

# Forward to the Party! Struggle for the Party!

No.4

This is the fourth of several issues of the special journal on the programme (and other documents) of the party. The purpose of this journal is to provide an important forum for discussion and struggle around the programme (and other documents) among all future party members.

None of these articles represents the line of the RU; none has been approved (or disapproved) by leadership bodies of the RU on any level. Instead these articles represent the opinions, criticisms and suggestions of particular comrades based on their study of these specific points of the draft programme (and other documents) and their own summation around them.

For this issue of the journal, as with the last one, a tremendous number of articles were submitted. This reflects the fact that the central importance of forming the party now is being more thoroughly grasped by all comrades. It

further reflects the fact that the process of forming the party from the bottom up, and linking theory with practice in discussion and struggle, is developing and deepening. All this is laying the firmest foundation for carrying the process through and forming the party, united to carry out the correct line as the advanced detachment of the working class.

In this issue of the journal we have limited the number of articles and printed those which most focus the discussion and struggle around the main points and will enable the journal to further this process the most at this time. For this reason many articles which were submitted but did not concentrate on these main focuses, were not printed. But, whether or not they appear in the journal the articles submitted will make an important contribution to the process of forming the party and will be used in one form or another as part of the process.

## On War and the International United Front

### One

The following is a response to an article submitted for this issue of the journal on the international situation. The editors of the journal felt the article submitted should be responded to, and assigned one comrade to write the response, which begins below. (The article submitted, to which the following is a reply, begins on page 3.)

The article in this journal sharply criticizing the line of the Draft Programme (DP) on the international situation and the world wide united front tries to replace proletarian internationalism with a line that must be characterized as "uphold international bourgeois democracy." At the heart of this whole criticism is the disagreement with the basic line of the DP that "The working class of all countries faces the task of building broadest united front, on a world scale, aimed at the ruling classes of these two superpowers, while at the same time uniting all who can be united *within each country to continue the battle for socialist revolution.*" (my emphasis) In opposition to this, the authors of the criticism, in spite of their claims to the contrary, place the struggle for proletarian revolution in conflict with the world wide united front and in fact liquidate the "battle for socialist revolution."

At the foundation of all this is the fact that the criticism is rooted not in the outlook of the working class—dialectical materialism—but in idealism and bourgeois logic (metaphysics). Although the criticism charges that "The DP does not proceed from the actual world situation taken as a whole and from a class analysis of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world," it is exactly the fact that the DP's line on the international situation is based on the stand of the working class and a class analysis of the forces in the world wide united front that most upsets the authors of the criticism. (Apparently they are even disturbed by the fact that the DP points out that the socialist countries are characterized by the fact that the *working class holds state power there—they leap at this to make the ridiculous claim that the DP denies that the socialist countries as a whole are allies of the proletariat in the U.S. and other countries!*)

The criticism covers itself with scattered phrases maintaining that the working class—specifically in Europe—must not rely on the bourgeoisie in the struggle against the superpowers, that the working class is the leading force, that it must strive for socialism,

etc., etc. But the criticism presents the struggle of *countries* as the main force in the international struggle. It denies, in essence (though, of course, not in words) that countries are divided into classes and that bourgeois forces rule the non-socialist countries. The authors of the criticism, in the name of the united front against the two superpowers, deny the decisive role of the masses of people, and reduce the working class to a subordinate role to the bourgeoisie, a tail wagged behind the bourgeois dog.

#### Line on Europe

This stands out most sharply in their line on Europe, specifically West Europe. First they claim that "All these components of the WWUF (world wide united front) have a material interest in bringing down their main enemy, *both superpowers.*" (emphasis in original) That the bourgeois ruling classes of Europe (and other areas) have contradictions with the two superpowers, that in certain ways they resist domination by the superpowers, and that the proletariat must make use of these contradictions and support this resistance, without however giving unconditional support or subordinating itself to these bourgeois classes—all this is certainly true. But do these authors really expect us to believe that the ruling classes of Europe have "a material interest in *bringing down*" the two superpowers!? To replace them with what—socialism under the rule of the working class?

Further, the authors of the criticism say that the struggle of the of the working class in Europe is "for an independent Europe and for socialism," and more, that socialist revolution in Europe "can only be achieved through building the united front against both SPs [superpowers]." While it is certainly true that the working class in the European countries should build the united front against the two superpowers, what our authors are saying here comes down to the line that it is *only through the fight for independence* that the proletariat will be able to advance to socialism. However much they may deny it, our authors are projecting a two-stage struggle in Europe—first for independence, in which the proletariat unites with the bourgeoisie but struggles for leadership, and *then*, emerging out of this stage, the second stage struggle for socialism.

And our authors have determined this to be the case now, even under the conditions when there is not yet a war in Europe. If the working class is confronted with the actuality of such a war—and the likelihood of this is growing—then it will have to deal with this situation, this necessity, in accordance with the actual conditions (more on this shortly). But while the working class must prepare for future developments, it is not the task of the communists to impose future possibilities onto the present situation and impose on the working class necessity which it does

does not presently face.

What lies at base of our authors' line is that they think the communists should give up on winning the workers in Europe—and specifically winning them away from the revisionist parties which hold considerable sway in the working class in a number of European countries—on the basis of their *class* interests and instead should rely on the bourgeoisie of these countries to "win" the workers on the basis of "national interest."

#### Question of NATO

In case there is any doubt about the line of our authors, look at what they say about NATO. First they admit that "At this point the U.S. is the overlord in NATO," but then they hasten to add that "in case of an attack by the SU NATO is the only defense organization Western Europe has." Then they say that with regard to the role of NATO in the future, there are two possibilities—either "Europe kicks the U.S. out of it and takes charge, or builds up its defense organization independent of NATO. The second solution seems the more likely one."

Our authors refuse to face up to a third possibility—that the U.S. will maintain, even strengthen its domination in NATO and that the war in Europe will not necessarily take place as a "war of liberation" by Europe against the two superpowers, but as a war between two imperialist blocs, headed by the two superpowers (NATO vs. Warsaw Pact). In such a case—and it is certainly a real possibility—what would be wrong with the working class in Europe taking the stand of "turning the imperialist war into a civil war" in the European countries themselves? After all, as Lenin pointed out, "a war *between* imperialist Great Powers . . . or *in alliance* with the Great Powers is an imperialist war . . . And in *this* war 'defense of the fatherland' is a deception, an attempt to justify the war." ("A Caricature of Marxism," Vol. 23, p. 34, emphasis Lenin's)

Unlike our authors, I am not attempting now to determine the actual character of the war, but only pointing to possibilities that they avoid and pointing out that in different concrete conditions the task of the proletariat must be different, even though its basic principles and its long-term goal remain the same. In any case, no possibility with regard to the war can be used to liquidate the class struggle and the goal of socialism, and to preach reliance on the bourgeoisie as our authors in fact are doing.

But there is something even more fundamentally wrong with their line and specifically with their reasoning around NATO. They argue, in substance, that so long as the Soviet Union maintains its military strength and alliances in Europe, to struggle to break up NATO "is to invite the SU to take over and make the situation even worse that it is now."

What they are saying is that in the face of the threat

Continued on page 2

# One...

Continued from page 1

of Soviet attack against Western Europe (they don't even deal with the possibility that the U.S. imperialists might launch an attack to the East in Europe in the face of Soviet gains—even economic and political gains—in the West), the only thing that West Europe (a *classless* West Europe) has to rely on is NATO—really U.S. imperialism, which they admit is now “the overlord” in NATO. Where do the masses of people figure into all this? Simply—they don't.

The correct stand, of course, is to struggle against both superpower military blocs in Europe (and elsewhere). But to argue that until Western Europe has its own “defense organization,” and unless the Warsaw Pact is “dissolved” at the exact same time as NATO, NATO must be maintained—even with U.S. imperialism as “overlord”—is to put yourself in a bourgeois logical trap. Again, it reduces the masses to a tail on the bourgeoisie—even the U.S. bourgeoisie—and recognizes no real, independent role for the working class. It is the “lesser of two evils” line on the international level. It is the same kind of thinking that Lenin criticized in speaking of “a bourgeois who believes that a war started by the governments must necessarily end as a war between governments.” (See Lenin, *Three Articles on War And Peace*, “Socialism and War,” p. 25, Peking edition, 1966)

When combined with the earlier statements on NATO—and with the specific refusal to deal with the possibility of the U.S. maintaining NATO as its tool of military aggression—what our authors' line comes down to is to unite all who can be united (even U.S. imperialism) against the Soviet Union. While they talk about both superpowers (even emphasize “both”) they are really saying that the Soviet Union alone is the main enemy of the people of the world and the sole source (or only really dangerous source) of aggression in Europe, the focal point of the future war. They are determining now that the character of WW3 will be a “united front against fascism” with the Soviet Union taking the place of Germany in WW2.

## Stalin Statement

This is the real point of their use of the quote from Stalin, that WW2 “assumed from the very outset the character of an anti-fascist war.” This statement was made by Stalin in February, 1946. While I do not pretend to know all the ins and outs of the struggle at that time—both on the part of the Soviet Union in the international arena and within the Soviet Party itself—it is clear that at that time the Soviet Union was attempting to make use of contradictions among the imperialists and to maintain certain agreements that had been made with the U.S.-British bloc, while the U.S.-British bloc was breaking these agreements, attempting once more to encircle and threatening to attack the Soviet Union.

In this situation it may have been very difficult for Stalin to say, “Well, as you know the Second World War arose out of the contention of the imperialists for world domination and began as a war between imperialist bandits.” Lenin pointed out that it is sometimes necessary to make compromises with bandits—and it is not always so simple or useful to curse bandits as bandits under such circumstances. Mao Tsetung criticized the infantile “ultra-left” line that demanded, during the formation of the anti-Japanese United Front, that if the Chinese communists made agreements with any bourgeois “leader” then “we must call him a counter-revolutionary at the same moment.” (see “On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism,” Vol. 1, p. 164)

But, whatever the particular circumstances, and the necessity faced by Stalin and the Soviet Union in early 1946, the fact is that WW2 did arise out of the contention between the imperialists for world domination and did begin as a war between imperialists. “The working class cannot support such a war,” the Comintern emphasized at the outbreak of the war, in the fall of 1939. The war was a “war by the ruling circles of Britain, France and Germany to decide who shall dominate the world.” “Down with the imperialist war.” This was the analysis of the Comintern, before the German attack on the Soviet Union and the change in the character of the war resulting from this. (Quotes are from a manifesto of the Communist International, issued November 7, 1939.)

This did not mean that, in China, for example, the Chinese people should not unite all possible forces and even make use on contradictions among the imperialists to isolate and attack the main enemy in China at the time—Japanese imperialism. But that did not change the basis on which WW2 began or the overall character of WW2 at its outset. (As the DP states, the change in the overall character of WW2 came with the attack on the Soviet Union, which meant that the immediate

task of the international proletariat was to defend the Soviet Union. Similar circumstances could arise in the future—and as the DP points out, we must arm the workers in this country with the understanding that the international proletariat must regard and defend the socialist countries as its own—but, as I said before, it is not the task of communists to impose future possibilities onto the present situation or impose necessity on the working class which it does not presently face. And at all times the working class and its party must concretely analyse the actual situation and alignment of forces, and determine its policy not by *mechanically* applying what was done in the past—and certainly not by basing itself on what *might* happen in the future—but by determining what will advance the overall struggle given the actual situation.)

Stalin himself in “Economic Problems of Socialism” (written in 1951-52) summed up the basis of WW2 and the change in its character after the invasion of the Soviet Union. The U.S.-British bloc, he wrote, built up Germany's economy “with a view to setting a recovered Germany against the Soviet Union, to utilizing her against the land of socialism. But Germany directed her forces in the first place against the Anglo-French-American bloc. And when Hitler Germany declared war on the Soviet Union, the Anglo-French-American bloc, far from joining with Hitler Germany was *compelled* to enter into a coalition with the USSR against Hitler-Germany.” (my emphasis) “Consequently,” Stalin pointed out, “The struggle of the *capitalist countries* for markets and their desire to crush their competitors proved in practice to be stronger than the contradictions between the capitalist camp and the socialist camp.” (my emphasis)

## “Relying on the U.S. Imperialists”

The use of the February, 1946 quote from Stalin, like the whole thrust of the criticism, is merely an attempt by the authors to promote reliance on the bourgeoisie in Europe, even to promote the line of relying on the U.S. imperialists as “defense” against the Russian social-imperialists and to determine now that the character of WW3 will be a united front against the social-fascist Soviet Union.

To cover themselves the authors try to use the fact that China, as a socialist country, uses its state to state relations in a certain way and makes certain agreements with non-socialist governments as tactics to advance the international struggle, to make use of certain contradictions and unite all possible forces, on a world scale, against the two superpowers. The authors try to say that the line of the proletarian party in different countries should follow exactly these actions of China. If we are to believe our authors these agreements and other similar actions of China are the sum total of its international line. To follow our authors' reasoning to its logical conclusion, China does not base itself on proletarian internationalism, really cares nothing about the world revolution, does not actually support the revolutionary struggles of the working class and other oppressed people around the world, and is not concerned with the achievement of socialism in other countries. Exactly the opposite, of course, is the truth.

Our authors even quote from Mao Tsetung's 1946 statement on the international situation, but they do not quote—or base themselves on—the essential thrust of Mao's 1946 statement. “The forces of reaction are definitely preparing a third world war, and the danger of war exists,” Mao begins in this article. In this situation, as noted earlier, the Soviet Union was making certain compromises with the U.S., Britain, and France. But, Mao stresses, “Such compromise does not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and make compromises at home. The people in those countries will continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions.” (Vol. 4, p. 87)

Does this principle still apply in today's world, and does it apply to the working class and the masses of people in Europe as well as other areas? Apparently our authors do not think so, but I do, anyway.

How do these principles apply in today's world? Today there are two main enemies of the people of the world, the ruling classes of the two superpowers. The working class in every country must actively build and give leadership to the struggle against superpower domination, but this does not and must not *replace* its struggle against its own ruling class. As the DP states, the working class must learn how to “correctly combine these tasks (struggle against the superpowers and uniting all who can be united within each country to continue the battle for socialism) so that it neither narrows the international united front nor loses sight of the goal of socialism.”

With regard to Europe in particular—the focal point of superpower contention—the working class must lead the fight against superpower domination—economic, political and military—even supporting certain moves of the ruling classes of the developed countries in opposing the superpowers. (This, by the way, is

what the DP means when it says that “in this *conflict* (my emphasis) the proletariat supports them against the superpowers.” The DP points to making use of contradictions and analyzes the *class basis* of these contradictions, which, again, apparently angers our authors, for they lash out with the flimsy “left” cover that the DP is advocating support of the ruling classes of the developed countries in their drive for profit! But the working class must not stop its struggle against its own ruling class for socialism in the European countries, even at the same time as it mobilizes the masses to oppose superpower aggression in any form and prepares its own ranks and the masses to deal with the growing possibility of a world war, with Europe as the focal point.

Again, as to who is really covering up the *class nature* of the bourgeoisies of Europe, note how our authors say, “We must oppose the European imperialists when they try to make deals with the SPs, when they attack the Third World countries or if they attack their own people.” (my emphasis) *IF?* This is Kautskyism all over again, treating imperialism as just oppression of the Third World and not the *system of capitalist exploitation in its highest and final stage*, which is *always* attacking its own people—in various forms, not the least of which its use of the state as its arm of repression and dictatorship—and which must and can only be overthrown by the working class.

## Spontaneous Tendency

Here, in the U.S., it is especially crucial for the working class to support the world wide struggle against both superpowers. But, at the same time, the party of the U.S. working class has the special duty to expose and oppose the aggression of the U.S. imperialists, while putting this in the overall context of opposing all superpower contention, aggression and moves toward world war. The spontaneous tendency among the masses in this country is not to underestimate the aggressive character of the Soviet Union, but to follow the line of the U.S. ruling class that the Russians are THE aggressors and U.S. actions are “defense against aggression.”

In today's world, the U.S. wants to maintain the present *status quo*, which favors it (in the final analysis it wants to and must, expand). The people of the world want to change the present *status quo* in accordance with their own interests. The Russian rulers, in a fundamentally different way, in accordance with their own imperialist interests, also want to change the present *status quo*. This makes the international situation all the more complicated, because wherever the people rise up against U.S. imperialism—which still has the largest “sphere of influence”—the Soviets attempt to move in to take over, and they even try to take advantage of the desire of the masses for change and revolution to instigate and control movements for their own imperialist aims.

The stand of the working class—keeping in mind always the goal of socialism—must be to support every genuine struggle for independence, liberation and revolution, and to oppose all superpower interference, domination and aggression, whatever form it takes.

But the present situation, and the tactics of the Russian social-imperialists in particular, opens the door to the line that any attempt to change the world *status quo* must not be supported, because it will strengthen the Soviets. This, unfortunately, is what the line of our authors comes down to, a line that in essence dovetails with that of the U.S. imperialists.

This is why the line of our authors is all the more dangerous. They claim that the DP underestimates the Soviet danger, seizing on the demand in the DP to “End all U.S. military alliances and military aid to U.S. puppets,” and failing to note that the same demand adds “oppose all superpower aggression, bullying and interference in the internal affairs of other countries”—which certainly includes the Warsaw Pact, for example.

The real fact is that our authors seriously downplay the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism and actually oppose the struggle against its attempts to use NATO and other means to carry out domination and aggression and contention with the Russian social-imperialists. The line of their criticism is not a line of opposing the two superpowers, and especially as a line for the party of the U.S. working class would lead away from our internationalist duties to say the least. It is not a line of relying on the masses, not a line that supports and advances the struggle for proletarian revolution in the U.S. and internationally.

The authors of the criticism turn things upside down in saying that the DP does not rely on the working class but “blames our backwardness on the workers.” In fact, it is the authors of the criticism who, at base, reveal a fundamental failure to believe that the working class, led by its party, can see through the deception of the imperialists and can be mobilized to fight in its own class interests.

This won't do. The Revolutionary Communist Party

Continued on page 3

# One...

Continued from page 2

of the USA at its very foundation must be based on the outlook of the working class and uphold and fight for the interests of the proletariat world wide. This is especially crucial at this time, when the party is being formed in the situation where on the one hand the danger of world war, arising from superpower contention—and from the very nature of the imperialist system—is growing, and, on the other hand the struggle of the international working class, uniting with all possible allies, is advancing, in the face of great difficulties and dangers, toward the goal of socialism and ultimately communism world wide.

The Revolutionary Communist Party must not go the way of Browderism, it must not degenerate into revisionism as the CP did. This is a life and death question for our class. ■

# Two

## Introduction

Comrades, this paper deals mainly with three questions on which the DP has a wrong line: 1) The international situation; 2) The world wide united front against imperialism aimed at the superpowers; 3) The tasks of the U.S. proletariat within it.

These are fundamental questions and we felt it was necessary not just to rewrite the sections concerned. We have tried to outline the world situation on which—together with our analysis of the internal contradictions of the U.S.—our strategy for revolution in the U.S. must be based. This is the reason why the paper is so long.

Contrary to the DP, we think that the so-called "three worlds" analysis is valid and that the world wide united front against both superpowers, which is based on this analysis, is the correct strategy for the international communist movement today.

This worldwide united front contains the following components:

- The workers of the world are the *leading force*.
- The Third World countries (developing countries in Asia, Latin America and Africa, including China, which is a developing socialist country) are the *main force*.
- The Second World (the capitalist and imperialist countries except both superpowers) in their struggle against hegemony are an *auxiliary force*.

These struggles, while different in form, advance the proletarian revolution on a world scale and find expression in the slogan: COUNTRIES WANT INDEPENDENCE, NATIONS WANT LIBERATION AND PEOPLE WANT REVOLUTION.

The DP, while paying lipservice to the world wide united front, violates it in fact in many ways. The most glaring error occurs when the DP, in calling for troops, etc. of the U.S. *only* to be withdrawn, objectively takes the side of the Soviet Union.

We are confident that this paper will spark plenty of healthy struggle which will lead to a correction of our line on the international situation and enable us to make revolution in this country and fulfill our internationalist duty to the people of the world.

Here are a few theoretical works which could help comrades to assess today's situation:

- 1) *Foundations of Leninism*, J. Stalin (Chapters III, VI, and VII).
- 2) "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement."
- 3) UN speech by Teng Hsiao-ping, April 10, 1974.
- 4) Documents, 10th National Congress of the CPC (pp. 21-26).

## I. The World Situation and Our Tasks

The present world situation is characterized by turmoil which sharpens all the basic contradictions in the world. In the Report to the Ninth Party Congress, the CPC correctly pointed these out: "the contradiction between the oppressed nations on the one hand and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other; the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist and revisionist countries; the contradiction between imperialist and social-imperialist countries and among the imperialist countries; and the contradiction between the socialist countries on the one hand and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other." Outstanding in this period are the contradictions between the two superpowers (SPs) and the people of the world and

the contradictions between the SPs.

As Chou En-lai pointed out in his report to the Tenth Party Congress of the CPC, "We are still in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution." Lenin and Stalin developed the strategy and tactics of the proletarian revolution for this era and "they remain the theoretical basis guiding our thinking today."

For the RCP this also has to be our point of departure for analyzing the world situation.

In *The Foundations of Leninism*, Stalin lays out clearly why it is not sufficient today for any revolutionary Communist Party to proceed in its class analysis and strategy for revolution from conditions within its national boundaries alone. Stalin says: "Formerly, the analysis of the pre-requisites for the proletarian revolution was usually approached from the point of view of the economic state of individual countries. Now this approach is no longer adequate. Now the matter must be approached from the point of view of the economic state of all or the majority of countries, from the point of view of the state of world economy."

Stalin continues to say that today under the world wide system of imperialism, it is necessary to speak of "world proletarian revolution; for the separate national fronts of capital have become links in a single chain called the world front of imperialism, which must be opposed by a common front of the revolutionary movement in all countries." And finally: "Formerly the proletarian revolution was regarded exclusively as the result of the internal development of a given country. Now, this point of view is no longer adequate. Now the proletarian revolution must be regarded primarily as the result of the development of the contradictions within the world system of imperialism, as the result of the breaking of the chain of the world imperialist front in one country or another." (*Foundations*, pp. 28, 29)

Any revolutionary party in the world must, in determining its strategy and tactics for the revolution, take into account the general line of the international communist movement. For the '60s this general line was laid down in the statement by the CPC, "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement." The essence of this line was that the workers of the world should unite with the oppressed nations and peoples, the socialist camp, and build a broad united front to oppose U.S. imperialism.

Since the CPC pointed out in the "Proposal Concerning the General Line" that the main enemy of the people of the world is U.S. imperialism, that world has changed. What has changed? U.S. imperialism has been weakened around the globe mainly by the united struggles of the Third World peoples, with the peoples of Indochina in the forefront of the struggle, supported by the American people and peoples around the world. The Soviet Union (SU) has been turned into a social-imperialist country after the revisionists took power there. Today, both SPs contend for world hegemony. While U.S. imperialism is on the decline, Soviet social-imperialism is temporarily on the rise in the vain hope of enslaving the whole world and building a new Tsarist empire.

Accordingly, the socialist camp which was referred to in the "Proposal Concerning the General Line" no longer exists today. The situation today is such that it is no longer sufficient to call for a broad united front just against U.S. imperialism—as was correct in the '50s and '60s. Today the general line is to unite all who can be united in a world wide united front (WWUF) against both SPs. Why is this necessary? And on what real situation is this conclusion based?

## Europe—An Outline of the Main Contradictions

As the DP correctly points out, Europe is the main area of contention of the SPs for hegemony. This results in a very complicated situation where many contradictions have to be analyzed in order to understand the situation.

In his great work, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Lenin points out that it is a characteristic sign of imperialism that it seeks hegemony over industrial countries and not just agricultural countries, as was maintained by the renegade Kautsky. This means that in their aim to control the world, the two SPs each has to try to maintain its own spheres of influence, particularly in Europe as a hinterland for expanding into each other's territories all around the globe. Many indications confirm this fact.

This drive for hegemony, which consists of economic plunder, political blackmail, military occupation and many other forms, lays the material foundations, first, for a potentially irreconcilable contradiction between the material interests of the countries of Europe (and the rest of the 2nd World) and those of the SPs; second: for common struggle of the 2nd and 3rd World against the SPs; and finally: for a united front in the 2nd World led by the proletariat for independence and socialism.

Today U.S. imperialism's position has been greatly weakened—though not defeated—by the struggle of the people of the world as well as by its internal contradictions. In the present situation in Europe, the SU has a clear advantage. This means that the greatest

threat to European peace is coming from the SU, although it is the contention between the U.S. and the SU which is the underlying reason why the situation in and around Europe is so tense. Despite all the talk by both SPs about maintaining a "balance of power," in the real world there is no such thing. Chiao Kuan-hua pointed out recently, referring to the SPs, that "as far as balance is concerned, it has always been relative and temporary whether in nature or in human society, while imbalance is absolute and constant." (Speech to the UN 29th Session)

A look at the military, political, and economic facts confirms that the SU has an edge in Europe.

Military: Two-thirds of the SU army, navy and air force is directed toward Western Europe. In terms of military materiel and soldiers, the Warsaw Pact (WP) has superiority over NATO. The military budget of the WP countries exceeds that of the NATO countries by far. Recently the SU pulled off one of the biggest war games in European history, named "Ocean 75," 220 ultramodern warships took part in this exercise which may be seen as a clear indication of the Soviet military strategy of encircling Western Europe from its flanks in the Mediterranean and the Baltic and North Sea and Atlantic Ocean. This view is supported by recent events in Turkey, Greece, Cyprus, Portugal, the Balkan countries, etc. and the Scandinavian countries to the north. The situation is accompanied by great contradictions within NATO which result in a very uncoordinated military apparatus (see events in Turkey, Greece, Portugal, France, etc.)

The so-called European Security Conference and Mutual Balanced Troop Reduction Conference are the main push by the SU to pull the wool over people's eyes and peddle their "detente." They also do this by taking credit for the great October Revolution and using the Revisionist parties of Europe as a *Trojan Horse*, which are directed to actively undermine the national defense of the European countries (or else what would be the reason for the Moscow-led revisionist parties advocating that their Western European countries stay in NATO? cf. Portugal), as well as presenting the SU as a representative of peace and justice.

Economic: More and more West European countries depend on the SU as an important source of energy (oil, gas, electricity, uranium). The SU makes very clear—especially just recently by its vicious opposition to England's joining the EEC—that they want to make Western Europe dependent on them and drive U.S. imperialism out.

In opposition to U.S. imperialism (later both SPs), a number of European countries formed the European Economic Community (EEC) or Common Market, which was summed up recently in a *Hsinhua* news release as follows: the EEC was "formed by countries with a combined total of nearly 256 million people and with economic capabilities close to those of the United States and exceeding those of the Soviet Union. Enlarged in 1973 from the original six to nine member states, the Community has, through repeated negotiations, worked out a series of measures to resist the two superpowers' economic domination and penetration and to strengthen political cooperation within itself. It has set itself the goal of turning its economic integration into a 'European Union' by the end of the 1970s so as to achieve greater political identity. Economically, it has unified tariffs for manufactured goods and adopted a common agricultural policy. It further plans to set up an economic and monetary union through gradual integration. In its external relations, it has been strengthening its ties with the Third World countries. Last February, for instance, it signed the Lome agreement with 46 developing countries of the African, Caribbean and Pacific regions." (June 18, 1975)

Today, a number of European countries see in the EEC a tool for resisting the pressures of the two SPs. They wish to expand this and also become militarily independent from both SPs, which in fact they are not, because the NATO is still under control of U.S. imperialism, while the WP is firmly in the hands of Soviet social-imperialism.

Among the European monopoly capitalists there is only limited unity on how to achieve this independence and whether it is a good thing to strive for anyway.

There are basically two positions among them. One is to make a deal with one or the other SP, to sell out the national interests of their countries and in case of war join with one or the other SP. Germany is a case in point.

The case for independence for Europe from both SPs is probably best demonstrated by the policies of France. France advocates a Europe which is militarily, economically and politically independent and a closer alliance with the Third World. In this it is wholeheartedly supported by the People's Republic of China, which recently sent Teng Hsiao-ping on a state visit to France.

Thus on the one hand the European imperialists seek to get their independence from both SPs—and this is clearly in the interests of the working class of these countries. At the same time, they actively exploit and

Continued on page 4

# Two...

Continued from page 3

oppress their own people and the Third World (although to a much lesser degree than the SPs).

The EEC is a good example of this contradictory situation.

While the EEC's main aspect at this time is progressive, it nevertheless by no means eliminates the internal class contradiction, but in fact it means increased exploitation of the European proletariat and peasantry due to increased concentration of political and economic power in fewer and fewer hands. While the working class of Europe supports the drive for independence, it opposes and resists the increasing exploitation. Many struggles in the past testify to this fact.

Especially in the last couple of years, the working class of Europe, as well as other segments of the people (students, peasants) have been engaged in great class battles. The general crisis of imperialism—inflation, unemployment, etc.—sparks these battles against the rule of monopoly capital. One reflection of this is the growth of a revolutionary communist movement in all Western European countries, which is becoming increasingly connected with the working class movement. This loosens the grip of the social democrats and revisionists which still exert a large influence in the working class movement.

More and more revolutionary communist parties and organizations are adopting the line of building a united front against both SPs in Europe. There is a consensus that the SU at this time poses the greatest threat to peace.

## Eastern Europe

The situation in Eastern Europe is in some respects similar, although in an overall sense it is certainly the fact that the SU still has a much better grip on its colonies than the U.S. has on the West European countries.

Countries like Albania, Rumania and Yugoslavia are standing in the forefront of the struggle against SP hegemony, a fact which is aptly illustrated by the fact that these countries have it written into their constitution that it is prohibited to surrender to any foreign invader. In contrast to this, East Germany has just altered its constitution to proclaim that there is no longer one German nation and that the SU is their friend forever.

While the SU at this point has a tighter control over things in their sphere of influence, events like Czechoslovakia and the workers' uprising in Poland point to the same underlying contradictions as those operating in Western Europe. As the SU spreads its fascist dictatorship it is just finding out about the law that wherever there is oppression there is resistance. The empire of the new Tsars is going to be just as short-lived as Hitler's 1000-year Reich.

## Third World

As signified by the great victories in Indochina, by the armed struggles in Africa, Asia and Latin America, by the oil boycott of the Arab countries, and last but not least by the struggle to unify the Third World politically in the UN and elsewhere, it is absolutely correct to state, as the CPC does, that the Third World is the "main force combatting colonialism, imperialism, and particularly the superpowers." (Teng Hsiao-ping, UN speech, April 10, 1974) The Third World countries are the weakest link of the imperialist chain and the "national democratic revolutions in these areas is an important component of the contemporary world revolution." ("Proposal Concerning the General Line," p. 13) This is all the more true today when the conditions for revolution are so much better than 15 years ago.

What is the material base for this? The system of imperialism is characterized among other things by "the export of capital to the sources of raw material (generally the Third World) which is one of the foundations of imperialism." (*Foundations*, p. 26) So the combination of several sharp contradictions caused by imperialism in these countries makes them "the most vulnerable areas under imperialist rule and the storm centers of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism." ("Proposal Concerning the General Line," p. 12) The statement concludes: "In essence, therefore, the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the world's population." (*ibid.*, p. 13)

The Second World (with Europe which we analyzed as its main representative) and the Third World have common ground to fight the SPs as well as contradictions between them. What should be the strategy of the world proletariat towards them?

## II. The WWUF and the Strategy for Proletarian World Revolution

As it is impossible today in the Third World countries to overthrow the survivals of feudalism, establish national

independence and make revolution without fighting imperialism and especially both SPs, so it is impossible today in the Second World (esp. Europe) to fight for socialist revolution without fighting for independence from both SPs.

In this situation there exists a real basis for a united front against the SPs between the people of the Third and Second World, because "in opposing hegemonism of the superpowers, the countries and people in the two intermediate zones (or two worlds) share common interests." (PR No. 45, 1972)

How does this united front affect the policies of the proletariat around the world? Is it not just a particular foreign policy which is advanced by China, as some people claim?

By no means! This WWUF is in the interest of the proletariat and the vast majority of people around the globe. It is not just a struggle *against* the SPs but in essence a struggle *for advancing proletarian revolution*. In this united front the proletariat around the world (including the U.S.) and the socialist countries must be the *leading force*, while at this point the Third World countries are the *main force*, and the Second World in its struggle against hegemonism of the superpowers and for national independence (and in this only), is also a component of the united front—an *auxiliary force*. All these components of the WWUF have a material interest in bringing down their main enemy, *both* SPs. In all countries the proletariat must take the lead in building this united front which consists of all forces which oppose the two SPs and all their lackeys.

Today, we are still in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, and the contradictions caused by the imperialist system are sharper than ever. We have to mobilize all forces which can be united to defeat both SPs. Only in doing this will we make a great step forward to proletarian revolution by winning leadership of the masses of people.

While many people agree that it is correct for the Third World to have a united front against the SPs, many comrades fail to see that this is also necessary in a case like Europe. What does the WWUF mean for Western Europe today?

The urgent issue of WW3 is confronting the people of Europe in particular, because that is where the war is going to be carried out. What are the legitimate interests of the people of Europe? A war between the SP blocks would be one which serves imperialist interests and in which the working class has no interest whatsoever. What is the strategy for opposing such a war, for trying to prevent it and once it has broken out, for stopping it?

To prevent war in general it is of course necessary to abolish imperialism altogether and build socialism. The correct way for the proletariat of Europe to do this today is to struggle for an independent Europe and for socialism and to unite all forces which can be united in this. The revolutionary CPs of these countries have to struggle for independence and socialism and build a united front under proletarian leadership, based on the masses of people and *not* based on their monopoly bourgeoisies. The proletariat is the only force which can carry out these tasks.

As Stalin pointed out: "Formerly, the bourgeoisie was considered the leader of the nation, which defended the rights and independence of the nation and placed them 'above everything.' Now there is not a trace of the 'national principle' left. Now the bourgeoisie sells the rights and independence of the nation for dollars [or rubles! our addition]. The banner of national independence and national sovereignty has been thrown overboard. Unquestionably, you, the representatives of the Communist and democratic parties, will have to pick up this banner and carry it forward, if you want to be patriots of your country, if you want to be the leading force in your nation. There is no one else who could pick it up." (19th Congress of the CPSU/B)

This united front includes all forces which sincerely oppose the SPs; it fights against all reactionaries, revisionists and other lackeys who are mouthpieces of the SPs. It may include bourgeois or even certain monopoly bourgeois forces. However, as history shows, these prospects are very limited, since the monopolies prefer to sell out the national interests of their countries, make a deal with the occupiers or simply flee the country and leave it to the stronger imperialist wolves. This has been proven by WW2 and is demonstrated by secret military plans which were recently revealed by U.S. imperialism for the case of an attack on Germany.

The proletariat of the European countries must forge a close alliance with the workers of the world, the socialist countries, and the Third World countries. They must struggle so that *even under the present governments* the greatest possible unity between the Second and Third World can be built. In this it is necessary to oppose all attempts on the part of the Second World countries to oppress and exploit any of the Third World countries, without these efforts this unity will be built on sand and cannot be successful.

However, it is also necessary to keep in mind the aims of the WWUF and direct the main fire at the superpowers. The "Proposal Concerning the General Line" points out that "in the capitalist countries which U.S. imperialism controls or is trying to control, the working class and the

people should direct their attacks mainly against U.S. imperialism, but also against their own monopoly capitalists and other reactionary forces who are betraying the national interests." Of course, today it must say "against both SPs."

In this united front it is of fundamental importance for the working class and its party to keep its political, organizational, and ideological independence, uphold ML, lead the masses in their day to day struggles, educate them about the necessity of overthrowing the whole imperialist system, expand its influence and fight the various bourgeois parties and ideologies, prepare for all forms of struggle and be ready to seize power once the time has come. If this is not done and the leadership of the united front is left to the monopolies, the CPs will sell out the working class and the masses of people.

The Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of France, as reported in PR, calls on the French people "to sharpen their vigilance against the danger brought on by the two superpowers, particularly by Soviet social-imperialism, to peace in Europe and national independence of European countries. At the same time, in continuing the class struggle for immediate demands as preparation for the proletarian revolution, it is indispensable to reinforce the unity of the European peoples in all spheres." "The unity of the peoples under the leadership of their proletarian revolutionary parties is welded by their fidelity to the principles of Marxism-Leninism" the communique of the MLCPF concludes. (PR No. 2, 1975)

The struggle for independence and socialism in Europe is not a two-stage struggle, first for independence and then for socialism. This struggle is to win the millions of people to defeat their enemies one by one and to continue in this until socialist revolution—which in Europe at this time can only be achieved through building the united front against both SPs.

If the working class in Europe does not engage in this united front, it is not possible to win the masses of people to make revolution. We must keep in mind that the purpose of utilizing contradictions among the enemies is to make it easier to "attain the goal of the people's revolutionary struggles and not to liquidate these struggles." ("Proposal Concerning the General Line")

On the question of the EEC, the proletariat must support the progressive aspect which is dominant at this time, the aspect of making their countries independent of the SPs. They must oppose any attempts at further exploitation and oppression which result from the increase of power "their" ruling classes get through the EEC, also any attempts on the part of "their" bourgeoisies to compromise with either of the SPs.

As to the question of military strategy, the general line is to arm the people to resist any attack by the SPs. Although given the present system, this possibility is limited, everything possible must be done to arm the people. However, it is correct to support an increase in *independent defense efforts* which are directed against an attack from the SPs. Of course, since we are dealing with the capitalist ruling class, this support can only be conditional and limited. Any efforts (and judging from the past there are going to be plenty) on the part of the ruling class to increase police and armed forces and actually employ them to put down the class struggle (or the Third World) must be strongly opposed. Any attempts on the part of the bourgeoisie to unite with one or the other SP and move towards WW3 must be constantly exposed and fought against.

Can the European proletariat rely on "their" bourgeoisie to protect them and lead them in the struggle militarily or otherwise? Of course not, they cannot lead this struggle, but some may under certain conditions participate under the leadership of the proletariat.

This is why the task of the communists is to prepare the people *today* militarily as well and never to place their hopes on the bourgeoisie.

However, to maintain that "their" bourgeoisie should dissolve the national army or decrease their *defense* efforts at this point would be to act as a fifth column, like the revisionist parties in Western Europe. To demand this today would only mean inviting the SPs to stay forever in their countries and to attack them whenever they please. Isn't such a demand, a refusal to support an independent defense effort, not taking the imperialist stand of the SPs, which constantly tell everybody else they should disarm while they themselves are in the midst of a frantic arms race? What we have to demand at this time is the disarmament of *both* SPs.

Lenin hit the point when he said: "There are compromises and compromises. One must be able to analyse the situation and the concrete conditions of each compromise, or of each variety of compromise. One must learn to distinguish between a man who gives bandits money and firearms in order to lessen the damage they can do and facilitate their capture and execution, and a man who gives bandits money and firearms in order to share in the loot." (*Left-Wing Communism*)

What about NATO? At this point the U.S. is the overlord in NATO and wants to run it as it pleases. It tries to use NATO as a tool in its struggle for hegemony against the other SP and the Third World. However, increasingly the European people

Continued on page 5

# Two ...

Continued from page 4

and countries are resisting this. As things stand today, in case of an attack by the SU, NATO is the only defense organization Western Europe has—and a very shaky one at that. What role NATO will play in the future depends whether Europe kicks the U.S. out of it and takes charge, or builds up its defense organization independent of NATO. The second solution seems the more likely one.

Whatever happens, the European proletariat can never rely on NATO, whoever runs it. The working class must build its own unity and its own army. However, as long as Western Europe lacks an effective defense organization, to demand to dissolve only NATO would be to invite the SU to take over and make the situation even worse than it is now. Therefore the general demand must be for the abolition of *both* the NATO and the WP. To demand abolishing only one would be to play the game of one or the other SP.

## World War 3

While it is important to struggle to prevent WW 3 by making revolution, it is also important to be prepared in case the war breaks out first. What would be the attitude of the European proletariat towards WW 3? "First, we are opposed to it, and second, we are not afraid of it," as was recently pointed out in one European ML paper. Would this war be an unjust or just war?

A war between the two imperialist blocks (NATO vs. WP) must be opposed no matter who starts it because it serves imperialism. As Lenin points out: "The Socialist, the revolutionary proletarian, the internationalist, argues differently (than Kautsky who called on the working class to support their imperialist ruling class in WW1." Lenin says: "The character of the war (whether reactionary or revolutionary) is not determined by who attacked or whose territory the 'enemy' has occupied; it is *determined by the class* that is waging this war, and the politics of which this war is a continuation. If the war is a reactionary, imperialist war, that is, if it is being waged by two world coalitions of the imperialist, violent, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie, then every bourgeoisie (even of the smallest country) becomes a participant in the plunder, and my duty as a representative of the revolutionary proletariat is to prepare for the world proletarian revolution as the only escape from the horrors of a world war. I must argue, not from the point of view of 'my' country (for this is the argument of a poor, stupid, nationalist philistine who does not realize he is only a plaything in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie), but from the point of view of *my share* in the preparation, in the propaganda, and in the acceleration of the world proletarian revolution." (*Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*)

A new imperialist war would be unjust; all resistance to it would be just. This would apply especially after the outbreak of WW 3, when the people of Europe would be engaging in a war of national liberation against both SPs. This war waged in the interests of the people of Europe and the people of the world would be a just war which must be supported. The task of the proletariat is to turn this war of liberation, should it take place, at the appropriate moment into a war of liberation from their own bourgeoisie and make socialist revolution.

In either case, whether revolution prevents war or war brings about revolution, the correct strategy in an overall sense is the united front. Although it is a very complicated situation and the alliance under certain circumstances with capitalists may sound strange to some people, as the CPC points out, we are living in an era when "we must be prepared to engage in great struggles which will have many features that are different from those of the past." (PR No. 21, 1972) Or to quote Lenin: "To carry on a war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie, a war which is a hundred times more difficult, protracted and complicated than the most stubborn of ordinary wars between states, and to refuse beforehand to manoeuvre, to utilize the conflict of interests (even though temporary) among one's enemies, to reject agreements and compromises with possible (even though temporary, unstable, vacillating and conditional) allies—is this not ridiculous in the extreme?" (*Foundations*, pp. 97-98)

## Learn the Lessons of WW 2

To learn from the past is a guide to the future. What is there to learn from WW 2? The DP sums it up this way: the competition between the imperialists which gave rise to WW 1 also gave rise to WW 2, but "with the German invasion of the USSR in 1941, WW 2 changed. It was no longer just a battle for the spoils among the imperialists. It became a battle for the defense of

the future..."

Stalin, who was a close participant of the situation then, summed it up quite differently: "The Second World War differed substantially in character from the first. It must be born in mind that before attacking the Allied countries the major fascist states—Germany, Japan and Italy—destroyed the last remnants of bourgeois-democratic liberties at home and established there a cruel terroristic regime, trampled upon the principle of the sovereignty and free development of small countries, proclaimed as their own the policy of seizing foreign territory, and shouted from the housetops that they were aiming at a world domination and the spreading of the fascist regime all over the world, and by seizing Czechoslovakia and the central regions of China, the Axis Powers showed that they were ready to carry out their threat to enslave all the freedom-loving peoples. In view of this, the Second World War against the Axis Powers, unlike the First World War, assumed *from the very outset* [our emphasis] the character of an anti-fascist war, a war of liberation, one of the tasks of which was to restore democratic liberties. The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against the Axis Powers could only augment—and really did augment—the anti-fascist and liberating character of the Second World War." (Stalin, speech Feb. 9, 1946, in meeting of voters)

The CPC, which participated in the war fighting the Japanese, also sums things up differently than the DP: "The anti-fascist war was a gigantic struggle between the world anti-fascist forces and German-Italian-Japanese fascism, a *just war* [our emphasis] on a scale unprecedented in the history of mankind." (PR No. 20, 1975) In an earlier statement, the CPC summed up WW 2 as follows: "The history of the Anti-Fascist War teaches us that the imperialist countries do not form a monolithic block. Owing to the uneven development of capitalism, the German, Italian and Japanese fascists struck first at the spheres of influence of Britain, France, and the U.S. Although in the early stages of the war the British, French and U.S. imperialists first followed the appeasers' policy of conniving at aggression, and then for a time after the outbreak of the Soviet-German war followed the policy of 'sitting on the top of the mountain to watch the tigers fight,' there were irreconcilable contradictions between them and the German, Italian and Japanese fascists. They finally joined the anti-fascist ranks for their own interests. Obviously, it would have been impossible to win the war without the unity of all the forces that could be united against fascism and without a broad, world-wide united anti-fascist front." ("The Historical Experience of the War against Fascism")

These statements reveal several important differences with the position of the DP:

1) From the very outset, the war against the Axis was a war of national liberation. The proletariat supported the attacked countries and encouraged them to resist. This also found expression in the foreign policy of Stalin.

The proletariat did not follow the appeasement policies of their ruling classes. As the CPC states, "The people of the world pursued another policy, that of dealing resolute counter-blows to fascist aggression." ("Historical Experience...")

2) The "imperialist camp" did not form a monolithic block. This enabled the proletariat to take advantage of their "irreconcilable contradiction."

3) Without doing this it would have been impossible to form a united front and defeat the Axis powers and to establish socialism and people's democracy in many countries after the war.

4) Stalin and the CPC make a clear distinction between the interests of the people and those of the imperialists. The SU united with the just aspirations of the people and not with the unjust aspirations of the imperialists, especially U.S. imperialism, which wanted to become Number One after the war.

To hold the position that because the imperialists had their own selfish reasons for entering the united front the united front should *not* have been built is a counter-revolutionary *Trotskyite* position, while as the DP correctly points out Browder, under the guise of building the united front, liquidated class struggle, which of course also amounts to selling out revolution.

From this we can draw some conclusions for today:

1) The proletariat has to take a stand of opposing the policy of hegemony and war of the two SPs, and that can only mean support of the just struggles of the Second and Third World countries and peoples. This is not just a matter of Chinese foreign policy but a policy which is correct for all communist parties (although there are some differences in the form in which this struggle is being carried out).

2) The imperialists do not form a monolithic block due to uneven development of capitalism, which lays the basis for building unity between the Second and Third Worlds. Contention between the imperialists, not collusion, is primary and absolute.

3) Without a WWUF against the two SPs, led by the proletariat and the socialist countries, it is impossible to defeat the two SPs and prevent war by

making revolution or make revolution in the course of or after the war.

4) We cannot wait until one or the other SP attacks a socialist country in order to take stand, although should this happen it would change the situation drastically, as it did when Germany attacked the SU.

Other lessons which we have to learn are that we have to build the WWUF against the two SPs in order to be able to defeat them once and for all and march on to socialist revolution, which is bound to be the case in many countries if we have a correct political line. As everyone knows, this was not carried through in some countries in WW 2. We ought to analyze these cases and sum up the bad as well as the good examples to learn from them. As Chairman Mao pointed out in his May 20th statement: "The danger of a new world war still exists, and the people of all countries must get prepared. But revolution is still the main trend in the world today." Let's get prepared for both possibilities.

## III. The WWUF and the Role of the U.S. Proletariat

We have to implement actively the general line of building the WWUF and integrate it with our central task of building the revolutionary workers movement. We must prepare people in this country for the possibility of a new World War and actively oppose any aggression by either SP.

We must actively support the Third World in its national liberation struggles and oppose reactionaries *from all worlds* who stand in the way, while keeping the WWUF in mind. So, for instance, we have to oppose the Shah when he butchers his own people and when he fights the revolutionaries in Oman and is the henchman of U.S. imperialism. We have to support him when he is actually helping to build the WWUF and struggles against the two SPs, even though it be in a very limited way. We have to oppose India in her expansionist policy where her leaders are doing the dirty work for Soviet social-imperialism. We must support the European people and countries which under the leadership of their revolutionary CPs are struggling for independence and socialism and building a united front against both SPs. We must oppose the European imperialists when they try to make deals with the SPs, when they try to attack the Third World countries or if they attack their own people. We must follow the same policy towards the other Second World countries in their attempts to free themselves from SP hegemony (Canada, for instance, or Japan, which throws the SU revisionists into a fit by wanting to sign a treaty with China and in it oppose *any* attempts at gaining hegemony in SE Asia). We must support the unity between the Second and Third Worlds which is being realized in some instances.

We must expose the particular danger the SU poses at this time toward peace in Europe and never cease struggling against our own SP.

The fact that we single out one SP in one area or particular situation does not mean to give up the struggle against *both* SPs. We must always, as Mao says in "On Contradiction," study the particularity of contradiction and understand each aspect of the contradiction. The living soul of Marxism, as Lenin said, is the concrete analysis of concrete conditions.

This means that while on a global scale *both* SPs are the main enemy of the people of the world, in a particular country one or the other SP may be the primary enemy while the other is secondary. Vietnam is a case in point, as well as Portugal, which also shows that which SP is primary is subject to *change*.

The demands for withdrawal of U.S. forces must be raised together with the demand for withdrawal of troops of the SU. (This is true in a general sense—it is our task to determine the particularity of a given situation and adjust our demands to it.) This is especially true in Europe at this time, where we must demand withdrawal of both SPs and not just "ours."

This also means full support for the struggle of people who demand withdrawal of troops from their soil. We should not take the position that U.S. troops should stay anywhere in the world to oppose the expansionism of the SU. No, we must not unite with our own bourgeoisie, but we must also keep the whole world situation in mind as it exists today. The people of the world do not need the "protection" of the SPs, all they do is bring war in the name of peace. The people can take care of their own affairs, and they will get rid of the SPs.

In short, we must actively take up the task of building the WWUF among the American people, especially the American working class. To wait and sit back, to leave the building of the WWUF to the Chinese Foreign Ministry, is to abandon the workers of our own country and to capitulate to the SPs.

In actively engaging in this united front we must never lose sight of our ultimate aim or cease preparing the people for this. We must never forget that in each country and in our own as well the fundamental contradiction is still operating and make the mistake

Continued on page 6

# Two...

Continued from page 5 of Browderism.

We must never have illusions about the class nature of the ruling classes in the capitalist and Third World countries and keep on fighting until the last imperialist and revisionist is wiped from the face of the earth. However, the way we do this has to be scientifically determined along the lines Mao Tsetung has pointed out: "The principle of the reactionary forces in dealing with the democratic forces of the people is definitely to destroy all they can and to prepare to destroy later whatever they cannot destroy now. Face to face with this situation, the democratic forces of the people should likewise apply the same principle to the reactionary forces." (Vol. IV, pp. 87-88)

Countries want independence, nations want liberation and people want revolution. These great struggles in today's world, while different in form, in the final analysis all serve our aim of overthrowing the whole imperialist system and building socialism and communism. Not to recognize this or only to support one or the other struggle and not see them as an integrated whole is to give up revolution in this country. We either recognize this great historical trend of our time and take the lead, or we will tail behind events and go against the tide of history.

#### IV. The WWUF and the Draft Programme

Up to now it was necessary to outline the world situation and the tasks deriving from it. In the light of this, we should now examine the DP, particularly the section on the United Front. The DP correctly states that we must not "fall into the trap of 'uniting' with one part of the main enemy against another." It correctly points out that there is a danger of war stemming from the contention between the two imperialist SPs, and that the "working class of all countries faces the task of building the broadest united front" directed against the two SPs and for socialist revolution.

But let's see if the DP lives up to its promises and applies this WWUF correctly to our situation.

#### Workers

First the DP examines the question of our allies. It lists the workers of all countries and those who have "already seized power." But here is the first mistake, where the DP maintains that *only* the workers of the socialist countries are our allies, not the socialist countries as a whole, which are under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Or is anybody of the opinion that the 500 million peasants of China who are building socialism are not our friends? And all the other people who are building socialism in China and the other socialist countries, aren't they friends of ours?

#### Third World

After the workers of the world and the socialist countries, the next allies mentioned are the "Third World." The DP states that the "hundreds of millions of peasants, who make up the majority of the population...are the bulwark of the *armed struggle* [our emphasis] against the imperialists and their feudal and bourgeois junior partners."

In a number of ways the DP reveals a failure to grasp the essence of the role of the Third World:

1) It doesn't mention that these struggles are an "important component part of proletarian revolution," on a world scale and also in the U.S. It was this fact which led to the slogan, created by Lenin (but not raised in the DP at all): **WORKERS AND OPPRESSED PEOPLES OF THE WORLD UNITE!**

2) By mentioning only the "armed struggles" of those countries it shows a lack of understanding of the material basis of unity between workers and oppressed peoples of the world. Struggles like the Arab oil boycott, for the 200-mile zone, the political struggle in the UN, etc., also help to isolate and undermine imperialism, especially the two SPs, a fact which the DP fails to point out here.

3) In failing to point out the material base of unity between the Third World and the U.S. proletariat, which has to be built in order to win national liberation there and proletarian revolution here (that is, we have the *same enemy*), the DP is not able to refute the position of certain groups (Prairie Fire, O.L., African Liberation Support Committee, etc.) which only pay lip service to support for Third World countries because they deny the essential connection and do not organize the revolutionary workers movement in this country. If the WWUF is not based on the class struggle in one's own country it is phoney, just as it is a fraud to confine oneself only to the class struggle on a national scale.

4) The DP fails to point out that the developing countries "constitute a revolutionary motive force propelling the wheel of world history and are the

*main force* [our emphasis] combatting colonialism, imperialism, and particularly the superpowers." (Teng Hsiao-ping, UN speech) In pointing this out, of course, one has to see that the "wheel of history" turns towards socialism and communism and nowhere else, and that while the Third World is the *main force*, the workers of the world and the socialist countries are the *leading force*.

#### Second World

How does the DP see the Second World and its position between the First and Third World? First off, it doesn't analyze the relationship between the Second and Third World at all and therefore entirely misses one important part of building the WWUF.

For the struggles of the lesser capitalist and imperialist states against the two SPs it states support. But again, let us see what reasons are given for this. The DP states that "their [the developed countries'] drive for profit brings them into conflict with the two SPs, and in *this conflict* the proletariat supports them..." This statement is false and turns the real world upside down. Why?

1) Today it is the drive of both SPs for superprofits, their policy of subjugation, plunder and aggression, even against their own "allies," and the struggle against this which is the cause of the "conflict." Do the lesser capitalists of the Second World have profit in mind? Of course, how could it be otherwise! They will never change their color! But does the proletariat support the Second World in its drive for more profit and in fact take the stand of the lesser imperialist countries in trying to grab a bigger piece of the profit pie? Hardly! As Chou En-lai pointed out in laying out the line of the CPC at the 10th Party Congress, "On the international front, our party must uphold proletarian internationalism, uphold our party's consistent policies, strengthen our unity with the proletariat and the oppressed people and nations of the whole world and with *all countries* [our emphasis] subjected to imperialist aggression, subversion, interference, control or bullying and form the broadest united front against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and in particular against the hegemonism of the two superpowers—the U.S. and the USSR." (p.29)

Isn't the formulation in the DP making a mockery out of the WWUF by telling our workers to support the other ruling classes in their drive for more profits? The DP fails to distinguish between essence and form, it does not bother to go beyond the appearance of things. What is the essence of the WWUF against both SPs? It is the struggle for independence, national liberation and socialist revolution. These struggles are different in form and in their immediate aims and are made up of different class forces, but their main aspect—despite all the contradictions within this united front—is that they weaken the whole world wide imperialist system and advance proletarian revolution on a world wide scale. And that is why—and for no other reason—the proletariat in the U.S. supports these struggles. So the proletariat does not support the Second World countries or for that matter the Third World countries in their struggle for a "bigger chunk of the exploitation" (DP, p. 21). No, as a matter of fact, it struggles against it on a daily basis in its class struggle with its own bosses.

2) To formulate the nature of the struggle going on in the Second and Third World today purely on the basis of their ruling classes' drive to get a bigger chunk of the pie is indeed a slander against the people of these countries, which indeed are the *main force* in carrying out this struggle. Or does anybody believe that a people's war in Africa is not carried out by the people of these countries and that is in their very interest? Does anybody believe that the struggle for an independent Europe must not be led and carried out by the people of these countries? To deny all this, as the formulation in the DP implies, is denying that the people make history, that the people at all times are the heroes and not some leaders.

In sum, the DP, as in the case of the Third World, does not correctly see the material forces operating in the Second World either.

#### WW3

The DP talks about the danger of WW3 and points to the two possibilities: that revolution will prevent war or war will give rise to revolution. What does the DP suggest we should do about preventing war or making revolution first? How should we get prepared in a concrete way in the immediate period, other than struggling directly for socialist revolution in the U.S.? As the DP points out, there are two possibilities, and we must prepare the American people for both and not just for the case of a war in the course of which the bourgeoisie "will expose its barbarous nature."

What the DP fails to do here is to point out that the key to making revolution (before, during, or after the war) is to build the WWUF, whose purpose is *not* just to create more turmoil, etc. (p. 22), but in fact to bring about the conditions for proletarian revolution.

It also fails to analyze the class forces involved in a WW3 between the two SPs and in fact does not tell

the U.S. working class that under no circumstances must they join the U.S. ruling class in a WW3 to maintain their world empire. Not only does the DP fail to point this out, it also fails to consider the possibility of the U.S. working class supporting a *just* war of liberation, say in the case of the outbreak of WW3 in Europe. Here again, we find that the DP doesn't base itself on the material conditions, which is not only expressed in what it doesn't say, but in what it does say as well.

In the section "Fight Against Imperialist War..." the demand for U.S. imperialism to withdraw all forces from foreign soil, etc. is one-sided. These demands are still based on the period when U.S. imperialism was the number one enemy of the people of the world. Today we have to demand that *both* SPs withdraw all their troops from foreign soil, etc. This is particularly evident in Europe where we must demand the abolition of *both* NATO and the WP. Not to do so is objectively to side with one or the other SP. The one-sidedness of the demands in this section (especially in light of the particular danger at this point that the SU may launch a war against Western Europe and the Balkan countries) is a clear indication of very incomplete understanding of the meaning of the WWUF against the two SPs. It is not just the task of the rest of the world to struggle against Soviet social-imperialism! It is ours as well. Although it is of course correct to point out "that the main contribution of the U.S. proletariat to the world wide revolution is to overthrow imperialism in the U.S.," it must be made clear that we can only accomplish this through a correct implementation of the WWUF *in our country as well*.

The main weakness of the way the DP deals with the international situation can be summed up as follows:

1) The DP in general does not proceed "from the actual world situation taken as a whole and from a class analysis of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world." (Prop. Gen. Line, p. 4)

2) The DP does not correctly analyze the role of the Second and Third World, their common basis for struggle, and how this is connected to the U.S. revolution.

3) The DP does not understand the essence and components of the WWUF and therefore

4) it presents a tendency to narrow the scope of the WWUF and tends to suggest that the WWUF is one thing, our struggle another. This among other things leads to an

5) underestimation of the danger and significance of Soviet social-imperialism.

Why does the DP make these mistakes? For this we have to quote a related document which throws some light on the problem. Here it is explained that in the DP, "the international situation, for example, is not dealt with by dividing the world into 'three worlds.' This 'three worlds' analysis is correct as a *general programmatic statement* of the world-wide struggle against the two superpowers. But especially for the working class of the U.S. at this time—a working class without a vanguard for many years, and a working class of one of the two superpowers—such a presentation of 'three worlds' does not adequately explain the character and aims of the international struggle, nor sufficiently emphasize the revolutionary role and duties of the proletariat."

This statement reveals several erroneous views which are clearly responsible for the mistakes in the DP:

1) While the statement concedes that the "three worlds" analysis is correct as a general programmatic statement, but says it is no good for the U.S. working class because a) our workers can't understand such an analysis (this presupposes that they understand the hodge-podge in the DP), and b) it is not revolutionary enough.

Here, comrades, the DP blames our own backwardness on the workers. What kind of logic is this? The "three worlds" analysis is "correct" but "not for us." Comrades, it does not matter what we think the world looks like, the only thing that matters is what the world *does* look like and here all argue that it is divided into Three Worlds. So the question really is, do we agree with this concept or not? *This is at the heart of the problem.*

In either case we have the duty to explain our position to the U.S. working class. To cover up our lack of understanding by pointing to the backwardness of the U.S. working class is a very cheap shot. Comrades, we have to face it, the world is actually divided into Three Worlds and we live in the first world (which of course does not mean that we have anything in common with the imperialist ruling class). Not to try to unite the Second and Third World into the WWUF and to support all genuine attempts to do so means in real life leaving those countries and people in them to the mercy of the SPs, to negate the content of the united front and in the final analysis to deny revolution in our own country as well, because we should not believe we are able to defeat the U.S. at home without the support of the people of the world and our allies, which are numerous all around the globe.

Finally, let's keep in mind that both SPs are paper tigers and that we can bring them down by understanding that

—correctness or incorrectness of our political and

Continued on page 7

## Two...

Continued from page 6

ideological line decides everything;

—the people are the motive force of history;

—strategically we despise the enemy and tactically we take him seriously.

ON TO THE PARTY! ■

## Three

The question of war is one of the sharpest the new Revolutionary Communist Party must deal with, and the DP and the latest document do an excellent job in setting forward the basic orientation of the party concerning war and how the proletariat takes up this struggle in a way to abolish war forever—by ending the source of war today—wage slavery and building socialism in its place.

The main strength of the DP is to put these questions squarely from the point of view of the proletariat and not some classless view of "peace loving forces," or worse, from the point of view of the bourgeoisie as those who make their main point supporting the Shah of Iran or NATO to oppose social-imperialism. This correct stand is generally shown by the class analysis on pp. 21-22 where the main allies of the U.S. working class in the United Front against the two superpowers is the proletariat of the world, particularly in the socialist countries; and secondary allies are the peasants all over the world.

The section also correctly deals with the bourgeoisie of countries that have contradictions with the superpowers. This way of laying it out—from the point of view of classes and class alliances—is definitely correct and as it points out in an earlier report, better at the present time than three worlds, etc. The problem with *this point is that* when it comes to correctly applying it to the question of war, serious shortcomings come out. *This we shall see later.*

The second main strength of the DP is that the contradiction is presented as between war and revolution and not between war and peace. Under the present conditions this is the only correct view—it shows that war springs from the very nature of capitalism, that the danger of world war is imminent and that the main force in opposing war is the revolutionary struggles of the masses here and around the world. Again, even though this is a great strength, there is a tendency in its concretes to downplay the actual struggle against war, to not see the struggle against war as one of the very main components of the revolutionary struggle at this time.

### One Minor and Two Major Points

Starting from a basically correct orientation and stand, though, there are several areas where the DP could be improved. I would like to go into one minor and two major points. First, what causes wars and the law of uneven development; second, the basic attitude towards war in different times and in particular the question of defending socialist countries; and third, the question of an "anti-war movement."

First, concerning the cause of war and uneven development under imperialism. When the cause of war is explained in the DP the cause is contention between the two superpowers; i.e., competition to gain more markets, influence, etc. in some part of the world or even to keep the other superpowers out. This is very true but if it's left at this level, wars break out when the competition gets too hot, or when some "spark" spreads into a battle, or when the domestic crisis of one superpower needs a war as a way out. The contention between imperialist powers explains the general inevitability of war but does not show why wars break out at particular times between particular nations—for this the law of uneven development is necessary.

Wars occur between imperialist powers to *re-divide* the world, since it has been completely divided since the 1870s. The division of the world into colonies, junior partners, spheres of influence, etc. is based on the total economic, political and military power of the imperialist countries at some time. Since uneven development, i.e., countries developing at different speeds, some raising, some declining, all at different rates, is the rule of imperialism then this world wide arrangement of forces that the division of the world is based on changes. Some countries gaining in strength, others losing. It then comes that the world must be *re-divided* to reflect the new balance of forces. The only way this redivision can occur is by war.

It is important to spell this out a little in the DP to

explain why war will occur between the U.S. and Russia at this general time. If this is not done, then war might be seen as "policy" chose to expand influence or to "get out" of a crisis—and while both of these are partially true, if they are put forward alone, then the same mistake as occurred around the energy crisis—i.e., the imperialists "choose" to raise their prices or hold back oil—giving the imperialists too much freedom, will come up again.

To summarize—the power of the U.S. has gone tremendously down in the last 15 years while that of Russia has grown tremendously. Russia is a younger, relatively more dynamic capitalism, hungering for the colonies and spheres of influence it had been kept from by imperialist military might and by its socialist past, and now it's on the make—something like Germany before WW1. (But certainly a much more *moribund*, "dynamic" capitalism than any on the make before—U.S., Germany. Russia is already a fascist, decaying country—probably the *last* on the make.) It is the law of uneven development that leads to the immediate danger of war between the U.S. and Russia. Contention and "solving" crisis could cause a war with anyone at any unknown time.

Secondly, what is the attitude of communists towards war at different periods and particularly during the period of the existence of one or several socialist countries while the imperialist powers seek to re-divide the world. As the DP correctly points out, there are just and unjust wars and the stand and history of the working class supports just wars and opposes unjust wars. The working class has no interests in pacifism and knows it has to fight for what it needs. The question is what determines whether or not a war is just. The DP says, "wars for independence, liberation, and socialist revolution are just, while imperialist wars for the purpose of plunder and oppression will always be resisted by the working class and oppressed peoples of the world." (p. 43) This is all certainly true but it is not sufficient guidance for what will determine the attitude towards war at present. In particular it says nothing about defending socialist China. Before we get into this it might be helpful to review a little how the attitude towards war has developed through different periods.

From the time when Marx began his work until 1871, Marx and Engels usually supported one side or the other in the wars in Europe. The Marxist method has always been to examine each war in its historical context and see whether or not it helped or hindered the development of human society. As Lenin says, "There have been in the past numerous wars which despite all the horrors, atrocities, distress, and suffering that inevitably accompany all wars, were progressive, i.e., benefitted the development of mankind by helping to destroy most harmful or reactionary institutions (e.g. an autocracy or serfdom) and the most barbarous despotism in Europe (the Turkish and the Russian)."

Lenin points out that from the French Revolution until the time of the Paris Commune—i.e., from 1789-1871: "one type of war was of a bourgeois-progressive character, waged for national liberation. In other words, the overthrow of absolutism and feudalism, the undermining of these institutions, and the overthrow of alien oppression, formed the chief content and historical significance of such wars. These were progressive wars; during *such* war, all honest and revolutionary democratic as well as all socialists, always wished success to that country (i.e., that bourgeoisie) which had helped to overthrow or undermine the most baneful foundations of feudalism, absolutism and the oppression of nations."

This even included, for example, support for Germany, during the brutal Franco-Prussian war of 1870—a war between two predominantly capitalist countries where Prussian (German) desire for French territory played no small part. This was because this war united Germany and smashed feudalism there. These wars were essentially part of the bourgeois revolutions and came to an end with the rise of imperialism and the end of the progressive era of the bourgeoisie.

The next period of wars, was imperialist wars fought to re-divide the world. Lenin struggled very hard against opportunism, particularly against defencism (defending one's own country because it was more "democratic" or the "victim of aggression," etc.) and laid out the basic line on imperialist war—that re-dividing the world for the bourgeoisie was in no way in the interest of the working class and that these wars should be opposed tooth and nail. Even more, the working class can build on the increasing revolutionary mood of the masses brought on by the horrors of such a war to call for the *defeat* (weakening) of its own ruling class and launch a civil war against it. This is the basic line of the DP on war between imperialist powers and is correct for that situation, but it is *not the whole situation* we confront.

Since 1917, the attitude of communists underwent another fundamental change—socialism

existed in Russia and the international working class possessed a base from which to build a new world. The question of war entered a *new period* that we are still in (with heavy changes—i.e., the existence of an imperialist country that cloaks itself with socialism). Defending the Soviet Union became as much a foundation of proletarian internationalism as revolutionary defeatism (Lenin's term for the above pre-WW1 line) and support for wars of independence and national liberation. This is the point that is not sufficiently emphasized in the DP.

At present the defense of socialist countries must be one of the basic departure points on the question of war, especially the defense of socialist China. China belongs to the international working class and represents one of its most hard won and valuable possessions—especially because the lies, actions and hypocrisy of the social-imperialists are exposed daily by the theory and practice of China. Some might protest and say the DP covers this (p. 43). Recently there was an article in *Revolution* (several months after the DP was out) that supposedly laid out the attitude towards war at present. *It did not even mention China!* This is serious.

The point of this article is not to try to spell out all the issues involved around the question of China and war—that will be done especially as the situation develops and we can see how alliances, relative strengths, etc. become more clear, but some principles can be laid out. I believe the article in *Revolution* grossly exaggerates but generally reflects the shortcomings of the DP. Instead of treating the revolutionary struggle of the international working class against its own bourgeoisies (especially the working classes of the two superpowers) as the *main* struggle opposing war, which would be correct, the article says essentially that it is the *only* force. To correct this error the DP should stress in the United Front part more clearly how other classes and forces oppose war and can defend China. In the part on opposing war the question of defending China should be spelled out in a separate paragraph—that this is a basic point of proletarian internationalism at this time and should be a basic point in determining our strategy against war.

The *Revolution* article, exaggerating the weaknesses of the DP, assumes an ostrich-like stand of putting its head in the sand to ignore a problem. The problem is this. There is tremendous danger of right errors on this question, as we have already seen from the OL's garbage on the Shah of Iran. The main danger on this question is defencism—i.e., uniting with the bourgeoisie of our country to oppose the Soviet Union because it is attacking China, or worse, just to weaken Russia in a war even if it is not attacking China. Defencism at this time would be dead wrong and pure social chauvinism and social-imperialism just as it was when Lenin fought against it during WW1. The main way it would come out now would be in a pro-NATO line or by saying it is wrong to demand just withdrawal of U.S. bases overseas.

This is not an idle question—it is a strong trend among some organizations and parties in Europe and will surely be one of the major questions to deal with in the '70s all over the world. While it is quite possible that conditions could change that would call for defencism, as they did during WW2 after the invasion of the Soviet Union, *these conditions do not now exist*—and any moves by communists to unite with U.S. military forces would be opportunist to the core. (Even if it ever was correct to unite with the U.S., the basic line of the DP of relying on the masses would be even more essential.)

The other danger around this area is that the struggle for proletarian revolution will be forgotten and sold out under the cover of building a movement against war—this will be covered in the third and last part of this article.

### Slogan Wrong?

Thirdly, how can a movement against war be built that shows the real cause of wars—capitalist exploitation and the real solution—socialist revolution. The DP sums it up this way: "Either the working class in the U.S. and the Soviet Union will prevent such a war by overthrowing these greatest oppressors, in conjunction with the world wide struggle against them, or they will launch a world war before they can be overthrown." (p. 22) Or again: "If revolution does not prevent world war, world war will give rise to revolution." (p. 43)

The second slogan is certainly correct, though it remains to point out exactly the relationship between the fight against war before and after its outbreak and the fight for revolution. The first slogan is at best misleading and at worst wrong. It is wrong to say revolution against both superpowers is necessary to prevent this war. As long as there are several imperialist countries the inevitability of war will continue, but individual wars can be prevented or at

Continued on page 8

# Three ...

Continued from page 7

least delayed and fought on more favorable grounds. Revolution in one superpower would most likely prevent this immediate war—or so change its nature (it would become an attack on a socialist country) as to require an entirely different strategy. What is misleading is that it is not clear again how the fight against war is part of the revolutionary struggle. Here is how the DP lays out the relationship:

"To eliminate war, once and for all, it is necessary to eliminate its source, imperialism, through revolution and socialism. But, as a vital part of building that struggle, the working class and its party in the U.S. raises the following demands: Withdrawal . . ." etc.

The phrase "as a vital part" is not sufficiently clear. The struggle against war will be one of the key struggles leading to the socialist revolution; it will be one of the very main forces in bringing down the bourgeoisie. Further, the struggles of the working class against war along the lines of the demands listed (strengthening the part on defending socialist countries) will be a key part in rallying other classes to see socialist revolution as the concrete solution to their problems. The masses of people, especially the working class, hate war. They suffer the miseries war causes, they do the fighting and dying. This provides the basis for the working class leading the struggles against war as a powerful thrust against monopoly capitalism—for only through destroying monopoly capitalism can war be ended forever.

The anti-war feelings of the masses is also the social base for revisionist, "peace" moves. If the working class does not lead the fight against war—either the petty bourgeoisie, or more likely, the bourgeoisie, will—and use it as a prop to defend its rule. The movement against war will be a social movement, broadly including all classes—but based mainly in the working class. This has not been true in the recent past but must be and can be true of the future. It is important to describe this social movement against war as a key force and not just say "a vital part" and list some demands. This formulation could lead to denying the importance of the social movement against war and could lead to saying that it is only possible to mobilize the petty bourgeoisie against war.

## Danger of War Very Real

It is true that petty bourgeois moralists and utopian idealists will only oppose unjust war in general, and that if you actually tried to build an "anti-war" movement today it would attract only petty bourgeois forces. The working class moves around real principles, real issues, and real oppression and not moral principles—but everything we say points to the fact that the danger of war will be very real in a year or so and come down over real issues, whether it be a grossly increased military budget, a new draft, or an actual war, etc.

These are real issues and the working class must be in the forefront of the battle against them. There are again real dangers of right errors in building a movement against war. It will be difficult to build it without it having a petty bourgeois character, there may be a tendency to see peace as an end in itself—to see the contradiction between peace and war resolved independent of the fundamental contradiction of capitalism. These are the dangers, but the danger in the DP is to not talk about building a movement against war because of these dangers—this is definitely wrong.

As the superpowers drag us ever closer to war, as the DP says, struggle increases against them. But if the party does not build a strong movement against war based in the working class, not only will the superpowers have more freedom to carry on their aggression, but no revolution will occur. During a war opposition to it is one of the greatest revolutionary movements. Remember the Russian Revolution and its slogan of Peace, Land and Bread.

One final point on this. As was said earlier in the World Wide United Front, there are some problems with how war is dealt with. Specifically, when the struggles of the third world are described, the struggle of the masses is described as "to win complete independence from imperialism and overthrow all exploiters." (p. 21) Since this does not mention the struggle against war (although it would be considered as part of the struggle for complete independence), it could leave the impression that this fight was up to the bourgeoisies of these countries. This could be corrected very easily by adding the word "war" after "complete independence."

To summarize the points:

- 1) Bring in the uneven development more to explain the present situation. This could be done on p. 3 of the DP.
- 2) Go into the principles of proletarian interna-

tionalism, showing how in addition to what is said the existence of socialism and its defense is a basic departure point in our line on war. This should be done on p. 22.

3) Strengthen the description of "a vital part" to include the necessity of building a broad social movement against war based on the working class as a key force-for revolution. ■

# Four

In the section, "World-Wide United Front" under THE UNITED FRONT in the DP, the strategy for world wide revolution is laid out as the United Front against the two superpowers from the point of view of the U.S. working class' role in the struggle, and correctly so, as the DP is speaking to the U.S. working class, in order to clarify who are our friends and on what basis we unite with them against a common enemy. On p. 22 of the DP:

"The main contribution of the U.S. proletariat to the world-wide revolution is to overthrow imperialism in the U.S." But the U.S. ruling class is not the sole main enemy of the working class in this country. Under "World-Wide United Front" it is stated that "At the present time, these two top dogs [U.S. and USSR imperialists] of the imperialist system are the main enemies of the people of the world. The working class of all countries face the task of building the broadest united front, on a world scale, aimed at the ruling classes of these two superpowers, while at the same time uniting all who can be united within each country to continue the battle for socialist revolution." (emphasis mine)

This is in accord with the CPC analysis as stated in the April 9, 1974 speech of Teng Hsiao-ping, Chairman of the Delegation of People's Republic of China, at the Special Session of the UN General Assembly. (*Peking Review*, supplement to No. 15, April 12, 1974). Here it is stated,

"The two superpowers of the U.S. and the Soviet Union, are vainly seeking world hegemony. Each in its own way attempts to bring the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America under its control, and at the same time, to bully the developed countries that are not their match in strength... The two superpowers are the biggest international exploiters and oppressors of today. They are the source of a new world war."

The CPC in this speech says, "Judging from the changes in international relations, the world today actually consists of three parts, or three worlds, that are both interconnected and in contradiction to one another. The United States and the Soviet Union make up the First World. The developing countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other regions make up the Third World. The developed countries between the two make up the Second World." The CPC, speaking to all countries of the world, and specifically to the international proletariat, describes the international situation in terms of the contention and alliances between countries, and between class forces within these countries. It accurately describes the international situation in terms of what the different countries of the world are contending over, i.e., oil, natural resources, colonial and imperialist domination, and the exploitation of their people versus the control of countries' own resources and the liberation of the oppressed people of the world from class exploitation.

From Teng Hsiao-ping's speech, "The numerous developing countries have long suffered from colonialist and imperialist oppression and exploitation. They have won political independence, yet all of them still face the historic task of clearing out the remnant forces of colonialism, developing the national economy and consolidating national independence... In the struggle for national liberation and independence, they have demonstrated immense power and continually won splendid victories. They constitute a revolutionary motive force propelling the wheel of world history and are the main force combatting colonialism, imperialism, and particularly the superpowers..."

"The hegemonism and power politics of the two superpowers have also aroused strong dissatisfaction among the developed countries of the Second World. The struggles of the countries against superpower control, interference, intimidation, exploitation and shifting of economic crises are growing day by day. Their struggles also have a significant impact on the development of the international situation."

The DP, in the sub-section "World-Wide United Front," describes the friends of the U.S. working class: "Besides the workers in every country, the proletariat in the U.S. has as its allies in the international arena today the great struggles of nations throughout the 'underdeveloped world' or 'Third

World' for liberation from colonialism and imperialism. The backbone of these struggles are the hundreds of millions of peasants, who make up the majority of the population in most of these countries and, particularly under the leadership of the working class and its party, are the bulwark of the armed struggles against the imperialists and their feudal and bourgeois junior partners. With the worker-peasant alliance as the foundation, these national liberation struggles can also involve broad strata of the population, including intellectuals and students, professionals and shopkeepers and even some smaller-scale merchants and factory owners who are more held down than built up by imperialist rule in these countries." And a little later the DP says:

"Not only in the Third World, but even in the capitalist and imperialist states outside the two superpowers [OF THE SECOND WORLD], governments are resisting to some degree the domination of the superpowers. The proletariat supports this resistance for the reason that it also weakens the main enemies, U.S. AND SOVIET-SOCIALIST-IMPERIALISTS [WHO MAKE UP THE FIRST WORLD]."

The capitalized words and phrases inside brackets are mine. They are suggested changes and additions. Although the DP doesn't lay out the world situation and describe it in terms of contradictions between First, Second, and Third Worlds, this section of the DP does not negate the correct analysis of the world situation or the united front against the two superpowers of the CPC. Many people who read the DP will never have heard of this analysis before, so I think it is important to name the three worlds.

I know I heard of the Third World way before I understood the correct analysis of the world wide united front, which meant I didn't understand either what the Third World was. This term is used incorrectly to describe oppressed nationalities within the U.S., for example. Also, there has been a tendency around for a long time, and still with us, to glorify and at the same time separate struggles of the Third World from our own, saying, in effect, well they're the ones that are really doing the fighting and negating our contribution and international duty in the world wide united front against the two superpowers. So, naming the three worlds in this section would help to clarify things from the get-go. ■

# Five

The sub-section of the DP on the "World-Wide United Front" is in general correct and clearly stated, but could be improved by amplifying on two points: 1) the distinction between the domestic programs of the fraternal Communist and Workers parties, and the foreign policies of states where the working class is in power; and 2) the obligation of the working class and its party to build the widest possible movements for friendship with those countries where the working class is in power.

The DP correctly defines the international united front not as a tactical alliance of states and national liberation movements, but as a strategic international alliance of class forces aimed at world wide proletarian revolution. The backbone of this united front aimed at the ruling classes of the two superpowers is the masses. The leading element is the working classes of all countries (especially those in power). The firmest allies are the masses of the Third World (especially the peasantry, but also the patriotic bourgeoisie to the extent to which they oppose the superpowers). Lesser allies are the ruling classes of the lesser imperialist powers; they are supported only in their actions against the superpowers and only for the purpose of weakening the imperialist system as a whole. They must eventually be overthrown by proletarian revolution.

Here the DP should explicitly point out that the overthrow of bourgeois, feudal or comprador regimes in no way undercuts the international united front. Rather it immensely strengthens the abilities of the peoples involved to resist superpower domination.

This section of the DP goes on to discuss the relationship between war and revolution. And it concludes with the key point that the international united front is not a substitute for proletarian revolution but a programme for advancing it on an international scale.

Both recent and past history of the working class movement shows that this point must be carefully explained to both the party and the masses if they are to retain the correct orientation in the rapidly changing arena of world events. In particular there has been a recurrent tendency to confuse the revolu-

Continued from page 9

# Five...

Continued from page 8

tionary programmes of the individual parties with the state policies of leading socialist states.

## Two Deviations

There have been two classical deviations on this question. The Trotskyist deviation, which denies the law of uneven development and existence of any contradictions other than that between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, insists that the state policy of socialist states should be the same as the supposed programme of the parties in the imperialist countries and should be oriented to the practical assistance of armed proletarian revolution, immediately, everywhere, and without "impure" allies. The opposite error, the Browderite deviation, calls for the liquidation of the domestic revolutionary programme and the adoption in its place of the state foreign policy of the leading socialist states.

The past has shown that without a correct orientation toward the component parts of the international united front, the working class and its party can become confused and suffer real setbacks in the face of rapidly changing international events. The American party which oriented its domestic program in the late '30s around the international struggle against fascism, was thrown into confusion when the Soviet Union signed the non-aggression treaty with Germany. The Chinese party survived quite well the Soviet Union signing a similar treaty with Japan at the same time that the CPC was leading the armed struggle against the Japanese invasion of China! Later the American party was seeking actively to repress all working class struggles and struggles of national minorities in the name of the war effort, while the Chinese party was forcefully pushing demands for the people's livelihood in order to strengthen the ability of the masses to resist fascism!

Recently we have seen the attempt by some so-called communist groups to put forward the state foreign policies of the People's Republic of China, particularly China's attempts in the UN and international conferences to unite other states against the two superpowers, as the sole essence of the "International United Front." (For background comrades and friends should re-read Teng Hsiao-ping's speech to the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Raw Materials and Development, where the First, Second, Third World description was first put forward.)

## "Upper and Lower Teeth"

The point is that the state foreign policies of the socialist countries and the revolutionary programmes of the fraternal Communist and Workers parties are both components of the international united front. They fit together like the upper and lower teeth; between them they crush the imperialist system. But they are not the same thing.

This distinction also raises the importance of building the widest possible movements of friendship for the socialist states. These movements hold up the shining example of socialism and the working class in power, and they defend the leading components of the international united front by restricting the bourgeoisie's ability to mobilize the masses for war against these states.

But, further, these movements must be constantly explaining to all of the people the role these states play in the world. It is especially important to win people to the correctness of the foreign policies of these states at times when reaction attempts to portray these states as acting in opposition to the interests of the masses, or when they make tactical compromises to advance the overall programme. (Remember how PL and the SWP assailed the Vietnamese for "selling out" in Paris!)

UNITE THE MANY AND DEFEAT THE FEW!  
BUILD THE INTERNATIONAL UNITED FRONT! ■

# Six

Article "Two" on War and the International United Front in Journal No. 3 is incorrect in the line that it takes to oppose the DP's description of the World-wide United Front (pp. 21-22). It falls into the error of raising the contradiction between oppressed nations and the superpowers to obscure all the other contradictions in the world today. This view advocates that the proletariat give up its role as leader of the world wide United Front and tail behind the other social forces.

How does Article "Two" do this? First, it criticizes the DP for not recognizing the national liberation struggles as part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution, by failing to distinguish between the masses in the oppressed nations and the reactionary regimes which resist superpower domination. This is not true. Over five paragraphs on p. 21 are used to clearly lay out the contradiction in the struggles in the Third World.

Next the DP is criticized for an inadequate definition of proletarian internationalism because it doesn't say the main context of proletarian internationalism in the U.S. is support for national liberation struggles. Again wrong. The world situation of one of change and flux. Defense of the socialist countries in the event of world war or support of revolution in capitalist countries, depending on the changing world situation, could be the cutting edge of proletarian internationalism. Whatever, the main internationalist duty of the U.S.A. proletariat is to make proletarian revolution in the U.S.!

The third point of the article is that the DP gives an incomplete summation of the world situation because it doesn't say the principle contradiction in the world today is between the national liberation struggles and the superpowers. It would be incorrect to identify a contradiction as principal today because of the rapidly changing world situation. Our analysis of what is principal would be shaky at best and even if it was right could be wrong tomorrow.

Finally, the slogan, "Workers and Oppressed Peoples, Unite!" is proposed to replace "Workers of the World, Unite!" A quote from Lenin and that the Chinese used this slogan against the revisionists are used as arguments. First, the quote from Lenin is horribly misrepresented. Lenin said the slogan, "Workers and Oppressed People, Unite!" was correct for communists to use-addressing the "peoples of the East." The Chinese comrades used the slogan in opposition to the revisionists in conflict over the national and colonial question. They never replaced "Workers of All Countries, Unite!" as the general slogan. The slogan proposed is correct and could be used on the national and colonial question but a communist would never use it to replace "Workers of the World, Unite!"

The general error Article "Two" makes is to break with a scientific Marxist-Leninist analysis of the world situation and puts forward the subjective moralism of the petty bourgeoisie.

WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!  
FORWARD TO THE PARTY! ■

# Seven

Clarify: The meaning of the DP and the latest document on the question of war and the international united front.

1) Imperialism is the cause of war. Contention between the two superpowers is driving them toward world war...not the isolation caused by the international united front, or the struggles of the working class and its allies around the world against the superpowers. External causes (international united front) become operative through internal contradictions (the laws of imperialism). Whether or not the superpowers are being battered by the international united front, there would be an increased danger of world war because of the nature of imperialism. Not to make this crystal clear leaves us open to telling the masses that it is the people's resistance that is increasing the danger of world war. The revisionist line says... "Don't struggle, you might start a world war. A single spark can start a holocaust," etc.

2) Also, in terms of the IUF itself—it's not that there's a positive side (it can temporarily prevent war) and a negative side (it increases the danger of war). The IUF is *not* a 50-50 thing. It can *only* advance the struggle of the working class and its allies, whether there is a war or not; i.e., it can temporarily prevent war, but even if there is war, it will put the working class in a more favorable position in terms of its own struggle, *and* in terms of the weakness and isolation of the imperialists. The IUF can only help the working class, and weaken and hurt the superpowers. Again, not making this clear means putting forward that the interests of the struggles of oppressed peoples, nations and countries are in contradiction with those who don't want a world war. ■

# Eight

Article Two in the "Other Articles" section of Journal No. 3 is incorrect in the line that it takes to oppose the DP's line on fascism, pp. 42-43. It falls into the error of not seeing the way to fight fascism is by taking up that fight as part of the overall revolutionary struggle. This view advocates that the proletariat give up its strategic aim of revolution.

First, the article says that the "draft programme states that the only way to prevent fascism is to make proletarian revolution." The DP does not say that. It says, "the only way to prevent fascism *for sure* is to make revolution." (my emphasis) The article sees only two alternatives, either the proletariat launches armed insurrection and establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat, or it establishes a "broad anti-fascist People's Front" to oppose fascism. The article says the DP gives up the fight against fascism with a dogmatic call for revolution. This is wrong. The DP calls for a resolute fight against all preparations and attempts at fascism, but, as "part of the general revolutionary offensive against the rule of the monopoly capitalists."

The article says the alternative of a United Front Against Fascism is only a temporary and tactical reorientation, but it seems to be a *strategic* replacement for the revolutionary strategy of the proletariat, the United Front Against Imperialism (UFAI). What would be the difference if it was only tactical? That it would take up immediate demands and struggles to curb or fight fascism? The UFAI takes up those struggles as part of the revolutionary struggle. Perhaps tactical alliances with sections of the bourgeoisie resisting fascism? The UFAI calls for using contradictions among the bourgeoisie. Well, what then??

It seems that the alternative advocated by this article boils down to a plea to the "liberal" bourgeoisie: "Please help us, the proletariat and its allies aren't strong enough to lead the fight against fascism. The proletariat and its allies will follow you." The alternative is to give up revolution and in the last analysis, accept fascism. No Way!  
I support the DP's position of fighting fascism as part of the overall revolutionary struggle with the UFAI as the only strategy. ■

# On the IWOs

## One

Since the DP has come out there has been much struggle around the question of IWOs, their relationships to the day to day struggles in the plants and their overall role in society. In the course of this struggle our understanding of the current situation that faces the working class and what must be done to promote the struggle of the workers has grown much deeper.

But not deep enough. The line put forward in the DP and the latest document on the IWOs does not and will not promote the struggle of the working class because it starts not on the basis of uniting with the actual struggles of the working class but comrades' wishes and desires of what ought to be. This failure to do a concrete analysis of concrete conditions has led to two serious errors: 1) to incorrectly emphasize the role of IWOs in building the fight against all oppression, which is not the primary aspect at this particular time; and 2) failing to understand how IWOs must be developed out of the actual struggles of the working class, specifically how it is incorrect at this time to build areawide IWOs that have no organized sections in at least several important shops.

In the DP on p. 31 workers who are the backbone of the IWOs are described as "workers (who) are coming forward in greater numbers to lead struggles not only in the shops and unions, but also in many other battlefronts against the bourgeoisie—for example, against police repression or imperialist aggression and war."

Which of the two aspects, "leading the day to day struggle in the shops" or "the other battle fronts against the bourgeoisie," is the one that we must emphasize and build on at this time?

From what the organization has summed up in the DP and the latest document, and from our own experience, the aspect that we must emphasize is the leading of the day to day struggles in the shop in the context of building the fight of the working class against the ruling class.

The DP in the section on the IWOs never emphasizes this aspect, but instead only talks about the advance in consciousness in terms of taking up broader struggles, the struggle against all oppression "of all sections of the people," instead of uniting with the actual struggles of the workers at this particular time, concentrating their demands into a fighting programme, dealing a material blow to the enemy, and spreading the sparks of the struggle to the workers involved and to their class brothers and sisters in as broad a way as possible.

### "Not In A Contest"

We, the authors of this paper, don't emphasize the in-plant aspect because we think the workers are a narrow bunch of people or because the struggle against all oppression is a fight for tomorrow.

Workers in this country have some general feelings about what the source of all the problems and misery is. They know that the capitalists that own their company are not the only enemy; they know from their experience in life, that the miserableness of this society doesn't just come down at work but to varying degrees everywhere else. In short, the aspirations of the workers are not just for a dime an hour more, but for a better life for themselves and their families and for all people getting ripped.

But the workers are not in a contest to link as broadly as you can; they are involved in a struggle for survival, to eat, be housed and to have clothes on their backs, a struggle that is determined at any particular point by the objective conditions, the level of consciousness of the workers and their sense of organization.

The workers fight back in the best way they know how, based on struggling for the tactics that get results and move their struggle forward. As we correctly say in the DP and the latest document, "the present struggles of the working class in this country are against individual employers (and employers' associations) around wages and benefits, working conditions, against speed-up and lay-offs, against discrimination."

These are the actual struggles of the working class, against individual employers, that we must in the main PROMOTE. These are the struggles that the IWO section in the DP must be based on, and must emphasize.

To help in this struggle and to offer our own two cents worth, we would like to submit the following

re-write of the IWO section in the DP. It is the product of much discussion, mainly around the questions developed by the national leadership of our organization and our own experience. The journal articles also helped a lot.

### Suggested Re-write

Suggested re-write: starts p. 30, right-hand side, paragraph no. 5:

"As this process develops, the workers, especially the most advanced, begin to see the struggle on the job in a different light. The face of the enemy and how to fight him becomes clearer. The struggle on the job becomes a part of a much larger fight, union brothers and sisters and fellow workers become class brothers and sisters; the struggles of other strata and oppressed people in society begin to be viewed in relation to how they weaken the common enemy and how they unite the forces of the people. The struggle for a living wage and a decent life begins to become the struggle to wipe out the source of all exploitation and misery in society, the ruling class of capitalist blood-suckers, the class that runs everything in its own narrow interests.

"The party of the proletariat must unite with these advanced workers to consolidate politically and organizationally this tremendous advance in consciousness by forming a workers organization that is more permanent and on-going than a rank and file caucus. An organization that grows out of the class struggle and in turn serves as the basis for the class struggle to roar on, at a still higher level. An organization whose backbone are the advanced workers who see the need to aim their blows squarely at the ruling class.

"These workers organizations are intermediate between the party and the trade unions. They do not compete with the trade unions for members, they are not the section of the party in the plants. Their role in society is to unite with and help lead the actual struggles of the working class, in the mines, mills and factories, which at this time are mainly against individual employers (or employers' associations) around wages and benefits, working conditions, against speed-up and lay-offs, against discrimination, in the context of building the struggles of the workers as a class, to fight for everything that is in our interests, to fight against everything that is not.

"In this way these organizations will be one important form in which communists can unite with advanced workers to build the United Front Against Imperialism under proletarian leadership. These organizations would unite with the struggles of the workers, help to formulate a course of action, a fighting programme, spread this fight out as broadly as possible whether it be in a department, plant, industry or across the country, and through the course of struggle raise the level of understanding of the workers to go from fighters on one front to recognizing the need to become fighters for all.

"Through this process the workers will more and more see the position of the working class in fundamentally changing society: how in the struggle against all manifestations of exploitation and oppression in society the working class in representing its interests, most fundamentally represents the interests of all of humanity. Further, other strata in society will see that their future lies in following the leadership of the working class, in joining together all who can be united to fight the common enemy, and in the long run many will desert their former class position and interests."

Page 31, left-hand side, start paragraph no. 5: "As an important part..."

### How Must the IWOs Develop?

The latest document on p. 21 goes a long way in overcoming some of the problems in the DP. We agree with the statement that, "these organizations can play this role [build the UFAI] only if they are rooted in the plants and other work places and play a leading role in the struggle there, as well as taking up major struggles arising in the area, or the country as a whole, applying the 'single spark' method and as the Programme states, 'mobilize masses of workers in these struggles and develop them into campaigns of the working class.'" The latest document further lays out in the next paragraph, "If these organizations are not rooted in the plants and do not lead struggle there, then there is no way they can mobilize masses of workers around broader struggles that affect the whole class. On the other hand, if these organizations do not take up these broader struggles and mobilize the masses of workers as a whole around them, then they will

not play their full role in helping to develop the struggles and consciousness of the workers as a CLASS." The final form of the IWO section in the programme of our party must reflect this understanding.

But while the latest document does make advances over the DP, it still falls short because it has a wrong understanding of how we are to develop these areawide organizations, specifically what is the relationship between areawide and single plant and industry IWOs.

On p. 21 the latest document states that trade unions are organized along industry lines, that this reflects the actual organization of the workers in production. It then sums up that "therefore, it is important to develop workers' organizations that are also based along industry lines, AND to link these with area-wide workers' organizations. Our aim should be to work toward establishing plant and industry-wide organizations as branches of the area-wide organization. In some cases this will mean affiliating already existing organizations in plants and industries, or at least many of the workers active in these organizations, to the area-wide organization as branches of it."

We disagree with this formulation. From what we have seen and from what the DP and the latest document sum up as the current situation, we feel we must build plant and industry IWOs as a necessary step in building towards an areawide IWO. Concretely, it is wrong to build organizations like M1WM that have no organized sections in the particular shops or industries in the area.

Again, it is a question of developing our line, organizations and tactics on the basis of applying the science to the concrete conditions that we face. As the latest document says, in the Lenin quote on p. 17, "The Party's activity must consist in promoting the working class struggle. The Party's task is not to concoct some fashionable means of helping the workers, but to join with the workers' movement, to bring light into it, to assist the workers in the struggle they themselves have already begun to wage."

### Struggle Against Individual Employers

At this particular time the workers are mainly struggling against individual employers. In the main our organization has recognized this fact and has gone into the plants to join with the struggles, and to try and develop them in accordance with the world as it is. Based on the actual struggle and based on communists striving to sum up the lessons to deepen and broaden the movement of the workers, advanced workers have come forward to see the need to lead the day to day struggle of the workers in the context of building a movement to wipe out the capitalists.

While across the country many workers of this type have come forward, and while through the course of struggle and the summing up of struggle by communists many more workers have increased their understanding, the characterization that the struggle of the workers in this country is mainly against individual employers is still correct.

What has been accomplished is that we have developed some single plant IWOs and some industry IWOs. We have also organized some classwide committees around particular points of struggle like police repression, deportations and fighting against layoffs, but we have not formed areawide IWOs except in a couple of places across the country.

To us this fact raised the question of where do we go with these plant and industry IWOs? How do we develop their ability to lead more struggle, how do we develop the class consciousness of their members? Also in some cases where we have spread a struggle through an IWO in plant x to workers in plant z, the workers in plant z want to know what we are doing and how they can start doing the same. How do we relate to these workers?

Nowhere in the latest document are these questions answered. It is assumed that areawide organizations now exist, that they are leading the masses of workers in struggle and that our task is to simply affiliate our plant and industry IWOs (or individuals in these) to our areawide IWO.

### Case Seems Closed

It seems like the case is closed on how to build areawide IWOs. This is wrong because the only real model there is at this time as to what these areawide organizations should be is the M1WM. We feel there is much that has to be summed up about this organization before it is used as the example for anything. In fact, from what we have seen about M1WM and from our own experience we feel that M1WM does little to promote the struggle of the working class and that what it basically does is

Continued on page 11

# One...

Continued from page 10

suck advanced workers (and communists) out of the struggle in the shops and also does very little to mobilize the masses of workers to take up the broader struggles in society.

M1WM has summed it up, and others in the journal have summed it up, that M1WM is external to the real heat of the class struggle. This is no great revelation because if you're not tied organizationally to where the main struggle of the workers is at (against individual employers) then you are relegating yourself to an external force.

In the M1WM article in the second journal the comrades sum up that "the main strength of M1WM has been that it has brought together a solid core of advanced workers from different shops and industries. These workers have united with communists to take important issues and struggles to the working class." Further, the comrades have summed up, "that the May 1 Workers Movement has been actively involved in a number of important struggles, including the Rucker electronics strike, the struggles of Asian immigrant workers in San Francisco's Chinatown, and a campaign against police repression."

No one will deny that it is not a good thing to bring workers together to sum up the struggles that they have been involved in, and we have to do more work supporting strikes and building the fight against police repression. But the question comes up—how are we taking up these struggles, are we relying on the masses of the workers, are we constantly summing up the lessons of the struggle pointing the way forward to revolution and socialism?

Workers learn through their day to day struggles. They learn everything including the need to go up against not just their boss but the entire class of capitalist pigs that their boss belongs to. Workers see pretty good what they need to do, the big question they got is how to do it.

M1WM doesn't even start to answer the question of how. How could it—it plays no role in the learning process. Instead of taking part in and promoting the actual struggle of the workers, M1WM "brings important issues and struggles to the entire working class." Instead of summing up the demands of the workers and developing the struggle in the context of eliminating the ruling class, M1WM proclaims "that it's time for workers from all industries and unions to get together as a class and take the offensive against our common enemy."

We should all learn from the comrades' sum up in the Nov. 1974 issue of *Revolution*, when they wrote that in the Rucker strike, "the M1WM has continued to put forward the significance of the strike and its lessons to other workers but as an external force it has not been in a position to play a decisive role in determining the strike's course."

## "No Interest"

We have no interest in building IWOs as external to the real heat of the class struggle and there is nothing to be gained by leading the advanced workers in that direction either. We can't see how the M1WM can teach the advanced workers that make up its backbone much of anything when it's not in a position to teach the masses of workers anything.

The failure of M1WM to lead and promote the actual struggles of the workers eliminates the basis to make links to the need to take up the broader struggles against all oppression. As it lays out in the DP on p. 32, "These demands [demands of the working class to defend its standard of living] represent vital questions around which masses of workers are fighting today. But as important as they are, they deal only with effects of capitalist exploitation and oppression. The fundamental task for the working class is to eliminate the cause—the capitalist system itself. To do this it is necessary to fight the effects to get to the cause—to utilize today's struggle as a means of building for the future showdown with the bourgeoisie."

Organizations like M1WM that have only an external relationship to the actual struggles of the workers, that have no organized section in the shops, fail to promote either the day to day struggles of the workers or the overall fight against all oppression.

## Trying to Develop an IWO

We have had some experience in trying to develop an areawide IWO in a small industrial city. This city has been the scene of many heavy battles between the workers and the bosses in the area. There have been many very militant strikes and wildcats which often

erupted into battles with the local cops and the courts. Workers in this city have also participated in campaigns against police repression, bad conditions in the schools, many have also participated in helping to build for May Day. Some workers have come forward out of these struggles and the organization has many contacts among the advanced workers in the town.

But while there has been much struggle in the area, and while we have had an open presence in many of the struggles, rank and file organizations have not been built in any of the shops (there have been some short-lived rank and file caucuses).

In summing up this situation we came to the conclusion that forming an areawide IWO would be the best way to move the struggle forward and would provide the basis to build both organization in the shops and to unite a much broader group of workers in the struggle. All the ingredients seemed to be there: we had contact with many advanced workers who led struggles against their bosses; and these workers and the struggles they led were relatively well known and these workers worked at the main shops in the area. Further, because this was a small town (where good news travels fast) and because there weren't any Trots or revisionists around, we could call these workers together, lay out what we thought was right, have some discussion and then pull together an areawide IWO.

The position we laid out to the workers that came to the first meeting was very much like that in the latest document. We stressed in the meeting that what we needed was an organization of workers that fought back against the capitalists; that built the day to day struggles in the shops with the line that the struggle could not just be around shop struggles, but we had to take up the fight against all the major attacks on us by the capitalists and their government. But we correctly stressed the in-plant aspect of the programme, laying out as the latest document does, that these struggles are the ones that we must in the main promote and that we must unfold the broader struggles in society around these.

But also like the latest document, we were wrong on exactly where to go with these workers. We saw the situation as one where we could form an areawide IWO with this group of advanced workers instead of seeing the need to build actual functioning organizations in the shops as a step in the process of forming an areawide IWO.

## Concrete Analysis

We failed to make a concrete analysis of the situation, instead we just applied the form of M1WM (we used it as a model except that we saw that it must be based on the day to day struggles). As we fell into the error that is summed up on p. 22, we treated the situation mechanically, we did not really grasp that "organization must serve the purpose of developing struggle. In different situations, the level of struggle and the level of consciousness differs, and the relation of organizations in the plants and industries to area-wide workers organizations will have to be determined according to the actual conditions and development of the struggle."

At the first meeting of our areawide IWO we talked about leading the day to day struggles, uniting the working class to fight as a class against all forms of exploitation and oppression. The workers talked about what was going on in their shops, laid out what they thought should be done to build the struggle and asked us and the other workers what we thought.

The workers were saying yeah, we got to build the struggle of the working class and yeah, it's more than the fight against our boss, but that's the fight we are in right now and these are the questions we must come to grips with to move it forward. We were saying, yeah, we got to build the struggle in the shops, but it's a much broader question than just one shop. First we got to build this areawide organization, then we can build the struggle in the shops.

The workers wanted to form organization that would develop the struggle, our line basically was to form organizations that would rip the advanced workers from the struggle and put in a secondary position building and promoting the actual struggle of the workers.

We were slow to learn this lesson, in fact only really began to sum it up when advanced workers stopped coming to IWO meetings because they didn't see them as important and their time could be spent better doing other things.

From this experience we have come to see much clearer that organization must "serve the purpose of developing the struggle," that we must start from what exists and move from there. We have seen that even in a small town (with no Trots!) this same law applies, and in fact it applies even to a single plant or department in a plant. Organization must be based on the level of struggle and the concrete conditions and it must promote (as a participant in) the actual struggles.

In this light our task is to unite with the actual strug-

gle (against individual employers) and form organization based on the consciousness and sense of organization of the workers as the struggle develops. At this time this means developing plant and industry IWOs in the context of building toward hooking these plant and industry IWOs into one areawide IWO that has its roots in the plants and the struggles there and sends representatives to a steering committee that would give guidance to the struggles in the plants and mobilizing the entire areawide organization around the struggle against specific forms of exploitation and oppression that come down (like a police repression case, a move toward war or imperialist aggression, a particular law or bill like Prop. 22, or the courts throwing out the seniority system).

In building these areawide IWOs, the party must initiate classwide committees around a particular struggle. They could be a "Right to Strike Committee," a strike support committee (around a major strike in the area or country or a police repression committee). These committees would not be on-going organizations but would live and die around an issue like a rank and file caucus. They would serve to build the struggles on a broader front, unite with and develop workers in shops where there are not IWOs to build them there and demonstrate in practice what role the class has to play in building the fight against all oppression.

To sum up this point, the latest document and to a lesser degree the DP must lay out more on how we proceed from where we are at now to build areawide IWOs. Specifically this means concentrating at this time in building plant and industry IWOs and in the course of some struggle and common work (around particular campaigns) and according to local conditions and the development of the plant and industry IWOs, join into an areawide IWO with sections.

The latest document should sum up that areawide IWOs like M1WM are wrong as they now exist and should be moved rapidly to unite with industry IWOs to form areawide IWOs with sections. ■

# Two

The struggle for the party has brought out sharply the important role of IWOs in building the revolutionary workers movement and the United Front Against Imperialism under proletarian leadership. We have been involved in a good deal of struggle around the question of IWOs. We've seen correct and incorrect aspects in various comrades' arguments as to what IWOs should be and what they should do.

On the basis of our collective struggle, we've united with the correct and criticized the incorrect and arrived at a generally correct line on this important question and are therefore submitting it to the struggle for the party. Since the "Clarify" article and Article "Five" on IWOs in the third journal (hereafter referred to as "5") both contained the most elements of a correct line and were therefore the ones we concentrated our struggle around, this article will focus on them.

To understand the role of IWOs we must first understand where the revolutionary workers movement is at today. As the DP correctly points out, "The present struggle of the American workers is primarily against individual employers (or employers' associations in different industries) around wages and benefits, working conditions, against speed-up and layoffs and against discrimination." (p.29) In other words, against attempts at increasing exploitation. Secondly, we see a small but growing number of workers taking up in a class conscious way the broader struggle of all the people against imperialism.

What should this mean to communists? What should we do in this situation? The answer lies in seeing that the day to day struggles of the working class must be the place we now concentrate our work. Our center of gravity. As the latest document points out, Lenin said, "The Party's activity must consist in promoting the working class struggle. The Party's task is not to concoct some fashionable means of helping the workers, but to join up with the workers' movement, to bring light into it, to assist the workers in the struggles they themselves have already begun to wage." So communists must enter the day to day struggles, lead them to as many victories as possible and within that context link these struggles with broader struggles by unfolding how at the root of these and all struggles is the fundamental contradiction between socialized production and private accumulation or between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and that this contradiction can only be resolved through socialist revolution.

But can the work of communists end here? Can the struggle of the working class end at this day to day

Continued on page 12

## Two...

Continued from page 11

level? The answer is no. With the day to day struggles as a solid basis, the working class must increasingly take up struggles of the whole class and of all sections of the people against the imperialist ruling class. "Only by uniting with all social forces fighting imperialism can the working class develop consciousness of its own historical role as capitalism's gravedigger." (DP, p.33)

### "Correct and Incorrect Aspects"

Around these points we see some correct and incorrect aspects to the journal articles. "Clarify" correctly brings out that the class is engaged in sharp day to day struggles and that these struggles are potentially revolutionary. However, as "5" points out, in doing this "Clarify" essentially "narrows the class struggle to the shop." (p.7) It does this because the people who wrote "Clarify" don't seem to understand and never brings out the crucial importance of the working class as a class taking up the struggles of all people against imperialism. In doing this the door is left open to the thinking that a class conscious revolutionary workers movement can be built out of shop struggle with perhaps a little help from broader struggles. This is, of course, incorrect. Article "5" correctly brings out this criticism of "Clarify" and the importance of workers taking up broader political struggles.

However, in doing so "5" loses its orientation. It talks of shop struggles as "one place where consciousness is developed." (p.7) but never brings out that the day to day struggles is the main way workers are fighting the capitalists and therefore the great importance of communists rooting themselves in these struggles and with this as a basis winning the class to taking up broader struggle. Without this correct orientation the working class won't take up the broader struggles in a correct way and communists will become increasingly isolated from the workers movement.

Understanding this, the next question is what is the role of IWOs? IWOs are an organization where communists unite with workers coming forward in struggle to build the revolutionary workers movement and the UFAI under proletarian leadership. To do this IWOs must fulfill certain tasks.

Firstly, IWOs must be rooted in the day to day struggles of workers in the plants and must be building them in a revolutionary way. That is, they must be constantly uniting with these day to day struggles, mobilizing the masses in the shop to take up these struggles in as big a way as possible and win as much as can be won. Within that, with communists in the lead, the IWOs must link these day to day struggles to broader struggles by bringing them out in a living way that the root of all these struggles is the fundamental contradiction of capitalism.

But rooted in these day to day struggles, IWOs must do more. They must "apply the 'single spark' method to take up every major struggle, of all sections of the people, against the ruling class, mobilize masses of workers in these struggles and develop them into campaigns of the working class." (DP, p.31) At different times the struggle being sparked will differ depending on the importance of winning the struggle, the political lessons the class as a class can learn from it and its possibility of sparking other struggle.

At this time, for example, we will see IWOs paying particular attention to developing important struggle against increased exploitation in one plant or industry into struggles of the whole working class. That is because at this time, by moving ahead these struggles, which the working class is mainly engaged in and which are getting consistently sharper and broader, to victory, by bringing out political lessons in the course of those struggles and by sparking other struggles off of them, the IWOs under the party's leadership will be helping the revolutionary workers movement make its greatest strides forward. Of course the IWOs must also "spark" other struggles of all the people against imperialism when the party sums them up as important battles.

### Question of Organizational Form

To carry out these important tasks, IWOs must have the correct organizational form. In general, we believe IWOs should be built in plants and industries as sections of a city or areawide IWO. The shop sections would pay particular attention to rooting themselves in the day to day struggles in the plants, and of course would be essential in bringing any "spark" to or from the masses at the shop. The areawide IWO would be made up mainly of

these different plant and industry sections (though individual workers could also join) and would certainly help build the struggle in the individual shops, but in a way the areawide IWO must be greater than the sum of its parts.

It must be an organization of the whole class, not a federation of sections or a left labor council. In practice, that means that under the party's lead the areawide IWO must not only help develop struggle in the individual shops but must, as their overall role, actively "spark" the most important struggles of all sections of the people against imperialism into struggles of the whole working class. Only in this way can the areawide IWOs play their full role in building a revolutionary workers movement and the UFAI under proletarian leadership.

Around the questions of role and organization of IWOs, the two articles' lack of understanding of the revolutionary workers movement and our orientation within that becomes manifested again. "Clarify" mentions the areawide IWO once and when it does all it says is that the sections of the IWO in the shop will build the day to day struggles.

This is all well and good, in fact, crucial, but since "Clarify" doesn't understand the importance of the working class taking up the main struggles of all sections of the people against imperialism it can't and doesn't bring out the importance of areawide IWOs as an organization of the whole working class, taking up such broad struggles and mobilizing the working class as a class to take up these struggles. "Clarify" limits the areawide IWOs to being a left labor council only really interested in building and leading day to day struggles in the individual shops and in doing that the article actually liquidates the need for areawide IWOs as an organization of the whole class.

Article "5" correctly criticizes "Clarify" for this error. However, "5"'s lack of orientation once again comes out when speaking of IWOs. This becomes clear in the last paragraph of "5" when speaking of the DP section on IWOs it states that all the section must do to be correct is to state "more clearly the need for organization to be developed as sections of the IWOs and to lead the struggles in the plants and unions." (p.7)

But "5" doesn't understand or bring out that the DP will only be corrected around these errors if it is understood that day to day struggles can be built in a revolutionary way and that only by rooting themselves in the day to day struggles will IWOs be able to win the class to take up the broader struggles it must. Without this understanding, without this orientation, we can't know why sections of IWOs must be built in the shops, nor will we understand the importance of building the day to day struggles in the shops.

We believe that the latest document answers the errors in each of these articles and puts forward the correct line on the role of IWOs when it states, "If these organizations are not rooted in the plants and do not lead struggle there, there is no way they can mobilize masses of workers around broader struggles that affect the whole class. On the other hand, if these organizations do not take up these struggles and mobilize the class as a whole around them, then they will not play their full role in helping to develop the struggle and consciousness of workers as a CLASS." ■

## Three

The DP should sum up openness as a characteristic of IWOs and should explicitly state that IWOs must lead the day to day struggles in the shops while their overall role is to apply the single spark method to every major struggle. These are two lessons we have learned from our work in developing an IWO in a large manufacturing plant.

Our groups has existed for more than a year. It developed out of struggle and has played a key role in many struggles and led some others. Included in these are a wildcat of several hundred workers, a struggle against job elimination (including demonstrations of up to 150 workers), a department slow-down, a struggle against layoffs, etc. The group also built for May Day, a regional action at the international union's constitutional convention, the April 26th rally for jobs, etc. We have also done support work around the miners' strike, work around police repression and around the Mideast.

Through the course of all this we have found that workers have come forward based on the fact that the group has been taking up struggle and not based on agreeing with our political line. In fact some have come forward in spite of disagreements with our political line. One worker would reject the local workers paper as "commie propaganda" but when the IWO took up a struggle against the denial of SUB pay during the miners' strike, this worker linked up with the group and actively built it. Through the course of struggle, this worker came forward and seriously went over the DP when it came out. We also had some similar experience around taking up the struggle against job elimination.

Our group doesn't have a statement of principles at this point. But it has said several times in the newsletter that it is open to anybody who wants to fight against the company and for the working class. And when we develop a statement of what the group is it will probably include a statement like that. Also in practice that has been how people have come forward. This has been true even though we have tried in all our struggles to direct the blow against the ruling class, which is not to say that there haven't been errors made in doing this. At all periods in our development, some of the members of the group have objectively been below the political level of the group even though they did relate to our activity pretty good.

### Day to Day Struggle

We also found that the basis for us winning workers to dealing with the broader campaigns was the fact that we took up the day to day struggle in the shops. If we just put a pretty good newsletter, we wouldn't be much different than the half dozen opportunist tendencies that distribute their rags at out plant. But we do more than that and in our struggles we try to direct the spearhead squarely at the ruling class. Although not everyone would spontaneously agree with that approach, we have generally managed to unite people around it and through the course of struggle won some workers over to that stand.

The DP does imply that the IWOs must take up the day to day struggles in the shops by saying that they must be based there, that the primary struggle of the working class is against individual employers or employer associations, and saying that the IWOs take up every major struggle. But it must go beyond that to explicitly stating that the IWOs must take up the day to day struggles in the shops.

In fact given our experience and the development of the crisis and stepped up attacks on the working class, it is correct for the latest document to lay out taking up the day to day struggles in the shops as the area of concentration of the revolutionary workers movement.

There also seems to be some confusion on just what is a revolutionary struggle. Article "Four" in the "IWO" section of the last journal says it's wrong to say that shop struggles are potentially revolutionary. Well, our experience has been that when properly carried out, struggles around shop issues can be revolutionary. We can bring out the irreconcilable antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie off of the SUB pay struggle. We could bring out how, as "long as the bourgeoisie holds state power it will continue to attack and attempt to corrupt every gain won by the working class" off of the way that struggle is unfolded. "Sometimes it is correct to carry out political agitation exclusively on an economic basis." (*What Is To Be Done?*) The error comes in when we limit ourselves to working solely off of the basis of the economic struggle. Then

Continued on page 13

# Three...

Continued from page 12

we fall into lending the economic struggle a political character.

On the other hand, there's Article "One" in the "Other Aspects" section. It takes issue with the DP for supposedly denying the revolutionary potential of the working class' key demands. Well, when we built struggle around all out SUB now, Stop the sellout (job elimination), Smash the ENA or Smash the Consent Decree, our demands were only dealing with the effects of capitalist exploitation and oppression. But we used these struggles to build the fight to eliminate the cause. We brought out who was behind these attacks and through the course of struggle, while fighting to win all that we could, brought home that to end these attacks we had to deal with the system that they stemmed from. And this seems to be exactly what the draft is getting at with its formulation. OL built struggle around some of the same demands but their approach was to obscure the cause. Push how Abel ought to be dumped like Boyle was or some other such BS.

## Political Level of IWOs

There is no areawide IWO in our area at this point but we are struggling to develop the basis for one. We see it as an important organizational form for developing the revolutionary consciousness, unity and struggle of the working class and its leadership in the UFAI. When one does develop, its political level should be basically the same as the plant IWO's is. Open ended, existing on a permanent basis, directing its spearhead squarely at the ruling class. However, it probably will mean a bit more politically for a worker to hook up with an areawide group. Doing so would be seeing that workers had to come together as a class to fight back, while hooking up with a group in the plant doesn't necessarily entail seeing that and in practice has often not entailed that.

What should be the relationship between the in-plant IWOs and the areawide? Well, some may be sections of the areawide and some may not be. In some cases we may only win some of the workers from the plant groups to relating to the citywides. This is ok because the key thing is not the formal development of structure but building the struggle. There may be cases where an in-plant group is well based in struggle and off of that has a real existence, but where it would be a paper move with no real meaning to formally make it a section of an areawide. The areawides should be organized by industry and in sections, but to say that every in-plant group has to be a section of it is to make the thing like a "left wing labor council" which I would say is something we definitely don't want to do. Not coming off of fears of dual unionism because, as was pointed out, that is a question of line, not structure, but to guard against reducing the areawides to being coordinating councils and not so much organizations in their own right. The way we see things developing, at all points there will probably be people in the areawide who aren't part of groups in their plants and may even be the only worker from their plant.

The DP is correct to characterize IWOs politically and not geographically, as some of the journal articles seem to. Article "Five" in the last journal's "IWO" section comes out and says IWOs are citywide and caucuses are in the plants. This is wrong, and it is this view, not the DP, which separates the economic and the political struggle organizationally. The overall role of IWOs, no matter whether they are areawide or in-plant, is to apply the single spark method to every major struggle.

There are several other weaknesses in the draft in this section. One is that while it is correct to bring out that the primary struggle of the working class is against individual employers or employer associations, and to show how in the course of this struggle the workers are able to lift up their heads, it tends towards rightism to only lay out that means of the workers developing class consciousness. Also, the draft talks about the need for the party (and the RWM) to be based in the shops, but doesn't clearly bring out that it is because that is the objective basis for the working class developing class consciousness and for grasping MLMTT as their own. That is because of their objective position in the society. This must be brought out, either in this section or the RCP section or the UF section. ■

# Four

The DP states that IWOs "must be based mainly in the plants and other work places," but does not say what this means. Our practice in the working class, in uniting with the class in its struggles and building organizations to serve these struggles, has shown that it is crucial to understand what it means to be based in the plants.

In the last several years comrades at company X have united with the workers in their day to day struggle in the shop and have tried to bring in other struggles outside the plant. We have built a multi-issue caucus that most workers look to as leading the fight back.

We have helped advance the workers' struggle against the employer, and also have involved some workers in the broader political campaigns of the class. Most workers came to the campaigns because they saw how we were leading the struggle in the shop. We have, however, made the error of separating the two, of flip flopping from either just building the economic struggle in a trade unionist way, or just building the campaigns. We did not understand how to correctly link the two.

We were able to get several workers involved in the Throw the Bum Out campaign based on their desire to take an active role in getting rid of Nixon. But we did not take the major lessons of this campaign back into the shop and apply them to the struggles going on there. Before the campaign ended all of the workers left because they didn't see the campaign as part of their struggle, as something meaningful to their lives.

The way we built the Smash the ENA and Fight Police Repression campaigns tended to center on bringing workers to the campaign (join this committee, come to this meeting, etc.) instead of bringing the main political lessons of these struggles to the struggles the workers were engaged in in the shop.

We didn't, for example, bring out the lessons of the police repression campaign and expose the role of the cops at our union meetings. We did take a step in the right direction, writing an article in our newsletter around contract time about the ENA. We tried to show the importance of the right to strike, and what the effects of us having an unwritten ENA were.

## Question of "Single Spark" Method

We were based in the plants, and we were trying to "single spark" the major struggles of the people, building the broader political campaigns of the class. But by separating these campaigns from the day to day struggle of the class we drew workers out of the shop and into the campaigns and did not bring the main lessons of the campaigns to the workers and their struggles in the shop. Because of this the workers were not able to make use of the campaigns to advance their day to day struggle, and through this to learn their correctness and importance and take up the campaigns as their own.

The DP says the overall role of the IWOs is "to apply the 'single spark' method to take up every major struggle, of all sections of the people, against the ruling class, mobilize masses of workers in these struggles and develop them into campaigns of the working class." It does not talk about "single sparking" struggles developing in the plant, although in explaining the single spark method the DP says we should "seize on every spark of struggle" and "build every possible struggle and build off of it to launch new struggles." This also tends to separate the role of the IWOs and the day to day struggle of the class.

We correctly single sparked some lessons learned in a shop struggle to get a janitor rehired. He had been fired for speaking up at a union meeting and disrupting the officials' plans for a quiet meeting. We built a campaign to get him reinstated, but after a certain point we left it in the hands of the union officials, who sold us out the first chance they got. We popularized the lessons from this, explaining how we should have jammed the union officials by building the fight among the rank and file and aimed squarely at the company and should have carried through to the end. A couple of months later we applied these lessons to the struggle to get another worker rehired, and this time we won. The workers

remembered the errors we had made and the summation we had popularized about how to fight and jam the officials, and this helped that struggle succeed.

What we have summed up from all of this is that it is not enough to just "be based mainly in the plants and other work places." The IWOs must actively lead struggle going on there by uniting with it and bringing in and applying to it the lessons of the broader, political campaigns. The working class learns through its day to day struggle, not simply by going to meetings or demonstrations. By uniting with the day to day struggle of the class and applying to it the lessons of the campaigns we can advance the struggles in the shop, build them in a revolutionary way, and build the class consciousness and unity of the workers. Through its own practice and the work of communists the class will grasp the importance of the campaigns and take them up.

## Two Articles

Two articles in the second journal speak to this question, "Clarify Role of IWOs" and "Lessons of the May 1 Workers Movement." We believe the "Clarify" article is fundamentally correct, because it speaks to the error in the DP of separating the role of IWOs from the day to day struggle of the class. It correctly points out that the IWOs "must lead the struggles in the plant." The article makes three errors, though.

First, while correctly pointing out that the IWOs must lead the in shop struggle, the "Clarify" article doesn't say how. Is it that the IWOs are more militant forms of trade unions, or that they can bring in and apply the lessons of the class' campaigns to the day to day struggle? It's not just enough to lead the day to day struggle anymore than it's enough to be based in the plants. The IWOs must lead by fanning every spark, building every struggle and building off of it to build new struggles. "And through the course of this to fan every spark of consciousness, to identify and isolate the bourgeoisie and its agents, and unite all struggles against this enemy." (DP, p.30)

Second, the "Clarify" article tends to liquidate the role of caucuses, the "xyz committees." Our workers organization is a multi-issue caucus, one that "relies on the rank and file, and [mobilizes] it to fight around its own grievances in the plant and union and to link up with struggles outside the plant." (DP, p.30) At first we didn't grasp what the concrete conditions were, what the level of struggle was and what the level of understanding of the workers who were coming forward was. We also didn't correctly understand what an IWO was. We want to build the political campaigns, but we divided them from the day to day struggle of the workers. We also thought that only an IWO could "single spark" these campaigns. We put all this together and said we had an IWO, one with a core of workers who were interested in, though not actively involved in, other struggles outside the plant.

The core of the IWOs is not a group of "interested workers," since most workers we talked to were interested in the campaigns. This core must be workers who "through their experience in struggle and the leadership of communists...have developed a basic understanding of the nature of the enemy and the class struggle against this enemy." (p.31) Thinking we had this core led us to call unity nights to build the Fight Police Repression campaign. No one came, because the importance of this campaign hadn't been brought to the workers and their struggle.

This error of voluntarism (wishing an IWO into being) on our part is what can come out of the "Clarify" article. If you need a workers group, make it an IWO, even if the objective conditions aren't there, because caucuses can only be short-lived, single-issue groups. In fact, our practice has shown that both IWOs and caucuses can be multi-issue, can apply the single spark method to struggles inside and outside the plant, and can and must lead the day to day struggle of the workers. We see the main difference between the two groups is whether there is a core of workers who have "a basic understanding of the nature of the enemy and the class struggle against this enemy."

## What Is An Advanced Worker?

Third, the "Clarify" article has an incorrect line on what an advanced worker is. The article says that IWOs must be open ended in order "to involve workers who come forward just to fight around any one issue as well as advanced workers." What are advanced workers but workers who come forward in the fight, whether around one issue or many? We believe the "Clarify" article runs counter to the organization's correct line on advanced workers: "To us, the advanced worker is one who has the respect of his fellow workers, to whom they come when they are in trouble and need to discuss their problems, whom they rally around when they face a collective problem and who provides leadership in struggle." (RP 6, p.53)

The point is not to quibble over definitions, but to

## Four...

Continued from page 13

see that workers are advanced in their relationship to their fellow workers and their day to day struggle. It is on the basis of this struggle that advanced workers come forward. To fail to see this is to fail to see the importance of the day to day struggle to the class, how it is this struggle that we must strive to unite with and lead, and unite especially with those workers taking a leading role in that struggle.

We believe that the "Lessons of the May 1 Workers Movement" is fundamentally incorrect, because it doesn't see bringing the campaigns to the day to day struggle and that this is how the IWO leads that struggle. It talks about bringing workers out of the shop to demonstrations, but not how the lessons of those struggles were brought back into the shop and applied to advance struggle going on there.

To sum up: The working class learns through its day to day struggle, and the organizations of the working class must serve this struggle. IWOs must unite with and lead the struggles in the shops in a revolutionary way, bringing in and applying to it the lessons of the broader political campaigns, and in the course of this winning workers to take these campaigns up as their own. In this way they can help build the struggle, class consciousness and revolutionary unity of the class and its leading role in the UF, and through the work of communists many of the most advanced among them will develop into communists and join the party. ■

## Five

In our area some comrades have been summing up our work and struggling over the role of the IWOs and their relationship to the shop caucuses and shop struggles. Through this struggle we decided we did not have the basis to build a citywide IWO at this time. And we feel that the formulation of the DP on IWOs and caucuses has some important weaknesses—it builds a wall between the caucuses and IWOs by pitting them against each other, with IWOs on a "higher political level"—"Directed squarely at the ruling class." And the shop caucuses on a lower level, dealing with the day to day struggle against exploitation and oppression in the shop.

The M1WM sum-up in Journal No. 2 basically unites with the same line. The article, "Clarify the Role of the IWOs" puts forward correctly that "the struggle of the working class around shop issues and around broader campaigns must be linked both politically and organizationally." The line of basing the IWOs on the "broad campaigns" *instead of* the shop struggles will tend to create a small band of revolutionaries, ready to fight on all fronts, but isolated from the masses of workers.

In one shop comrades have been leading a caucus for several years. The caucus has a history of struggle in the shop around contracts, layoffs, firings, discrimination and against union hacks, including putting up candidates for union office. And from the *beginning* workers who are the core of the caucus have become involved in other, broader struggles, including IWD, May Day, Farah, TTBO, etc. And these broader campaigns were a part of the regular work of the caucus in the meetings, newsletter, etc.

As the DP correctly puts it, the size and activity of this type of organization ebbs and flows, depending on the struggles being fought and the work of comrades. A meeting in an ebb might be 6-8 workers, while an in-shop meeting during a shop struggle might be 30 or more. But the core, the members who are solid both in ebbs and flows, are advanced workers who see that *the fight in their shop is part of the overall class struggle against the bourgeoisie*. They're fighters in the shop as well as linking up with other struggles. These workers and this caucus would fit the description of IWO in the DP—not a politically lower or less permanent form of organization.

As we built for May Day this year, we also took up the question of building a citywide IWO. Although we decided not to go ahead with it at this time, we did learn some things which should help us lay the basis for a solid IWO in the future. Basically we started off seeing the citywide IWO as being the place for the revolutionary-minded workers to come together and lead the broader political or revolutionary struggles of the working class. Essentially for us at this time this meant uniting with the core of UWOC, the committee to fight police repression, and a handful of workers from the shops, the most advanced workers in one organization. The basis of this IWO was a high level of consciousness, not a fighting program, which is also the emphasis given in the DP. Its program, as far as it was developed, was seen as being around police repression, uniting with a current strike, the fight against the ENA, etc.

What we came to understand through the discussion

and struggle around May Day and IWOs was that while we were able to unite a group of workers and build a successful May Day demo, the May Day committee which was seen as an embryo of the citywide IWO actually tended to be isolated from the working class rather than rooted in it. Many workers who came to a build-up demo against the ENA and a dinner did not take May Day out to their fellow workers, and some didn't come to May Day themselves. While there were contingents from some shops at May Day, we had not been concentrating on these workers as the base of the IWO, and some shops had a poor showing at May Day. A number of shop speakers came shakey and cancelled out, so the day to day struggles were hardly in the program at all. We had a tendency to see the "advanced" as those who were ready to *leave the shop* to be on a committee of one sort or another. While many workers will come forward in the struggle against police repression, to build May Day, and in UWOC and in other such struggles, as well as in the shop struggles, and in our work many have, our job is to unite with these and the advanced workers in the shop to lead the masses, and not rip them away from the masses.

As the DP correctly points out, "The present struggle of the American workers is primarily against individual employers (or employers' associations in various industries) around wages and benefits, working conditions, against speed-up and lay-offs, against discrimination." But the DP also states that "While these organizations [IWOs] must be based mainly in the plants and work places, their overall role is to apply the 'single spark' method to take up every major struggle, of all sections of the people, against the ruling class, mobilize masses of workers in these struggles and develop them into campaigns of the working class." While this is not clear, it seems to pose a contradiction between the "main base" of the IWOs and the "overall role" of applying the single spark method. In order to really be based in the shops, the IWOs must go into, and lead the main struggle of the working class at this time as summed up in the DP, and develop the day to day struggle in the shop as part of the overall class struggle against the bourgeoisie, *along with* other struggles such as against police repression, deportations, unemployment, cutbacks, etc.

We had developed a tendency to downplay the day to day struggles in the shop, "rate" the "broad campaigns" above them. This showed up in the amount of attention the organization gave these struggles, the relatively low priority given these struggles in the workers paper, and our initial line on the IWOs. Because of this tendency, we do not now have the basis for creating a solid IWO.

The M1WM report in the second journal seems to share some of our incorrect line and that in the DP on the IWOs. The sum up states that "In applying the 'single spark method' it is important for communists and active workers to take the main political lessons of key struggles *back into* the shops and apply these lessons to the struggles developing there." This is certainly true. But communists and advanced workers must also bring out the political lessons of the struggles in the shops, as the DP sums up in "The working class learns through its day to day struggle." It is wrong to separate these tasks politically or organizationally. The IWOs must do both. It is more than a question of the IWOs linking up more closely with shop organizations. As the "Clarify" article puts it, "the various industrial 'sectors' of the IWO (will) be firmly rooted in, and leading the day to day struggles in the plant." ■

# On Other Aspects of Building The Workers Movement

## One

"One of the most basic principles of this revolutionary science is that the masses are the makers of history and that correct ideas arise from and in turn serve the struggle of the masses of people. The masses, in their millions, in their daily experiences in class struggle, in production and in scientific experimentation of all kinds, amass great but scattered and unsystematic knowledge. Understanding this, the party of the working class, in leading the class, applies the mass line. It takes these scattered and partial experiences and ideas, and by applying the science of revolution, sums them up, concentrates what is correct, what corresponds to the development of society and will move the class struggle ahead. The party returns these concentrated ideas to the masses and they become a tremendous material force as the masses take them up as their own and use them to transform the world through class struggle." (DP, pp.16-17)

In summing up our work in an unorganized industry, and in light of a particular discussion on the orientation of the party, we feel some basic errors in applying the mass line have been holding back our work. "But lying at the foundation of all these deviations, and the continuing struggle against them, has been the basic question of class stand and orientation—the question of grasping that the working class is the only truly revolutionary class..." (latest document, p.5)

Our error came out particularly sharp when cadre kept raising the question of "What are we going to tell the workers to do?" An example is when we were contacted by workers in a plant we had leafleted where we had no cadre, or any contacts working. We had written a good agitational leaflet condemning an explosion which had happened there. Our first (and only) response when the workers contacted us was to run to leadership asking what we should tell the workers to do! Here we had done no investigation, had never met with these workers, and our only concern was to "concoct some fashionable means to help the workers."

This uncovered how idealist our thinking was. We had the answers and could figure out a plan without concrete investigation. In the course of our discussion around party orientation we tried to justify running to leadership with the question "what do we tell the workers to do?" We said it was right to seek help from leadership's experience, that they should know what's going on, and that we should have collective discussion on what we should do. But the real question came down to *on what basis* do we seek help and collective decisions? On the material basis of what the workers are *already* doing, and what they want to do, and on that basis only will we know what we can do to *further* the struggle, bring light into it, and fan the flames. We must start from reality, not what we *want* reality to be. In essence we were saying that *we*, the communists, are the heroes, the true makers of history, and without us nothing moves, including mass struggle. And even further, we were saying that the only activity of any significance is what we initiate and lead. We hadn't grasped that the workers are already struggling and that our work must be based on this struggle.

### Another Example

Another example of this error came up at another plant where workers were struggling around the company's attempts to screw them out of unemployment benefits during a shutdown. Spontaneous struggles were erupting against foremen, the workers were ready to fight the layoffs. What was our idea? We wanted to hold a demonstration at the plant gates—until we realized that it would only be a handful of us with picket signs with the workers inside the plant wondering what was going on!

What were the concrete conditions? The workers had begun to struggle *in* the plant against the company's attacks. We at first wanted to take them *out* of the plant where they were struggling face to face with the bosses. Because the workers would have to take off

work, and would be immediately identified if a few of them did join our picket line, they would probably be fired. Most fundamentally, the demonstration wouldn't have come out of the struggle of the plant because our work wasn't very developed at all, very few workers knew who we were or what we were about. What it came down to was we hoped to show them we were fighting for their interests—to build our committee, *not* the workers' struggle.

There were massive layoffs in our industry. When we went down to the unemployment office we found ourselves laying our "rap" on workers about the system. We seldom really listened to the workers. We felt we had everything to tell them and they had nothing to tell us. We became discouraged when the masses didn't flock to us (although we *did* have a lot of contacts who we lost because of reasons stated above), and some of us even said the workers *didn't want* to do anything. What we should have said was the workers didn't want to be removed from the day to day struggle and come to our meetings where what we mostly did was tell them about ourselves and struggle with them to agree with our ideology.

It happened again recently when we went to talk to a worker who called off our leaflet. This older worker had many rich experiences with unions and a real hatred of the bosses. Instead of uniting with him on the basis of his strengths and using them to overcome his weakness, using his own experience to draw the lessons, we got into a rap of "I know what you're saying but we don't agree." We tried to change 60 years of thinking in half an hour—not grasping that workers learn through their day to day struggle. And while he is just the kind of person we want to unite with, his parting remark was "I'm sorry to disappoint you." He felt he had nothing in common with our fight and he wasn't who we were looking for!

### "Beginning To Grasp"

We are beginning to grasp that we must learn from the masses and "investigate broadly," that ML is the science of the masses and their struggle, that the masses are the true makers of history and are struggling daily "even if it is only angry outbursts or writing on the wall." As the latest document says on p.18, "If we fail to recognize that in the daily struggles of the workers lies the potential for the revolutionary movement of the working class, then we will fail to develop this potential into a reality. If we do not actively and militantly lead these battles then there is no way we can lead the class to win the whole war."

Where we have correctly applied the mass line, we have brought workers forward and developed the struggle. We had a cafeteria boycott against rising prices which mobilized an entire plant, work slowdowns during layoffs. We had a demonstration for "jobs or income—no layoffs" that workers came to, risking their jobs, off a leaflet alone because it summed up concrete conditions and real struggles the workers were already waging. We joined up with a couple of workers' struggles around wages and harassment at one plant and developed it into an entire department walking out and demanding a meeting with a big-wig.

"Our basic guideline must be the principle set down by Lenin: 'The party's activity must consist in promoting the working class struggle. The party's task is not to concoct some fashionable means of helping the workers, but to join up with the workers' movement, to bring light into it, to assist the workers in the struggle they themselves have already begun to wage.'" (latest document, p.17)

We know we have a ways to go and are still in the process of summing up our work, especially in regard to bringing light into the workers' struggle. But we have grasped that making errors around the fundamental principle of *assisting* the workers in their day to day struggle will make it impossible to bring light to these struggles and develop them in a revolutionary direction. ■

## Two

The DP correctly lays out that the greatest part of working class struggles are in the shop around day to day demands, that it is sectarian and "left" if we underestimated the importance of these struggles in the process of raising the understanding of the class.

The bourgeoisie surrounds the working class with its propaganda of defeatism and individualism, with its philosophy of "you can't beat city hall." It divides the workers along national, cultural and sex lines. It uses the union bureaucracy and the tricks they have become adept at to divide the workers.

**IT IS NOT ENOUGH FOR COMMUNISTS TO BE BOLD IN TAKING UP THE STRUGGLE; WE MUST LEAD THE WORKERS IN WINNING.**

A strike vote comes up...Is there any question that communists should favor the strike? Isn't it only the company boot lickers and scabs that would oppose such militant action?

Such reasoning is not the way a Marxist looks on any workers struggle. We must weigh the possibility of winning against the risks and consequences of losing. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the company and the strengths and weaknesses of the workers? When we decide to take up an issue, for example a strike, *we must pay attention to every detail*. What is the main thrust...how to organize it. Can we use the companies' competition to weaken the company, who are our allies, how do we rally other union and working class support?

Every striker must be mobilized and given specific tasks. Committees to aid strikers to get food stamps, to fight for unemployment insurance. Publicity committees to reach the rest of the class and the public and to tie up the company products. Attention must be paid to strikers with large families and with debts—to aid them in getting over the hard times. The families of the strikers must be reached; auxiliaries organized. Legal assistance in event of arrests. We must pay attention to EVERY worker. Solidify the leadership around a militant course of action; isolate the company hangers on, guard against the maneuvers of the hacks... No detail is too small. Our party must show leadership in all phases of the struggle.

The importance of WINNING is that it is the living example of the strength of the working class, the power of unity and organization; it cuts through the defeatism of capitalist propaganda and builds the independent organization of the class and exposes the role of the hacks. There are, of course, lessons from defeats as well as victories and these must be summed up....but the purpose of summing them up is to insure against them in the future.

It is in exercising leadership and winning in "small" day to day struggles that will attract the best leaders of the working class and educate the whole class in the tactics of struggle and convince the workers of the possibility of winning not only the day to day struggles but the broad political struggles as well, and train our cadre and the class for the final revolutionary struggle ahead. ■

# Three

The DP and latest document are correct in focusing on the key areas the party must take up. But in the parts on unions—the struggle to put them back into the hands of the workers and to organize the unorganized—one thing is left out: the struggle to keep unions.

For example, in the construction industry contractors have increasingly been signing with non-union labor and even threatened to break a major carpenters strike with non-union labor. Other strikes or contract negotiations have put the union's existence on the line—in the newspaper industry threats to shut down the plant and move only 50 miles away to a non-union area.

The party should take up this struggle not to simply maintain the democratic right to have unions, but because the working class needs unions as a defense against the bosses, and losing them strips away gains workers have made. The attack on the unions is an attack on the growing struggle of the working class. ■

# Four

The section of the DP on trade unions inadequately characterizes the role of lower level union leadership. Add the following to the programme, p.31, top right-hand column before the first full paragraph. That is, following the sentence that ends with "this is the policy of the proletariat and its party in the unions."

"The union 'hacks' at the local level, local presidents and business agents, are members of the petty bourgeoisie. As such they will vacillate between uniting with the working class and compromising with the bourgeoisie or even siding with it against the proletariat. Today many of the union officials even at the local level are sellouts. Because of their close relationship to the workers they must to some degree be responsive to their needs and demands or else be out of office. This is the basis for winning them over. But because of their class position and because of pressure from labor traitors at the top, it will not be a simple one shot struggle to win them to stand with the working class. For the immediate time ahead, this will be a process of jamming them again and again to represent the true interests of the proletariat. Because of the vacillating nature of the petty bourgeoisie, some will side with the bourgeoisie. These traitors like those at the top must be exposed, rolled over, and kicked out of office." ■

# Five

What is the basis of unity between employed and unemployed workers? To say, as the article "Focusing Struggle in UWOC Work" does in Journal No. 2, that our unity is in raising the same demand is to fail to bring light into the struggles the working class is waging against layoffs, plant shutdowns, short work weeks, etc., and for jobs, and income for those out of work, etc. It says we can't be united as a class against the same imperialist enemy, that we can't "develop the workers' movement into a struggle on all fronts against the ruling class, developing fighters on one front into fighters on all fronts." (latest document)

In summing up our work uniting employed and unemployed and building an Employed/Unemployed Committee (EUC) at our plant, we've come to see the importance of taking a correct line on this. We, too, saw that the basis for uniting workers in the shop with unemployed workers in UWOC was that we had the same demand. Only the demand was for unemployment checks on time. UWOC in our area had been focusing struggle around getting the checks out on time, and out shop was having periodic plant shutdowns, not to mention layoffs, to cut down on their inventory. When workers didn't get their unemployment checks after the shutdowns, there was considerable spontaneous struggle around this—going to the union, personnel, and the compensation offices to demand the checks.

We correctly linked up with this struggle and tried to lead it forward and build organization in the course of this, but our errors caused many setbacks. One of those errors was in saying to the workers that our unity with unemployed workers was just that they too were fighting for their checks. We didn't unfold around the struggle the real unity between employed and unemployed, that we're members of the same class being oppressed and exploited by the same enemy.

At one joint meeting of workers from UWOC and the EUC, the workers themselves in informal discussion before the meeting began, spoke of this unity, the ways the capitalists try to divide us, the speedup coming right along with the layoffs, and the need to unite to fight all of these attacks. But as soon as the "official" meeting began that conversation was dropped and all we talked about was wanting our checks and how to build the picket line we were calling for. We substituted our own backward ideas for the correct ideas the workers were putting forward. Instead of "Employed/Unemployed—Same Crisis, Same Fight," we were saying "Employed/Unemployed—Same Demand, Same Fight."

## Worker Fired

In the course of this struggle an active fighter in the caucus and in the struggle for the checks was fired. When workers from UWOC came out to the picket line at the plant as part of the fight to get him reinstated, we weren't able to (didn't) bring out to the workers in the plant why they were there, since our only unity was in fighting for unemployment checks. In fact, the workers in UWOC understood better than we did that the unity of employed and unemployed workers is that we're one class fighting the same enemy, no matter how he attacks us.

We also narrowed the fight to one for money, never mind the layoffs and plant shutdowns. We did put out the slogan "Jobs or Income—40 hours work or 40 hours pay," but what the hell does that mean? We never built struggle around concrete demands like "Stop the Layoffs," "Defend Every Job," "No Short Work Weeks," or "No Plant Shutdowns." In fact, what we came down to saying is you can't really fight these things, so we might as well settle for some money while we're laid off.

One petition we circulated at work said, "We, the overworked, underpaid, and mistreated workers at [Plant A] are FIGHTING MAD! At Christmas we were forced on lay-off by the company and still many of us have not got our unemployment checks for it! Now, the bloodsuckers at [Plant A] have laid us off again. Brothers and sisters, at [Plant A], will we let this go on? Hell no! We demand: 40 hours work or 40 hours pay; Cut the red tape, we want our checks and we want them on time; and hire adequate staff, more unemployment compensation clerks." We never really questioned their right to lay us off any time they need to.

Or how about this from one of our leaflets: "[Plant A] is speeding up the work, doubling rates, working us overtime and getting ready for another big layoff—and we'll just be waiting months again for those compensation checks, just like millions of unemployed workers are now." We better fight for our checks since we can't avoid being laid off. Also,

"We're not interested in fighting each other for jobs. We're interesting in uniting employed and unemployed workers to fight together for our checks on time!" Not only are we not interested in fighting each other for jobs, but we're not interested in fighting the capitalists for jobs, either.

As Article Two, under "Other Aspects" in Journal No. 3 puts it, "In focusing totally on benefits we missed opportunities to expose the system. In particular, by not fighting the layoffs we missed opportunities to point the struggle directly at the companies. We didn't clearly raise the point that the capitalists have no right to lay us off. We have a right to jobs, there is plenty that needs doing and what we workers want is a job! Not a handout. There's something wrong with a system that can't provide jobs."

## Purpose of Organization

Finally, the latest document is correct when it says, "Organization must serve the purpose of developing struggle," and "...these committees are not important as an end in themselves, but as part of building the fight against layoffs and the unity of employed and unemployed workers. It is with this understanding that we must take up the building of these committees. And even where it is not immediately possible to force the union heads to make them officially part of the union, while keeping control in the hands of the rank and file, we should unite rank and file workers into committees and other forms of organization to carry forward the fight for jobs, in unity with the unemployed and with UWOC in particular."

We didn't grasp this initially. We took around petitions calling for the formation of an EUC "in our union to fight against layoffs and for a living income, paid on time, for *all* periods of unemployment." The response was favorable, so we raised the demand in our next union meeting. Of course, the hacks first claimed "no quorum," and then adjourned the meeting, but the workers responded enthusiastically to the proposal, so we called a meeting to form the committee. Only one worker came, so we called another meeting, and nobody came to that one. Well, clearly, calling meetings wasn't the way to go. We had to build the struggle going on first, and in the course of that unfold the need for organization and the need to force the union to take this up. Part of "bringing light" into the struggle is bringing in the need for organization. So we began building the fight for unemployment checks.

A few workers showed some interest in the EUC, but we still didn't grasp that we had to involve the masses of workers in struggle, and build the EUC in the course of this. We wrote an article in our caucus newsletter that ended like this, "The Employed/Unemployed Committee is collecting names and social security numbers of [Plant A] workers, whether they're working or on layoff, who are still missing their checks. We'll be in the X before work for people to sign up and talk with us. Bring your social security number and let's fight for our money! We will go to the main unemployment office downtown and demand that the checks be sent now!" The point is, the EUC, like UWOC, "cannot be a 'social service' organization, bogged down in endless legal battles over grievances. Neither can it be a small propaganda sect 'enlightening the unemployed.'"

It is crucial that the EUCs mobilize the broadest masses of workers in struggle against layoffs, shutdowns, etc. and for jobs, and income when there are no jobs, for those on layoff. Jobs or Income is the demand of the class arising from the conditions of the unemployed, and that's why the EUCs raise it and fight for it, not because it's the correct demand to raise against layoffs. The EUCs must build the unity of employed and unemployed, and force the unions to support this struggle. Recently our union officials have begun to spread their poison of "Bring Our Jobs Back" from overseas, pointing to "foreign" workers as the enemy.

Plant-wide and industry-wide workers organizations, where they exist, must play a leading role in these EUCs, linking up the fight against layoffs with the other struggles the class is waging, and pointing these struggles against the real enemy. And, as the latest document states, "The development of area-wide workers organizations will also help to strengthen the unity of employed and unemployed workers."

The EUC should not be a section of the areawide IWO, because it doesn't take up all the struggles of the class, but instead focuses on the fight against layoffs in a particular plant or industry at the level of the trade unions. However, especially when there is no plant or industry-wide workers organization, active fighters who come forward in the EUC should be encouraged to join the areawide IWO, and, together with communists in the EUC, work to link the EUC with other struggles of the class, and especially with UWOC. ■

# Six

In the course of struggling for the new party, our collective, which is concentrated in basic industry in a major center of production, has taken up how we have brought the local police repression campaign to the working class. We are convinced that much of our work in this campaign was marked by serious right errors which came out chiefly in the form of Bundism. These errors came from an incorrect class orientation. And we feel that similar errors were made in Article "Two" of the last journal on merging the national and class struggles.

What do these comrades who wrote "Two" say exactly? The main point is summarized: "And more importantly, it was by building our campaign as part of the fight against national oppression that we were able to make our most important breakthroughs in building the revolutionary movement. This should be reflected more fully in the programme."

This is a fundamentally incorrect and Bundist line. Yes, one way that national oppression comes down is through police repression and terror in the communities of the oppressed nationalities. And if our point of view is that of the oppressed nationalities our line would be that the struggle against police repression should be taken up as part of the struggle against national oppression, as the writers of "Two" are saying.

But if our point of view is that of the working class, our line would be that of the DP: "They [the bourgeoisie] maintain a state of police terror in the ghettos of the oppressed nationalities and carry out repression in all working class communities... This repressive apparatus [the state] is mainly directed against the proletariat and its party, but also enforces the rule of the bourgeoisie over all the classes and groups in society."

To the extent that national oppression is a factor (and it is NOT in almost every case, as "Two" says), we of course take it up from two sides, uniting both the oppressed nationalities and the multinational working class to fight this oppression. But first and foremost, the way we take the police repression campaigns to the working class is to show how these attacks are part of an overall campaign of repression and terror on the *working class* in order to maintain and intensify our exploitation and keep us from fighting back against it. And in the future we will see increasing examples of divide and rule tactics by the bourgeoisie, to try and separate the working class from its class conscious leadership.

## "Narrow-Mindedness"

Then "Two" falls into incredible depths of narrow-mindedness: "Since the youth killed was not a worker, the campaign provided the *opportunity* [our emphasis] to show how as a class we must oppose attacks on Black people as a whole." What if we took up a campaign around a *white* youth who was a worker?

Heavens forbid! Just think of all the lessons we couldn't show from this example! We couldn't show how police repression hits other classes and strata besides the working class. We couldn't show how police repression comes down on "Black people as a whole," let alone the other oppressed national minorities. All we'd be left with is that most "narrow" of lessons that police repression comes down on the working class "as a whole" and it takes up the fight against it in its *own* interests. These are the conclusions that the line and outlook of "Two" would lead us to.

Well we disagree. First, we don't think we have to make a campaign out of a wife-beating to "show" the working class that we must stand for the equality of women. Second, we don't think that the main emphasis of these campaigns against police repression should be "to show how as a class we must oppose attacks on Black people as a whole." This is a Bundist line, as pointed out above, and completely misunderstands the role of the proletariat in the united front. The working class doesn't run around like missionaries taking up the struggles of other classes and strata. It fights for itself as a class, and takes up struggles only insofar as they move the struggle of the working class forward.

"Two" might argue that taking up the struggle of "Black people as a whole" isn't taking up the struggle of other classes and strata because the overwhelming majority of Black people are workers. We would argue that in the course of taking up police repression as an attack on the *class*, we unfold from there the multinational character of the class, the nature of national oppression, and then seek to unite

the broad masses of people in the struggle against this attack because it doesn't only come down on the working class, but the masses of people generally.

## Another Criticism

Another criticism we have of "Two" was their statement in the fourth paragraph: "...our line on the need for multinational unity and that the working class must and will take up and *eventually lead* [our emphasis] the fight against police repression, made real headway among the Black people we work with when they saw concretely... that the working class is taking up the fight." And a little later: "The *ultimate aim* of our work in fighting police repression is to build the revolutionary movement..."

Once again the comrades' incorrect orientation and Bundist line have turned things on their heads. What is the task of communists anyway? It is certainly not to base ourselves among any particular nationality, or any other class or strata, in order to make headway with them by showing how the working class is taking up their struggle ("they're such good people, those workers!"). Our task is to base ourselves among the working class, take up the struggle from that point of view, and in the course of that win allies among the oppressed nationalities, national minorities, and masses of people generally. This "eventually lead" stuff doesn't make it. With a correct line and orientation the working class *will* be leading the struggle. With an incorrect line and orientation the working class will never lead.

Second, the "ultimate aim" of our work is to overthrow the bourgeoisie, build socialism, and move on to communism. The immediate aim of our work is to build the police repression campaign as part of building the struggle, class consciousness, and revolutionary unity of the working class and its leadership in the united front. This isn't being picky. Not to understand this leads to rightism in our work, as it has with these comrades.

We feel that in our local police repression campaign problems of orientation and political line led to important setbacks in our overall work. The problem of orientation—not grasping that the working class is the only truly revolutionary class and that we must base ourselves at the point of production—led to pulling ourselves out of the plants and into the communities. Many comrades spent dozens of hours a week canvassing these communities, ringing doorbells, going into small shops and bars, leafleting, postering, etc. During this period of time we were much less able to stay on top of the day to day struggles going on in the shops, and therefore much less able to build the campaign at the point of production as part of the overall struggle.

What communities did we go out to? Our city is a very segregated one—there are very few communities that you could call multinational. In the name of going out to the working class, we found ourselves concentrating almost exclusively in Black and Latino communities. So the "communities line," which flowed from a basic problem of orientation, served to cover a Bundist line—that the struggle against police repression should be taken up as part of the struggle against national oppression.

Why didn't we go out to white working class communities? In incorrectly thinking that the main tendency in our work was liquidating the national question, we were unable to recognize and root out some of the reactionary ideas we had, like the line in "Two" which says "that almost all cases of police repression... have objectively also been examples of national oppression." In other words, white workers don't face police repression. We found out that this line doesn't cut much ice with white workers.

## White Workers Fighting Back

In spite of our line, we've found out recently that white workers do face police repression and have been fighting back against it. In one incident recently a group of 50-75 white youths mercilessly beat down a pair of cops that were harassing them. In another incident 500 people threw rocks and bottles and chased a cop from the scene of a police murder—and if he hadn't been shooting as he ran away, he might have been a casualty of white workers struggling against police repression. We also learned about a woman who recently set up a committee to stop police brutality—in an all white working class community.

Taking the struggle out of the plants and into the communities of the oppressed nationalities was the clearest example of a Bundist line in our work. But there are others. In taking the campaign up in the shops we would encourage Black and Latino workers who were interested to go back into their communities (with us) and build unity nights (neighborhood meetings to build support for the campaign). They were also encouraged to join the workers committee against police repression.

For white workers who were interested, though,

the only thing they could do would be to join the committee. This was our version of taking up the struggle against national oppression from two sides. What we hardly did at all was to rely on these workers to build this struggle in the shops by linking it up with and unfolding it around the day to day struggles workers were engaging in.

What this reflected in part was a problem we've had of not thinking in terms of the majority, of how to move the overall struggle of the working class forward. We'd be thinking of how to move this particular campaign forward by building for unity nights, demonstrations, dinners, meetings, etc., and didn't understand that it had to be based on and unfolded around all the struggles the working class is waging, in order to move *all* these struggles forward.

Or we'd be thinking of how to move a particular worker forward in the campaign by having long, intense ideological discussions separate from the actual struggle, not understanding that only in the course of the actual struggle against the ruling class can the masses really take up and grasp these ideas. Or we'd be thinking of how to move the struggle of the oppressed nationalities and national minorities forward, not understanding that that could be done only by basing ourselves in the working class and moving *its* struggle forward. In general we found that the error of Bundism and incorrect orientation are closely linked together.

## Some Victories

Certain victories have been won in the course of this campaign. A young Black worker shot in the back by cops in the course of a spontaneous struggle in his community against police harassment, and who was then framed on trumped up charges, was acquitted because of mass demonstrations, picket lines, and turnouts at the trial.

A few workers and others have moved forward as a result of their work in the campaign. Some gains have been made against capital and its state in restricting its ability to carry out this repression and terror against the masses of people in this city. And we have begun to learn some important lessons around this area of work in particular, and how it relates to other campaigns and struggles. But overall we feel our errors have meant a setback for our work in the working class, precisely because we were pulled away from the multinational proletariat and what must be the center of gravity of the party's work—the day to day struggles of workers around wages, speedup, jobs, etc.

We fully unite with the line of the DP and latest document on the question of police repression. And we unite with the latest document when it says, "While communists in the recent past have waged considerable struggle against this tendency [tailing after bourgeois nationalism]—and at the same time have continued to struggle against white chauvinism—this struggle has only begun to get to the roots of this deviation."

We hope that this contribution to the journal will help in the struggle against this deviation in order to form the party on the firmest foundation possible in the working class. ■

# Seven

Page 34 of the DP states: "...The party wages the most consistent and thorough struggle, among the masses and in its own ranks, against the bourgeoisie's ideological props of *white chauvinism* (in particular the poisonous idea that white Americans are superior to other nationalities who are 'the cause of the problems,' and that white workers should unite with the imperialists to suppress them) and *narrow nationalism* (in particular the poisonous idea that oppressed nationalities should be concerned only with the advancement of their own nationality and should fight people of other nationalities, especially white workers, for a bigger 'piece of the pie.')

On p.33 of the DP, it states: "There is nothing the bourgeoisie won't stoop to, no lie too low or vicious, in its desperate attempt to maintain its exploiting rule. 'Blacks have all the jobs, and the Jews have all the money'..."

Practice in the class struggle has shown that these ruling class "divide and conquer" schemes do not merely take place in the realm of ideas, such as their propaganda and culture, but in fact often take the form of a vicious carrot and stick (the carrot for looking, the stick for feeling) routine: now granting some concessions to whites while tightening repression against Blacks; now building up some Black bourgeois forces while blaming them and the Black workers for what it rips off from white workers, etc. This rearranging of the crumbs represents the ruling

Continued on page 18

# Seven...

Continued from page 17

class' main efforts (especially as the principal contradiction between the ruling class and the whole working class becomes ever sharper) to divide the class while they attack, and they rely on this more than on ideas of "superiority," etc.

Sharp examples are the games played with the poverty programs following the Black rebellions starting in the late '60s: token benefits granted to Black communities while adjacent communities with similar conditions of oppression received nothing; elaborate "quota" and "affirmative action" programs that did almost nothing to improve the position of the workers of oppressed nationalities, while providing employers with the excuse to offer white workers they didn't hire: "we have to hire Blacks (or Puerto Ricans, or women) this week—so sorry," when the fact is no jobs exist. And, of course, the recent examples of busing make the schemes of the ruling class clearer than ever: rob the class and tell the workers of each nationality that the hand in their pocket (or closing the school door) belongs to the workers and petty bourgeoisie of the other nationalities.

An example of this type of maneuver by the ruling class was the government-ordered seniority changes in the steel industry culminating in the infamous "consent decree." In the struggle against discrimination in the industry and our plant, against these rulings, and against the Bundist tendencies within the ranks of the communists that came out around this struggle, we were able to learn some important lessons on how to build the struggle against national oppression "from two sides" and unite the workers in building the struggle against the ruling class.

## History of National Oppression

One of the few big mills that had employed large numbers of Black workers prior even to World War 2, our plant has a history of blatant national oppression. The worst departments (in both conditions and pay) were all or almost all Black. Skilled and high paying units were generally all white. (In earlier days, immigrants of certain nationalities also suffered discrimination.) Locker rooms and bathrooms were separate (in some cases up to 5-6 years ago!) and many departments found Black and white workers working side by side but in separate "units" with wide pay discrepancies. All of this was reinforced by the unit seniority system (you lose seniority if you transfer to a better unit) and the active cooperation of the union officials.

Of course there was a fierce struggle against this. "Steel and Shipyard Workers for Equality" (SWFE) was formed in the heat of the growing civil rights movement. While many court suits were filed, and appeals made to politicians, this movement was based in the masses of Black workers and was characterized by struggle: demonstrations, mass militant rallies and meetings, some walkouts, etc. The leadership of this group, however, emerged as thorough careerists, deserting the mass struggle and accepting various bureaucratic positions with the government, union and groups like CORE. They have linked up with local Black politicians and a few union hacks, and form the main social base for bourgeois nationalism and reformism in this struggle.

Overall, this movement represented great advances for all the workers. While the basic structure of national oppression still remains, concessions were won and consciousness was raised, about who the enemy is, who to rely on, that it is possible for the workers to fight back and win without the hacks taking it up, and about the need for Black and white workers to unite. While at first there were serious contradictions among the workers, like walkouts of mechanics when Blacks first joined the department, and walkouts over integration of the locker rooms, the growing trend has been unity. This is based in the fact that 1) the white and Black workers are working more closely, and therefore engaging directly in joint struggle, and 2) the militant struggles of the Black workers have inspired all the workers in seeing the potential strength the workers have in taking on the company.

In the face of all this, and the deteriorating position of the industry, the ruling class unleashed a couple of test "orders," on rearranging the seniority system. It was no coincidence that it was issued around the same time as the ENA (just as the "consent decree" came out at the same time as the 1974 contract). The order basically gave Black workers in predominantly Black departments special privileges to transfer to predominantly white departments, and use their company seniority (rather than the unit) to compete for jobs within that department/unit. Black workers who had already transferred from Black departments were

also issued special numbers and supposedly given the right to advance on the basis of plantwide seniority.

Initially, we summed this up as an attack on the struggle against discrimination, saying it didn't go far enough. The restrictions were so heavy that very few Black workers had much to gain by transferring, and even those who had already transferred were very limited. And all other forms of discrimination in the plant were untouched. We demanded full plant seniority, back money and other basic demands against discrimination. This was correct as far as it went, because the order did leave the basic structure untouched. No organization existed in the rank and file at the time, but we pushed this line in newspaper articles and in the departments. Many of the Black workers united with this line. Several hundred attended meetings of a hastily revived SWFE to find some way to go beyond the ruling and fight for real equality.

Where we came up shakey was in taking up the struggle among the white workers. The great majority of them took the line that company seniority was bad and threatened their jobs. Fist fights broke out in some mills. In struggling with them, we put forward the line that the fight against national oppression was in their class interests, and showed how the unit seniority system had actually divided workers, and kept down everyone in the plant. While some of the more backward said "Bullshit, there was no discrimination," most said, "O.K., I can agree these guys deserve a chance at a better job, and compensation for what the company has deprived them of. But it was the company that discriminated, not me—why should I have to pay, why should I give up my job?"

The Bundism we tended into around this was covered with a prettified veil of idealism—we knew better than to run a white-skin privilege line that the white workers *should* have to pay for "racism," but because we were unwilling to deal with the realities of an attack coming down on all the workers (it didn't fit in too well with "Black workers take the lead") we stuck our heads in the sand and said, "Don't worry, you won't get bumped, the order says so (the bourgeoisie's order!) Don't hassle fighting for your job, what we must fight for is simply stronger measures against discrimination."

Well, reality slapped the workers in the face, and jolted the communists awake. Cutbacks hit, and workers bumped and losing up to a hundred dollars a week behind the order. What really made us sit up and peer beyond our haze was that a good number of Black workers were also being bumped, sometimes by white workers.

On the basis of what was actually happening, we were able to sum up that a very serious aspect of the fight against the order must be the fight against all cases of the company using bumping to rip people off. We began to see that the main thrust of what the company was trying to pull was not concessions to the fight against discrimination, the problem with which was that they didn't go far enough. In fact, the concessions were practically non-existent, while the main thing happening was the company jockeying jobs around pretty much at will in order to create turmoil in the ranks of the workers—all at basically no extra cost, since almost no Black workers picked up on the "gift" of being able to transfer to a lower job in a white unit with no pay reduction.

Seniority is something the workers have fought long and hard for, basically to smash company favoritism and discrimination, and deprive brown nosers of promotions for services rendered. While we must fight for the most fair and non-discriminatory system (in this case, plantwide seniority) company attempts to undermine the seniority setup completely are an attack on the basic fighting strength of the workers. Faced with a no-strike deal, stagflation, and deteriorating conditions, as well as continuing discrimination, the workers needed this strength more than ever.

## Taking Up the Fight

Criticizing our earlier line for the petty bourgeois moralism that it was, we took up the fight against the way people were getting screwed by bumping. The program we began to push in literature, in union meetings and on the shop floor called for full plant seniority, with no pay losses due to bumping (differences to be paid by the company), back pay for those discriminated against equivalent to what they would have made in the better white units, and an end to all discrimination in job placement, testing, foreman harassment, etc. In doing this, and uniting with workers to fight for these demands, we came into conflict with a variety of opportunist forces, all of whom opposed merging the struggle against national oppression with the struggle of the working class.

On the one hand, some local union officials took up the fight against bumping in a loud but half-assed way. They not only wanted this struggle entirely within their control and acceptable bounds, they also wanted nothing about fighting discrimination hooked up with it. They attacked every effort of

the rank and file to get a voice in the order (and later the consent decree). Along with them there were some more isolated Triple O's who attacked the order in a more openly racist way, hiring a lawyer connected with the States Rights Party to sue against company seniority.

On the other side of the coin were the Black petty bourgeois forces and those allied with them in the union. They were able to rally up to 800 Black workers for meetings, where they put forward their plans for fighting the order through the courts. They cut out any possibility of rank and file action to fight for these demands. As for bumping, they came up with the line that we should fight against Black workers being bumped, but as for white workers, we should pass out jars of vaseline to them (to ease the ——— they would get). This line drew laughter not only from people like OL, but also from some of the Black workers. While the Black bureaucrats were the main ones pushing reactionary nationalism, our practice has born out that this deviation can become a serious problem among the Black workers as well.

Rather than predetermining which reactionary ideas are more dangerous and which not so, we must analyze the particular contradictions in each situation and struggle against *all* bourgeois ideology. For example, after the coke ovens walkout brought pay increases to the ovens, placing them above many other departments, it was as much of a struggle with the majority of the coke ovens workers (who are 90% Black) to win them to seeing the need to fight for company seniority (along with the demand to make the company, *not* the workers, pay), as it was to win over white workers who were afraid of Blacks taking their jobs.

## Some Gains

When some local officials took some steps toward mobilizing workers against bumping (at this point things in the mill were close to the boiling point with spontaneous walkouts threatened), we were able to make some gains in linking this with the struggle against discrimination. At the largest union meeting in recent years in one local, where the only thing talked about was fighting bumping, we put forward that *no* workers should be paying for the company's discrimination, including both those being bumped, and those still stuck in the rotten jobs. A rap which said we must unite these struggles in order to advance either, and pointing to the recent coke ovens walkout as an example of the way forward, drew enthusiastic applause from a large section of the overwhelmingly white crowd. The line we held to before would have painted these workers "racist" and prevented uniting with them.

To the extent that we took up this line, practice proved it to be correct. After the consent decree was signed we were able to unite a good number of Black and white workers in opposing it and demanding that a mass local meeting be held to unite the workers in fighting it. The paper of the organization in the plant received almost unanimous support for this program among the workers, even though confusions and divisions around the issue were still high.

When we took around a petition that demanded an end to the no-strike deal, the right to vote on contract, and opposed the consent decree, calling both for full plant seniority and an end to all discrimination, and no pay loss due to bumping, most workers were willing to sign. At first some of us were hesitant. A lot of white workers wouldn't go for the plant seniority, and this might prevent uniting with them against the ENA. In fact, although some people still said, "This could mean someone taking my job, I can't sign this," overall Black and white workers alike were more than willing to sign the petition.

The main limitations on success in advancing the class struggle around this line were our vacillations in mobilizing the masses around it. While we were able by some persistent struggle, and agitating widely in the mill, to force the bureaucrats to agree to call a special meeting on the consent decree (something they dreaded since it was certain to be huge, angry and directed at how to smash the decree rather than accommodate to it), we pulled the rug out from under the upsurge by sitting back and waiting for them to call it—which they never did. Also, while we worked some within SWFE (which was hard, since it doesn't do much), we never put forth boldly and clearly to the workers who came to their meetings what our plan of action should be. A lot of people agreed with the suggestions of the shop newsletter for mass demonstrations around our full list of demands, and agreed with the criticism of SWFE as tailing behind the courts, and dividing the workers, but at all the mass meetings the reformists held sway and no effective challenge was mounted.

Main Lessons: First, that we must firmly grasp that "It is the basic contradiction of capitalism and the class struggle that arises from it, between the working class and the capitalist class, that stands even more

Continued on page 19

## Seven...

Continued from page 18

prominently at the center of the stage in the United States today," if we want to understand any of the particular struggles that are now unfolding around this principal contradiction. To do otherwise, and fail to look at things from the standpoint of the proletariat as a class, can lead among other things to doing the bourgeoisie's work of dividing the class under the guise of "fighting racism."

In line with this, it is correct that the programme aims its fire at both white chauvinism and narrow nationalism as props of the ruling class, without setting up one or the other as less dangerous among the masses or communists. We also can see that "building the fight against national oppression as part of the overall

class struggle" and of "working at it from two sides" is the only way forward for both the national liberation struggles in this country and the overall class struggle. If we fail to build the struggle among the oppressed nationalities, or fail to mobilize the *whole class* around this struggle, or fall behind bourgeois nationalism, or separate it from the overall class struggle; in any of these cases we will be sabotaging the struggle rather than leading it forward.

We can also see that as the principal contradiction comes more and more sharply into focus, and the crisis deepens, the bourgeoisie will rely more and more on "crumb-shuffling" divide and conquer schemes to pit the workers of the oppressed nationalities against each other. While the freedom of the pigs to offer selected handouts is rapidly decreasing, schemes like the consent decree and our local school plan (which involved transfers but no state-financed busing) which have the same effect and essentially cost nothing, will be used more and more. The party must have a clear stand on dealing with these attacks, and the programme should speak briefly to them. ■

# On Propaganda and Culture

## One

In the course of summing up the work in our area on the local workers newspaper, we have come to essentially the same conclusion as indicated by the DP and other documents about the papers. We think that the party's approach to newspapers should be quite different from that used in the past. In fact, we think an even more major change is required than that called for in these documents.

Specifically, we are recommending that the party launch a mass distribution, workers newspaper. Secondly, that a more analytical publication also be produced. This proposal is a change from the past in several ways. First off, we are proposing a *party* newspaper, not an "anti-imperialist" paper. Secondly, we are proposing a nationwide newspaper, not many, different local papers. However, local areas, who have the resources, could also produce local supplements to insert in the national paper.

Our local paper was formed just as the organization in this area was beginning. We had a very primitive idea at that time of how to build the revolutionary workers movement. Also because of geography and organizational primitiveness, we were very isolated from the rest of the organization. Our line was muddled, and filled with rightism, economism, "workerism," two-level work, and (especially later) Bundism. We tried to build up a workers organization around the newspaper, but ended up failing, both as a real revolutionary newspaper, and as a workers organization.

In the wake of the struggle against Bundism and economism in our area, we analyzed the newspaper. One of the many problems we discovered was the combining and confusing of program and ideology. We have summed up that an intermediate workers organization (IWO) must be united around a *program not an ideology*, and that it must be open at both ends, with communists working to increase the political understanding of other members of the IWO (and others as well) through the course of struggle.

We discovered that no matter how hard we tried, we could not put out a newspaper that was not a "marketplace of ideas" without uniting around a ideology, and as a result, "closing up" the group at one end. Every issue of the paper, news questions would come up—the McGovern campaign, the role of the Soviet Union in the Middle East, how to cover events organized by bourgeois nationalists, etc. At every turn, we were faced with alternatives—all of which are unacceptable when you're trying to build an "anti-imperialist" organization which puts out a newspaper: 1) we could try to manipulate, by getting a "good" person to write the controversial article with the correct line on it, or we could "fix-up" the article as it was being typed or pasted down, hoping the writer wouldn't notice; 2) we could allow wrong lines on important issues to be printed; 3) we could struggle to unite the staff around the correct line before printing anything about a particular question.

Usually we did the third, but the problems didn't end there. Holding off until we could win people over

on every new issue that comes up takes time, and combined with other problems meant that we were never "hot on the spot" with answers to the questions on people's minds. And the analysis was usually superficial since we were always fearful of going "beyond" our "anti-imperialist" level of unity. The result was right errors in the articles. After two years, the RU finally had "its own" column, which meant that subjects like Marxism-Leninism, revolution, and socialism finally appeared openly in the paper. But that did not solve the basic questions. Now new questions were asked: How many articles by the RU should there be?—("One is O.K., but two...?" etc.) What types of articles should the RU do in its name?—(Save the "heavy" ones for the RU, etc.)

And while we were busy watering down what got out to the masses, our level of unity was constantly being raised with each new issue of the paper. Though the "Who We Are" said that the unity was "around the five spearheads," in practice the level of unity required was general unity with the RU and a willingness to follow the RU. The group could in no way function as an IWO or even as the "editorial staff of a newspaper of an IWO." Since we did all our work (for a long time) through the newspaper (strike support, primarily), we were making "left" errors with workers and others who wanted to join us in common struggle—"you've got to agree with us on everything first"—and we left no room for programmatic unity...all in the context of consistent right errors with the masses as a whole.

And we found that, generally, getting people involved working on the newspaper was not the best way to reach out to new people. Workers, especially, were intimidated by the idea of writing newspaper articles, etc. In a sense, we were trying to turn workers into journalists instead of integrating with their struggles, building them, and broadening their understanding. We failed to understand how people learn through struggle, and the role of communists and propaganda work must play in this.

We see now that a newspaper that is a publication which comes out often, which covers all of the important questions of the day, must have an ideology to guide its work. The bourgeoisie has its own ideology, and its press, and through it, promotes its views of the local, regional, national, and international situation. The proletariat and its party also need to have newspapers as part of the struggle to win over the masses. We must work towards a situation when the working class has its own newspaper(s) that the masses look to (every day, eventually) instead of the bourgeois press to find out what is going on in the world and how we can go about changing it. Such a newspaper(s) would be a powerful instrument for the party to strengthen its organizations and to spread its influence among the masses.

Does this mean that the paper will be isolated from the mass struggle? No, that will depend on the line and practice of the party. What will connect the masses and their struggles with the paper(s) will be the party. Party members would use the paper systematically in their work—building struggles in the plants, against police repression, etc. The paper would help comrades bring the party's line to the masses and the work of the party will make more and more people look to the paper for answers. The party would have to set up ways for cadre to constantly evaluate the paper and constantly improve its mass line and popular style.

Would the paper(s) only involve party members? No. Many people who like the overall work and line of the party would be encouraged to sell the paper,

write articles and letters, etc. The party would have complete and open editorial control. (Whether or not the paper said so in print would of course depend on the concrete conditions, especially security, at the particular times.)

In the long run, it will mean more people, not less, will support the party and its paper, because the party will be able to get its line out this way much more effectively and clearly. And by separating the question of uniting ideologically from uniting programmatically, we can go out much more broadly among the masses, uniting with them in a program of struggle, while preserving our clear ideological independence and struggling with people, step by step, to advance people's political understanding.

The party's mass working class paper(s) would be widely distributed—even in situations where mass organizations have their own publications. Many plant, industry, and areawide IWOs will have their own newsletters (and other publications, in some cases), as will UWOC, VVAW/WSO, etc. The party should work to develop and build these, while being careful not to see these as a substitute for the party's mass paper(s). In general, these mass organizations' publications will not be fully developed newspapers, but will have a more limited scope, because their level of unity is also more limited. In general, these publications will be limited to coverage and analysis of the work of the particular group and to issues and events which are related to their work.

### Question of Frequency

There are other important problems with the local papers. First of all, they come out monthly or even more rarely. This severely limits their effectiveness. People cannot look to a newspaper to find out what's going on in the world if they must wait a month to get it. Newspapers must have *news*, which means that they must come out frequently.

Do we have the ability to put out weekly newspapers in each area in the foreseeable future? No, we do not. In fact, we do not have the forces to put out even monthly newspapers in many areas of the country.

The only way we can solve this problem in the immediate future is to overcome primitiveness and centralize our resources and launch a *nationwide* newspaper. This paper should come out frequently, perhaps every other week at first, and then become a weekly.

There are of course many obstacles to be overcome in order to do this. Channels would have to be found to ensure that the paper would have real links with the masses, that it would have a really mass style, that it would accurately report what is happening in the local areas, and speak to the real concerns and questions of the masses. And, of course, constant struggle would always be required to make sure that the newspaper staff and the local committees would carry out the party's line and not create separate centers.

But the history of the communist movement around the world, as well as the tremendous advances we have already been making in the U.S., have shown that it can be done.

This newspaper would be putting out the party's line, with its major emphasis on shorter, agitational articles about struggles in the various areas. It would discuss and analyze developments in local areas, nationally, and internationally. And it would popularize and develop further the party's

Continued on page 20

# One...

Continued from page 19

local, regional, and national campaigns and work. What the paper prints would depend not so much on how "famous" or "large" a particular event or issue was, etc. Many of the articles now found in the local workers papers where workers "spill their guts" about the suffering and oppression they have seen or experienced in a local plant, or around a particular incident of police repression, for example, should be printed also.

And the paper, as a party organ, can also run broader propaganda articles summing up the general situation and the road forward for the working class, and explaining, in popular form, important questions of communist theory.

## Supplements

Local areas could produce two to four page supplements to insert in the paper with articles which the national paper could not include. But in general, local areas would *not* be putting the important local news here, but submitting it for printing in the main paper itself. This way the paper would "stand on its own" and could be used even in areas too small or undeveloped to produce their own supplement on a regular basis. Thus the inserts would serve as kind of a "safety valve" to make the transition to a national paper and to take care of situations when struggles in a local area cannot all be covered as extensively as needed in a particular issue of the paper because of lack of space, etc.

The main newspaper would be in English and would include a sizable Spanish section. In areas where Spanish is particularly important, the local supplement could also have additional articles in Spanish. Also in areas where other languages are widely read and spoken, Arabic and Chinese for example, the local insert could also provide a section in that language. As the party's size and practice grows, the party should work towards having separate editions of its paper in Spanish and other languages.

And, of course, the party, in its own name or in the paper's name, would also produce many leaflets, flyers, etc. on a local, regional, or national basis.

The local papers now require a tremendous amount of work which is not in direct contact with the masses—article writing, typing, proofreading, layout, etc. A national newspaper would eliminate a lot of this duplication of work. Except for the producing of inserts and writing the local articles, having a national newspaper would greatly reduce this type of work. A tremendous amount of time and energy could be released for use in other, more valuable ways—getting out with the paper much more often and more systematically, and to do other work. This would make better use of cadre and as a result advance all of our work.

The local papers, because of limited space and resources, have often not had adequate national and especially international coverage and analysis. A national paper, with greater resources, can overcome that problem.

Also these local papers in most areas are very expensive to produce because of their small press runs and circulation. One national paper could be produced much more cheaply per copy and pay for itself instead of being a drain on the finances of the party, its cadre, and others close to the party's work.

## Relationship to Other Publications

In relation to all of this, we must also sum up the role of *Revolution*. *Revolution* played a key role as a "party organizer." It helped to overcome localism and regionalism within the RU and to advance the political development of cadre. It has played a key role in the ideological struggle to build the party, and has been useful in developing advanced workers, and others who have come forward, into communists.

Nevertheless, the role of *Revolution* has to be evaluated in light of the tasks of the new period. *Revolution* never had the circulation of the local papers. (In our area, it had about one fourth the circulation.) It was not sold at factory gates, so in order to get one, you had to be already in contact with us, or go to the "movement bookstore," or go to a demonstration.

Now the party will have its own mass circulation paper, which, while reaching out to all workers, will as a secondary task be used to find and develop advanced workers, and bring them to the party.

Also the party will have to have a theoretical journal. The journal will have to be "down to earth" and easily readable. This will be especially

important as the party carries out its task of proletarianizing itself. All the party's literature will have to be written in the plainest, most straightforward and popular way as possible, while still getting across all the important and often complex political questions.

What all this means is that instead of having a mass paper(s), *Revolution*, and a theoretical journal, that *Revolution* must "divide one into two." Presently *Revolution* does some of the job of a mass newspaper and some of the job of a theoretical journal. Those short, popular articles now printed in *Revolution* should be in the mass paper instead. Articles summing up in depth work of communists in particular struggles would probably remain in *Revolution* (except for a few so important, popular, and interesting that they should be in the mass paper.) The longer theoretical articles would remain in *Revolution*. Very long theoretical articles would be either serialized, or put out separately in book form like *How Capitalism Has Been Restored in the Soviet Union and What It Means for the World Struggle* was done. Thus *Revolution* would become the party's theoretical journal. *Revolution's* format could be changed to magazine format, if necessary, later. *Revolution* would be widely circulated to people working closely with the party or looking to it for leadership, and would be used with party members, advanced workers, and others to further consolidate their understanding of Marxism-Leninism and the line and practice of the party.

The party would also produce many pamphlets, and also internal documents.

This proposal would both decrease the strain on the party's resources caused by producing so many local and national publications, and improve the quality of what is produced. And it would make the party's line and publications more widely and constantly accessible to the masses of people. ■

# Two

The question is now before us as to whether or not upon forming the new Revolutionary Communist Party will the party dissolve the local workers papers and publish one national workers paper or will the workers papers become organs of the party in the local areas at this time. We feel the latter is correct and agree with the latest document where it states: "What it does mean is that these papers should put out the party's line, with their major emphasis on shorter, agitational articles about local and regional struggles and the development of national campaigns and struggles in the area. These papers should also, as their secondary aspect, put out the party's line on major questions of the day, nationally and internationally; and they should run some broader propaganda articles summing up the general situation and the road forward for the working class, and explaining, in popular form, important questions of communist theory...." "Under the direction of the Central Committee of the Party (and its standing bodies) a news service will be developed to assist the local papers. This news service will issue several articles centrally each month to the local papers on key questions and struggles (as well as sending other materials, such as pictures). This will strengthen the party's leadership in the local papers and the presentation of the unified line of the party on these key questions and struggles, and it will aid comrades leading these papers to present the struggle in the local area in the overall context of the struggle of the working class as a whole."

Point 1—Why retain the local papers? Wouldn't it be easier to have just one national paper? Wouldn't this make sure that only one line—the party's—is in that paper? The only way to answer these questions is to do some concrete analysis of the concrete conditions—what are the needs of the working class, what is the development and consciousness of its struggle? What is the development of the party at this time? Dissolving the local papers for one national paper does not do this. Instead it says what should communists be doing to be correct communists. From this perspective many errors follow. For example, concrete analysis would show us that the more pressing need of the working class is papers that are published much more often, that are timely; say two times a month right now with the goal of a weekly and then a daily.

## Present Level of Consciousness

Also dissolving the local papers does not take into account the present consciousness of the working class, which the DP and latest document say (and we agree) that it is mainly a group of workers vs. an individual employer. This does not mean that the class conscious-

ness of the working class is not developing, but it is not a very high, revolutionary consciousness yet. By liquidating the local papers, the party would liquidate the importance of going deeper into the class struggle, giving particular guidance to key struggles and spreading them throughout the class. But the position in Article "Two" (in the "Workers Papers" section) of the last journal wants to skip this and says in fact that only the intermediate workers like to read about local struggles!

Point 2—All the articles in the last journal on party papers spoke of the continual error of the papers to be narrow and stamped with localism—my workers vs. my boss in my town. Wouldn't a national paper, as Article "Two" suggests, smash this localism? This fails to see what is primary: how the papers are published and their line, though the article says line is primary. Exactly—the problem of narrowness and localism is a political error. Whether we write articles on Watergate or a sick-out, it must always be written with the view of the entire working class. Writing on local issues is not localism, writing on local issues and limiting the struggle *is*. Dissolving the local papers to eliminate this error is a structural solution to a political problem. Although Article "Two" sees the errors, its answer to them will not correct them. Though this does not mean that the party should leave the workers papers out on a limb to resolve the problems. Creating a news service under the direction of the Central Committee of the Party will aid in this as well as a constant struggle within the party against narrowness and localism.

Point 3—Are the workers papers mainly propaganda or agitation? They are mainly agitation. Lenin states in *What Is To Be Done?*, in the section on Trade Union Politics and Social Democratic Politics, in discussing Iskra, "The question arises, what should political education consist in? Can it be confined to the propaganda of working class hostility to the autocracy? Of course not. It is not enough to explain to the workers that they are politically oppressed (any more than it is to explain to them that their interests are antagonistic to the interests of the employers.) Agitation must be conducted with regard to every concrete example of this oppression."

The workers papers must be tools in the hands of party cadre and advanced workers; tools in building the struggle, class consciousness, and revolutionary unity of the working class and leadership in a broad united front against imperialism and social imperialism; tools that help the working class fight its day to day battles and build its struggle into a broad social upheaval that points the finger at the enemy and why we must destroy. If the workers papers fail in this as their primary task it will be a tremendous setback.

## General Thrust

But the general thrust of the type of paper Article "Two" discusses is more propaganda, more theoretical—"In many ways *Revolution* has played the role of a nationwide party paper." This leads me to picture a workers newspaper issued roughly once a month dealing mainly with articles, say, on Portugal with coverage of only the most important struggles, say city cutbacks in NYC. Again the error flows from what are the needs of the working class vs. what should correct communists be doing?

This does not mean that the local papers will not have long analytic articles on major questions, or that there even *never* should be a nationwide workers paper. What is does mean, however, is that at this time the revolutionary struggle of the working class can be best served at this time by struggling to bring the workers papers under the leadership of the party and retaining the local issues while creating a national news service at the same time. ■

# Three

I believe that the question of culture has been dealt with to some degree both mechanically and idealistically, in the DP, and latest document, as well as in the last journal article on culture.

I think the sentiment of the journal article is correct in that we haven't really understood the importance of the role of culture in building the Revolutionary Workers Movement, and that comrades haven't really grasped the concept of culture as a weapon to be honed to a sharp edge. I particularly agree that there has been a tendency to fall into seeing the forms (song, theatre, etc.) as making up for the content (line), and along with that the attitude of "...but so what, it's only entertainment..."

I agree with the criticism of the DP (p. 11) on culture inasmuch as it would be incorrect to just view culture as "creating public opinion." But the fact is that the DP goes on to state, "Developing and promoting proletarian culture is a *crucial* part of building the revolutionary struggle of the working class to overthrow the bourgeoisie." The journal article also criticizes the DP (p. 33) for not explaining exactly "how" we develop proletarian culture. I don't believe it is the job of the programme to point out these kinds of tactics to cadre. In fact, I think that the journal article falls into the same error that the last document does, and to some degree the DP as well, and that is viewing culture idealistically, and therefore dealing with it mechanically.

The journal article is correct to state that culture "...must be criticized, politically honed and sharpened in the same way as we criticize and sharpen our other agitation." But it does not point out the particular problems in developing culture at this time.

## "Negative Results"

In the past most of our errors have come from not clearly seeing the correct relationship between theory and practice. Several negative results have come of this.

Mainly it has given rise to a situation where we have an incorrect orientation and class stand on culture. In many cases our tendency has indeed been one of "culture is icing on the cake." Our approach has been to leave it to those who want to do it, who feel it is a particularly enjoyable area of work, with no regard for these comrades' theoretical understanding of culture. If we saw a certain speech to be made as particularly important would we saw, "Who wants to do it? Who would have the most fun?" Of course not! Yet this is what it boils down to when workers see people performing who look like they're having a clandy little time for themselves and give the impression that our struggles are simple sing-song issues.

Another indication of incorrect orientation is that some comrades, myself included, have taken part in writing movement style, "in crowd" type of songs to the point of "cleverly" criticizing one organization or another. This is characteristic of the old period.

A problem that goes along with these errors, which in our area has been overcome to a great degree, is the struggle to select the best comrades to do the work. There has been some subjectiveness around this and it comes from the ideology that anyone who wants to do it should do it. It means not understanding that people with the best technical ability, *along with class stand and a good grasp of theory*, should be put forward. Understanding this is part of understanding the correct line on cultural work.

All these errors are self-indulgent. But where do they come from? From the bourgeoisie. They are not only made by comrades with petty bourgeois background, but by working class comrades as well. Under capitalism all culture is reduced to "show-biz," whether music, literature, or art. It is highly exclusive and highly self-indulgent. In the case of working class comrades it represents a chance to leave wage slavery behind.

## Some Advances

We have made some advances in cultural work, but without summing our work up scientifically we will never reach the correct orientation. And that means struggle. Struggle to find what it means to say that we must develop proletarian culture from the masses where it originated. I think it means that taking culture to the working class is taking it home.

Mao says, "The more you put on the airs of a veteran before the masses and play the 'hero,' the more you try to peddle such stuff to the masses, the less likely they are to accept it. If you want the masses to understand you, if you want to be one with the masses, you must make up your mind to undergo a long and painful process of tempering."

The point of all this is struggle for correct orientation; struggle to develop an understanding of culture

that will move the day to day struggles forward.

I feel that if these questions and others are not brought out and resolved, the result will always be a mechanical approach to culture. This is my criticism of the article in the last journal.

In the DP section, "Life Under Socialism," when we talk about culture we should speak to the fact that in that period we will resolutely struggle with "established" artists to help develop artists from the working class. As Mao says, "Our literature and art workers must shift their stand; they must gradually move their feet over to the side of the workers...through the process of going into their very midst..."

I think that our party's internal documents could give more guidance in summing up past tendencies, laying out advances, indicating the errors holding us back, and pointing the way forward to understanding how to better use culture in day to day work.

To just say that we use culture as a weapon and will continue to do so, and at the same time negate the struggle to learn to do these things better, is idealist. ■

# Four

The two sections in the DP on culture (on p. 11 and p. 33) provide good *descriptions* of proletarian culture. But the draft does not draw out enough the *essence* of the matter, which, as the article on p. 41 of Journal No. 3 correctly points out, is that culture is a *weapon* in the hands of whatever class wields it.

The draft does say, on p. 11, that culture is a weapon (although not just for creating "public opinion"), and on p. 33 states that "Works of literature, music, film and other forms of art that represent the proletariat arise from and in turn serve the struggle of the masses of people." This is good. But then it goes on to say that these works "reflect [the masses'] great power in opposition to the decay of the imperialists and radiate the confidence and militancy of the proletariat as the class of the future." And on p. 11: "It arises from and reflects the outlook and interests of the working class in its revolutionary struggle." Again, good. But most importantly, and this is what is left out, works of revolutionary art and culture *further* the interests and struggle of the class and of the masses, *deepen* and *advance* their outlook and understanding, *unite* and *inspire* them, and *build* their confidence and militancy.

Anyone who has been to a Prairie Fire performance knows the truth of this. Their songs do all these because, as the introduction to their book says, "these songs... take a stand with the working class, point out the enemy we're fighting, and [are] aimed right at its rotten heart." They help the masses to "sum up [their] experiences in struggle and inspire them to move forward." And by taking this strong, *open* class stand, these songs are also able to help the masses understand and eliminate backward ideas, to unload these "burdens hampering them in the struggle," as Mao calls them. (The question of the open class stand of proletarian culture, as opposed to the very important function of bourgeois culture which is to mask the class structure of society, should be emphasized more in the section on p. 11.)

A good example of depicting and aiding this process of remoulding is Prairie Fire's song, "Who's To Blame" which describes the transformation of a working class couple whose marriage is breaking up under the pressure of trying to make a living, working hard, losing jobs, etc. Someone at the unemployment center "talks up a storm" about how "us working people ain't the ones to blame...it's the rich men, the capitalists/ Who keep all us people down./ But when us working people get together/ When we unite and fight back/ We can drive those bastards into the ground." Through this understanding, they come back together to "join together/ With others of our class/ To fight until another great day/ When our freedom is won at last!"

Another example of how revolutionary culture arises from and in turn serves the masses can be seen, for example, in how the idea for the song, "Not For Sale," about the struggle against the ENA, arose out of that struggle, and in turn, the chorus of that song, which goes: "Take Your Hundred And Fifty, Abel, And Go To Hell/ The Right To Strike Is Not For Sale!" became a slogan and a rallying cry for the demonstration at the steelworkers convention in Atlantic City last fall.

Also, Article "Six" on p. 42 of Journal No. 3 is correct in pointing to the confusing way the section on ideology and culture is included in the section of the draft called "The working class will lead the fight against all oppression." (pp. 32-33) This both weakens that section, and blurs the role of proletarian ideology and culture. These paragraphs should be taken out of this section and be put into a separate section immediately after, under the title "Smash Bourgeois Ideology and Culture, Build Proletarian Ideology and Culture."

logy and Culture, Build Proletarian Ideology and Culture."

The key role the party press and other, non-party publications play in this struggle should also be included in this section, while again emphasizing that these publications are primarily tools for advancing the struggles of the masses, and not just sources of "good ideas." (This question of the party press and other publications merits more mention in the programme than the few lines it receives on p. 17 in the section on the party. After all, it has been, and will continue to be, a main user of the party's time, energy and cadre. It should also appear, and this is the most important place it should appear, in the heart of the section on "Build the Revolutionary Workers Movement," outside of the section on ideology and culture.) ■

# Five

"As a key part of the struggle against the bourgeoisie, the working class and its party must give full flower to proletarian propaganda and culture, while exposing and ripping out the poisonous weeds of the bourgeoisie. This is an immediate task and cannot be put off until socialism, (DP, p. 33)

This understanding is correct, and must be deepened considerably. Neither the DP nor the latest document give much guidance as to how the party will take up and develop cultural work. This is especially important as it is an essential part of the struggle, a part we cannot be without. As Mao says, "We must also have a cultural army, which is absolutely indispensable for uniting our own ranks and defeating the enemy." And it is also especially important as it is a part of the struggle that we have not developed very far and which we have not deeply grasped as integral and necessary to the revolutionary struggle.

There have been attempts at developing cultural work (mostly music) in this city over a period of almost three years. But only over the last short period of time have we paid any consistent attention to it, consciously and systematically taking up the task of giving it political guidance from the organization, as opposed to the independent guidance from different comrades involved based on their individual grasp of line.

This has been an important advance, yet there are still many weaknesses. The main strength is that we go about it *as a political task* more than ever before. We understand, to a degree, that culture is not just something you add to a list of speeches at a program to keep it from getting too boring. But we have not yet developed as full a grasp as we need of culture as *a weapon to advance the struggle of the working class*. A large part of what we have yet to do is to root out the influences of bourgeois ideology around the question of culture. These ideas seem to linger longer here than in some other areas of work. The bourgeoisie has had many years of practice, and has developed some skill to be able to pervert the forms developed by the masses with its own bourgeois content, and its own bourgeois ideas about what constitutes culture anyway.

## Question of Audience

The main way that culture is still taken up here is as part of a program—IWD, May Day, etc. And this speaks to the question of audience. Of course it is important to have culture at these programs, and we have to take the correct approach. Too often we have seen, even in using culture at these programs, while we choose songs, for instance, that put forward a correct line that can help to move the struggles forward, our approach is that we are singing songs to an audience who has heard it all before and of course they like the songs so we'll sing for them. They need to be entertained, so it may as well be political entertainment. We even forget that at these programs our audience is not just a small circle of friends, but is more and more becoming the working class. Part of this is a tendency to think we won't mobilize anybody new for a program, demo, etc., and the other part is not particularly caring—and the latter makes sense if it's just approached as "political entertainment."

This is not to paint a picture that everything on the cultural front is dark and dismal—this is not the case at all. This area of work is moving steadily forward, and not just a small part of that due to the Prairie Fire tour. But the point is that we have to make a leap into the new period, and the key to that is making a break with the old approach.

The larger part of the question of audience is do we take our culture out to the masses. And if so and when we do, how does it move things forward? One time

Continued on page 22

## Five ...

Continued from page 21

we went to a picket line and took our instruments along. This was a strike that the workers paper had been working with for some time, and had done some good work. We knew what the strike was all about and should have been able to approach our responsibilities around cultural work there on that basis.

Well, you'd have thought all we knew was that they were on strike. We picked some songs about strikes (in this case "Ballad of the Women's Emergency Brigade" and "Casey Jones")—these workers of course couldn't be interested in anything beyond the shop struggle (in spite of the fact that the workers paper had won them to participate in a demo around one of the campaigns—I don't recall which one at that time.)

In any case, however, the workers united with us and enjoyed it. To a degree, also, it helped to develop the militance of the picket line, but this was more due to the spontaneous influence culture has on people, than it was our doing. In fact, when we were done singing (read "performing"), the workers wanted to continue singing while they picketed, and we were some of the least enthusiastic about it. Our guitar player even refused to play—they could sing if they wanted, but we were there for a performance only.

Another time a group went to an action at an unemployment office, planning to sing "Hard Times Are Fightin' Times" after a speech by UWOC. They summed up that they shouldn't sing because they didn't have the support of the masses. Later, when the police came in looking for the "guy with the bullhorn," the workers in the office pulled these people into the lines with them, and denied that there had been a bullhorn. These were the workers who "didn't support us."

### "Our Only Interest"

All this stuff about performing and political entertainment and when do we sing and when don't we flows from nowhere but imposing bourgeois ideas about culture onto proletarian culture. That's not to say that proletarian cultural workers don't perform—but it's on a qualitatively higher level than bourgeois performers. The only interest we have in performing is to move the struggle forward. We want our culture to inspire people to carry on the struggle, to make revolution.

Proletarian culture is not just the opposite of bourgeois culture (and this could be brought out a bit more clearly in the DP, especially about where proletarian culture is developed from)—it is culture developed in the highest form. As Lenin says, "Not the invention of a new proletarian culture but the development of the best models, traditions and results of the existing culture, from the point of view of the Marxist world outlook and the conditions of life and struggle of the proletariat..." ("Rough Draft of a Resolution on Proletarian Culture," *Lenin on Culture and Cultural Revolution*, p. 150, emphasis Lenin's)

Proletarian culture moves the struggle forward mainly by summing up the mass line and putting it out in popular form. And it's a lasting expression of the spirit of the working class to put an end to exploitation and oppression once and for all. It expresses the joy that comes out of the struggle—points to the bright future. Sometimes we let this understanding get the better of us and fall into the error pointed out in the last journal (No.4 under "Other Articles"): "Mysticism on the question of culture, the tendency to think that the form prevents thoroughgoing criticism of the content, or the tendency to think that form will somehow make up for weaknesses in content..."

I would add to this the tendency to think that culture performed by "political" people is automatically correct.—We had a struggle here over Prairie Fire's song "Partner's Trust," which some of us had criticisms of. The majority line was "OK, there are those criticisms, but they know the correct line, and they're trying, at least some of it is correct." (Don't raise the criticisms, the main thing is that they know what's correct, and in that light the errors are insignificant.) Another struggle came out over a song about police repression written to the tune of a revolutionary Irish song, which initiated so much struggle over the form (it was in real Irish form—not just tune but the words also, and true enough it's not a form that the majority of people are real familiar with and identify with) that we almost ignored the political errors in the content. We have to recognize that political errors in culture are very dangerous, perhaps to a degree more dangerous than in some other areas of work, because the way good culture (formwise) affects people.

The flip side of this error, however, is not pointed out in the journal article—to criticize culture to death before it ever gets out to the masses. Of course, we don't want to put out something that has glaring errors, but if the problem is that it's in the main correct and

we're looking for perfection, we ain't gonna get it by shutting up the cultural workers in a hothouse. We have to rely on the masses.

One time a group had written a song and sang it at a party, asking for criticisms. They listened to what people thought, then went in another room and worked on it for awhile. A couple hours later, they sang it again and the line had immensely improved. But there were still some weaknesses, they asked for criticisms again. They eventually decided to scratch the song, which was probably correct, but the next one they wrote, they insisted on perfection before they would even let anyone hear it. In summing it up, however, they feel that the first way was much more correct—they had a much better basis for deciding what to do with the song when they took it to the masses and asked for criticism.

The point is, as Lenin says "Think of the pressure exercised on the development of our painting, sculpture and architecture by the fashions and moods of the tsarist court, as well as by the taste, the fancies of the aristocrats and bourgeoisie. In a society based on private property the artist produces goods for the market, he needs buyers. Our revolution has lifted the pressure of of this most prosaic state of affairs from the artists. It has made the Soviet State their protector and patron. Every artist, and everybody who wishes to, can claim the right to create freely according to his ideal, whether it turns out good or not. And so you have the ferment, the experiment, the chaos.

"But of course we are Communists. We must not put our hands in our pockets and let chaos ferment as it pleases. We must consciously try to guide this development, to form and determine its results..."

"...Art belongs to the people. It must have its deepest roots in the broad mass of workers. It must be understood and loved by them. It must be rooted in and grow with their feelings, thoughts and desires..." (quoted by Clara Zetkin in *Reminiscences of Lenin*, International Publishers edition, p. 12, 13)

This is the spirit of the latest document when it says "The Party must take this up as a key front in the class struggle (encouraging and guiding the growth of proletarian culture) and, through its leading bodies, sum up experience in this field and develop and guide an army of cultural fighters." This is certainly correct, and this guidance must be based in an understanding of the first point Lenin makes in the Draft Resolution (see earlier reference), "Not special ideas, but Marxism." And the party must give leadership to cultural leaders in this regard.

### How Best To Do It

But what we have to understand better is how this can best be done. The whole thrust of the DP and latest document around culture is that it is a necessary weapon in the overall revolutionary struggle. It is certainly correct to have a division of labor between cultural workers and other areas of work, but what bothers me is that the tendency in the past has been, even where the RU has been giving guidance as we have locally, to separate cultural work too much from the overall work.

Another point in Lenin's Draft Resolution is "Prolet cult's close link with and subordination to the Commissariat for Education." Now of course we don't have a situation like what Lenin was talking about, and the working class doesn't have state power here—but that's all the more reason to grasp this fundamental point. While the party leading cultural work is the key thing, we must put more emphasis on the importance of linking it with other areas of work.

For example, in the situation described above where cultural workers went to a UWOC action, it should have been UWOC who summed up whether they should sing or not, or at least in conjunction with the cultural workers. The point is that the tasks laid out in the latest document should be drawn out a bit clearer, so that the thrust of our understanding of culture comes out in the particulars as well.

There is a division of labor between cultural workers and other areas of work, but the link is the key thing. Having a firmer grasp of culture as a weapon will lay the basis for making this link a reality. ■

## Six

The sections of the DP on proletarian culture, on pages 11 and 33, don't really speak to the working class and tell them what proletarian culture is. Unless you're already familiar with some work done in this sphere of the class struggle, like Prairie Fire's songs for instance, then you're left asking, "so, what is proletarian culture? Is it some whole new art form? What do you mean it's 'the exact opposite of bourgeois culture'? I like some of the culture that's around now—is this all to be destroyed?" The way the DP is written, you get the impression that what we have now is 100% bourgeois culture, and that there is no unity between the existing culture and proletarian culture. This is wrong. Within the existing culture lie the aspects of proletarian culture which have been ripped off and distorted by the bourgeoisie to turn it to their own interests. We want to build on these aspects and turn them into weapons against the bourgeoisie.

Comrade Mao speaks to this in "Talks at the Yen'an Forum on Literature and Art" when he says, "We should take over the rich legacy and the good traditions in literature and art that have been handed down from past ages in China and foreign countries, but the aim must still be to serve the masses of the people. Nor do we refuse to utilize the literary and artistic forms of the past, but in our hands these old forms, remoulded and infused with new content, also become something revolutionary in the service of the people." And Lenin also recognizes this in the draft resolution "On Proletarian Culture" drawn up for the First All-Russian Congress of the Proletcult organization in 1920. He writes, "Marxism has won its historic significance as the ideology of the revolutionary proletariat because, far from rejecting the most valuable achievements of the bourgeois epoch, it has, on the contrary, assimilated and refashioned everything of value in the more than two thousand years of the development of human thought and culture."

Again, in "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues" in the same year, he says, "We shall be unable to solve this problem unless we clearly realize that only a precise knowledge and transformation of the culture created by the entire development of mankind will enable us to create a proletarian culture. The latter is not clutched out of thin air; it is not an invention of those who call themselves experts in proletarian culture. That is all nonsense. Proletarian culture must be the logical development of the store of knowledge mankind has accumulated under the yoke of capitalist, landowner, and bureaucratic society. All these roads have been leading, and will continue to lead up to proletarian culture, in the same way as political economy, as reshaped by Marx, has shown us what human society must arrive at, shown us the passage to the class struggle, to the beginning of the proletarian revolution."

Again, Article "One" in "On the Role of the Workers Papers" in Journal No. 3 speaks to this when they say that in writing reviews of bourgeois movies, and TV shows, "the task is twofold—to expose the deception and class nature of them and sum them up from the proletarian standpoint; and to explain what it is that workers like about these things and unite with what is progressive. If we fail to do this last part, workers see us as cynics who trash everything, as separate from them."

And in *Revolution*, April 1975, in "Prairie Fire Tour Greeted Everywhere": "Prairie Fire has pointed out that they use many forms, drawing on the rich variety of music that's the heritage of the working class and oppressed nationalities in this country. But they go on to stress that it's not the arrangement of sharps and flats that's key, although that does have some importance, but what you're saying in the songs. A proletarian class stand and a content that helps propel the class struggle forward can be reflected in all the various styles." "Their songs build on the past creations of working and oppressed people and develop these forms to give full expression to the determination, dignity, unity and joy of fighting for a new world."

What is needed in the DP is not only a description of bourgeois and proletarian cultures, and the roles they play in the class struggle, but also how the existing culture, the culture people are familiar with, fits into all this. (Even cop shows have a progressive aspect when you see them finally getting some rich head of a smuggling ring that's been ripping everybody off, or something. What we want to do is take that aspect and show how it is really that we're going to deal with these creeps.) If this isn't brought out clearly in the DP, we will not really be arming the masses with this weapon, because they're not going to know what this weapon is in real life and where it comes from. ■

# Other Articles

## One

In our discussions on youth and students we feel that both the DP and the latest document make some errors, most important of which is creating an artificial wall between working class youth and students. The DP does this with two separate sections, tending to divide and separate the struggles of students from those of working class youth. The latest document, while it does point to the need for communist youth organizations (CYO), something the DP does not, separates and builds a wall between these organizations and communist student organizations (CSO).

We agree that at this time, there needs to be two separate organizations, because of our work among students in the past and because it is possible at this time to build a CSO and not a CYO. But the way the latest document describes them would come down in practice to saying that the CYO is where the working class youth will be and the CSO is where we'll keep the petty bourgeoisie. It says that there are really no working class students who will take up the struggles of students.

The latest document, for example, says, "...our policy must be to consolidate and build the CSO on the one hand, and at the same time to assign Party cadre to work separately among working class youth to build mass struggle and the basis for a communist youth organization there. Our goal must be to unite these separate forms into one communist youth organization, once a strong enough basis has been laid and communist organization built up among working class youth." (p.34) We are doing this, the latest document says, so the few working class youth ready to join a CYO will not be "swamped by the mainly petty bourgeois base of the communist student organization."

We have several objections to this. First, where we work many young workers are also students, going to school in the evening. They often talk about their problems at school, with getting financial aid, etc. They definitely are a part of students.

Second, are we afraid to bring workers into the new party because they might be "swamped" by the petty bourgeois majority? Certainly not; the latest document correctly says, "Comrades from the working class must be relied on and developed as a powerful social force within the Party..." (p.7) Working class students will NOT be swamped by the petty bourgeois base of the CSO because it will be the party, and not the petty bourgeoisie, that will be leading the CSO. The party will bring out the leading role of the working class and help win other students from other strata to this in the course of struggle.

### "Leading Role of Working Class Students"

And third, the latest document states that while the CYO will "include youth from other strata" its main base "must be among working class youth." (p.32) But it says nothing of the leading role of working class students in the CSO, leaving us to assume that either we don't want any working class students in the CSO and it should be a petty bourgeois organization, or that there aren't any working class students that will take up the fight of students. Both are wrong.

Working class youth who are students can and will play a leading role in the CSO, and the other students can learn from them. They must be relied on to help move the whole organization forward toward proletarian revolution, as well as helping the students in it to take the stand of the working class. We should not fall into the error of building two different organizations based on two different classes, one for working class youth and one for petty bourgeois students. The working class needs both these organizations (and in the future a merged, single organization) to help fight for proletarian revolution. The working class must lead both organizations.

We think that the latest document's proposal on how to build the CYO and CSO should be rewritten to reflect the leading role of working class students in the struggles and organizations of students. Also, we think the DP's sections on youth and students should be combined, though not in the manner described in the third journal, article No. 5 in the section on youth and students. It says, "...the sections in the programme on youth and students [should] be combined, recognizing the differences that exist but more importantly recognizing the fundamental similarities between their perspective

on capitalist society." Youth and students are not classless groups, and the classes in them definitely do have different "perspectives on capitalist society." We think that there should be a youth section in the programme, with a subsection on students, bringing out the leading role of working class youth and students in the struggles of both. We must remember that the DP is a statement to the working class from its vanguard, and not to students.

We think that the error of dividing working class youth from students is related to several errors in the section on students in the DP. The DP lays out the three important contributions students make to the struggle for proletarian revolution:

"First, because they have the opportunity to study and seek answers to the problems of society, many, especially in the course of struggle, turn to MLM, become communist intellectuals, join the party and take this new found weapon to the working class, which in grasping this science can change the world. Second, students as a group spread the struggle against imperialism and revolutionary ferment among the masses of people, as was the case with the civil rights and anti-war movements. And third, their struggles in themselves are a vital force in the fight against the monopoly capitalists." (p.47)

In the old period, when the working class did not have its party, it was true that the primary role of students in aiding the struggle for proletarian revolution was to bring Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought home to the working class. But now the class will soon have its party, and it, more than any group of students, will be the main force bringing in and applying MLM to the struggles of the workers. And more and more it will be the workers who will come forward, out of struggle, to grasp MLM, join the party, and take it out to their class.

### Advancing the Struggle

We feel that the main role students will play is in advancing the struggle against imperialism, both spreading "the struggle against imperialism and revolutionary ferment among the masses of people" and in their own struggles "against the monopoly capitalists." It will be their struggles, not their ability to take MLM home, that will be primary.

We also must understand the importance of the struggles of students. The DP says that "The bourgeoisie opened higher education up somewhat more... because it needed more managers, technicians, and professionals." (p.47) Well, this was true to an extent, but it was not the case that the bourgeoisie was completely on top of the situation, and could see to the smooth development of society. Principally it was the struggle of the masses of students that opened up higher education, and this should be brought out in the programme. And in talking about the struggles and demands of students, the DP does not say anything about the struggle waged for financial aid and work-study programs, without which the struggle for open admissions, which the DP talks about, would have meant little to working class students.

Lastly, we had difficulty discussing the journal articles on youth and students because of their almost total lack of a summation of practice. It was difficult to test the correctness of the articles' conclusions, since we don't have any direct contact with student work. The journal articles should be written to all those struggling for the new party, not just those comrades in student work. These articles are important to the working class so that we all can grasp a correct line to guide our work, not so comrades can battle back and forth among themselves.

Our student and youth work must be oriented to the overall struggle of the working class to make revolution. It must be the class that leads those struggles, and we must not look at youth or students as classless groups outside of society, but must concretely analyze how to correctly build and organize the struggle forward toward proletarian revolution. ■

## Two

We believe that the comrade who wrote Article "One" in the "Other Articles" section of the third journal is incorrect for criticizing various documents for speaking of the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat as the fundamental contradiction of capitalism. We believe it is correct to speak of that contradiction as fundamental.

In "On Contradiction" (*Selected Works*, pp.328-329), Mao states that Marx "discovered that the basic contradiction of this society [capitalism] is the contradiction between the socialized character of production and the private character of ownership." Mao goes on to say of this fundamental contradiction, "In terms of class relations it manifests itself in the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat."

We take this to mean that in the real world of classes the fundamental contradiction comes down as the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The proletariat is the main and greatest socialized productive force and the bourgeoisie is certainly the main and greatest private owners and accumulators. So it seems correct to speak of the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat as fundamental to capitalism. It seems that Mao agrees. In "On Contradiction" (p.325), in giving an example of how the fundamental contradiction in a process does not change but intensifies as the process develops, Mao says, "For instance when capitalism of the era of free enterprise developed into imperialism, there was no change in the class nature of the *two classes in fundamental contradiction, namely the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.*" [our emphasis]

Furthermore, that contradiction remains fundamental into socialism. In his "Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China," held in March 1949 our great leader Chairman Mao pointed out that after the countrywide victory of the Chinese Revolution the basic contradiction of Chinese society was "the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie." (*Three Major Struggles on China's Philosophical Front*, written by the Revolutionary Mass Criticism Writing Group of the Party School under the CPC's Central Committee, p.2, our emphasis)

So, in summing up, we can see that Chairman Mao and the CPC think it correct to speak of the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as the fundamental and basic contradiction of capitalism and socialism. It is correct because when you talk of the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, you are talking of the fundamental contradiction between socialized production and private accumulation in terms of the classes that "represent" them, proletariat—socialized production, and bourgeoisie—private accumulation.

Communists must grasp this truth and arm the working class with it. That is that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is at the root of all the contradictions, of all the struggles that go under capitalism and socialism, and that it is only the working class, the only thoroughly revolutionary class because in being the main socialized productive force the working class is in direct opposition to the bourgeoisie and private accumulation, that can overthrow the bourgeoisie, resolve the contradiction between socialized production and private accumulation, and end all exploitation and oppression once and for all.

To deny that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is, in class terms, the fundamental contradiction, is, in the final analysis, to deny the leading role of the working class in the fight against exploitation and oppression and to deny that the fundamental contradiction between socialized production and private accumulation will only be resolved by the proletariat by first overthrowing the bourgeoisie and then under socialism repressing the bourgeoisie and carrying on the sharpest class struggle against all remnants of bourgeois society.

To deny all this could lead to serious errors. Under capitalism it could lead to ideas that the working class is not key, that perhaps someone else will lead the fight for socialism. This tendency was particularly strong in the '60s when the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie was not prin-

## Two...

Continued from page 23

capital but has even come up more recently in the form of Bundism.

Under socialism that denial could lead to the revisionist conclusion held by Lju Shao-chi that all that we must do is develop the productive forces and forget about class struggle. We must avoid such errors in making revolution in this country, and we will be less likely to make them if the party and the proletariat is armed with a correct understanding of the fundamental contradiction. ■

## Three

In describing the crises under capitalism (p.1 of the DP and p.9 of the latest document), it is essential that these crises themselves, the reasons they happen, why they lead to increased exploitation of the working class at home and expansion abroad, and why they intensify as history moves forward, be presented correctly. We can all agree that these developments are a function of the inherent laws of capitalism and are an inevitable part of its historical development. The incorrect view which is counterposed to this correct perspective is that the capitalists are just greedy, that they only want more for themselves. The logical conclusion of this is that they have choice and freedom as capitalists to decide how and to what extent they will exploit the working class and make profits for themselves. This line extended says that production, the economy and ultimately the historical development of capitalism is a function of the free will of the capitalists. This is pure and simple Kautskyism.

The DP and the latest document are essentially correct in their line on this question as it comes down around fighting the attacks on the class at the point of production as principal over layoffs and UWOC work in that this is where the bourgeoisie will try to increase its profits in a crisis. The line is also correct in as far as it presents the principal aspect of expansion abroad as seeking areas for investment as opposed to merely searching for new markets. But in the discussion of crises under capitalism there is unclarity which if not sharpened will lead to Kautskyism in our work. The unclarity is around the question of the falling rate of profit as the law behind the capitalists' search for higher profits, increased exploitation of the working class, and the historical intensification of the crises under capitalism.

In the DP it says (p.1): "Under the capitalist system, production only takes place if those who control production, the capitalists, can make profit from it. And they can make profit only by wringing it out of the workers, and constantly pushing their wages down to the lowest level..." Why do the wages of the workers have to be constantly pushed down to the lowest level? Is it because the capitalists are greedy and want more, more, more? No, it is because there is a falling rate of profit under capitalism and if they don't keep up their profits, the falling rate of profit will catch up with them and they will

lose out. Further on in the DP the same problem arises: "Capital chases after the highest rate of profit, as surely as iron is drawn to a magnet—this is a law beyond anyone's will, even the capitalists', and it will continue in force so long as society is ruled by capital." (p.1) Again the question arises, why is capital drawn to the highest rate of profit? Is it because there is a magnetic force between the two? No, it is because the capitalists are threatened by a falling rate of profit which spells their doom if they do not stay as far out ahead of it as possible.

One aspect of the falling rate of profit, i.e., competition and the crises of over-production, is correctly presented in this section of the DP. However, there is another aspect which is fundamental in the long term development of capitalism which insures that each crisis, as it is escaped by the bourgeoisie, sets the stage for a successively more intense crisis. This aspect lies in the relation between variable and constant capital. Variable capital (i.e., labor) creates value. Constant capital (i.e., tools, machines, raw materials, etc.) does not create value, but only adds all (raw materials) or a fraction (machines, etc.) of its own value to each product. As capitalism develops, production becomes increasingly constant capital intensive. There is great expansion in the productive forces, so the volume of profit grows, but there is a constant decline in the rate of profit, i.e., units of profit realized per unit of investment. The fundamental reason why crises under capitalism are not mere periodic ups and downs that can be patched up temporarily is because there is this falling rate of profit.

In his book *Political Economy*, A. Leontiev says, "In order to save themselves from this tendency [the falling rate of profit] capitalists establish enterprises in backward countries where hands are cheaper, the rate of exploitation is higher...In addition the capitalists combine in all kinds of unions (trusts, cartels, etc.) in order to keep prices at higher levels, trying thus to increase their profits, to keep the rate of profit from falling." (p.140) Leontiev further states that "...the tendency toward a lower rate of profit still exists and exerts a powerful influence on the entire development of capitalism. This tendency towards a decrease in the rate of profit greatly sharpens the contradictions of capitalism. The capitalists try to counterbalance the falling off in the rate of profit by increasing the exploitation of the workers, which leads to a number of contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The fall in the rate of profit sharpens the struggle within the camp of the capitalists." (p.139)

This same weakness in the explanation of the capitalists' search for greater profits is found in the latest document. As was stated, the tasks ahead are correct and do not reflect a Kautskyist line, but the discussion of crises must clearly provide a basis for why the tasks are correct. The key thing is that it must be clear that there are laws within capitalism—competition and crises of over-production are aspects—but fundamentally the falling rate of profit pushes the capitalists to seek higher profits, expand abroad, and intensify the exploitation of the working class. To not be clear on this only sows confusion and eventually leads to Kautskyism, revisionism and reformism. ■