As a result of two articles in recent Or- ganization, Silber has threatened the PWOC with a split. According to Silber, we have been guilty of "clauding over personalities of political difference be- tween the Guardian and the PWOC", and even begun to use terms like "the divisive aspects of our organization", when ideological differences local be fully and honestly aired while maintaining a "multiclass organizational integrity" of the Guardian.

Silber offers two charges falsely made up, we first, we have betrayed the GWOC for "an attempt at hegemonism in the party-building move- ment", and second, we have endorsed the "Leninist/Euro- communist" view that the Guardian has not given us an accurate perspective of the party-building movement and our emerg- ing anti-dogmatist and anti-revisionist trend.

Nothing could be further from the truth. If the Club had been internally prepared in the same modest tone in which they are now being acknowleded, if the Guardian reallly views them in the way that it is presented, why then from the forward, then we support them without reservation.

The problem is that the Guardian has backed away from its original conception of the club in his introduction to the "party-building supplement", in that supple- ment, under the heading "Organizing for the New Party", the Guardian advanced its call for Clubs immediately after emphasizing that in the rest of our movement "localism and small circle mentality domi- nate", that our forces are characterized by "breakthrough the" Society of the new national cen- ter", that "a serious [emphasis on the DP] pan- tation is the movement for a new national cen- ter", and that "a serious characterized by to say that the Guardian's plan amounted to "an attempt for it to set itself up as a center for the Marxist-Leninist trend.

Furthermore, it is clear, given the con- text, that we did mean "a center and not an attempt at the formation of an entire center of the party-building movement and in the formation of a national center on the ideas of the party-building movement and in the formation of a national center on their own initiative”. We do not, however, intend that the formation of a national center on the ideas of the party-building movement and in the formation of a national center on their own initiative. We do not, however, intend that the formation of a national center on the ideas of the party-building movement and in the formation of a national center on their own initiative.

Silber interprets our criticism as a "charge of hegemonism". We do not. Our hegemonism was an attempt to dominate the development of the party- building movement.

On the other hand, quite frankly, we did not feel that the way the Guardian approached our efforts to develop a genuine center exemplified an attitude of striving for the best interests of our em- bryonic trend. On the contrary, it tended to show an excessive concern with the places and influence of the Guardian.

Unfortunately, similar narrowness is ap- parent in Silber's article in several places. Consider, for example, their discussion of the the likelihood of the development of a national center. "Given the parti- cular circumstances of our own move- ment," he writes, "it would seem inevi- tably that our movement would encounter some obstacles that would have to be surmounted."

Then Silber states, without offering a shred of evidence, that the PWOC is "ob- taining the leadership of one such 'cen- ter'." This, in itself, is a jaundiced view. As we have stated repeatedly, coming together of a broad range of forces in our trend on a principled basis can create a genuine center. While the PWOC did initiate an effort to develop such a center, we do not feel that the Guardian's organization has been a collective process from the very beginning.

Nevertheless, after implying that the PWOC is setting itself up as a center, Sil- ber proceeds to point out the Guardian's "differences with the PWOC and the organizations "associated with it. He makes no assessment of the depth of the ideological differences for why they present a common effort to create a single center.

The clear implications of Silber's com- ments are: many centers are inevitable; the PWOC is setting itself up as a center, why should the Guardian be criticized for taking steps to set itself up as a center? Perhaps it is inevitable that several centers will develop in our trend given its dispar- ite ideological character. However, those who are in the position of duty, those on the forefront of their efforts will, in principle, strive for the development of a single center. They will only support the creation of distinct and competing centers in cases where their ideological differences in principle make it inevitable.

The Guardian should adopt a more unitary spirit. It should prove its dedication to the interests of our emerging trend by asserting its commitment in principle to the development of a single ideological center and its willingness to join in a common effort to develop one.

The implication of Silber's discussion is that the PWOC and the organizations associated with it are not inevitable. The PWOC and the organizations associated with it are not inevitable. The Guardian should adopt a more unitary spirit. It should prove its dedication to the interests of our emerging trend by asserting its commitment in principle to the development of a single ideological center and its willingness to join in a common effort to develop one.
"We Need Help from the People of the World"

Many remember the case of Joani Little, the Black woman who killed a prison guard in self defense. The treatment meted out to Joani Little is by no means unique as the following letter from a white woman prisoner testifies. (The letter has been edited for reasons of space.)

To whom it may concern:
We need help from the people of the world. Since I have been in Arkansas me and two juvenile girls were raped in the county jail by the Sheriff and his deputies. Then I was sent to prison at Pine Bluff.

The warden told me and the other women they would kill us because we supposedly helped kill an Arkansas police officer. I didn't believe it at the time. I thought they were trying to scare us. But I believe it now. Because I have been chased out, beaten, drugged up, tortured and threatened to be killed.

The warden then told me they would build a new prison but just another torture chamber. We still get beaten and drugged up. I tried to kill myself because I couldn't take it any more. Now they say they have me where they want me. They say they can kill me and make it look like a suicide and people will believe I killed myself because of my record.

Its not just me. One woman was beaten and drugged up. Another got a fractured rib. Major Lindell Campbell is the leader of the beatings and torture. I refuse to go along with her they get fired.

So I'm pleading for help from the people of the world. If we can't get help soon more inmates will be beaten or tortured. So please help us prisoners before someone gets killed or badly hurt. The officers and Major Campbell are not going to change unless they are forced.

Write:
Mr. Robert Faulkner
U.S. Magistrate Office
Box 999
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

Also write to the governor, David Pryor in Little Rock and Judge Smith-Henley, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Arkansas, Pine Bluff Division, Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

A Sister in a Struggle
Pine Bluff, Ark.

Women Struggle Against Reaction

(Continued from p. 9)

Of course women are not accepting these setbacks without fighting back, and there are numerous examples of individual victories. Major sex discrimination cases have been won, such as the suit against the Reader's Digest. Local 1971 of the United Mine Workers elected that union's first woman president. Major demonstrations have been organized in defense of the right to abortion.

A serious drive is being organized to extend the time allotted for the ratification of the ERA beyond the present March 1979 deadline. Hospital workers, teachers, and clerical workers continue their determined push to organize themselves into unions. In Wisconsin, a judge was recalled and a woman elected in his place when the judge practically condoned rape because of the "provocative" nature of women's clothing styles.

Perhaps the Houston conference best illustrates both the strengths and weaknesses of the current fightback. There is no doubt that the determination and spirit necessary to win were present among the many women there. In fact, the delegations were sufficiently representative of the nation's women to push through a fairly progressive platform. The weak-kneed anti-discrimination organization proposals were replaced by a firm resolution condemning the double oppression of national minority women, and calling for affirmative action to correct it. The right to abortion on demand was affirmed, despite organized efforts on the part of the Catholic and Mormon churches and other reactionary forces to block such a step.

But the significant weakness of the conference was that it was not tied to any ongoing and strong grass roots organizations. It had only the weakest links to organized labor, and although a number of unions have given lip service to the demands of women, few have taken steps to translate that into action.

The movement for the democratic rights of women continues to be divided and disorganized. Its leadership is still overwhelmingly dominated by petty bourgeois and bourgeois forces, and it is politically bound to the existing two parties, parties which have shown over the years their disregard for the needs of women.

The future of the movement for democratic rights of women depends on our ability to turn this situation around. Involuntary numbers of rank and file workers are beginning in the movement to understand the central character of the struggle against sexism and growing sections of the women's movement are dedicating themselves to solving the problems of the masses of working class women.

As these two movements become linked, it will become possible to transform our struggle from a defensive one to one in which the joined forces of the workers' movement, the women's movement, and the movements for rights of national minorities join together in a mighty attack.
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PWOC Responds

(Continued from p. 18)

develop a sound material base. Yet the ideological debate continues — but this is an organizational attack that could have serious consequences.

it would seem that Silber has no problem with general ideological struggle but demands that we keep silent on the Guardian's organizational efforts. Now the PWOC certainly has no desire to weaken the material base of the Guardian. Given our own modest resources and financial burden, we have done what we could to provide the Guardian with needed support — including sustaining, writing articles, and limited fundraising. We have repeatedly, in public and in private, urged other organizations to do the same. And it is our intention to continue doing so.

However, if we believe that the Guardian is not behaving in a manner which best advances the future of our Party, we will feel compelled to feel compelled to blow the whistle. As much as we desire to support the Guardian, we cannot submit to its demands that we feel undermined respect for the Guardian's political integrity.

One final example. Silber says, "we have some desire for yet one more 'split' in a Marxist-Leninist movement already incredibly fractionalized." And then he talks about how we have begun to go over the borderline.

In our view it is a sign of maturity in politics that one does not go around threatening among the organizations with a 'split' every time they raise a criticism you do not like — even if you feel that it is totally unprincipled one. Those dipped in the circle spirit may take one more split lightly, but Marxism-Leninism will only support a split that is based on serious and unavoidable differences in principles.

The Guardian should adopt a more unitary spirit. It should strive to understand the interests of our emerging trend by shifting its emphasis from the narrow principle of the development of a single ideological center and, in addition, its willingness to join in a common effort to develop one. If the Guardian chooses to take this course, it can silence its criticism of its original plan for the split without having to threaten "yet one more split!"