

PLP CONVENTION BULLETIN # 9

On Revisionism.....	1
Work in the Latin Community.....	4
The party's TU work, and the work of one member at GE.....	6
Challenge, What's its role?.....	16
SF May Day report.....	19
Re: West Coast WAM convention - report to party members.....	20
Make Challenge a <u>Mass</u> Revolutionary Paper.....	21
Internal Letter on the Coming Struggle in Auto.....	23
Bay Area Study - Action groups.....	26
Bay Area Cahllenge Sales.....	27
Expulsion notice.....	28
LA Mjay Day report.....	29
Notes on a few on-going struggles.....	33
Syllabus for discussion group against racism.....	35
On recruitment to the party.....	37
Suggestions for Challenge.....	40
Further Discussion on Criticisms of Challenge.....	41
On our Election Experiences.....	47
Challenge sales.....	49
More on Left Wing Bureaucracy.....	50
On Fighting Sexism.....	52
A criticism of Challenge.....	56
On Male Chauvinism.....	58
On Pl's attitude toward homosexuals.....	60
More on PL's attitude toward homosexuals.....	62
Comments on Fighting Sexism in Bulletin III.....	66

Convention
Whiteland Bulletin - San Diego Rev Act

①

The main idea in RRIII is that you can rely on the workers to fight for socialism. The Swedish Marxists made a good point in their article on Korea: Tremendous quantitative advance in industry with no qualitative change in methods of production is what produced the red rulers--not the other way around. This means that if you don't rely on the workers to fight for socialism at the point of production you can only build capitalism. You may deserve to be shot if you are helping to run things like this. The Korean party leadership had no faith in the workers.

Another key loss of faith in the workers came when the international communist movement adopted a nationalist approach to 'save' state power and then justified it with theory. Deals between governments seemed a better bet than workers demanding socialism.

So this means the communist movement developed lack of faith in workers 1) at the point of production and 2) in matters of international war and peace and retention of state power.

Revisionism in P.L. can be measured on this same scale, which really boils down to measuring the extent of erosion of the basic idea in RRIII (reliance on the workers for socialism).

1. If you resist being involved in your union, building a caucus, and WAM, and PL, (yes--all at the same time), doesn't this indicate that you don't see how workers can be won to socialism?

2. If you don't organize study groups doesn't this mean you don't think people can be won to join the party?

3. If you don't want Challenge to call Golda a nazi doesn't this mean some smaller capitalist governments aren't all that bad?

4. If you don't sell Challenge at factory gates and on the job doesn't this mean you have no faith in socialism and d. of p. at the point of production?

5. If we have a party to guarantee total faith in our class achieving d. of p. and communism and to do what's necessary to get there, but you don't carry out an agreed upon line, isn't it a ninety to one chance that you lack faith in the people?

My work has included more than one example from each category in the last several months. I am trying to weed them out by noting the connection between my fears and reticence, and my disregard in practice for the FACT that taking every communist lead and practice to the people is the ONLY way to win (both small now and big later). An example: I have got to become a more open Pler on my job; (include WAM builder) or chances are much greater we'll have a sell-out contract again next year. It is clear that the force of r. and f. militancy has as its major stumbling block its disorganization and dividedness based on the limited spread of WAM members' and PL members' ideas and proposals on how to fight. Especially prominent in this limitation on r. and f. militancy is my lack of writing and handing out WAM leaflets, Challenge articles, with the several people where I work who will ALWAYS do this stuff, and the almost non-existent recruitment of minority workers into WAM (which is completely possible even with my present contacts.)

2

I don't mean that my work determines the class struggle, but how much work is done around the ideas of unity, smash racism, workers' revolution, 30-40, internationalism, has a daily effect, ranging from working conditions remaining tolerable, saving a fellow's job, to winning a decent wage increase. If you don't do it, you can't win it.

I think the Party's rightward drift is rooted in weakness in relying on the people. The expressions 'Its so hard to organize on the job' or 'Its so hard to explain Chall-Desaf' or 'Its so hard to do WAM agitational work too' are all symptoms of this same thing.

PUTTING FORWARD d. of P. IS A GOOD WAY OF WINNING A CO-WORKER TO THE IMPORTANCE OF HIS OR HER COMING TO A MEETING - IT SPEAKS TO THE QUESTION OF HOW WORKERS CAN RUN THINGS IN THEIR OWN INTEREST - THEY HAVE TO BE ACTIVE.

Why this lack of reliance on workers for socialism?

When we entered the mass movement with the goals of fighting for reforms AND raising revolutionary ideas we had the right goals. But we did not struggle to implement this line hard enough. Gradually we gave up a little on the second part (what does PL do as PL in a given union, what does the party do in the WAM chapter, What is PL raising in SdS?). And this led somewhat to the party not guaranteeing too much straight reform work either (my work in winning co-workers to WAM, guaranteeing WAM leaflets, SdS conf. back East, West Coast WAM conf. planning etc.).

Now the reason we retreated from concretely guaranteeing Party presence INSIDE THE MASS MOVEMENT IS NOT BECAUSE IT WAS SO DIFFICULT TO ENTER THE MOVEMENT (even though everyone has this nagging at the back of their mind-or at least I do). To be honest, it was relatively easy, sectarian as we might have been. The problem was that raising PLs ideas with people you're working side by side with who AREN'T your friends from the anti-war movement or the civil rights movement etc. takes some commitment. It takes reliance on the people. Remember? This is what no party ever did before. The people we are working WITH in these unions and movements ARE the working class: Its them we have to win, not just the most militant. ESPECIALLY in the unions, we are now starting to win the working class to P.L.: not just those workers who are buying Challenge during Challenge selling, but those who will read it after talking an hour after a union meeting. We want to be working with these friends for years to come. I don't think there is a problem with workers not being willing to work openly with the party. Its that the party hasn't figured out HOW to work openly right now with these workers-like openly inside coalitions or unions, or WAM. (Workers usually don't mind a little openness, but it drives misleaders crazy.)

Most movements have a pack of shit misleaders; and the task we've taken on is large. But this is exactly the battle that RRIII is all about. I think the pre-convention discussion is part of a fight for and against advances mapped out in RRIII. I think the fight against RRIII is being waged mainly by the low level of struggle of all of us to rely on the people with PL's ideas out front. How many people have you struggled with over the idea of them taking initiative (the guy that sits in back of you?) How come you won or lost this struggle? I think more of this pre-convention discussion has to boil down to self-criticisms to discover the details of whats holding back implementation of RRIII. Somebody criticized the last convention because the papers submitted weren't self-critical at all.

3

Workers ARE coming around PL from the unions right now. Any retreat from the attitude of Challenge summer (all workers are open to our revolutionary communist ideas) is garbage. We need to be working with people as if we were planning on building the paris commune-since we are. We have to work like this because plenty of workers want to know right now what's going to make socialist society any different. Our practice has got to start showing the answer more obviously.

Jon
San Diego 4-1-73

(4)

FOR INTERNAL BULLETIN---WORK IN THE LATIN COMMUNITY

In New York City, PL has an open field to do community work among the Latin-American community. We have about a dozen members of Latin origin. We have twice as many friends or close friends that will do some work. Our party is well known in many Latin communities. DESAFIO is well sold in Manhattan's West Side, East Harlem, Chelsea. The same to a lesser degree in the Bronx and in Brooklyn. Really, we don't have that much of competition (compared to a few years ago when the Young Lords were in vogue) from many nationalists groups. Many of the anti-poverty pimps are more worried about whether the govt. will sponsor them next year than doing anything else. Many of our former enemies are at least willingly to do minimum work with us (e.g. El Comité on the West Side--whatever is still left of them). We have very good relations with other groups that have a base inside the community (El Ejército in East New York, Resistencia in El Barrio--although they seem to have disappeared or gone "underground" in the last few past weeks, the Dominican nationalists on the West Side, etc.) El Ejército and Resistencia (when they were around) have a fair good base inside the community, are essentially very honest people.

In a few words, we have an open field in the Spanish community (which is less nationalist than the Black community in relation to Whites). Our own subjective weaknesses have kept us from winning many more people to the Party. In East Harlem, after a couple of years of just agitational work there (mainly selling C/D), we began to have an opportunity to build PL. There was a parents' boycott that was an open field for the Party. We failed to get involved in it, just at the last moment. Even so we met a few people with whom we never kept up with. There were other struggles (like against Metropolitan Hosp.) where we could have played a better role and gotten the struggle thru a better line and gotten somplacé with it. Instead, the whole thing (which was run by Resistencia with a rather good line and approach but without any real base inside the Hosp.--the whole base inside the hosp. was left to a doctor, who turned to be a real right-winger, possibly even a cop. He was seen talking to some cops the day of a demonstration in front of the hosp.) folded up without anything coming out of it.

On the West Side, PL is well known among the Many Dominicans living in the community. The party is respected (if not liked) by the Dominican nationalists--mainly a few bullshit students. C/D is well sold there. We bring a few people from that community to the party demonstrations, but still we have not been able to win as many people as it is possible to the party. The reasons again are basically subjective (although they might appear objectives to some people).

Right now, the biggest competition will come from the liberals and to a lesser degree from the Puerto Rican "Socialist" Party (PSP) in some communities (specifically in Williamsburgh, East Harlem, Newark, Chicago and even in Boston, and some towns of Connecticut).

PSP has the biggest base of any nationalist group. It just had a Congress April 8 with over 1500 people. Its line is strictly nationalist. They say that the Puerto Rican people is one people and that here their duty is to help the national liberation movement in Puerto Rico. Their program says that the Puerto Rican workers are not so important in the shops and that their main

here

(5)

NY LATIN COMMUNITY

STRUGGLES TAKE PLACE IN THE COMMUNITIES, THEREFORE PSP IS GOING to concentrate its work in those communities. In their workplan for the months of May thru Dec., they plan out to develop nucleus in the West Side, Tremont, Ridgewood-Bushwick, Hunts Points, East Harlem, East New York, Bay Shore-Brentwood (Long Island). Their program do have one drawback, they don't plan to get involve in any actual struggle. Just to involve people in purely bullshit activities (movies, conferences, paper sale, etc.). As a matter, PSP is famous for just that.

The liberals are in disarray. Their last hero is Badillo (among the Latin liberals). But this guy is so inept that he couldn't lead anything. Most Latin workers dislike him very much.

Again, PLP members and friends can win a lot of people from Latin origin closer to the party. Among non-Puerto Rican Latin (Dominicans, South American), the big issue is the immigration deportation threat (Rodino Bill, regular raids by the Immigration Dept. ect.). Among Puerto Rican, the big thing is the general deterioration of living conditions (the same as all workers). Most of the Latin workers are factory workers. A great deal work in the Garment Center (30 for 40 is a sure winner). Many PLP members speak some Spanish. They should try to learn a bit more. Our Latin members should try to get involve more in their communities, among their friends, etc. Bring the class struggle to your lives. Build the party.

--A NoYo PLPer

6

A short time ago, the party made the evaluation that the main thrust must become the trade union work. If we were to make serious progress toward becoming a working class communist party, that can lead a revolution, we would have to have firm roots in that class.

This is important for two reasons. The first is that the relationship that the working class has to the point of production is extremely critical. They are the people who can make production stop. They create both value and profits for the bosses with their labor; it comes from nowhere else. When the workers stop production, the profits for the bosses stop. It is this that now forces the bosses to grant our class some reforms. So if we want a revolution we need to have the power of the class that can change things.

The second reason is that if we want to develop a program that can win the workers, that can defeat the political ideas that now hold them back, it is vital that we be immersed in the struggles that they are in. No one will say the working class is ready to give up capitalism now, but the point is that they can and will if we are there, leading struggles, fighting rotten ideas like racism, nationalism, liberalism, pacifism, anti-communism etc. Only by being involved can we accurately judge what the main obstacle is at that moment that is holding the struggle back from advancing to a higher level. We cannot give the working class up to every bit of political trash that comes along; if we want to win, we need the working class.

Now, as historically, both the main and most important mass organization for the workers are the unions. Objectively, even with all the misleadership, workers see the unions as one of the main ways for them to get things that they need.

7

There is not any indication of a mass movement by workers out of unions, and quite the opposite, there are many excellent examples of militant fight to organize unions.

The work in unions can grow way beyond the confines of one particular local. Unions are involved in many other activities: charities, political candidates and lobbies thru COPE, community projects etc. Unions have teams and leagues that play with other unions. Locals are usually part of state and city or county labor organizations as well as higher bodies within the particular international. 30-40, as well as any other political program or idea, therefore don't lack places to be pushed and spread. The question is will we be there to spread them, or is this idea just pissing in the ocean?

The very limited work that has begun here seems to indicate that this work has many possibilities and potential, and proves out the validity of our line, as far as we've gone.

About 10 months ago, I took a job at GE. The local at the plant was weak, for two main reasons. The local leadership was very weak having the political outlook that the only way we could get anything from the company was if we were nice to them. The other reason was that the sell out by the international and the lies of the local reps during the strike three years ago still has a bad effect on the members and non-members. Of these two reasons the more critical was the first, since it is the local that people have contact with, it is the local that can fight to change things, both in the shop and in the international, and the local is their direct representative with the company.

The main thing therefore was to try and strengthen the local, get it involved in struggles, and bring in new members. (At

8

the time I went to work about 35% of the shop was union) The main thing to attack was the company.

This was important since people really wanted to get the company, stop the harrassment, the unsafe conditions etc. yet it was not clear to them we could do it. ("Our plant was different, they all knew of good unions and good locals but here, at GE, the people would never stick together"). The main enemy was the company, not the union--the bad leadership was an obstacle to our fighting the company.

The first thing that I did, besides getting to know the people in the plant, was to start attending union meetings and trying to put forward ways to build the union and fight the company. One concrete thing that we did was to start a local newsletter. This did two things immediately, It gave the union a very visible presence in the plant, as well as being a way of starting some constructive political discussion. It contained articles about plant problems and solutions, other strikes, news affecting workers, 30-40.

A big obstacle to growth still remained, the local leaders were unwilling to engage in any fights with the company, and unless some struggles were started nothing would grow. We started a very informal caucus to try to speak to members about what we wanted to do, and how our exec. was in the way. Most people thought this but didn't know that we could do anything about it. Pressure from enough people made three exec. board members resign, and in practical terms, three members of our caucus were elected--vice president, recording secretary, and chief shop steward. The basis of the caucus was that we wanted the union to start to do something, and we would try to push for certain things at union meetings. Most of

9

the people in the shop--members and non members saw that we wanted to change the way things were. Within the caucus I was able to raise ideas of union democracy, 30-40, anti-racism, etc.

The first thing that people noticed we did was to make the dealings between the company and the union open. Letters that we wrote to the company and the bosses reply were circulated around the shop so that people would know what was going on. This was a change from the past where these communications were kept top secret.

The first major fight we had with GE was over the issue of job safety. Many of the machines were unsafe and broken, the forklifts were in need of new motors and the plant was a horror house and people were always talking about it. We filed grievances about it, one of the steward had a big shouting match in the middle of the plant with the foreman about it. We had alot of facts to back up our claims, and we said GE was in violation of the national contract since they had agreed to provide safe working conditions. The company agreed to all our demands, and for the first time ever, they admitted they were wrong. This victory, though small, solidified our support in the plant. After this, when a federal health and safety inspector came in, on a health complaint one of the union members sent in, people were ready for great things. Since I was the chief steward, I got to spend the day with him going around the shop. He told me he wouldn't cite the company for any serious violation, since they could not reasonably be expected to correct it, and we found out the the average OSHA fine against GE was \$17.00. At lunch I reported this to the union, spoke about the connection between the government and the bosses and showed, as we had done

10

before that, if we wanted anything we would have to do it ourselves.

making political analysis is crucial since most union meetings I have attended are marked by a lack of political discussion and when things don't go well can easily lead to cynicism. Political understanding can help direct the anger into a good direction.

The 14 international unions that are negotiating with GE held a series of ~~grass~~ ^{grass} root meetings around the country so rank and file members could tell the international reps. what we wanted in the next contract. Our union brought about a dozen people to the meeting, and we presented a 30-40 resolution.

The reaction of the union officials was just about the same as the companies response would be--they argued against it. The good result of this was that we heard the echos from the meeting for a week later. Our proposal was talked about in many shops, and one member told us her hairdresser told her she heard about it. (This stuff really does mushroom). Our local sent the CBC (the board made up of all the union) ^{a letter} telling them that we thought the meeting was a joke.

The next major struggle started over a racist remark by one of the foreman. Here we did something that we hadn't done before. The union put out a leaflet discussing the incident, explaining how racism hurts, and demanding that the foreman apologize and the company guarantee that it won't happen again. The union put out another leaflet on the average of about 4 days apart. This struggle got us the best results to date: we forced a half apology out of the company, which nobody is satisfied with, we won the right to have the person whose grievance we are fighting ^{for} be in the meeting with the boss, and most important 13 people, ^{3/4 of them black,} joined the union within 2 days after the first leaflet. Many people

Union membership is now about 90%.

11

were showing the leaflet to friends of their in other shops around the city. This struggle allowed us to raise the idea of fighting racism, the need for unity, why you need to ^{Stand} up to the boss and by doing that you can win, etc. The company is now trying to take back some of our gains by pushing racism more. What they are doing is upgrading minority workers ahead of white workers with more seniority. The result of this is many white workers have a bad reaction to it. GE says they understand the problem but the government is "forcing" them to do it. The fact that this came right after our anti-racism campaign dulled the racism somewhat since we were able to point out it was another way GE was trying to split us up again. In the longer range however, it will be necessary to build a campaign FBR preferential hiring. We are going to start having discussions about it in the union meetings, the steward meetings (which I lead), and by putting out union leaflets about it.

There are a number of important things that I have learned from doing this work. The biggest thing is that the romanticism that I had about the working class is being replaced by a clearer understanding of the political weaknesses and struggles that need to be launched before a revolution can take place. The workers do not automatically jump at the most militant plan that is put forward. Liberalism has held people at my plant back in some cases. Even as little a thing as going into the boss with a petition signed by all of us or going in without the petition at first, required that we have a special meeting at the plant gate to discuss politics involved. Many very good members thought going in at first with the petition would only serve to antagonize the boss.

12

When we began to fight for plant safety issues some people put the idea forward that if we try to get too much GE will just shut the plant down. A bigger problem still is that the strike 3 years ago left many people unwilling to strike again. They were on strike for 3 months and got the same contract the international rejected at first. ^{To} ~~For~~ them, ~~because~~ they lost during the last strike, rather than gained. We are going to try to put out a national WAM-GE leaflet that deals with this last question. Briefly, if we give up the strike, GE or any company will see no need to give us anything, and in fact, there will be no ^{thing} ~~obstacle~~ ^{Keep} to them ~~taking away anything we have gained in the past.~~ ^{About} The other two examples I gave ^(the petition & the plant shutting down) we defeated those ideas thru discussion and by actually trying them and seeing that they didn't work. The point is, though, that you cannot assume a political understanding.

In some cases ^u because of the relationship to the means of production it will be alot sharper, but ^{in those cases,} ~~it is~~ the bosses will try to push their ideology that much harder. Another point that is important is that most of these things are bread and butter to those involved, and people will not just jump unless they are won to the correctness of it.

So far, what I have tried to point out are the positive developments, and some of the potential that exists in doing this work. There are however some ^a weaknesses that have developed at times that are worthwhile discussing.

One weakness was not getting the local to endorse 30-40

13

as a main demand sooner and to set up a 30-40 committee sooner-- right after the grassroots meeting. We have now done it, and the 30-40 committee will serve to reach out to other unions and locals with the program of 30-40. This committee is serving as the core of a TU 30-40 committee in the city-wide WAM chapter. If this had been done sooner and in a formal way, this aspect of WAM would be more developed by now.

Another weakness was lack of putting the party forward. People on the job know about PL, some Challenges are sold or given away, and one worker is in a PL study group, but it is sometimes easy to forget that our main purpose is to win people to revolutionary politics and not just to be better union members.

It is very important to learn all about the contract, about union procedures, about filing grievances, the laws that you may need to use, etc., and not just dismiss them with a wave of the hand or think that people are going to shut down the plant at the slightest provocation. But it's easy to fall into a trade union rut, not putting forward a vanguard or independent line, forgetting to build PL and the necessity for a communist party. As the demands get bigger and bigger, it's much harder to get what you want within the laws or the contract, and people have to be progressing along so that they see the need to break those parts of the contract that are screwing them. They won't get this understanding unless we help give it to them. It is real important to keep pointing out the victories the union has won in the past and to use them as a rallying point to go on. And if this is not done all the time, (remember the company is trying to undermine the work all the time) it is real easy to lose it all or have the people become cynical about the new leaders (us) too. Always building the party, thinking

14
about how to do it will help insure that temporary losses can be built upon.

The limited work that has been done so far seems to prove that the party's line on building the TU work is correct. As the work has started to grow in my shop, we are able to carry on the work in many other trade union meetings, and put forward ideas such as 30-40. The outline and plan in Build Rank and File Caucuses seems not only to be correct but a real possibility, although a very big task. The unions represent the best way now for us to reach the mass of workers and get them involved with PL. The work in my shop has helped to bring people into the city-wide WAM chapter, and has helped to build WAM. The 30-40 committee will help to build WAM even more. The ideas that we push in my local are getting spread to other shops and other locals. People from my shop show our leaflets around to their friends, many of them in other unions..

It would seem that this work can really expand and grow and can reach areas that at the beginning you can't anticipate. Much more time and effort needs to be put into this work to make sure that it can develop like it should.

Does GE ¹⁵ mean Equal Opportunity???

On Tuesday May 6, members of Local 786 went to a second level grievance meeting about the charge of racial insults against Foreman Henry Holton. We wanted a written apology from GE and a statement saying this won't happen again and discrimination was against the policy at GE.

WHAT HAPPENED?

Deeken said that we were creating a mountain out of a mole hill, and giving the statement a meaning it didn't have.

How many ways can this statement be interpreted? "You cannot explain anything to a Mexican and make them understand because they are so hard headed." We believe the only way is as an insult. It is not a joke, or a misinterpretation. We believe that Henry Holton knew exactly what he said, and that he meant what he said.

We asked for a written apology, which Deeken refused, and a statement assuring us that this behavior won't happen in the future. / Deeken said that he wouldn't give us any such assurance, that he couldn't control his foreman's behavior, and when we asked what if it happened again he said we'll cross that bridge when we come to it.

WHAT DOES THIS ALL MEAN?

We think that the refusal to apologise and give us a statement against discrimination means that Deeken and GE has no intention of stopping these actions. Playing one group of workers against another means we are split up and can't unite together to get what we need. We can't fall for these tricks. We must get together and unite together to get what we all want and deserve.
IUE Local 786 labor freely doanted

16
Challenge, what's its role?

May 17, 1973

A lot of articles for the pre-convention discussions have been written about the paper. Left wing, right wing, opportunists, etc. But little has been discussed about the relation that the paper has to building the party and the mass movement and ^{the} communist international movement based on our most important theory...RRIII. One of the main points that we learned from the old communist movement was its failure to rely on the masses of workers and failure to make M-L a daily guide for the party cadre and masses. We say we want to start correcting these mistakes now. For example, a few years ago the staff of Challenge was out from approx. 10 full-timers to maybe 2 or 3. We wanted a broad section of party members and friends to participate in writing stories, analysis, getting interviews, taking pictures, selling the paper, etc. Bylines no longer appear. We said that names of individuals who write articles was not necessary in a communist paper. Although this doesn't automatically lessen the reliance on a few good or ambitious or hard working people, it does give us a chance to struggle for broader participation in putting out ^{lit.} and developing the party through its press. This is a revolutionary phenomenon. Lenin argued for a highly trained professional staff to work on Iskra. Whether they would be paid or not is unclear but basically a specialized group. Is this what we should have? It would probably go a long way towards correcting some of the errors, improving the layout, and providing more time to research facism, etc. ..therefore making some of the needed changes that have been suggested. Some may say that it doesn't matter ~~what~~ what number of people ^{are} needed to solely work on the paper. "the main thing is having a good paper that people will accept, and besides if the line is correct, why be concerned whether the paper is the work of the whole party and friends or a specialized group"?

2.

17

But if the paper reflects the work of the party and the writers and interviews are few, then those who ~~eventually~~ keep fighting for the line and goals of the party will dwindle to a few in the long run even if the membership is in the hundreds of thousands. The article in bulletin #5 on democracy in the party is concerned about more people in the party helping to develop the party's line and policy, but the suggestion about elected leaders won't insure participation. There is no easy way, but broad participation from the party cadre in building Challenge can develop all of us into better communists. Everyone knows when we discuss writing a Challenge article collectively or putting out a pamphlet, we benefit from the experience. (providing the line we come up with is correct or we stand to be corrected if it is not)

So in practice, we should realize that the paper improves as we improve our struggle around RRIII. The role of Challenge is to fight for RRIII....reliance on the people and broadening socialist consciousness, fight revisionism, racism, nationalism and fight for internationalism. We should be able to eventually have hundreds of people, party members and non-party friends, turning in cartoons, stories and interviews. The non party workers and students should be recruited because they will see Challenge as part of building the new communist movement. What better way is there to fight the cynicism towards communist revolution and the "they will sell out in the end", attitude in ourselves and others?

All this is not to say that we should be satisfied with the paper until we can do better ^{base building} next year or sometime later. We can always do better immediately and the paper has been improving. We should have people whose main responsibility is the paper but they ~~are~~ also should be involved in 30-40 campaigns, selling the paper and mass struggles. The staff in NY does these things to my knowledge and should keep doing them.

The leadership the staff and other leadership (NY, area, editorial and circulation leadership) gives does involve others, but the leadership of these groups is key. This shouldn't be overlooked.

3.

(18)

The last point is that we should be more aware of pointing out to people we sell the paper to, the relationship of many of the articles to RRIII. In other words, what articles show the fighting militance of the working class despite revisionism, racism, cynicism and nationalism? Does it matter to the workers of Angola or London that Nixon went to China? Maybe? But what about the class struggle? Did Mao and Nixon stop that? What's the significance in the party organizing the WAM convention without pushing for black or Latin or women's caucuses? Or the significance of having a conference of nearly 600 workers at a time when some say that people are dissoluted. This conv. was basically organized by PL not the Demo. party and people knew this and came to offer ideas but mainly to unite with communist leadership. Our ideas in RRIII about M-L leadership, relying on the masses and base building are key here but too often we make things too complicated and can't see the obvious and therefore don't struggle with ourselves and others about the importance of Challenge and RRIII.

John H.
SF

May 10, 1973

May Day

(19)

The May Day dinner here was well attended, proximately 300 adults. Some bought tickets and did not attend. People in general seemed to like the program of xxx songs, poems of struggle, a skit, a speech from a rep. of the farm workers union staff and a speech by the party rep. There was plenty of food, displays, etc. I feel that some of the enthusiasm of past May Day week-ends was missing. Part of the reason, I think was the lack of a demonstration or march, some event that we have to org. the real fighting back movement and spirit of workers and students. We made an estimate that because a session of the labor movement in the area was calling a protest rally on April 28th against phase III, unemployment, etc., and that many thousands of workers would come and therefore we should build all out to have contingents from WAM, 30-40 referendum coalition, and PL. We felt that to have our separate demonstration as originally planned would be isolating and bad. Also if we wanted to have the original April 28th demonstration on another day, say May 1st, something would be missing in the plans for all three things. We felt that we couldn't adequately build for the April 28th labor rally, the May Day dinner and another demon. on May 1st, all to be done within four days of each other. Anyway we made a decision in favor of the labor demonstration and the dinner. The labor rally was attended by about 2000. About 60 of our forces were there with C-D, WAM lit., and 30-40 petitions, tables of lit, etc. We did ok in terms of sales, signatures, contacts, and agitation but I think we misestimated the willingness of some of these union officials to mobilize workers for such a demonstration even though they probably would be able to control it temporarily. Or maybe they didn't want to take the chance of possibly not being able to control it. Also we should have been able to gather from people on the job what the general response was. We knew that most people were in favor of a protest but didn't realize that thousands were not going to be downtown that sat. at the rally. I think in the back of our minds that we were hoping that this was going to be a somewhat magical event that would turn out thousands, we could hit them with our ideas once we were all there and presto! a base. Needless to say this was all fantasy.

Also, the failure to build Wam, was responsible for the lack of groups of workers attending the dinner, say, from a particular industry or job. Did we have a group from such and such a caucus? No, because they don't really exist. There were workers from some jobs and workers who were personal friends but there was areal lack of people from daily struggles. The exceptions were friends in struggles from teachers, office, 30-40 and student work. If we don't build struggles around WAM, caucuses, or 30-40 committees at the hospitals, phone co., and make contacts at the auto factories and others, we will never consistently be able to bring those workers into May Day activities, party groups or the party itself.

The fact that the week-end was as successful as it was still demon. the power of our communist ideas, and our limited efforts to put the ideas in practice, accomplishes some results but still not enough. Workers and students buy C-D when we sell it, buy subs when we ask, fight the boss on their own and, when we lead in a communist way, fight even harder and better; join WAm, study-action groups and the party when we struggle, and give money when we ask.

We want to have a bigger and better May Day next year because we will be struggling to build WAM, caucuses, the fight against racism, the fight for 30-40 and the party this year.

John Davis

20

May 4, 1973

West Coast Party members
re: Sept. 29-30 WAM conv.

We should be making specific plans right now for the Sept. WAM convention. To start later will be too late. In the Bay Area we are making plans to basically rebuild WAM. Because of the failure of the leadership to consistently struggle to build the organization and because we had let WAM become buried in the Shorter Work Week Coalition, we have to almost start from scratch. We had a meeting of the TU section about WAM and there seems to be a good feeling of commitment towards building WAM on a bigger and better basis. Before we had isolated one so-called WAM club to the task. This was a bad approach and we weren't serious about the role that such an organization could play in fighting for 30-40 and rebuilding the labor movement around our TU program. Now, the entire non-student section (and even them in some cases-campus workers and others) of the party should be committed to building WAM, with the TU section taking the lead. Over the past year we have made more ties with workers on and off the job in this area and throughout the coast. This is reflected in the May Day marches and dinners and other functions. But we have not gone a long way toward consolidating our ties. We need a LEFT group of workers who are organized to daily fight around a program like WAM's. This goes a long way towards the goal of rank and file power and socialism. WAM is not meant to take the place of the unions but to provide the politics and organization for activists to go beyond pure trade unionism. In this sense, many who are first attracted to WAM may not see how 30-40 can be won or how workers can take the unions back. So this is the role that we play as party members and others trying to build WAM. We want to show how being a part of WAM can accomplish these things. This means being committed beyond a rank and file caucus or 30-40 committee. People in these groups (some) should be in WAM or in some cases being in WAM can lead to the formation of a caucus or committee.

Each area should make sure that adequate leadership is being given to building for the convention. As we said earlier this wasn't done in the Bay Area. Now we are trying to change. Bill W. is not in student work now but will be working full time on the conv. John H., Ken E. and others in leadership will primarily be working to build WAM and the conv. This means lots of hard work for all of us but we can do it. The conv. in N.Y. was living proof of the correctness of our line re: WAM and the approach to workers in general. The ruling class and their revisionist friends must be shaking in their boots. We should make a plan to use the articles in C-D and the next WAM newsletter about the conv. in our clubs and study groups right away so we understand the politics and will be better prepared to take these articles and newsletters to people we are trying to win to WAM and the conv. This should be done right away.

Regular WAM meetings and events should be guaranteed in each area. For example, a WAM meeting is planned for SF and Berkeley each, next week. A picnic is planned for Memorial Day week-end. At least one city wide event other than a meeting should be held every month. This could include film showings, picket lines, dinners, etc.

We should also concentrate on strengthening one of our major weaknesses while building WAM, that is winning workers to the party from the TU section. Building WAM helps us do this but it's not magical. More party study groups of workers should come out of our work. Lets learn from the N.Y. conv. --- Build WAM, the WAM conv. and the party!!!!

John

(21) for internal bulletin
Pre-Convention

MAKE CHALLENGE A MASS REVOLUTIONARY PAPER

We are in the mass movement and work in reform groups as a tactic to:

1. Increase class consciousness of the masses to raise the level of class struggle.
2. Win needed reforms when possible to make our lives a little better and to unify the working class.
3. Build a base for the party with our goal being the destruction of the capitalist system by the only means possible, a violent revolution, and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Any revisionist party or organization can accomplish the first two points--the C.P. in the 1930's is living proof. The last point #3 makes PLP a truly communist party serving the people and separates us from the revisionists. The best means possible to keep PLP on course towards a violent revolution is to always increase Challenge sales with the paper maintaining the party's revolutionary, non-revisionist line.

Developing a mass presence of the party by the use of Challenge will help recruitment in all sections of the party. Increased Challenge sales will aid in defeating revisionism within our party by: 1) Proving once again that workers do respond to our party and its line. Not to increase paper sales is to make the revisionist concession that workers can not be won to the party. 2) Building the mass movement by offering a non-capitalist ideology that can help the mass movement fight the bourgeoisie and rid itself of the revisionists and opportunists. With the use of Challenge the party can assist in the solving of the negative contradictions within the reform movement (racism, male chauvinism, worker vs. student antagonisms, etc.). If Challenge and the party are absent from the mass movement, the masses will not be learning the valuable lessons about the nature of the state and capitalism. Only PLP through its mass organ Challenge can point the way to the liberation of the working class--the dictatorship of the proletariat. No one else is doing it.

To build the mass movement, to defeat revisionism within our own ranks, and to educate the masses politically, Challenge must always put forward that any reform movement (including 30 for 40) can be taken away from us by the bourgeoisie until we finally put an end to their class rule.

22

PLP is based on the principle of struggle. Many of us have joined the party because some comrades dared to struggle with us over certain views we held before we joined the party. In the same vein Challenge should be an organ of struggle. The line of the party should be presented sharply but in a friendly way. The desired result sometimes should be to raise eyebrows. We should present our party as possessing very clear class hatred. On this point we should ~~NE~~ never be apologetic. The ruling class is a vicious gang of killers who must be destroyed. Challenge readers should have to think twice about some of the things that the party believes to be correct. Although they may not agree initially people will be ~~WMM~~ won over a period of time because what we say will coincide with their experiences.

Challenge should let its readers know what PLP thinks on contemporary issues. Fuller discussion within the party is needed about questions such as the Equal Rights Amendment, the free abortion movement, Nixon's budget cuts, etc. What are the progressive aspects if any to the fights on these issues? What is outright reactionary? I don't feel that I as a party member can put forward a position of the party on these issues. I think Challenge should have immediately attacked the reactionary leaders of the meat boycott who resided in the rich suburbs. Imagine that the bourgeois press actually tries to make Ethel Rosen of Winnetka, Ill--3rd richest city in the U.S. as a leader of the people. The trots think the boycott is wonderful and the C.P probably does too. We should clearly separate ourselves from the revisionists who tail after the mass movement.

One final point to consider. If we abandon Challenge as a revolutionary paper, we have abandoned the working class. Who else will tell the masses the world is divided into classes? Who will expose the capitalist state, the revisionists and opportunists currently misleading the mass movement? Who will display the real class hatred necessary to smash the ruling class? Who will offer the alternative of socialism? No one else will be there! More people will die and the masses will be forced to live under the intolerable conditions of capitalism for that much longer. PLP is the only party that right now can advance the struggle for socialism in the U.S. Challenge is our main tool. Make Challenge a mass revolutionary paper!

A Chicago Comrade

23

INTERNAL LETTER ON THE COMING STRUGGLE IN AUTO:

May 16

Yesterday at a meeting among Milt, Wally, Chris (Chicago) and Walt (Detroit), we discussed and proposed the following to advance our work in auto:

An analysis of current events in auto apparently revealed that the UAW leadership is even more docile than usual in keeping quiet about demands, a possible strike (they're talking "no strike this year"), and especially on wages. No one appears to be coming forward with any program nor with any strategy for the contract battle. ~~There~~ There also is lurking in the background the possibility of following the steel sell-out pattern, of a no-strike agreement in advance, of trying to sneak it over on the membership as Abel did in the USW. For all these reasons it becomes especially important for PLP and WAM to step into this vacuum of leadership and take bold steps to help give leadership to the rank and file. And this time around we have members and friends INSIDE the plants to carry out this struggle. PLP is already being attacked (see CHALLENGE-DESAFIO coming out this week).

The contract will expire in mid-Sept. That leaves barely 4 months. WE MUST GET STARTED RIGHT AWAY. Every week lost means that much more of a defeat for the workers and for the Party. Auto is our number one concentration nationally. We have made a modest advance here, with a number of members and friends ~~of~~ of PLP and WAM now working in the plants, in the union, in ~~the~~ committees, etc. Several auto workers have been recruited right out of the work into PLP, into study groups and even more into WAM (the four auto workers brought by our comrade from Local 420 in Cleveland ~~to~~ to the WAM Convention all joined WAM when they got back). We also have coordination between the Party and WAM in four cities--Detroit, Cleveland, Toronto, Mahwah. Based on the importance of this coming battle in auto and on the small increase in our forces here, we can try to do the following:

- (1) Organize an auto worker picket line of the UAW international headquarters in Detroit in June (either sponsored by WAM or by any united front of WAM + caucuses + 30/40 committees, etc.).
- (2) Local leaflets put out by groups of workers we can organize in each plant or department calling on the leadership to come ~~up~~ up with a plan, strategy, etc. for a strike, and DEMANDING TO KNOW THE NATURE OF THE DEMANDS.
- (3) WAM leaflets at every plant exposing any possible sellout in advance, putting forward a program built around 30/40, and spelling out other demands (no compulsory overtime, etc.). Call on workers to join WAM and organize the rank and file for a strike at all the Big Three.
- (4) Organize symbolic picketing at close of each shift, against specific company practices which weaken chances of winning a strike (overtime to ~~making~~ stockpile cars, ~~speed~~ speed-up to do the same thing), asking workers to join the line as they leave the plant, to demonstrate to the company that the workers are preparing for a big fight. Demands could be raised in signs carried.
- (5) TIE ALL ACTIONS AROUND GRIEVANCES, FIRINGS, ETC. TO A COMING STRIKE. Anything that the company does from now on should be pointed to as having an effect on winning or losing at contract time. And any-

24
thing the rank and file does in retaliation (or takes the offensive on, such as slowdowns, etc.) should be tied to strengthening the workers for the contract struggle. Nothing that happens from here on in should be allowed to be viewed as just something isolated, ins and of itself. Company victories on firings, harassment, etc. = weakening the workers. Rank-and-file fight-back + organizing for a strike = strengthening the workers' hand.

(6) Unity with all other workers striking in the area between now and Sept., so that the basis for their support of auto workers is established for Sept. Especially true for auto worker support of GE, postal, and teamsters if strikes occur in those unions. This could answer the UAW Woodcock that we can't have strike because the strike fund is "depleted." We'll get our support from other workers, who we are giving our support to in the next four months.

(7) Raise demands and call for strike at every union meeting. If no meetings, ~~get~~ circulate petitions according to union by-laws calling for special meetings. The act of spreading these petitions in itself becomes a form of preparing for a strike and militant fight for demands.

The Party should:

(1) Publish a pamphlet on the auto industry, citing facts and figures, putting forward the Party's entire line in auto (to be done in Detroit, by June) and sold in thousands of copies for a nickel or 10¢.

(2) Put out a flyer on strategy building for a strike--a PLP flyer--based on the two articles on auto strike strategy in C-D--to be finished and shopped in two weeks and distributed in U.S. and Canada (a joint PLP/CPL flyer?). (To be written by Wally in NY)

(3) Intensify C-D sales ~~x~~ inside plants and at plant gates.

(4) Articles in C-D IN EVERY ISSUE FROM NOW ON, adding up to an auto page in the paper--reports from the plants, analysis, struggles, etc. This would really make it that much more important to sell the paper to auto workers.

(5) A People's Tribune every so often among auto workers, starting with questions like what would you want in the next contract, what do you think of the way the UAW leadership is "leading", how do you propose to beat the companies, etc.

(6) Have a meeting with PLP/CPL representatives from Detroit, Toronto, Cleveland and Mahwah in Detroit on Sunday, May 27 ~~(PLP/CPL)~~ ~~representatives~~ to plan much of the above, especially the picketing of UAW; and to discuss how to organize any or all of the other proposed ideas and actions, as well as come up with others to do. This meeting should also set up future week-to-week coordination and become responsible for regular internal bulletins reporting progress to the whole party.

35
All this could be aided by periodic Party-wide mobilizations in support of the auto workers as the contract expiration draws near. Tie-ins can be made to struggles of auto workers going on in other countries.

Six months from now we should have a circulation of many thousands (specific figures can be determined by the PL/CPL intern'l committee), many more ~~in~~ auto workers in party study groups, and a number recruited into the Party. A WAM organization of hundreds of auto workers could be built out of this struggle.

The auto workers, WAM and the Party can emerge from this battle infinitely stronger than what we are now. A COMMUNIST BASE CAN BE ESTABLISHED IN THE AUTO INDUSTRY AND UAW THAT THE RULING CLASS WILL FIND IT IMPOSSIBLE TO DISLODGE AND PREVENT FROM GROWING STILL FURTHER.

26

May 7, 1973

Bay Area study-action groups

Not much has changed since the April 8th meeting.* Two of the groups in Berkeley had a combined and expanded meeting to hear a report on the short history of the party and how we were involved in the Cuba trips, HUAC hearings, etc. Two SF 30-40 groups also did this. Most people in the groups invited others and people were generally excited about the sessions. One union member in one of the classes, after hearing the report about PL invited someone from the party to come speak to his union. (this person was invited to the group by a friend in the group). We should follow this up with WAM. The recruiting group is planning an expanded meeting the first week of June about PL.

The main thing to accomplish, say, in the next two months is to involve the groups more in the daily life of the party. For example we should have reports from the WAM conv. and plans for WAM in this area discussed in the groups, not just in the party clubs. This is the biggest undertaking for the party in the next period and the struggles in the study-action groups should be a part of that. People in the groups should be clear why we want to build WAM, what is the significance of the Sept. 29-30 conv., why is 30-40 the strategy, etc. Some of these questions have been discussed but only to the extent that we in the party were committed in the past, which was not enough. Also more regular contributions to the party and C-D selling should be discussed during the meetings and between meetings. People in two of the groups were asked to give money to the party for the first time about four weeks ago during an emergency fund drive. They all came through with no problems. They were glad to give and wondered why they weren't asked before. Now some must be wondering why they haven't been asked since. Unless we systematically take up every one of these struggles many strong fighters who will build WAM, SDS, and the party will slip through or only hang around the class struggle. This will basically be our fault.

The FBI has visited two members of the study groups in the last four weeks. Non party members. On both occasions they (fbi) tried to warn the people to stay away from PL ("they have criminal records") and wanted to know who was behind the 30-40 campaign. Of course their attempts failed and both people told them to get lost. The ruling class knows the power of M-L and job it can do on them. Sometimes we hold back our ideas and the faith that we and others will become stronger through struggle. The study-action groups are places to start changing these attitudes.

* i.e. no new groups or new people in the regular groups

John

to Jim D.

.....all Bay Area party members

27

May 2, 1973

From now until at least the party convention John H. will be responsible for the Challenge sales. There has been lots and lots of talk recently about improving sales but very little concrete struggles leading to real changes. The S.F. student club and one or two of the 30-40 clubs have made some slight progress but the overall situation is little better than a joke. The sales among the T.U. clubs are the worst.

A regular selling schedule will be gotten from everyone. Yes we've made schedules before and they were not carried out for the most part. Part of the reason was that struggle stopped after the schedules were made. If a person doesn't make an appointment, for example, to sell the paper at Kaiser hospital at 3:45 on Wed....why.. what happened? We want to know. All this is assuming that everybody wants to sell the paper. At least that what we all say in the clubs and classes. We are all very self-critical. If there are people who really don't want to sell the paper, then that's another story. We want to increase the sales to 3,000 by the convention. Each club will be assigned a suggested quota. The club collectively should figure out how to reach the quota and even exceed it. This effort should be lead by the club leader and everyone else in the club. If the club leader isn't giving leadership, someone else should.

.....

-we should have a bullhorn and signs rally at least once per issue. This would usually be every other Fri. (4:30-6pm.) The circulation committee and some members of the leadership class should make more specific plans to coordinate this. The next C-D rally or rallies should be Fri. May 11. The last rally on 16th & Mission was about May Day. We had signs, speakers, etc. Those of us there sold over 100 papers with the help of the cop harrasment. We should all MOBOLIZE every Fri. after work or school to sell. The committee should pick the best places and let people know where to go. But don't just sit and wait on a call; take some initiative. We should also sell still on Sat. where it doesn't interfere with petitioning. Nobody petitions all day. For example some people in the outer mission sell at Albertsons at 11:30 for an hr. and then petition other places for a couple of hours.

-regular leaflets will be coming out to be used at the selling places. this should help the sale of the paper. We will be putting up C-D posters all around town in order to help raise the visibility of the paper ...in other words its around and we want everybody to know it and read it.

-when the clubs discuss this bulletin and organize schedules thought should be given to who else can be won to sell and leaflet and poster. There are usuall at least 2 or 3 more non-party people around each club who will sell or do other things with the paper if we make a plan and pursue it.

-finally, be bolder in using the paper to build the party and the efforts of the party... like the 30-40 campaign, SDS, and especially WAM and the WAM conv. for Sept. There are WAM cards that can be taken along while selling. These can be filled out on the spot by those interested. These cards will be at the C-D pick up places.

Steering committee

28

MAY 10, 1973

TO ALL MEMBERS BAY AREA PLP:

This is to give notice that Scott Appel has been suspended from membership in the party by the hospital club of which he formerly was a member. He has been suspended for extreme male chauvinism, which included becoming involved in serious relationships with two women simultaneously, one of whom is married. He has agreed to all the criticisms of himself and also agreed with the decision to suspend him. At the club meeting he was very self-critical about his weaknesses. However, he has never written a self-criticism although he has been asked repeatedly, and has repeatedly agreed to do so.

It was the intention of the club to propose certain definite changes that Scott make in his political work, in his corrupt relationships with ~~women~~ women, and in dealing with his isolation from and his arrogant attitude toward people; in this way we hoped he would eventually rejoin the party. However the position paper which Scott wrote attacking the party--instead of the self-criticism he was supposed to write--makes it impossible for us to work together, and casts into question the honesty of his self-criticism.

Scott says that although he has his disagreements, he wishes to continue to work with the party. We hope he will do so, and that he will change his chauvinist and arrogant practices that undermine his political work, and that he will change his line which is using to justify these weaknesses.

It is important for all of us to look at this occurrence seriously. This behavior didn't come out of thin air. It resulted from Scott's failure to carry out the line of the party--the failure to build the party by fighting against racism and male chauvinism, by fighting to build the 30 for 40 movement and WAM, by selling Challenge and winning our co-workers to seeing the importance of it, by building lasting ties among the people. In short, if we don't take the ruling class and its ideas head on, then we are defeated by it. Our club takes this lesson very seriously and are struggling to improve our work which right now means first and foremost increasing our Challenge sales, especially hospital workers, and making 30 for 40 and WAM a force in the hospital unions.

SF. HOSPITAL CLUB

29

Preparations for May Day began one week after the National Committee Meeting of March 3 and 4, where the right wing trend in the party leadership was discussed and criticized. The city leadership in Los Angeles agreed that the decline in Challenge sales, subs and study groups did reflect a tendency to submerge the party's Communist line in the variety of organizations and struggles that the members were involved in.

To combat this trend, we agreed that the party itself should be much more open and publicly identified with the major reform struggles in the city. We mapped out a plan to build May Day with a march along the main downtown streets to protest the Rodino Bill and to advance the fight for a shorter work week. This plan had two aspects. On the one hand to involve every club and member in street rallies every week, where party members analyse and attack the Rodino Bill, linking this attack to 30-for-40 and ultimately to the need for socialist revolution.

On some Saturdays two or three such rallies were held in different parts of town. Wherever possible, loudspeakers were used. Many papers were sold. Leaflets about the march were distributed and even some tickets for the party's May Day Dinner were sold in this way. Challenge sales at the street rallies ranged as high as 340 in one two-hour meeting. The party also held four public forums in Los Angeles and San Diego.

The second aspect of the plan was to try and develop a coalition with sympathetic organizations to co-sponsor the march. A coalition called the Los Angeles Committee Against the Rodino Bill was formed. Four meetings were held at the headquarters of La Raza Unida party, which joined the coalition. In addition, the Congreso Obrero, a newly formed workers' organization, based on rank-and-file led struggles in Local 500 Furniture Workers and Local 300 Laborers' Union became a co-sponsor. Finally, a small UCLA campus union, Local 2070 of AFSCME, unanimously endorsed the march, as well as a student radical group called Fanshen.

The struggle against the Rodino Bill, which will have a disastrous effect on 250,000 workers in Los Angeles alone, got a big boost from the effort to build this march. Many people including the direct victims of the Bill were unaware of it back in March. In three weeks we distributed 20,000 leaflets and put up hundreds of posters. Three ads appeared in La Opinion, the Spanish-language daily. In addition, La Opinion carried three articles sympathetic to the struggle against the bill, and

30

mentioning the link to the shorter work week struggle. The call for the march was carried as a front-page letter to the editor in five English-language community newspapers on the east side, and the Sentinel, a newspaper in the black community. Two Spanish-language radio stations carried free announcements every hour for four days prior to the 28th. Finally, two party members and a representative of the Congreso Obrero went on a two-hour radio talk show on Thursday, the 26th.

More than 300 people marched on the 28th in a highly spirited sidewalk parade. One group of 15 workers representing 350 strikers at an L.A. plant joined the march. They are stroking for a union contract, and we have since been involved in their struggle with the company and the leadership of the laborers' local that represents them.

May Day achieved a number of good things:

1. It made the struggle against the Rodino Bill much more of a public issue.
2. It broadened the party's base and militant reputation. A number of new workers were won to study groups and Challenge selling.
3. It exposed the reactionary character of the Communist Party.

The revisionists, in alliance with some nationalists, went all out to attack the march. CASA, a fraternal organization that purports to defend the illegal aliens, but which is led by Bert Corona, an old CP-affiliated hack, currently the darling of their People's World banquet circuit, launched an all-out attack on the march.

First, they refused an invitation to participate in the coalition. They circulated rumors that a leading PLP member of the coalition was a policeman. Then they attacked the Farmworkers organizers in the coalition as traitors to the union because they had linked up with PLP and with Anglos. Seven United Farmworker Union organizers and workers in Los Angeles headed up the parade on the 28th and their representative spoke at the rally.

When pressure from other members of the coalition began to grow, CASA reversed field and said that they would participate but that they would not attend any meetings at La Raza Unida party headquarters.

31

Finally, in an act of desperation, CASA went on the air during the talk show before the march and urged the community not to participate in the march because:

1. "SDS, a sponsor, was responsible for all the violence on campus".
2. "PLP was responsible for the Chicano Moratorium violence".
3. "The shorter work week would only benefit the middle class and government bureaucrats".
4. "The march is bound to be attacked. There will be arrests".
5. The organizers of the march were outsiders with foreign ideologies.
6. "The representatives of the PLP say that the government sows confusion among the people. In fact, however, it is the way the PLP has pulled off the trick (of organizing this coalition) that has really created confusion".

Throughout the week before the march, the CP organizer on campus helped circulate this police line coming out of CASA. At UCLA they lied, claiming that Local 2070 had not endorsed the march. This lie was also repeated on radio.

The cowardly Communist Party has a long history of siding with the police department whenever the class struggle begins to warm up a bit. In the 1964 Harlem uprising, CP leaders went on TV in New York City to join Mayor Wagner in denouncing the PLP and, by implication, the people.

The attacks on the highly successful struggle and march against the Rodino Bill on May Day were taken straight out of the HUAC manual on PLP or quoted directly from some of J. Edgar Hoover's releases on "internal subversion and SDS".

The police-type attacks on the coalition and the march backfired completely. The CP and the clique of nationalists they are currently promoting were exposed. The PLP came out with many new friends and a step ahead in the struggle against Rodino.

In evaluation of May Day, the following criticisms were made.

32

1. With a few exceptions there was little representation of organized trade union caucuses or committees.
2. Very few black workers or students participated, indicating a serious shortcoming in the party's base.

The party got a big boost from May Day overall. We are now turning our attention to building WAM and preparing for the West Coast WAM Convention in late September.

33

May 22

Dear Comrades,

Just a note on the reporting of various worker/union struggles going on around us which we don't seem to either know about or have a relation to. In reading the bosses' press--Wall Street Journal, NY Times, U.S. News, Daily World, Workers' League Bulletin--we've come across various events about which there is nothing in C-D. For instance:

--Goodrich Strike (& possible Goodyear wildcat rebellion against sellout settlement). While we asked Cleveland members to interview workers at Akron (what about WAM strike support activity), there are Goodyear plants in L.A. and other cities (and dealers in all cities)--so far we've received nothing about the strike + heard of no action on our part. We could have rewritten bosses' press stories into C-D, but why?

--Teamster contract proposals, especially the agreement of the Chicago local leadership not to "leap-frog" over it this time and force it upwards, as they've done in the past. It looks like a Fitzsimmons-Nixon deal to keep things (and the freeze) under wraps.

--Steel rumblings against the Abel no-strike sellout. While we had what essentially was a re-write of a PL Gary leaflet on the contract, we've had nothing since. And there are reports that some locals have taken the initiative to vote it down, even though this has no bearing, "technically" on its taking effect. It might be a good move to introduce it, though, where we are.

--Auto--Virtually nothing from Detroit, where the work seems to be going forward (C-D sales way up, participation in strikes--of which nothing in C-D) nothing about what's going on in Cleveland, aftermath of WAM Convention, etc.; Fremont, Calif. local had a rally of 300 outside GM plant (which we used to work in and presumably have friends in) allegedly organized by a large "Brotherhood Caucus" (which may be no better than the leadership, but meanwhile we know nothing about it one way or the other). We've ~~been~~ started to insure articles coming out of Mahwah, hopefully in every issue.

--So. Calif Teamster strike in 7 Van & Moving Men locals rejected Fitzsimmons' call for approval of contract and voted it down, continuing strike of several thousand. Any Teamster rebellion in Calif. is particularly relevant in light of Fitzsimmons' treachery against farmworkers and attempt (failing?) to get rank-and-file Teamsters to back it.

--ILWU convention and possibly repeating Abel sellout in that union, no-strike contract, differences settled by arbitration, etc. by July 1 expiration date.

Now, this is not to say 1) that we have no t.u. ~~struggle~~ struggle articles in C-D (and some analysis, but mostly written in NYC), nor 2) that we aren't active in various locals, etc. GE stuff for WAM and ~~in~~ C-D will be coming in from Houston, hopefully steel from Chi/Gary, etc. and a lot of this ~~stuff~~ reflects ~~our~~ ACTION in which we're involved (hospital in

NYC, etc.), And, of course, we put a lot of energy into the WAM Convention and now, hopefully in spreading WAM and new chapters, etc. But it would seem that some of these struggles ^{is} just what the WAM and PL members should be spreading into or analysing. Maybe I've become too ~~involved~~ involved in NYC t.u. work to the detriment of keeping up with national t.u. stuff (although I am trying to keep up with auto and GE nationally, and pushing forward in those two areas). But it does seem there's something lacking in leadership given to the t.u. work, especially in the larger PL areas, AS IT RELATES TO OTHER T.U. EVENTS AROUND US, AND ESPECIALLY WRITING ABOUT THEM, as well as as possibly moving WAM into action around them.

As the contradiction between the working class in the industrial capitalist countries and the bosses there sharpens, and especially in the U.S. where the ruling class' economic policies are in big trouble (the rubber strike and others, + possible ones coming up to break the intolerable wage freeze--even capitalist spokesmen say you can't expect workers to continue to take it while prices skyrocket, etc.)--as all this ~~happens~~ happens, we can't sit ~~on~~ on our ass or merely limit ourselves to our "own things." Rather we ~~we~~ should use the experiences and base that exists ~~where~~ where we are to extend and ~~x~~ expand to these other rumblings in the working class--and the NC members, especially, should write and analyse them. Maybe we could spend a few minutes ~~on~~ on this at the NC meeting.

Comradely,

Wally

P.S. We ARE participating in a black/t.u./leadership-led conference of 1200 black trade unionists in Wash., D.C. this week-end (and the D.C. club is ~~ix~~ involved in a gov't worker-union mass conference around their union demands also taking place in Wash. this week.

Progressive Labor Party is forming a discussion group against racism. In order to defeat the monstrous government attack on the working class and especially on minority workers, it is necessary to develop a concrete political strategy. The government pushes a million tricks to divide and oppress us---racist theoreticians in the schools, police terror in the community, speed-up on the job and the wage freeze and unemployment. It is especially the poisonous racist ideology that is taught in the schools which prevents us from uniting. The rulers hope to win over a whole generation of college students to racism.

But workers are fighting back. It is the history of the world that oppressed people rise to battle the exploiters. Right now all over the world and in this country the battle rages on. But in order to win---to really crush racism once and for all we have to attack and overthrow the source of the problem---the ruling class. And we have to develop a clear understanding of how racism works---how it hurts all of us and how it can be defeated.

PLP is organizing this study group to develop our political understanding. We will be discussing how the U.S. government is consciously building racism in order to increase profits. We will study what the racist theories say to be in a better position to fight them and how communist leadership is necessary to destroy racism.

The discussion group will meet every two weeks throughout the summer. The agenda is a thorough examination of the government's racist offensive and a revolutionary strategy to defeat it. We invite everyone's active participation to make the group a success.

Meeting 1---May 20th

PLP's strategy in building an anti-racist student movement---the government's racist offensive and our answer. Building the fight against racism in Chicago---fighting Banfield and supporting Woodlawn Hospital strike.

Readings---"Racists on the run" PL magazine Jan 73.
"Worker-Student Alliance" section of SDS conference pamphlet.
"Social Engineers in Retreat" Fortune Oct 72.

Meeting 2---

The importance of the fight against academic racism

Readings---"Fighting the theories behind the practices" section of SDS conference pamphlet.

"How much can we boost Scholastic Achievement"- Harvard Ed. Review
Jensenist resolution and our counter resolution.

Meeting 3---

The history of government's racist attack

Reading----PLP article on eugenics

Dear reader columns on eugenics

Meeting 4---

What racist ideology leads to in practice---an examination of the medical field.

Readings---"Article on lobotomies"---Ebony Feb. 73

"Communist Doctor Debates Racist Beast of Willow brook"---PL mag.

articles on health conditions in Chicago.

Meeting 5---

The "lower class culture" argument

Readings----"The Unheavenly City", E. Banfield
The Unheavenly System Pamphlet
newspaper article from Chicago Sun-Times citing Banfield
as the reason not to build low-cost housing in white areas.

Meeting 6---

The international working class fights back against racist exploitation.

Readings---"Revolution Will Win" PL magazine
Articles from C-D about struggle in Europe esp. of immigrant workers
selected articles on the class struggle in the U.S.

Meeting 7---

Should academic racist be banned from campus?

Readings---Article in C-D on "muzzling the racists"
"Academic Freedom" section of SDS conference pamphlet
Herrnstein's article in Commentary attacking SDS

Meeting 8---

Progressive Labor Party's strategy for crushing racism by workers' revolution.

Readings----PLP Pamphlet on racism
Plp pamphlet on building rank and file power in the trade unions.
Lenin's "State and Revolution"

Chicago PLP Student Club.

This is a copy of the study guide developed by the Chicago PLP student club. In light of the NCS call for revitalized study groups, we hope this guide will be useful in winning students to the PARTY.

37

5/2/73

This writing originally began as an article on recruitment, and at the beginning I saw 2 possible roads I could take - a general, "objective" line of the Party work or relating my own experiences. I felt the latter would deteriorate into a personal polemic. I avoided it and instead became a theoretical parrot, not even sure of what I was parroting as I am not a Party member.

I will be presenting my experiences and "recruitment" to the Party in the hopes of exposing a bad situation. My intent is constructive - I don't want what has happened and is happening to me to happen to other people coming around the Party.

COMING TO SAN FRANCISCO

I was won to the Party when I was in high school and without any direct contact with the Party. My main objective was to move to a city that was a Party center, work with the Party, and develop politically with the Party's aid.

After getting in contact with people here and going to a study group, I was left wondering when I was going to be asked about selling C/D. I went through, in this order, one non-member, 2 Party members, and another non-member before I found out about the mass mobilizations on Saturdays.

INVOLVEMENT IN PARTY WORK

Since it was apparent I basically agreed with the Party's line (I assume this), no Party member ever engaged me in any political discussion outside of the study group. And since I have the unfortunate habit of doing what I say I will do, I became a functionary. No one struggled with me over my weaknesses, no one criticized or praised anything I was or was not doing, no one even asked me for anything besides a sustainer.

I am now working in the 30/40 initiative and jobless. It was brought up to me that I become a full-time petitioner during the summer (a petition a day). I cannot see that this will advance me or anyone I come in contact with - it will be a "job" that I would be doing out of the generosity or timidity of my heart. To become a full-time functionary and to see that as my involvement with the Party is not healthy for either of us.

BEING ASKED TO JOIN THE PARTY

For about a month before I was officially asked to join the Party, I felt my relationship with the Party was disintegrating. Examples: going to the study-group was mechanical, the club with which I was working not bothering to tell me of a change in the Saturday selling schedule, my own paper sells falling to about 2-5 per issue.

When the directive for recruitment before the convention came out (my assumption, again) I was asked to join - being the only non-party person who was still around the club in any

(2)

38

consistant way.

My main objection to joining was that I myself had not recruited anyone. This was not viewed as a serious shortcoming since I was reliable, ie: a good functionary.

ACTION

I intend to present this to the club & I am working with and attach their comments.

SELF-CRITISM

1. Chauvinism - I allowed myself, to a degree, to fall in to the situation I am in by not consistently fighting the sexism within myself and the Party. From what I have seen, women are usually in more functionary roles than men in the Party.
2. I do not criticize as things come up, but allow them to build up within. Perhaps this is due in part to not personally trusting people within the Party.

CONCLUSION

It is a good thing I ~~had~~ had been won to the politics of the Party before I started working with it in San Francisco. That's a very cold statement, but I feel my experience justifies it.

I believe in communism - and that means, for one thing, that I cannot make it politically on my own.

Tony Blaster

3 - from club

39

As a result of Terry's article an expanded meeting of our 30 for 40 club was held (4 Party members and 2 candidates). We felt at least that it would improve the working relationship between our club and the candidate members.

It was agreed that many of the criticisms were valid although the sarcastic and cynical tone was detrimental. We felt that while it is ~~was~~ wrong to bring up criticisms in such a manner, the party is also responsible to search out criticisms before they become cynicisms.

The basic point is ~~that~~ that the Party in general and our club in particular has not had a clear program for recruiting people. Recruitment involves both struggling around the ideology and strategy of the Party and putting that strategy and ideology into practice through mass work. Candidates in this area are in a candidates class where struggle over the line of the Party and political commitment to the Party is carried out. However, since the candidates are from all areas, little struggle could be waged around their day to day work. For example, Terry and Colleen are involved primarily in the 30 for 40 initiative campaign and have received little specific guidance from the class about Party members (and candidates) responsibilities for carrying out the Party's line within the Coalition.

It is here that the Party falls down on recruitment practices. The club has not had a specific program for struggling around the Party's line in the Coalition with Terry and Colleen.

Terry felt her ~~responsibilities~~ responsibilities were primarily ~~organizational~~ organizational and pragmatic, that there was no opportunity for discussion of the Party's strategy or direction. The club, by default, laid the main responsibility for recruitment ~~on~~ on the candidates class, forgetting the need of the candidate members to work closely with individuals in the Party in putting the theory and strategy of the Party into practice.

For ~~example~~, example, the club had held no expanded meetings and there was little or no political discussions on even an individual level of the Party's strategy withing the campaign. Selling and other internal responsibilities were not discussed from a political standpoint.

Part of the problem stems from the fact that the Party is just beginning to become involved in mass work. A rightward drift manifesting itself in a pragmatic approach has already been recognised. But as the Party becomes more involved in mass work, the need for political discussion and direction ~~within~~ within and outside of the Party will become more vital. If we ask little of those who are willing to become committed to the Party, it is because we are asking little of ourselves as members.

In general, the Party must provide a framework within ~~which~~ which candidate members can put the Party's line into practice. There should be regular expanded ~~club~~ club meetings (once every 2-3 club meetings) to discuss the Party's role in the mass work and the particular responsibilities of the club members and candidates. Candidate members should also be asked to voluntarily accept Party discipline, ie: discussing communist ideas with friends with the outlook of drawing them closer to the Party, ~~improving~~ improving Challenge sales, and carrying out other internal responsibilities.

The ~~Party~~ Party should not assume that a candidate has no questions regarding the Party's role or his/her part in that role. Party members should not only be open to political discussions but ~~should~~ should feel the responsibility to initiate them. Each candidate member should be working closely and ~~regularly~~ regularly with a club member who has the responsibility from the Party to struggle with the ~~candidate~~ candidate on his/her work.

Before joining, the candidate ~~should~~ should not only understand the ~~Party's~~ Party's line but should have practiced it on a day to day basis with guidance from the club.

40

suggestions for Challenge (from Party base group - Berkeley)

- Don't print photos without a long caption (or a story) to go with it.
- Never make a political point without explaining it at least a little. (Don't assume the readers already know and understand the line).
- Articles should provide background information on the story so it can be understood by readers in other cities.
- Primary role of the paper : put forward the line. Secondary but important role : carry the news of the people's struggles that are blacked out by the ~~press~~ bosses' media.
- International news round-up would be a good idea.
- Where articles are grouped by topic, use CED editorial boxes to put forward the line.
- Start a regular feature : revolutionary communist dictionary (or the anti-revisionist) where "bosses", "Nazi", "communism", revisionism, etc would be explained, using wit and cartoons. (We volunteer to ~~me~~ take charge of such a column).
- Have CD comment on the People's Tribune question, especially if the people we ask have a different line than ours.
- Stop the anal fixation (catch the bosses with their pants down, Lindsay breaking wind, the toilet bowl of history, etc.)
- Headlines (front-page and inside) should not be used to put forward the line in a dubious "punchy" way. Instead they should be used to describe the content of the article, or the paper. The line should be put forward in the articles.
- Box with who to contact in various cities if you want to help gather signatures to put 30 for 40 on the ballot. (Similar boxes for other things).
- "Question-and-answer" column on ~~me~~ 30 for 40, possibly based on Berkeley Committee for a shorter work week pamphlet. (One question per issue).

Plus one grandiose suggestion for when we have the base and money and time to do it : have local inserts where we would print local news that are not important enough to make the nat'l newspaper.

PL
41

FURTHER DISCUSSION ON CRITICISMS OF CHALLENGE

1. In the first Internal Bulletin for the convention, our club published a letter putting forth certain criticisms of Challenge. In turn, several comrades and clubs sent in letters which, for the most part, rejected the initial criticism. Those replies were thoughtful, and several linked up the weaknesses they saw in the criticism which several right-wing tendencies in the Party. Some of those tendencies are present in our work (not writing enough for Challenge or center-liberal publications; not selling the literature to our friends and acquaintances enough). Yet, we feel, others are not--including whether we fight various misleaders in the movement sharply enough and whether we condemn the Israeli leadership for being the genocidal bunch of racists and murderers that they are.

After reflection, and speaking only for myself, I have concluded that the major thrust of the initial criticism was correct. The differences between the initial criticism of Challenge and the various responses to it involve: 1) different conceptions of our audience and what arguments will most quickly move them to a communist position; 2) differing conceptions of the persuasiveness of terms like "Nazi" or "the Ilse Koch lampshade award" when talking of racist professors, and 3) political differences as to what term or definition we should use when talking about members of ruling classes of all kinds and types.

A. EVEN IF GOLDA MEIR, HERNSTEIN, ETC ARE "NAZI'S", CALLING THEM SUCH IN THE OPENING HEADLINE OF A CHALLENGE ARTICLE OR THE BEGINNING OF AN ARGUMENT ARE 1) NOT AMONG THE MOST IMPORTANT OF COMMUNIST POSITIONS TO WIN OUR AUDIENCE TO AND 2) NOT EFFECTIVE MEANS OF MOVING OUR AUDIENCE CLOSER TO ANY COMMUNIST POSITION, INCLUDING THAT THEY'RE NAZI'S.

1) That Meir, Hernstein, etc Are Nazis Is Not Among the More Important of Communist Positions To Which We Want to Win Our Audience--At Least Not Given Most People's Initial Reaction to That Description

Our experiences in trying to build fights against the teachings of Hernstein, Jensen, Jencks, etc. on campuses and among intellectuals around the country have shown that many or most center people have been and are influenced by several ruling-class ideas or misconceptions. Some of these include thinking a) that all people are equally racist, that they are naturally racist, and that working class people are as racist or perhaps even more racist than members of the ruling class; b) that fighting racism is not that important, that significant gains for the working class and other oppressed groups can be won without defeating and fighting racism; c) that the views of those racists are just other set of academic viewpoints and have no political animus or motivation; d) that

44

article is obvious. Ladybird is an active intelligent member of the US ruling class, and is continuing on, through her television stations and the like, with the exploitation of American workers that she was engaged in during her marriage to LBJ. Further, she can carry on quite efficiently, without a husband to help her; no one need fill her "ad" for her to carry on her ruthless work.

Oh, well, you say, "So it's a bit sexist in its implications: But it's making the point that LBJ was a murderer." Yes, but since when does Progressive Labor Party try to expose the fact that a person who the media is mourning is responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of human beings by a joke!! Amusing? Is that how we want to treat that subject. In fact, Milt's article in Int. Bull. #2 was its own refutation in that it vividly reminded us that Vietnamese people's "blood was still flowing as they put Johnson in his grave." That was not a long-winded article or statement, but it vividly and accurately portrayed the working class hatred we should all feel toward Johnson. The "advertisement" conveyed none of that hatred, and treated Johnson's atrocities flippantly.

Similarly, the March 22, 1973 issue of Challenge carries an article whose headline reads "Banfield's 'Unheavenly City' Wins the Ilse Koch Memorial Lampshade for Racist Book of the Decade." (emphasis added) Ilse Koch was the Nazi who made lampshades out of the skin of human beings who the Nazis had exterminated. Not everyone may know who she is. But there we are, with our cute historical reference. Aren't we smart; aren't we witty. Perhaps; but are we fighters for the working class when we joke like that. Further, imagine how this reference might affect the families and friends of those who the Nazis did kill at Koch's ^{and camps} who are all too aware of what the esoteric "lampshade" reference is all about.

These examples are rare. Challenge on the whole is getting better and better. It is incredibly less sectarian and more persuasive than two or three years ago. But in response to the initial criticism, there was a whole rash of swastikas appearing in the paper, along with references to "nazi's", and the reference described above. What is suggested is this: The above articles are indicative of an outlook toward our audience--the working people, students, and intellectuals whom we're trying to win to communism--that is not familiar with their thoughts, concerns and sensitivities. It is indicative of at least a tendency to not make our arguments on the basis of what will best persuade people to communist ideas but of what is a uniquely left statement and/or witty statement. It's as if we're are looking too much at ourselves and how unique or different we are putting forth a position ("a Jewish leader, a Nazi!"), rather than at our audience and what we can say to them which will best convince them that Meir or Johnson committed atrocities and are/were enemies of the people.

~~xxxxxxx~~

I am certain that this tendency is not dominant in Challenge, the Party, or the persons who wrote the articles. But I sense we have it--all of us--and its growth in the matter of Meir, Hernstein, etc., ~~is~~ as suggested here, is what prompted this article.

45

G. MEIR, HERNSTEIN, LBJ, MC NAMARA, THE KENNEDYS, FDR, CHOUEN-LAI, ETC. ARE NOT NAZI'S SIMPLY BECAUSE THEY HAVE COMMITTED OR SUPPORTED ATROCITIES AGAINST WORKING PEOPLE IN THE PAST OR WILL IN THE FUTURE; THEY ARE MEMBERS OF THE BOURGEOISIE.

Some people have argued that Meir has committed nazi-like acts and that Hernstein teaches propaganda as bad as that taught by the Nazis. Therefore, they are nazis. But, that conclusion does not follow. The Nazi Party was a specific party, with specific leaders, during a definite historical period. The term Nazi in fact is far more narrow and specific than the term "fascist", which is often used to describe actions of a highly oppressive nature or attitudes consistent with such actions. Some persons who make up our audience, the people we're trying to win, have the narrower, historical definition of Nazi described above. Why then are we trying to change definitions on them?

It could be that the Party is putting forth a new line ^{liberals and revisionists} on LBJ and McNamara were responsible minimally for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of people. Jack Kennedy, with the close advice of then Attorney General Bob Kennedy, appointed some of the most racist Circuit Court of Appeals judges presently sitting in the US. FDR prevented effective aid to the Spanish Loyalists, thus aiding the eventual victory of the fascists and causing the deaths of thousands. Chouen-Lai supported the slaughter of Ceylon revolutionaries and attempted genocide by West Pakistan leaders against East Pakistanis. All these were nazi-like acts. Thus, all the above-mentioned leaders are Nazis. All ruling class members have been or would be perpetrators of murder, racism, and repression. That's what the Nazis did; therefore to convince people that such ruling class figures are that bad, we will label them as such.

But haven't we done so all along? We have always called such oppressors the bourgeoisie, capitalists, or the ruling class. There seems no need to shift to a new definition, especially when it involves a term the associations of which make our use unpersuasive to large numbers of people.

Further, the term adds nothing to our political line, assuming that we are in fact not pussyfooting on the ruling-class nature of all the above people. -- Calling them "nazi's" does not sharpen the line, as calling ourselves "communists" does. "Communist" connotes a type of party, a type of organization, that we say is absolutely necessary if the working class is to win the class struggle. We argue that all working class forces must unite under the leadership of a communist party, a party that serves as the general staff of the army of the proletariat.

The term "Nazi" implies no such organization, or at least not one that encompasses the organized forms in which a Golda Meir, an FDR, a Johnson or Nixon, or a Chouen-Lai function.

In sum, we can argue that a Hernstein or a Meir is as bad as the Nazis, or might match their actions. But that danger is the thing we are trying to convince people of; not the label

itself.

We can most persuasively convince people of the incredible danger without using the particular label of "Nazi."

Even if all of the above has been accurate, our line and our literature is carrying forth the interest of the international working class. ^{Moreover} it has been during the life of our Party. Challenge has been and continues to be a major weapon for the working class. We must increase our writing for it, and giving it the widest possible circulation. The preceding pages deal with a very small percentage of the total Challenge articles published in the past year, and argue against the usage of only certain terms and certain symbols which themselves comprise even a small portion of the articles mentioned. It would seem clear that Challenge in the main is improving as our roots in struggles broaden and increase. It is only the tendency to forget our audience and how we can best win them to communism, to instead focus on our wittiness or our ability to put forth a uniquely worded "left" proposition, that this article is concerned with. While I think this tendency could become very detrimental to Challenge and the Party in general, we're farther down the road of defeating it than we were years ago.

end

OUR EMPHASIS IN THE '72 ELECTIONS WAS MISPLACED & WE THEREFORE UNDERESTIMATED NIXON'S ABILITY TO TEMPORARILY SWAY LARGE NUMBERS OF PEOPLE, ESPECIALLY MIDDLE AGED & OLDER WORKERS. MANY GROUPS WENT GOP FOR THE FIRST TIME SINCE THE NEW DEAL. ONE EXAMPLE WAS ITALIAN-AMERICANS IN NEW JERSEY.

TRUE, A DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS WAS VOTED IN, & A GREAT NUMBER OF VOTERS (45% OF THOSE REGISTERED) MERELY STAYED HOME. BUT THIS STILL LEAVES MILLIONS WHO VOTED FOR & HAD HOPES FOR NIXON'S ABILITY TO IMPROVE THINGS. BEFORE WATERGATE, HE MADE SOME BIG EFFORTS TO CONFUSE PEOPLE WITH HIS MOSCOW & PEKING TRIPS AND "PEACE" WITH HANO I. HE ALSO TRIED TO DEFUSE A MAIN SOURCE OF SUPPORT AND ORGANIZERS FOR THE OPPOSITION LIBERALS BY CUTTING DOWN DRASTICALLY ON THE POVERTY PROGRAMS.

WE TEND TO UNDERESTIMATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS TYPE OF POLITICAL DECEPTION IN OUR COUNTER*ATTACK. WE AIM AT THE LIBERALS SINCE THE LIBERALS PUSH TO LINE UP THE MOST AWARE WORKERS AND STUDENTS BEHIND THEM. BUT WHILE MILLIONS OF WORKERS AND STUDENTS VOTED McGOVERN MILLIONS MORE VOTED NIXON OR STAYED HOME. A RECENT SURVEY SAID 16% OF BLACKS WHO VOTED DEMOCRATIC IN '68 VOTED OTHERWISE IN '72.

WHILE WATERGATE IS A HUGE AND MAYBE DECISIVE ISSUE TO THE RULING CLASS AND MIDDLE CLASS, WE SHOULDN'T ASSUME THAT NIXON'S BRAND OF MODERATE*CONSERVATIVE & FLEXIBLE POLITICS IS FINISHED. TO THE CONTRARY, CONNALLY & AGNEW ARE WAITING FOR THEIR CHANCE TO CONTINUE IN THE ~~EXX~~ SAME MOLD. KISSINGER, HAIG, RICHARDSON, ETC. WILL DO LIKEWISE IN BOTH FOREIGN & DOMESTIC AFFAIRS.

AS WATERGATE PROCEEDS, SO DO SOME IMPORTANT INTERNATIONAL IMPERIALIST NEGOTIATIONS:

- 1) U.S.-SOVIET EUROPEAN TROOP REDUCTIONS.
- 2) INCREASED U.S.-SOVIET TRADE PARTLY STIMULATED BY THE WHEAT DEAL.
- 3) AGREEMENT WITH RUSSIA OVER UNIFICATION & MILITARY NEUTRALIZATION OF GERMANY.
- 4) MANEUVERING TO KEEP JAPAN A LESSER THREAT ECONOMICALLY.
- 5) TAKING ADVANTAGE OF THE NEW CAPITALISM IN CHINA TO KEEP A FIRM SHORT*TERM ALLIANCE AGAINST JAPAN AND RUSSIA.

INTERNALLY, BY DEVASTATING OEO & REDUCING OTHER AGENCIES LIKE HEW THAT HAVE MANY LIBERAL MINDED GOV'T WORKERS, NIXON HELPS KEEP THE LIBERAL OPPOSITION DISCOURAGED & RETREATING & NOT FULLY ABLE TO PRESS THEIR ADVANTAGE ON WATERGATE.

BASICALLY, NIXON, LIKE BISMARCK, HAS BEEN MORE TACTICALLY FLEXIBLE THAN THE LIBERALS

48
WHILE DISARMING MOST OF HIS RULING CLASS OPPOSITION. WATERGATE, MAY CHANGE THE MANAGERS
LIKE IN BASEBALL BUT THE MELODY WILL LINGER ON.

WE MISSED OUT IN '72 BY NOT CAREFULLY EXPOSING BOTH GUYS. WE SHOULD HAVE DEVOTED MORE
TIME TO REPUBLICAN RALLIES & FUNCTIONS EVEN IF THEY TENDED TO BE IN OUTLYING SUBURBS.

IN '76, WITH AN OPEN REPUBLICAN FIELD OF MODERATE-CONSERVATIVES & LIBERALS, WE SHOULD
GO TO PRIMARY ACTIVITIES OF BOTH PARTIES. IT IS IN THE PRELIMINARIES (PRIMARIES) THAT
THEY RECRUIT STUDENTS AND PROFESSIONALS & MAKE THEIR OPENING APPEAL TO WORKERS -- 6 MOS.
TO A YEAR BEFORE THE ELECTIONS.

THE '76 BICENTENNIAL HOOPLA WILL BE A BIG FORUM FOR BOURGEOIS POLITICAL ACTIVITY & WE
SHOULD BE THERE EXPLAINING WHY WE ARE FOR THE SECOND AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

WE SHOULD ALWAYS PRESENT ACTIVISTS WITH A REAL CHOICE** CAUCUSES INSIDE CAMPAIGNS,
UNITED FRONT GROUPINGS, 30/40 & OTHER PETITIONS, ETC. THAT ARE EASY TRANSITIONS TO
A MORE RADICAL OUTLOOK AND COMMITMENT, YET AT LEAS STILL SOMEWHAT WITHIN THE ELECTORAL
PROCESS.

P. A.

49
Over the last three years, I've participated in quite a
few discussions of why we sell Challenge and why we should sell
more. ~~However, I believe~~ ^{My conclusion is that} we approach the question of quotas
mechanically and hence unproductively. For example, the letter
sent out by the NSC concerning raising circulation of the paper
suggested the quota of 60 be raised to 100 per Party member. To
propose this to those who sell only 20 per issue would be point-
less and only frustrating. I suggest an alternative approach:

Each club should discuss each member's sales, i.e. how
many he/she sells, the quality of sales, and the consistency.
Based on such a discussion, a reasonable quota be established
for that person, which may or may not be a compromise. It
would be based partially on that individual's other commitments -
job, school, family. (Clearly a fulltime party organizer with no
classes on the campus can sell more than a fulltime grad student
with a parttime job and 2 kids.) Of course the main question is
always commitment to building PL (for instance, some fulltime
workers with families sell more than single students). The point
is that we need a more honest approach to commitment, one in
which we really do struggle for higher and higher commitment by
forcing ^{each of us} ~~people~~ to defend our practice.

I don't think it's liberal -- in fact, it's far more liberal
of us to say everyone in the Party should sell 60 and then allow
people who sell 30 to continue as full members, on a "struggle"
basis for months and more. If a member participates in the
club's discussion of what's expected of him/her, that person is
more likely to carry it out. If the member does not, ^{carry it out} then the
needed struggle will be less liberal and mechanical, and much
more straightforward in terms of should that person be in the
Party or not.

I agree with much of what has been said in previous bulletins about the relation between left-wing bureaucracy and commandism and the lack of serious study in the Party. Most people in the Party operate on a pragmatic basis, waiting to be told what to do, and very often doing things in a half-hearted way that they really disagree with. The lack of political discussion in the clubs is responsible for the fact that club members do not take enough initiative. On the other hand, because they ^(club members) don't take enough initiative, club leaders are constantly put in a position of telling them what to do. Thus, a vicious circle is set up. We cannot explain the ideas of real democracy for workers under socialism, particularly as elaborated and developed in RRIII, to people unless we begin to understand and practice them ourselves in the Party. And the main ~~xxxx~~ prerequisite for workers and Party democracy which is lacking is in depth study, understanding and discussion by all, rather than reliance on leadership to figure out the line and tell people what to do.

This tendency is ~~not~~ only bad in how it affects Party members and their activities, it also would necessarily have to carry over to our mass work--how we put the line forward in the mass organizations and how we organize in groups such as WAM and SDS. If we don't know how to encourage initiative in Party members, we will have similar problems encouraging initiative in other workers, relying on our own leadership rather than on their developing as leaders.

To rectify these tendencies I'd like to add the following to what has already been proposed:

1 - that ~~an~~ education committee be reorganized in each city to make sure that every Party member and close friend is in a study group on a particular level--taking into account previous study

groups attended, works read and practice of that particular person.

2 - more political discussion be formally organized in every party group: club, section, etc. and the party attempt to bring more political discussion into mass groups -WAM, SDS, etc.

3 - part of this discussion involve democratic centralism--in the Party and in mass work

4 - discuss what criticism self-criticism means and ensure it is really carried out in every Party club, section, etc., and even in the mass work.

Cathy Mason

NYC

5. The Ed Committees insure that the study groups be related to the concrete practice of each member, rather than only academic discussions.

52

While the party has taken some steps to combat male chauvinism, it seems to us that the question of sexism, which is a strategic question, has not been taken seriously enough. The fact that many women have been developed and are now in leadership positions in the Party is good, but not key. Basically, we think that the problem is that the Party really needs to hammer out a strategy for winning women to the revolution and making sexism a class issue. We have to examine Marxist works and practical revolutionary experience and develop a detailed strategy just as was done in developing a trade union strategy and a strategy to combat racism and nationalism, which aren't the only major tools used to divide the working class. Sexism is a double-edged sword by which the bosses not only divide workers on the job, but in the home as well.

Regarding trade union strategy, ^{the Party} we understand why winning power in the trade unions is key to the revolution and we have worked out detailed tactics to accomplish this: 30 for 40, rank and file caucusses, union democracy, building WAM, etc. Regarding racism, the attack against racist professors and the fascist genetic theories they push is wonderful and has proven very successful in not only defeating racism ideologically, but also in building SDS, MCHR and the Party. An attack on sexist culture ^{though secondary to racism,} is also necessary as sexism too can be and has been used for fascist purposes. In fighting racism, we understand how minority workers are key in heavy industry and why it is key that they be won to leadership in the t.u. movement and the Party and we have discussed tactics here also: 30 for 40, preferential hiring, upgrading, etc. But with regard to sexism, we would like to see more discussion on how women are key to the revolution--they are basically not in heavy industry, etc. and what are the main tactical reform struggles to engage women in and how can the party begin to do this as

53

a whole.

Women are part of the most oppressed masses. Minority women are the most oppressed and they logically would fight the hardest against capitalism. Thus, we must figure out how women can become a more viable and leading force in the t.u. movement and the revolution, *not just expecting them to come around because their husbands are active.* In fighting revisionism, we also need a thorough discussion of this question. We don't want to leave loopholes for the bosses ideas to creep in. The fact that some Party members make and take sexist jokes lightly shows a weakness in their understanding of the oppressiveness of male chauvinism and how the fight against it is necessary to winning the revolution.

We have somewhat of a line on sexism, but many ~~women~~ people in the Party have not even been won to that because the Party is often not mobilized to fight on various reform issues affecting women. How many Party members are involved in the day care fight? Why is it that sexism is left out of most major Party speeches? Also we think it's wrong for Party people to feel that day care and sexism are a women's problem and a group of women should discuss a line and tactics for action, as is sometimes thought. We don't ask a group of Black workers to discuss fighting racism and begin to fight racism by themselves. The WAM daycare workshop, for example, consisted of all women. We have to begin to view these questions as class questions.

We think the Party should take these questions up seriously in the convention and come out with a pamphlet on the woman question, and propose actions on various reform struggles.

Another thing a pamphlet should deal with is ~~the~~ how oppressive marriage, as an institution, is under capitalism. Housewives could better be won if they realized their problems were universal and explained by the science of Marxism-Leninism. The financial and social pressures of workers' marriages, heavily tainted by sexism, are the way in which bosses divide workers in the home. Men are socially forced to be the family breadwinner and women work equally as hard, raising children and doing housework, for no wages. Even when ~~women~~ women do hold jobs, these jobs are often viewed as secondary, pin money and most ~~women~~ working women continue to shoulder most of the responsibilities in the home thus leaving them with virtually no time for relaxation and/or political work. Male chauvinism divides all workers' families, including the Party's.

The family pressures, financial and raising children, are oppressive even if husbands help because they really have to be viewed as collective, societal responsibilities. Under socialism, housework and daycare are communal jobs. We have to develop reform tactics leading in that direction so that our socialist ideas become realistic rather than utopian in the minds of working women. Thus, we feel the key to combatting male chauvinism is to build a national fight ~~for~~ in the trade unions and in the communities around reform issues affecting women such as day care and equal pay for equal work. Through this, more women should be won to building WAM and the Party.

This is only a small proposal on how to change things and what to do for we are still unclear about many aspects in the division of working class men and women. This is why we feel an important effort should be made at the convention to iron out the wrinkles in our almost non-existent line on sexism.

Cathy Mason N.Y.
Bonnie Savitz N.Y.

Another aspect of this that we left out is that the bosses use racist and sexist ideology to justify their attacks of people on welfare, who are mainly women, and divide them from the rest of the working class. For example, the theory that women on welfare have lots of children so they won't have to work. We need to talk more about what our line on abortion, forced sterilization and contraception should be (as was begun in Challenge). While we feel women should have the legal right to abortion, if day care were provided, women might not always feel pressured into having abortions.

56

The current issue of Challenge (May 3) carries a story that shames the paper and us as a party. The story, on page 7 consists of a photograph, a caption "Black slaves for sale - 285 Pounds each", and a small article, apparently a reprint from an unidentified (British?) newspaper or magazine source. Above the photograph we wrote in "Racist European Bosses Still Promote Slavery", and below the article, "Workers Unite. Smash Racism". But the photograph and the accompanying story makes a mockery of everything we have ever said against racism. They promote racism more openly than the establishment press dares, at least these days. And what is not said in as many words but comes across like a blow to the face is that, in this instance, Challenge is helping to promote racism in a disgusting, fundamental form. Hard as it may be to believe, in the PL paper, the message that I and whoever I've talked to got was "See the African Savages, Still Being Manipulated by Superior Whites, Still Enslaving Each Other". It really makes me question how seriously we take ourselves, how seriously we take the paper, and how seriously we take the people we ask to read it.

How seriously do we take ourselves (our line against racism, Challenge articles and actions against racist theorists, and movies)? It seems that for all our talk against racist ideas in medicine, learning theory, textbooks economic and welfare policy, we either can't recognize or don't take seriously, the common, straightforward ways these ideas are presented to the working class. Yet these ways are important because they are the foundation for current racist campaigns by the boss class, the ones that we pride ourselves on exposing on the campus and in the pages of Challenge. It is by reinforcing these simple basic-level racist attitudes that the bosses plan to pass racism along from generation to generation of workers. Look at the photograph, and the article: they use many of the cultural cues that white superiority advocates have planted and are still planting in the minds of whites and blacks, especially with respect to the primitiveness and childishness of Africans and in general all inhabitants of 'backward' countries (or, wherever we may have to fight an imperialist war sometime.). It's all there: the loin clothes of the captives (as opposed to the semi-'civilized' dress of the tame Africans who helped to capture them), the background of collapsing grass huts, naked girls in the forefront of the captives, breasts exposed to the thoughtful eye of the 'aloof' white master. The text below spells it out: It ~~suggests that~~ compares the captives to 'animals', who 'cower' etc etc; it suggests that slavery is peculiar to Africa, "a group of black men turn back the pages of African history, to the gruesome days of slavery, to a time of misery and greed and human exploitation" (so unlike the U.S. of A!), "The captives have been 'rounded up in the bush', (do they live there, or in homes?) They are hunted by fellow Africans ("men with bows and arrows") and sold most likely to neighbouring African countries. The photographer doesn't know for sure, since having tracked the trade fearlessly (and implausibly) deep into the bush, he had to split back to civilization and a darkroom, but not before suggesting that the buyers are other Africans: He did find out the price though, but wouldn't add for the enlightenment of his western public that it was beyond the means any African beside a government official. Now, none of this is, shall we say, clarified by editorial comment (compare the article on Saab on the previous page), and in fact our headline and slogan seem to be conclusions we have drawn from the article and give the impression that we generally think it is accurate.

How seriously do we take the paper? The paper is our main mass work. It's also the proposed frame of reference for discussions of the party's future at the coming convention. But in this instance, one that really makes the party into a ~~joke~~ bad joke, we are just about as careful in regards to what ideas we present and how we do so, as a sea gull is in regards to where he shits. This sloppy shit and fly attitude is precisely what we admit to, and are trying to correct. Supposedly. Did we check the accuracy of the story? Perhaps it is asking too much to expect us to know that the area (the Niger

57

This is particularly important since there have been recent efforts by European press, (particularly the Italian press and cinema) to exploit various areas of the underdeveloped world, by presenting a carefully distorted picture of their 'quaint and savage' customs. Infact, a special market has been created, catering to the same tastes as porno flicks, which made millions for such movies as Mondo Cane, Malamundo, and Africa Addio. Nearer home we have similar venturers with sensational exposes of white sex goddesses in the Amazon etc. Just superficially, there is much much in the photograph and article that looks staged, or at least suspicious enough to be checked out, if we took the paper seriously: the stereotypes of white hunter with Hemingway beard and safari suit, servant with bow and arrow, the captives, obviously children, tied around their necks with a spotless white rope, convenient for photographic contrast.

How seriously do we take the people we ask to read Challenge? Obviously not much. This is the kind of article that could make someone who feels really strongly about racism - is in fact close to our line - never want to read another challenge. Such an article would not have been permitted in PL magazine without a check for truthfulness, and editorial comments. This might partly be because articles for the magazine get more preparation. But I think too that there is greater concern for winning people who read the magazine than the paper. Who, for example, among the Challenge readership knows what 285 Pounds sterling means? Do we care if people who buy the paper understand it? Here I think that this article, for its particular sloppiness, exposes a problem that applies to more carefully prepared articles and sometimes to the paper as a whole. And if we do not take the Challenge readership seriously, who are we really relying upon, as a matter of policy? I think this revisionism, relying on forces other than workers primarily is already in evidence in the party. This article, while most like the result of some one's fuck up, is not an exception in terms of the ideological currents it represents in PL. Some of us really do feel that sensationalist National Enquirer type exposes is a good way to get our ideas across, the way the capitalists do theirs. In other words, some of us think the capitalists are right about the working class.

Male chauvinism is an ideology which benefits the ruling class in a threefold manner:

- 1) It creates a cheap labor force and thereby keeps the wages of all workers at a depressed level
- 2) It is used as a justification for the miserable conditions under which many female workers labor
- 3) It is a direct prop of racism, supportive of the racist garbage spewed out by Banfield, Moynihan, et al.

The ruling class is able to use chauvinist ideology to justify keeping the wages paid to women at the lowest possible level. Women employees are paid less because "they are the family's second income", or "they will only be here a short time while looking for a husband to support them," or "they can't do the same job as a man." The effects of this ideology mean \$100 billion extra profits for the bosses per year in pay differentials between male and female workers in this country alone.

This benefit is a double one for the ruling class, for in creating a cheap labor force they are able to depress the wages of all other workers and undercut job security.

In addition, women workers are used to mask the incredibly high unemployment rate. If this rate were known to be actually anywhere from 15-20%, one of the major contradictions of capitalism would be starkly apparent. As it is, neither domestics nor part-time workers, large numbers of whom are women, are included in the unemployment rate. In conjunction with this, the ruling class is able to manipulate the media in such a way as to encourage or discourage women to enter the job markets, depending on the needs of the ruling class at the time. During WWII women were urged out of their homes and into the factories, where they could benefit the bosses the most. Now that some troops will be returning from overseas, the bosses try to get women out of the job market and back at home. Otherwise the unemployment rate will jump sky high. A month ago on the front page of its women's section the San Diego Union ran a review of a book by a psychologist dealing with the importance of the mother being in the home during a child's "formative" years. This is nothing but a boss's tool to get women out of the job market, as well as a justification for closing day care centers around the country. When this is done, mothers will be forced to remain home with their children.

The phone company is a prime example of the way chauvinism is used to vindicate sweatshop working conditions. What chauvinism means for telephone operators materially is that they have to ask permission to use the bathroom (and one at a time only), there is no permanent scheduling until anywhere from a year to two-and-a-half years on the job, and there is no maternity leave with pay, as well as no guarantee of a job upon return from such a leave.

At the same time, pay differentials between "men's" and women's jobs in the phone company may be as high as \$50 per week or more. Men have greater health care benefits and greater overtime pay. Even when men hold the same jobs as women, ~~that is~~ as in the case of male telephone operators, they are awarded privileges the women receive only on the basis of seniority.

Therefore, chauvinism is used not only to make the day-to-day lives of these women as miserable as possible, but it has a potential of being a serious divisive factor between male and female workers.

Thirdly, chauvinism is used as a major prop for racism. Bronfenbrenner, Moynihan and Banfield all include specific references to the cultural deprivation of the children from black families. This evokes images of a fatherless home with a bossy, domineering mother who is incapable of properly caring for her children, thereby necessitating compensatory programs such as Headstart.

Poor and black women are portrayed as promiscuous, with a never-ending series of lovers and children, which make them prime subjects to be "welfare leeches."

Who has not had someone tell them about the black woman who has a baby every year, always by a new lover, so that she can get more money from welfare? This is a buildup for the forced sterilization of black women, which is being heavily promoted throughout the country.

Lobotomies are performed mainly on women, and the majority of these women are black. They have been classified as aggressive or depressed and a lobotomy would do wonders for removing these tendencies, rendering them still capable of being adequate housewives.

Because chauvinism plays an important role in the oppression of the working class by the ruling class, it is necessary that ~~all~~ struggles involving fights against chauvinism be put forward as such. Neither the San Diego article about the telephone company nor the article about the Lynn GE wildcat dealt at all with the question of chauvinism as it pertained to the fights involved. By identifying it as such we become aware that the phone company is not merely committing these acts against a group of women who work for them, Chauvinism is an ideology consciously put forward ~~by~~ by the ruling class as a tactic to divide the workers and support the bosses. These are not individual acts, but part of a larger framework with longterm goals. This kind of deception must not go unchallenged. There are no good, non-male chauvinist bosses. The ruling class pushes chauvinism because it is in their class interest. We must fight the bosses ideology because it is in our class interest, both in terms of day-to-day reforms and the long range goal of socialist revolution.

L. Y.
SAN DIEGO

60

TO THE EDITORS OF PL MAGAZINE:

I'd like to raise a question about PL's attitude to sexism. Not about the role of women-- although I feel PL is and has been weak on fighting male chauvinism, the situation is getting better-- even though there are still people writing for Challenge who say things like "the workers need more balls", and there are still too many people in and around the party who think that the whole question boils down to equal work rights, and that sex roles in the social and personal areas are not important.

I'd like to question PL's attitude toward homosexuals, or gay people. I really can't think of a reference to gay people, in PL Magazine or elsewhere, that hasn't been very bitter-- ^{sick, monsters,} gays are , they have been "defeated by Capitalism". Is this a good line?

A friend of mine, now in the Party out in Minneapolis, was working in a hospital once, where his boss and a lot of the other workers were gay. My friend's wife was about to have a baby-- their first. My friend called in to work, and told his boss he wasn't coming in-- he was going to the hospital where his wife was in labor. His boss told him he'd better come in-- or else. My friend told him to stuff it, and hung up, absolutely convinced he'd lost his job. But a couple of days later, the boss was calling him back, asking sweetly when he was going to come to work. After my friend went back, he found out that when the other workers had found out what the boss had done, they got together-- gay and straight-- and

61

told the boss he'd better bring my friend back-- or else.

The question I'm trying to raise by telling this story is-- what is it about gay people that makes it impossible for us to unite with them to fight the ruling class? As far as I can see, only ourselves. What ever you may think of homosexuality, the idea that gays have been defeated by the bosses just because they are gay is a bunch of baloney. Now I realize the party wants its members to be stable people-- and its pretty difficult to be gay and stable too

PL Magazine uses gws people the idea that they shouldn't
in PL, at this point, would be able to work with gays even
in this society. The problem, however, is that ^{the kind of language} people

in a united front. Articles in PL have referred to gays as if they were like heroin addicts, or something, and groups which did work with gays have been ridiculed for it.

Now admittedly there are a lot of workers that can't stomach the thought of homosexuality. (There are also a lot of workers that can't stomach the thought of Communism.) But should we be pandering to this reflex-- or should we be trying to unite all workers and all people who can possibly be united against the ruling class?

-- A Friend of the Party

(Gregory Scott)

(62)

Dear Milt: (or whoever it is that reads ~~the~~ these things:)
I drew this letter up some time ago, after the last PL magazine came out, but hesitated over sending it. I wasn't sure whether it was really important. But I was urged to send it in by some people in the Sexism workshop at the SDS anti-racism conference and here it is.

The letter is based on the following passages:
"Prior to this Black Panther leader Huey Newton announced a united front with the Gay Liberation Front. He indicated that homosexuals are oppressed by the system and therefore are candidates for the anti-imperialist united front. Obviously Newton, and more important, many others, don't realize the stiff price workers and revolutionaries have had to pay for those in their ranks who became victims of drugs and homosexuality. More to the point, movements which unite with drug addicts and homosexuals close the door to workers. The leaders of these bogus antiimperialist united fronts know full well workers, no matter what their color, will never unite with these people. Naturally, we realize both problems of drugs and homosexuality are results of capitalism; but capitalism cannot be crushed by those who it has already defeated. It can only be defeated by those who have the strength to withstand its blows, grow stronger and fight back. After socialism drug addicts and homosexuals can be treated and rehabilitated into useful roles in society." page 8, PL mag., vol. 8, #1

"The rulers today seek to establish that prison rebels are freaks, psychopaths, nuts, monsters, and homosexuals." page 92, PL magazine, vol. 9, #1

The first question is- why did the writer of the first passage assume that homosexuals are like junkies? Is every gay a potential Phillip Abbot Luce?

How many people in PL-- how many of the people who make these kinds of statements-- know any gays? To what extent are these statements based on practice? And remember- these are the only statements the party has made on homosexuals in at least the last five years.

I mayself make no pretense of having the final answer to the question of homosexuality-- or even much of an interim one. I do believe, however, that the Party- in light of its other strengths- has been remarkably medieval on this question.

(63)

no further consideration:
I think if you're still putting them out- this letter (perhaps including the cover comment) might be better included in the bulletins than in PL mag. Not that it would be good to publish it there...

Of course this question has hit me, too, on the level of practice. Not to the extent it hit my friend (per Nyberg - Terry, his wife, is head of party work in mpls) - with him, the question of homosexuality was the main obstacle which held him back from making an effort to organize his workplace. But I've had the experience of selling challenge to an interested person who identified himself as a homosexual - and not knowing how to proceed. By the PL article, one would think I should have said - "bug off, monster." But I think those articles are actually reactionary.

(over)

64

As for myself, I'm not sure what to think. I don't think homosexuality is a disease - it's a learned behavior pattern. And someone that can't bring themselves to sleep with women has got problems.

But people who have a knee-jerk, hysterical reaction to gays, which is totally disproportionate to any relationship being gay may have to do with the class struggle we're involved with - for gays can be workers, middle class, or bosses, too - these people also have a problem.

And that's what the letter was written to combat.

By the way, I think the author of C.B. #1 article on "Our line on Vietnam" is pushing the most right-wing line since C.B. #2. To not call Ho a lizard sounds a lot like not calling Gotha a Nazi, 'cause the Jews suffered so much under

65

Hitler, etc. I thought the 2nd article on Viet Nam was one of the better things I've read - the distinction between reformists & revisionists is really key, I'd never thought of it in that way before.

Does that friend of the Party know that in 1945, Ho signed an agreement with the French which left Vietnam as a colony - not even with the "independence" that was being used, wrong, say, by Gandhi & Co in India? That the Vietminh moved to people's war only after the French then tried to outlaw them, & crush them?

"Lizard" is too good for this jerk!

Gregory Scott

(66)

Comments on "Fighting Sexism," Bulletin III

I do not at all disagree with the point of the article that PL must develop a stronger line and more developed strategy for fighting sexism. On the contrary, as one of the major tools of the bosses for dividing, oppressing and exploiting the working class, there should be more focus on sexism in Challenge and PL magazine articles and in SDS and WAM struggles. Also, the party should develop its relations with some womens' groups like NOW which at least relatively speaking have a more working class orientation. However, I do take issue with some of the suggestions and implications of the article concerning how we should build anti-sexist struggles.

I do not think that permanent anti-sexism committees are necessary, although building a committee to deal with a specific sexist issue might be appropriate. Each club discussing its work in relation to sexism is a good idea. For example, in SDS at UCLA we have an anti-racism committee and a worker-student alliance committee. The first is currently involved in fighting psychosurgery and the second is about to organize a campaign against the Rodino Bill on campus. Obviously these issues involve sexism as well as racism. We should raise the similarities between these two ruling class ideologies. We should point out that women are considered better subjects than men for lobotomies because of their "natural passivity", because impairment of their faculties is considered less important than that of men. And the Rodino Bill, like all racist immigration laws also involves sexism. The anti-working class paranoia about poor people, particularly minorities, having "too many" children and posing a burden is especially directed against working class women. It depicts them as irresponsible, neglectful and ignorant. According to this view, women do not have large families because they want them, but because they're too "stupid" to do anything else. And it is suggested that their children are unfortunate, not just in the sense that capitalism will warp all our lives until we overthrow it and establish workers' rule, but because they have bad mothers. This brings me to my second point.

Certainly there are arguments for the demands of legal and free abortions. It is true that abortion laws have always affected working women most harshly. It is they that died at the hands of butchers while rich women flew to Switzerland and Sweden. But the argument against making abortion rights a major part of PL's program for women's liberation goes much further than the statement that abortion is against the interest of the working class "because we need all the revolutionary fighters we can get." Rather, it is a question of the ruling classes' genocidal attack on

(67)

working people to rob us of the revolutionary fighters they fear. This attack is a fact. It is manifested in the forced sterilization and the pushing of "family planning" both internationally and in the USA. Examples of its ideology are Erlich's "The Population Bomb" and Jensen's theory of the degeneration of the race. Legalizing abortions would help this immense anti-working class campaign, not hurt it! Abortion laws are no longer in the interest of the ruling class. It is for this reason that abortion laws in many states have been abolished or liberalized in the past couple years. Pressure was needed to be sure, but the ruling class didn't put up much of a fight- it didn't show the kind of resistance it has to 30 for 40 and other working class demands for political and economic power.

If one looks for the main way in which capitalism oppresses women, even as specifically regards their family life, it is clear that the availability of abortions is not the major problem or solution. The abortion demand implies that the problems women workers face raising their children under capitalism should be solved by having less or no kids at all. It adds to all the other privileges that the bourgeoisie enjoys that should belong to everyone, the right to have a family. Higher wages and welfare payments, shorter hours, good childcare centers and schools, decent healthcare for mothers and babies, freedom from the threat of forced sterilization, these are the demands which will really give working women and men the right to choose their family size. And these are the demands which will hit capitalism where it hurts- it's going to cost them.

I am not saying that PL should be against the legalization of abortions. Like most laws under a bourgeois dictatorship, anti-abortion laws harass the working class and are part of the hypocrisy of the rulers (as Lenin points out in "The Working Class and Neomalthusianism"). We should oppose them like we should oppose anti-marijuana use legislation and capital punishment-- not because marijuana use is progressive, in fact it is the opposite, and not because we oppose capital punishment in principle, but because the laws concerning both are used for the selective oppression of workers and students. Since capital punishment is a more serious weapon of the ruling class, and since its abolition under capitalism could hardly be turned around to hurt workers, as could the abolition of anti-drug and anti-abortion laws, it should be fought more actively and vigorously. But in all of these cases we must state our whole position--what reservations we have about a demand or how it is put forward, why exactly we support it.

One of the most frequent arguments related to abortion demands, in addition to the zero population growth garbage, is the idea that a fetus is part of a woman's body and no one has any right but her to decide what happens to it. This is bourgeois individualism; it is both unrealistic and reactionary. For one thing, one can hardly compare a potential human being to a piece of pancreas. For another,

68

while it is no business of the bosses how working women and men choose to plan and raise their families, it is of vital concern to the working class as a whole, to its revolutionary goals. This doesn't mean every class conscious woman should have ten kids to increase the numerical strength of revolutionary forces. It just means that her decision does not only affect her. While fighting all aspects of ruling class interference in and control over workers' lives, which can only be eliminated through workers' revolution, we must not allow these struggles to degenerate into opposition to the "interference" of people in each others' lives. Such movements have nothing to do with socialism, except to retard it. To sum up, communists must involve themselves in every struggle against ruling class oppression, including women's liberation, but if we behave opportunistically toward bourgeois demands and ideology, then we ourselves ^{are} ~~our~~ dooming that struggle to failure.

a member of LA PWP