for a serious effort to reverse this trend; (2) sketch out the possible development of our line on culture; (3) offer some modest examples of what we could do. First, self-critically, I have to say that though I have been asked several times to write on these subjects I haven't done so. It was easier to take an opportunist anti-party or anti-intellectual line -- that the party didn't give a damn about culture, or that it wasn't relevant, just an intellectual's game. Yet it is a task to be taken up, I believe, by all of us.

I. PREMISE: IMPORTANCE OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN CULTURE FOR THE MASS MOVEMENT AND THE PARTY

We all give lip-service to the idea of destroying bourgeois culture and replacing it with proletarian culture, new in form and content. But we are not convinced of this in practice. We see this task as far off in the future, instead of as vitally important to us now, in the present stage of the movement. Instead of looking at cultural struggle in the abstract, we should consider our poli-

cy on culture from the vantage-point of the people we are now trying to influence, the workers and intellectuals. We want through our line on culture to influence them in the direction of a working-class world outlook, serious reform and socialist revolution. Our line on culture must help solve practical political tasks, winning workers and intellectuals from various weaknesses and illusions that at present confine them to a bourgeois world-outlook, and to a no-struggle attitude or to ineffective methods of struggle sanctioned by the bourgeoisie. This effort is in contradiction to the effort of the ruling-class in culture, designed to influence the very same people towards passivity, individualism, racism, sexism, etc., and away from serious reform and (above all) socialist revolution. The present stage of this struggle between us and them is that they hold the field virtually unopposed. Bourgeois culture is a powerful force working against all our political efforts and our operating strategy of fighting racism and rebuilding the labor movement.

We recognize this in one form -- the use of academic theorists to push racism through other cultural channels (press, schools). These social "science" theorists have an immediate impact on people's acceptance of public policy (Nixon's cutbacks), so we see them as a major target, and rightly so. But the impact of bourgeois culture in general is more insidious and affects the private life of individuals. Hence, in practice, we do not recognize it as a target, do not see its relation to our political work. In practice, we act as though the effect of countless hours of TV, newspapers, radio, advertising, films, music, magazines and books can be destroyed by trade union struggle and the campus anti-racism campaign. It can't. These struggles, which do change the bourgeois world, certainly are the foundation of changes in outlook. But an extension of these struggles is needed, towards direct challenge of the ruling-class domination of all the organs of culture. The anti-racist movement is in fact a form of class struggle in culture, and will not develop fully unless we carry it explicitly into the various media, both from the inside by building a base among media workers and artists, and from the outside by bold political action against racist TV, films, records and books.

The trade union strategy has already been linked in Convention Bulletin #1 to cultural struggle, with the example of the CIO spur to working-class theater and art (this is a good subject for a PL article). In the days of the CIO, this new theater and art came mostly from intel-

11

lectuals (linked to the workers' struggle by the CP), which was good and something we should work for too. But the CP worried then over the relative absence of worker-artists from this new workers' art, and since we aim at becoming a working-class party this should worry us too. From the very beginning of WAM and the 30-for-40 movement, we should be looking for new ways of developing new art from the workers themselves. In general, we try to fight where the enemy is weak and we are strong. In culture, where bourgeois dictatorship rules supreme, there is little prospect of doing battle with our own TV stations and film studios. But in the trade unions, in forms like short or longer or improvisational plays, videotapes of struggle and discussion, film documentaries, poster and mural art, songs and music, poster-poems, fiction on leaflets, autobiographies on tape, we will have a fertile field for circulating class-conscious art among a huge working-class audience. And if we develop this, we will certainly be able to bring it with fantastic effect into the lives of students and intellectuals.

If this seems too grandiose, think of what steps are needed to get us to that point. For example, what are the assumptions in workers' minds about art? If we can answer this question we can begin struggling against the assumptions that hinder the growth of working-class art (e.g., art is useless, effeminate, pretentious -- who needs it? art is for the rich; art is made by geniuses; workers' experiences or language or thought are not adequate for art). With some progress in that struggle what could be made of the tremendous experiences of our friends and members in the factories of Cleveland, Gary, Detroit, Lynn -- by those workers themselves? A longer play for the WAM convention? Videotapes to sell to our whole base, to bring these struggles into one hour, at least, of the enemy's prime time? Stories, dialogues and biographies that dramatize the contradictions of struggle and the development of individuals -- fiction that teaches (makers as well as its readers), that gives the lie to racism and sexism, that inspires struggle, that can be used in discussion groups and on picket lines? ("Caucuses and Communists" in the latest PL points the way.) Songs and new music, new forms, out of the rhythms of workers' lives and not the worn-down traditions of the recording studio? Every member and friend of the party should be asking these questions and trying to produce something in response. Political life is rich and full of interest. Great art, like scientific discovery, comes out of the collective labor

12

of countless people, reflected in old traditions and new pressures for change, and the great works that will be born in the struggles of our class need to be prepared by the modest and mass efforts of all of us. How many musicians and writers have lived and died in American auto plants and steel mills because the bourgeoisie had no use for them? But we have use for them our class does! Then we have to prepare the climate in which workers will awaken to their own creativity as they awaken to other forms of class consciousness. Not to do this, not to expect workers (and ourselves among them) to create the art of their own liberation struggle, is to succumb to the brainwashing of the enemy -- to accept the anti-working-class and racist line that we attack so vehemently when it takes the form of "working-class kids can't learn." If PL doesn't start to create this climate of expectation and acceptance for workers' art, who else will?

Related directly to our operating strategy, then, the struggle for working-class culture and against bourgeois culture can be seen to have an important place in our current work. Both aspects need to be developed, but the first is the primary one for the long haul. We can criticize and dissect bourgeois culture till we are blue in the face, and if we have no new and better art to praise and enjoy, people will regard us as sterile and boring. Perhaps this is why our Challenge pieces have dried up: by itself, negative criticism is too limited a form of activity in culture, too one-sided. The analysis of racism in culture has to be carried on in a context of new stories, plays, tapes from our friends and ourselves that show racism exposed, overcome in the course of getting out from under some oppressive part of life under capitalism. Bourgeois caricature of workers or pushing of decadent ideas and styles should be attacked in a context of stories by and about workers that show in new ideas and styles the force that can remake the world. Trade union cultural committees and campus study groups should create as well as criticize.

## II. DEVELOP OUR LINE ON CULTURE

The argument above rests on the specific relevance of cultural struggle to our current work. The next step is to plunge in and learn something; practice will be the main source of our line on culture. But we should recognize, in addition, that the question of art and culture is an important question of general communist theory over which much ink and some blood has been spilled.

In the future we should study this question, taking up, for example, the following points:

(i) What is art? What is the origin of art? Is it found in all societies? Is it necessary? What is the social function of art? What is the relationship of art and the means of production in various societies? What is the relationship between art and the various social classes (the relations of production)?

(ii) Are there any elements in art that transcend class? Is there any permanent value in works of art? Is there anything liberating in bourgeois art? Can proletarian artists learn anything from the art of old exploiting classes? Should a socialist revolution destroy all the art of the old exploiting classes? Is form in art ideological?

(iii) What does it mean to say art is a weapon in the class struggle? What significant examples of this can we show today? From history? Why do bourgeois artists not see art in this way?

(iv) What is the relation of art and culture to the State apparatus and other forms of bourgeois dictatorship? Who are the bureaucrats of culture? Is art important to the bourgeoisie? How does the bourgeoisie control the production of art, its distribution, its preservation? Is art primarily a commodity in bourgeois society? What is the relation of art to other elements of the bourgeois superstructure: religion, politics, science, the family, children, sex, health, food, rest?

(v) What is the relation of the artist in bourgeois society to the working class and the ruling class? What historically have artists tended to do when class struggle sharpens? What is the material base of the artist's "freedom," and what conditions in the ruling class limit this freedom? Who controls the artist? Who is an artist?

(vi) How do bourgeois individualism and elitism shape our concept of art and the artist? Who decides what is good art? Is art still mostly produced by an individual working alone? Should workers' art and socialist art all be collectively produced? Are past examples of collective art (ritual art, medieval cathedrals) relevant to the collectivist ideal of socialism and communism?

(vii) Has there ever been a genuine proletarian art? Is proletarian art more political than bourgeois art? More realistic? Is socialist realism the necessary form for proletarian art? Should proletarian art confine itself to the language and images and ideas of the workers?

Who should control proletarian art? What are the conditions of its production, distribution and preservation? What is the relation of proletarian art to the collectivist economic base and to other elements of the socialist superstructure: ~~religion~~, politics, science, the family, children, sex, health, food, rest?

(viii) What is the relation of art to the dictatorship of the proletariat? To the communist party? What is the history of cultural bureaucracies in socialist countries? Who decides what is good art?

(ix) What are the problems in developing workers' art in this country? What traditions can we build on? What should we preserve from the past working-class literature and art? Are there existing art forms we should encourage? Why do periods of great struggle not necessarily produce great art? What are the tasks of a communist party in developing workers' art and fighting for socialist form and content? What are our tasks with respect to progressive artists (not working-class)? What should we consider progressive and revolutionary art?

(x) How does revisionism express itself in art? What is the anatomy of revisionist art theory? What does the history of the USSR, Cuba and China show? What is the relation of the artist to the workers and the red rulers in revisionist countries? What would revolutionary art be in a revisionist country?

(xi) What is the relation between art and racism/nationalism? Does racism/nationalism pervade all art? Is art one of the chief expressions of racism/nationalism? Is advanced bourgeois art internationalist? Is it possible to have an internationalist art (bourgeois or proletarian)? How has racism/nationalism affected proletarian art and the communist theory of art? Are national languages obsolete and reactionary? Is there a racial/national cultural identity above or beyond class? How is proletarian internationalism built through art and culture?

(xii) What is the relation between art and sexism? Does the form and content of art vary with different family structures? Is women's art different from men's? Is there a sexual cultural identity above or beyond class? What roles in art and culture do the various exploiting classes assign women? What is the relation between workers' art and the liberation of women from sexism?



(15)

(xiii) What is the relation between art and the education of children in various societies? What is the impact of art on children of various classes in this country today? What should revolutionary art do in the education and participation in social life of children? What are the tasks of a communist party in the education of children under capitalism?

We can consider these and other questions on many levels: we can do serious, detailed, scholarly work on them and attempt to win respect for the Marxist-Leninist theory of art among artists and intellectuals; we can take up some of them in study groups and inner-party education (from which we should develop a strategy and tactics, a political focus, for our activities in culture); we can see how the questions apply in our own reading or film-going, etc., and write more theoretical short pieces for the party press. The purpose of the questions here is to stimulate thought and criticism -- more questions, some answers.

### III. WHAT CAN WE DO NOW?

In the two related fields of action (develop workers' culture, destroy bourgeois culture), there are some immediate possibilities:

#### (i) Critiques of significant and influential works of bourgeois culture.

These critiques (in the party press and elsewhere) should concentrate on what most workers or students and intellectuals consume. This has been our main cultural activity to date: we just need more of it.

(ii) Analysis of Trends. (a) Articles for PL on current decadence and quasi-fascist culture: pornography and its direct connection to the State (courts and police); the vogue of horror-films; the romanticizing of gangsterism, prostitution and the police; the cult of homosexuality; the "nostalgic" music and art trends; the gross racism/nationalism of the new "Black" films-- all this, plus drugs and religion, adds up to a cultural decadence unprecedented in the U.S.A., which we should deal with. (b) Articles on Movement art of the sixties (e.g., the poetry in Campfires of the Resistance, ed. by Todd Gitlin, and Viet vets' poetry; collections of agitprop theater; posters and film (e.g. from Newsreel); political songs; black nationalist and neo-feminist writing), which would relate the strengths and weaknesses of this work to the politics of the Sixties and the tasks ahead.

(16)

(iii) Political Action against Bourgeois Culture. Campaigns to ban racist and anti-working-class and sexist books in schools (we have done some of this); picket-lines at especially rotten racist etc. movies drawing large crowds, and boycott campaigns (including petitions) against such films or TV shows (we have picketed newspapers already in the anti-racist campaign); these tactics could escalate to sit-ins, with agitprop drama (has any of us ever expressed our anger and disgust at some of these things in an adequate political way?). Another possibility is demonstrations and agitprop inside movie houses, classrooms, concert-halls, live TV shows. Abbie Hoffman has given this sort of thing a bad name, but it ain't necessarily so.

(iv) Consolidate the Art of Struggle We Already Have. Was Gitlin's Campfires of the Resistance really all that SNCC and SDS produced? We could publish a PL Songbook with new and old songs. We could collect the agitprop drama we and others have found successful. We could produce one or two good posters worth keeping (e.g. on 30 for 40, anti-racism, internationalism) from graphic work already done for our press. A new PLP-IP with something from the new factory organizing might be an immediate possibility. Tapes and videotapes to preserve the rich experiences of workers we know could be made very quickly.

(v) Start Discussions of Culture among the Workers. A regular social gathering or dinner is a good setting for discussion of a book we have recommended. Reading-guides should be worked up of books people would enjoy. This kind of reading circle can begin to detach workers from the media, where the bosses have a field day. It is a form of organizing and education with a long history in the working class. We should encourage people to write up their reactions.

(vi) Reprint Classics of Working-class Literature. Who knows some? The suppression of workers' art is one of the regular activities of the bourgeois cultural machine.

(vii) Start Union Cultural Committees. To produce thousands of small contributions to a new culture: music, plays, videotapes, posters, songs, poems, stories -- aimed at spreading the 30 for 40 movement, at dramatizing key issues in the union, at exposing racism and sexism, at organizing the unorganized, at understanding events. The efforts of a few determined workers at the start could have a very broad effect, and the point of workers' art, solidarity, liberation, would outlast the immediate benefits. We can raise the idea of workers leading the whole of social life, and we can start now.

(17)

Is Challenge <sup>very</sup> sectarian? We would like to take issue with this sentiment, expressed by some party members and by the "Criticisms of Challenge" writer in the Convention Bulletin #2, pp. 31-33.

The Bulletin writer says, "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 .... we should have a style palatable enough that people can be exposed to our line, and not give up right away."

If it's often true, as this writer maintains, that criticism of "bias, exaggeration, and rhetoric" are really differences with our line, then the "palatable style" must mean a change in the line of Challenge -- or else we're talking about sneaking communist ideas to our readers without their knowing it or without struggle. This is revisionism! Wasn't this Castro's policy, when he announced in the early '60s that the Cuban "revolution" was actually socialist, much to the surprise of many who fought for it? I'm not implying that the writer favors Cuba's "independent" path to socialism, but rather that fighting for Socialism without struggle leads to Castro's conclusions.

The examples the writer mentions underline our interpretation that this article calls for a change in PL's public line. (And there isn't any private line if we understand the idea in RR3 that communist politics must be the property of the masses, not just of the party, to advance Socialism.)

"How many PLers talk about 'goose stepping racists' in SDS, on the job, in the McG. campaign, etc., when they're trying to win people to oppose Jensen," the writer asks. If its true that these Nazis are really Nazis, then we should say it in our United Front (UF) work, too! Otherwise, we're being opportunist about PL's line and we won't be building a political basis for revolution, no matter how many groups we work with. "Liking" PL organizationally or liking a PL member personally is no substitute for liking PL's politics.

We don't have to dot every "i" (say everything at once) when we explain our line, but we should start in, or we'll never get anywhere.

If we find it hard to defend calling Golda a Nazi, this means one of two things. Either we don't agree with this line or we don't know enough about the situation. That's OK. We learn through struggle what we need to know to be better communists. Putting a Hitler mustache on Golda forces us to learn about genocidal attacks on

working people

(2)

(18)

Palastinian, Israeli gov't racism towards non-Europeans, the oppression of and resultant strikes by Israeli working class. The Israeli gov't talks about "our land", "the chosen people", etc. If this isn't fascist, what is? By pointing this out, at least we make people think about it, even if they don't agree at first. We're sure that, after the Lybian airplane was shot down, not a few people remembered C/D's picture of Golda with a Hitler mustache.

What's behind this "be rational" argument? Isn't it projecting onto the masses our own opportunism, to feel uncomfortable with a picture of Lady Bird calling for a new pimp to replace her dead one? Why does this have to be explained? It isn't "bad taste", it actually tastes good to raise our line immediately. This also encourages the hidden left, that is, people who already agree with us out of their own experiences. Just the other day, someone told us, "I thought you guys were crazy at first calling Golda a nazi, but the more I think about it ...." By putting the line forward sharply, we rached someone who might otherwise have become demoralized, thinking that no one else actually agreed with his gut hatred of Israeli fascism. Because of C-D, he is now more likely to put forward left politics more vigorously and strengthen his relationship with PL.

People hated Johnson for years. Remember the mass chants of "Sieg Heil" by thousands of demonstrators at the '68 Democratic Convention or "LBJ, pull out, like your father should have". Or do we just react to the conscious whims of the mass media, which now build Kennedy-Johnson as lesser-evils, or Humphrey as a leader of the struggle against the budget cuts? Do we call Meir a fascist for the week after they shoot down civilians and then change our line when the media counter-attacks with sympathy for her government over the terrorist (or CIA agent) Black Septembrists? Or do we believe that a leopard doesn't change its spots?

Most people don't get turned off to personal vilifications. Millions turned on to watch fascist Joe ~~Joe~~ and his TV talk show a few years ago, where he made fun of everyone -- workers, students, blacks, women, etc. who showed up. Not that we cast verbal stones at the people he attacked, rather at our rulers, whom he respected. Today many laugh at 'debo nair' Bill Buckley's racist and anti-working class jokes.

The writer of the bulletin article feels it's wrong to say "millions of students demonstrated against US imperialism in the 60's in opposi-

tion to its murder of Vietnamese workers and peasants, "because (students demonstrated against the war, only because) they didn't want to be drafted, and because of pacifist sentiments, not because of a class understanding of imperialism."

The ideas that students are either fully pacifists, draft avoiders, etc. or, on the other hand, totally "anti-imperialist" (whatever that phrase of a pure mind without internal struggle means) is very undialectical. Actually more students were involved in local on campus struggles, under SDS anti-imperialist slogans against ROTC and racism than marched nationally to hear McG., etc. speak at revisionist-led demos. Does this mean that Harvard students were "anti-imperialists" during the week, while they were blacking recruiters and occupying buildings, but pacifists on Saturday when they marched on Washington? It means neither, of course. It means that students and workers ("who are anti-communist or conservative to one degree or another" to quote the Bulletin writer), just like PL<sup>m</sup>embers, have dual aspects.

The writer feels "We are constantly interpreting news from our vantage point, not from the vantage point of the people involved in the incident." There are only two kinds of vantage points in any struggle, left ones, which move the struggle forward, and right ones which hold the struggle back. If our vantage point was totally different from that of the people, as the writer's quote implies, it would mean that Challenge and PLers involved were totally removed from the actual situation. I assume the writer doesn't mean that this is usually the case. PL tries to build the left aspects of the struggles it's involved in. This is our vantage point. The only other vantage point is one which tones the struggle down and moves it away from a communist understanding of the situation.

One point we have not talked enough about is the need for struggle when talking about Challenge: If people we know get turned off by Challenge and we don't struggle with them, the results are not encouraging. To be criticized is a good thing only when we do something about it. Without struggle on our part it doesn't matter what's in Challenge. C/D can't do the job of Party members. This means if the people you work with get turned off, it's often a sign your relationship with them does not allow for struggle, that is they don't feel comfortable raising differences with you, allowing you to struggle with them. Challenge should not be blamed for our

problems with base-building, or for our not putting forward a revolutionary line in our work.

The basic purpose of C-D is to relate the party line -- i.e. the class struggle and socialist revolution -- to the concrete situation in which we live and operate. This means that each article contains and illustrates an aspect of that line. This doesn't mean that each article ends up with a little ditty about how socialism would make things better. Rather it means that articles should explain how in each situation we're in, the class struggle can be sharpened. Sometimes this means making the struggle more mass, it may mean increasing people's consciousness about some sellouts, or about the nature of the enemy, etc. But whatever the particular point is, it represents a concrete application of the party line.

Of every article we send into challenge, we should ask the question, "What is the point of this article?" Are we raising our line in it -- are we pointing the way to victory? In Boston, for example, we recently submitted an account to Challenge of a conference of African students which PLP members attended. Many of these <sup>students</sup> ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> very committed; some have served time in Haile Sellassie's prisons. And they respect PL. Their line, however, is not to involve themselves organizationally with the American student movement, but to spend their time in this country studying Marx, Lenin, socialism, Mao, and Trotsky. Our article, however, reflected the weakness of our political work with these students, and made no concrete suggestions to help build internationalism, for example by co-sponsoring Mayday. Instead, we reported on the conference from the "vantage point of the people involved", and thereby condoned nationalism and did nothing to advance our work with these students. But by writing the article for C-D, we were forced to think about these things, and made a plan to turn around the situation.

Another example concerns the work at Northeastern University in Boston. The area leadership asked the club members to submit an article about the struggle there against Banfield's Unheavenly City. There are many black and white students there who are doing little things against the racist who uses the book, but we had no real plan to build this into a coalition against racism. This was reflected in the first draft of the article, which contained no concrete suggestions for how to advance that situation. Rewriting the article forced us to think

21

more about more seriously about the party's line in that situation and present it in a mass way for the readers of Challenge.

IMPROVE CHALLENGE AND THE WORK AROUND IT

As we know, Challenge sales have been very low lately. If we don't sell the paper, which precludes our struggling with anyone about the content, it doesn't matter what Challenge says.

In Boston this has been one of the main weaknesses in our work, and it goes hand-in-hand with other forms of not building the party-- selling subs, raising \$\$, discussing the line with our base, etc. It is absolutely crucial for all of us to sell the paper more!!!!

We don't mean to imply that Challenge is perfect. We in Boston have turned in articles which have been terrible at times. At times we have substituted superficial phrases for real analysis, and slogans for content. This mainly comes from not treating the paper very seriously. Articles are prepared without thought, without discussion, and in a hurried and confused manner. But with proper planning and political struggle these weaknesses can be changed. We don't feel that the way to improve Challenge is to tone down the party's line!

We feel that that the attitude expressed by the Bulletin writers (with the exception of Milt's article) is opportunist and revisionist. Unfortunately many in the party share these attitudes especially around Challenge, writing for it and selling it. What is most distressing about the articles in the bulletin was that for the most part, they are totally un-self-critical. There was no mention of how many (or few) Challenges the writers were selling, nor any mention of whether the writers have attempted to contribute to the paper. We are sure that if the writers had submitted something to Challenge, it would have been put in, or some discussion would have occurred about it. It seems that this didn't happen. Criticism without participation, and without self-criticism is not serious, it is arrogant.

One example of this is that the writers make numerous suggestions about what the editors in NYC can do-- but what about yourselves?

WE feel that Challenge has improved lately, and that the weaknesses it has are not that it is "too left", or "too crude", but that we do not give enough thought to the articles we write and to how the party's line can be put across thru the paper in the articles.

Comradely,

Boston Challenge Editorial Collective-- Jim Cronin, Jim Sober, Al Furst

SUMMARY OF SEATTLE CLUB'S DISCUSSION OF CHALLENGE-DESAFIO

22

Generally, the discussion is best summed up in the comment a Ft. Lewis G.I. made to one of our members: "PL must be a really strong revolutionary organization to put out a paper like this." It was felt by all members that putting out and distributing the paper was the best thing we do. We took strong exception to the changes advocated in the last internal bulletin that tended toward diluting the Communist content of the paper or being too nice to enemies. "These people (Golda Meir, etc.) are enemies and should be killed. There is no sense in being nice to them.", the Club agreed. Most of the workers, students and G.I.'s we sell the paper to feel good when they see the Party is bold enough to call Nixon a fascist pig and worse; if we don't call these enemies every name in the book, who will.

In this regard we felt the recent Challenge staff letter had an unfortunate tendency to downplay political articles in favor of putting communist politics in recipes, advice about cars, appliances, etc. If the "apple" article was an example of this, it was a miserable failure. We felt this "health" article on eating apples was: (1) a waste of space, ~~xxx~~ and probably bullshit as well, (2) made the mistake of advertising a particular capitalist product, (3) was more ~~xxx~~ suited for a Washington State Apple Growers advertisement in an underground newspaper than in our communist paper. It is a big mistake to think that most people won't read longer political articles. The three most commented upon articles recently were the analyses of the UMW elections, the Philadelphia Teachers Strike and the "end" of the war in Vietnam. Ours is a political paper. It cannot and should not try to ape the dailies' feature pages. People who buy Challenge don't want a working class version of the feature pages in the Daily News; they expect and should receive: (1) articles about their class in struggle (2) analyses from a revolutionary communist point of view about important trends and events in the trade-union movement, student movement, in the class struggle internationally.

Some specific suggestions toward improving Challenge were:

- \* More articles going into depth showing the relation of reform to revolution.
- \* Racist book of the month good--reinstitute "Boss University of the Month" feature again, too.
- \* PLP's role in certain struggles should be played up so readers don't get the impression we are only talking about what other people are doing.
- \* It is important to talk about weaknesses in even positive struggles so we can help raise the struggle to a higher level.
- \* We need a regular column explaining M-L principles and terms such as ruling class, imperialism, Marxism-Leninism.
- \* We have to watch the infrequent but not totally eliminated practice

p. 2 Seattle Disc. of Challenge

23

of using in-group terms and in-group jokes in the paper.

For our part, we in Seattle have to do much more to guarantee the content of the paper. In this respect, we are preparing (1) a four part series on conditions and struggles at the Shipyards, (2) an in-depth series of articles on the Kellogg, Idaho silver mines (3) a series exposing the Group Health Cooperative Hospital in Seattle.

We need much improvement in selling the paper. Some suggestions made for improvement were:

\* We should thoroughly read the paper before we sell so that we can point out articles to people when we are selling.

\* Consistency is key, and we shouldn't stand around talking when we are supposed to be selling.

\* Enthusiasm--people can detect if you are reluctant to sell and they won't buy.

In selling the paper to your co-workers, in the final analysis the question is what kind of relationship you develop with people. If you have friendly ties with people, and if you are known on the job as one who resists the bosses and is a fighter, people come to ask you what literature you have to give them today. Under these circumstances, selling the paper ceases to become a chore; people see the need for the paper and ask you.

More on Challenge

24

1. Raise the price to 15 cents. This will increase the Party's income, and it will not reduce sales. In fact poverty-stricken readers are given free copies once in a while. We would be in a better position to do it if the price went up. After all with inflation, ~~the~~ Challenge has been getting cheaper and cheaper.
2. We should have more news and less slogans on the major front page headlines. This would help sales, and would not affect the political impact. For example :  
"Bosses' peace = blood-soaked profits" instead of "Fight for socialism".  
"Teachers strike nationwide !" "Students fight against racist profs."  
"30 for 40 on ballot in five cities"  
"Unions fight for shorter work week"  
etc.  
The idea would be to pick the key theme that ties several of the most important stories together and make it a headline focussing on the news - not the slogan. (We should put forward our strategy and our line but it can be done much better inside the paper.)
3. Class hatred is a good thing - but calling people Nazi has a shortcoming. It cannot build class hatred! (because the ~~the~~ history of the Nazis is not well known and understood by the masses) Most people think that Nazis and communists are similar. <sup>(totalitarian)</sup> Most people don't know communists led the fight against the Nazis. I suggest a Dear Reader on the history of the Nazis, and more caution ~~in~~ when we call today's racists and anti-communists Nazi; for example give some information on how they are the same.
4. Use long captions as a summary of the story ~~●~~ that goes with the picture, because many people just "flip through" the paper.

Pre-convention discussion

Drugs.

Drugs try to provide a chemical solution to problems and pressures caused by capitalism. PL thinks the solution is political, not chemical. Revolution, not drugs.

However, the ruling class has succeeded in building a mass base for drugs, especially alcohol and marijuana. Medically and politically, moderate and occasional use of both these drugs is not dangerous. Therefore, it would be sectarian to wage major struggles against such use.

The only difference between marijuana and alcohol is that marijuana is illegal. This means it can be used by the ruling class as an excuse to arrest communists and other activists.

Conclusion :

1. Party members should not get drunk.
2. Party members should not use marijuana, and should struggle with room-mates to keep it out of the house. (We get arrested for enough other serious things.)
3. No hard liquor or marijuana at party events.

A life with a revolutionary purpose does not need chemical escape-hatches. This is shown by the experience of ~~hundreds~~ dozens of party members who stopped using drugs once they joined the Party and did not miss them one bit.

All this is not to deny the need for relaxation and fun, both of which are crucial.

On the Situation in England and Europe

I was sent to England by the International Committee to sense the situation there and to make some contacts among rank and file workers overthere. I did meet rank and file workers. I met head of shop stewards committees in different industries and got a pretty good view of the class struggle in England. Later in my trip I went for a few days to the Continent, I went to Denmark (where a general strike was going on), but I wasn't so successful due to the fact that I did not spend too much time there and that I did not know anybody overthere that could have gave a start (something that made my trip quite successful in England).

In England, the working class is on the move against prime minister Heath Phase II (along with pay board and V.A.T.--extra taxes on all articles which means an increase in the cost of living). Heath's Phase 2 is very similar to Nixon's. It only allows \$2.40 increase plus 4% of a Co. pay bill, , it does not control prices at all (the cost of living is quite high in England while salaries are quite low. A skilled car worker makes between 40 to 45 pounds a week (about \$100); salaries for male manual workers are about 30 or 35 pounds (about \$75). According the the Grocer magazine. prices of fresh food rose by 10.2% during the first 11 weeks of the wage freeze (Phase one). And they are rising even more due to the 10% devaluation of the pound and Britain entry to the Common Market (EEC) which will force her to raise food prices to the level of the EEC food prices. A survey in 1971 by Family Expenditure Survey showed that for families with incomes of less than 35 pounds a week (at that time the majority) more than 40% of their weekly expenditure went on housing and food together. Over two millions tenants were to receive increases on April 1. Mortgages interests charges were going up (from 8.5%) for private homeowners. Profits will be "controlled" by a very small staff. It is estimated that Ford Motor will make an extra \$75 millions profit this year just because of the devaluation of the pound. Profits made by British companies in foreign countries won't be controlled. British companies make about one third of their profits from their operation in foreign countries. There is not restriction on profit margins on exports. Their profits may not rise beyond the average of the best two of the previous five years. This is generous, because they can include 1968, which was a very good year for bosses in Britain. So, as it can be seen Phase II is going to be very good for capitalism and very

England 2222

bad for the working class.

(27)

The \$2.40 increase ~~for~~ plus 4% is not much even as it is. By allowing increases according to group pay bill they mean that in a Company employing 1,000 workers with a weekly bill of 20,000 pounds (before payments for overtime), the maximum amount of money available will be 1,000 pounds (one pound per head) plus 800 pounds (4% of of 20,000 pounds), making 1,800 pounds a week. It could be distributed as 1.80 pound per worker. or in whatever way agreed, but the total amount must not exceed 1,800 a week. A "group" is defined as the employees normally covered by a pay settlement. For workers subject to national and local agreements, the total must not exceed the norm in a period of 12 months. As it can be seen, things are not too good for the working man (women) with this deal.

It will also be illegal (as of April 1) to go out on strike for higher wages than \$2.40 plus 4%.

Of course, this is the government pla. But, what are workers doing about it? First of all, most working men hate Heath govt. In every demonstration I went to, one of the big chants (among teachers, steel workers, aircraft workers, printing workers, dockworkers, hospital ~~work~~ workers, etc.) was "Heath Out". They hate the freeze. Working people are trying to beat the freeze. But, even with their militancy and with all kind of actions, it seems like the ruling class is going to come out on top. The why will be examined later on.

I went to a national picket line in Plymouth (see Challenge for pictures) where about 600 workers from as far away as Scotland came down in support. The picket was called by the Fine Tubes Strike Committee. These workers have been on strike since 1970, when they went out on strike for higher salaries against the U.S. company (owned ~~by~~ Superior Tubes of Illinois). The boss fired all the workers and hired scabs. The strike became not only for higher salaries, but the right to unionization. The workers saw this unionbreaking act by the boss as the beginning as a whole plan to destroy unions in this part of England--a lot of new companies are being set up there. The workers, now down to only 32 after three years, have been picketing the plant during the day and at late afternoon for three years everyday. They have not had the support of their unions, but just the support of rank and file workers. Rank and file shop stewards committees came down to this demonstration--workers from Chrysler,

England 3333

(28)

Rolls Royce, Dunlop, dockworkers, etc. came down to show their support. They kept a lot of scabs away and beat up quite a few of them and a few cops--seven workers ~~■~~ were arrested. Afterwards, they gathered in a local moviehouse and militant workers got up and denounced the govt., union sellouts (some of them present in the meeting) and call for a workers govt.--socialism. It is important to notice that neither the CP members nor the strike that spoke mentioned anything close to socialism--they all agreed in what you need is a govt. of labor with left politics.

Another interesting struggle going on since June 1972 is the takeover by the working staff of Briant Colour Printing in London. Workers decided to take over the shop when the owner declared himself bankrupt and was liquidating the company--leaving the workers without anything. The workers have been running the shop ~~&~~ since then, doing work for a lot of trade unions (they did the poster that showed the five dockworkers imprisoned last year and that came out in pictures all over the world). The 90 workers (representing four unions) decided to do this and were supported by their shop stewards. Now they are looking for a buyer that guarantee thier jobs. They guard the plant 24 hours a day and work almost everyday. ~~■~~ many of these workers came down to support the Fine Tubes workers.

What all this show is that rank and file leadership is very important. The shop stewards are probably the most influential force inside any union and they are the one pushing the top union bureaucrats to take militant actions. They have forced the one day token general strike (although most rank and file leaders wants a longer and more militant strike). The top union sellouts are ~~■~~ smart. They have tried to cool down the militancy of the workers by calling sporadic partial strikes in all the industries demoralizing the workers and leading them into defeat. They have done it with the train drivers, with the Ford workers, ~~■~~ and are doing it with hospital workers. These strikes are very similar to the one pulled by Woodcock last year in many auto plants throughout the country. The union sellouts in the Trade Union Congress are playing the double role of pleasing the militants and pleasing the govt. Of course, they pleased the govt. much more than the militant rank and filers.

But the main cause of the possible defeat of the working class in ~~the~~ Great Britain lies in the revisionists. The "C" P is using its influence inside the tradeunions and the shop stewards committees not ~~■~~

(29)

England 44444444

so much to defeat the wage freeze, but to force a united front with the Labor Party and become part of any future Labor govt. This is the same tactic ~~is~~ followed by all the revisionists all over Western Europe. In England, they seem to be in control of the shopsteward movement (although the movement seems to be spontaneous in many parts). In many unions, they are part of the union bureaucracy. They are probably the biggest roadblock for the advancement of the working class towards revolutionary ideas and the eventual take over of state power. The militancy pushed by the "Communist" Party is a dead-end militancy for most workers. It is a militancy, that if led by a revolutionary Communist Party, will lead the working people of Great Britain towards workers power.

The "Communist" Party of Great Britain is a relatively small organization (compared to the other revisionists in Western Europe) but highly influential. Its membership is something like 30,000. It has a daily newspaper The Morning Star (which is read by a lot of production workers--not like the Daily World in the U.S.). It has been in the leadership of the most militant actions in the last few years--the dockworkers, the Upper Clyde Shipyards--where workers took over the shipyard and had a soviet for days to save the jobs of 8,000 workers, Briant Colour Printing, etc. It also has helped sellout many workers. They are part of the leadership of the Teachers Union in London and led these 36,000 teachers into a sellout for their struggle for higher living allowance in London. The leaders inside the "C" P in this union completely refused to call an all out strike in support of 2,000 striking teachers and went along with the other sellouts in this. The "C" P influence among production workers: miners, auto, shipyards, among workers in key industries like miners (where since 1959, the workforce has diminished from 700,000 to 260,000), etc. put them into a key position to gain real reforms and to advance workers ideas towards the goal of revolution but they don't do that.

The Trotskyite in Great Britain are quite numerous. There are about a dozens or so trotskyite sect there. Some of them have a couple of thousands members (mainly part of the petty-bourgeoisie). They all claim that the "C" P plays a counterrevolutionary role, but their line is very similar to the "C" P. All of them call for a "Left" Labor Party Govt. committed to socialist policies (whatever that means)

(30)

ENGLAND 5555555

plus their line range from extreme opportunism to extreme sectarianism. Their influence inside the labor movement is minimal and they don't any role among working people. The Maoists are so reduced that it is even hard to find them. I couldn't find them in any struggles. They don't seem to have any influence among anybody, plus they don't seem to have anybody.

#### A CASE FOR A REAL WORKING CLASS COMMUNIST LEADERSHIP

The working people of England needs leadership, they are looking for it, they want it but they can't find it anywhere. The Labor Party is quite discredited, the "C" P does not provide it. The situation in Great Britain points out the need of a revolutionary Communist organization. Without real communist leadership, the workers will be defeated no matter how militant they are (England, Italy, France are proofs of this). The cry of the working class can best be made by the final speech given by a worker at the Fine Tubes demonstration in their meeting at the moviehouse, he said: "Are we prepared to go on living in a society where workers and our children go on struggling day by day. We must build an organization based on the rank and file to gain control of our lives. Let me end with something that was said during the French revolution 200 years ago, 'the greats appear greats because we are on our knees, let us rise'".

The situation in England can serve as a good example to our comrades involved in trade union struggles in the U.S. We, as revolutionary communists in PLP, must never forget to put forward our ideas of revolution. It does not matter how militant or how many reforms one win, without a clear perspective for revolution and socialism the working class loses in the long run. To be a good trade unionist, a good militant is not good enough, we have to be good communists. If we fail to advance socialism as the only way to defeat totally the working class, there is no way why we shouldn't become like the "C" P in England, here and all over. Fight back and communist ideas are the answer. If this is not put into practice, Phase 3, 4, 5, 6, etc. will be forced upon us by the bosses.

#### RACISM IN WESTERN EUROPE

Racism is on the grow all over Europe. It is being pushed by the bosses. In West Germany, there are over 3 million foreign workers (from Southern Italy, Yugoslavia, Spain, Turkey, Greece, Portugal)



(31)

ENGLAND 66666

The same is true in France (with the addition of Algerians and Africans), in Switzerland, Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, and England. In Great Britain, workers come from Pakistan, India, West Indies, Africa and from Ireland. The biggest racist in England is Enoch Powell who is pushing for a "send-them-back-to-where-they-come-from" policy. The bosses are trying to push the same lie they are pushing here, that these foreign workers are the cause of unemployment, and of all the evils caused by their profit system. These lies are pushed to superexploit these workers and to keep them divided from the rest of the working class. In Germany, where the foreign workers are 10% of the labor, without them, the economies of all these countries will go down like a falling jet plane. In Germany, these workers are paid miserable salaries (\$1.70 an hour compared to \$2.20 for German workers in unskilled jobs), they are housed in lousy tenements and are treated overall as second-rate citizens. In many of these countries, foreign workers are key in basic industries: Half of the French Renault auto workers are foreigners, foreign workers produced half of France steel, half of Germany's Ford workforce is non-German, every Belgian coal miner work side by side with a foreigner, London's Transport (subway and bus system) is run by Blacks, Indians and Pakistanis. It is quite interesting to see that in order to stop the need of cheap foreign labor inside their countries, some West German companies are considering building plants in Poland & Czechoslovakia, and Rumania (great "socialist" countries) according to Otto Wolff von Amerongen, president of the German National Chamber of Commerce. The Netherlands central planning board suggests another alternative--women.

As it can be seen, the antiracist fight is international too. Again the need for revolutionary communist leadership. In France, the "Communist" Party takes the side of the bosses in the question of the immigrant workers. The "C"PF controlled tradeunion leaders refused to defend and sometimes even to organize foreign workers. The present strike in Renault by foreign workers for better pay and upgrading (they are all unskilled workers) is a wildcat strike opposed by the "C"P sellouts. In Spain, whose many workers are sent to work outside of Spain to be superexploited in the Common Market countries, the head of the "Communist" Party, Carrillo, advocates Spain's entrance to the EEC. Even China woos the EEC countries in

(32)

ENGLAND 777777777

their "fight against the two superpowers".

INTERIMPERIALIST CONTRADICTIONS

It seems that as interimperialist contradictions develop, the exploitation of the working class gets bigger and bigger. Wage freezes, Phase 3,4,etc., racism, deterioration of working conditions, strike-breaking unionbreaking laws are rampant all over Western Europe, as well as in the U.S. and Japan. The working class, of course, is fighting back all over (strikes in England, Japan, Denmark, U.S., France, etc.). The main reasons for all these Phases imposed by bosses in each country, devaluations, inflation, etc. seems to be the desire of each ruling class to come ahead of the other and in order to do this they have to use a mixture of racism-nationalism--wage freezes-speed-up. We in the U.S. can play a big role in defeating all these attacks by the international bourgeoisie against the working class of the world. We must develop international ties with workers in these countries and fight for the development of a new international communist movement as a must to defeat these attacks. A good way to start this international working class upsurge is developing the fight for the shorter work-week along with the fight to defeat the wage freezes. In Denmark, they seemed to have won as their major demand a reduction of the work week from 42 1/2 to 40. In England, many workers are fighting for a 35 hours work-week. In Spain, April 3, a construction worker was killed by the police in Barcelona, when they held a demonstration during their strike for higher salaries and a 40 hour work-week (they work about 45 or more hours there), in Mexico, a 40 hours work-week is the main demand of the trade-union. Let's defeat the imperialists with a working class upsurge. Let's rebuild the international communist movement. Let's fight racism worldwide. Fight to win.

33

ENGLAND ADDENDUM 1- 888888888

It seems like the govt. has defeated the working class militancy against its wage freeze. The big help seems to have come ~~for~~ from the own trade-union sellouts. A clear example was the head of the National Miners Union, Joe Gormley. This sellout during the TUC meeting where the "one day of national protest" was called came out as a very militant tradeunionist. He said: "the whole trade union has to do something together against Phase 2". But what happen, through a very slick manouver he pushed a "vote against a strike among miners", even though he was "for a strike". The London Financial Times (England Wall Street Journal put it very clearly: "From his moderate standpoint, the build-up opposition to the Govt. pay policy could have upset advances made in his own industry So mr. Gormley adopted the robes of a militant in order to be seen to be making the pace, out-manouvers Leftwingers who would have liked industrial troubles".... He was playing a dangerous game " This sellout wont even call out its membership to go out on strike in May Day (the day of national protest). The miners, as well as postal workers, & auto workers, etc. have accepted pay offer in the framework of the Phase 2. Even the May Day protest is now in doubt.

This should be a good lesson to us here in the U.S. We must always remeber again that militancy is not enough. The ruling class is pretty smart and unfortunate in this perio they have more room for manouvers than the working class.

- - - - -

ADDENDUM 222-

To take a trip like the one I did, a few things should be learned by many & comrades who will be travelling. Even on your vacation, you could make contacts for the party or WAM. First of all, one must be bold. Most workers won't welcome you (in many foreign coun@-tries) if you come as an American tourist, they don't like U.S. tourist too much (and I can understand that), but if ypu tell them you are an American trade-unionist interested in learning from their struggles and to bring their struggle back to the U.S.(to the workers movement), they will open your arms for you. At least, that's what I learned. An organization like WAM is more likely to be accepted than an open Communist Party like PLP by many workers This doesn't mean that you should hide PLP, but it is just a tactical way of approaching any group of workers.

34

ENGLAND ADDENDUM 999999999

It is always good to know somebody in the foreign country. It is not good to stay in a hotel. I was lucky enpugh to have found some people that 2 comrades from Maine knew, ~~was~~ without the aid of ~~them~~ this couple in London I would have been lost there.

ADDENDUM 33333

The strength of the shop stweards movement in Great Britain can best be seen by the case of the Rolls Royce Aircraft plant in Coventry. There are about 300 shop stewards in the whole plantt for the blue collars workers, An average ~~of~~ of one shop steward for every 16 workers. In the Ford plant at Mahwah, there ~~are~~ is one shop steward for every 200 workers. The shop stewarda are organized in a Shop Steward Committee, which is linked to a shop stewards council for the whole city

Desafio/Challenge report on "Phila. Workers' Arithmetic" (35)

Southworks---65  
 Day-Care Rally---106  
 Roosevelt---27  
 Inland---43  
 Medical Center---24  
 Ford---20  
 Lower Northern---7  
 Hotpoint---68  
 Latino Strategy Conference---75  
 Billings----10  
 Stewart-Warner---22  
 Telephone---6  
 On the Job Sales---87

TOTAL-560

There has been an improvement of the sales for the last issue even though they are still quite low. Two issues ago we only sold 209. By concentrating on improving the sales they will increase the ability of the party to reach the working class with a communist line. For example, at the Latino Strategy Conference we played a leading role in bringing up the fight against racism. The comrades at the conference fought for involving more workers from the community in the leadership in the movement instead of relying on some hotshot organizers tied to the Democratic Party. At the same time we sold a considerable number of Challenges-Desafio which guaranteed a presence for communist ideas and aided the struggle at the conference. This use of the paper within the mass movement and trade unions will shappen the fight against the bosses and win more workers to the Party.

At this point we want to increase the circulation of the paper in Chicago-Gary to around 2000 an issue. This will be a hard fight and needs the active participation of all party members and friends. At this time the main placás we want to increase sales are:

- 1) Increase the sales at steel mills---this is importnat since steel is the main concentration of the party. At this time the comrades at Inland are planning an election campaign. The sale of the paper at this plant will greatly help that work especially in combatting anti-communism which will surely be raised in the campaign. The editorial in the current C-D about the electoral work at GE in Lynn shows that mass sales of the paper can have a decisive effect on workers supporting open communists.
- 2) Campus sales---very few papers are sold on campus even though students are very willing to buy C-D. The student club will increase the sales as one of its main assignments.
- 3) Adding some new sales---in the last weeks several sales were added. We started selling at Stewart-Warner and Ashland-Division. Other possible sales include: street sales in Gary, Cook County Hospital, 91st and Commercial, neighborhood el stops, post office, etc. Any suggestions should be told to John B. or Howie W.
- 4) On the job sales---as of now most party members sell 3-5 papers on the job. This can be doubled or tripled with a little effort. If we consistently reach workers we know on the job and in the union, it will greatly increase our ability to increase the Party's base in the union.

Thus, C-D sales rose slightly as a result of a little more effort, but this is very far from what's needed. We can definitely raise sales to over 2000 as soon as we place the correct emphasis on Party-building.  
 \*\*\* \*\*

PS - NOTE ON PARTY FINANCES...  
 In the past week (before March 31) we closed the gap between monthly regular income and monthly regular expenses, which amounts to some 400 or 500 additionally needed, as reported in the recent finance bulletin. Additionally, we sent \$100 to the National Office which was asked for largely because we haven't been supporting the national party. In the past month non-Party pledges rose from \$120 to \$194.50. Our aim must be to expand non-PL pledges and other regular fund-raising in by as much as possible, at least \$500 more per month, which is reasonable according to committee estimates... Let's try it! In all last week we raised \$575 from club quotas and \$125 from back pledges, which are mostly caught up. ALL LITERATURE MONEY MUST BE TURNED IN! This must be sent separately to the national office, and lit is now being paid for in advance.

The Party Needs More Formal Procedures to Insure Democracy and Struggle

Election of club chairmen, and financial and membership reports, are a regular feature of many "democratic" organizations controlled by the bourgeoisie. Elections and reports drag on without there being real discussion about what the organization should be doing, etc. We are in a different position in PL. Most of our meetings are devoted to figuring out what to do and how to do it. Do we need nevertheless these formal procedures of elections and regular reports from the leadership? I think we do.

Many people in PL who support the general aim of the party and work hard to implement it have a passive attitude towards evaluating and developing the line and the leadership. This hurts the work. If you think that only the leadership, way off somewhere, should be making the big decisions, then you will end up doing the wrong thing, or the right thing halfheartedly.

As far as I know the impetus to reevaluate the C.W.S.A., the Challenge Corps and the concentration on the unemployed, for example, all came from the leadership of the party rather than the members of the work. But given some understanding of the general line of the party, the people in the work were in the best position to know that these programs were not doing well. In my experience criticism leading to the removal of a club chairman usually originates in the local leadership rather than in the club. And many good ideas are not acted on because members do not think it their place to raise them.

Of course there is much more democracy and struggle in the party than formal structure shows. Members of the N.C. are active in the local leadership bodies of most areas. How the local leadership bodies are chosen may vary from area to area, but they do respond

Procedures, p. 2

to the problems of the clubs without being directly responsible to them. But what works now with problems, in a small party, won't work at all in a large one. What an N.C. of 10-15 can guarantee in a party of 500 cannot be done by them in a party of 10,000, much less ten million. There if the membership is not involved directly in evaluating the line and leadership of the local bodies the party will atrophy or fall apart. Now is the time to think big and rely more on the rank and file.

What of the danger of factionalism? What if a club elected a chairman who disagreed with the rest of the local leadership on some question important to that time and place? Should he then be removed from the local leadership body? Yes, if he could not put forward the local leadership's line in his club. Does that mean that the local leadership should choose the chairman of that club? No, although obviously some other member of the local leadership would then have to bring their line to this club. Complicated? Yes, but better a few collisions than everyone trying to get somewhere with their brakes on.

Of course in the absence of understanding and devotion to the working class formal rules are just so much horseshit. But devoted people who see someone else as responsible for the line and the leadership of the party are in no position to bring PL to others. If a few formal rules can make it clearer that the members are directly responsible for the local leadership then the party and the working class will be the stronger for it.

(39)

I worked on the 30 for 40 campaign in Berkeley from September until January 1973. During that period our goal was to get 30 for 40 on the April city ballot as an initiative measure. We were primarily involved with collecting enough signatures from Berkeley residents and getting support and endorsements from unions, organizations and groups. From the start, I wavered between feeling excited and feeling doubtful about the campaign. After much thought, I concluded that my inability to feel consistently certain about the campaign could be largely explained and understood by examining the political issue (as well as my own political and class background); that my difficulty perhaps reflected the weakness of the campaign.

The relationship between 30 for 40 as a reform and 30 for 40 as a revolutionary tactic was a key issue for me. I understood the relationship to be that 30 for 40 would strengthen the labor movement by uniting the employed with the unemployed; that the organization necessary for winning 30 for 40 would provide leadership for a revolutionary movement. I always felt uncomfortable when we were petitioning about making these connections. It was clear very few people would respond to us if we said, "Would you like to sign a petition for a reform that will prepare the labor movement for revolution?" And yet, asking for their support for a shorter work week did not feel adequate since the reason I was working on this campaign as opposed to the marijuana initiative or the ecology initiative was broader than just winning the reform. I would tack on the ideas of providing millions of more jobs, of building working class power; then I felt honest about what I was doing. Most people responded to the idea of a shorter work week because it is a good reform that would improve their lives. I don't think it provided much opportunity for people to think beyond the narrow self interest demands that have been typical of the labor movement for the past 30 years.

The reforms we choose to support must meet real and immediate needs for people, must clarify the enemy as capitalism and imperialism, and must provide the opportunity to see that our power lies in uniting, that by involving ourselves in political struggles we are best serving ourselves.

In trying to resolve whether 30 for 40 fulfills these criterion, I concluded that shortening the work week is not a pressing need for most workers. It is indisputably a good and progressive reform for the working class but there are many other issues such as rank and file control, speed-up, wage freeze, racist hiring and firing, that relate more directly to the

(40)

to the immediate needs of working people. Most unions in this country are undemocratic and corrupt. The vast majority of workers are not even unionized. If only the most organized segment of the working class could hope to win 30 for 40, how unifying a demand can it be? More jobs is a pressing need and although one of 30 for 40's main thrusts is to provide more jobs, its primary appeal is to those who already have full time jobs and are in strong unions. (That 30 for 40 is not a pressing need perhaps accounts for the fact that there were very few working people (or not from student backgrounds) involved in the electoral campaign). There are some unions for which 30 for 40 is a number one contract demand. These unions should fight for it and win it. I don't see the issue as immediate enough for most working people to justify waging a national electoral campaign.

It requires a delicate balance to build revolutionary consciousness within a capitalist framework. A reform must point in the direction of the kind of society we want to live in. It must clearly be a right thing to have. It seems there are too many clarifications necessary for 30 for 40 to clearly be understood as morally right. It is not right for some people to work 30 hours a week and others to have no jobs at all. It is not right that working people in this country can essentially win a 25% wage increase, get a bigger piece of the pie, while working people in the rest of the world are being so dreadfully exploited by U.S. bosses. There are answers to these snags. 30 for 40 won nationwide, would put enormous pressure on employers to hire more employees. And although workers are fighting for more in an oppressive society they certainly are not responsible for that oppression. I refute wholeheartedly the argument that the relatively high standard of living of some American workers is the cause of the imperialism, pollution and consumerism typical of any capitalist country. But these answers require a certain political sophistication or sympathy with working class politics. It is too easy to misconstrue the demand of 30 for 40 as benefitting American workers at the expense of the international working class, as benefitting organized labor (most of whom are white men) at the expense of the unorganized and unemployed workers. 30 for 40 understood as a call for full employment is by every standard and in every way right. The fact that a country should provide enough jobs for everyone who can work, presents no snags. But full employment is only a real possibility in a socialist system and we are still far enough away from a strong revolutionary movement, for 30 for 40 to provide an effective link from a capitalist to a socialist ideology.

(41)

30 for 40 is not a good tool for educating people about imperialism, racism or sexism, or for identifying capitalism as the enemy. Without affirmative hiring, 30 for 40 (at least at the beginning) will primarily benefit white men. The organized unions will win it first and white men will be hired, for the same reason that all the strong unions are now dominated by white men. It potentially strikes out at racism and sexism, since the numbers of unemployed women and minorities is unproportionally high. And yet unless 30 for 40 is actively fought for by women and minorities, it will be seen as a demand that primarily benefits white men, and cannot be unifying.

It is clear that 30 for 40 is bad for the bosses and good for the workers, but it doesn't guarantee reaching beyond the ripping off, individualistic mentality that this society fosters in all of us. Most workers rip off their bosses. Although it does only serve the individual it stems from alienation and a natural understanding of exploitation. That anger and alienation must be redirected toward collective and cooperative struggles. In this country, at this time, there is too much of a possibility that a movement for 30 for 40 could be waged without educating people toward revolutionary thinking.

Just as a national liberation struggle can either be progressive by inherently attacking imperialism or reactionary by completely denying the class struggle, so 30 for 40 can either conclusively implicate capitalism or become misconstrued as another as another narrow and limited demand. The 2 factors that seem to determine which way the struggles develop are the leadership and the objective circumstances out of which the struggle is growing. It is good to me that communists are leading the 30 for 40 campaign, but I don't think there is as yet enough disillusionment with the American system and dissatisfaction among working people in this country for the campaign to be understood as an attack on capitalism. In a prison the demand for better food could take one of many forms. It could be a proposal attempting to make minor improvements in the lives of prisoners. Or, if there is already an established unity between prisoners and an understanding that their interests do not coincide with the interests of the prison authority, an action around the food could be understood by everyone involved as an attack on the prison authority, as a rebellion.

P.L. sees 30 for 40 as taking an offensive action against the bosses.

(42)

The national campaign was not conceived to satisfy a pressing need of the working class, but rather as a preparation for the future, when a fight for a shorter work week could be the force behind a revolutionary movement. Therefore, many of the questions concerning the specific time, now, and the specific place, Berkeley, could not be adequately answered. What about prices being raised to compensate for higher labor costs? What about speed-up used as an alternative to hiring more workers? What about runaway shops? What about people moonlighting and taking up the new jobs created? There have been incomplete attempts made to answer these concerns as they relate to Berkeley. The only conclusive answer is that when we have a strong enough movement to win 30 for 40, we will be able to effectively win our other demands too. This seems to be approaching the difficult task of building a movement in a backwards fashion. Masses of people can fight and win when they are fighting for things they need so much, they have nothing to lose by struggling.

A more specific criticism I have of the Berkeley campaign is that there was not enough talk about the analysis out of which 30 for 40 grew. I needed to understand why that demand was chosen, what part of the working class was P.L. trying to appeal to, how did they envision the growth of a revolutionary movement in this country. Without an understanding of these questions, I could easily be discouraged by negative response and intimidated when challenged by other political groups. I felt as if there was a consistent tendency to submerge the political ideas behind 30 for 40. Instead, we must talk about women and minorities, about the quality of our lives, about our attitudes toward our bosses and our fellow workers. It must be clear that 30 for 40 is more than getting a bigger piece of the pie. And it must be clear from the first day of the campaign and to all supporters and potential supporters.

\* In rallying for mass support, I realize a balance must be achieved between talking about the economic reform and the political and social analysis. This is a difficult task and such an important problem that it is the dividing point between the many communist factions in this country.

Ruth Kiefson

March 30, 1973

(43)

AGAINST SUPPORTING MCGOVERN \* by some friends of PLP in Boston

The article, View on Elections, puts forward that the party should adopt a line of supporting McGovern for President. It says we should do this in order to fight sectarianism and to enable us to build a united front. This suggestion demonstrates a complete misunderstanding of the nature of the ruling class.

"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." (p. 37, Bull #2)

This is precisely the aim of certain sections of the ruling class, to convince the workers that McGovern will make capitalism respond to their needs. McGovern is little different from Nixon - they use a different approach to save capitalism from a revolution - the carrot and the stick. The stick is the easier method to maintain capitalism - it requires little in the way of concessions - just scare the workers into keeping their place. But when workers start to rebel, it is necessary to give them a few carrots to calm them down.

Witness the reforms instituted in the New Deal, when millions were organized by the CP into fighting for reforms such as the minimum wage, the 8 hour day, unemployment compensation, welfare, etc. The ruling class was scared of revolution, so they

dole out a few crumbs (carrots) to calm the workers down. This happened again in the 1960's, when ghetto rebellions and campus unrest seemed to pose a real threat to the ruling class. OEO opened up offices, giving out money left and right to divert this action into easily controllable channels - if you have a problem, go to legal aid.

If your welfare is lacking, go to welfare rights, a co-opted organization of welfare recipients, designed to keep mothers fighting among themselves for a few petty salaries as VISTA's, rather than fighting the welfare department militantly as they had done during ghetto rebellions. But although many felt these OEO grants represented a

ELECTIONS 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

(44)

victory for the working class, they in fact represented a way of controlling rebellion. Channel it safely - get people caught up in funding of community organizations, counter-institutions, etc., and they will stop fighting the bosses. Now Nixon feels safe in cutting back on these fundings - he has even stated in a recent speech that in the 1960's the U.S. was in danger, but now things are quieted down - people have stopped fighting back (he says) so we can take away these carrots. McGovern represents the other viewpoint of the ruling class - keep giving out these carrots as long as you can - for you can continue to control rebellion in a softer way. McGovern is part of a long line of liberals, claiming to be in the interests of the working class, but only succeeding in further mis-leading them - like the Kennedy's - JFK did all of those wonderful things for America, fighting for a new frontier, supporting civil rights, money for the cities, etc. - yet look at what else he did, to prove his insincerity with these reforms - got the US involved in Vietnam (or at least sharply stepped up the involvement), staged the Bay of Pigs invasion, built up the CIA and counter-insurgency forces, founded the Alliance for Progress aimed at keeping Latin America down - you name it, he did it, to keep workers from rebelling. Kennedy should be a lesson for us all - these carrot-bearing members or tools of the ruling class only represent a more subtle kind of stick.

This is some thing which we cannot forget as communists, or as supporters of revolutionary communism. PLP, the communist party, must see its role as pointing out to people that there is no real difference between McG and Nix. The few crumbs McG would dole out would represent no victory for the working class. To think that McG would be a middle man or a mediator between the bosses and the workers is to misunderstand that we live in a class society, and that the ruling class has many agents who try to keep the workers down. The only way to prevent workers from being

45

deluded about the nature of this system is for a communist party to put forth a communist line - namely that the only victory for the working class is a communist revolution, and that any crumbs we get are meaningless unless we have struggled for them and unless we have won more people to the ideas of a communist revolution. The only way we will get these crumbs is by fighting for them - if we ~~kk~~ give up the fight and support a ~~tool~~ tool of the bosses like McG, the bosses will see no reason to give us (the working class) any more crumbs - and will resort to a stick like Nixon. The weaknesses in the communist movement have allowed us to take losses up to this time. Workers stopped fighting back - the communist party never told them about the need for socialism, and therefore people became cynical when they lost out. It is only through a strong trade union movement, <sup>led</sup> by communists, and heading towards communism openly, that we can win.

46

Pre-convention discussion

Party involvement in electoral work. Political lessons from the Berkeley 30 for 40 campaign.

There was a great deal of resistance in the Party when we started the campaign. (I understand there were long discussions everywhere around the question of whether it was revisionist to participate in elections.) I for one did not want to do it. Later I was convinced. The ~~xxx~~ main argument that convinced me was that it would be sectarian not to be involved in "every form of struggle" possible. I left it at that. Now I realize that this was not adequate. There is a sharp contradiction that should not be underestimated between the Party's line and the political line of the 30 for 40 electoral campaign.

PL line : ~~ix~~ Bourgeois democracy is an illusion. The bosses have all the power, no matter what happens in elections. Only a reform movement that threatens the bosses financially or politically can succeed. The highest form of struggle for reform or revolution is armed struggle, then comes the general strike, the occupation of factories, rank-and-file led strike, sit-in, demonstration. Electoral work is <sup>a</sup> pretty low level of struggle in many ways because it relies overwhelmingly on the bosses' state in terms of the rules of the game, and even in terms of the content of the struggle.

No arm of the government-including city government- can serve the people. The cops are 100% tools of the bosses and enemies of the working class.

Campaign line : (irrespective of what the leaflets say)

30 for 40 can be won through the ballot. If the thing passes, it will be enforced by a board selected by the City Council. The cops <sup>should</sup> ~~xxx~~ get 30 for 40-i.e; there should be more of them.

The way we solved the contradiction at least temporarily was that we saw that the drawbacks of electoral work would be over-shadowed by the advantages. The advantages are : A strong electoral campaign can make 30 for 40 a mass issue and help our I.U. work\*. It is a good tactic to meet union members. It is a form of work where it is easy to involve people.

\* Hundreds and hundreds of 30 for 40 pamphlets were sold. (campaign pamphlets)



How it worked out in practice :

(47)

In unions : the campaign literature pointed out that 30 for 40 couldn't be won through the ballot alone, that union involvement was key. We addressed a number of unions, and made some contacts that way. For various reasons this did not go very far. However, where we had members or friends we made a little headway. (Increased our personal base and the base for 30 for 40. Hopefully it can be consolidated into committees or something).

But the most interesting thing that happened was in ILWU local 6. We had one comrade in the union. He built a base in a good way, among black and white workers, focusing on building the union and attacking the company, pushing 30 for 40 and criticizing the leadership. He started a petition to make 30 for 40 number one negotiating demand. Dozens of union members circulated it in many plants on both sides of the bay. Hundreds signed. He joined the legislative committee. (The one that makes political endorsements and lobbies in Sacramento). There he raised the question of endorsing the 30 for 40 initiative on the ballot. He was viciously attacked by the leadership who claimed the initiative was hurting the union, because one company (the biggest one in town) had threatened to run away to Utah, and had started a petition campaign among its workers against the initiative. The comrade was won ~~the~~ the union leaders' line : He came home saying : "Who are we to start such a campaign ? We should have talked to the union first." After talking to some rank-and-file members of the committee, and discussing it within the Party he realized that his reaction was revisionist. He self-critically recognized that he was picking up the CP-RU style of work (opportunism, go whichever way the wind blows in the union). Interestingly enough at the pre-contract convention, nine rank and file resolutions for a shorter work week were introduced, including the one we started. The way the leadership defeated them <sup>all</sup> was by sending the matter to the legislative committee, because they said it could not be won by the union (exactly the opposite of what they had said at the legislative committee meetings when we raised fighting for 30 for 40 thru legislative means)

How it worked out in practice :

(48)

In the Berkeley Coalition (the organisation that runs "radicals" for City Council)

We sought endorsement from the Berkeley Coalition. They opposed our initiative for various reasons. The most easy to expose were quickly dropped (for example <sup>for a while</sup> ~~that the jobs that would open up as a result of 30 for 40 would go to~~ residents of neighboring cities.) The key objections ended up being :

1. The fact that we included cops.
2. That businesses could not afford it if it just happened overnight. They would raise their prices and/or leave town.

~~They were the sixties~~ We got smashed in the vote. In a meeting of <sup>600</sup> ~~600~~ people we got maybe 15 votes. (Many people abstained)

Now you can't blame the people for having voted it down. The arguments are powerful. They are based in the nature of the campaign, which is electoral.

We have to include cops (for legal and political reasons). We do not have the kind of movement that can effectively fight the price hikes or the run-away shops. So what do you say ?

We said that the inclusion of cops was unfortunate but unavoidable otherwise the initiative would be discriminatory and thrown out in court.\* He said that businesses could afford it and that they are always threatening to leave town. Also that they would have to contend with competition from out-of-town. I should point out though that a ~~large~~ number of <sup>active</sup> members of the Coalition do support the initiative. But they are not organized, or interested enough to push it.

Among the people : the response was terrific. During the canvassing, the petitioning, the leafletting, the challenge-selling, ~~at~~ the people's response was tremendous. When followed up with a decent effort of base-building, it ~~is~~ clearly a campaign that could build a real left-center coalition. <sup>However</sup> the limited nature of union participation and endorsements, combined with the attacks from the Coalition made it hard to keep people in the campaign. ~~first it is necessary~~ ~~other for of party work has to build a base.~~

\* The real reason was we didn't want to get bogged down in discussions of cops which would have happened if we had excluded them.

(49)

What can we learn from the experiences of the Berkeley campaign?

I don't think we should drop electoral work. The advantages do outweigh the drawbacks. But we must be very careful.

We ~~is~~ will have a serious problem of opportunism every time we get into it. ~~of course~~

I'll try to be concrete.

No matter what, the electoral campaign carries heavy implications that we do not agree with. The answer is not to drop the campaign; nor is it to have "left" campaign leaflets. This would lead to isolation. The answer is vigorous PARTY BUILDING. All out. It is not enough to say we are not reformist as long as we are still selling the paper. It depends on what's in the paper.

And what else we do. We should put out Party leaflets about the electoral campaign. We should write articles for each issue of the paper. We should sell it. We should build the Party within the campaign thru the literature, study groups and so on. the key political point of the Party in all this is on the nature of the state. (We used to think the key point was to stress the need for union struggles for 30 for 40 - But the campaign can do that.

The campaign cannot expose the state without dissolving!) There was a great deal of wavering on Party-building here. Basically we did not do much of it.

(I think we can take a turn for the better.) It was even argued by Party leadership we should not take Challenge to campaign meetings, so as to convince center people we are serious about the reform and not just out to build the Party. This counterposing is incorrect. Our seriousness is measured by how much work we do. In fact we are not serious about the reform if we don't build the Party. (Since the Party is main leadership in the nationwide movement for 30 for 40).

A couple more suggestions.

We should avoid putting initiatives of the type of the Berkeley one on the ballot. We'd be better off using policy statements or recommendations to the City council. This would avoid getting lost in legal complications, as well as the figuring out of utopian details on the specifics of the implementation. Instead we could focus on the politics. Besides it would be much more honest because it

does not imply that this vote will do it.

(50)

For a while now, in the name of fighting sectarianism, we have been going from group to group asking for endorsement of whatever our current project is. Let's stop that trend. Asking for endorsements is a tactic like any other, it must be evaluated in terms of whether it will build or hurt the work. I would say that due to insufficient discussion it has usually hurt us. Here is the usual pattern: we address a meeting of the group ~~to~~ <sup>or</sup> its leadership and present our proposal. We get turned down. What have we gained? Did we expose the leadership? NO. We exposed our isolation. There have been cases where we got the endorsement. ~~and it~~ Usually it did not make the activity broader. The groups where we had been getting endorsements get tired of getting hassled by us every time we have a new project. They feel like they're going to look like a PL front group. They ask why no one else will endorse us. Here is my suggestion: only bother with the endorsement bit when something can be gained from it at the rank and file level. (If it will help our base-building in the group) Within this guideline we ~~will~~ <sup>can</sup> still make mistakes (being too timid or too pushy). But it is a much better outlook ~~it~~ than the present one. (It's the old united front from above or from below question).

If we had carried out Party building in an intensive way, we could have turned our defeat in the Coalition into ~~it~~ <sup>a good thing</sup>. We could have strengthened our impact on ILWU. There is one more month ~~to~~ before the elections. We should start writing articles for CD again. Sales have already started picking up. A study group looks like a definite possibility soon.

(51)

A parcial answer to one of the concerns on bolletin #4, page I2. "to build the party".

My answer is to what is stated as a charge "to stop using such words such as Marxis-Leninims". such sugestion seem to some party people as derechist tendency Only dialectics will clarify apparences.

Here, only I answer one of the charges. The others points raised, shall be answer one by one by other members. The writer, I suppose is a member, affirms that who reccomended to supersede the rutinary use by rote of Marxist-Leninism (a cultist fervor to individuals, whom by being revolutionaries did contribut theoricly, cientiphicly, and practicaly), but such critisism of the words when rutinarily employ is a criticism which manifest righness tendencies.

But apparences do not make the facts.

As a given exeples, is my personal attitude. I'M in agreement to overcome that formality of cliches... because I consider myself an ultra left, nothing of reverence to stablish frases and of which ha to have rutinary attachment... tht makes me a rightist? My wil, be though to be so by those who don't know me, but the true is tht I'm philosophicly, academicly, ideologicly, anarchistic, and I do make the effort to integrate myself to reality, to life, and present history, foreing myself to be a good real communist.

So as an exemple, my case, can be taken, that attitude of mine, of extreme left, lack of respect to the use of certain wordings, of frases, which implies out of proporsinns an autoengrandaisment by second, other persons, I try to overcome it, I almost dare to repudiate it, and due to that, semms then that I'm a rightist? if ones does not accept, repits and attaches to the conventional.

The manner by which we of P.L. in our relations, to each other, is with us rare the custum of formalisms, of calling, mention, repiting continiously comrade, companero and because it is so then I ask: that make us righ wingers? when such rutines of greetings are not customary?

Another occurence that can be taken to be a potential rihtgistr tendency is P.L. Which has a sort of banking hours, from 8 to 5 p.m., close saturdays and sundays, and holydays, (bosses one's mind you!). That I suppose seems to someone to be righist manifestations too! because and by such convensionaty of schedules hours, and days?

There ara not any preponderant women in the leadership, neither blacks, no latins, I would not say that that is a proof of rihg wing tendencies, it is because P.L. demanda a great sperience and ideological capacity, political practice.

It is true that the most easy and known autocriticism by everyone is the political ones, but the personal ones is much to be desired, they are very superficial, the easy natural criticism are the one among close friends as members, whom are well known to each other, but very lichte among acquaintances, that is very superficial...

5 I do recommend that there should be an open and wide criticism. How? Well, by plasing it in a special bolletin board, for everyone to see, in the office 617, which will say:

political, personal criticism. Exemple given:

Of Clubs,  
Argument to be debated: low paper sales are indications of derechistic tendencies.

Of individual members.  
Comrade X, personal, public political line is not as the same on home relations, there is is to much accomodations compromising for the sake of home pease tranquility, condesending liberalism...

Answer:

But the opposite can be said, if sales where bigger that the righ opportunism was helping to sale, why? because there is not quality of sales, no follow up, no recruitment to the party, etc.

Answer.

Well, looks that way because some times I like small talk. Also I'm very formal in my rutinary dealings which seems to be a manner of being superficial and detached. I'm aware of some contradictions in my human relations the way I treat people in general, I do promese to change with friendly help, advice on time.

A.P.L. friend from N.Y.C.

53

As I understand it, PL's line is that all bosses and politicians are equally bad. RRIII says on page 14 "liberals are as bad or worse than the so-called ultra-right". PL says that the extent of reform gains depends on the extent of mass pressure. The attitude of the boss or politician is irrelevant.

I believe that the possibility of winning any reform depends on two factors. The primary factor is mass pressure. The more mass pressure, the better the chances of victory. The secondary factor is the attitude of the boss. The more liberal the boss, the better are your chances of victory.

Example 1. At APG we circulated a petition in our shop to protest working overtime. I presented the petition to a colonel. The overtime was stopped. I do not feel however, that the colonel was forced to make this decision. People in the shop at that point were not willing to do more than sign the petition. They weren't willing to come to a meeting I tried to organize to discuss what to do. I don't think they were ready to pull off a serious slowdown. I think that if the colonel had refused us he could have gotten away with it. The petition was a factor. I think the colonel's liberal attitude was also a factor.

Example 2. Some guy in the Dutch Army started to organize a union. He got a couple of hundreds of guys on his base to sign up. He got some publicity. He went in to see the government and convinced them to ~~not~~ recognize the union. The union is a very useful form ~~XXX~~ within which the GI movement in Holland now operates. It was definitely a gain for the soldiers. The government was not forced into recognizing the union. There was no mass struggle or strikes. The liberal attitude of the govt. was an important factor in this reform victory.

I think it requires less mass pressure to win ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ certain reforms from a liberal than from a fascist. Therefore it is in the people's interest to be ruled by liberals. I think that there is such a thing as a lesser evil. When people in struggle demand the resignation of a particularly right-wing administrator, boss, or cop - many of them don't think his replacement will be a saviour. They just think he will be a little more responsive to reform.

It is fine to talk about how what we really need is workers power and socialism. However, everyone knows that's a long way off. Meanwhile people are fighting for reforms. One reform they fight for is for a more liberal boss or politician.

This fall many radicals voted for and worked for McGovern. In Germany it was the same thing for Brandt. These people know that these politicians aren't saviours. They know that eventually we'll need a revolution. All they are saying is that the movement for reform can win ~~XX~~ more from the liberal than from the conservative.

I don't see any contradiction between thinking McGovern is another pig and voting and even organizing for him. I think that millions of people vote for the "lesser evil". It doesn't mean they think the guy is a saviour. It doesn't mean they think The American System works.

I feel that organizing for a more liberal boss is a legitimate reform struggle which we should engage in. At the same time we can put forth our line that in the long run all bosses must be smashed. I see no contradiction.

54

I think that that temporary alliances with bourgeois elements may be a legitimate communist tactic. It is true that in such an alliance you lose your freedom to publicly put forth your independent line. However, you gain the ability to put forth your independent line on a person-to-person level with many people from whom you were previously isolated. You are in the position of uniting in a reform struggle with active people. From what I have seen, the main way people get won to the party's independent line is through discussions with party members, and not through party literature. Therefore I think that in some cases the benefits of a temporary alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie may outweigh the costs.

I am not convinced that its alliances with the bourgeoisie is what held up the CCP. They might not have been able to go as far as they did without them. I think their major error may have been to recruit bourgeois elements into the party. I don't believe that was an inevitable result of their united front.

Regarding McGovern, I think we were wrong to say that he would be as bad as Nixon. I don't think he would have tried to make North Vietnam look like a desert. I think he would have been more open to amnesty, tax reform, civil liberties, and perhaps some other things. While its true that the differences wouldn't have been great, I think they would have made a real difference in a lot of people's lives. I think the Party, on its part, should have been willing to ally with and build the McGovern movement.

Dear Jon,

Tried to call you twice but couldn't get through. This is just a few more of my ideas and questions about RRIII. We got our 1st Sgt to grant us a room for a company meeting of E-S's below only to discuss our grievances. Now we only have to go out and get people to show up.

Also the Army's taking a hard line on drugs over here. They are taking the door off any room they "suspect" drugs are used in. They are also putting "known abusers" in special boys, watched by lifers, and taking away their civilian clothes.

If they try it in our company - we think we can raise some hell. - John

55  
PRE CONVENTION DISCUSSION

Some of the things I wrote and some of my work here has contributed to the right wing trend in the party. I criticized Mao (mostly correctly) for developing dialectics so as to bury the party and then went ahead and buried the party.

I <sup>was</sup> wrong to say that we do not need to use the term Marxism-Leninism. We need to fight for our friends and members to read and explain what it is. We have to fight for the idea that we are dealing with a body of scientific knowledge that has to be learned by everyone in the party.

I <sup>was</sup> wrong to say that anything that is very complicated is probably wrong. It is not that Marxism-Leninism is really complicated but it is hard to understand. This is precisely because it opposes all the capitalist ideas that we have absorbed in our lives.

We meet workers that say that the party is too hard ~~to~~ for workers to understand. Only college trained people can understand it. We meet college trained people like lawyers or teachers who say the party is too hard to understand, only workers can understand it. I have been back pedaling and not fighting to sit down and discuss the party point by point. Instead I frequently would say, well it is hard, we'll try to make it easier.

Challenge sales were lousy here. The party wasn't being raised strongly on the job. We lost sight of the key importance of the party, its paper and its ideas.

The CP used to have ~~for~~ what they called "American Exceptionalism". All workers were revolutionary except U.S. workers. We "developed" a new brand. In my shop, my school, my neighborhood, the workers,

50  
teachers, etc. were too anti-communist to raise the party boldly and openly. Wonderful to raise the party everywhere but here. Raise the party boldly in WAM or the 30 for 40 committees and the workers will jump up and run away. And I know these people because I work with them; who could know them better than I. Maybe you can raise the party everywhere else but not here.

Now Mao had his brand of exceptionalism too. He called it the particularity of contradiction. After explaining what a wonderful science Marxism-Leninism was he "explained" how in the particular case the Chinese party was in, it was okay to ally with the Nationalists and bury the party. ~~It~~ I guess it's easier to see it when it's on the other side of the world than when it's in front of my nose.

Another way this burying the party, this revisionism, came out was in our 30 for 40 campaign. Revisionism takes the form of an apparent "easier" path. Bury the party for a little while until we get a foothold in the 30 for 40 movement. Don't raise the party ~~so~~; don't scare people away. Then we'll take them aside and win them over. After all, isn't that building the party? In the meantime we deny the workers the key idea they need in order to win 30 for 40: rank and file ~~and~~ <sup>power</sup> ~~power~~ in the committees in order to seize and hold control of the 30 for 40 movement. Rank and file power has to be built by involving workers in day to day campaigns against the boss that ~~build~~ ~~the~~ ~~rank~~ ~~and~~ ~~file~~ ~~power~~ are linked to 30 for 40 and build real active rank and file <sup>to day</sup> day/participation. This is socialism, the dictatorship of the working class at its beginning level. Without starting out and keeping this strategy of socialism in mind; without building active rank and file power from the start, we will never get to

(57)

socialism, workers will not gain the confidence they need to run first their ~~own~~ 30 for 40 committees, then their unions and the state.

Not to fight for the party, for socialist ideas within the 30 for 40 movement delivers the movement into the arms of the ruling class and their union leader allies. "Rely on us the "progressive" labor fakers say. "30 for 40 is impossible but anyway if it is possible, we can do it for you better with our connections". "You guys are small, how are you going to spread this movement all over the industry?" This is the way any struggle will go: towards socialism, greater active rank and file participation; or into alliance, led by the labor fakers who will try to maintain a passive rank and file, not mobilize workers to actively fight the company, try to maintain a dependence upon themselves, and jump into the leadership of the 30 for 40 movement like Khrushchev wormed into the leadership of Russia.

Only the party can guarantee that the first path will be taken. It looks like the harder path because we have to sail into the teeth of capitalist ideas that ~~prevent~~ rank and file workers won't get together, etc. But it is actually the only path. Our job is not just ~~to~~ to be around to fight for socialism after 30 for 40 but build socialism today: to avoid all of the bosses traps and pitfalls like the hope of an easier victory through "progressive" union leaders. *Another trap is 30 & out.*

We can build 30 for 40 even if we are only in a few plants now. We're going to get more and more workers together in those plants to actively put the heat on these bosses and get rank and file workers to run these committees and press ahead

(58)

for 30 for 40. And right in the middle of this we're going to build the party like the eye of a 30 for 40 hurricane. Our friends and relatives in other plants will ~~hear~~ <sup>hear</sup> about it. Once we've guaranteed the work in our plants we'll visit other plants to meet other rank and filers.

Since we've discussed this a little, Challenge sales have about doubled here. Sales which had been discontinued at plant gates were started up again and comrades and friends sold a little more on their jobs. We're taking steps to improve our study. All of this should help us bring more people to the WAM convention and May Day.

*al S., Clave.*

(59)

## WITHOUT REVOLUTIONARY STUDY THERE CAN BE NO REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

The first thing to be said about ML Study is that it doesn't happen for the most part. Many members do not even read all the articles in PL Magazines. And it is rare for PLers to read works of Lenin, Mao, Stalin, Engels, Marx (I for one have never read any Marx except for the Communist Manifesto, which makes calling myself a Marxist-Leninist an exaggeration perhaps).

Off and on, some members and leaders have suggested that study is not important, a diversion from the day-to-day work, and really only for 'armchair Marxists', not for revolutionary communist activists. Even when these arguments have not been put forward, the absence of leadership to study has been blatant. At one point I was in an inner-party study group about the Russian Revolution. The leadership took the position that they would stay out of it, so as to develop new thinking and leadership. We met three or four times. A few of us did some extensive reading, but we were unable to organize fruitful discussions or get everyone to read. At the 3rd or 4th meeting, one member (who did little reading) complained we weren't oriented to practice enough, so we started to talk and find out what work each person was doing; it didn't have much to do with the Russian Revolution, or at least ~~we/were~~ our low level of understanding prevented us from making the connections. We never met again.

I believe that study can and ~~is~~ must be an integral part of our work, and that this does not exclude so-called 'intellectual' discussions about what happened 50 years ago, 100 years ago, here or 6,000 miles away. Our Party's line and practice has been derived from that of millions of workers, peasants, students, and Intellectuals in all parts of the world. History has bequeathed us many lessons, and learning the lessons thoroughly means more than applying them to our concrete situations; it means understanding the history which produced those lessons, so as to better put them into practice. My commitment is always increased when I learn and see what the Bolsheviks or Chinese Ultra-leftists did right and wrong; the article on the eugenic movement really strengthened my determination to fight

(60)

Jensen all the harder, so as to defeat his ideas before history repeats itself.

### Implementation:

- A. The leadership should organize study. Often readings are suggested, but never insisted upon. The struggle to convince members to become active in TU's and in electoral campaigns might have been sharper sooner if everyone had read "Left-Wing Communism -- an Infantile Disorder" (I started it but never got through). In addition members, might have gained some insight into what traps if any, the Bolsheviks fell into in that work, which we would want to avoid.
- B. It should be carried out through the clubs. We can best relate reading to practice if we discuss it together with others involved in the same practice.
- C. Study should have a balance between on the one hand party articles (C-D and the mag), current articles by center and revisionist forces, and on the other such classics as "What Is To Be Done?" (which bears light on the 'Right -Wing Trend in PL'), or "More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us" (a favorite when I was coming around the Party), and many others which I don't know about, but which will give us depth to our understanding of Party building, and our vanguard strategies.
- D. These discussions should also be carried out in base groups with those we're trying to win.

Our strategies have been developed by Party leaders based on an analysis, including objective conditions today and historical experience. Members often accept these strategies simply out of slavishness. Then they find that their friends don't always agree on what's most important: "30 for 40 now...why?", or "Sure I'm not against fighting Jensen, but I'm busy working on the farmworkers or the budget cuts" etc. Often comrades who were not won to the line -- partially because of insufficient study -- get convinced <sup>out of it</sup> by their friends, ~~but~~ since they never understood the why's and wherefore's of the line in the first place. Hence study is essential.

(61)

THE RIGHT WING TREND IN THE STUDENT WORK AT BERKELEY.

The main weakness of our work has been in not carrying out the struggle against Jensen to the fullest. We found a million and one important issues to get involved in (and we never got really involved because we never had a political strategy for those struggles to win); we ran from one meeting to the next (hoping to outturn the RU); but we did little to agitate against Jensen or Jensenism directly. Out of five or six leaflets last quarter, only one was devoted mainly to attacking Jensen, and that was to build a forum. The forum was good but no action was taken against academic racism. In essence our practice was tailist -- we tailed the mass movement, following its practice of reacting in crisis-like fashion, providing no leadership to it.

for example: "There's a lot of good center people in the farm-workers we can't ignore them,"  
 or  
 "This Third World Strike Commemoration is a great way to unite w/ minority students + put forward our line!"

We can win leadership of the mass movement, not by submerging ourselves in it, nor even by attempting to lead already existing struggles, but by daring to provide direction, in fact a new direction, for the mass movement. This requires boldness, as well as the confidence that comes with understanding why what we are doing is absolutely correct. Building the vanguard work is not only a prerequisite to advancing the movement towards revolution, it's also the key to strengthening (qualitatively) all other struggles.

Some people have suggested that fighting racism, or making it our main thrust, is sectarian. (Bulletin #3, P. 17). The implication is "Yes of course it would be nice to have a mass movement opposing Banfield, Herrnstein, Jensen, etc... but that's not where people are at, and you only turn people off by talking about it all the time." Such an argument reveals a lack of understanding of how a mass vanguard movements are developed. Was it too early to call the war in Vietnam an imperialist bosses' war when we did? Should we have waited before differentiating ourselves from liberal politicians and, yes, even turning some people off? Today every radical under the sun is anti-imperialist (to the point where the word loses meaning at times...). Similarly, everyone is pro-worker nowadays, while five years ago the prevalent idea was that workers didn't exist,

(62)

here in the USA. If we had waited to talk about imperialism or workers, it's questionable whether anyone else would have raised these at all. The point is, if we hesitate to raise anti-racism today, and not just raise, but push, then we are setting the whole movement back.

The second answer to the objection of 'sectarianism' is that the anti-racist struggle can be mass now, not just in five years. The immediate mass potential for anti-racism is stronger than it was for the two above ideological thrusts. Why?.... One reason is that the civil rights movement and even the Panthers and other black power groups, built somewhat of a base against racism, despite the weaknesses of those movements, so that overall what we're introducing is not brand new, although the ideological line is: racism hurts all of us, and we all need to fight it for our own survival; and that academic racism is central to developing government rationales.

Developing and spreading racist propaganda is the main function of the universities today. This means we're getting to the heart of the very existence of universities when we fight Jensen and his cohorts around the country. In previous struggles, our blows were at secondary functions: true the ruling class wanted to keep ROTC at universities and colleges, but training officers could have been carried out solely at private military schools without too much trouble; and of course the Regents and Trustees make \$\$ by exploiting campus workers, but that doesn't differentiate schools from factories. Brainwashing does, and this is not a trivial point! It implies that stopping racist ideology may be the main focus of student and college professor organizing till (& even after) the seizure of state power by workers and the complete destruction of the bourgeois university!

To tie into the question of whether this struggle can be mass now, remember that by getting to the raison d'etre of universities and colleges, we are opening ourselves up to the most rabid assaults by the ruling class. Which is a good thing, for we always grow the fastest and win the most people to our line when we advance under attack.



(63)

Concretely, the main reason the anti-racist struggle is not very mass now is that we have not gone to the masses with our line. Every time we have, new people, often in large numbers, have been mobilized. At UCLA hundreds showed up when Jensen was scheduled to speak; one illegal rally (before Jensen's sabbatical) resulted in over 100 people attending Jensen's class --with no prior building for this action; a teach-in at University of Buffalo, and so on and so forth as we've read in Challenge.

Some are saying we are too narrow in our approach to the student or other movements. While this was a weakness, & in a few cases may still be, at this point a far greater danger exists. That is the danger of opportunism, of abdicating leadership to the revisionists by failing to raise the ideological understanding of the movement, by failing to up the ante in the class war we're waging. In fact, we have not been narrow-minded enough in pursuing an unwavering attack on Jensen here. (By the way, Jensen hasn't wavered so much -- he just published a couple more books.)

sample of fund-raising packet - includes 10 "Dear Friend" letters - 1 packet per member... (64)

Dear Comrade,

There has been a lot of discussion recently about the necessity of building the party-in order for the mass movement to go forward. Members and friends of PL generally agree with this, but usually we don't think too much about party building. Perhaps the phrase "independent work" is unfortunate. Building the party (putting forward the party's ideas on how to move the mass movement forward and ideas about revolution, winning people to the party with its clubs, programs, democratic centralist organization--the whole kit and kaboodle) is not "independent" but it is part and parcel of all our work. It is the logical outcome of mass work. It is the nightmare of the bosses.

Not to build the party is the essence of revisionism.

To learn more about why and how to build the party, the national committee is calling for intensive study focused on the PKP pre-convention bulletins. This should involve members and friends of PL, in clubs, CHALLENGE clubs, and study groups. These convention bulletins are forums for debate and we hope there is a lot of debate in the discussions. And also we urge members and friends of the party to write up their ideas for the bulletins.

Just as important, the Boston area leadership called for three campaigns:

**RAISE MONEY FOR THE PLP!**

Raising money is central for party building. If the working class doesn't support PL with money it doesn't support PL (ditto for students and intellectuals) "Put your money where your mouth is" is very apt. This is not meant to be a criticism of the workers and students but a criticism of us! Our hesitency or inability to raise money reflects isolation or (more often) opportunist ties. To help change this the area leadership will plan to issue regular fund raising packets. A new one will come out every few weeks. If you have any ideas let us know. They will include materials which will help you raise money around pressing issues. The first concerns the CPL whose offices were wrecked. Using the CPL letter and the Canadian Worker you could go to:

- \*friends who agree with your politics
- \*friends who don't agree (yet) or don't know
- \*co-workers to whom you will be selling challenge for the first time
- \*people who seem interested when you sell them challenge on the street
- \*students to whom you sell challenge in class
- \*neighbors

Students could canvas dorms with PL magazine or other lit and raise extra money using the packets. Members and friends setting up tables at hospitals or communities like Lynn could do likewise. Obviously if we ask people for money some will have political objections. They will either hesitate to give or more likely hesitate to give very much. They will ask questions. We shouldn't be afraid of explaining our ideas and we shouldn't mistake curiosity or misinformation for hostility. This is a good opportunity to expand the base for our ideas which, after all, is not something we do apart from our work but rather is the heart of political work. We should welcome questions and disagreements, and then struggle to win.

NOTE: The CPL packets include several fund raising letters and several copies of the Canadian Worker. If you need more (we hope) there should be plenty in the office.

Sunday April 15 or 22 a fund raising cocktail party, five dollars admission (plenty of other ways to spend money once you're inside) will be given mainly for faculty, grad students, and professionals. Probably in Cambridge, organized by

John and Emily Berg.

**EIGHT THOUSAND CHALLENGES BY JULY!**

66

Challenge-Desafio sales reflect the strength of the party's ideas. Many people can be reached by Challenge who we couldn't reach in our day to day work. At the same time, Challenge encourages us (in fact it sometimes forces us!) to talk with the people we see every day about various sharp and significant questions. For example, when we sell a friend a copy of Challenge with the Golda Meir cartoon in it, it puts us in the position of having to explain why we think Golda is a Nazi--which is not a bad position.

There is a Challenge editorial board in Boston made up of Jim Cronin, Al Furst, Jim Sober, and Jared Israel. This editorial board and similar ones in other areas led by the editorial board in New York try to get articles into Challenge which reflect aspects of the party's analysis of struggles, especially ones we are engaged in, and which use as well as feature articles which raise ideas in the context of movie reviews, satire, health and medicine, cartoon strips, and whatever. In other words, we are trying to make the paper as helpful as possible and we think it is pretty good.

Therefore, once the paper is put out, the trick is to sell it. We propose that Challenge sales be boosted dramatically to 6000 per issue during the month of April, and then to 8000 per issue by the July PLP convention. In order to do this, clubs would have to reach a quota along the following lines: we propose that each PL club sell 100 Challenges per issue per person. Thus, in a student club with 3 members each member would sell enough Challenges that all together the club would sell 300 issues. Non-student clubs, we felt, should include in their totals, papers sold by non-members.

To reach these quotas there are several things we could do:

- \*sell more seriously on the Saturday blitzes and make up selling times on the blitzes we miss
- \*discuss and evaluate ways to improve selling. "Poor sellers" can learn from "good sellers"
- \*sell regularly on the job, in school, and in the neighborhoods where we live
- \*carry lit with us and sell at subway stops and on the trains and buses, and to friends we happen to meet. Using this approach several people have already boosted very low sales considerably on this issue.

**SELL SUBS!!!!!!!!!!!!**

Challenge and PL subs represent regular guaranteed political exposure to our ideas. We should renew expired subs we sold or purchased for people last year, and sell a whole mess of new subs. To guarantee this Boston area leadership proposed a sub drive. Every member of PL (with a few exceptions clubs should decide on) should sell a sub a week until the July convention. (it's better to sell Challenge and PL subs to one person but that only counts as one sub). Sub renewals count as half a sub. We suggest that PL club meetings begin by collecting the week's subs, and discussing the work of those who do very badly or very well. As with fund raising and paper sales this requires serious discussion with people so this suggestion is not merely a mechanical device--rather selling a sub a week is a way to stimulate party building and struggle among members and friends over building the party. We urge friends of PL to take part in this campaign. A sub book is included in the first fund raising packet. Saturday, April 14, there will be a sub drive party, probably at MIT (party and dance) price of admission a sub to PL or challenge.

Build the party! Power to the working class!

66

Fraternally,

PLP Boston area leadership

labor donated, Inc.

Criticism of Al Strelzoff's article on dialectics.

67

The article is correct, except for two points.

1. Anything that is difficult to understand is not necessarily wrong. Al's article itself is difficult to understand. So is What is to be done? by Lenin.

So are some PL magazine articles. Yet they are all correct.

2. The boundary between internal and external is very important. In fact the idea that "internal contradictions are primary" is correct and useful.

Let me give some examples.

The Challenge sales of a comrade or club are low or high depending on the political commitment and understanding of the comrade or club. Not external factors such as the weather, the headline, or "the people's consciousness."

A political organization such as the CP or the Panthers has a bad line because of bourgeois ideology in the organization. Not because the time is not ripe for good politics, or because of repression, or because of bribes.

The external conditions affect the development of an internal contradiction.

But the internal struggle is the key. Understanding this leads to criticism and self-criticism, and <sup>strengthens</sup> ~~strengthens~~ the fight against revisionism and other forms of bourgeois ideology.

To Milt

68

April 1, 1973

Dear Comrades,

As we agreed on at the last club meeting, this is the first report that I will do between club meetings, summarizing the previous meeting and outlining what we have agreed to do, especially in terms of basebuilding and recruiting to the party.

At the meeting of Monday March 26, we discussed the latest NC report. We agreed with the substance of the report. We agreed that there has been a rightward drift in the work of the club as we have become more involved in the mass movement. We have been involved in many anti-racist struggles both on campus and on the job, yet there has been no recruitment to the party of anyone- especially minority people. Recently as we have established the Challenge Club, we have laid the basis to reverse this situation. Needless to say, this doesn't mean that they will join the party and stay in the party. Whether or not people are won to commit their lives to PLP depends on the leadership that we give. How well do we know the people? Do we really know what is on their mind- about different questions, about their personal problems, about their commitment, about what they want to do with their lives? How do we as comrades deal with our own problems????

It was my feeling at the meeting, that club members more often than not do not know what is on each other's mind. There has been a lack of leadership from myself, which is compounded by the fact that the club is spread out geographically. If the party is to be built then all members and not just the club chairman will have to think about whether or not the work is getting done that we agreed on in the club meeting. If not what are the personal and political problems that are holding it back?? If somebody (Bob) doesn't ask you how the Challenge sales are going, then maybe you had better ask? If you don't, then someday you may not have to worry about it because the party will either fall apart or go the road of all the revisionists. THINK ABOUT IT. If you have a problem, talk to somebody in the club about it. Don't brood for days, weeks, or months about it. Political work is a hell of a lot more than leaflets, demonstrations, meetings, Challenge sales, etc. There has been a serious resistance in the club to this concept. People basically thought that the drift to the right would be stopped, basically by having more and better planned activities, which is partially true, but our ability to do this depends on our relationships with other people, and leading a normal stable life.. For example, the campaign against Banfield was wiped out basically because of subjective reasons on the part of our comrade there. Same reason that Ken is no longer in the party. These events are to be considered as defeats. There will be more of the same unless we all change. Why should minority people join the party and stay in the party, if we don't change???????????????? The spirit of our last meeting was very positive on this questions, BUT WE MUST CARRY IT OUT.

69

On organizational questions, we agreed to do the following:

1. Challenge sales for this issue are to hit 200. Last issue was 156. \$ subs are to be sold by April 8.
2. There is to be a PL forum as part of the anti-racist symposium at Temple. John is to give the forum. Bonnie is to help him prepare. Subject is to be on racism as the roadblock to workers' revolution. Subs are to be sold all week along with Challenges.
3. Mass work at the auto plant is to be done for the WAM convention.

Next club meeting is Tuesday, April 10, 6:30 PM at Bonnie's.

Reading: Build A Base in the Working Class  
 Discussion: How these ideas apply to recruiting the people in our base to the party. Specific plans for recruitment will be made.

Plans for May Day weekend will be discussed in detail. Everyone should bring a list of who has paid by then and who has said they will be coming. Money is due for Challenge and sube, along with a written report. If you have any additions to the agenda try to tell me before the meeting.

As of today, There are 12 paid registrations for the WAM convention. 3 for SDS to my knowledge.

for the party,

Bob

# Danish strike ends as unions accept compromise deal

BY HILARY BARNES COPENHAGEN, April 9.

THE LABOUR conflict which has brought most of Danish industry to a halt since March 21 was ended this evening when it was announced that member unions of the TUC and a general meeting of the Employers' Federation had voted to accept a mediation settlement.

The employers voted by 454 to 105 and the unions by 319,702 to 144,440 votes to accept the settlement. Work will resume to-morrow for the 258,000 workers affected by the conflict.

The compromise on which the parties have now agreed provides for a 40-hour week by December 1974. It is now 41 1/2 hours. It gives an increase in the basic hourly wage of Kr.1.70 in six-monthly increments over two years. The basic wage is now about Kr 13.60 although the average wage in industry is about Kr 22. The basic wage will now be equal for men and women.

Union members will also obtain Kr.0.40 instead of Kr.0.30

an hour for every 3 per cent. increase in the cost of living index, but the employers have only agreed to the settlement on condition that the Government sets up a Commission to examine the whole question of the cost of living wage escalator system.

The employers claim that when all factors are taken into account wages will increase by about 18 per cent. over the two years of the settlement and wage drift will come in addition to this.

Apart from a lack of newspapers, the public has hardly noticed the conflict which barely touched public transport or other facilities. With domestic and foreign demand booming industry is confident that it will catch up on lost production in coming months.

The Government is now faced with a strike of 1,300 key personnel in ministries, universities and grammar schools from May 1. Graduate employees are dissatisfied with the meagre terms the Government is offering them in current wage talks.

# Ford lays off 9,000 at three car plants

MORE THAN 9,000 Ford Motor workers at three plants were laid off yesterday because of separate local disputes, with no sign of any early bid to break the deadlock in national Ford pay talks.

Ostensibly, yesterday's disputes — at Dagenham, Halewood and Southampton — were not directly linked to the national talks, but in the current atmosphere of negotiating stalemate small incidents have led to a number of Ford walk-outs in recent weeks.

Vauxhall pay talks resume today with union negotiators due to reply to a £2.40-a-week offer — in line with the rejected Ford offer — and improved fringe benefits. Vauxhall stewards are pressing for a strike if the offer is not improved.

At Ford's Dagenham complex the 68 electricians, whose walk-out last Thursday over a foreman allegedly doing their work has hit maintenance work at the engine plant, voted yesterday to return to work.

The decision came too late to avoid 7,000 day and night shift workers being laid off yesterday, and a further 3,000 day-shift assembly workers have been told not to report for work to-day, leaving the company 24-hours' car production work more than £1m.

Rubery Owen's factories in the Black Country entered its second week, the stranglehold of essential component supplies for the motor industry tightened.

British Leyland said that on Wednesday it would have to review production prospects for the Mini made at its Longbridge, Birmingham, plant.

The 2,400—of 3,000 labour force—who have rejected management proposals for a new wages structure that would give more to the lower-paid, are not due to meet until Friday.

The strike has already caused a week's shutdown of tractor production at the Massey-Ferguson factory at Coventry (600 laid off) and of car production at Rover, Solihull, where 1,280 are idle.

Proposals to discuss the dispute with national officials of the transport and engineering unions over the weekend could not be put into effect, partly because engineering workers' leaders were gathering for their annual conference.

The attitude of the strikers has hardened, and pickets were out in force yesterday. There was the further threat that if the strike was made official all work from Rubery Owen factories in Wales, the North

# Pay: Scanlon yields—with a warning

BY ROY ROGERS, LABOUR CORRESPONDENT TORQUAY, April 9

MR. HUGH SCANLON, president of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers, to-day conceded the Government had won a "temporary" victory with its wages policy, but warned of an "explosion" if prices continued to rise while wages are restricted.

In his presidential address to the annual meeting of the national committee of the AUEW engineering section, Mr. Scanlon expressed hope for early resumption of talks with the Government and industry on a voluntary pay and prices policy.

He stressed the union must maintain the right to decide its own policies and pursue them through free collective bargaining.

Mr. Scanlon listed gas workers, postmen, miners and "some Ford workers" when giving examples of the victory of the Government's wage restraint policy.

The AUEW had remained in the forefront of opposition to the Act, a position which had cost the union some £70,000 in a "temporary" victory with its wages policy, but warned of an "explosion" if prices continued to rise while wages are restricted.

Concerning his recent speech to the Parliamentary Press Gallery, widely construed as a significant change in attitude to the Act, Mr. Scanlon said it was beyond his comprehension that the matter had been distorted into suggestions of a volte face.

He has said he favoured resumption of talks with the Government provided it gave some "earnest" that the talks were likely to be more fruitful than last time. Pressed further as to how this earnest could be expressed, he had suggested the Government might offer to make several amendments to the Act.

# Influence

Delegates were also warned that if, when drawing up this year's engineering pay claims, they insisted on a settlement irrespective of the Government pay policy, it would inevitably lead to a fight with the Government.

Mr. Scanlon recalled the poor response to last year's call for militant local bargaining after national pay talks collapsed. He clearly does not want to be placed in the same position again this year of being bound by a policy if members are not prepared to support him.

Much of his speech was spent "setting the record straight" on the union's position on the Industrial Relations Act and the series of negotiations to find a voluntary policy to combat inflation.

An increase in Left-wing influence on the national committee this year may allow the Left to delay major policy decisions on the attitude to the Industrial Relations Act until the amalgamated AUEW conference in June when the construction and technical and supervisory sections of the union could sway the balance of power in their favour.

This year's national committee, which just maintains its traditional Right-wing majority, could be one of the last, for Mr. Scanlon revealed plans to set up a new policy-making body for the amalgamated AUEW. If agreed, this would replace the existing sectional bodies and could result in an even greater influence for the Left.

# Call for meeting by hospital union

BY NOEL HOWELL, LABOUR REPORTER

LEADERS of 220,000 hospital ancillary workers yesterday pressed for an early meeting with Sir Keith Joseph, Secretary of State for Health, to discuss special-case treatment for any group of workers before they pressed their case. Three of its pay policy, due in the autumn.

## Ford pays on 9,000 at three car plants

MORE THAN 9,000 Ford Motor workers at three plants were laid off yesterday because of separate local disputes, with no sign of any early bid to break the deadlock in national Ford pay talks.

Apparently, yesterday's disputes — at Dagenham, Halewood and Southampton — were not directly linked to the national talks, but in the current atmosphere of negotiating stalemate small incidents have led to a number of Ford walk-outs in recent weeks.

Vauxhall pay talks resume today with union negotiators due to reply to a £2.40-a-week offer — in line with the rejected Ford offer — and improved fringe benefits. Vauxhall stewards are pressing for a strike if the offer is not improved.

At Ford's Dagenham complex the 68 electricians, whose walk-out last Thursday over a foreman allegedly doing their work has hit maintenance work at the engine plant, voted yesterday to return to work.

The decision came too late to avoid 7,000 day and night shift workers being laid off yesterday, and a further 3,000 day-shift assembly workers have been told not to report for work today, losing the company 24-hours' car production work more than £1m.

### Discipline row

Twenty-five workers walked out at Halewood in protest at what they said was insufficiently firm disciplinary action against a foreman; and 1,500 day-shift men were laid off before the end of their shift.

A dispute over a local grading claim made 700 idle at Southampton. All three plans should be back to normal to-night.

At the Perkins plant at Peterborough a work-to-rule and overtime ban, in support of a claim for parity with Coventry tractor workers which would mean £20-a-week pay rises, has cut production by 40 per cent.

Our Midlands correspondent writes: As the pay strike at

Rubery Owen's factories in the Black Country entered its second week, the stranglehold on essential component supplies for the motor industry tightened.

British Leyland said that on Wednesday it would have to review production prospects for the Mini made at its Longbridge, Birmingham, plant.

The 2,400—of 3,000 labour force—who have rejected management proposals for a new wages structure that would give more to the lower-paid, are not due to meet until Friday.

The strike has already caused a week's shutdown of tractor production at the Massey-Ferguson factory at Coventry (600 laid off) and of car production at Rover, Solihull, where 1,260 are idle.

Proposals to discuss the dispute with national officials of the transport and engineering unions over the weekend could not be put into effect, partly because engineering workers' leaders were gathering for their annual conference.

The attitude of the strikers has hardened, and pickets were out in force yesterday. There was the further threat that if the strike was made official all work from Rubery Owen's factories in Wales, the North West and Scotland would be blocked.

At Coventry Jaguar was hoping to recall more than 2,000 assembly workers if 100 men at the associated factory making gearboxes and other components call off their pay strike when they meet today.

The situation began to ease when 25 external transport drivers agreed yesterday to resume immediately. A full resumption will enable Jaguar to re-start car production to-night, after a week's standstill.

There was better news also from the Daimler bus subsidiary, where 80 workers have ended their sit-in and will be discussing grievances at a plant conference today.

More Labour News Page 15

## Labour News

# Call for meeting by hospital union

BY NOEL HOWELL, LABOUR REPORTER

LEADERS of 220,000 hospital ancillary workers yesterday pressed for an early meeting with Sir Keith Joseph, Secretary for Social Services, in a move to try to end the five-week-old campaign of selective industrial action in the hospitals.

The move follows the agreement by the TUC finance and general purposes committee last Friday to ask other unions to refrain from exploiting any above-the-limit settlement for the ancillary workers in the event of the Government treating them as a special case.

Sir Keith was yesterday sent a copy of the TUC's statement. In a covering letter, Mr. Alan Fisher, general secretary of the National Union of Public Employees, stated that the TUC decision "points the way for further discussions between us on ways in which an acceptable solution to the current dispute could be concluded."

So far, the Government has

shown no signs of conceding special-case treatment for any group of workers before Phase Three of its pay policy, due in the autumn.

Nevertheless, hospital ancillary unions are hoping Sir Keith will agree to meet them within the next few days and any progress made at such a meeting could then be followed up at the scheduled meeting of the ancillary workers' joint negotiating committee, due to take place on Friday.

Yesterday, Sir Keith visited Preston and some 300 hospital strikers took over the Manchester Regional Hospital Board headquarters in a short protest after learning Sir Keith would be missing a demonstration the had planned for him.

NUPE claims there is a step ping up in the campaign of selective strikes which now affects some 268 hospitals. Hardest hit this week are Wales the South-West, the North-West the North, and Scotland.