We use IWD because we see that day as speaking to all women's oppression—and that oppression crosses class lines. On that day we should be speaking to working class women, the secondary reserves which include non-working class women, lower petty bourgeois women and revolutionary women we've moved. Speaking only to working women ignores the secondary and indirect reserves, excludes non-working women like students, office employees, oppositional non working women, housewives, women on welfare, etc. Our task is to bring the whole women's movement under the leadership of the proletariat. We don't do that by excluding the non-working women on that day, which is what we are doing. We don't address the plight of women.

As Lenn Stated

"The Communist women's movement must be able to advance as a movement, a part of the general mass movement. Not only of the proletariat, but of the masses of people which are oppressed, all victims of capitalism or any other mastery. We demonstrate thereby that we recognize these needs, and are aware of the humiliation of the women, the privilege of the man. That we hate, yes, hate everything, and will abolish everything which tortures and oppresses women workers, women, the woman, the wife of the petty trader, yes and in many cases the women of the petty bourgeoisie, petty bureaucrats and social regulations which we demand for women from bourgeois society show that we understand the position and interests of women, and will have considerations for them under the proletarian dictatorship (Letter in the Woman Question,-page 9)."

The women's movement does not recognize that the source of women's oppression is the bourgeoisie and capitalism, and that the solution of this question lies in the abolition of capitalism. The danger of bourgeois women's movement is the quidation of the leadership of the working class in the name of the woman question. But that is not at issue. What LPR is describing is the level of consciousness of the women's movement and the working class on the oppression of women. But what is at issue is how we move the consciousness forward and take the correct paths.

How do we develop the women's movement as a reserve, how do we link the two movements, and how do we use the unity of the working class around the woman question, COREs sees the way to do that is by addressing ourselves to all women's oppression and its roots. And even though we seek conscious women workers as leader of the women's movement, we don't think calling the day IWD will facilitate that strategic task.

Communists are champions of women's liberation as well as the liberation of the man, the worker, the wife of the petty trader, yes and in many cases the women of the petty bourgeoisie, petty bureaucrats and social regulations which we demand for women from bourgeois society show that we understand the interests and problems of women, and we will have considerations for them under the proletarian dictatorship. Not really. The class nature of the woman question doesn't mean that working women suffer the most (In fact, oppositional feminism works women on publicity), but instead, it means that only the elimination of class society will end women's oppression be ended and in that, women's lot lies with the working class. Using the term working women, even if used in the sense of women workers, doesn't make that link because it's too mechanical, not the same scientific term, and belittles the question of consciousness. The term working women,aus understood by the masses of people in the US at this time, jumps together professional women, office workers, women workers, and for some includes any woman that does house work, and any woman who gets paid. Use of this term at this time doesn't indicate which segment of working women we are promoting as leadership. At the same time, the name IWD would not include non-working women of the working class who in fact we do promote to promote.

LPR says that using IWD links the question of women's oppression to the class question. Not really. The class nature of the woman question doesn't mean that working women suffer the most (In fact, oppositional feminism works women on publicity), but instead, it means that only the elimination of class society will end women's oppression be ended and in that, women's lot lies with the working class. Using the term working women, even if used in the sense of women workers, doesn't make that link because it's too mechanical, not the same scientific term, and belittles the question of consciousness. The term working women,aus understood by the masses of people in the US at this time, jumps together professional women, office workers, women workers, and for some includes any woman that does house work, and any woman who gets paid. Use of this term at this time doesn't indicate which segment of working women we are promoting as leadership. At the same time, the name IWD would not include non-working women of the working class who in fact we do promote.

Right now IWD doesn't achieve what we would want it to achieve because of the low consciousness on the woman question and the patriarchal bourgeois ideology. How are we to resolve the contradiction? By holding events called IWD and then struggling with the professionals, petty bourgeoisie, office employees, secretaries, etc. which consider themselves workers women to show them why they are not the leadership we are talking about? By struggling with working class women who are not working to show them that IWD would mean them too? Isn't that being sectarian, idealist and voluntarist? We want IWD to be a revolutionary holiday that will move our work on the question forward—that will unite the class, develop allies and educate and train workers in the revolutionary struggle for the emancipation of women and the working class. We want our campaign through IWD to be achieved not through lumping of the name but through a series of tasks.
Working Class Sheds No Tears for Dead Traitor

George Meany, despicable misleader of the US working class, is dead. You'll par
don us if we don't cry, if we hold the tears back with the tightness of teeth in agha
ese and sigh with rel

Why?, you ask. Well, George Meany was beloved by the giants of finance and indus
and destroyed, the Workers and made big efforts to prevent workers from taking militan
and destruction of Vietnam, and the use of union funds to subvert Latin American
government. A key example being the support he lent the reactionary Chilean
truck drivers to undermine the government of President Salvador Allende (Lenin, Conversations with Clara Zetkin)

It was an advocate capitalist country like ours, where the women's movement is so
infectected with the ideology of the bourgeois feminists, where its leadership is in the
hands of the petty bourgeoisie, and where the demands of working class women are
linked to second place. That is why the international character of the celebration becomes even
more critical. Calling for the celebration of a "Women's Day" leaves the content of the
celebration wide open. It is not the mere fact of being a woman, it is not a whole class
of women that we are honoring, but the great majority of them, that is, those that are
oppressed and are struggling against their oppression. And this oppression falls most of
all upon the women working in the fac
tories, the mines, as well as in the offices, and hospitals, and on the women, mothers
and daughters of the workers. IWWD re
flects their struggles and sufferings and shows that the oppression of women over-
all is intimately linked with the struggle
and oppression of the working class. Thus it is something that women of the highest
classes, who are also oppressed, must learn to recognize, and gain consciousness of
the fact that the end of their oppression is
in fact linked to the end of all oppression. We must thus help women gain conscious
ness of the nature of their oppression and "so bind it firmly to the proletarian class
struggle and the revolution," as Lenin says

IWWD celebrations should focus on the struggle and oppression of working class
women (focus does not mean exclusively, but it does mean to address the oppression
of all women linking up their oppression to the oppression and the struggle of the
class). Accordingly, the name given the cele
bration, should reflect our focus on the ex-
class lines and because among IWWD would
include and thus alienate those other sec
tors of women. We do not think so. First of all, though it is true that women's oppres
sion goes beyond class lines, women's oppression is not classless, and the March 8th celebration is not classless either. For
other, we think that women who believe
that their oppression has nothing to do
with the oppression of the working class or the capitalist system are in themselves
alienated from their own reality. For us to use IWWD so that they don't feel "left
out" is for us to further alienate them
They would not make them further out, but rather keep them back and keep
the whole movement back. Secondly, for IWWD celebrations in the U S , and the wo
men's movement in general, the problem is not that they only address working class
women, but rather all the way around. They are so broad that they liquitate the class
class character of the woman question. They fail to link the struggle of women with the struggle of the working class and all oppressed people for socialism. They declare working class movement
and they either liquidate or push to the back
ground the demands most intimately link
to the oppression of working class women. In fact, the widespread use of IWWD to
reflect a great variety of social classes, and
or must be accompanied by an active struggle for revolutionary celebrations showing the
class nature of the oppression of women, helps to create consciousness around this
question. Our tasks as communists is to, first, start up this question every, day, everywhere. We are to actively
take up the woman question in all its as
pects, including that struggle for the imme
diate demands of women to concretely demonstrate that we recognize the immediate needs of women and are willing to struggle for them. It would be shameful to limit ourselves to giving lip service to the oppression of women. By concretely showing that we are staunch defenders of women's rights we gain the confidence of the masses of women. But we must do this, again, everyday and every
where. Only in this way can we effectively point out the connection and help them recognize that we must fight together, for revolution and socialism

Secondly, we must fight against all kinds of opportunist deviations in our mo
vement on this question. We have to watch against the "left" error of liquitating the roots of the problem, the misinterpretation of the term IWWD. This error of reformism in our view is something that is the result of capitahst women, forgetting to make the connection between that oppression and the struggle for socialism. That is, they must see the "clear and ineradicable line of distinction between our policy and feminism", as Lenin says. This is the error that best char
acterizes the women's movement in the U S today. It is the error of reformism on the one hand and the opportunism on the other. We are combating
and it is one of the reasons we are strongly advocating for the revolutionary character of March 8th, under the name IWWD. It is one way of firmly bunding the proletarian class strug
gle and revolution, and an struggle for the emancipation of women.

George Meany, crook, traitor, liar and licky, dead. Let us be thankful he is gone
Let us forget him and consign him to the garbage heap of history.

Let us, however, remember his treache
ry. Let us learn from our mistakes, that we can no longer allow ourselves to be called "leader" like him again.■

LPR's POSITION