

# INTERNAL BULLETIN #1

Challenge-Desafio.....	P.1
Situation When I Joined Party.....	P.2
Fighting Chauvinism in Party.....	P.3
Critic of "Comment on Levey's Paper".....	P.7
More on Base-Building.....	P.11
Ideas on the Women Question.....	P.1
Self-Criticism.....	P.16
Individual Work Evaluation.....	P.19
More on the Chinese Revolution.....	P.22
An attack against the party to consider..	P.24
The Party, the current period, fighting the right-wing trend.....	P.54
Proposed plan for study.....	P.61
On Male Chauvinism.....	P.71
Losing A Shop Steward Election.....	P.74
A note on Chomsky.....	P.76
Women's Oppression under capitalism.....	78

July  
23, 73

of

July 20, 1973  
SF

Challenge-Desafio

1. WE sell about 2,000 papers here. We distribute another 1,000 thru street paper racks. (approx. 25-35% are paid for) We mail out about 400 subs from here. All these numbers can increase. We can deal with this in the next report. We have a meeting in a few days of the circulation and editorial committees. The proposals from the convention and ideas to expand the circulation will be discussed.
2. We have found it helpful to reprint articles from the paper. Enclosed are some recent reprints. We mass distributed a reprint of ~~xxxx~~ one of the Watergate editorials. The response was good. We got requests in the mail for more literature such as "Who Rules America" based on the distributions. Also people have come by the office to pick up the same literature. Also we have used the auto articles at the two assembly plants in the area. Since we are trying to spread our ideas completely from the outside, the C-D articles from Mahwah, Detroit, etc. are crucial. We have written and distributed WAM leaflets about the need for 30-40, WAM, anti-racist struggles, and distributed the auto flyer, but the specific examples of struggles in the articles should help us to better make contacts. We just heard about an ex student who was friendly to SDS and who recently renewed her sub to C-D. It turns out that her father works in one of the auto plants where we distribute lit and he has gotten out lit and we can see him soon.
3. We have done very little, in a planned way, to use the paper to help win people closer to the party. There are a number of newer people around and in study-action groups. We can definitely improve our attitude on this score.

2  
I. SITUATION WHEN I JOINED PARTY Spring 1970

I was a member of SDS when I joined the party 3 years ago. It was a time of demonstrations, ROTC take-overs, and "fighting in the streets"; needless to say they were exciting times. I was recruited because of the role I played in these struggles. Mainly it was an anti-racist role, an aggressive role with an ability to make friends easily.

II. INVOLVEMENT IN DIFFERENT GROUPS 1971 (LSU)

Soon after I joined the party it was agreed that I quit SDS and should work in the Latin-American Student Union. (The party had the wrong line at the time that minority party members should work solely in minority groups)

My attitude was very good then; I had a good base, some are still around, one joined the party. LSU died soon after; I did not help to build it that much.  
1971 (CARMC)

After LSU came the Coalition Against Racist Medical Care. A really active group that the party organized from a struggle at Woodlwan Hospital. I worked very hard to build this group. Unfortunately we were all students building basically what was a community group. We made some racist mistakes and disbanded the group.

1972 (SDS)

Went back to SDS again but also worked in a Latin American group (EL Cuadro) until graduation last year. I started doing less work and selling less Challenges. My base dwindled and I became more interested in graduating than in building SDS and the PLP. Almost quit party at this time because I thought I could do the same work outside the party I was doing inside without the "burden" of party discipline. Of course this was a cop-out and just a way of leaving the struggle.

III.. THE PRESENT 1973 - At Work

I'm working at a community house teaching English as a Second Language. My political work here has been next to nothing. I have been inhibited by the revisionists-nationalists working here and as a result have held very ~~little~~ <sup>few</sup> Challenges or discussed ~~with~~ the party with many people. I think this right-wing pull got a hold of me to the point where I didn't care if I stayed in the

3  
party or not. I felt the party would continue without me. It was easy to think of leaving because seeing a few other members leaving was an excuse not to struggle with myself. I could say, "It's just not me; it's a phase we're going through; everyone is depressed now, nothing is going to happen anyways. Let those stronger party members do the work; I'll join later when things get exciting again."

There are several reasons for the emergence of this right-wing drift, but for me it was the realization that a revolution will not occur tomorrow but that it's a slow, day to day, sometimes unexciting work. That it means selling Challenges, because as one ~~party~~ bulletin put it, "NO CHALLENGES=NO PARTY".

I have decided to struggle with myself and pull myself out of the muck. I intend to sell Challenges on my job and transform my social relationships there into political relationships. Above all I must build a base. As to date I have sold Challenges to a few people that I have never sold to before on the job plus got into discussions with them. I am also looking into an anti-deportation committee that might turn into something.

For Convention Bulletin:

4

#### Discussion on Fighting Chauvinism in and Around PL

Recently a number of discussions in Detroit with party members and friends <sup>have</sup> made it clear that we must sharpen our internal struggle against male chauvinism. Quite often lack of struggle has made it possible for men around the party to maintain chauvinist ideas, <sup>sometimes</sup> with a left cover, that hurt the party's work. These ideas prevent women from developing politically, demoralize people (women especially), and belittle the leadership of women. We must recognize that male chauvinism is the primary problem in male-female relationships. In every discussion we had, men started out feeling (at best) that responsibility for problems was divided 50-50. It isn't: men around the party have absorbed ruling class ideas and act as oppressors. Until there is agreement on this it is impossible to struggle over other problems, personal or political.

Generally, the problems centered around housework. Particularly when their wives were not PL members, men would say "Politics is primary--my time is therefore more important. And anyway she's the one who's hung up on neatness."

In some cases men whose wives are in PL had been struggled with to do housework. But they were still not taking responsibility for it. Consider--in building a struggle the hardest part is the thinking: figuring out what should be done and how. That applies to housework as well. A woman who spends half her time thinking about the laundry and how she's going to nag her husband into doing some work is not thinking about 30 for 40 on racism or revolution. Furthermore,

MORE

the laundry and the nagging are so oppressive that she spends the rest of her time thinking about what a bastard she married.

Of course, chauvinism also interferes more directly with political work. We have all been aware of men who don't want to talk politics to their wives or see their wives become active. But it also prevents the development of men. One man who had worked with PL lost interest when his wife joined. He just couldn't respect an organization that took her seriously and he didn't want her struggling with him. The same thing happens with women in leadership--men think, "I don't really have to listen to her, I'm obviously smarter."

Based on our discussion<sup>s</sup> here, a number of suggestions can be made:

1) Party members and particularly party leadership should be more sensitive to chauvinism in members and friends. We should be a little sceptical when a married man has lots of free time, an "unwinnable wife" or a wife who's "a neatness freak." A couple of points to consider--every single man this was discussed with felt that his wife had a quirk about housework. And most women pointed out that if the house, the kids, or even the husband was a mess, people commented on it to her rather than him. (Chauvinism in our personal lives should be discussed in clubs and with recruits before people are miserable, considering divorce etc.)

2) We should struggle against the tendency to confuse a right-wing, all-class movement with fights against a really oppressive ideology. This goes for struggle within the party as well as against the ruling class. This means that women who get mad about chauvinism should not be told they are subjective.

They have a right to be mad--men sometimes act like bosses. Ideally, it would be possible for women to criticize chauvinism in a comradely fashion, and we should

MORE

work towards this. But when a woman has been put down time and again for bringing up housework etc. the content of her criticism is primary.

3) The struggle against chauvinism should not be seen as the problem of the woman involved. Again, ideally it would be possible for men and women to sit down and work everything out. But a woman has a hard time convincing a guy who oppresses her that he should respect her. Party leadership should guarantee that she doesn't have to.

4) Couples in and around the party should plan out housework and discuss it regularly. Old habits don't die easy and if there isn't regular discussion, any new problem will fall back on the wife.

5) Couples should also discuss their relationships regularly. Generally, it is the woman who is forced to bring up problems and start discussions. This is, in part, because it is materially harder for women (who earn less, may take more responsibility for children etc) to split up. Men should recognize this and initiate discussions.

6) Time spent on personal matters should be evaluated before it is labeled a product of subjectivity. Occasionally it is; but sometimes men use this excuse to avoid housework, childrearing, taking responsibility for the relationship.

This article should not be interpreted as an attack on the party's line on marriage. Just as joining PL makes it possible to sharpen struggle about Communism, marriage, making a commitment, makes possible sharper struggle against chauvinism. But that struggle has to be guaranteed or the work of husband, wife and the party are weakened.

Also-much of this applies to girl and boy friends as well. Although such relationships are not as decisive as marriage, they are important in our lives.

Debby Allen

This paper is a criticism of the "Comment on Dave Levey's Two papers" in Convention Bulletin 12B. It is not a defense of Levey's positions, but an attempt to clarify some issues that I think are unclear.

I would like to say something first about the tone of the Comment on Levey's papers, especially the tone of the criticism of Levey's views about the decline of the U.S. empire. I think the Comment becomes very flippant and sometimes sarcastic (the arguments pass from the obscure to the ridiculous", p. 10, "Dave plays his last card" p. 11). I feel this tone is very intimidating toward comrades and friends who might wish to contribute to the convention bulletin. The author of the Comment seems to be implying that Levey is very foolish, and it is the fear of seeming foolish which often keeps our comrades from coming out and saying what they think. I believe our discussion in these bulletins should display confidence in our comrades' ability to correct our errors and that criticisms should be made in a fraternal and constructive way. (If we don't feel that confidence in each other and feel that it is necessary to ridicule what someone else has written, this must be because we feel that someone is motivated by something like individualism or the desire to be unique or different. If this is what the author feels, he should say so.)

As I understand Levey's piece in Bulletin 10 about the decline of the empire, he is saying that there are two possible views about the state of the U.S. empire:

(1) The U.S. has declined from a position of hegemony over Europe, Japan, and the less developed countries to a position where it must compete on more or less equal terms with other major imperialist powers. In that competition the U.S. has some advantages and some disadvantages, but

U.S. power will not decline in the future as it has in the past. (This is Levey's position)

(2) In the intensified competition between the major imperialist powers the U.S. will inevitably come up on the short end of the stick. (This is the position Levey ascribes to Challenge-Desafio. I do not think this is the position of C-D.)

(Since Levey feels that (2) is the position of C-D and that this position is part of the explanation of Watergate in C-D, he thinks his rejection of (2) requires a different explanation of Watergate. I do not think C-D relies on (2) to explain Watergate. I will come back to this later.)

As I see it, the Comment on Levey's paper offers ample evidence that the U.S. has declined economically in the past and that the U.S. is not in a position to reassert hegemony over Europe, Japan or the less developed countries that are slipping from its control. Levey's argument is not inconsistent with this. Levey argues that no major imperialist power is likely to have the trade surplus which would give it the capital which would allow it to rapidly expand overseas investment. (This was the point of Levey's reference to the need of Europe and Japan to import food. Because they will have to import food they will not be able to

achieve a large long term export surplus which would allow them to rapidly expand overseas investment at the expense of the other major imperialist powers. So the author's sarcastic statement that "Dave is back to trade after two paragraphs" misses the point of the paragraph under discussion.)

Personally I do not feel I know enough to say whether (1) or (2) is right. I do not know whether the U.S. will continue to decline, relatively to the other imperialist powers, at the same rate or at a rate comparable to the one it has declined. But the question of whether

(1) or (2) is right is not crucial to the party's analysis of the decline of the U.S. empire.

In the article "Imperialists at Each Others Throats" (PL magazine, Vol. 8, No. 2 August 1971) the party argues that U.S. economy has been declining steadily since the end of WWII relative to other major imperialist powers. At the same time, the U.S. retains political control over a major portion of the world's raw materials. There is always a time lag between the decline of an economic empire and shift of political control from a declining power to the rising powers. Moreover, the struggle for political control takes place through war. So the article predicts a loss of the U.S. political empire and a struggle for political control of that empire in world war. Regardless of whether U.S. bosses can arrest the decline of the U.S. economy, the U.S. political empire will continue to be dismembered. Already the U.S. has lost control of a number of countries, as the author of the Comment points out. But this decline is surely not at an end.

From the beginning the party linked the decline of the U.S. empire to the intensified attacks on workers here. This seems correct and nothing Levey says challenges this or attempts to challenge it. In a period of intensified inter-imperialist rivalry each imperialist power attempts to improve its competitive position by tightening the screws on the workers in the factories, mines, etc. it controls.

Recently, the party has linked the decline of the U.S. empire to the Watergate scandal. Both Levey and the author of the comment on Levey's paper feel that if Levey's view that the ruling class has arrested the decline of the economy is right, the party's analysis of Watergate must be wrong. But they both seem to misunderstand the party's analysis of Watergate.

From the beginning our analysis of Watergate was that there were real policy differences within the ruling class. We linked these policy differences to the decline of the U.S. empire. The old money felt the policies of the new money were leading to crisis and disaster. Because the U.S. empire has declined, the U.S. is in a very touchy competitive situation with respect to the other imperialist powers. They need every advantage they can get. This situation is new. When the U.S. was undisputed king, the bosses could afford a few slip-ups, but not now. So the policies the Nixon administration followed of overly rapid expansion of capital and profits endangers the very tenuous competitive situation of the U.S. and threatens disaster and even more rapid decline. (This is made clear in the p. 12 analysis of Vol. 10, no. 2) This analysis assumes only a very tenuous competitive position for the U.S. bosses, a point that both Levey and the author of the Comment on Levey's paper could agree to. It does not predict the inevitable further decline of the U.S. empire.

Our analysis of the decline of U.S. imperialism has two consequences: (a) the U.S. is in a very touchy competitive situation with the other imperialist powers; (b) the U.S. political empire will continue to disintegrate. (The facts cited in the p. 3 article of C-D Vol 10, no. 1 only spell out some of the consequences of the decline that has already taken place. They do not predict further decline.)

Both Alan Gilbert (in convention Bulletin #11) and the author of the Comment on Levey's papers in Bulletin 12B offer valuable and correct criticism of Levey's tendency to downplay the importance of the working class's holding state power under the party's leadership. The political domination of any other party would mean the reversal of socialism and a political defeat for the working class. I think everyone should read both of these criticisms carefully. Also, despite its weaknesses Levey's paper/contains much valuable material that we should discuss more.

However, neither author discusses what might have motivated Levey to suggest that the party encourage the formation of other parties under socialism. He seems to link the existence of other organized parties to the flourishing of proletarian democracy. He seems to suggest that unless other organized factions exist, there will not be a lot of political struggle. This seems to echo some remarks in the article on the seventh comintern congress in RRIII. Discussing Mao's theory of new democracy as a joint dictatorship of different classes and our view that despite the existence of other tendencies in the Chinese revolution, the Chinese government was still a form of the d of p, the article says

Mao confuses the governmental form of the dictatorship of the proletariat with the class essence of state power. In Russia the dictatorship of the proletariat took the governmental form of an alliance between the workers and peasants. (Initially the left Socialist Revolutionaries were represented in the government.) The dictatorship of the proletariat means that the proletariat controls the armed force necessary to suppress hostile class (bourgeois) opposition to carrying out policies that are in its class interest. When the Soviet Union was a socialist state the government and state apparatus (after the ouster of the Socialist Revolutionaries) was under a one-party monopoly. In the thinking of the international communist movement and the international proletariat, a one-party system (the Communist Party) became identical with the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This was a grave mistake. It narrowed the base of the dictatorship of the proletariat and confused and inhibited the development of proletarian democracy.

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat the Communists must lead (but not monopolize or dominate) the working class (industrial and agricultural, urban and rural) in its alliance with other class friends (middle peasants, and other petty bourgeoisie, revolutionary intellectuals, professionals, and students.)

So this document claims that the identification of the d of p with one-party rule inhibited the development of proletarian democracy. The corollary seems to be that to enhance proletarian democracy we should encourage the participation of other parties in the government. The rationale for this might be that it would raise the level of struggle in the working class.

However, I don't think this would be a correct conclusion from the passage I quoted. If we identify the dictatorship of the proletariat with one-party

rule we may be led to suppress other factions with guns before their ideas have been defeated among the masses. This would have the bad effect of intimidating many workers who might be in the grip of their ideas. So these people would feel politically inhibited, would not struggle for their ideas, would not participate in building socialism, and the base for building socialism would be narrowed unnecessarily. This would be a mistake if we suppressed these other groups only because we felt the d of p required a one-party government monopoly. We would have unnecessarily narrowed the base of the d of p just as we unnecessarily narrowed the base of SDS after the split.

However, the continued existence of the d of p may at some point require the forceful suppression of another faction with a base among the working class. While this would probably have the bad effect of intimidating some workers and lowering the level of struggle in the working class, we should be ready to do what is necessary for the w c to maintain state power. This means we must decide at a given point whether the continued political activity of a faction actually threatens the continued rule of the w c under our leadership. We must be ruthless with enemies of the working class when they threaten workers' state power. This will be especially necessary in the beginning of the d of p when racist ideas and other pro-boss ideas may still have a strong hold on a substantial number of workers. We shouldn't take a easy going attitude toward a group that would organize for racism (though perhaps behind a red flag). If the existence of such a group threatens to reverse socialism, we must disband it forcefully. If it can be defeated through political struggle with its members, then this may be a better course. The point of the passage quoted is that the mere existence of such a group, even in the gov't, does not mean that we don't have a d of p. However, the political domination of such a group would be the end of socialism.

Encouraging the existence of other groups is not the way to raise political struggle. To think that it is is to put forward a formal criterion for when there is good struggle. My experience in SDS is the existence of corrupt factions can lower the level of political struggle, leading to sterile debates rather than to political discussion with people whose minds are open. I think if each of us examines our own political experience we will realize that sharp political struggle with our friends does not require the existence of different factions in the organizations we work in.

If this could be printed right after the original article, it would probably be better, and make the point more sharply.

Dear friends:

In a recent article I wrote for one of the bulletins, entitled, "The Party, the Current Period, and ~~the~~ fighting the Right-Wing Trend" I put forward one point which in retrospect seems a bit one-sided. In point #11 on page 6 of that report I wrote: "People don't look towards PLP mainly to find friends; that is not <sup>why</sup> we joined PLP. For that you can join the YMCA. PLP is not the YMCA. "

That section seems to downplay the importance of having deep and well rounded social relationships between party members and their base, and within the party as well. To advocate that would be a serious error; the ruling class has many ways of winning people to serve it, or at least to prevent people from fighting it. Many of those ways are weapons which often appear to be only "matters of personality" or other seemingly non-political things. In order to really win people to the party, and in order for members to sustain their commitment, it is necessary for the party and that person's collective to BE FRIENDS with that person, and to help that individual work out his or her problems in a serious way. It would be entirely wrong, and would reflect a very narrow and naive notion of the many ways the ruling class can maintain its hold on people, even communists in PLP, if we were to deny the importance of carrying on that aspect of the struggle. However, I would like to reiterate one of the main points of that article which is that all "friendships" have to be based on struggle of some sort, and if we do not struggle to help our acquaintances solve their problems, and win them to an outlook based on never exploiting a member or ally of the working class and working hard to defeat the ruling class, if we fail to do that with anyone, and especially with party members because we are concerned with "keeping the peace", then, that kind of pseudo-"friendship" the working class can live without. PLP should not be interested in promoting bourgeois and reactionary notions of friendship; and leadership, while taking a well rounded approach and a sensitive approach to each members development, should never be vacillating, opportunist or weak. This only undercuts everyone's confidence in the leadership, the party, and the entire working class as well. The ruling class works desperately hard to spread cynicism and to spread the idea that we, the working class, does not have the power to change the world; they are desperately afraid that as we grasp that fact more and more firmly, it will represent a major political victory against them, and hasten their downfall all the more rapidly. Anyhow, I hope that clarifies what was somewhat one-sided in the original article.

END

12

Some ideas on "the woman question" for convention discussion

The party needs to consider much more carefully the question of doing work among women. I feel we deal better with the question of working women--because the situation is the same, the boss is clear to see, etc., perhaps this is easier to deal with. I am going to try to deal somewhat with the question of housewives. I have not thought through a lot of the questions, but maybe this article can open up some thinking on the subject.

#### THE ROLE OF HOUSEWIVES UNDER CAPITALISM

This is basically two-fold: one, as unpaid domestic servants. The work of cooking, cleaning, shopping, etc., which is necessary work to the society, is done in the ruling class by paid servants, but in the working class housewives do it unpaid. The other job is the raising of children -- for the bosses, a new generation of labor to exploit. (For the working class, a new generation of revolutionary fighters!) This labor is also unpaid. Between these two jobs, most housewives work 12 to 16 hours a day.

#### OPPRESSION OF HOUSEWIVES

- 1) Unpaid domestic labor. This labor is also unfruitful, that is, you are doing the same jobs over and over again, but not producing anything: just keeping the house clean, food on the table, etc., only to have to do it all over again the next day.
- 2) One of the worst aspects of the situation of housewives in this society is their isolation. Each woman is set away in her own house or apartment, to do her work by herself all day. This is a product of the way the family has evolved under capitalism as little cellular units. Thus you are not only doing unproductive labor, but are doing it alone, uncheered by fellow workers.
- 3) The frustration of raising children (the ones who make it all worth while) in this set-up. Because of the isolated, cellular family, and the fact that the bosses don't give a shit, it is hard to find playmates, play areas, constructive, collective things for kids to do. It is doubly hard to oppose all the ruling class ideas they are bombarded with and that are built into the situation: selfishness and self-centeredness.

racism, male chauvinism, etc., etc., etc.

4) Male chauvinist treatment by husbands (more or less according to the ideas of the husband) -- such as wife-beating, arrogance, refusal to share in household and child raising responsibilities, etc.

#### THE FIGHT FOR THE LIBERATION OF WOMEN IS THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

Under socialism, both domestic work and child rearing become what they really are -- social labor, labor that the society as a whole takes responsibility for. This takes the form of adequate nurseries and day care centers, primarily. Women are encouraged to take part in political work and in productive work, and it is made possible for them to do so. The rights and needs of children are respected and provided for by the society.

In addition, the struggle for socialism (before and after the revolution) requires the full participation of women and a sharp fight against male chauvinist ideology and the various forms of oppression of women. This in itself is "liberating."

I think that being in the party, or having a long-term understanding of these points, makes it a little easier to be a housewife. Being active gives you a purpose in life and in the raising of your kids, without which life would be much less bearable.

#### PLP'S RELATION TO THE "WOMEN QUESTION"

On the positive side, our party has put forward the best line about the "woman question." This is amid all kinds of bourgeois ideology on women's liberation both in the left movement and in the bosses' press. We have come out with a class line on the question, an understanding of the need for unity between men and women in the workers' movement. We have opposed ideas like "men are the enemy," that idea that "liberation" is hiring a maid and having a career, the idea that rejecting bras and make-up is the essence of freedom, and many more. This is all to our credit, and all to the good.

However, it has been somewhat of a drop in the bucket. Also, most of it was several years ago when the question came up in the student and anti-war movements. 2

Recently we have done very little in the way of ideological leadership on this. We need more articles in Challenge-Desafio and PL examining and explaining the oppression of women, putting forward our line and a program on it. Perhaps we could produce a pamphlet on the "woman question" covering both working women and housewives, well-written, entertaining, with illustrations, etc., for use among our friends, neighbors, fellow workers, as well as with all our other political contacts. This could help a lot of women see their way clear of their problems, understand that the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the party, is the solution, and get more active with us.

Also in line with the very good (I think) articles on culture that appeared in some of the convention bulletins, we should produce art that deals with this issue. Cartoons in the paper, posters, skits, songs, short-stories ...

Another aspect of PLP's relation to this question is the very strong tendency we have to underrate male chauvinism and women's oppression by thinking that we are somehow exempt from it. (or the U.S. is exempt from it or it is less sharp here?) Every aspect of the oppression of women existing in society also exists in the party along with all the bad ideas that stem from it. These things have a very big effect on the party and the functioning of party members.

Family life of party members is very influential in our political work. It can hold us back or give us tremendous strength and support. It cannot be underrated and is too little discussed. (Even though struggle in the party over developing a line on how the family should be operated has been too little, still it is often the case that party members' families are more stable than many and that many people have respect for us because of how our families function. We shouldn't underrate the effect of this on our base building. We also shouldn't -- vice versa -- underrate the effect of chauvinist family relations in the party.)

Women in the party, and wives of party members, face all the problems non-party women do. The absence of a line on dealing with this has led to some young mothers leaving the party, usually on the basis of "nothing being able to cope with everything" or "putting my family first." It is connected to fostering a certain degree

of selfishness of the form of being in your own house taking care of your own kids in your own way and not wanting to have it disrupted, even if something important comes up. It should be the exact opposite, because the fact is that only building the party, the revolution and socialism can make it possible to overcome women's oppression in the long-run. And the struggle to do that can make life better and more meaningful now. After all, dropping out of the party (or staying home and doing little) can't make your family better, your housework more fruitful, your children grow up to understand and be able to cope with the problems they face.

The tendency also exists in the party, as in the mass movement, for the husband to be more active than the wife. (This is a tendency, not an absolute.) Also the tendency for other male chauvinist family practices which put a lot of pressure on the wife and create antagonisms in the family exists in the party as well as outside of it and needs to be fought.

Finally, we need to develop more of a program both directly on women's oppression and also to integrate housewives into the working class and trade union movements.

I have more questions than answers on this:

- \* what about women's auxiliaries to t.u.'s? should we build them among wives of union members we're active with, as active, political union groups like the ones in the 30's (i.e. not coffee clutches)
  - \* a WAM housewives group? what would it do? maybe 30/40 agitation of some sort in communities?
  - \* what about helping set up co-operative day care programs and summer vacation programs in neighborhoods? this might help facilitate women doing other political work with the party.
  - \* fights for recreational facilities for kids?
- other??????????

These are just a few things that come to mind, maybe good, maybe bad. I'm sure there are others.

I hope others will respond, criticize or add to this article so that we can have at least some discussion on this at the convention. It is a necessary part of the party maturing and becoming involved in all aspects of the class struggle. It should also be considered in relation to a line on individual development.

## SELF\*CRITICISM

The forthcoming convention of the PLP, our third, marks a turning point in the history of the Party. It will be the first Convention that is dominated by ~~x~~ working class members of the Party and should mark the winning of the entire Party to a line of building the Party, building a mass movement among the working class for 30/40, fighting racism, and fighting the rightwing trend. At this juncture I began to think more seriously and, I hope, more deeply about my own work in the PLM and the PLP ~~xxxx~~ and arrived at some self-critical conclusions which I thought would be helpful to most Party members.

I have tended to be on the left in all inner Party struggles except one: the struggle to defeat sectarianism and win the Party membership to participating in the mass movements for reform that existed or to build such movements where they didn't exist. It was quite an effort to win me to this line. I was afraid of contaminating the ideological "purity" of the Party with the dangers of opportunism and reformism. No other CP had been able to survive the pre-revolutionary period, so why should we. I was eventually won to the line, at least in theory. But ~~xxxxx~~ what does adherence to such sectarianism reflect? In retrospect it is obvious that without becoming deeply involved in the day-to-day struggles of people we could never establish hegemony ~~xxxx~~ within the working class and never lead a revolution. And historically, it was obvious that the problem with previous CP's was not that they did too much mass work but that what they did IN the mass organizations was incorrect. They were opportunist not in the sense that they fought for reforms but in the sense that they did not use the fight for reforms to ~~xxxxx~~ build the Party as a revolutionary communist organization.

Basically it seems that I didn't believe that workers and other oppressed people could be won to communist ideas. I also didn't think that reform struggles were very important. "After all," I thought, "all that counts is the revolution." "These reform struggles never really accomplish that much." This attitude reflects two things: 1) I ~~didn't really care~~ didn't really care that much about what bothered other people, their concerns, only my own cosmic objections to the system; 2) I didn't really believe that I needed these reforms. I didn't really believe they affected me or my family. This is patently ridiculous of course. Less crowded schools, a shorter work week, smashing racist medical care would all benefit me and my family. (That is why I am being won to more participation in the mass movement.)

A corollary of this weakness was that I have been very impatient with people in my base who are not won to communist ideas. This includes many of my petty bourgeois professional friends who are basically liberals. Their political outlook reflects their intermediate class position and their shortrange outlook, especially the transient ~~possibility~~ possibility for them to succeed materially somewhat in the system now. At times I have alienated people like this who in other respects were honest and dedicated fighters for reform in the community and

7  
within their professional organizations. Once again I did not care about THEIR concerns. All that I cared about was my "profound" Marxist understanding of the "ultimate" source of their problems.

The arrogance that is implicit in this outlook needn't be emphasized. Unfortunately it afflicts all too many of us and antagonizes all too many basically good people who may be liberals, or under the influence of the revisionists or the nationalists. It also affects our relations with wives, husbands and other family. The crucial question seems to be to realize that these reform issues do affect us, too, and are worth fighting for. If we can integrate communist politics with the struggle for reforms, eventually the mass movement will make the qualitative leap to revolutionary struggle as people realize that there is no other way to satisfy their needs..

It is interesting that if one examines ~~that~~ the adherence to sectarianism dialectically one realizes that devotion to the revolution in this ~~sectarian~~ sectarian way really means devotion to the status quo. The revolution is really an abstraction when viewed in isolation from the mass movements that lead up to it. If I really believed that people couldn't be won to reform struggles because they wouldn't accomplish anything or that if they were won they still wouldn't accomplish anything, how could people be won to revolution except as a purely abstract bookish, scholastic devotion. Under those circumstances being a revolutionary is both literally and ~~figuratively~~ figuratively a posture, a stance, like waving the red flag on the front steps of the Pentagon.

Racism only intensifies this problem for what is the point of winning black ~~people~~ people to a struggle for reforms. They certainly won't get anything out of anything short of revolution. So I didn't struggle with my black friends politically even though the line of our work is racism ruins medicine.

And since the only solution is revolution and nothing in between is really worth fighting for much less taking risks for, I became overly concerned with bourgeois concepts of success, prestige, etc. My particularly job became more important to me than the class struggle. Of course since my "goal" was revolution and nothing less, I was a set-up for demoralization and guilt feelings since the revolution never came. I could never do enough to make it come so I always felt pressured. Thus I could never really relax and build a base with particular people. After all, the revolution is just around the corner. How could I waste time with people who might not be won for years? Well of course if the sole or overwhelmingly main criterion in ~~friend~~ friend-ship is political expediency you won't have many friends. And if you constantly worry about what your boss will think of you, you won't build many struggles. And you will be more demoralized. It is a self-fulfilling prophecy.

~~Nazi~~ Nationalism was another weakness. Since the USA is the key country in the world in which to defeat capitalism ( a nationalist and ethnocentrist position) what difference does the revolutionary movement elsewhere matter except in

18  
so far as it helps us. Especially egregious was my neglect of the revolutionary struggle in Puerto Rico, the focal point of US capitalist and imperialist contradictions. I didn't read the literature of the LIGA in Spanish even though they translated most of our key articles into Spanish so that their base could read them. This had manifestations of both racism and nationalism.

Because of my lack of faith in mass work, the mass movement and people, I didn't take seriously the ideological struggle in my area of work. I didn't see it as important to write scholarly articles attacking the racist, elitist, professionalist offensive of the leaders of my profession. I have been sitting on a potential article on human ~~experimentation~~ experimentation for over a year now that should have been written and in PL magazine a long time ago.

I don't want to create the impression that I don't think I should be in the Party. I have made some contributions. My agitational work is pretty good; I sell the paper, etc. Over the years I have won a number of people to the Party. In the section I have played a positive role ideologically and even in terms of winning many people to the Party line which I myself barely carried out. However, as the Party grows, and we win more people who are active in the mass movement, those of us who started the other way around, i.e. communist ideology leading to communist agitation leading to..., had better get involved in mass work or we will become fossils, antiques, useful in their time but purely decorative now.

Encl - 6-28-73  
JMG

6/5/73

Mike Dejan

Individual work evaluation- independent party work

I. self criticism student work

A. SDS- Loyola U. 1st semester after joining the party

my first involvement was getting to know some black students on campus better on a political basis. Some time had passed in idle conversation. I felt obligated to explain to people my involvement with politics. I found time to talk with:

1. intensive one shots--which were too romantic.
2. others in casual group discussions--all black students that knew me, also knew i was a communist (not knowing of the FLP or what that even meant).

There was no attempt at this time to make the parties press, C-D, known, even though and because of the Muslim paper of Terry X. I saw all blacks as being either reactionary or do-nothings. My main weakness was a non-committal attitude of struggle, e.g., one shot romantic raps about revolution with no plan for it.

summary of weaknesses; sectarianism, opportunism, chauvinism, elitism, i.e. no political organizing, just rapping.

summary of strengths: got to know black students, was in the mass movement.

B. SDS-L.U. spring '72

Spent less time with black students bullshitting. was encouraged to sell C-D regularly on campus in a mass way. Related more to white and other minority students in their separate hangouts. Tried more to follow up contacts, and by so doing, won Felipe and Carlos to go to the SDS Convention. They became my main concentration. At the Convention I didn't concentrate on discussion with them. As a result, they were consolidated as nationalists by another faction there. Back home again, Felipe became more involved in nationalist struggles of the Spanish Coalition for Jobs, the CTA demo in Pilsen, etc., and less involved on campus. He quit school for the community and joined La Raza Unida Party.

\* note- Felipe and I ran on a Tokem Ethnic slate for student government after the Conv. I didn't actively participate but was very critical (sectarianism).

Carlos, pres. of LASO, still bought the paper, but was not involved in too much mass activity. He was involved in the CTA demo, but was on the fringe. I didn't talk enough about the party and the weaknesses of nationalism. Both Carlos and Felipe participated in the Latino Strategy Conference.

C. After the SDS Convention.

Still no plan for political organizing among black students, but some discussion of the racist theorists and the need to fight them. People had a lot of respect for me as a fighter (arrests in welfare demo, picture in the paper attacking Herrstein, Shockley), but little idea of the party. More people were willing to "listen".

Worked more with white students:

Rich, Al, Tony, Linda, MaryLou, Elmer, and Colin. They participated at the Nixon blockade, in classroom organizing, and in discussions of racism-nationalism. We attempted to form a radical student group, but were caught up in the tactics; I was not directive enough in this center grouping.

D. Last semester at Loyola

summary of weaknesses: not being able to involve my base in the mass work, nor in the independent party work.

summary of strengths: good working relations; all these people were actively concerned about Southern U.--leafletting, telegrams, classroom organizing, and fund-raising; three of these people went to the Inaug. demo, raised money, talked to people, etc.

II. criticisms

Not a consistent enough plan for the work at L.U. because it was not a main concentration. Our unclarity on working more consistently with minority students. No center people involved in the work at L.U. in relation to SDS. I didn't see the need for a plan for organizing.

III. present work projected

A. work closer with : Roy, Rich, Al, and relatives. talking about:

1. the vanguard line
2. the independent party line- the need for a party, C-D, the need for a socialist revolution, and how the party sees that coming about.
3. involvement in the mass work--unions, Wam, etc.

21

4. study -discussion groups
5. donations-pledges- subs
6. joining the Party

B. I will do what ever I can on my job. Which means:

1. talking to people about the need to fight racism, anti-working-class, and other ruling-class ideas.
2. selling C-D to fellow workers
3. introducing them to WAM and the Party.

I will be in a good situation to develop a relationship with the parents of clients; E.G., One parent is a steel worker at Southworks, one is a clerk at the P.O. This will be a good opportunity to involve some of these people in the work of the Party.

( I work at a so-called "home for wayward girls". I do counseling and casework, and work with a team of teachers and residence mothers most of whom are lay people.)

C. Party leadership

I will be giving political leadership to the community sub-club. This means guaranteeing more that the Party's line gets carried out. It has been suggested that I be on the Chicago steering committee, I will carry out the line and will struggle to build the party in the interests of the working-class.

IV. Longer range political perspective

Before, I was hoping to go to graduate school in Social work. I felt that this was a mandate due to the increased competition for social worker positions. The bosses' present plan is to drastically reduce the contact between workers and clients; I feel that they are hoping to offset the relationship that could produce greater unity in opposition to their racist oppression. The M-L's ideas have given these workers more power to fight back. Their plan is to also pay less to workers, while increasing work loads. I feel now that I should and can fight these things on my present job. My fellow workers are pissed off and are seeking ways to fight this oppression. I hope to contribute communist ideas and leadership to this struggle. Eventually, I hope to work in a social service employees' union.

This is a general point that may help to clarify the discussion about the reversal of socialism in the Soviet Union.

Our line on China is that the reversal of workers' power comes with the reversal of the Great Leap Forward. At this point the struggle in the party between bourgeois and proletarian lines is decided and the central committee of the party leads the reversal of the gains made by the working class during the great leap. We would say that up to this time China was a dictatorship of the proletariat, that the party was following a working class line (despite reversals such as the elimination of the supply system). The reason we would say this is, I think, that through the period 1949-1957 the party was leading the masses in the direction of greater and greater equality and collectivism. So ~~despite~~ despite contrary trends (elimination of supply system) the direction was toward communism. In reversing the great leap, the party leadership moves to reverse a tremendous advance toward communism. (as it is now reversing the gains of the cultural revolution)

Can we use a similar criterion to apply to soviet history? I do not know of mass x movements which were relatively independent of party leadership which the party leadership intervened to reverse. If we apply the criterion to movements in other countries, we might have to say socialism was reversed in the 20's (I am told that the soviet leadership told revolutionaries in Germany and Hungary to "cool it"). Did the NEP constitute a reversal of the gains made by workers during the period 1917-21? If so, would we have to, by this criterion, say the revolution was reversed with the NEP?

The point is that in the case of the Chinese revolution, I understand why I think the bourgeoisie ~~reversed~~ took state power during the great leap. The proletarian and bourgeois lines fought it out and the bourgeois line won. I feel I don't know how to decide the question in the case of the Soviet Union. Was there ever such a decisive struggle in the party?

23

Dear comrades,  
 As the writer indicates this paper was submitted too late for the internal bulletins.  
 We wonder why? Obviously these ideas didn't appear over-night in his head. These are long held views. The only reason this article was suppressed by the <sup>WAS</sup> writer because he was afraid of the party members. Like all cowards he sent in the article when he thought there would be no scrutiny. He intended it as a "cheap shot" against the leaders and some members of the party. The NSC felt that it would have some value if it saw the light of day. A convention resolution calling for a continuance of internal bulletins provides a good outlet for these ideas. One might say that these ideas are the logical conclusion of revisionism. Attached to the article is the pedestrian attempt by these two to disrupt the convention. Rejected by party members they went outside the party to organize against it. Their political line internally and externally smack of the usual anti-party rituals.

since the convention both Dennis and Bruce have been expelled from the party. However, many of their ideas abound to some degree among most of us. And so, it is by negative example that we feel this piece is of value. (Another long piece by Bruce is incomprehensible therefor we are sparing the party. However, the ideas are the same as in this one by

Dennis.)

Wally -

NSC.

24

I didn't figure this could get printed before the convention --- but I wanted you to have a copy anyway (I am not circulating it around the party on my own).

Fraternally,

Dennis

1 of 24 25

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PARTY CONVENTION

submitted by Dennis King, West Side club (N.Y.)

I disagree with the basic thrust of the convention discussion bulletins. The "rightwing drift", if it exists at all, is not the main problem in the current period. It is being emphasized with increasing hysteria because our leaders and members are afraid to deal with the really urgent dangers that threaten our party with extinction.

These dangers are sectarianism and inner-party bureaucracy.

Because of these twin problems PL is not growing in influence among the masses. And the quality of its internal life has sharply declined (as proven, among other things, by the lack of creative analysis in the convention bulletins so far).

A communist party can only follow a mistaken path for a limited period before quantity changes into quality. Either it corrects its erroneous tactics or an irremedial degeneration sets in. PL is getting close to that point of no return. Our convention can either enthrone sectarianism and bureaucracy as permanent fixtures (which will probably kill the party), or carry out a far-reaching transformation of our program, our mass work, our party structure, our press, and of the ingrained habits and mentality of our leaders and members: the narrowmindedness, arrogance and fear that keep the majority of our members isolated from the masses, and the majority of our leaders isolated ~~from~~ both from the masses and from the party rank-and-file.

The following are the most essential points on which the convention should act:

1. Overcome sectarianism in relation to our united front work.

The main resources of our party at present are going into building parallel organizations: our own party-led pseudo-mass movements such as WAM and SDS (the post-split SDS). In spite of large sums of money and herculean energies being spent on conventions for these organizations, they remain--and will always remain--mere front groups, outside the mainstream of the class struggle and with no real life apart from their party nursemaids. The conventions and demonstrations held by these groups--and the leaflets and newspapers issued in their name--spin a web of illusion. PL members are enabled to say, "we pulled out 700 people for the latest WAM convention,"--but how much is this really worth? The CP, SWP, and Labor Committee all claim equal or greater numbers for their front group conventions. Meanwhile, there is a mass movement out in the mainstream of American society comprising millions of working people. Where are we in relation to it? The minor advantage of conducting agitation through our front groups is more than offset by the disadvantages: they have become an out-and-out diversion from the real task of burrowing into the already-existing mass organizations in American society --the unions, churches, neighborhood political clubs, parents associations, daycare centers, pressure groups, etc. which already embody (in spite of bad leaders) the reform aspirations of the people.

WAM and SDS, in comparison to this vast mass movement, are inconsequential. Worse, they are a diversion and an illusion. I propose that we abolish ~~them~~ them and throw our main energies into the already existing center-right (mainstream) organizations and movements.



We must stop misinterpreting Road to Revolution III! This document, as everyone knows, condemns any form of alliance with the liberal wing of the capitalist class. But people misread it to mean that we should not support any reform demand that also happens to be supported by the liberal bosses. As if supporting the reform demand means ipso facto making an alliance.

Many of the reforms pushed by liberal bosses, however, are good reforms (or have a good aspect), regardless of the bosses' motives. For instance, lets suppose the liberals in Chicago introduce stringent air-pollution control legislation. If we sit on the sidelines, and the legislation fails to pass, then the working class loses (does even the most sectarian Pler believe that workers are fond of smog?). If we sit on the sidelines, and the legislation passes, then the liberals are able to hog all the credit and increase their ideological grip on the public. Again, the working class loses. Afterwards, of course, the bosses devise a way to make the working class bear the cost of the new smokestack filters, etc. In a sense, one could still say its a bona fide reform (better higher taxes than more emphysema), but why not attempt to counter such a move--why not launch demonstrations, lobbying efforts, etc. around a slogan of making the bosses bear the cost. Obviously, this would only be possible if we had influence among environmentalists, the people who are already committed to fighting around the pollution issue (if we can't move them, we can't move other segments of the public--whose attention is distracted by a thousand and one other issues and outrages on the job and in the community). But remember: in our hypothetical example, we stood on the sidelines. We failed to establish a communist presence in the environmental movement at the point when we were needed the most (i.e., when the original legislation was being proposed ~~and fought for~~ and fought for). So the ordinary, honest supporters of pollution control now won't listen to our plea to continue the fight. The workers end up paying higher taxes or prices, and Challenge ends up gloating: "See, we told you that's what the liberals would do; we told you ecology was a phony issue"--a self-fulfilling prophecy if there ever was one!

Now lets take some real life examples:

1) The environmental movement emerged in 1968-9 as a nationwide phenomena. The ruling class helped build it, but real people nevertheless got involved around real, anti-capitalist issues (the California oil spills, for instance). We could have played a role, won some credit in the eyes of millions of working class and middle class people who believe that clean air and beaches are important. Instead, we sneered--while other forces jumped in and won credit for a series of significant reforms.

Score: Ruling Class 1, Progressive Labor 0.

2) An Equal Rights Amendment passed Congress recently and was ratified by many states; it needs victory in just a few more states to become law. This amendment, if it passes, will bring urgently needed reforms to American society (in its legal implications, it goes as far towards equality for women as most of the revisionist countries have ever gone). Yet the women's lib groups apparently aren't quite skillful or powerful enough to overcome a last minute conservative counter-attack. PL could play a major role at this juncture, and guarantee an ongoing influence for itself in the women's rights movement. But we choose to sit this one out.

Score: Ruling Class 2, Progressive Labor 0.

3) Nixon is suddenly exposed while in the midst of a lot of police-state type shenanigans. The greatest "scandal" in U.S. political history ensues. The working class public watches the Senate hearings on TV--and gets plenty angry. But does PL launch a mass movement around Watergate, as French socialists once did around the Dreyfuss affair? Do we organize mass marches to impeach Nixon, to get the U.S. out of Cambodia, to demand government reforms that would slow down or halt the police-state trend? Do we take the urgently needed steps that Brezhnev ordered Gus Hall and the troika not to take? No, our newspaper takes a negative attitude again (ah, what's the difference...its just a squabble between new money and old money...its only diverting the workers' attention from 30-for-40...). Well, maybe there is a squabble between liberal and conservative bosses--but what the hell? We could ~~have~~ moved vast numbers of people! Instead, we sit ~~there~~ out, letting the N.Y. Times take all the credit for checking police-statism.

Score: Ruling Class 3, Progressive Labor 0.

One reason we give for not getting involved in such issues as the above is that they are "too middle class" or "not sufficiently working class." One wonders how such mystical judgements are arrived at. Our party's top leaders have been out of the shops for ten years. Many of our new leaders have never been near a shop. None of us study the ruling class opinion polls (which do tell what the working class is interested in at a given moment--the bourgeoisie is curious, even if we aren't). None of us think of organizing our own PLP or WAM opinion polls. So who the hell knows which issues are "sufficiently working class?" We attacked the "counter-culture" for years, saying it would turn off workers. Meanwhile, an entire generation of young workers joined this counter-culture and developed an intellectual curiosity and cultural sophistication (from ruling class movies, television and rock music, ironically) that Challenge hasn't even begun to catch up with!

### 3. Overcome our sectarianism in relation to reform tactics.

When a party member enters a mainstream group, after a long sojourn in party front-groups or inner-party leadership roles, he is not unlike a high school football star going off to college, and discovering, suddenly, that he is a nobody, a lowly freshman. He steps from a comfortable little world in which PLP is regarded with respect--to a world in which PLP is either unknown, regarded as irrelevant, or positively disliked. He steps from a world in which leadership had been handed to him on a silver platter--to a world in which leadership must be earned. He steps from a world that is controlled by PLP--to a world where PLP has no control, and where you "pay in blood" for being sectarian and arrogant. He steps from a world in which everyone thinks alike and follows the cues of the cheerleaders--to a world that is ornery, cantankerous and full of life.

What happens then? His Challenge selling falls off; his recruitment of study group members slackens; he fails to bring his quota of people to party demonstrations. Why? Some observers would say its culture shock. Others would say its the right-wing drift. I would say that its the normal reflection of the realities of the situation. You can't measure mainstream work by the same standards of success as front-group work or independent party work.

Our main goal in mainstream groups, at this stage, should not be to recruit a lot of people to the party and win the mass membership to revolutionary politics. Firstly, because its not yet possible on a significant scale. (America is not in a revolutionary situation; the masses are not spontaneously yearning for communist leadership.) Secondly, because trying to put party-building first would only divert us from the realistic tasks--the tasks which, if accomplished properly, will lay the basis for vigorous party-building at a later stage.

What are these realistic tasks? To win the confidence of the people inside these movements--their confidence in us as persons, and their confidence in us as leaders of reform struggles. This is the kind of influence it is possible for us to have in the mainstream at the present time. The influence of PL's strategy for revolution will emerge over a period of years.

Winning the people's confidence in us as persons is relatively easy, if we are friendly and sincere. Winning their confidence in us as tactical leaders is not so easy. At first we will be fighting alongside them and advising them, but not leading them (except in rare cases). To really become part of their leadership (i.e., part of the honest element in their leadership) we will have to prove our consistency in and devotion to the reform cause at hand. Furthermore, we will have to prove our competence--by producing results in the work, and producing them over and over again.

Here we come to the real problem. PL members can only develop influence in mass organizations if they develop effectiveness in the fight for reforms. But most PL members don't really think reforms are important! And even when they do, they are so amateurish and sectarian in their tactics that they can't produce the goods.

My position is this: Reforms are important because the revolution is a long way off, the people are suffering, and anything we can do to relieve their and our suffering should be done. Reforms are possible because other forces win them, quite often, and the only reason PL doesn't is because of its sectarianism and amateurishness.

What does a serious approach to reforms mean? It means studying the issues that relate to your mass organization with the thoroughness of a Ralph Nader. It means looking for the weak points in the system--where something can actually be won. It means not sneering at opportunities for winning small or secondary or easy victories. It means using the entire arsenal of methods available under bourgeois democracy: not just mass struggle and symbolic actions, but also the more "respectable" methods: lobbying, electoral work, public relations ploys, courtroom maneuvers, boycotts. It means not using the "respectable" methods in a shame-faced way but actually mastering them. It means being infinitely detailed and imaginative and realistic in the formulation of one's program. It means charting out longrange plans for winning a particular reform and then sticking to one's guns, not giving up after a single splash.

People will say to me: "Aren't we already doing this? Look at the 30-for-40 referendum in New York." In my opinion, this referendum is just another case of amateurishness. First, because we are conducting it through a front group, in isolation from the mainstream movements. Second, because 30-for-40 isn't close enough to the daily needs of the people (or to their political concerns--Watergate, etc.) to really grip them. Third, because the campaign is purely agitational--even if the referendum wins, it will only be a symbolic expression of opinion, and I don't think most working people are interested in moving on something that can't lead to a concrete victory. Fourth, because the demand, even as pure agitation, is unrealistic for a single city: If actually implemented (as the ruling class in Berkeley shrewdly pointed out), it would only cause industry to leave that city, destroying its tax base and creating further unemployment.

On the credit side of the ledger: One reason the party got involved in this referendum campaign was because our leadership believes--tentatively--that we should be involved in electoral work. I agree--but if we're going to do it, lets go all the way. Our vacillation and timidity about electoral work (which has been going on for several years) only produces an oatmeal mush. Serious electoral work means running candidates (or supporting someone else's candidate) and learning how to make use of Democratic party primaries (as the Black Panthers are doing--although I don't condone their opportunist program).

4. Keep people in one spot.

This sounds obvious, yet it is one of our party's vexed problems. Our leadership simply does not understand the advantages of keeping the same people in one neighborhood, one industry or shop, or on one campus for 10-20 years (indeed, for a lifetime). Only through this can our members develop the all-sided, subtle and deep understanding of issues, organizations and personalities (and the encyclopedic knowledge of local "lore") that is so essential to giving mass leadership in a particular spot. Only through this can our members develop ties of trust and confidence not just with a few people, on the basis of close friendship, but with wide circles, based on consistent work and service and mutual obligations formed in a long series of community or shop struggles.

Building a base (in terms of objective ties and also in terms of one's subjective understanding) is like raising a child: it takes ten or twenty years to do the job properly. And if you're not going to do the job properly, there's no sense in doing it at all.

Keeping people in one spot is also important for the development of the party's line. Indeed, it's like having a controlled laboratory of the mass work. Such people can observe year after year the effect of every twist and turn in the party's line on the same neighborhood or shop, the same mass organizations, the same personalities and local "types." They can develop, thereby, an intuitive knowledge of what we can and can't "sell"--an intuitive knowledge that would be impossible if they had been flitting around from one area of work or leadership task to another.

The bourgeoisie understands this very well: their politicians and union hacks stay in one spot, even if the "base" is relatively mobile. I think we communists should cultivate hundreds of permanent local cadres; I think our leaders should recognize that to move a "permanent"--except for the direst of reasons--is like cutting the heart out of the party. Our war with the bourgeoisie is not a guerrilla war, but a positional war: we've got to outlast them. Every time a person who has begun to develop deep roots and an intuitive understanding in a particular spot moves, that is a victory for the bourgeoisie. Every time a young cadre who is talented and could become a "permanent" is allowed to run all over the city playing "leader," that is also a victory for the bourgeoisie.

The process of being transmuted into a "permanent" is a change of quantity into quality that takes a few years. It involves (among other things) the development of a fierce loyalty to the neighbors or co-workers with whom one is associated year in and year out--and I don't just mean loyalty to a few friends but to the wider circles as well.

What are the reasons our members leave a spot before this transmutation can take place? Or, more tragically, after it takes place?

1) They leave because the party needs them for leadership on a higher level (which isolates them from the very thing that might make them really competent leaders in the long run);

2) They leave because the party needs them to open up a new city or region;

3) They leave because of personal problems (usually the party doesn't encourage this--yet doesn't fight vigorously against it, either);

4) They stay put geographically (in the same apartment) but move into another area of work (from community to student or trade union work, for instance); this is the same thing as moving to another city--staying put, to my way of thinking, means

staying put all the way, in a single area of political concentration.

5) They leave because the party put them in the wrong spot in the first place (a student in basic industry, for instance). This is the only universally valid reason for leaving.

The first four reasons are occasionally valid (in one out of twenty cases, perhaps). Usually, however, the benefits to be gained by shifting a "permanent" are more than outweighed by the ties, local knowledge, etc. that are lost. (As to the gaining of varied experiences: the opportunity is present, in any good spot, for an enterprising party member to participate over the years in dozens of forms of political strife and to meet hundreds of social types. A single shop or neighborhood is like a drop of pond water seen under a microscope--a seething cauldron of problems and complexities that could challenge one's intellect for a lifetime.) Unfortunately, most of the pressure to move is directed at the most talented people in the party, the people most capable of building something in one spot. I say: If they are needed for higher levels of leadership, let them stay in their spot and do their inner-party leading on a part-time basis. If they are needed for another city, forget the other city: Quality in a few--even just one or two--areas is better than ciphers in a dozen areas. "Permanents" can set the sort of example in mass work that will eventually spread the party like a prairie fire elsewhere.

Just as we think of permanent individuals, I think we should begin to consider the question of permanent clubs. A party club is most valuable if its members have ties of trust among one another, ties of the sort that can only develop over a period of years. Thus, if a club has problems, the leadership should try to keep it together, and encourage it to work things out over the long haul. How can people develop mutual trust and confidence without occasionally getting into squabbles. The constant juggling of club memberships inhibits the development of exemplary collectives which can embody (on a higher and more comprehensive level) the same qualities as the individual "permanent."

10 of 24

34

5.  
4. Building the party.

As a result of our sectarianism and isolation from the mainstream mass movements, we have mostly recruited individuals who are themselves semi-isolated and sectarian. The assumption has always been that they would change, once inside the party, by "ideological struggle." This is an unwarranted assumption. Ideology, at this stage of the game, may have the power to change people's political opinions and organizational affiliations; it does NOT have the power (except in rare cases) of transforming the lifelong habits and characters of individuals. If someone is naturally isolated and lacking in initiative, they will stay that way (or only change over a ten or twenty year period). Perhaps this would not be so if society was in a process of rapid upheaval, with icons being smashed on all sides. Perhaps this would not be so if bourgeois ideology had suffered a strategic weakening (which it has not, either in society as a whole or in day-to-day relations within the party). Perhaps this would not be so if our "natural sectarians" were surrounded on all sides by loving, helping collectives of friends, co-workers and relatives--all imbued with socialist consciousness. Such conditions, however, do not yet exist.

We must face the facts: the type of people we are recruiting ~~are not~~ are not, by and large, going to be able to have a significant impact on mainstream mass movements; i.e., to become people's leaders. The ability to be a people's leader is a matter of pre-existing aptitude, of special combinations of personality, character, intelligence, integrity, fighting spirit, initiative, spontaneous love of people, etc. that people bring into the party with them. We must find and recruit people who already, in large measure, possess these qualities.

The best way to find them is among people already involved in mainstream struggles, issues and organizations, usually on a consistent basis. (This is one touchstone of their potential as communists--the fact that they didn't wait for us to organize them before getting involved.) We must realize, however, that these people are already committed to the struggles, issues and organizations they are in (this commitment is another touchstone). We can't get at them by requesting that they drop what they are doing and join WAM or the 30-for-40 referendum campaign. We've got to join the struggle already dear to them. We've got to develop ties of mutual obligation, trust and friendship while helping them develop these struggles. We've got to be willing to learn from them as well as teach them.

Unfortunately, most PL members are looking for people that they can involve in a front-group activity. This means their attention is directed away from the already-committed people we so desperately need. This means their attention is focussed on isolated people and people lacking in initiative--people who are waiting to be told what to join.

But this is not the only problem: Natural leaders tend to be relatively mature and realistic in the approach to life; they also tend to have (already) a great deal of experience--often more than any of us. Our party's newspaper and sectarian tactics appear kooky and even infantile to these people. They may work with individual PL members (and respect these individuals); they may come to party events out of curiosity or a sense of personal obligation to their friend in the party; they will not, however, join the party. As an organization, it lacks credibility to

11 of 24

35

them. They will only join it when it takes serious steps to change its sectarianism.

Perhaps the reader thinks I'm exaggerating? I believe too many of our members and leaders have become so isolated that they have forgotten how ordinary people think and feel. They simply don't realize the harm done by the jargon in our newspaper, by the bloodthirsty posturing and posing, by the childishness of scattering swastikas all over the paper, and by the tactical reflection of all this nonsense in our mass work. (See the section of this paper that deals with Challenge.)

Recruiting more natural fighters and people's leaders is a life-and-death matter for the party. Not only because they are the path to influence in the mass movements, but also because they are the only force that can prevail over the creeping glacier of bureaucratism in our party. To get them, we've got to make momentous changes in our tactics and style, all down the line.

I do NOT, however, think we should close party membership to people who are personally isolated, etc. The fact is that making a revolution is a many-sided process which can use hundreds of types of skills. Recruiting semi-isolated people is only a danger when they are the main type you are recruiting. If we recruit some people's leaders, the latter will be leaven in the bread and may even be able to transform some of our semi-isolated members through careful advice and guidance and through the benefit of their experience. One thing is certain, our present lower-level leaders (who are themselves often isolated) will ~~transfer anybody~~ will never transform anybody through the currently popular tactics of commandism, psychological bullying, and quasi-religious exhortation.

### 6. Overcoming sectarianism in our party journalism.

The main way in which the masses know the party, as an organization, is through its press. For this reason, it is urgent that we transform Challenge from a sectarian-communist paper into a mass-communist paper. The idea expressed in one of the previous convention bulletins that a paper cannot be both communist and mass at the same time is one of the most pernicious ideas ever advanced in our party--what it really says is that communism should never aspire to be more than a sect. Transforming Challenge is the main link in the chain in the fight against sectarianism!

People say that the main reason Challenge sales have dropped is because of the right-wing drift among the members, who have stopped selling hard enough. And that the solution is more exhortation by the leadership. This is a fundamental miscalculation (as proved by the fact that it hasn't worked, even though the exhortations have constantly escalated in ferocity over the past two years).

The real problem with respect to Challenge sales is Challenge itself. Most ordinary people don't like it. They read it once, twice, and then stop. (If this wasn't true--if we didn't have such a high readership turnover--then we could easily have maintained our 100,000 circulation figure.) Even our small base of steady readers aren't really enthusiastic about the paper. Many of them buy it out of loyalty to the party, or friendship, or respect for the reform militancy of the PL member in their shop, rather than because they really want to read it. As a result, it has very little political impact on them; i.e., it doesn't build the party.

Only by transforming Challenge will we be able to turn one-shot or occasional buyers into steady buyers! Only by transforming Challenge will we be able to turn steady buyers into steady readers! Only by transforming Challenge will we be able to turn steady readers into devoted, avid readers whose entire world view is step by step moved to the left through its influence! And only through setting in motion this entire process will we be able to build a circulation in the hundreds of thousands and eventually the millions.

Some people say the problem is the style of Challenge. I think we have to look much deeper than that.

The main thing that comes across to the average Challenge buyer is not our party's political line, but the sectarian approach to life with which our political line has gotten so hopelessly entangled. The party leadership, and most party members, are deeply isolated from the mainstream mass movement in America, and from the daily aspirations, thoughts and emotions of the average worker and student. The convergence of this objective isolation with the subjective sharpness of our line, in the consciousness of our leaders and members, produces a peculiar distortion of consciousness (the "PL disease"). The main aspect of this distorted consciousness is not the sharp (and generally correct) political line, but the isolation--and the bourgeois ideology connected with the isolation--which twist the line into a travesty of itself (so that the defense of the D. of P. becomes a defense of Golda's moustache).

Challenge is written and edited by people with this distorted consciousness--and reproduces it with photographic precision. The average man in the street (already afflicted with his own type of craziness) is either turned off, or just puzzled. As we said above, he buys the paper once, or twice, and then stops buying it.

Example: Challenge presents a visionary world in which everything is front-line struggle--because that is all we think about. Meanwhile, the average worker is living in a world in which he is very rarely on the front lines. He may have an interest in what goes on there, but he also has an interest in a great variety of other things.

Example: Challenge presents a dreamworld in which the most important news events are the picket lines of PL and its isolated front groups--because this is what we wish the masses were interested in. Meanwhile, out in the mainstream, plenty of forces are hitting on things a lot heavier than SDS's anti-Jensen campaign--things which go unreported, not only because our party is isolated from them, but also because we persist in excusing our isolation (by saying the other forces are unimportant, or represent a dead end, or have rotten leadership, etc.).

Example: Challenge assumes a dreamworld in which the average man in the street is like Wally Lindner; i.e., has a deep, scientific interest in analysing the details of minor shop struggles around the country in order to apply them in his own situation. In fact, no such interest exists (although, hopefully, it will one day). We fill the paper with detailed accounts of this or that local contract negotiation or union sell-out, and nobody reads these accounts (except the people in the shop concerned--who could get it all from a leaflet).

These are three glaring examples--but our distortion of consciousness, like any disease, produces a thousand and one minor symptoms and, again, these are reflected in Challenge--in its strident style, its kooky headlines, its heavyhanded jargon, and the parrotlike repetitiousness of its articles.

Isolation feeds the distortion of consciousness; the distortion of consciousness feeds the isolation; at a certain point, quantity changes into quality and the desperate edge of fanaticism emerges. The leadership announces not that we're going to return to reality, integrate with the mainstream mass movement, and start seriously educating people in the program of R.R.III. No, it announces (in relation to Challenge) that we're going to escalate "sharpness" (i.e., intensify isolation). Furthermore, it announces that the workers are deficient in class hatred and that we're going to instill them with it via Challenge cartoons (as if class hatred can be fostered by cartoons anymore than true love can be promoted by pornography).

But even if Challenge would purge itself of all this sectarianism, we still would not be left with a paper whose circulation could soar into the hundreds of thousands and which could eventually become the Daily Challenge.

The paper is not only sectarian, it is amateurish. The bulk of the articles are written by people in local clubs who have no training in professional journalism. These articles are worked over--and the remainder of the articles are written--in a central office in New York, where the staff also has no training in professional journalism.

14 of 24

38

Now a lot of people think that the idea of professionalism is revisionist. Let me forestall them: I believe that policy decisions under socialism should be made by the masses, not by cliques of experts. I believe that experts should live like ordinary people. But I do not believe that society can dispense with experts--on the contrary, under socialism everyone should gradually become an expert in some field or other.

Challenge needs a professional staff; it also needs to decrease its reliance on locally-written articles. We are not living in Lenin's Russia. American working people today are deluged on all sides by well-written professional journalism. They are accustomed to this high level of skill. They are accustomed to lively, vivid, often humorous articles. They are accustomed to the "human interest" angle. They are accustomed to varied copy, to startling facts, to a wealth of ideas and opinions in what they read. If we want them to read Challenge, rather than the bourgeois press and magazines, we've got to be able to compete on this level. And that means a professional staff because our local club members around the country--and our present untrained staff--are not equipped to do the job.

Now lets boil this all down into concrete proposals:

1) Recruit a proper staff. Scour the party membership and base around the country for people with some professional experience and talent for journalism. In this field, as in mass leadership, experience and talent aren't artificially created through ideology. Bring them to New York and constitute them as a staff on separate physical premises from the national political leadership. Cut other party expenses to the bone to pay for this. Building a mass circulation press is the most important thing, par none, on which we must spend money.

2) Return to the standard journalistic style of the American press (the so-called objective style). The bourgeoisie doesn't use this style for arbitrary reasons: they use it because it convinces people. Preaching and Bible-thumping doesn't convince people. This is not to say we should never get angry or passionate--of course we should, at real crisis points in the class struggle and in the wake of a special atrocity. But if we use this style all the time, its like the boy crying wolf.

3) Cut out most of the local struggle articles which currently clutter the pages of Challenge--most of this stuff doesn't belong in a nationwide newspaper. The articles thus cut should be issued as local leaflets (with a Challenge masthead). That way, they would reach a hundred times as many of the workers or students directly concerned. Also, they could go into more detail (most of the local struggle articles in Challenge are neither fish nor fowl--too detailed for the national readership, and not detailed enough for the local readership).

The national leadership of the party should select those national or local struggles (three or four--no more) which are most typical, exciting, illuminating, etc. The Challenge staff should then play these struggles up big--give them professional coverage and plenty of space and a superb layout. That way, we would three or four really excellent and enthralling struggle articles per issue, instead of a dozen boring, mediocre articles. This emphasis on quality rather than quantity would build the reader's interest in struggle, not lessen it.

15 of 24

39

4) Cut out most of the articles regarding PL or WAM picket lines, etc. There are usually far more important things going on in the mainstream mass movements.

5) Use the "liberated" space in Challenge for feature articles, exposes, human interest stories, on-the-spot coverage of key national events, interviews (with both big-name people and ordinary workers), non-sectarian cultural reviews, etc. To facilitate this, one of the Challenge staff members should function as a full-time East Coast roving reporter.

6) Anthologize from other radical publications. The underground press is still a mass movement and has recently gotten into issue-oriented politics in a big way. Prison and army underground papers often contain fantastic articles. Even our rivals on the left sometimes publish articles worth reprinting (the Labor Committee's New Solidarity, for instance). The Challenge staff should carefully read all these publication and select the best stuff, condense it, and put it into Challenge (giving full credit, of course). That way, we will be drawing not just on our own membership's talents and sources, but on those of the entire radical movement in America. We don't have to agree with everything these other groups say in order to recognize their ability to produce good articles; anything we disagree with (in a particular article) we can either leave out or else correct by an editor's note.

7) Constantly scour the world bourgeois press, Government publications, the Congressional Record--and select out and put into our own words a never-ending stream of hard-hitting factual material. This would be a truly unique service for working people--perhaps more than anything else, it would solve the problem of readership turnover.

8) Conduct periodic Challenge "marketing surveys" (via the local clubs)--learn from the masses.

16 of 24

90

7.

Overcome inner-party bureaucracy.

If we are going to have a strategy of a new type (R.R.III) then we also need a party of a new type. The Third International's conception of democratic centralism helped, everywhere, to produce revisionist parties; the structure and rules of these parties worked, in every case, to the advantage of revisionist cliques. The proof is in the pudding: the leftwingers in the old parties found it impossible to turn "democratic centralism" to their advantage in even a single case. Everytime, they went down in defeat. Every time, the party rule were used to "police" them; i.e., to intimidate and "contain" them and expel their main spokesmen. In other words, the democratic centralism of the Third International was really bureaucratic centralism.

The persistence of such an obviously bad type of party structure was partly due to the infallibility doctrine (Lenin, Stalin and Mao--and Trotsky--all endorsed it). It was also due to the fact that this structure embodied two features that were necessary for making revolution, and that were not provided by any alternative (bourgeois) mode of party organization.

I agree with the bureaucratic centralists that the minority should be bound by the decisions of the majority (and of the party's leading bodies which represent the majority) but only under certain conditions, i.e. only if ongoing opportunities are provided for the democratic re-evaluation of decisions--and only if the leading bodies are really elected by the majority at frequent intervals.

I agree with the bureaucratic centralists on the necessity for prohibiting factions. This prohibition, however, is only prevented from working against inner-party democracy if alternative modes for ~~of~~ expression of minority opinion are maintained. Otherwise, the party becomes a monolith in which the national leadership is itself a faction, the only faction. Time and again, we have seen such leaderships conspire against the membership, especially the leftwing in the membership, in order to enforce revisionist policies.

The Trotskyite answer to this problem was to return to a bourgeois form of party organization (i.e., to allow factions). The real answer, however, is to go forward to something new. And the key to that party of a new type is contained in our base-building line and in Road to Revolution III. All we have to do, really, is apply in our own ranks what we advocate for society as a whole.

Here are the basic principles as I see them:

1) The ultimate obligation of every party member is to the working class, not to the party apparatus or an infallible leader. For this reason, the "right to rebellion" is the highest right within the party, taking precedent over party discipline. If members are ideologically sound, they know that one does not rebel for minor reasons. If a bad decision is made, one must have patience--believing the party will correct itself (or that oneself will be proved wrong). If a party takes an out-and-out revisionist course, however, and there is no reasonable chance of opposing this course via the "rules," then rebellion is justified. The decision to rebel is always taken in consultation with the masses and with close comrades. In the final analysis, however, it is an individual decision, resting on individual political judgement and moral conscience.

Hence: In a tactical sense, revolution depends on loyalty to the party and faith in collective decision-making. In a strategic sense, revolution depends on loyalty to the working class as a whole, and on the judgement and conscience of the individual.

17 of 24

41

2) Every party member has a dual aspect. He is a delegate of the masses to the party, and an ambassador of the party to the masses. In the making of party decisions, his role as delegate of the masses is primary. In the carrying out of party decisions, his role as ambassador to the masses is primary.

3) The party member's role as "delegate of the masses to the party" also has a dual aspect. He is a delegate of the working class as a whole, but he is also a delegate of his own base (of the circles that he comes into contact with and serves on a daily basis). His role as delegate of the class as a whole is mediated through his role as delegate of his base; his loyalty to the class as a whole is concretized by his loyalty to his base. Loyalty to and representation of the abstract entity (the class) can never be separated from loyalty to and representation of flesh-and-blood people. Love of the "masses" can never be separated from love of one's friends, co-workers and family. This is the most elementary dialectics; it is also the most elementary common sense. Personal emotions, loyalties, ties and obligation--not just ideology and "line"--are necessary to sustain a party over the long haul.

4) It follows from the above that no party can be really democratic unless it has a hardcore of people's leaders within its membership and unless the majority of its members are doing some basebuilding, have real ties with people. Furthermore, it follows that the majority of party members must feel and understand their obligations as delegates of their bases. Otherwise, how can any individual stand up to the moral pressures for mindless conformity that inevitably arise in communist parties (as in any human organizations).

5) Within the party, every leader from top to bottom has a dual aspect: He is not just the representative of the national committee to the city committee, or of the city committee to the party club. He is also a delegate of the lower body back to the higher body. Hence he has two binding obligations: first, his obligation to carry out the decisions of higher bodies; second, his obligation to represent the democratic will of the lower body back to the higher body. For instance, a club leader tries to convince his club of a decision; they disagree. He and they carry the decision out (within reasonable limits) while he carries their opinion back to the higher body and  fights for it there. I am aware that this is a new conception of how things should be done--but it seems to me that this binding obligation of the club leader to the majority will of his club is absolutely necessary to prevent the emergence of a stratum of contemptible toadies and squealers on the lower level of leadership--whose only "obligation" to their clubs is to manipulate them into carrying out the decisions of the higher bodies (so the toady can earn more brownie points). Every communist party in history has been plagued with such a stratum--why should we tolerate it any longer?

(This binding mandate should not be applied to party conventions, where every individual should vote his conscience.)

6. The majority is not always (or even usually) right; this applies not just to the American public (which voted for Nixon) but also to the majority of PL's national committee and national steering committee. The reason for this is that reality is constantly developing, the old is giving way to the new, and yet the new--in its embryonic form--is only recognized at first by a few. (Just look at our own tiny organization--we are far from being a majority of the American people.) Perhaps this will change as communism liberates men's minds, but I doubt it: the errors will merely.

18 of 24

42

become more subtle and complicated. There is a psychological inertia that prevents most people from recognizing truth in its embryonic form--and a person who happens to recognize it in one sphere of life will be blind to it in another sphere. Does this mean that we should become anarchists and individualists? Of course not. Human society cannot exist without organization and discipline. We would be extremely foolish, however, if we failed to recognize the unavoidable price that society pays: the truth which is needed so desperately must fight its way through a jungle of prejudice, fear and conservatism (even in the most revolutionary of parties) to win acceptance. If we want to build a party that can win, we must not ignore this principle. We must build a party in which minority viewpoints are encouraged--and listened to seriously by the leadership--at the same time that discipline is enforced. We must build a party in which criticism and re-evaluation take place continuously on all levels. We must build a party in which no one is called a "revisionist," "nut" or "wrecker" before their ideas have been given a fair hearing--and in which a fair hearing is easy to obtain.

7. The tactical initiative for the next step forward in a party's development does not always come from the party center (i.e., from the national leadership); quite often, it comes from somewhere on the periphery of the party. And this may also hold true for the strategic initiative: after all, wasn't China's ~~protracted war~~ peasant-based revolutionary war begun on the periphery, by a minority faction? In my opinion, the central leadership of our party should spend less time trying to impose a monolithic tactical conception and more time evaluating and passing on local experiences. It should allow ~~and encourage~~ a broader role for local ~~and individual~~ initiative. It should actively encourage individual party members and their bases, and individual party clubs, to think creatively for themselves, to develop their own tactics. Let a thousand experiments be conducted! You never can tell which one might be "it."

A word of warning, however: This can't happen if a party develops an apparatus of personally isolated functionaries, who will inevitably view rank-and-file initiatives as a threat to their self-image and ambitions.

8. The principles of the Paris Commune can and must be applied inside of communist parties, as well as in mass organizations. How, under socialism, can the mass organizations really exercise "mass democracy" (constant discussion and struggle, initiative and referendum procedures, the right of instant recall of elected officials, universal participation, etc.) if their communist party--the organization which leads them--fails to set an example in its own ranks. The form in which the principles of the Commune are applied in a party will differ, of course, from their form in the mass organizations and the workers' government. But in both cases, the realization or betrayal of these principles will be dependent on rank-and-file enthusiasm, understanding and vigilance. In a communist party, there must be a universal and passionate belief in the right and duty of every party member to help lead the party. Every party member must speak and write about questions of nation-wide and local strategy and tactics--and encourage his comrades to do likewise. Every party member must take part in periodic collective discussion on levels higher than his own club. The party base

19 of 24

43

(nonparty members) must be provided with channels by which they can directly influence party decisions.

The "party of a new type" is a party in which formal leadership, delegated to a few, is supplemented by informal leadership, the duty of all.

9. To prevent revisionism in a party, one must prevent the transformation of professional revolutionaries into professional functionaries. The key to this is not the question of salaries (all parties need fulltime paid leaders, journalists, etc.). The key is rather the relationship of the full-timers (especially, of the party leaders) to the masses. It is essential that every full-time party leader be spending a large portion of his time directly engaged in mass work (longrange mass work, preferably in his community). First, because leadership by example is the highest form of leadership. Second, because only in this way can leaders maintain a sense of reality. Thirdly--and most importantly--because every party leader (like every party member) should be a direct "delegate" of the masses (see above). The idea of a special stratum in the party whose base is only the party itself --i.e., whose social ties and political responsibilities are only to their fellow national leaders and to the lower-level leaders who come to them for advice (not to a base among the masses)--this idea has always smelled rotten to me. Every leader should do consistent mass work. And when I say mass work, I mean real mass work--not frontgroup time-serving. (Some people will say PL's leaders are "too busy". I say: let them drop some of their leadership tasks. What we would lose in quantity thereby, we would gain back tenfold in quality.)

\*\*\*\*\*

P.L. today has an advanced case of the bureaucratic disease. The latter is at once the result and the cause of our sectarianism. By what path did it arise? First, the founders of PL were imbued with a lot of the bureaucratic habits of the old CP (they had been trained, for decades, in those habits). They saw the necessity for a new revolutionary program, but not for a new type of party. Second, they recruited, in the early years, people (mostly students) who were personally isolated and who were, as a result of their isolation, quasi-fanatical in their approach to people and to life in general. Try as they might, the founders could not (to this very day) recruit very many people who were not of this type. A vicious circle developed: the more isolated types the party recruited, the less attractive it appeared to bona fide people's leaders. Nevertheless, the party grew in numbers; the need arose for a middle-level leadership--and the latter had to be drawn, in large measure, from the ranks of the semi-isolated. Many of these new young leaders had strong personal ambitions, exacerbated by their isolation, and no concept of how to rely on the rank and file. The founders were themselves weak on this point, yet even if they had tried, the membership might not have responded: the latter included too many

0 of 29

44

people who were not delegates of the masses to the party, but delegates of nobody to nobody, people who didn't try to engage in strategic thinking, who didn't try to stand up for their inner-party rights, who didn't try to take initiative in the mass work. At any rate, the founders, in desperation, turned to the old C.P. methods of commandism and exhortation to get things done. The newer, younger leaders went along with this commandism because it gave them a functionary structure to feel important within and a "ladder of success" to climb. The chickens came home to roost after the failure of PL's attempt to organize and lead its own mass movement in 1970-71. Rank-and-file understanding of Marxism declined; Challenge sales dropped off; Challenge articles developed a hysterical tone; the functionary structure loomed larger and larger in the party. None of this was the result of a conspiracy, or of anyone's evil intentions. Like Topsy, it "just grew."

The existence of a functionary mentality, as a result of the above evolution, is one of the greatest dangers facing our party. We have a stratum of people who rely on the party apparatus for everything in their lives--not only for their salaries, but for their social contacts and friendships, their ego gratifications, and the answer to all their questions about life. If the party apparatus is all-important (rather than the party program and the masses), then it follows like night from day, that one's self respect comes from one's position in the apparatus. Climbing the ladder (even though it doesn't mean a house in Scarsdale) becomes a life and death matter. And ~~xxxx~~ security (not being kicked off the ladder, not losing one's current status) becomes life itself. The moral pressures on a person caught in this plight are usually enormous, and not having anything to sustain him outside the apparatus, he usually succumbs. Thus we see our younger generation of leaders (in New York, at any rate) scrambling around to see that ~~their positions xxxxxxxx~~ quotas are met--so that their positions will be enhanced. We see a cheerleader mentality, disgusting in its mindlessness. We see the formation of little cliques, gossip behind the back of anyone who doesn't "go along," whispering campaigns, sorority-style blackballing and ostracism. We see the doctoring of reports to Milt (to make oneself and one's clique look good). We see a fear of criticism or of the slightest display of initiative or creative thought from below.

I am focussing on this functionary mentality because destroying it is absolutely crucial to destroying sectarianism. The functionary types, you see, have a vested interest in maintaining the party's current concentration on front-groups and 30-for-40 gimmickry. It is precisely all this useless paraphernalia which justifies their parasitical role in the party, and conceals their isolation from the masses! If we want to thrust aside frontgroupism and all the other forms of sectarianism that prevent our party members from linking up with the masses, then we'll have to engage in serious inner-party criticism of careerism and functionaryism.

21 of 29

45

Let me conclude, once again, with concrete suggestions-- suggestions for a major overhaul in our inner-party life.

- 1) We need a party convention every two years.
- 2) We need democratic election of convention delegates by the party rank and file.
- 3) We need an end to the state of affairs by which the national committee can drop or add members at will, year after year, with no rank-and-file consultation. Unless the party should go underground, we should have a policy of democratic election in these matters; every NC member should be held personally accountable to the ~~pxx~~ party membership in his city or region.
- 4) Everyone in the party leadership--including Milt, Wally, and Bob Leonhardt--should be spending a major portion of their time leading by example through consistent, longrange mass work in some mainstream-type situation. Furthermore, every party leader should belong to a rank and file club.
- 5) We should have sectionwide meetings, throughout the party, once a month. Every party member (and selected ~~partyxxf~~ nonparty friends) should gather to discuss the same problems that the national committee discusses. In other words, these should not be pep talks or exhortations, but serious discussions of the deepest problems ~~faeting~~ facing the party--and of how to solve them. Evaluation of the performance of individual party leaders should be a matter open for discussion at all times. If a section meeting arrives at a "decision" about something, through majority vote, then the national leadership should be formally obligated to consider this "decision" at its next meeting, and take its own vote on the matter. Furthermore, the section meetings should be encouraged to elect a spokesman to go to the national committee (if the matter is a serious one) and argue the section's case there. These provisos are not meant to promote ultra-democracy, but to guarantee that rank and file opinion is taken seriously.
- 6) For rank and file party members--and section meetings--to make serious contributions to party policy, they must have access to more facts about the party's nationwide life; i.e., they must have ~~an eagle's eye view xxxxxxxx~~ ~~For this~~ the "eagle's eye view" that traditionally, in most parties, has been the exclusive property of a few leaders. For this purpose, the party leadership should supply the entire membership with ~~xxx~~ monthly reports on the party's work that would go into greater detail than any type of report we've received in the past. These reports should go into the "embarrassing" problems in every area of work and the private and ambiguous truths that party leaders usually discuss only among themselves (while feeding ~~xxx~~ the rank and file a cheerleader's broth).

This is not to deny the need for secrecy in some areas of party life. But I ask you: should we be like the old C.P., in which the average party member didn't know a fraction as much about the inner workings of the party as the FBI did?

- 7) We need a criticism campaign in the party to dig out the functionary mentality on all levels. The best way would be for the national leadership to go to sectionwide meetings of the type described above and simply say, "Look, maybe we've made

22024

46

some mistakes--what should we do about it?" And then not try to turn the meeting into another pep talk, but listen to what the rank and file has to say. (Such a criticism campaign against functionarism should be linked to a criticism of sectarianism in the mass work--the two problems are inseparable.)

8) We need an end to the party leadership's super-sensitivity about rank-and-file criticism. In my opinion, the rank and file is under no particular obligation to be overly tactful. If bourgeois politicians and Presidents can take sharp criticism from within their own class without getting upset, then surely proletarian leaders can do likewise.

Here we get into the personal weaknesses of Milt and Wally, and I'm going to speak bluntly. First, they love to dish it out but act like hurt little boys when they have to take it (even in a tactful way) themselves. Second, Milt enjoys and subconsciously encourages flattery and a "courtier" spirit. These are serious personal weaknesses, and I don't think we can have vigorous inner-party democracy until our top leaders overcome ~~their~~ them.

23024

47

#### 8. On our strategic line.

There is a single glaring problem that I think our conference should clear up. This is the problem of totalitarianism. Heretofore, communists were always reluctant to take a stand against the lack of personal freedom in Soviet bloc countries--especially under Stalin--because we felt this would be anti-communist. But doesn't Road to Revolution III essentially free us from this dilemma? The totalitarian actions by Stalin and his successors were not and are not actions by communists but by a "Red" bourgeoisie. Hence to be anti-totalitarian, it seems to me, is no longer to be anti-communist.

The dictatorship of the proletariat means two essential things: guns are held only by the masses; and the masses repress anyone who takes up guns illegitimately to overthrow socialism. Also, an apparatus is maintained for the restraint of social crime (a volunteer militia, revolutionary juries, humanely-run prisons). In peacetime, what other necessary dictatorial functions are there? (Obviously things are different in the midst of a civil war or an invasion by a foreign imperialist power.)

PL has already said: no standing army or cops (secret police) under socialism. PL has already said: let the masses rule directly, through "soviets," not through a bureaucratic caste. I think we should go a step further, and say: Complete freedom of speech, press and assembly under socialism. And when I say complete, I mean for everyone, including the enemies of socialism. It has to be for everyone, because when you start drawing lines there's no stopping the process. Counterrevolutionary opinions, under socialism, will not just be held by ex-bosses, but by many workers. Everything will constantly be in flux; rightists will be posing as leftists (and denouncing leftists as rightists); at any given moment it will be extremely difficult to tell who is a bona fide revolutionary and who is a ~~rightist~~ revisionist. If you give the state apparatus the right to tell people what they can or can't think, say or read, then you immediately get into the age-old dilemma of "who will guard the guardians." And what will prevent revisionists (who will inevitably, at some point or other, gain a measure of control over the state apparatus in this or that city or state--or even in Washington D.C.) from using the power of repression against the true left-wingers? Hasn't the latter happened in every so-called socialist country so far? And didn't the repression of opposition ideas by the bolsheviks immediately pass over into repression of the trade unions, of the soviets, of the party rank-and-file, of the very proletariat that was supposed to hold power?

The totalitarianism of Soviet Russia was not an outgrowth of Marx's ideas, but of the historical culture of Russia: a country that never had known anything but autocracy. The bolsheviks merely fell back, after a few years, into the same pattern of censorship and secret-police rule that the Czars had used.

Why do we, like all the communist parties of the past fifty years, have to remain tied to a lot of autocratic Russian nonsense--nonsense that is completely foreign to the sentiments and common sense of the American masses. The workers in this country know that in Russia you can't speak your mind, go on strike, etc., and they think that is communism, and they will never, in this day and age, follow a communist party unless that party makes it crystal clear, from the very beginning, that it doesn't believe in such methods.

24 of 24

48

We should publicly and sharply draw a line between ourselves and the entire heritage of "left" totalitarianism. We owe to the American working class a solemn, public, constantly-repeated pledge that we are NOT aiming to create such a society. I think our basic statement of purpose in Challenge should include a statement on the sanctity of freedom of speech and other civil liberties. Its not incompatible with the dictatorship of the proletariat and its not incompatible with winning a civil war (nobody expects full civil liberties in wartime). And in the years ahead, as we reach out to the masses, we should constantly hammer this point home, and mean it (sincerely, not like the Browderites): our party is the champion of democratic rights. Why, just because of the stupidity of Stalin and Co., should we let the bourgeoisie pose as the champions of freedom (which they actually hate) while we, who by the logic of R. R. III should be its real champions, are tarred as its enemies? Don't you think its time we turned the tables? And wouldn't this enormously increase our ability to win the minds and hearts of the American people?

49

July 12, 1973

Dear Comrades,

The enclosed letter and petition to the National Committee were delivered to Milt by Bruce Bailey at 2:00 this morning.

Neither Bruce Bailey nor Dennis King was selected as a party delegate to the convention by the NYC <sup>community</sup> section committee. Their names were not placed in nomination at the section-wide meeting that took place on June 24. They did not attend the meeting. It is true that Bruce, who meets in a club with Dennis, was told late about the meeting, but he was told nonetheless, and he was informed of the subjects the meeting would cover. Both he and Dennis could have attended.

Bruce and Dennis submitted lengthy position papers differing sharply with the party line on major questions (C-D, united front work, 30/40, etc.). These papers also sharply criticized the party leadership and methods of organization. ~~These papers were submitted too late for printing in any of the pre-convention discussion bulletins.~~

Despite the fact that neither Bruce nor Dennis were named convention delegates, the National Steering Committee and the New York City Committee proposed that they be invited to present their viewpoints at the convention as special guests of the National Committee. Efforts to reach them were under way when they delivered the enclosed material.

Obviously, this invitation is no longer valid. It was extended for the purpose of sharpening political discussion at the convention and strengthening the party. The enclosed material indicates that Bruce and Dennis are not interested in this kind of constructive activity. In the name of "avoiding inner-party factionalizing," they are attempting to factionalize against the party among non-party people on the West Side. There is no reason why our party's national convention should legitimize these attacks by providing a forum for them. Sharp debate, political discussion and criticism are one thing. Public slanders against the party by party members are another.

Comradely, WSC

By Bruce's and Dennis' own admission,

55

cess along with determination and speed. The various "peace" negotiations on the other hand, only serve to (temporarily) confuse and mislead masses of people. These false lessons are as deadly as bullets; in fact they inevitably mean more suffering, exploitation, and bullets for the working class. To sum up, then: WHAT MATTERS MOST OF ALL IS WINNING PEOPLE TO FIGHT FOR REVOLUTION, SOCIALISM, AND COMMUNISM. Any activity which does that should be judged an advance; any activity which does not do that should be judged a setback.

4. Now relate this to the questions of "sectarianism" and "opportunism". Sectarianism is not the result of being "too Left." Sectarianism means that you are not getting involved with people on the day to day level of their immediate struggles against the system AND THEREFORE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO EFFECTIVELY WIN THEM TO COMMUNISM! It is NOT sectarian to attack McGovern, Chavez, and Mao when they sell out workers; that has nothing to do with sectarianism. If anything it is sectarian to NOT criticize them because to be nice to them would be to set ourselves against all the working class people whom those three are hurting. Sectarianism means that you are not seriously trying to win masses of people to communism. It means not seriously struggling with those people who have right wing ideas and not trying to change them. Opportunism is exactly the same thing---it is an unwillingness to struggle against right wing ideas and right wing mis-leaders. How can one error be an antidote for another? It can't! In one city, for example, the party had work in a particular union, but it was mainly agitational. Papers were sold and PLP had some presence on the job, but party members were not seriously involved in union issues. They were not in the position of being in a serious struggle in the union as a way of showing fellow unionists how their own experiences point out the need for socialism. To improve the work, they got more active in the union, were involved in a few actions, speak up alot at union meetings, etc. But Challenge sales dropped off, study-action base groups withered away, and while the members made friends, there was even less of a party presence than before. That is in part because the members thought that the earlier weakness was that "they were not involved in the union." This is only partly true. The political nature of the error was that we were not in a good position to win people to communism!

This shallow misunderstanding leads to shallow rectification---"simply get involved in the union," instead of concluding "We have to win more fellow workers to the party, and we have to use the union as a tool to heat up the struggle, so we should get more involved in the union." Result--more opportunism. Rather than getting bogged down in terms like "opportunism" and "sectarianism" which are sometimes seen as tactical questions, it is better to first ask the basic political question: how can we win these particular people to fight for communism, explicitly and consciously, and to win them to the party. To change the form of the error without changing the substance will only make things worse. In Road to Revolution III, the PLP broadcasted loud and clear "THE MASSES NEED REVOLUTION AND SOCIALISM, AND THE MASSES CAN BE WON TO USING MARKISM-LENINISM AND THE PARTY AS THE WAY TO WIN SOCIALISM." It is our job to win the masses, organize the masses into a politically conscious fighting force that will destroy capitalism.

51

Does the party leadership take its own theory and constitution seriously?

From "On the Party," by Milt Rosen: "These are three concepts to be fought for to make democratic centralism work. First, the ability to engage in full, frank discussion from top to bottom on basic political questions. Second, ties to the people, to prevent the discussions from becoming academic personal exercises in rhetoric. Third, the willingness to subordinate your individual desires and thoughts to the will of the majority.

"By utilizing these three concepts, we can accomplish the following: arrive democratically at decisions; be able to carry them out among the masses, and at a later date re-evaluate experiences democratically, based on serving and learning from the ~~people~~ people...

"One could say that our leadership is thoroughly committed, but not fully developed. Therefore, our leaders need a lot of help from the members. The democratic aspect must be xx developed with a capital D." (emphasis ours)

Also from "On the Party:"

"Too many of our people take a casual attitude to party ~~decisions~~ decisions....All of these faults indicate low political level and poor leadership. Democratic centralism can become an abstraction (this rule to fight over and that rule to fight for). Our members and leaders must be vigorous, conscientious and responsible--all adding up to doing real political work on the job or in the community."

Which one of us ~~xxxxxxified~~ (the national committee--or Bruce and Dennis, rank and file members) has taken upon himself to modify the constitution in the spirit of Road to Revolution III? Which one of us is following the spirit of democratic ~~centralism~~ centralism--from the people, to the people?

We await your response,

Bruce Binkley  
Dennis King

P.S. ~~ix~~ This was done in one day. Given a week, we would have had the signatures of many more leaders and activists in all areas of community life.

52

## PETITION

To the National Committee of  
the Progressive Labor Party

We, the undersigned, are active participants and leaders in the community groups on the Upper West Side that are engaged in daily battles with Columbia University, the landlords, Grosvenor House, the supermarket chains, St. Luke's Hospital, the Board of Education and all the other forces that prey on our community. Many of us are Challenge readers and have participated in PL and WAM demonstrations and rallies.

We are concerned with the fact that West Side PL members Bruce Bailey and Dennis King are not delegates, representing our community, at the upcoming PL convention. We understand that the West Side is being represented exclusively by individuals who are not involved in the people's movements in the community. Bruce and Dennis have, for many years, always been there as PL members when the squeeze was on: fighting urban removal and evictions and in a hundred and one other struggles. We rarely ever see the other West Side PL members except when Bruce or Dennis mobilizes them for struggle. At least one West Side PL member, Ruth Leacock, has engaged in ~~an~~ slander against the Committee for Community Control of Grosvenor House--the leading independent organization in the fight against racism in our community--and is proud of maintaining her ties with the Uncle Tom flunkys in the community who have sold out to the Grosvenor House Board of Directors (composed of the wives of the top financiers of U.S. imperialism). Furthermore, we have heard that a leader of PL on the West Side, Lenny Dick, recently approached Bruce and Dennis and tried to pressure them into withdrawing their support for the Committee for Community Control, attacking the committee's correct political struggle against the Uncle Toms in the community as "malicious." Finally, we understand that Bruce and Dennis were pressured by the PL leadership to go along with a plan for the West Side work that would have required them to abandon their work with us--in the organizations and struggles that already exist and are of vital importance for the community--in order to build a rival, exclusively PL-led movement that, as proposed, would have looked for support from the very Uncle Toms who do the dirty work in our community for Eugene Callender, Percy Sutton, and the racist Grosvenor House Board.

Furthermore, we understand that the Columbia student/faculty community is being represented at the PL convention by an individual, Robby Nerenberg, who last year abandoned the Columbia Tenants Union--the key community organization in the fight against the Columbia administration--when the CTU was under sharp attack. We recall that at this point Bruce and Dennis began to work with the Tenants Union, stuck with it, helped to beat off the physical attacks of the police-anarchists, and helped to build it into an organization of over 250 dues-paying members. We also understand that Robby Nerenberg rebuffed repeated attempts to get PL students involved again in this key battle--claiming he was too busy "fighting on the ideological front." We also understand that this individual then had the effrontery to slander the honest fighters among the Columbia students--who happen to be members of C.A.I.M. (the Columbia Anti-Imperialist Movement)--terming them "right-wingers," although these so-called

53

right-wingers have stuck with the CTU through thick and thin from its very inception and have never pushed tactics detrimental to its growth.

We believe that a party of the people (such as Bruce and Dennis represent PL to us as being) needs constant criticism from fighters outside its ranks to help strengthen its relevance to the struggles of the people. We are concerned that the current organizational manipulations and slander campaign aimed at Bruce and Dennis within PL will prevent the party from developing further as an important and positive force in the united struggles of the West Side community. We think that if the attacks on Bruce and Dennis within PL continue, it will discourage honest fighters among the people from continuing to cooperate with PL in common struggle.

We strongly question the legitimacy of a PL convention which excludes the PL members who are most deeply involved in the people's struggles. We are offended by a policy which penalizes PL members for refusing to abandon their friends in the community and for taking a principled stand in the fight against racism.

Such exclusion is tantamount to exclusion and penalization of the people (including ourselves) and ill becomes a party which, in the past, has often professed its aspiration to be a vanguard of the people.

We understand that the delegates to the PL convention have been chosen by the leadership, not the membership--in violation of PL's own constitution. We understand that Dennis King was not even informed of the meeting at which the rank and file "approved" the West Side community delegate slate (and that Bruce was only informed a day and a half beforehand--without being told what the meeting was about).

We are offended that our community is being represented at the convention by a Robby Nerenberg, who abandoned the struggle, and a Lenny Dick, who is so ignorant of the problems of our community that he ends up defending the enemies of the people.

We believe that delegates to a convention of a party such as PL should be freely chosen by the party membership in consultation with the people of the community who fight side by side with them in the common struggle against the common enemy. We do not believe they should be chosen by a few top leaders who have never set foot in our community.

We demand that Bruce Bailey and Dennis King be seated as the delegates representing our community at the PL national convention. We also demand that the other criticisms we have voiced be acted upon as soon as possible.

(signatures on following page)

57

The Party, the Current Period, and Fighting the Right-Wing Trend

1. Given the decline in Challenge-Desafio sales, and the fact that our rate of recruitment is not as strong as it should be, it is clear that there has been a right wing trend within the party. Two years ago we launched a major struggle against sectarianism within the party. Although sectarian weaknesses in the work are still there, there have been certain improvements. There is a lot more union work going on, students are more integrated with fellow students, and we have developed a more flexible understanding of working with reform groups. Now there seems to be a shift to the right.
2. One of the problems with trying to understand this seeming pendulum swing from being "sectarian" to being "opportunist", from being what seems to have been "too Left" to being "too Right-wing", may lie in not really understanding just what communists mean with the words "sectarianism" and "opportunism." There seems to be a certain notion among some comrades (and within myself, as well) that the two errors are dialectical opposites, like fire and water--in other words, that the two errors are exactly the opposite of each other, and that what we have to do is to strike a balance between these two "extremes". To see it that way is to see it superficially, to only see the superficial form of those errors and to not understand the fundamental SIMILARITY between both of those errors. Fighting sectarianism, itself did not create the right wing trend.
3. What makes PLP's political line different from the political lines of the revisionists and the reformists (including the sincere ones) is a firm commitment to what is the most crucial principle underlying the analyses of Road to Revolution III. That idea says that THE MOST IMPORTANT ADVANCES THAT CAN COME OUT OF A STRUGGLE OR ACTION IS THE WINNING OF MORE PEOPLE TO THE STRUGGLE FOR REVOLUTION, FOR COMMUNISM, AND TO ALLY WITH AND JOIN THE PLP. That is more important than a wage hike. A wage hike is good to win, but can be taken away because the bosses have state power. It is much harder for them to "win back" a worker who has chosen to dedicate himself or herself to revolutionary struggle than it is for them to take away a wage hike. (Of course the bosses can "win back" a certain number of revolutionaries; but it is not easy for them unless the party is making serious errors.) The Paris Commune, the Attica Rebellion---working class rebels are murdered and their immediate demands are not won. Yet PLP says that those struggles were victories for the working class. The Geneva Accords for Vietnam in 1954, the current Paris Peace negotiations, the Nixon visit to China---these things (according to the newspapers) help bring "peace" to the world and will save many lives. Yet PLP says that those were defeats for the working class for the time being. Why? Because in the Paris Commune and Attica rebellions, the lessons of rebellion and revolution were grasped by millions. New and deeper understanding about capitalism and revolution were grasped by large numbers of people, and this understanding helped move world revolution. (which will free humankind and save many, many lives in the long run) this understanding helped organize people to move the revolutionary pro-

# 50

MR. MILTON ROSEN  
APT 8-6

To the National Committee:

We have taken the steps of circulating the enclosed petition to protest the undemocratic and illegitimate convening of this convention. One of the worst results of the arbitrary selection of delegates to the convention is that the party's two most active community organizers in New York City do not have an ~~an~~ opportunity to represent their base to the leading body of the party.

We wish to make it clear that we carefully did not circulate this petition among party members or among Challenge sellers close to the party, because we did not want to do damage to the ongoing activities of the party in the neighborhood. We do not yet believe that inner-party factionalizing is a proper mode of struggle.

Instead, in keeping with the spirit of Road to Revolution III, we are circulating this petition among our base--the leaders and members of the center organizations in the neighborhood who are close to us. None of the people on this petition are ideological enemies of the party; in fact, through us all of them have a friendly view of the party. All of them are people known throughout the neighborhood for their ~~sex~~ ~~xx~~ qualities as fighters and their involvement in community activities.

We are aware that this petition is in violation of Section IV, Number VIII of the party constitution. However, we have no choice but to ~~xxx~~ violate this section of the constitution, for the following reasons: 1) The party leadership did not deign to respond to Bruce Bailey's criticism of the illegitimate delegate selection. 2) The party leadership has simply ignored the primary provisions of the constitution and the basic principles of democratic ~~and~~ centralism pertaining to the necessity for election ~~of delegates to the party's leading body~~ (election by the clubs) of delegates to the party's leading body--the ~~lx~~ national convention. 3) The party leadership went further and insulted any member capable of independent thought--by claiming the authority of a fictitious constitutional amendment that allows them to select delegates. This is a trick ~~xxx~~ cheap enough to be worthy of the shadiest union hack bureaucrat. 4) This is simple authoritarianism. We cannot stand by but must respond in a manner worthy of Road to Revolution III's best aspect: go to the people!

(over)

56

5. The key then is to judge all our actions, strategies, even the articles in Challenge by that principle. If an article in Challenge calls for supporting the meat boycott and says nothing else, is that article moving the understanding of the masses closer to communism, or is it telling the working class to unite behind Ethel Rosen, an upper-middle class liberal from a rich Chicago suburb? The People's Tribune column is a good idea, and can be a good way to overcome sectarianism. But when we interview six or seven people and none of them puts forward the party line, and one even goes so far as to say that the main problem nowadays is that nobody trusts anyone very much, and when that appears in Challenge with no response or critique or even a friendly comment disagreeing with that, does that advance the working class' understanding? Probably not. Challenge is basically very good, and People's Tribune can be a good idea; but in our eagerness to fight sectarianism and be "where the people are at", we cannot encourage (rather, we should not encourage) people to accept false notions about the nature of reform movements, the nature of the ruling class, or the idea that the working class world-wide and in the U.S. can live decent lives without making a revolution and building socialism. MISLEADERSHIP is the essence of what is opportunism.
6. There is no such thing, really, as a political line which is "center." Part of the confusion may come from believing that there are three political lines in a situation, the Left, the Right, and the "Center." The "Center" is not some third type of location which is neither Left nor Right. On the contrary, what we mean by "Center" is that it has elements of both Left and Right. There are only two lines---the Left, and revolution, and the Right, and capitalism. A "Center" person is someone who can be won to the Left but who has a lot of Right-wing ideas. Therefore, the center is not a group separate from the Party and the ruling class with whom the party has to make friends before the ruling class wins them over. The "Center"s' lives are intertwined with BOTH the need for revolution AND deep rooted bourgeois ideology. THE ONLY WAY TO WIN THE CENTER IS TO STRUGGLE. You don't win a tug-of-war game by trying not to pull on the rope too hard. The masses have brains; we won't win them by avoiding struggle or by being opportunist.
7. Some comrades used to have few or no friends on the job but maybe went through the motions of carrying out the party line by merely conducting agitational work in a seemingly "sharp" way. In struggling against sectarianism, many members made friends on the job or campus. That was good but it really was not deserving of a medal; most people make friends on campus or the job. Every party member must seriously ask herself or himself whether they are only going through the motions, the superficial forms of carrying out the line by either agitating in an isolated way or having friends in an apolitical way. WE ARE IN THE PARTY TO BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT. Apolitical friendships are very important, crucial in fact. But political relationships and friendships are more important. Apolitical friendships often move Left as the friend realizes that even the most personal types of problems are caused by capitalism. Some friendships may take longer to move LEFT, and we should still maintain them. BUT WE SHOULD ALWAYS BE WORKING, IN A FRIENDLY WAY, TO MOVE THAT FRIEND TO THE LEFT.

57

Real friendships, even "apolitical" relationships consist of people trying to help each other out with their problems. If we are "true friends" to our acquaintances, we would be trying to win them to revolutionary struggle and to the party. At a minimum there should be struggle against reactionary ideas that prevent that friend from understanding and solving her or his problem--reactionary ideas like racism, male chauvinism, and particularly cynicism which is a very political reactionary idea.

8. There seems to be a certain amount of subjectivism within the party as in much of the "movement" about the current period. Mass actions have declined somewhat, the anti-war movement is quiet, the strike wave seems to have declined and armed rebellions led by black and latin working class people have become less common. There have been government cuts of some social services which the working class won, and there is the notion around that Nixon is more ready to use fascist repression and overt force to crush an insurgent movement. "We are in a new period" some people say. Well, that is partly true. But it is NOT true that the movement has necessarily retreated. While there seems to be less reform struggle than before, the decline is not really as great as it seems. Strikes are still commonplace, though we are not in a strike wave. Demonstrations against social service cuts and police brutality are not rare. What has happened is that a certain number of people are cynical about reform struggle because of the crushing of the ghetto rebellions, the continual sell-out of union leaders and big-time politicians, and the open murder of liberal reform students. Some might say that the student movement has retreated because a student might say "Why should I demonstrate; I know now that the government has no qualms about killing me if I get in their way." Is it a retreat in someone's consciousness for them to realize that the government is a dictatorship? No, not necessarily. Not at all! unless the Left allows the once militant center to fall for the ruling class line of cynicism and lose confidence in the ability of the working class and allies to change the world.

In other words, the party is in a terrific position to win over millions of people who have moved left since the 1960's. The "climate of the times" is another way of saying: "the particular way the ruling class is using the carrot and the stick in a particular period of time." Superficial generalizations about how "such-and-such" a time period is really "better" for party building, is both idealist, unscientific and reactionary. Many communist parties have grown tremendously in "adverse" periods---such as fascist repression. Other communist parties were able to grow during eras of relative "liberalism." What really determines whether the party increases in size and quality is THE LINE OF THE PARTY, AND THE PRACTICE OF THE MEMBERSHIP.

It is true that we have to become more adaptable in our tactics as the ruling class changes theirs. But their strategy is the same, and ours must be the same: winning masses to Marxism-Leninism to smash capitalism. The masses are still oppressed during this "new era"; they still need to fight back; we still need to fight back, and we all still need Marxism-Leninism and the party to be able to win. The 1970's need not be a repeat of the 1950's when the U.S. movement was set back. The reason it was a setback was because of the errors of the Left and even then it was only a few years before the masses again began reconstructing the movement.

58

9. Within the party, some of the subjectivism no doubt comes from the fact that mass struggle seems to have declined; most of our members are young and were recruited during a period when the mass movement was particularly potent, with simultaneous struggles in the factories, communities, and campuses. As a result, they do not have enough of a sense of the twists and turns of a developing movement; a twist or turn in the movement need not be a retreat.

One problem is that not enough comrades have an understanding of how their work can help lead to a revolution in this country. Similarly, do most members have a sense of what they will be doing in ten years, or even one year? Do we have an understanding or a plan of what our particular club will be doing in three or five years? Who will be the members, where will they be working, etc. Unfortunately, too many would say: "Three or five years? I guess we'll be doing about the same thing." With that notion, it is no wonder that some people say "Is it worth it?"

It is the responsibility of the party to clarify to the masses (as well learn from them) how particular groups and individuals can contribute to building the revolution. It is the responsibility of the party leaders to clarify to the membership (as well as learn from them) how particular collectives and individuals can contribute to building the revolutionary struggle. For example, suppose we have a club working in the AFT (teachers). No doubt there is discussion about day to day work within the union (hopefully). But is there an understanding of how we are going to work to build a left center coalition to take power in the union, to get the local union to support the struggles of other workers locally, to build a nation-wide caucus within AFT, to try to dump the current leadership (and maybe get kicked out in the process)? What role would a Left Center coalition led in part by the party have if we were in a situation like Philadelphia when they nearly had a general strike, or Detroit during the ghetto rebellion? What role could such a union play in building a revolution? How can we create a situation within that union to enable us to give leadership now and in the more turbulent times that are sure to come? In other words, are all party members thinking strategically about the role of their collective in the revolutionary process? I'm sure we all think tactically somewhat; and I'm sure that there is some (though definitely not enough) general discussion around questions of China, USSR, works by Lenin, Marx, etc.

Is there enough discussion about the state of the mass movement in which we are working; are we engaged in serious study of the broad class forces and how they are aligned within our own area of work? M-L theory can help us interpret the reality of the situation, but it can't be found in "The State and Revolution" the facts about which groups of people are likely to be have in which types of ways within the AFT in New York, for example.

10. To a large degree, subjectivism within the party is related to how much we try to build a base for communist ideas. We want to get others to join the party. Well, ask yourself---Why did you yourself join the party??

59

Probably it was because you were involved in struggle at some level against some part of the system, and came to understand that YOU NEEDED THE PARTY in order to improve your work, and in order to win. It became clear that YOU NEEDED THE COLLECTIVE to help plan and discuss your work. Well, YOU STILL NEED THE PARTY! And the MASSES STILL NEED THE PARTY. So why does anyone have the right to keep the masses from getting what they need. We don't need alot of fancy words to understand what revisionism is---revisionism is TRYING TO KEEP THE MASSES FROM GETTING WHAT THEY NEED. They NEED PLP; they NEED Challenge, they NEED to understand that McGovern, Mao, Meany, Rockefeller, Senator Ervin, and Cesar Chavez are not their friends. If we keep Challenge and PLP from the masses, we are helping keep them in slavery to the murderous system. If we don't attack something rotten, then we are saying that it is not so bad and we (in effect) are supporting it. I don't mean to get moralistic, but the only way to understand ANY political question is to understand what it means in real live terms, life and death terms to the working class and its allies. You don't "feel" like selling Challenge? That means you don't "feel" like telling workers what they need to know to save their lives and the lives of their children. The main thing about Challenge is not that it is a nifty way to meet new contacts. That can be very important, but the MAIN thing about Challenge is that it can clarify and explain to thousands or millions of working class people things they need to know, NEED to know.

11. Now, nobody in the party wakes up in the morning and says "I think I'll make revisionist errors today." It comes from not realizing that you need revolution. And it comes in part from not realizing how your own particular work can contribute to revolutionary struggle. It is important for club meetings to be organized to deal with this problem. It may be important to discuss ticket sales for some event, at a meeting, but alot of that can also be done between meetings or informally. Sometimes it is necessary to discuss these things in meetings, but sometimes we spend too much time in meetings getting bogged down in very minute tactical questions which could be resolved outside of meetings. As a result a meeting might lag on, or just might not get to the study section, which gets put off until next week, unless another emergency comes up. Club leaders should try to talk with each club member at least once between meetings--leaders have to take more initiative. Almost nobody quits the party because they claim it is "too totalitarian;" very few people close to the party have dropped away because they felt that PLP was "too totalitarian" (though we may have been sectarian in certain instances.) In general, things start going downhill WHEN LEADERSHIP IS NOT STRONG ENOUGH! People want leadership, just as we did when we joined PLP. Of course we have to be friendly and understanding. But if notions about being friendly and understanding keep us from giving strong leadership, then we are really up the creek. People don't look towards PLP mainly to find friends; that is not why we joined PLP. For that you can join the YMCA. PLP is not the YMCA. The work, in fact, goes downhill when people lose confidence in leadership + party and don't believe that we are "together enough", organized well enough, to be able to move forward.

61

②

The current right-wing drift in the party is due in part to lack of study and understanding of the revolutionary process. THIS IS NOT TO SAY THAT THE PROBLEM WOULD BE SOLVED IF EVERYONE READ MORE MARX AND LENIN. Far from it; what is needed is for us to learn how to discuss or DAILY WORK, our practice as it relates to building a revolution. There is a problem of pragmatism but reading something by Marx won't necessarily help solve it. However, developing the understanding that Marx & Lenin dealt with similar problems (Lenin's position in the world socialist movement was similar to PL's position today, for example), and seeing how they fought to resolve them can be a big help to helping PL members develop a more long range view, a more revolutionary view towards our work. One collective recently discussed "Wage, Labor, & Capital" by Marx and was able to develop certain insights into the weaknesses of consumer boycotts, the critical, political (not just tactical) importance of point-of-production industrial organizing, and the importance of 30 for 40 as a weapon against the bosses rather than just a "nice thing" to win. We barely only touched on these questions, but now plan to discuss them in depth.

The idea behind this rather comprehensive plan of study is for all Party members to be involved in study, not only of traditional Marxist literature and/or PLP material, but also to study what the current alignment of class forces is, what is going on in the world today, what is the main form that bourgeois ideology takes in different areas of policy and thought. For that reason a number of bourgeois works have been included. We can learn a little something about the workings of the welfare system by reading a book like "Regulating the Poor" that can help us expose the calculating oppressiveness of that system; at the same time, and more important, we can also get a better understanding of the limitations of the liberal analysis put forward there so as to improve our work and enable us to better struggle with serious people who are somewhat anti-establishment but who are not revolutionaries. In other words, the idea is to read all these works critically including the works by Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and PLP.

Each topic is divided into sub topics, with relevant readings specified. In addition, a few questions around which to structure the discussion are posed. Each sub-topic may take one or more meetings. Certain sections may want to investigate a particular topic or sub-topic in more depth (for example, a club working in welfare should spend more time analyzing the welfare system than another club). All members should have a general idea about most of the topics, however.

All the readings in a particular topic should not be required, though it would be good if at least one person in each collective would read a longer work in the particular section and report on it to the whole group; that way everyone in the group would get an idea of what is in all the readings, without having to read everything. Some readings should be read by everyone, however. Naturally, this guide should be improved, expanded, etc! The order proposed here seems to be a good one, but a different sequence of study might be better. Also, there is bound to be some overlap and repetition (for example, discussing nationalism one week and revisionism another week); therefore the readings will probably be relevant to more than one topic. Everyone should have discussion questions on hand before they read the works so as to make the readings more relevant, and everyone in the club should lead discussions around the readings.

Out of these discussions we ought to be able to get articles for PL magazine, Challenge, and Internals. Involving the whole party in this would be an important step forward. But most important, the main purpose of this type of study plan is to try to make every individual member and every club get a clearer idea of what their role in the revolutionary process is, what kind of a contribution they can make to building the revolution. Without this understanding, the work is either pragmatic, and revisionism and demoralization can seep in; or, occasional study is done in an abstract and mechanistic way, which also does little to give members and clubs the understanding of the importance of the contribution they are making to building socialism; gaining this understanding is one of the most important things to come out of our study.

60

12. Some recommendations.

A) There must be more rank-and-file struggle within the party.

The ten or so bulletins which have come out around the convention have really been inspiring. There have been, in my opinion, a number of right wing articles as well as some Left-oriented articles. But all in all, the fact that dozens and dozens of rank and file party members have been working to contribute to the overall line of the party is a genuine step forward; we should continue to publish bulletins of this nature after the convention. But there is much more to do. The leadership has issued a number of bulletins very sharply criticizing themselves for being primarily responsible for the current right wing trend. That is basically true but doesn't really let the rest of us off the hook. How many of us have spotted signs of the rightwing drift and instead of dealing with it or at least raising questions, we let it slide? Surely many of us noticed the decline in Challenge sales. How many of us have questions about the line but don't raise them. If you have a question, chances are other PL members also have that question. Raise it! For example, the "Equal Rights Amendment" is a fairly big topic of discussion; most party members do not have a clear line on it. (I don't either!) While it shouldn't be the main thing we talk about, we should have a unified line on it. How many of us have tried to work out a line on that question, or at least raised questions so that the party could deal with it. Instead, we either don't deal with it at all, or, more likely, we give this Nixon-sponsored bill uncritical support (after all, isn't that "fighting sectarianism"? Certainly we are against sex discrimination; but not struggling to be clear on the reactionary quality of much of the ERA bill and then supporting it uncritically is exactly how revisionism can infect our work. Building a revolution is a complex job and we need everyone's opinion: don't be afraid to contribute, and don't be afraid to be called wrong; if you are wrong, we and you all gain more clarity on it--if you are right we all gain clarity on it. See the party as a tool to do a job and help make that tool better and stronger.

B) Meetings have to be better organized. Tactical discussion is important but much of that can be done between meetings. Clubs should be clear on how their particular work on a day to day basis is moving the party and working class closer to revolution. There should be an evaluation of a club members work every meeting or so (when was the last time your club systematically evaluated the work of the leader, or any member? Those discussions should deal mainly with how that member's work can contribute to revolution, rather than simply offer tactical or criticisms of "attitude", though these should be discussed also. There should be discussions of basebuilding, (not simply lists of names) where we try to determine what the main obstacle to recruiting this or that person to the party is. We should see the reform movement as a school for communism in our basebuilding; we win people not simply by talking to them and convincing them of the "logic" of revolution, but by joining them in fighting the system, helping structure their experiences so that they can see the need for the revolution and PL from their own experience. Our study has to be improved. It is not enough to read only PL material and occasionally something by Marx or Lenin. We need to study the alignment of the class forces today as they affect our work; we need to study it in terms of Marxist theory, and we need to study it as it relates to our day to day work. This strategic study can link our day to day work with Marxist literature and help us understand both in terms of each other instead of sometimes narrowly, pragmatically discussing day to day work and other times narrowly reading Lenin in the abstract. It is critical to have clear in our minds the relationship between our day to day work and the revolutionary process if we are to sustain our commitment over the years.

C) Boost Challenge sales and recruitment; pay careful attention to Party Base Action-Study groups. This is the heart of our strategy and political line as expressed in Road to Revolution III---THE MOST IMPORTANT GAINS THAT CAN COME OUT OF ANY STRUGGLE, ANY ACTIVITY, IS THE WINNING OF MORE PEOPLE TO CONSCIOUSLY SEE THE NEED FOR USING MARXISM-LENINISM AS THE ONLY WAY TO BUILD SUCCESSFUL REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE TO END OPPRESSION, AND TO CONSCIOUSLY SEE THE NEED FOR ALLYING WITH, BUILDING AND JOINING THE PROGRESSIVE LABOR PARTY.

---T.C.

\* \* \* \* \*

\*\*Those readings with \*\* go into considerable depth on the topic ; it may not be necessary for everyone in the collective to read works with \*\* before the name.

### Topic I--General Overview of Marxism

- 1) The communist Manifesto--Marx and Engels
  - 2) The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism--by Lenin (5 pages)
  - 3) Socialism-Utopian and Scientific----Engels  
(the above 3 are in a good book "Selected Works Of Marx and Engels" by International Publishers 381 Park Av. South, New York City 10016 for \$3.95.)
  - 4) "Karl Marx" by Lenin (Peking book) gives good general overview (45pp)
  - 5) Foundations of Leninism--by Stalin--just read pages 1-54 (4 Chapters)
  - \*\*6) Dialectical and Historical Materialism--Stalin
  - \*\*7) The German Ideology--Marx and Engels
  - \*\*8) PLmag (Nov-Dec 1967) "Can History Be a Science" p. 97 pp.
- A few discussion questions (think up more and better ones!)
- 1) What does it mean to say that the political struggle for power reflects the conflict between economic systems?
  - 2) What is it about the working class that makes it key to the struggle against capitalism and for socialism today?
  - 3) What is the relationship between theory and practice; how did Marx and Lenin develop their theories; how does PLP develop its theory?
  - 4) Give some examples of changes in PL's line. What was it that led us to change our analyses on certain issues? What led to feudalism getting overthrown by capitalism? What factors will help cause capitalism to be overthrown by socialism?

### Topic II--Economics

#### A) Sub-topic: Internal Contradictions of Capitalism

- 1) Marx--Value, Price, and Profit
- 2) Marx--Wage, Labor, and Capital (read this before reading the one above)
- 3) PL Mag. June, 1968---Primer on Imperialism

#### Questions:

- 1) What does "surplus value" mean?
- 2) Why does the capitalist need ever increasing profits in order to simply survive; how does competition between capitalists weaken their whole system?
- 3) How does the capitalist try to increase profits? Where does it come from?
- 4) What is the difference between saying that the boss sells the product for approximately what it is worth and only pays the worker a fraction, AS OPPOSED TO SAYING that the boss pays the worker what the product is worth but then jacks up the price for the consumer?
- 5) What determines the value of a thing? Why is organizing on the job much more powerful than organizing boycotts against prices? Why is 30 for 40 a better demand for the working class to make than just asking for a 30% pay boost? Why will 30 for 40 hurt the bosses more?
- 6) Are depressions and economic crises inevitable under capitalism? What is meant by the 'crisis in overproduction.' Would a socialist society have "crises of overproduction."

### Topic III--Role of the Working Class in the revolutionary process

#### A) Strategic Questions (Subtopic)

- 1) PL book--"US Workers-Key to Revolution"
- 2) PL mag (nov. 1969) "Don't Abandon the Workers"
- 3) PLP 30 for 40 pamphlet
- 4) PLP pamphlet--"Rank and File Caucuses"
- 5) PL mag (jan. 1973) "Marx and the Workers"
- \*\*6) Engels, "Socialism-Utopian & Scientific"

### TOPIC III

#### Questions:

- 1) Of all the oppressed groups, what is it about the working class, and particularly the industrial working class, that makes it the group BEST capable of leading a socialist revolution?
- 2) In addition to desiring to overthrow capitalism, is there anything in the life experiences of workers that make them more ready than other groups to accept the collective socialist way of life?
- 3) What is the relation of the union movement to the working class?
- 4) Are unions part of the bourgeois state apparatus or do they belong to the working class, or neither?
- 5) As the country gets more and more automated, does that weaken or strengthen the strategic power of the workers?
- 6) How should the party operate within unions? Should members run for office?
- 7) What is the role of the caucus? What is the role of WAM? How do they differ? How can they overlap?
- 8) What is the relationship between the party's line of fighting over every single grievance no matter how small, and the vanguard position of 30 for 40?
- 9) Do you believe that 30 for 40 really is the best vanguard strategy for the party's work in the labor movement? Why or why not?
- 10) How does your club work to strengthen the party's trade union work? Does it relate at all? Should it? Are we working to build alliances between people on our job, or campus, or community AND industrial workers in struggle against the system?

#### B) Subtopic: Labor History & History of Mass Movements in the U.S.

- 1) PL pamphlet--"Great Flint Sit-Down Strike"
- 2) Labor's Untold Story" (paperback)/PLmag (April, 1973) "UMW Elections"
- 3) Pages from a Worker's Life by William Z. Foster
- \*\* 4) Autobiography of Big Bill Haywood
- 5) A film available from Amal. Cloth. Wkr. Union--"The Inheritance"
- \*\* 6) W.E.B. DuBois, "Black Reconstruction: 1860-1880"
- \*\* 7) Biography of John Brown
- 8) PLmag (feb, 1969) "Factories in the Fields" PP72-97

#### Questions:

- 1) What does the history of labor struggles in the U.S. tell us about the nature of American democracy?
- 2) Has the shorter work-day been much of an issue in labor struggles?
- 3) What was the role of communists in the labor struggles of the past?
- 4) What were the strengths in the work that they accomplished?
- 5) What weaknesses in the work of the communists helped bring about later setbacks to the labor movement?
- 6) What can we, in PLP, learn from the successes and failures of communist work done in unions during the 1930's and 1940's?
- 7) To what degree did racism against Italians, and Eastern Europeans, as well as blacks, help the ruling class suppress the whole labor movement? What role did deportations of militant non-American workers play in the attack on the labor movement? What can we learn from that relating to our work today?
- 8) What should PL's attitude be towards liberal leaders like Chavez, Arnold Miller, etc. etc.

### TOPIC IV

#### : Capitalism & Imperialism

- 1) Lenin--Imperialism, the highest Stage of Capitalism
- 2) PL Mag. -Aug. 1971--Imperialists At Each Others Throats
- 3) Challenge-June 14, 1973--". Dollar Swoons" Page 3
- \*\* 4) Harry Magdoff--Age of Imperialism, (Monthly Review Press)
- \*\* 5) PL mag--June, 1970--Life in These United States p. 26
- \*\* 6) PL mag--Crisis Weakening US economy, (Sept, 1970)
- 7) PL Vietnam Pamphlet pp. 18-21 and pp. 59-67

TOPIC IV

Questions:

- 64 (4)
- 1) Why is it necessary for the survival of capitalism today that it be imperialist?
  - 2) What are some of the benefits (reasons why) the capitalists go abroad for extra profits?
  - 3) Do U.S. workers benefit from the profits of U.S. imperialism abroad?
  - 4) What does it mean to be anti-imperialist?

TOPIC V

The Nature of the Bourgeois Capitalist State

- 1) Who rules America #I & #II, PL pamphlet
  - 2) Lenin, "The State & Revolution"
  - 3) World Revolution Mag. May, 1969--"Inside Capitalist Yugoslavia"
  - 4) PL mag, (Aug. 1972) 'Is Chile Socialist?' pp25-37
  - \*\* 5) Djilas, "The New Class" (Yugoslavian revisionist)
  - \*\* 6) C.W. Mills, "The Power Elite" (claims "Managers" run U.S.)
  - \*\* 7) Galbraith, "New Industrial State", liberal's ideal dream of a fascist "welfare" stateshows flexibility of bosses to save capitalism.
  - \*\* 8) Galbraith, "Affluent Society"
  - \*\* 9) Marcuse, "One Dimensional Man" --variations on this analysis, that "forgets" about the working class, are still believed by many.
- 10) Challenge-June 14, 1973--"Workers Must Not Choose.." page 2

Questions:

- 1) Who Rules America?
- 2) Can more than one class hold state power?
- 3) What is the difference between a capitalist state that has introduced some social reforms, and a socialist state?
- 4) What are the key institutions that must be controlled by a class before we can say that that class holds state power?
- 5) What does "democracy" mean; what is difference between bourgeois democracy and proletarian democracy?
- 6) If you support dictatorship of the proletariat, does that mean that you are against freedom? What do Marxists mean by freedom as a materialist concept (or as a class concept)? Can both the bosses and the workers have freedom? What about freedom of speech?
- 7) Could the working class take power in the U.S. or some other country without using armed struggle?
- 8) If a person is "independent" of the party and of the working class, does that mean that he or she is really "independent"? Can a person really be "independent" of the class struggle? What happens if you try?

TOPIC VI -Revisionism

A) Subtopic: The Stages theory of revolution

- 1) Mao--On New Democracy
- 2) PL Book--Road to Revolution II
- 3) PL mag --"Road to Revolution III" (nov. 1971)
- 4) PL mag--(nov. 1971) "Strategy and Tactics of the International"
- 5) PL mag--(Nov. 1971) "Seventh World Congress"
- \*\* 6) PL book--"Road to Revolution I"
- \*\* 7) Lin Paio--"Long Live the Victory of Peoples' War"
- \*\* 8) Lenin on War and Peace (short book from Peking)
- \*\* 9) "Two Different Lines on War and Peace" --(Peking polemic against Moscow)

Questions:

- 1) Is it sometimes all right to ally with the more liberal wing of the ruling class against the more fascistic wing?
- 2) What is the difference between PLP's strategy of uniting with non-communists in reform struggles, and of uniting with Liberal politicians against the conservatives?
- 3) How does PLP's notion of building a united front as a way to build revolutionary struggle differ with the "2-stage" theory of revolution?

65

- 4) What is the most important thing that can come out of any reform struggle?
- 5) Are we against all negotiations with the capitalist class?
- 6) What are the political features of a revolutionary People's War? Does the notion of winning the masses to revolution contradict the 2-stage theory of revolution?
- 7) Can the working class as a class have "peaceful coexistence with the capitalist class?"
- 8) In your day to day work, do you sometimes use the "2-stage" theory in the united fronts in which you are involved? How is not selling Challenge a form of the "two-stage" theory? Do you, in fact, practice "peaceful coexistence" with your boss, your school, or even with such "allies" of the ruling class as racist comments, male chauvinism, or cynicism?

B) Subtopic: Revisionism AFTER a socialist revolution

- 1) Mao--On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People
- 2) PL Mag (nov. 1971) "Cultural Revolution & Reversal of Workers Power" p.25-49
- 3) PL Mag (Jan. 1973) The 1970 Polish Uprising
- 4) PL Mag (Aug. 1972) "Whither China" (sheng-wu-lein statement) pp68-87
- 5) PL Mag (nov. 1971) "Lessons of the Paris Commune of 1871"
- \*\* 6) Trotsky, "Permanent Revolution"
- \*\* 7) World Revolution Mag. (May, 1969) "Inside Capitalist Yugoslavia"
- 8) PLmag (April, 1973) pp.33-54 "Swedish Marxists Critique N. Korea"

Questions:

- 1) Why do we say that revisionism is a bourgeois or capitalist thing? Why not, instead, say that it represents a form of imperfect socialism?
- 2) What is the key thing that determines whether a country is revisionist or is simply making some errors?
- 3) What are some of the signs of revisionism within a country like Russia or China?
- 4) If it is written into law that the working class owns all the industry, why can't we say that a country is socialist?
- 5) What are some ways that the working class can maintain its power against bourgeois revisionists who try to take leadership?
- 6) Is the Dictatorship of the Proletariat a kind of United Front or Left-Center coalition?
- 7) What is the role of the Party in a Dictatorship of the Proletariat?
- 8) If the Party directly runs the government, does that mean that the country is a socialist country?
- 9) What is the type of foreign policy that a revisionist country has? How is it different from a socialist foreign policy?

Subtopic

C) Revisionism WITHIN a revolutionary party & the question of building the party

- 1) Lenin--"What is to be Done" (maybe just the last third)
- 2) PL book--"On the Party"
- 3) Stalin-- Foundations of Leninism--pages 101-120
- 4) PL book--Build a base in the Working Class & Fight Individualism
- 5) PL book--"Criticism & Self-Criticism"
- 6) PLP CONVENTION BULLETIN #4 pages 1-16
- 7) PLP CONVENTION BULLETIN #9 "on Revisionism" pages 1-4
- 8) PLmag (Jan, 1973) "Revolution, A Life & Death Struggle" p.53-63

Questions:

- 1) Could there be a successful revolution without a party?
- 2) What is "democratic centralism"?
- 3) Is democratic centralism mainly a good organizational technique for getting a job done?
- 4) What is the difference between democratic centralism, bureaucratic centralism, and a party without centralism?
- 5) What does it mean to say that democratic centralism is the "scientific method" applied to social relationships and politics?
- 6) What does it mean to say that the party as a unit is stronger than the sum of its individual members?

Questions:

(VI,C)

66

- 7) How are revisionist influences within ourselves and within the party expressions of the bourgeoisie's control over culture and ideology? How are these revisionist ideas actually a part of the capitalists' state apparatus? Give some examples.
- 8) Can an individual overcome his or her bourgeois weaknesses without the party?
- 9) How important is it to the party to have a newspaper like Challenge? Couldn't we do almost as good work without it?
- 10) Why do we say that two main barometers of revisionism within the party are low Challenge sales and slow recruitment?
- 11) What are main obstacles to improvement in recruitment and selling Challenge on your job or campus? Do they reflect bourgeois influences, or is it "something else?"
- 12) What is the effect of "cult of the personality" within the party?
- 13) What is the role of criticism and self-criticism: has there been systematic evaluations of all club members, including the club leader's work, in recent months?
- 14) In what ways are revisionist ideas within the party a reflection of an anti-working class bias in attitudes?
- 15) What should the standards of recruitment and maintenance of membership be?
- 16) What forms did revisionism take in the Chinese Party? What were the effects?

Topic VII-Racism

A) Subtopic: The nature of Racial oppression

- 1) PL book--"Black Liberation Program"
- 2) PL book--"Black Workers-Key Revolutionary Force"
- 3) SDS pamphlet on "GENOCIDE"
- \*\* 4) Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (commonly called the Kerner Commission Report) (someone should read it)
- \*\* 5) Eugene Genovese, "Political Economy of Slavery"

Questions:

- 1) Who benefits from racial discrimination?
- 2) Do white workers and students benefit from it?
- 3) Are the liberal big businessmen against it?
- 4) Is there a difference between racist exploitation by big businessmen, and nationalism on the part of blacks?
- 5) Is racism part of the capitalist system such that the bosses NEED to maintain racism for their own survival, or could they do away with racial discrimination if they wanted to? Explain the role racism plays.
- 6) Is racism mainly caused by ignorance and lack of knowledge on the part of people who believe racist ideas? What role does the ruling class play in consciously pushing racist ideas?
- 7) Should PLP support preferential treatment, hiring and up grading of minority workers?
- 8) What about demanding more black college presidents, judges, and businessmen?
- 9) What do we mean by "super-exploitation"?
- 10) Give examples of racist super-exploitation or racist extra-oppression on your job, workplace, campus, or community.
- 11) Give other examples of how racism ALSO helped split up workers in struggle against the bosses. Give examples from housing, from schools, from colleges, on the job, and other examples as well
- 12) The kerner commission report gives many examples of racism and discrimination in the U.S., and then pins the blame on the fact that the American people are "mainly responsible" for this, because of racist prejudice. Discuss this viewpoint.

B) Subtopic: RACIST IDEOLOGY--the genetic viewpoint

67

- 1) Richard Herrnstein article: "IQ" in Atlantic Monthly, 1971 (the most vicious of the bunch, important to read)
- 2) UAG pamphlet "Born to be Unemployed" (on Herrnstein)
- 3) Fortune magazine (Oct. 1971) "The Social Engineers Retreat Under Fire"
- 4) Sillen & Thomas "Racism & Psychiatry" (very good background) (NY: 1971)
- \*\* 5) Montague, "The Concept of Race"
- 6) PL mag (April, 1973) "Racism & the Eugenics Movement"
- \*\* 7) Ebony Magazine (Feb, 1973) "Lobotomies & Psychosurgery"

Questions:

- 1) Do people believe any of this stuff? What effect does it have on people?
- 2) Why is this stuff spread? Relate how these ideas fit in with government policy.
- 3) Why do we say that "race" is a socially defined concept, rather than a biological concept?
- 4) How can we fight against these ideas? What about free speech?

C) Subtopic: RACIST IDEOLOGY--the "environmental" view

- 1) "Blaming the Victim" by W. Ryan--paperback that everyone in the party should read.
- 2) Banfield, "Unheavenly City"
- 3) UAG pamphlet "Unheavenly System" (on Banfield)
- \*\* 4) The "Moynihan Report"

Questions:

- 1) What is the difference between the "genetic" view of black inferiority and the "environmental" view of black inferiority? How are they the same?
- 2) What sort of government policy flows from this "environmental" view?
- 3) How can we fight against these views? Give some examples of where views of this nature were expressed in your campus, job, or community, or in the media. Did they stimulate black-white working class unity against the boss? What were the effects of these ideas on students and working people?

TOPIC---NATIONALISM

- 1) Stalin, "Foundations of Leninism" pages 70-82
- 2) Stalin, "The National Question"
- 3) PL book "All Nationalism is Reactionary"
- 4) PL "Vietnam: Defeat U.S. Imperialism" pamphlet
- 5) Autobiography of Malcom X
- \*\* 6) Franz Fanon, "The Wretched of the Earth" (paperback)

Questions:

- 1) In what sense is nationalism a response to racism or imperialism?
- 2) Where does the idea come from? Is it a "natural" response or does it actually express bourgeois aspirations?
- 3) In what sense do nationalist solutions really do nothing to hurt the international capitalist class?
- 4) Why do capitalists sometimes attack nationalist movements in other countries, and other times side with nationalist movements?
- 5) How do capitalists in the U.S. use nationalism to increase their profits? How do capitalists in other countries do it?
- 6) Should members of PLP work in any nationalist groups? Would we ever ally with a National Liberation group that was fighting against imperialism? What kinds of relations could we have with a group like that?

TOPIC---Women & Socialism

- 1) PL Mag--(Feb. 1970) --"Political Economy of Male Chauvinism" pp46-55
  - \*\* 2) Engels, "Origin of the State, Family, & Private Property"
- (The party has few other articles relating to the extra-oppression of women and the role of women in revolutionary struggle. Hopefully, this part of the study plan can be expanded. Also necessary are works by bourgeois liberals (Friedan, Steinem, etc.) that lay out their general views; if we read them we can get a better idea of how to win people away from them)

Some questions:

- 68
- 1) Who benefits from the oppression of women?
  - 2) What are some of the forms that the extra oppression of women take?
  - 3) What is the role of anti-women ideology in the media & schools?
  - 4) Do most students and working people believe anti-women ideology?
  - 5) What are the effects of this male-chauvinist ideology?
  - 6) Should PLP support the Equal Rights Amendment?
  - 7) Should PLP support the repeal of laws restricting abortion?
  - 8) Do we believe that abortion is simply "A Woman's Right to Choose"?
  - 9) In a socialist society, would we say abortion would be commonplace?
  - 10) How can we win more women to the Party? What forms does male chauvinism take within the PLP?

TOPIC--EDUCATION AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

- 1) PL mag, (Sept. 1970) "Public Schools: Battlegrounds"
- 2) Kozol, "Death at an Early Age"
- \*\* 3) Christopher Jencks, "Inequality"
- 4) PL mag (April 1973) "Racist Thought of Christopher Jencks"
- \*\* 5) The "Coleman Report"
- \*\* 6) Kohl, "Thirty Six Children"

Questions:

- 1) What is the main reason the capitalists have schools for working class youth?
- 2) What role can school teachers play in the class struggle? Are they part of the working class?
- 3) What is the structure of your union of teachers? Is there an anti-racist grouping in it? What role should the party play within the union?
- 4) Some liberals claim to sympathize with working class students (particularly black and latins), but say that the MAIN problem is that the teachers are too racist to deal with them. How should we deal with that argument?

Would integrated schools be better for the working class than segregated schools which exist now? What should PL's line be on that? What about bussing? Is it good or bad?

(WE SURE COULD USE A PAMPHLET ON THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS)

TOPIC: Students and Revolution

- 1) PL handbook: Students and Revolution
- 2) PL mag, (oct. 1968) "SDS-An Analysis"

Questions:

- 1) What position do students have in the class structure of the U.S.?
- 2) What do we mean by worker-student alliance? Is it realistic?
- 3) What role does fighting racism play in building worker-student alliance?
- 4) Do you think that fighting racism in education, classes, & textbooks should continue to be a main focus of PL student work?
- 5) How can we broaden the fight against racism on campus? How can we broaden the worker-student alliance?
- 6) What is the main ideological obstacle to winning more students to the party? How can these obstacles be overcome? What is the role of individualism & drugs on campuses? In what ways is racism manifested by students on campus? How can we struggle against these things, and win?
- 6) What should the role of SDS be in building the student movement? What should the party's role within SDS be?
- 7) In addition to SDS, with what other groups and in what ways can we unite with other students.
- 8) Is there really much purpose in selling Challenge to students on campus?
- 9) What role can students play in mass struggle and in revolution?

TOPIC: The Welfare System

- 1) "Regulating the Poor" by Cloward & Piven (paperback)
- \*\* 2) "The Other America" by Michael Harrington
- 3) Milwaukee County WRO pamphlet: Welfare Mothers Speak Out-- We Ain't Gonna Shuffle Anymore

Questions:

- 69
- 1) What is the role of the welfare system?
  - 2) How does it relate to unemployment?
  - 3) What role can people on welfare play in the revolutionary struggle?
  - 4) How can we build alliances between those on welfare and employed workers? Can WAM play any role in this?
  - 5) In working with recipients, what should be the main line that the party puts forward? How can we win more recipients into PLP?
  - 6) Are caseworkers and other welfare workers really part of the working class? What role can they play in building revolutionary struggle? What role could the social worker's union in your city play in building mass struggle and revolutionary struggle?
  - 7) What role could the party play within that situation? What line should the party put forward within these unions?
  - 8) What is the main problem with our work among social workers?
  - 9) What is the main obstacle to winning more of them to the party?

TOPIC: United Front and Electoral Movements

- 1) PL mag, (nov. 1971) "Fight Sectarianism"
- 2) Lenin, "Left Wing Communism--An Infantile Disorder"
- 3) Stalin, "Foundations of Leninism", pages 82-100
- 4) PL pamphlet, "Who Governs McGovern"
- \*\* 5) Greenfield & Newfield, "Populist Manifesto"
- \*\* 6) PL mag (Oct-Nov, 1966) "Elections, A Method of Struggle"

Questions:

- 1) Should PLP ever support a Democrat or Republican for President?
- 2) Could we ever support a candidate from an independent left party?
- 3) Should PLers get involved in elections in unions? What is the difference between union elections and presidential elections?
- 4) Could the working class take power in the U.S. via elections?
- 5) Could the rank-and-file take power in a union via elections? What does it mean to "take power" in a union?
- 6) Should we work on referendum campaigns? Can we win reforms with referendums? What role should PLP play in a referendum campaign?
- 7) What are the prospects for a mass based left-liberal party in the U.S. in the coming years? Will the Democratic Party adopt that role?
- 8) What is the difference between the party's independent line, its vanguard line, and its mass line? Do these three lines change during the course of struggle? How?
- 9) In fighting sectarianism, how can we avoid moving to the Right?

TOPIC: Health Care & Capitalism

- 1) PL mag (March, 1972) "Drugs-U.S. Govt. is Biggest Pusher of All"
- 2) PL mag (August, 1971) p. 53 "American Health Empire: Unexposed..."
- 3) PL mag (April, 1973) "Socialized Medicine" P. 67-72

Questions:

- 1) How is health care part of big business in the U.S.?
- 2) In what ways is medical "care" racist?
- 3) How can we forge unity between doctors, nurses, hospital workers and patients? Around what lines could we unite?
- 4) What role can PL play in such a situation?
- 5) What types of groups could form? What role would they play in the revolutionary process? How can PLP affect these groups?

TOPIC: Capitalism, Culture & Art

- 1) Mao, "Talks at the Yenan forum on Literature and Art"
- 2) PL Convention Bulletin #5 ppl-17
- 3) PL mag (Oct. 1968) "Marcuse & his philosophy of cop-out"
- \*\* 4) Book: "The Greening of America"
- \*\* 5) Book: "The Making of a Counter-Culture"
- 6) C. Cauldwell, "Studies in a Dying Culture" & "Further Studies in Dying Cul." (some weaknesses, but very useful & interesting)

70

Questions:

- 1) What is Culture
- 2) How is culture a carrier of ideology?
- 3) Can culture exist outside of the class struggle?
- 4) Is capitalist culture all that bad; isn't some of it apolitical?  
Try to discuss examples from TV, comics, movies, music, literature
- 5) To what degree is "cynicism" part of American Culture; is cynicism much of a political concept?
- 6) What can the party do to develop better working class culture?
- 7) How can the party unite with artists, writers, etc? On what basis?
- 8) How can we be more creative & skillful in our use of culture to win people over to communism?

(10)

TOPIC: Ecology & Revolution

- 1) PL mag (Sept, 1970) "Ecology Movement Exposed" pp50-65
- 2) "The Earth Belongs to the People" (radical pamphlet from Berkeley)
- 3) PL mag (Sept, 1970) "Love the Earth-Hate the People" pp64-68
- 4) Ehrlich, "The Population Bomb"

Questions:

- 1) Who causes pollution? Who benefits?
- 2) Are there too many people in the world today?
- 3) Why do capitalists sometimes encourage high population and other times call for population control?
- 4) Why is much of the population control propaganda racist?
- 5) How can PL relate to serious forces in the ecology movement?
- 6) What can we do to struggle around the environment that workers, especially in factories are subjected to?
- 7) How can we win serious activists in the ecology movement to PLP?

TOPIC: Anti-Communism & Theories of Human Nature

- 1) Engels, "ANTI-DUHRING"
- 2) Marx & Engels, "German Ideology"
- 3) Eric Hoffer, "The True Believer" (standard line on anti-communism that many people in U.S. believe today)

- \*\*4) Lorenz, "On Aggression"
- \*\*5) Ardrey, "Territorial Imperative"

Questions:

- 1) What do Marxists say about "Human Nature"?
- 2) Why is anti-communism essentially anti-working class?
- 3) How can we struggle against these theories of "human nature" and anti-communism in others? In what ways do individualism and anti-communism reflect themselves in the party?

Lastly, there are many other potential topics, eg "Science & Marxism" that others should develop study guides for. This guide represents thinking of one club; surely it can be improved. Additionally, films might be useful to discuss, esp. "Battle of Algiers", "Salt of the Earth", "Sacco & Vanzetti", "Sounder", "State of Siege", "Potemkin", "Z", and the pl film of the March on Washington. Mainly these should be reviewed critically and discussed that way in meetings.

This guide clearly needs more books & works that reflect bourgeois and liberal bourgeois thought. We have to understand this crap in order to defeat it!

Also, while practice is key, it is foolish to downgrade the importance of study. Most of PL's leadership has studied Marxism much more than the average member, and it certainly must have helped them in maintaining and sustaining a revolutionary outlook and commitment. The whole party needs this understanding.

Study is IMPORTANT. Perhaps club meetings could start with study for the first half and discuss more tactical issues in the second half. Or on alternate weeks, the first half could be intensive evaluation of a member's work, & the second half would discuss the more tactical questions. Of course we have to discuss the concrete work, but we have to stop putting off study and member-evaluations. A RIGID plan may be necessary. Also, often the concrete discussion will be sharper.

MOST IMPORTANT OF ALL, THOUGH, RELATING TO THE WHOLE QUESTION OF STUDY, IS THAT ALL OUR STUDY HAS TO BE ORIENTED TOWARDS IMPROVING OUR WORK. WE WANT TO LEARN FROM THE PAST AND THE PRESENT TO IMPROVE OUR WORK. All the "great" classics of revolutionary literature were written for the same purpose. Marx did not sit down and say: "I think I'll write a universally true Marxist classic today." They were studying to overthrow capitalism and build a society free from exploitation. Our study must be for the same purposes. Always ask: "What can the party learn from this bit of literature which will help build and strengthen the party, and bring revolution that much closer?" \*\*\*

for the Convention Bulletin?  
71

Dear Comrades,

The discussion over sexism in the recent C.B.'s has been great and may lead into a better developed line on sexism. But we will be held back in that work if we do not understand how much it is sexism within the party that is behind our "failure to develop a line," our "playing down the issue," etc. It seems to me it is not even so much that the party doesn't see the importance of sexism as a bosses' tool as that the party doesn't recognize sexism where it exists.

Take for instance the recent column on the Pill in C-D. It made many correct points about the dangers and side effects of the pill, which are generally ignored by ruling class propagandists in their zeal to keep working class women from having a lot of children (among other things). But the conclusion that "the pill is a killer" and should not be used is way off base, or at least highly highly debatable, and could mess up the lives of women who take seriously what they read in C-d (thank god the apples/vinegar bullshit probably had destroyed most people's faith in that particular column already!). Whether or not they will be forced to be baby machines (just as much as the opposite, whether or not they will be forced into sterilization) is a life-and-death matter to many women, especially young women workers who are often forced into full responsibility for another person while they are still kids themselves. And the pill is the only sure contraceptive (therefore the only method acceptable to the many women who no birth control method is perfect or even harmless - and the pc. doesn't care enough would object to getting an abortion if they got pregnant). Printing

this misleading and harmful article for the sake of "controversy," which I gather was the idea, is playing with women's lives and is sexist. The editors were not seriously considering the needs of women reading the paper, or the whole question of childbearing, childrearing, etc.

About abortions. They are by no means the most important point

about women to develop better ones.

72-

at which to fight sexism. In fact the only reason they have become so primary is that the phoney SWP leadership of the women's movement (through WONAAC, etc.) has tried to submerge all other issues into this one--they don't even call for free abortions, only for legal ones. But even if free abortions are not primary we clearly must support them, coupled with the demand for no forced sterilization (permanent or temporary), as an important improvement in the lives of working class women. The comparison of having an abortion to smoking marijuana is appalling. Abortions are simply a form of ~~birth control~~ birth control, and few people nowadays will take a principled stand against birth control, or not see it as a valuable technological advance. I think much of the opposition to abortions within the party is opportunist: some honest people oppose abortions so we must not offend them. *this is not intended to be a complete discussion of the abortion issue, which must take place elsewhere.)*

At the WAM convention a woman made a proposal on how to fight sexism within WAM. It was not put forward in the best way (form a women's caucus, etc.), but was trying to fill an unacknowledged need. The reactions included catcalls and a denial that sexism exists within WAM. When the woman said something like "there is some sexism within all men," she was answered not by a serious discussion of sexism within WAM but by a woman's ringing statement that "there is some sexism within all womentoo." This drew applause and a hasty end to discussion by the decision that sexism was to be discussed within every workshop (which by the way I am dubious will happen). The comments I heard from men sitting around me were quite sexist and derogatory ("what's that bitch doing up there?" "Women's lib bullshit"). Where was the party providing leadership, pointing out that sexism is all-pervasive, that the important thing is to recognize and fight it, and not to quibble over the formation of committees? If the topic had been racism, would anyone have thought

7-3-

Sorry not to be more constructive. Sudden personal problems prevented me from working on this any more. Susan

it of primary importance to counter a statement that all whites are racist with a statement that all blacks are racist (white chauvinist) too? This reflects a certain tendency to blame the victim, to criticize women, the oppressed, for not being perfect, and not criticizing men for the ways they allow themselves to be used as tools of that oppression (much less showing them how sexism screws them too).

I have ~~heard women~~ been in the Challenge office and heard women described as "chicks" or "broad"--as a joke? I have heard party members laugh when told women are harassed sexually while selling the paper, and refuse to discuss ways to handle this. I have repeatedly heard party members repeat uncritically vicious ruling-class slander against women's liberation groups, without trying to distinguish friends from enemies. ~~xx~~ And men in the party are often not criticized for chauvinist relationships with women as long as they are "serious," i.e. monogamous, rather than promiscuous. In general, my impression is that ones attitudes toward the oppression of women, except as it is related to the trade union struggle, is seen as a personal, not a political thing. Like rooting for the Mets.

Most party members have by now been won at least in words to fighting their own male chauvinism. Imagine if that sentence had read, "Most party members are won to fighting their racism," it would immediately be seen as shameful (they should all be, of course). ~~x~~ If we do not consider it a serious political task to break down the barriers between men and women within the party we will never really join the fight against women's oppression, much less lead it.

\*\*\*\*\*

Fraternally (sisterly) Susan Levinsky

77

74

For the Internal

Losing a Shop Steward Election

About a month ago, I lost the election for shop steward in my location in a welfare center. It was a surprise to a number of workers as well as myself, although it was close. One aspect was that the rival who beat me did practically no unionwide work, whereas I did quite a bit, including playing a large role in getting 30 for 40 passed by the union (SSEU-371) and putting out an open leaflet about my role as a PL member (which they had long known, anyhow).

My estimate is that I lost for a couple of key reasons. One, the workers didn't identify me with fighting for their gut interests, and second I had no close friends inside or outside the office. For example, I didn't even try to put a slate together. Many of the workers said it was the leaflet I put out that was too strong, and secondly that I was more loyal to PL than to local 371 or D.C. 37. How did they get such a picture of the party, that it didn't reflect their interests? It was because I didn't struggle with them over the answer to the wage freeze-the general strike- I didn't struggle with them over slave labor being racist- I didn't struggle with them enough over hiring more clerks, as they were caseworkers and supervisors. In other words, I put out a P.L. leaflet, I sold 60 Challenges an issue on the job, but I didn't fight with them for the P.L. line on the gut issues that concerned them. I was too busy concentrating only on the city-wide caucus of mainly shop stewards. I never put out a local leaflet on local issues and/or city-wide issues, nor did I put out with the help of other workers a newsletter, something I had done five years ago before I was in the party. The newsletter, I thought, would take up too much of my time. So, I reaped what I sowed. To the 94 workers I had represented, I hadn't cared enough for their interests, and since I was in P.L., to them P.L. didn't care about their interests. The union did, D.C. 37 did, but P.L. didn't.

Well, it isn't too late. Shop steward or not, the local leaflets

75

can still come out, the newsletter can still come out with the help of other workers, the party line can still be struggled for on the gut issues, and a close friend or two can still be made. The next six months to a year will show whether or not I will have learned something about how to work in the trade union movement. Long live the party!

76

A Note on Chomsky and Allying with Intellectuals

I want to point out another way in which Chomsky's theory is reactionary (not mentioned by Steve Cushing). Chomsky does not put forth the tendency for human beings "to live with each other in peace and freedom" as the only innate idea; he also says that what linguists call the "dominant" (or most frequently occurring) word-order for the English language is an innate "mental" structure serving as a basis for ~~all~~ the structures of all languages. In English the "dominant" word order is Subject-Verb-Object (SVO), and although many languages have this same order, VSO and SOV orders are also quite common. Chomsky and his followers justified their choice of SVO as innate by saying that any word-order could be adopted, but they chose SVO because it happened to be the order of the language (English) they used for data. Other linguists came up with various modifications of this assumption, but basically they ~~made~~ adopted the same reactionary tendency of constructing ~~an~~ innate universals from what they knew about English (and only Standard English at that). ~~One might argue that~~ I think there are racist implications in this assumption, but that's not what I want to bring out here. What seems more important is the ease with which so many academics could rely on English alone to derive Universals for all languages. The English language must have a great deal of weight with these people to permit them to do this.

An overemphasis on the importance of English is also found in the work of William Labov. Here, however, it is only in terms of Standard English vs. the English of black working people. Labov proposes that black people should be taught Standard English as a "second dialect" in the schools, to be learned in addition to the Black English they already speak. He argues that black people's nonstandard dialect is socially stigmatized and therefore keeps them from getting good jobs. If they learned to speak educated English, as well as their dialect, their chances of getting better jobs would greatly improve. Certainly this is pure nonsense. In the first place, many black people already speak Standard English as well as their own dialect, and in the second place, bosses aren't racists simply because they think black dialect is "bad" English: they're racists because they make bigger profits that way. Wherever people form different social and ethnic groups, dialects will be formed within these groups. But the ruling class commonly ~~uses~~ points out these dialect differences in order to have prejudice against certain groups taught in the schools. Black English, Southern dialects, "Brooklynese", etc. (all of them for the most part working class dialects) are described as "bad English", "uneducated", etc. We should try to raise the issue that the Standard English norms taught in schools are anti-working class and racist, an effort to build prejudice against working people by attacking their language.

One further reason Standard English is given this undue prominence by English teachers, educators, linguists, etc. is the "Prestige" role it has been given by its use in scientific and technical writings and in the growth of imperialism. Today there is a large corps of teachers expert in "Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages". They teach English to the elites of other countries so that they can play a more efficient role in building the U.S. imperialist apparatus. In these (usually

2

non-white countries English is often made into the language of education, especially at the university level, to the neglect of indigenous languages; little translation into native languages is carried out and the masses of people remain uneducated. The English language has played its role in building racism and imperialism around the world and its use in ~~the~~ other countries is frequently to the advantage of the imperialists.

My opinion is that neither Chomsky nor Labov will make good allies because they are both too entrenched in the system. Their theories and research are taught nationally (even internationally), they have important positions at ruling class institutions, and they have long records of having their research funded by ruling class institutions and agencies. Though the findings of Labov's research contradict some of the basic principles of Chomsky's theories, Labov doesn't try to refute or reject these theories but integrates his findings into them. Chomsky's Ramparts (1972) article on Herrnstein rejects SDS' position that Herrnstein is racist and only attacks his research as "scientifically insignificant". Chomsky has openly allied himself with the Hanoi bourgeoisie and testified in favor of Karl Armstrong in hearings over the explosion at the Army Math Research Center in Madison, Wisconsin. I don't think PLP should have anything to do with reactionaries like this, other than to attack them.

Approaching those at the top is no way to build an alliance with the mass of intellectuals. Many college teachers at all levels, ~~are~~ many already in unions, are involved in working class struggles, such as more financial aid to minority students, more jobs or no cutbacks in jobs, etc. College teachers and intellectuals often take pro-working class positions on most issues, but then suppress these politics when it comes to their "professional" work. We have to encourage them to put forth their politics in their teaching and writing.

A friend of PLP.

78

We all know women's oppression is bad, the question is, what is the significance of it. How badly does it need to be fought? In face of racist genocidal war in Vietnam and genocidal policies of the US government at home, problems of women pale in significance. Yet this article ~~wants to~~ <sup>will</sup> argue that 1) the fight against sexism, far from being a diversion, must be an integral part of the fight against racism. Capitalist ideologies bolster each other. 2) Sexist exploitation is crucially important to the capitalists and a direct fight against it as part of the trade union movement is a winning strategy. 3) Although women ~~would~~ <sup>will</sup> fight for ~~the~~ <sup>a</sup> revolution (in fact, after minority workers, be most militant) and state power could be seized without an explicit fight against sexism, socialism could never be achieved if we don't fight sexism from the beginning. Anything which oppresses over half the population must be fought. The only chance to end sexism is to overthrow capitalism, but revolution doesn't guarantee an end to sexism.

Elitism is fundamental to capitalist thought. It is the main apology of the system. Under feudalism the theory of the 'divine right of kings' said the power of kings was granted by God. Under capitalism the power of the ruling class is justified by their supposed merit in organizing industry and competing in a free market economy. 'The best man wins' is the fundamental justification for privilege under capitalism. Racism and sexism are subideologies of this. Superoppression, says bourgeois ideology, <sup>justified</sup> is deserved because of the ~~extra~~ <sup>inadequate</sup> lack of merit of the minorities and women.

79

I Does sexism have to be fought alongside racism?

Racism and sexism are clearly parallel ideologies. Both claim that a subgroup of the population is by birth inferior to the others. Both appear to be supported by reality since minorities and women have an inferior position in society, economically, politically and culturally. Both racism and sexism exist in concrete forms and as myths pushed by every cultural medium (education, books, TV, etc.). Racism has two functions, to justify superexploitation and to divide the working class against itself in order to weaken it in its struggle against the ruling class. Sexism has the same functions.

The base of the superexploitation of women is a huge wage differential. The median wage for fulltime female workers is 60% that of fulltime male workers, just as fulltime black males make only 70% the median wage of white males. A higher proportion of women than men work parttime, so that when the yearly wages of parttime workers are averaged in, women make only 40% of what men make in a year (\$4,903 for men, \$2,408 for women). (All figures from Bureau of the Census, 1971). Women have a higher official unemployment rate than men, and through lack of day-care centers, many more women workers than men are forced out of the labor force by circumstance. (Bureau of Labor Statistics). Thus wages are much lower, unemployment and underemployment much higher for women than for men.

Further, women suffer double exploitation because of domestic slavery. Whether they work outside the home or not, they are expected to do all the housework, which as Lenin said,

"crushes, strangles, stultifies and degrades her, chains her to the kitchen and the nursery, and she wastes her labour on barbarously unproductive, petty, nervewracking, stultifying and crushing drudgery." (Emancipation, p. 64) In summary, the ideology of sexism justifies superexploitation of women workers, superunemployment among women, and non-payment for housework (domestic slavery).

Furth, sexism divides the working class into two. Many a strike has been broken by dividing male from female workers. The AFL in its early years didn't organize women workers. The family is a bulwark of capitalist relations. In it the authoritarianism of the man preserves the system in microcosm. The woman is the man's slave rather than his comrade in the fight against a common enemy, the ruling class. His outlook towards her strengthens his belief in the justice of capitalism, and her belief in the immutability of her subjugation.

Just as with racism, the working man doesn't actually benefit from sexism. Rather, it tricks him into accepting a weakening of one sector of his class (by lower pay, unemployment, etc.) which in fact weakens his position relative to the bosses. Further, sexism spoils the most intimate relationship in his life and involves him innumerable family troubles and emotional miseries. Domestic slavery, though letting him off the hook from a second job, creates a division between him and his potential ally in the struggle against his own exploitation. Thus, just like racism, sexism is an elitist ideology which divides the working class and justifies the superexploitation of women.

The main difference between racism and sexism is the extremity of the exploitation. Although women make lower wages than

black men, the overall economic position of married women is better, because of the income of their spouses, than that of black people in general. A woman isn't threatened by police murder just because of her sex, whereas a black person will be murdered <sup>simply because he's black</sup> by the police, as for example Phillip Johns, who was murdered in his bed in Los Angeles on \_\_\_\_\_ when the cops came to arrest someone else. The government doesn't have a genocidal policy towards women, as they do towards black people. However, many aspects of the genocidal policy are directed against black women, and the whole justification for it is based in sexist arguments (see next section). Further, there are <sup>only</sup> physical forms of exploitation women are subject to, prostitution and rape.

Another difference between racism and sexism is their relative significance in revolutionary strategy. Racism must be overcome by the working class or there never will be a revolution. The potential of race war is a key weapon for the ruling class. A whole movement of the masses could be destroyed by a racist scapegoat campaign such as took place in Nazi Germany. It is hard to imagine the capitalists succeeding in an effort to foment a sex war, by contrast. Racism wins American to fight imperialist war and diverted the whole antiwar movement away from an anti-imperialist line in the racist slogan "bring the boys home". Today racism is the key cutting edge of the bosses' anti-union activities. Racism can divide the trade union movement fatally.

Official Racism bolstered by Sexism

Racism and sexism not only have similar functions, as forms of elitism they bolster each other. This is not surprising because all forms of elitism <sup>mean</sup> one group is better than another and therefore deserves privileges. If someone already believes in one ~~such~~ elitist division, such as sexism, he is that much readier to believe in another one, such as racism. The Nazis pushed sexism to the hilt just at the time they were building racism against the Jews, all to garner support for an authoritarian regime. (Millet) (Note anticommunism intertwined with antisemitism).

Official government racism in recent years draws upon our well-ingrained patriarchal view that women aren't rational and responsible enough to run a family <sup>in order</sup> to convince us that the problems of the ghetto derive from the patriarchal black family structure. An official publication of the Johnson Administration was the Moynihan Report (1965).

Moynihan in Ryan p. 64

At the heart of the deterioration of the fabric of Negro society is the deterioration of the Negro family. It is the fundamental source of weakness of the Negro community at the present time.... Unless this damage is repaired, all the effort to end discrimination and poverty and injustice will come to little. 2

*Wm. Miller in his book "Pinning the Victim" has analyzed the Ryan p. 64 The Moynihan Report as follows:*

One can readily summarize and simplify the essential elements of this ideological position. First, the Negro family, as a major institution within a Negro subculture, is weak and unstable, tending toward a patriarchal form. Second, the present status of the Negro family is rooted in the experience of slavery. Third, the distortions in Negro family structure have been maintained by Negro unemployment that has continued at disastrously high levels for many decades. Fourth, the weakened Negro family produces children, particularly sons, who are so damaged by their family experience that they are unable to profit from educational and employment opportunities. Fifth, therefore efforts to achieve formal change in such social institutions as ghetto schools and discriminatory employment practices will have little effect on present patterns of inequality and poverty will not, and cannot, be achieved until something is done to strengthen and stabilize the Negro family.

First, it isn't even true that the black family is matriarchal. Although there is a higher proportion of black families headed by women than white families, 75% of black families are headed by men. Ryan points out that generally in poor families, necessity dictates a larger share of economic responsibility be shouldered by the women, so even the higher proportion of female-headed families correlates with poverty, not race. (Ryan p. 67)

The significant thing is that Moynihan nowhere attempts to prove that females run families less well than men. We all know women are weaker, less rational, less consistent than men. Thus, all he has to do is say the black family structure is matriarchal. Thus he need only claim the black family structure is matriarchal and sexism a la Freud fills in the remainder of the argument leading to the conclusion that the problems of the ghetto derive from characteristics of black culture (the black family), rather than from poverty.

84

(because Freud f---s kids)

Similarly, we all know that the key thing in a boy's life is identification of his sex role, which clearly can't be given by a woman. Therefore Negro boys are forever marred. The unresolved Oedipus conflict is seen as fundamental cause of their 'failure to succeed.' But Ryan quotes a large-scale investigation, the Midtown Manhattan study, which

Ryan p. 76

~~The Midtown Manhattan Study~~ "found no overriding effect of broken home on mental health; the effect varied markedly depending on which parent was lost, the age of the child, and the social class of the family. Their study indicated that there is very little effect if the home is broken after the age of six, and that there is a substantially greater risk of emotional pathology if the mother is lost. A five-year-old child in a poor family who loses his mother is very clearly running a high risk of psychological damage; a twelve-year-old in a middle class family who loses his father is not.

Ryan p. 77

...The view that a female-headed broken family is especially pathological, then, is simply not consonant with the available evidence...

85

Although Moynihan has been well-refuted by his academic colleagues, this has not deterred another government advisor, Edward Banfield, from coming out with an even more racist extension of the Moynihan theory. Banfield is anti-working-class, racist and sexist all at once. The main point of his book, the Unheavenly City, is that no amount of social reform will solve the problems of the cities---the poor city-dweller, that is---because of a 'pathological lower-class culture' which is self-perpetuating. He denies he's talking about black and Latin people, but ~~MA~~ sinne he frequently uses phrases like 'mostly Negro' it's clear who he means.

(quote lower-class individual loves the slums?)

~~Part of the problem of course, is the female-based family.~~

And guess who inculcates this devastating lower-class culture? In particular Banfield supports the view that lower-class women do not communicate with their children in elaborated linguistic codes, but rather by restricted codes---mainly implicit meanings, gestures, intonation and non-verbal cues. The mother's 'low level of conceptualization/constrains, among other things, the intensity and extent of his curiosity, his attitude toward authority (as opposed to power), and his ability to identify with the aims and principles of a society (as opposed to a local group), to verbalize his feelings and to express them in socially approved ways, and to take an instrumental (which is to say a future-oriented) attitude toward people and things.' (p.225-6)

Banfield further charges that the lowerclass mother doesn't give the child "the support and stimulation it needs." (p.226)

He considers several alternatives for social policy:

1. removing children from their mothers
2. selling children
3. offering scholarships for children to be placed in year-round boarding schools
4. day nurseries (He immediately rejects this "Even under the best of circumstances they are not likely to succeed in bringing children out of lower-class culture" because they are still "confused and stultified by what they are and are not exposed to at home." (p.232-3))

Once again Banfield's book demonstrates that capitalist ideologies of racism, sexism and class elitism bolster each other. Class elitism prepares us to believe that lower class people are oppressed because of their own internal deficiencies ("lower-class culture") rather than class oppression. Since most lower class people are black class culture"), rather than class oppression. Since most black people are lower class (says Banfield, see Appendix, p. 265-8), class elitism prepares us for <sup>the</sup> racist conclusion that all black people are deficient. In the same way sexism, in particular the belief that women are less intelligent and self-reliant than men prepares us to believe that lower-class mothers <sup>rearing their children alone</sup> mar them permanently by not developing their minds, their linguistic abilities or their characters. These totally unsupported false accusations lead to the racist, genocidal proposals above. The Geneva convention defines removing children from their parents as genocidal. He rejects these as unfeasible, and finally proposes the

following:

1. Identify the incompetent poor ("inveterate 'problem families'") and "whenever possible, assist the incompetent poor with goods and services rather than with cash; depending upon the degree of their incompetence, encourage (or require) them to reside in an institution or semi-institution (for example, a closely supervised public housing project).
2. Give intensive birth-control guidance to the incompetent poor.
3. Pay "problem families" to send infants and children to day nurseries and preschools, the programs of which are designed to bring children into normal culture. (p.246).

He laments his proposals won't be accepted because of pressure groups (labor and civil rights).

Perhaps the most extreme example of defending racist arguments with sexist ones is found in a 1967 article by Urie Bronfenbrenner, a supposed liberal and founder of the Head Start Program. He claims that black males suffer from a "cognitive inadequacy" due to, among other things, prenatal damage and paternal absence. On the one hand Bronfenbrenner attributes the "overaggressiveness and "exaggerated toughness, aggressiveness and cruelty of delinquent gangs" to "the desperate effort of males in lower-class culture to rebel against their early overprotective, feminizing environment". On the other hand, he says, "despite their desperate attempts to prove the contrary, a latent femininity is nevertheless present in 'fatherless' youngsters, and results in a confused sex identity." (p. 915) These completely unsupported, internally inconsistent lies can only be believed if one first accepts the Freudian-based sexism they assume (see p. 7 above)

The recent restatement of super-racist theories assumes the sexist prejudices of the reader and uses them to support the IQ test, which then becomes the basis for claiming black people are genetically inferior. In his infamous article "IQ", Richard

88

Herrnstein cites the Terman study of 1500 "gifted" persons (IQ over 150) to support the value of the IQ test. "Right from the start the findings were informative. For example, highly bright boys were easier to locate than highly bright girls. And the disparity increased slightly with age, suggesting that whatever IQ is, boys maintain it better than girls." He then goes on to say, assuming the reader has accepted the value of the IQ test because of the way it screens out the women from the ranks of the gifted, that the study discovered that there were mostly children from the professional class and a "shortage of Latins, non-Jewish, Eastern Europeans and Negroes" among the gifted.

The number of racists who use sexism to back up their arguments in is so great that I can't quote them all here, but the list includes Jensen, Coleman, Kretch, Crutchfield and 1. Jensen, Coleman

2.

and Livson authors of Elements of Psychology quoted p.

I'm sure a study of Schockley, and Jencks

A study of Schockley, Jencks and Eysenck would undoubtedly reveal similar arguments.

A study of Schockley, Jencks and Eysenck would undoubtedly reveal similar arguments.

Racist and sexist statements precede policies and laws being enacted all over the country.

1. forcing welfare mothers to work in New York and Chicago.
2. proposed forced sterilization bills in Indiana and Illinois
- 3.

89

but the list includes Jensen, Coleman and Livson, authors of Elements of Psychology quoted p.

A study of Schockley, Jencks and Eysenck would undoubtedly reveal similar arguments.

Racist and sexist statements precede policies and laws being enacted and proposed all over the country.

1. Slave labor for welfare mothers in New York and Chicago.
2. Proposed forced sterilization bills in Indiana and Illinois.
3. Removal of children "from unfit welfare mothers" and their placement in "well-run state institutions" proposed by Stanford professor Freeman.
4. Intensive birth control in minority communities by Zero Population Growth.
5. Genocidal neurosurgery to control "violent behavior" being performed in state prisons in California. This practice has *psychic abuse by mutilation*.
6. Lobotomies have been performed mainly on women.
6. Blood tests to determine paternity and prosecute men
6. Blood tests to determine paternity in order to prosecute fathers of children on welfare for desertion. (During the Congressional welfare reform flurry last year, Sen. Roth (R.-Del.) proposed the establishment of a "parent locator center" in the Justice Department, the use of blood tests to determine "the paternity of children abandoned by their fathers to the welfare rolls", and that it be a federal crime for fathers to desert their children. In other words, punish the fathers in families broken up by the sexist welfare system.) (LA Times, Oct. 3, 1972)

In order to understand why so many racist genocidal practices are also sexist we must examine the sexist basis of the welfare system and its pivotal role in preserving the system of chronic unemployment.

13

90

The trade union movement originally fought <sup>for</sup> and won welfare in 1935 (Social Security Act), to relieve the victims of chronic unemployment. The spirit of that reform legislation was pro-working class and ostensibly not sexist or racist. In 1961 AFDC was introduced and made welfare explicitly sexist and it was used to heighten the racist arguments that the ruling class has always used to divide the working class. AFDC pays only women, <sup>who are usually housewives</sup> with dependent children, <sup>assuming</sup> that a woman cannot work and have her children cared for in a day care center. During WWII the nation had thousands of child care centers and women did the work. <sup>When the ruling class needs the labor of mothers, they drop care centers.</sup> Interesting, that the idea of child care centers doesn't lend itself to blaming the victim as a lazy, shiftless, minority woman who has babies in order to avoid work. Further a woman who cares for children all day long is not exactly doing nothing, in fact she is performing a socially valid function and ought to be paid a salary for raising the next generation instead of being spat upon. ~~Next they pay such low benefits to the unemployed workers family that they have lousy housing, food and medical care, thus insuring a large number of people who can be easily pushed into unskilled and low paying jobs, using as a rationale their poor background. I'm sure that many people believe they are at fault somehow for their poverty and therefore fall prey to blaming themselves.~~

<sup>What hypocrisy?</sup>  
A pretty neat system! First convincing people that any home where a woman is head of the household is inferior and then creating the conditions for forcing many families to break up in order to collect welfare leaving the woman as head of the household.

14

91

THE CLASS NATURE OF SEXISM

In the previous section we investigated race and sex prejudice based on theories of inferiority of minority races and women spread by the government, <sup>the arts</sup> academia, and the media. ~~(all the ideological instruments)~~. These forms of elitism are not only related and supportive, but they also justify similar systems of economic exploitation. Women are workers, but denied that status by the myths of 'domesticity' and 'dependence. As workers, whether in the home or in industry, women make lower wages than men, and black women make the lowest wages of all. Domestic work is an expected and unpaid aspect of female labor. All this is justified by a series of myths (widely believed, but untrue about female labor). This system provides the ruling class:

- 1) A cheap and extremely flexible labor pool
- 2) Bearing and raising of children, <sup>propagation of the working class.</sup>
- 3) Lack of organization of women workers
- 4) A fundamental division (psychological and organizational) of men and women, in spite of the great unifying potential of the family relationship.

Women constituted 37% of the total work force in 1966 and 40% of those receiving wage income. Ninety percent of women work at some time in their lives. The main cause of non-participation in the work force is child care. Work life expectancy of women is as follows:\*

Unmarried	45 years
married, no children	35 years
" one "	25 "
" two "	22 "
" three "	20 "
" four or more	17 "

\* page 7-8, Handbook

The wages of women are 1. In 1966 the wage differential was:

92

	MEDIAN YEARLY INCOME
White men	\$7,164
Black men	\$4,528
White women	\$4,152
Black women	\$2,949

In general women make 58% of what men make. A black woman earns 41% of the median white male income. Further, because of higher part time employment among women, the median income for all women workers in 1966 was only \$2,149 compared to \$5,693 for men (Handbook p.132).

In addition to low wages, women face higher unemployment and underemployment. In 1968, 37% of all workers were women but 50% of unemployed workers were women. The female rate of unemployment was 4.8%, while for men the rate was 2.9 (Handbook p. 12). Underemployment is revealed by the fact that only 42% of women have year round jobs, while 70% of men stay employed all year (Handbook p. 55). As one might suspect, home responsibilities is the reason women give for not working full time. No doubt day care centers would allow women to pursue more full-time work and strengthen their role in the trade union movement.

As a result of the sexism and the systematic discrimination, women are usually employed in the clerical and service industries. These jobs are by and large not covered by union organization and the pay and working conditions are poor. Only one seventh of women workers are unionized, while one fourth of the male work force is organized. (Handbook p.82) In the "blue collar" industries where there are large numbers of women such as the garment industry (ILGWU, Amalgamated Clothing Workers), the electrical industry (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers), retail clerks, restaurant workers, and communications workers we find that women are leading and active participants in the trade union movement. The sexism of the big shot union leaders accounts for

the weak efforts to organize more women workers.

Not only does a woman work at her low status, poorly paid, unorganized job for eight hours a day but is expected to come home and do another six hour of domestic labor, while hubby watches. If a male does some house work he is considered a hero. In the long run this "exploitative" situation leads to bitter feelings and divorce. It is imperative that domestic labor be viewed as equal to labor outside the home and not as a "labor of love".

How do you fight for higher wages when you are not paid? How can you bargain for better working conditions with a husband? What's even worse, how can you develop consciousness when your contacts are small children and the TV? The contacts for a housewife consist of a few coffee klatches and PTA where most of the ideology is re-enforcing to the male chauvinist status-quo. The working women is far more likely to come into contact with ideas and methods which would lead to change.

Interestingly, being a mother is no exemption from working. In 1940, 9% of mothers worked, today it's 38% (Handbook p.40). Only 2% of working mothers are able to place their children in child care centers. The others are cared for by relatives, friends and neighbors. Thus, if a woman can find a relative who can care for the children for nothing then she can go to work. If she has to pay a friend or neighbor a small sum, then working becomes a less attractive plan, but if the need is great enough, a women might go to work and realize \$40-\$50 a week if she's lucky!

If a woman is unmarried then she has to live on the pitiful wages of \$3,000 - \$4,000 a year. If she is married, then presumably she shares her husbands status, but in many ways she is a slave to him and is a part of a man's profess

him and part of his property.

92

The rather unappealing situation of women needs some ideological underpinnings. It is said that women are naturally inferior, they are the weaker sex, not only physically but emotionally. It's nature's law. When the logic of 'natural' exploitation fails to justify low wages, 16 hour days, or second class citizenship, then the social argument is trotted out. The social order demands a boss-employee relationship, it's better to let the man be the one who carries the burdens and allows the woman to remain pure and sweet. Some women fight these "natural laws" and they are branded as masculine, lesbians or bitches. The media and the arts play a major role in forming these types of stereotypes. The movies in the thirties portrayed women as reasonable intelligent and capable, the present movies portray women as either dumb, sex pots or mean, hard boss types (the woman who acts like a man). Similar to the type of stereotyping they do of different races.

The differences between the sexes are real but they extend no further than the child-bearing role and the weaker muscular structure of women. These differences do not in any way justify the exploitation of women or the division in the working class that has been fostered up to now. Looking at history, Engels pointed out that men and women used to share social production equally. The woman was supported during pregnancy and not looked down on for bringing the next generation into the world. The role of women in rural society was crucial and appreciated, valued and supported by the men. Not to idealize these

18

times, but to illustrate that this situation is not a permanent state of mankind.

95

Women are sometimes accused of working for fun or entertainment and that their income is therefore supplemental. That they receive their real income from their husbands salary. The fact is that most men don't make enough money to support the family and the women has to go to work just to make ends meet. The propaganda machine would have us believe that when women have to work to support their families that they should have married a better man. (Presumably by being more sexy and "flower-like") The specter of women working doesn't occur in "normal families". The myth of the supplemental income is used by industry to justify low wages for women workers. Further, this myth creeps into help the bosses keep certain jobs (usually better paying) reserved for family men. But then women are kept in their place and the labor movement is weakened. Wouldn't all workers benefit if women workers were all paid the same as men? Is the fact of the women's weaker muscles in any way justify lower wages? The fact of the matter is, the jobs that require big muscles are low paying and low status. In this category women do much of the strenuous work, factory assembly lines, retail stores and farm work to name a few. It has been pointed out that domestic labor is heavy work, and when you add caring for a young child, the amount of physical exertion equals any mans. "Many women work harder than either man or woman should work, harder even than a mule should work." (Inman p.29)

The division of job categories enhances the myth that women

have it softer than men. In janitorial work ( an area where women are concentrated) often male janitors do the floors, women do the bathrooms sinks and toilets and empty the trash. In actual fact, the two tasks are equally exhausting, but it is said that women have the privilege of not pushing around the big waxers( of course they do push around big barrels of trash). The bosses walk away with a dollar an hour more profit for every women woeker with this neat "division of labor."