

PLP

CONVENTION

BULLETIN 12B

Methods of Leadership.....	P. 1
A Comment on Dave Levey's Two Papers.....	P. 9
Fight in Welfare	P. 21
Army Work at Fort Lewis	P. 25
Build a Base Among Students	P. 31
Quitting?	P. 34
Evaluation.....	P. 40
A Comment on Self-Criticism.....	P. 44
About 3rd World People's Coalition.....	P. 45
On Teaching.....	P. 47
Analysis of Weaknesses in Student Work at U. Conn.....	P. 51
The Need for Political Organizing in Classrooms.....	P. 55

What are the questions to deal with in leading a club? I'll talk mainly about TU clubs, since that's what I work with.

The main task of leadership is to produce stable, committed members. That is, to guarantee the development of people in the party and those who are joining by having the fullest possible collective struggle around political unclarities, people getting into stable work and living conditions with a consistent base, and the fullest collective discussion around life problems (marriage, children, individualism, etc) that are basic to solve if we are to move forward. Political education always related to the mass work of the member and evaluative (self-critical) handling of people's base-building is crucial. Leadership must also constantly fight for recruitment, especially of minority workers, and to make sure that the racist, anti-worker attitudes of the present ex-student members which a) hold them back from the everyday struggle and b) are the reason they often do NOT want to recruit and consolidate workers, especially black ones -- to fight to make sure these ideas are constantly struggled with and defeated.

1. DEVELOP STABLE COMRADES

Right now the party ~~isn't~~ isn't in a position to lead huge workers' struggles to change the objective situation. We're small.

2 methods of leadership

(2)

Our influence in industry is growing, but still small. Thus our main task now is to train ourselves and our friends to build the kind of movement we need for a revolution. We aren't very experienced. We have to learn by gathering info, evaluate the situation and the work and learn to do things differently, so that we can have a greater effect next time by involving more and more people on an increasingly higher level. We've got a golden opportunity now to do this through WAM (if we'd done this at GE for the past year and a half, maybe there could have been WAM-influenced strikes over this contract - maybe ^{WAM} even [^]risen to leadership.) We have no hand books on this work. We've only got our own experience and that of communists in the past.

It seems in the work I've been doing, which is medical - unions & MCHR - and welfare, there are big ups and downs. There has also been a marked lack of boldness in starting or joining struggles on the job, around the 1199 organizing drive, ~~in~~ in the already established unions, or in terms of fighting racist experimentation. Why?

1) Because of my lack of attention to building leadership or initiative in members - not making a plan and then following it along through all its stages with the person

or persons, figuring out what to do. I rarely take a direct hand in other people's work. Instead, I do a lot of talking in meetings and on the phone. I don't meet people's base enough or even build a consistent base myself. If I did, I'd have much more experience with which to lead others; I'd be more aware of the objective and subjective problems of winning people to fight and to join the party, etc.

Obviously this couldn't be done with all the members. But this process could go on with those members who are most willing to jump into the class struggle.

— 2) A number of the comrades doing this work are somewhat new to it. They've worked a couple of years after going to college and they seem to be on the fence a lot - not sure they are going to stay in this thing, hesitant to do the work, not feeling they're going to be doing this stuff everyday for the rest of their lives. that they have to do it to survive and that they are going to solve the problems that come up and develop the work and the party. Aside from racist & anti-worker attitudes (which I'll discuss later) and apart from the objective problems of ex-students doing this work, I agree with the Bulletin 8 article that this hesitation (to being committed to party building forever! as a way of life!!!) is largely due to a lack of dealing politically with personal problems. A few women who have had babies recently are half flaking out of the work in New England. Some members waver because of ^{a politically} antagonistic spouse, or because in their marriage struggle is off limits, or because they don't have a boy or girl friend, or because their job does not pay enough, or all or some of these reasons, etc.

— 3) There is not enough political education, which I think is only useful when the practice of the members is involved! That seems to be the only time much controversy comes to the fore - when the practice of the member, club or the party is discussed and tested in terms of the line. That's where the disagreements are drawn out. For example, 2 tu study groups were lively (in fact, almost glib!) in discussing the SDS Genocide Pamphlet, until the question was raised: How in our day-to-day work/lives do we fight racism? Then there was a profound silence. Followed by some real discussion.

4

2. TWO WAYS TO LEAD

My leadership (as well as the area leadership as a whole) has been less than consistent and also has been mechanical in the past. We'd make a plan in the club for all the tasks that should be done that week at this hospital or that welfare center or whatever, but the members were not necessarily won politically to a goal and a way of getting there (strategy), nor did I necessarily have one in mind. We didn't do the necessary investigation of the hospital, union situation in Boston, etc. The absence of study groups, especially internal ones, was ^{Chronic} until 4 months ago. Everyone was very encouraged, then, when we began alternating study with club meetings - it helped defeat some people's feeling that they did the political work because NOT to do it would be to sell out, rather than that they were convinced that racism had to be smashed and 30 for 40 had to be won so we must plan how ^{to do} the job.

One problem which reflects ~~mechanical~~ errors by me: one thing gets done at a time. PL non-party study groups, OR Wam OR the 1199 org. drive. Whatever a leader stresses gets done - this holds for Challenge quality sales, fund-raising, sub-sales. When we give these responsibilities to others, they are often dropped. Hence WAM dies periodically when the leaders' attention is elsewhere. Obviously we don't build leadership effectively enough in the area. There is a servility problem. I think the New England leadership tries to get others to take responsibility, but we don't do a good enough job. This can change if we take the political approach to leading -- that is, if we follow the three points discussed earlier. Only this political approach to leading can work - leading can't be a shoestring operation. There must be a political strategy worked out in the clubs and then in between, the leaders & members should do repair work on that strategy - while it's being carried out.

THE OTHER WAY OF LEADING is to call people up every night, ask them "did you sell 20 papers, did you sell 2 subs, did you get 5 people to the WAM meeting, did you raise 10 dollars, etc." This is the "get off your ass" approach. I think it's a loser. This undercuts people, sells them short, doesn't allow them room to take on a project and develop it for the sake of arming the working class - but instead builds up individualism, looking for praise, fear of criticism, etc. People don't see a way to win, having not been politically convinced, but do the work anyway so they won't look "bad." This

5

makes for weaker work! Of course we do have to struggle around producing quantity. The struggle around this has to be serious and consistent - but what lasts is building initiative, understanding of and confidence in the line and the working class. The other approach is stop-gap.

3. HAVE TO RECRUIT WORKERS - ESPECIALLY MINORITY WORKERS

We've recruited 8-10 workers to tu work in New England. Most are now on leave or out. They were lost (temporarily or permanently) because we failed to figure out how to seriously deal with real life problems. We disregarded family or other responsibilities people had and tended to run them to death - from 1 meeting to another, sales on Sat., ~~party~~^{party} meetings too often, etc. We have to integrate working people into party life, not make them choose their lives OR the party. (We have an ex-student mentality!) S., a black worker, said he was going to so many PL meetings etc. that he felt he didn't have time to carry out the line. We asked a white working class comrade at GE to do a lot of mass C-D sales and participate in all activities of the Lynn club when his wife was opposed to him being away so much and somewhat opposed to us. A longer view would have meant having him work only in the plant, which he'd have felt more comfortable about anyway, and I (who was friendly with his wife) could have been more helpful to her, maybe won her over. (Maybe I still could.) 2 comrades had never been taught to read and although there were some *attempts to make sure* they learned, they were basically left to go through study groups ill-prepared, feeling self-conscious and bored, agonizing over selling C-D for fear people would question them on it and they couldn't read it. (Parts of the paper were read to ~~them~~.) One young white worker was in the party a year and led a club briefly, but I never knew what she thought! We had little study then, she was very quiet but seemed to agree with the line, changed her job to where we planned, sold on schedule, struggled on the job - but never brought anyone around. One day she disappeared. We've seen her since and still don't know exactly why she split, her view on her party membership, etc. This point about not knowing what the worker-comrades think about PL - what the party does, the discussions we have, etc. - is the most chronic problem with all of them.

It's based on elitism. "If we ask what they think, what is unclear to them, etc. they might think we think they're stupid." This attitude shows that if they ^{did think} ~~thought~~ that, they would be right! Often there's a marked lack of participation of the working class comrades in study groups. I led a couple of these. I was uncomfortable, but did nothing to make things better, just continued with the same intellectual, pretty bullshit level. We even managed recently to discuss the SDS genocide pamphlet on a fairly abstract level. Once I asked a club leader to discuss with a working class member why he said nothing in the group, but it never really got done. When Lois, a young black comrade, started getting discouraged with "her contribution to the party," having been in a club with all ex-students who never helped her by discussing her base building or anything else (who basically, as we'll see later, didn't really want black workers in PL!), we decided to change our "keep-the-blinders-on" approach. We set up a separate hospital club around the working class comrades plus those ex-students who'd done some decent work in bringing workers around PL. I lead the club. We try to have lots of frank discussion about what the workers think we should do, what we do wrong, what to study and discuss, what they don't get, etc. The key is doing an especially serious job on training this club to win workers to the party. We've so far had 2 meetings - one on why we have to and how make PL a truly working class party. Before this second meeting we read Build a Base in the Working Class then planned a struggle in the Mass. General Hospital kitchen around racist harassment and a policy of refusal to upgrade any of the (mainly black) dietary workers into training programs, etc. We also planned a fight vs. the firing of an aide friend of ours at Boston City Hos'l and trying to turn that fight into a move to stop layoffs at City, due to budget cuts, which has already meant the loss of hundreds of jobs. We planned building WAM around both struggles. It was the liveliest meeting I had ever been to and I think it was a relief to the black comrades in the club. For study, we're going to use C-D and a lot of other PL lit, perhaps discuss how we'd talk about this or that article with a friend, discuss the capitalist news some and relate it to our line, discuss how a revolution is going to be built through this work and discuss recruitment, especially of minority workers, also white ones. And we have to discuss how our day to day work relates to what we read, as well as discussing all the problems of life. This will only work if we get moving better on these struggles that actually fight racism, its actual practice against the workers and ideological as

well as other attacks on workers. (We're starting a WAM campaign to get a decent intensive care unit in the building that houses the poor & welfare patients, like the one they ALREADY have in the building that's exclusively for the rich!)

4. DEFEAT THE RACIST AND ANTI-WORKER ATTITUDES IN THE PARTY

The main way these attitudes come out is in reluctance to recruit workers. S. was around for some time at Mass General. He'd been in 1199 in NY, worked on the Rehab. strike, was very interested and helpful - sold the paper consistently. Despite 5-6 discussions with a club leader telling him to recruit S, the leader and other club members were always reluctant. They just couldn't put their finger on why! "Well, he doesn't know the difference between us and the trots." So why not explain it??? "But he doesn't know exactly what it means to be in a marxist-leninist, democratic centralist party." Sure - nobody wants to talk to him about it. Finally, Wally Linder came up for a tu leaders' meeting and at that meeting we had this club leader call S. and ask him to join. He joined. Naturally, there was still a lot to talk over with him, and there still is. But this guy has a load of friends, he's been in union struggles and has more experience in the class struggle than most comrades here. Another comrade, Lois, was around the party almost 2 years before we recruited her. She sold many papers, did all the work of a party member, was very loyal, etc. We belatedly asked her to join. But once in the club, she was not an "equal" member. When other members wanted to talk over their work, they either called each other or me. In study groups she was not drawn out or asked to prepare reports, etc. She was the only member in the blue collar union and got little or no help from the white collar union comrades at City Hospital. We made plan after plan for comrades to go with her to talk to her friends so they could evaluate her work with her. But the very few times this happened, the white comrades did most of the talking and then had little discussion with Lois afterward. A few times, they called me, the club leader, to say that Lois had been opportunist on point A. ^{or} had made a wrong estimate of so and so. The racism in this club reached its high point when we had a struggle against the budget cuts at City Hos'l which were being justified by calling City a "black" welfare hosp'l. We took some people to the Council hearings having worked out an anti-racist leaflet and distributed it at the hosp'l. Nothing much was happening at the hearings until, at the 2nd session, Lois attacked the Council as racist, attacked the cuts and the whole way City Hosp'l is run as racist. In other words she put forth the party's line. The City Council proceeded to launch a racist attack against her. There was almost no defense from the audience, even from

8
page 8, methods of leadership

the people we brought. Another comrade, a white woman, spoke after her about how the City Council was crooked and they had stolen some money in the past! She didn't utter a squeak about racism or the attack that had been made on Lois. The Council made some nasty remarks to her, anti-woman remarks, and this got our members and friends in an uproar. PL members & friends were more concerned with these bastards mocking a pregnant woman than with deadly racism! Lois thought she had made a big mistake and the other comrades didn't notice anything wrong until another black comrade who was observing raised it with the area leadership and we made a big stink.

With this racist approach within the party, needless to say we didn't stop the racist budget cuts. But there was good discussion which led to more seriousness, and to the plan for a new club to immediately overcome this ~~stage~~^{crisis} of racism.

The racism & anti-worker attitudes go even further in that the white middle class comrades don't really get to know workers, even in the party, socially and reject them as political comrades or friends. Everybody is freindly but who are people's BEST friends? Who are the people they really take pains to win over? (Our line that people should get jobs & live where they can last (not having Harvard grads working in shoe factories) does NOT mean everyone shouldn't be winning workers. We've essentially dropped work with campus workers, although the student section leaders have repeatedly agreed (and even gone through motions of plan-making) that this has got to be worked on! Even in the 1199 work, some white technicians don't make much effort to meet the blue-collar workers in the drive or in the hosp'l. Within the party, I think the white, ex-student members view working class comrades as center people who they should drag from place to place to put forward our more center-type positions, like 30/40, rank-and-file control of the unions, etc. - whereas the middle class types will be the real communists who figure out the intricacies of the line and win people to the d of the p, to see revisionism as the main enemy within the movement, etc. There is a double standard which is protecting these ex-students from having the ante upped by the sharper, more class conscious experience and views of the working class comrades.

Ellen Israel

**** A COMMENT ON DAVE LEVY'S TWO PAPERS

Comrade Dave has written two thoughtful papers*on different aspects of the Party line. If adopted as the PLP line these ideas would have widespread ramifications on our practical work. These ideas should be debated and challenged by all PL members. The following represents in my opinion where Dave is wrong.

**** A FALSE VIEW OF SOVIET HISTORY

The question of Stalin, a revolutionary who made severe mistakes or the viscious leader of the counter-revolution in Russia, is likely to be debated for some time because the facts with which to make a judgment are not all in, and because a correct view of Stalin is crucial to the larger question of when capitalist restoration took place in the USSR. Naturally, the Trotskyites, the Revisionists and the liberal historians have all decided the question already. But before we take this plunge, we should be careful where we get our facts. Since we know from personal experience in the U.S. how these forces lie and deceive, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ why should we take their word, as Dave apparently has, that:

"the collectivization of agriculture is carried out... by an expeditionary force of urban functionaries and the armed forces. The resistance of the peasantry is ferocious (sic) and extends to all strata, including the poor."

or

"The reduction of rural standards of living and the ending of the traditional rural unemployment sent millions of new workers into the factories where the freezing of wages at a lower level reinforced by massive inflation of the prices of manufactured goods and the speeding up of the pace or work, ..."

* In Convention Bulletins #3 and #10.

10

or

"more and more repressive labor legislation, including the establishment of a fairly significant network of forced labor camps."

or

"a fascistic secret police apparatus which acts to ~~kill~~ stifle all dissent from the working class and sympathetic intellectuals."

and so on.

This, of course, is the standard bourgeois historical text, and one of Trotsky's "great historical contributions." I would maintain that no more evidence exists for these "facts" than the opposite. In my opinion, the above-mentioned "facts" are not facts at all, but a collection of slanders, half-truths, exaggerations, etc. I have heard these "facts" of Dave's 1 000 times and read them in dozens of books and magazines from the scholarly type to Reader's Digest type, but never seen any real irrefutable evidence for any of them. ~~NIHIL~~

Maybe we can't know if these are facts or slanders, but we do know somethings about the Soviet Union under Stalin and Lenin's leadership. We know that mistakes were made, wrong strategies formulated that cummulativey lead to a new bourgeoisie seizing state power and turning that country into a modern fascist imperialist state, true. But that is only one side of the coin. We also know that the world's first dictatorship of the proletariat was formed ~~xx~~ here and so threatened international capital that they, responding to Winston Churchill's call to "strangle Bolshevism in its cradle", launched wave upon wave of attacks on the Soviet Union.

These included:

- (1) the armed intervention of 14 nations in the civil war
- (2) the Polish invasion of 1921
- (3) the "peaceful" invasion of U.S. and German capital in the 1920's.

(4) the nationalist uprisings in the Ukraine, and elsewhere

(5) the desperate attempt of the Trotskyites and other bourgeois forces to seize power in the thirties by a campaign of assassination and subversion

(6) the Finnish war

(7) the all-out Nazi-led invasion, which involved the armed forces of 10 nations and over. 2000 divisions, the largest and best armed armada ever assembled in history.

These attacks can't be explained solely as "inter-imperialist contradictions." That explanation won't hold water. They were attacking and attempting to destroy the world's first socialist state. Just as Lenin predicted, their attacks were 1000 times more furious after they lost their power.

What Krushchov, Winston Churchill, Hitler, and Leon Trotsky hated was not so much Stalin, the man (They could deal with him on that level.), but the dictatorship of the proletariat. This can be the only explanation for their furious assaults on the Soviet leadership and their oft-stated wish to see Stalin dead. And not understanding the dictatorship of the proletariat lies at the root of Comrade Levy's other main error in his first paper.

**** AN ANARCHIST PERSPECTIVE

Comrade Levy faults the Bolsheviks falsely for outlawing "all other political parties after the revolution," and proposes that the "D of P will be a coalition of organized parties, trade-unions, etc." (his emphasis) Now either a party represents a class or it doesn't; either there is one vanguard or many vanguards of the working class. Either the Party exercises leadership over the working class and its allies and in all mass organizations or there is no revolution.

12

Let's deal with the situation in Russia concretely. Contrary to what Dave says, the following parties among others, maintained a legal existence well into the twenties:

- (1) The Left-Social Revolutionaries (the section that revolted and attempted to assassinate Lenin was outlawed.)
- (2) Martov's group of "Leftist" Mensheviks
- (3) Maxim Gorky's group
- (4) Various nationalist parties in the Ukraine, the Caucasus and Central Asia.
- (5) Trotsky's counter-revolutionary clique that operated as an organized faction within the Bolshevik Party.
- (6) The syndicalist "Workers Opposition" which fought Party leadership in the trade unions.

It is hard to see who else Dave wanted to remain legal. The Mensheviks or Right Social Revolutionaries that were openly fighting with Kolchak, Denikin and the foreign imperialists? Kerensky's Party? Who? I would maintain, on the contrary, that the Party was far too liberal in allowing these above elements to exist organizationally, a severe mistake that the Party paid for dearly in the thirties when elements of these various groups made an all-out bid to assassinate the revolutionary leaders and seize power for their friends abroad.

Opposing "freedom of action" for the Party and remaining in state power confuses the issue. For only with power is there real freedom of action. Power is the name of the game; if the Party gives up power to the other "organized parties" in order to "maintain its freedom of action", it gains neither. History shows that ~~x~~ working class parties that abandon power to play the loyal opposition are not treated so kindly by their enemies. Isn't this

the crucial error of the Left in the Cultural Revolution? wasn't this the lesson of the Revolution of 1848, and the German Revolution of 1919?

Of course, the D of P means that the Party is "identified with the state." What's wrong with that? A true D of P that really represents the workers--why wouldn't we want to be identified with it? Naturally, we should unite with non-party forces which should take some responsibility and leadership, but a vanguard Party will maintain and consolidate its leadership in all spheres and try to recruit non-party forces to the Party, not maintain some other "organized" Party. And our leadership has to be more than "fundamentally that of ideological leadership." We are not academics or phrase-mongers; this isn't a debating society. We are practical people--leadership during and after a revolution has to be economic, industrial, medical, military, scientific and political, as well as ideological.

If the revolution seems too far off, think of the ramifications of Levy's ideas to our trade-union work right now. We wouldn't try to seize power in a union because that would compromise our freedom of action. We might be identified with the union. We would not try to produce good contracts or better working conditions but our leadership would be "fundamentally that of ideological leadership in the fight for socialism."

To sum up this point:

(1) There is only one working class party, PLP,; other parties do not represent our class, but represent at best certain vacillating petty bourgeois elements we can work with; in most cases they represent the enemy.

(2) In order to make and consolidate the revolution we have

14

to gain leadership over the whole working class and its allies and in all significant mass organizations.

(3) Organizations under control of the enemy or their pseudo-working class parties must be either taken over or destroyed.

(4) We must never abandon power in the D of P or the revolution is lost.

(5) The Party must lead in all spheres of life in a practical way as well as provide ideological leadership.

**** RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION, ETC.

I don't want to disagree with many of the valuable points Dave makes here. But, ~~h~~ even here, his tendency to stress the ideological leadership of the Party to the exclusion of practical politics could lead us astray. Relations of production don't mean a dam if nothing is produced. And you won't maintain leadership of the working class even with the most socialist of socialist ~~ixx~~ relations of production if you can't put meat on the table. True, we must develop socialist ~~i~~ relations instead of copying the old capitalist system, but by George, we have to produce, too. Let's not ~~fix~~ forget that.

****THE WORLD ECONOMY

In his second paper Comrade Levy advances the unique view that in the last few years U.S. imperialism has arrested its decline and is showing its strength. If true, this would be welcome news to the monopoly capitalists who have been constantly bemoaning their continuing decline, at least in their publications, like Business Week and Fortune.

But let's see what facts he advances to support his singular opinion. Amazingly the best he can do is to quote a publication which shows how U.S. exports as a per cent of the market declined a steep 1.3% for ten years; then the decline eased off slightly in

16

first time in years.

8. ^{sharp} ~~An~~/increase in indebtedness to foreign banks.

Note, that trends of investment as well as trade are shown here and the decline is most frightening (to the capitalists) when their investment position is analyzed. (See Business Week May 12, 1973, "The U.S. Can't Live Off its Investments"); the title speaks for itself.)

B. INDUSTRIAL POWER

U.S. production has been declining and continues to decline with respect to the other key imperialist powers in the following industries (as well as in others): 1. steel 2. cement 3. motor vehicle production 4. electric power 5. aircraft production 6. shipbuilding 7. production of the means of production (machine tools, complete plants, construction equipment) 8. chemicals

Of course, this is the key; the trade and monetary declines are just a reflection of industrial decline.

C. POLITICAL POWER

In 1956 U.S. imperialism (or its junior partner British imperialism) completely controlled the state structure and the economies of the following countries that are all now under the control or coming under the control of the key rival imperialist powers: (Germany, Japan, USSR): 1. Cuba 2. Chile 3. Peru 4. Argentina 5. Spain 6. Egypt 7. Syria 8. Lybia 9. Iraq 10. India 11. Burma 12. Ceylon 13. Bangladesh 14. Yemen 15. South Yemen

Moreover U.S. political and economic control is seriously waning and under sharp challenge by the rival powers in the following nations as well: 1. Bolivia 2. Uruguay 3. Ecuador 4. Norway 5. Denmark 6. Turkey 7. Sudan 8. Zambia 9. Indonesia 10. Taiwan

17

11. South Korea 12. Australia

The loss of India with its 550,000,000 people and of industrialized Spain as well as the impending loss of Argentina and the threat of loosing Australis and Indonesia are especially serious defeats that can't be explained away.

D. MILITARY

Here we could mention the military, if not political, defeats of U.S. forces in Indochina, the growth of the Soviet navy, now bigger than the U.S. navy and missile forces, also bigger than U.S. forces; the development of atomic weaponry by three rival powers. And there is the growth and development of French, German and Japanese military strength. Japan has over 1000 advanced combat aircraft; France boasts 21 modern subs. The Common Market armies together now equal the U.S. army in manpower and weaponry.

**** INFLATION AND DEVALUATION

But one projected statistic is enough for Dave, and he goes on to give "causes" of the "reversal". Here he mentions the rate of inflation in Europe and Japan and the devaluation. But you can't have it both ways; the two "causes" cannot co-exist. This is because it is precisely the devaluation that is behind the fantastic upsurge in the U.S. inflation rate and at the same time eased the problem for Europe and Japan--to the point where the figures he quotes are now way out of date. As for the devaluation, if it was such a brilliant move by Nixon and will have such salubrious effects as Dave thinks, then why didn't the bosses institute it on their own, instead of being forced into it.

"But why all the concern over exports," says Dave, after spending the first 40% of his article talking about exports, "the essence of

18

imperialism is not the export of goods but the export of capital." Precisely so, and a little more careful reading of the C-D article and the previous PL editorials would indicate that we talked mainly about how the devaluation would affect investment.

On that subject, here is my projected statistic to throw out:

"Japan is expected to pour an estimated \$25 billion into overseas investments in the next decade." (Business Week, 6/2/73) That statistic (even if only half true) is enough to shatter Dave's ^{AND SPECULATIVE} complicated reasoning about "financing foreign investments," etc.

But apparently, Comrade Levy doesn't believe that "the essence of imperialism is not the export of goods, but the export of capital," after all, since he attaches great importance to the fact that the devaluation raises the dollar value of investment profits, supposedly offsetting the cost of exporting capital. If exporting capital is the essence of imperialism, then the increased cost of exporting capital is what is hurting U.S. imperialism. Moreover, the raise in dollar value of receipts of investments exists only on paper because U.S. net investment income declined last year and is expected to decline this year.

**** A CLASSIC ERROR

At any rate, Dave is back to trade after two paragraphs. At this point, his arguments pass from the obscure to the ridiculous. He states that U.S. production of oil and food is the ace-in-the-hole for U.S. imperialism.

With his reasoning we should expect that Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Brazil will be the most powerful imperialist powers in short order. Actually, the export of raw materials is a sign of weakness, not ~~strength~~ strength. A well-developed imperialist power exports capital and manufactured goods and imports ~~rx~~ raw materials. That the situation is beginning to be reversed is a dangerous sign to the U.S. imperialists. Exporters of raw materials are completely at the mercy of the importer; all the Arab leaders' rhetoric to the contrary. Look what harm just the Russian wheat deal did to the U.S. economy;; look at the weakness and poverty of the key raw material exporting nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Finally, Dave plays his last card, the supposed U.S. technological lead. But like everything else for U.S. imperialism, this is fast disappearing. For example, Dave points out that the U.S. is building a first generation nuclear reactor in France. True, but in the second generation of nuclear power plants, the U.S. has dropped to sixth place ~~technically~~ technologically behind France, Britain, USSR, W. Germany and Japan (Business Week 6/22/73). Actually, U.S. technology leads only in computers and sub-sonic aircraft; Japan leads in steel, auto, shipbuilding, electronic component technology; W. Germany in machine tools, chemicals and scientific instruments; Russia in power generating α equipment, rockets and super-sonic aircraft.

Of course, this decline is not irreversible, nor did we ever say that things couldn't change. Moreover, we emphasized that the U.S. bosses still have some strengths (like computers and Persian Gulf Oil) and possess maneuverability; they still have the biggest if not the most vigorous empire; they have the

fella 1

FIGHT IN WELFARE

Boston - 60r bulletin

The main strategy for the welfare club within the context of building the fight for revolution and socialism is to build the fight for the shorter work week on three fronts - in the social workers' union, in the clerks' union and among employed welfare clients. Failure to follow through with this strategy, starting with building WAM, reflects a lack of seriousness in terms of dealing with my commitment to PL and the class struggle. The welfare club has existed for almost 5 years and has been enmeshed in some of the sharpest struggles in this area involving hundreds of working class people at times. Why then the small returns for the years spent? Why then the low level of struggle at this point and the absolute refusal to go out and build WAM or any other struggle in the last 6 or 8 months?

The Welfare industry is certainly a key area of work and ripe for WAM because it's 1) the means used by the ruling class to maintain the unemployed at less than subsistence level to use against employed workers and most people in the industry see that in varying degrees.

2) welfare workers are in some ways a leading force among state workers historically in terms of fights for better conditions and political development (i. e., anti-war activity). In Mass., state workers comprise a large number of workers. I think they are about 13% of ^{all state employees.} Welfare clients and state workers are undergoing serious cutbacks in this period - cutbacks originating at the federal government. Political consciousness is high and if there was ever a place to win people to the party it's among this group of people. Our work has not reflected an awareness of this situation and has been stunted and parochial.

The overriding weakness of the club has been opportunism and missionarism. The main source of this weakness has been with its leader, not because I wasn't well intentioned. The cause is not making the decision to make my life's work fighting the ruling class. At times when there was decent struggle in the club and the club was involved in mass struggle that contradiction seemed at the time to be secondary or resolved because of course "one can't cop out with all of this going on." But in fact the opposite of this was true. Failure to win anyone to PL out of these struggles is the greatest cop-out ever. When it came to starting any kind of study group or winning anyone to seed the paper or build the party in any way I dragged my feet like crazy. Winning someone to the party meant that I would have

to put my money where my mouth is. I couldn't trek off to the northern woods or whatever. This cycle of "struggle - rest" with no party building becomes increasingly debilitating; each time it happens it becomes obvious that no one is being won, so my answer was recently to "not engage in the mass struggle." The question of building the WAM work and through it the party is the sharpest way this contradiction has ever been raised.

Let's take the election campaign that the club was involved in to illustrate the problem. It's the logical extension of this approach. I have worked in the department for almost 6 years and have a reputation of fighting. Blairs, The Mothers' Committee to Smash the Flat Grant, as a shop steward fighting around individual and group grievances, etc. Everyone knows I'm in PL and the party is somewhat ~~respec~~ respected through those fights. Last year we made an estimate in the club that the union leadership was in a precarious position because of its consistent policy of selling out the workers and the clients. The plan was that I would get together with other progressives and run a slate. The fight would be around the Dept.'s planned reorganization and client cutbacks. We said the fight for the shorter work week was the main thing to win people to because that would turn around the attack and bring alot of people closer to the party. First thing off the bat I procrastinated for several weeks when club enthusiasm was at the highest from writing the article for CD that would launch the campaign. I was supposed to consolidate my close friends at my office into a campaign committee based on the past struggles we had had there and to start more, thus fighting the ruling class and exposing the leadership. My activities barely touched on that plan. I went to this group of candidates for endorsement. My line was "you need me because I'm a black militant, a woman, I know alot of people", etc. - never because I'm a communist. The tone soon became "I'll be good inspite of the fact that I'm a communist." This core of opportunism grew because by not putting the party forward as a necessity and winning at least some of those candidates only served to build anti-communism. The more anti-communist people appeared to be the more opportunist I became. People knew that I believed in more than just clients and workers getting together, but what else? When the inevitable red baiting came from the ruling class via the union leadership the candidates were unprepared to defend

me or themselves except in the mildest forms like not wanting to raise any politics when campaigning to, thinking that maybe they shouldn't be associated with me. I began to look at this group as the keystone of the campaign. My political estimate of each of the candidates was varied each day according to how nice so-and-so was to me that day. These people were an important aspect of the campaign but not the only one. The group of friends at the office were key, and could've helped to reverse the situation with the candidates if I had gone to them with a winning line, involved in were carried through and became more involved in them. What I did was to say to myself that I've got a good reputation all I have to do is get my friends to talk about what a good fighter I am. Several friends ^{went} ~~went~~ to the different offices with a good deal of enthusiasm and talked about only why you have to get rid of the sell-outs. No one was won to seeing the attack that we government workers are under or the fact that we're in the same class as welfare clients was ever raised. This level of understanding among the base made it seem impossible to raise 30 for 40 as a serious ~~fight~~ fight for welfare workers to wage. I rationalized away the situation by developing a line that says that when workers in heavy industry get it, we'll get ^{it} ~~it~~. In no way did I connect it to the struggle that is constantly going on in our industry. Another example of how not building the party leads to corruption of the line is underestimating what the ruling class will do to keep communists out of the class struggle. The union leadership sent out phoney ballots to make sure their guys won. My first reaction was complete and utter disbelief. My base said that the entire election was rigged and we had to have a complete new one. The union had a phoney excuse that they had made some typographical error. My line was: the mistake was possible. In spite of the political sabotage that went on throughout the campaign (mine by not building PL) we got a large number of votes. It was a victory of sorts because many many people voted for a communist. The victory was however shortlived because not one party study group or CD club was set up among those workers. No one was really won to basic concepts of class war that is necessary to build a WAM chapter on a good basis.

It is not the point of this report to paint a bleak picture of the welfare work and argue that all is lost there. The point is that the problem is seen in a sharper and more honest light than before. There are many such examples that I could describe. We've learned a very serious lesson and must change our style of work. We live under the U. S. capitalist class and have no choice but to change and fight back harder or die.

Stella 4

24

* * * * *

The brand of opportunism that led to the situation I described has a more definitive aspect - missionaryism. The "on-again-off-again" approach is a result of thinking that I am doing the working class a favor by being in the struggle or in the party. "I'm really not the one hurt by capitalism, but I really want to help people" is the embodiment of that approach. This weakness has been long standing throughout my political life and certainly has held back ^{my own and the club members'} personal development ~~a great deal~~ ^{(in other words, there's not much sharpness).} Missionaryism is the thing that keeps the welfare system going, in fact. It sets social worker against client and vice versa because when the people we're "doing good for" fight back ~~they~~ they are not "grateful enough." This is the ideology that the ruling class fights like crazy to maintain in social workers. As a communist I haven't dealt with that attitude in myself effectively. The election campaign was an attempt by the club to rectify the problem. We turned from "community organizing" around specifically client-oriented issues (~~to~~ no hot water in the projects, broken elevators, no extra grant at Thanksgiving) to fights in our own trade unions. It is in these unions that the fight for the shorter work week can become reality. It is in fact through these fights that ~~we~~ our club members and friends will be able to save their jobs and maintain a barrier against the incredible speed-up that the ruling class is trying to force on us through 'separation' and the Talmudge Amendment.

There has been some improvement in this missionary outlook but as I pointed out above, weaknesses in actually winning workers to understanding the class structure of capitalism and the ramifications of that system insures that the situation continues. I feel ~~that in writing this analysis~~ ^{from} a great optimism ~~through~~ ^{becoming from these defeats} writing this analysis and know that we can build on what we have and improve the work.

Stella R.

A Little History

25

I came to Ft. Lewis about nine months ago. I started my political work on the basis of fighting the UCMJ, Article 15, harrassment and a little around the Free Billy Smith campaign. Some good things happened. My friends and I formed a small VVAW chapter--mostly white--circulated an Article 15 petition and held a joint demonstration with the Seattle VVAW to Free Billy Dean Smith.

No real break-throughs occurred, however, until after the rebellions on the "Constellation" and "Kitty Hawk." We began to see then that racism was the cause of the most militant struggles in the military. We immediately confronted congressman Floyd Hicks about his racist report on those rebellions. He said the Kitty Hawk rebellion was the work of a few Black sailors, all of whom were of "below average mental capacity." We drew up a program around fighting racism in the military. A number of demands have been raised, the most prominent being: ~~XX~~ (1) No job discrimination, (2) No "Less than Honorable" Discharge, (3) No "riot" control, (4) Fight the racist UCMJ; (5) dismissing ~~xxxxxxx~~ any lifer or officer ~~x~~ who is caught using racist slurs or performing racist acts.

We now have weekly meetings of VVAW of a dozen or so GI's, at least 50% minority. ~~XXXXXX~~ More white GI's are around too! We have been involved in many anti-racist struggles on the company level. We have forced the brass to release one VVAW member from the stockade, won an honorable discharge for another GI threatened with a bad discharge, won better jobs and schooling for a number of GI's. (See ~~X~~ "May Day" Challenge.)

General Filthy (Fulton), the post commander, saw fit to devote his entire speech at a recent review of all the troops at Ft. Lewis to attacking us. He was also one of the most interested spectators at the VVAW Armed Forces Day demonstration of over 100 people.

26

(He was behind a wall of MP's; of course.)

There are two party members here now--one Black and one White. One member was recently recruited out of the work. We have bi-weekly study groups and sell about 100 Challenges on Post, including 35 subs and 4 or 5 from the rack. Party members also sell additional papers at Saturday Mobilizations in Seattle. The Party is generally respected within the VVAW, though there are some undeclared anti-party forces in and around the chapter.

The brass have recently counter-attacked by throwing a Black friend of VVAW (non-party) in the stockade. He faces up to two years in the ~~xx~~ stockade. We have started a stop racist persecution campaign concentrating on this case, but also mentioning attempts to harrass and persecute GI's around the ~~xxxx~~ post that have come to our attention.

Fighting Racism is Key

Various objections have been raised by party members and others to making the fight against racism the main focus in the military. I feel almost all these objections boil down to the same central issue: ~~XXXX~~ Can White GI's be won to fighting racism? The answers to this question are not new. What about White students and Workers? Just like all workers and students, GI's must fight racism if they intend to build an effective struggle and build any type of organization that can withstand the R.C. attempts to kill us off in their world wide search for profits.

The accompanying leaflet passed out at the Armed Forces Day demonstration deals in some detail with this question. I'd only like to add a couple of other observations. Since we have started this anti-racist campaign, the brass have been doing their best to scare White GI's away from fighting racism. One White friend of PL and VVAW,

27

James was threatened with a bad discharge for associating with Black guys. The C.O., Capt. Adams said he would "get Jones and his nigger friends" and called him "White trash." Adams' scheme backfired however, when VVAW launched a campaign to jail racist Adams, not Jones. Jones ~~was~~^{now} has an honorable discharge and racist Adams has a lot of trouble.

These scare tactics have not worked. We have succeeded in gathering some of the most militant, serious fighters, Black, Latin and White, around the Party by concentrating on the fight against racism. We have had some small success in recruiting where those comrades who continued to concentrate on fighting harrassment have not had any to my knowledge.

In sum, our experiences over the last nine months have taught us that fighting racism is the key reform strategy at this time and probably through the duration of the peace time Army. This type of strategy enables us to build GI unity, militancy and class hatred and to create reform organizations, find and develop leadership from which it is very possible to recruit to the party.

Style of work:

A bold approach and flexible tactics have produced the best results. This includes being involved in every G.I. struggle whether it is shouting back at a lifer or leading a confrontation with a C.O. Many different situations offer an opportunity to point out how racism weakened the G.I. struggle and even how revolution is the only answer. "Riot" control classes and Human (/Race) relations class and councils set up and formally led by the boss are great places to raise anti-racist politics. Sometimes to get on these bodies it is necessary to hide any association with PL or VVAW, but still it is worth it. Usually G.I.'s find these classes very boring, but things

28

really pick up when someone raises a good political line especially if you can relate that line to an on-going struggle.

The main problem holding back the work:

There's just a limit to how far we can advance without recruiting (an unfortunate choice of words in the Army), new members to the Party. As we grow bigger, the attacks by the brass and the various vultures on the left increase. This is to be expected and shows we must be doing something right. But we ~~can~~ cannot advance under this attack unless we recruit.

The potential for recruiting is good. We have a good reputation among scores of G.I.'s. Of course, there are external factors which hold us up: anti-communism and other groups around. However, mainly it is our own failure to realize how crucial the question of recruiting is that has held us back. Somehow, recruiting doesn't seem as glamorous as building a mass organization. You work with fewer people. It doesn't seem as "action" oriented. You don't write a "Challenge" article or issue a leaflet about recruiting a new member. But just what would the situation at Ft. Lewis be if the Party was not around? Racism would still be here and probably there would be some spontaneous fights against it. But there would be no VVAW that united Black, Latin and White to carry on a consistent battle against racism. After all who else would build an organization with politics like that. None of the other fakers on the left have that line. The brass is busy pushing racism and nationalism. The hard fact is that without the party there would be no united organization to fight racism. And without PL in the future that organization can't continue to grow against increasing attacks. This is not to say there are not a lot of sincere anti-racist fighters in and around VVAW who are not in the Party but it is only PL's ideas of class unity, no respect for the bosses' laws, and eventually revolution put forward in an organized way by

29

PL members that will advance the struggle.

But, most important, how is PL going to lead a revolution unless we ~~EX~~ recruit working class members like the GI's we know. The guys in VVAW are working class guys with a rich history of class struggle and tremendous class hatred for the bosses who messed over their friends and relatives and forced them into the Army. These guys believe in PL and need PL's ideas to advance our class.

In order to carry on an organized campaign to recruit I think it is essential that we adhere strictly to the following as a bare minimum:

(1) We should spend time each week to discuss the Party with those we think most likely to join. Particularly, we should concentrate on their questions, disagreements or anything holding up recruitment. This should be in addition to the study groups or just bullshit time.

(2) We should continue to guarantee bi-weekly study groups taking pain to prepare the classes and get those most likely to join the party to the classes.

(3) We should ~~h~~ have some PL function (Dinner, Speaker, Picnic, Demo, etc.) every couple of months, probably with Seattle.

(4) We should sell "Challenge" with those who want to, and especially try to get some people up to the Sat. Mobs in Seattle where they can meet other party members.

(5) Ask everyone on the list for recruitment for a sustainer and subscription to Challenge and PL if they don't already have one.

30

ARMED FARCES DAY

DEMONSTRATE! MAY 19th, SAT., 12 Noon
Madigan Gate

MARCH! thru tillicum to Todd Park

May 19 has traditionally been the government's day to parade its armed strength. In recent years, it has also been a day when GI's and their civilian supporters have demonstrated their determination to resist the brass and the government. This year Armed Farces Day can have special significance for GI's and their supporters here at Ft. Lewis. This year Armed Farces Day comes on the heels of two important victories on base and months of anti-racist struggle by VVAW.

... In the 864th Engr Bn, Black, Brown and White GI's united to fight racism and harassment. Their militant confrontations with the CO and collective refusal of direct "orders" won GI's some important reforms. A number of GI's (largely minority) have gotten better jobs, various GI's have been given leave previously refused. The CO was forced to cancel Article 15 punishment for 15 GI's (about 55% minority) involved in the action. Some GI's previously refused permission to go to school have now been granted permission and NCO's will not be allowed in GI rooms when the occupants are not there.

... In the 2/60th, racist Cpt Adams was called on the carpet by VVAW for his threats to Pvt James Rumsey. Adams threatened to "get Rumsey and his nigger friends" and called James, "white trash" for associating with Black GI's. Cpt Adams tried to frame James on phony AWOL charges. His plan backfired, however, when GI's from all over the post vowed their support under the slogan "Jail Racist Cpt Adams, Not Rumsey." The Army was forced to give James Rumsey an honorable discharge - not jail! The fight against Cpt Adams goes on as others in the company continue to write up Article 138 statements on the racist practices of Cpt Adams.

These two victories will have repercussions far beyond these companies. These victories attack the most important weapon the brass has to keep GI's from fighting back - racism. Minority GI's are singled out for special oppression. They are burdened with more than twice the number of punitive discharges, courts-martial, Article 15's, confinement, and get the worst jobs. To add insult to injury, when minority GI's lead the fight against these atrocities, they are slandered by racists like Cpt Adams and Congressman Floyd Hicks. Hicks said that the Black sailors that rebelled on the Kitty Hawk were "of below average mental capacity."

- over -

Fight to Win - Fight Racism IN THE MILITARY; ON THE STREETS
Indict the US Gov't for Genocide AT HOME AND ABROAD

31 BUILD BASE AMONG STUDENTS

The primary tasks of the student section of the party are to build a mass, anti-racist movement on the campuses and to win more minority students to the party. These 2 tasks are completely inter-related. If we do not move forward from the very small beginnings we have made in the fight against racism, we probably will not win many more minority students to the party. And if we do not expand our base among minority students we will not be able to carry the fight against racism beyond a very limited stage.

At this timethere is, at least in Boston, a tremendous weakness around the question of winning minority students. The main reason for this is racism among the comrades in the party.

Some of us have no ties at all with minority students, ~~and~~ the racist nature of this situation is clear.

But some of us know many minority students and still have done very little to win ~~in~~ any of them to the party. Objectively this situation is not much better than not knowing any minority students-- The results are the same--we do not extend the party's base; the fight against racism doesn't grow.

For example, during the '71-'72 school year, I was involved in a campaign against Herrnstein. As a result of our agitational work, I got to know a fairly large number of black students and several Chicano students. But almost all of these relations were very superficial politically and personally. They came to very little--no one was recruited to the party ~~and~~ or even won into a stable ongoing relation with the party. Now this situation was partly due to a general opportunist weakness in my work. I wasn't doing any great job ~~among~~ building the party ~~among~~ among white students either. But there was a qualitative difference in my work among white and minority students. I was especially timid about raising the party's line among the minority students I knew, and also about developing deeper personal ties with any of them.

I think that a lot of this timidity came from a basically missionary and individualistic approach on my part. I didn't see racism as a life or death question for our class. I was involved mainly because it was a noble thing to do (missionaryism) and I was ~~mainly~~ largely concerned with how good I looked in other people's eyes (individualism). Given this outlook, I became very worried about making racist mistakes in talking with minority students, so I tried to keep things on a very superficial plane and held back from really trying to win them to the party. Better to know a ~~small~~ number of minority students on a superficial level (it ~~looks~~ looks good) than to really sit down and try to win someone to the ~~the~~ party--I might lose which would look bad. Obviously if I really understood that racism posed a deadly threat to my own life, and the life of our entire class, I would be less concerned about maybe making a mistake that would make me look bad, and more concerned with

32

the lethal mistake I was making in failing to win these students to the party.

A similar example from my own work was at Southern University this past fall. I spent about 4 days before the students were killed and another week after the shooting in New Orleans. During this time I got to ~~know~~ be personally friendly with a number of the students these including some who were most active in leading the struggle. ~~They appreciated what SDS was doing around the country to support them and they were impressed enough to send Alma as a representative to several campuses. But I hardly discussed our line on racism with them--especially the question of how racism hurts white people too. About all they knew was that we thought racism hurt black people and that wasn't good. They probably concluded that the white comrades, at least, were militant liberal, missionary types. And even if we were really committed to the fight (which wasn't clear) we were an exception and there was no material basis to win masses of white people to an anti-racist position.~~

Because of this lack of political basebuilding we were essentially isolated at the meeting we called in New Orleans when the nationalists launched their big attack. The nationalists said that white people gained from racism and therefore white or integrated groups were not reliable. And they won--we were not able to get the meeting to call for any meaningful joint action.

Had I discussed the party's line with people in New Orleans more before the meeting, I might not, of course, have won them over. In 2 days time, ~~we~~ I almost certainly would not have. But at last we would have known (before we flew people in from all over the country) where they stood, and they would have known where we in the party stand. As it was the meeting was a total waste except for what we may have learned from it.

After the meeting, and a lot of struggle with the other comrades who had come down to New Orleans, I did discuss the party's line more thoroughly w/ a number of the people I'd met. One of them agrees with us a fair amount, ~~and~~ Th others who I spoke with do not agree, ~~but~~ that racism hurts white people, but they do understand know that we hold that position, and I think they respect us more for it.

I said before that knowing minority students and not winning them politically is ~~objectively~~ objectively the same as not knowing any minority students. My work this past school year shows this clearly. In the absence of a ready-made fight like the one against Herrnstein the year before, I did nothing to initiate a struggle against racism until the very end of the year, and in fact helped to hold back the struggle a couple of times. I have met almost no minority students this year.

33

3

Now obviously this opportunism with minority students is an especially sharp weakness in my work, but I suspect that it is also a problem for a lot of other comrades. Recently one guy in the party was telling me about his work in a class where Banfield was being taught, and it sounded like the same situation. Everyday he and the other comrade taking the course would make a point of sitting with the minority students, got to know some of them fairly well, joked about the Professor and talked some about how rotten Banfield was; but they never went much beyond that.

~~Summary~~

In order to correct the overall weakness in winning minority students to the party and advancing the fight against racism, we need to discuss these problems much more in the clubs ~~and~~. I hope that people will have a lot of ideas about how to go about correcting these weaknesses. A couple of suggestions that occur to me are:

1. We should ~~discuss~~ ~~the~~ basebuilding among ^{minority} students regularly at every club meeting just as we have started to discuss the other key aspects of party-building--C-D sells, fund-raising, etc.
2. Every party member should write up an evaluation of their current work with minority students, and their attitude towards that work. These reports should be discussed in the clubs and the situation in each club should be reviewed by the leadership.
3. Every club should prepare a concrete plan to expand or initiate anti-racist struggles on the campus.
4. All other activity of the club should be evaluated from the perspective of how it contributes to this part of the work. For example, if we're involved in a campaign against ROTC or military recruiters, how are we going to use that campaign to strengthen anti-racist struggles on campus.

Jan. Bellard
B.C. Pl. Club

34
QUITTING??

About six months ago I was seriously thinking of leaving the party. I didn't have any political disagreements and I was not particularly worn out from the class struggle. After a certain amount of discussion it became clear that my reason for wanting to escape was isolation stemming from lack of basebuilding and dropping mass work. The question of mass work - selling Challenge, leafletting, etc. - became chronically debilitating to the point where I just refused to do it. I had previously been a better than average seller for four years when I was asked to sell at a professors conference I just chickened out. Around basebuilding, I had dropped friends and since I was unemployed I found myself spending lots of time with me.

At this point, a number of things occurred in the party. 1) First we decided to have a city-wide referendum around 30/40 - which I was asked to lead. 2) Study was being discussed as something the party lacked rather severely, 3) Challenge sales were drastically low and a struggle to make sales a key indicator of the political work of the party was beginning.

I agreed with the need for study but initially refused to lead the referendum or sell the ~~app~~ paper. I thought it would be ridiculous to have me, who was "scared to death" of the people, lead a campaign that centered around mass work. It was at this time I had a very helpful discussion with a friend in the party. My friend likened my

35

fear of mass work to being out of shape politically. He said that it was like an ~~aging~~ aging runner who had begun to run less and less. Each run hurt more, yielded less and became less attractive each time. He said that I should take a protracted view to my Challenge selling and start to slowly but surely build up my sales. Likewise we discussed that the referendum campaign with its mass work might be just the dose of political medicine I needed. Secondly, it was pointed out that giving leadership to the referendum within the party didn't mean collecting every signature needed, it just meant getting my share and helping other comrades overcome political problems arising from the campaign.

So I decided to give all four things a try, ref., study, Challenge sales and basebuilding. I wish that I could tell you that everything worked out hunky dory and I married the frog and lived happily in a socialist society ever after but it's not true. Although there have been ^{alot of} ~~been~~ improvements, the ref., my club's work and my Challenge sales reflect the lingering effects of my errors.

The referendum has a certain aspect of unseriousness: first it hasn't taken a turn towards the unions, the union contacts have not been seriously followed up, the coalition work with the unions has been neglected and the factory and shop haven't been swamped with 30/40 ref. literature and petitions. I believe this is true mainly

36

-3-

because of my fear of doing this type of bold work. For a time a few comrades within the club tried to do this important work; they didn't lack courage or faith in the people, they just lacked the experience to make their courage worthwhile. I sat on the periphery of the effort and secretly hoped for its disaster because I knew that success would lead to similar ventures which I could not avoid forever. When these attempts at reaching the unions workers with the ref. sort of petered out, through lack of political guidance and discussion (my direct sabotage) I then came up or agreed to (I forget which but what's the difference since I led to it) a political line that said the union coalition couldn't be done. Thus I had extended my own weakness to the club and succeeded temporarily in keeping a number of industrial workers from knowing about 30/40.

Along the same lines, the ref. campaign suffers from lack of base building. I feel greatly responsible for this error, also I still have an inclination to avoid people, especially in two cases. The first being where people are going to struggle with me and second, where the person needs a certain amount of guidance or struggle (by the way, one form of this self-proclaimed isolation is not answering the phone or answering phone messages). Well, anyways, the two above mentioned cases led to a bad situation in my club. One club member has a tremendous amount of energy, a really outgoing personality and desire

to fight the bosses. But his political perception of how to win his friends and neighbors to the party are unclear. He raises the party but usually in a missionary way, as something he is doing to help the people. If he portrayed our party and the working class movement as a life and death struggle that he and his friends need to survive, his potential to recruit new communists would really blossom. What I have done with him has been very mechanical. We discuss how he can better do his bureaucratic work. For example, how to get so and so to do any one of many tasks, how he can be responsible for getting more people to the ref. meeting.

In many cases my advice has been helpful in building this guy's ability to function within his neighborhood community organization. But it is limited. The crucial work of helping him develop his base in a communist way is missing. I have hung back from taking a direct hand in meeting his base, watching him in action as he talks to friends and contacts. If I would get off the phone with him and go to his pal's house, we then could more accurately evaluate his basebuilding. Now I realize I can't build a base for him but I could make some helpful suggestions if I had first hand information. One small example of this occurred by accident when I was selling Challenge in Jamaica Plain. A girl in the club was doing community organizing there and having a lot of trouble overcoming fear of the people and the subsequent

38

-5-

opportunist bag she was in. She and I had discussed the nature and depth of her opportunism but I couldn't really drive home the seriousness of the problem. While I was selling, I met an old high school friend of mine who was working politically with the PL member. He told me that she was the best ^{PL} member we had because she wasn't pushy about politics, like the paper was, that he and she got along so well and agreed on almost everything. He then went on to describe the class struggle in such a naive, liberal, anti working class way that I turned green. At that point I realized that this guy was winning our party comrade to liberalism and I was doing nothing to help her develop as a red. The Pler and I then rediscussed the whole question of her work, relating it to the discussion with my old friend and this time I convinced her of the errors of her ways. Since then she has operated as an open communist and anti-racist within the anti-bussing movement in her neighborhood and last week was elected onto the community school council - getting the 20th seat, running against 70 people including 10 government-backed racists! Unfortunately, examples of this sort in my work are few and far between and I think besides coming from personal corruption are somewhat a product of a bad political line we have developed in Boston around the question of leadership. Let me explain - about 3 months

39

-6-

ago my wife, a PL member, then in the hospital work, asked me who my base was. I immediately said "my club of course, there are 10 people in it, aren't there? That's a lot of work!" was my attitude, "how dare you ask about my base!" This is wrong in two ways.:

First it is wrong because to give leadership is to insure the party's growth ~~through base expanding~~. And my work was aimed only at maintaining the status quo in the party and in my club which essentially would mean, if continued, its demise. Because for my club members to "hang in there" and develop requires winning over new recruits to PL.

This is obviously also true for the party's growth and development. Secondly, this can only happen by my taking a direct hand in helping each club member win people and/or winning new people to PL myself. Otherwise, my "leadership" is only phony expertise ~~used on only my club members~~

~~involved w~~

Jay S.

I would like to evaluate my work on two levels--within the party, in terms of giving leadership; and outside the party, in terms of winning others to the party.

I feel I could give much more leadership to the party if I paid more attention to developing the party's line. For example, in leading the teacher work, I have not taken the responsibility for helping to develop our line on racism in education. Yet if we are to build an effective movement in the schools, we must have a thorough understanding of the way racism works--specifically in the Chicago public schools--to justify tracking, bad conditions in the schools, etc. Further, we have to understand exactly how tracking is used--how does it build racism in all black or all white schools; what exactly is the difference in what goes on in the classroom of a black school as opposed to a white one; what is the party's answer to the idea of "Black English" which is currently being pushed; and so forth.

The strengths I do have--a basically strong sense of the need for the party, the need for struggle within the party, the need to fight to build the party; consistency in terms of follow up with club members; an agreement with and understanding of the party's basic ideas--these strengths will turn into their opposite unless I start paying more attention to development of the political line. I say this because I know that nothing can stand still--either I must go forward and help the party go forward in its development or else I will fall back.

Some reasons for this weakness are my anti-intellectualism, the idea of "letting someone else do it", and male chauvinism. Anti-intellectualism in this sense is actually anti-communism. It is saying it isn't important

Carol/2

41

to approach things in an objective, scientific way--to study each situation as it develops so as to figure out what we as a party need to do to within that situation to bring us closer to socialist revolution. The idea that I should let someone else figure it out is revisionist. What it says is that we don't need collective thought--all we need is a few smart leaders to figure things out. Everyone in the party--and especially someone in a position of leadership in an area--must take responsibility for helping to develop the party's line. That is one of the lessons of Road to Revolution III. Male chauvinism hinders me in that because of it, I have developed certain habits and patterns in terms of de-emphasizing study and theoretical development. This makes it harder for me to get used to study and analysis on my part, even though I see the necessity for it. But we cannot allow the ruling class to so easily hold back half the working class force in this country--we must all make an effort to see that women do develop politically and contribute to the development of the line of the party.

To correct this weakness, I propose three things right now--perhaps there are other suggestions people will have. One, that I be responsible for developing, with the education club an analysis of racism in the Chicago public schools, as referred to in the second paragraph of this evaluation. Two, that I have some responsibility for helping to develop a program for internal party education. Three, that I subscribe to and read certain magazines such as Business Week, Fortune, etc. so as to help develop my understanding of the current economic situation and that I try to analyze what I read from a communist viewpoint.

42

On my job, I have been slow getting started (in terms of talking to people about the party and selling Challenge). However, I have increased my Challenge sales from 5 an issue for the past couple of months (previously there were no on-the-job sales) to 9 this issue. I feel that I can continue to increase this number and should strive to sell more each issue, especially as some people become regular readers and I can sell to them with little effort. I have one sub promised, but no cash yet, (Movita) and there are two more people on the job I can ask (Ann and Forestine). In addition, I can ask these people, who don't work at ^{AHA--} Jane S., Paul & Randee A., Virginia S., Lou N., and Linda T. (as well as working with these people to whatever extent I can.)

My main weakness on the job has been that I discuss politics or the party on a sporadic rather than a continuous basis. This comes from not having an outlook of winning people on my job to WAM or to the party and from not seriously thinking about what I should bring up at lunch or on break so that I don't fritter away that time with chit-chat. It also comes from a fear of struggle with people outside the party. Another reason, in my opinion, is that there has not been much struggle with me to do political work on my job and this, compounded with my own weaknesses in this respect, has meant for a long time I did nothing of a consistent nature at work. Now that there has been so much discussion about fighting the right wing trend (and since I am out of jail and people no longer feel justified in being liberal in struggling with me) I feel that my work in this area can greatly improve. Two evidences of this are the increased Challenge sales and that two women from work came to the forum. Specifically what I should strive for: a sub a month; upward sales at work each month; have at least one political discussion a day with someone at work; see someone outside of work (at this point, Movita, Ann, or Forestine) once a week; win some people to WAM (this is vaguer because I haven't talked to many people about WAM specifically); and win Movita to be in a party study group and to sell Challenge.

Carol/4

43

I should make a report on the development of this to the steering committee and my club in two months and should by that time be able to go more deeply into what exactly my relations are with specific people and what is the status of winning them closer to the party.

4/4

A Self-Critical Point About Self-Criticism

The New England area leadership read over some articles for the bulletin from Conn. & Boston. They raise many valuable self-critical points, over-all, and that's to the good. Secondly, there's a tendency to be too negative. It seems comrades feel that self-criticism should stress the bad side of things. Why is this?

Sometimes this stems from a moralistic - that is, a bourgeois-moralistic - approach. Sometimes overly harsh self-criticism is not meant very seriously. Sometimes it stems from a short-sighted approach of being too impatient with various shortcomings. At times, the leadership here has encouraged overly negative self-criticism, with bad results. We are trying to correct this serious error.

Self-criticism in the true sense means analysing the work to find the roots of its strengths and weaknesses, so we can make basic changes to improve the work. At this point our goal must be to transform PL into a truly mass party especially by winning many rank-and-file trade union militants from basic industries - especially minority workers. What holds us back, in general, is resistance in the party to building and consolidating ties with workers. Our self-criticism must be more and more geared to overcoming this resistance. We need a constant struggle to build up the good - the future! - and to defeat the old bourgeois ideas and practices. But this is a long-term struggle. So let's not kill the patients while we're carrying out the cure!

There is room for a very negative approach. We should save this approach for when we're dealing with people who'd like to kill PL. With them we should be very negative.

Jared I.

45

INTERNAL BULLETIN ABOUT THIRD WORLD PEOPLE'S COALITION

....the purpose of this letter...is to give some information about the Third World People's Coalition. I did not go to their conference in Princeton, but have kept close contact with a Brazilian girl, who's the person in charge of building the Boston chapter.

The group was started by an organization named CARIB, a group of Brazilian exiles in this country. The Brazilians seem to have a large network around the world. They exist in Europe, and Latin America (I imagine they are in Canada, too). Their main purpose is to expose the Brazilian military regime, especially the torture that goes on in the Brazilian jails. Their political line is hard to guess. Judging from the girl here, they are socialists in a very broad sense... though with very "good instincts". And judging from Jean Marc, a Brazilian who came in a speaking tour (he resides in France), they have a pretty good position. When he spoke, he said that the only solution to Brazil's problems was an armed socialist revolution. When asked about the peasants in Latin America, he answered that peasants were agricultural workers, and that the agricultural sector was essentially capitalist, and not a remnant of feudalism. In addition, he told the audience, white and Latin students mostly, that the best way to help Brazil was to fight the budget cutbacks, which had just been passed at that time. His tour was partially co-ordinated by USLA (SWP front organization), but when we asked him about it--this was after the forum--he told us that he didn't like the trots, but nobody else could have helped.

CARIB seems to be the backbone of TWPC. The general secretary of TWPC is another Brazilian, Joadino. The idea of the coalition is that of an umbrella, under which other "Third World" organizations can come together. The objective is to provide a forum for information and activities. Their politics are very broadly defined as an organization of "all oppressed people engaged in revolutionary activities" and the goal is to support struggles that aim at the overthrowing of capitalism. They recognize the oppression of the U.S. working class, and there's discussion within the group of working with revolutionary groups in the U.S., primarily black and Puerto Rican. There's nationalism and nationalists within the organization, but I'm not sure that's a dominant force. However, there seems to be a lot of liberalism and opportunism, reflected in their tacit alliance with SWP-front groups, such as USLA. The size of the organization is not clear. The conference in Princeton consisted of 100 people, supposedly all representing different groups.

Here in Boston, we (International Unity) have allied with them and are trying to build a chapter. There hasn't been much political struggle as yet, partly because very few new people are around. The chapter as of now, consists of the people in IU plus the Brazilian girl and an Argentinian girl who is very confused--she does some work with USLA, but she doesn't like them that much. We have planned to have a film festival in July. We'll have a film every Friday, for a month. At the end of each film (which will deal with a particular country) we'll have a speaker, and some sort of workshop or open forum to discuss the film. Those are our plans, so far, aside from contacting more people, individuals as well as organizations. By sept. we would like to have a program of activities, that will include some direct actions, like support demonstrations, etc.

46

THIRD WORLD 2

...I am not sure on what do we, PL, want to get out of working with an organization like this. We want to recruit some of these people, but I think we also want to build organizational ties with groups like CARIB--if it's as good as it seems--and with some of the other organizations...

Hasta la Victoria-Siempre

P.S. We have just formed a club to deal with foreign students in particular. And I have a question about this: Is there any other area that is doing this kind of work constantly? If so, could you write me about it, or put me in contact with them?

Gerardo, Boston

ON 47 TEACHING

Recently where I teach there was a sharp struggle which although I had in part initiated became larger than I had foreseen. The kind of struggle that was waged may be of some benefit to those party people who are on campus and who are engaged (or should be) in some aspect of the fight against racism.

I teach Reading at Ramapo State College in Mahwah, New Jersey. About 10 teachers in the Learning Skills Center offer remedial skills in reading, writing, math, science and English as a second language to any of the incoming students who show deficiencies in these areas. The college determines these weaknesses through standardized tests. Roughly half of the students in this center are in the Economic Opportunity Fund (EOF) program which is made up of primarily poor blacks and Latins. The purpose of this jazzed up version of freshmen composition is to prepare the students for success in the college as a whole. While the modernity of our methods are somewhat unique in college (i.e., thousands of dollars of tapes, recorders, mechanical readers), more and more of these kinds of programs will be offered in the future unless minority students are denied access to college which now seems to be the case.

In the two years the Learning Skills Center has been in existence the black and Latin students have been failing the courses at the rate of between 40 to 70 per cent. Generally these students--as do the white students--find the courses boring, totally unrelated to their lives as working class people, oblivious to the fact that they are black and poor, and filled with the text-book jargon and abstractions so dear to the bourgeois academic mind. The students failed mostly because they wouldn't and often couldn't attend class. Since many of the EOF students have to depend on transportation supplied by the college they are sometimes late or they become so disgusted with the humiliating dependence they drop out. Many of the

48

EOF students must also supplement their grants by working. The EOF program not only provides little money but next year it will be cut further statewide (New Jersey).

I started teaching at Ramapo this year and although I thought I was quick to see the inequities of the program I was too slow to see how critically racist the whole thing was and far too slow in reacting to it. Worst of all, I became a part of the whole operation, that of failing the black students. Based on attendance records, classwork and the standardized tests, I found myself in the unsupportable position of failing most of my black students. My argument was that they weren't "ready" academically to justify a passing grade. What followed was the sharpest confrontation I ever had in my 6 years of teaching experience. Groups of black students showed me the absurdity of my position and, even more, that it was openly racist. How could I tell them, they argued, that they weren't prepared for their other courses when they were already passing them? I was struck by the fact that unwittingly, I had taken the administration's side against that of the students' and why should I penalize the students, especially since the content of the courses had been so anti-workingclass? I told the students I'd been wrong, that of course I'd change all their grades to passing grades (which I did over the objections of a few faculty members) and that, most of all, we should now fight to change the entire program to accommodate better the needs and interests of the students. This we did.

What had also confused me about the program was that the head of our school, the director of the EOF program and the two EOF counselors--all of whom are black--had a complacent attitude toward the program as a whole and I felt reluctant to lead a fight against it because I thought it was essentially a black fight--more of my own racism and cowardice.

Finally, in the spring, I suggested to the EOF counselor and some faculty members that we have a symposium with students to discuss both the methodology and the content of what we were teaching. As a result, we had a full three day open discussion with students. Later the administration was invited to hear our proposals. Despite the fact that classes were then over and students had families to go to and work responsibilities, about 15 black and Latin students were present for the three days. There ensued a fight between students and some faculty on one side, and the director of the Learning Center and the head of our school (a division of the college) on the other. The director was explicitly told by the students he was running a racist program.

As a result of these meetings at least two things were concretely accomplished: 1) the college would pay about 10 students during the summer to work with the faculty to plan a reading, writing and math syllabus for the coming term, a syllabus which would incorporate black oriented material and which would rely less, if at all, on standard textbook material 2) The director will run the program

only with the cooperative effort of one teacher from each of the academic skills areas together with as many students who care to participate in the running and formulation of the program. They were to be paid for their services on an hourly basis. All this is quite innovative on the college level. It remains to be seen if the administration will keep its word, particularly on the question of pay for the students.

This was the first time I saw how successful a teacher-student alliance could be if they both fought boldly to change a curriculum. Both teacher and student saw how their interests in education overlapped. Both parties wanted NOT to teach or put up with the same old rotten content material which all of us are spoon fed from kindergarten on. There are "Dicks" and "Janes" in college too.

Many of the teachers and all of the students rejected the essentially dead things that are taught in school and which working people generally are more and more fighting against on campus. We should join and initiated this fight.

The students really educated the teachers to the fundamentally racist character of teaching from inert texts, texts which do nothing to motivate blacks, Latins and whites from working class backgrounds who might never need to know such stuff as "patent laws" or "man-made rain" or "the mystery of the Mayas" --all of which we actually used in class to my subsequent shame. It is not merely Herrnstein or Banfield whose texts are obviously racist and tailor-made for an anti-racist fight, but the general curriculum content of most liberal arts courses in all colleges which don't help anybody to think critically and imaginatively but only help the middle class to continue its own love affair with elite, dead and destructive ideas. The latter is a weapon for the ruling class educators to kill the students off intellectually and spiritually

and in effect get them out of school. Even if ~~these~~ ^{they} students don't accept these ideas ~~that~~ learn that school is not for them or that they are ill equipped to stay in college.

Getting the faculty to think about what they teach proved to be electrifying for them. Nobody really had enjoyed teaching the dribble he had been served by the school, administrators to teach. Once the discussions got started it was far easier to show faculty people that really the academic content was racist in nature because it hurt first the minority students, and also that it isn't much accepted by white students either. Since we do not accept bourgeois ideas, methods and the intellectual heroes who parade these ideas, why should the students?

Unfortunately, I didn't carry out an independent PL line on many of these issues during the three days. I might have driven home more of the fact that the campus in America generally is becoming a fertile ground for the ruling class to spread racist ideas to first the students and then to the American public. I failed to stress that these ideas hurt not only the minorities against whom they are directed but also the white students who will also be oppressed when they get out of school after having suffered in school. I might have spoken as a PL member and developed even more of a link with students and friendly faculty colleagues. In the back or front of my mind I kept thinking that if only I can last until I am tenured, I will be more valuable to the party and that, also, I will still have my job. These things should be discussed partywide, especially if we are going to recruit college teachers.

Analysis of Weaknesses in Student Work 51 at U. of Conn.

In the course of the spring semester at UConn, SDS made a small beginning in the effort to build a serious movement against racism. We found that racist ideology and racist practices were rampant at our school. Professors Page and Smith were open advocates of Jensen's crude theories of black genetic inferiority. Laughlin and Ginsberg were teaching racist theories of human evolution. John Greene, public defender of racism, rose in the Faculty Senate to attack the Committee against Racism (a faculty group) and SDS for being "professional anti-racists" and witch-hunters. Meanwhile, the UConn administration was engaged in hiring discrimination against minorities and women which was so blatant that even HEW had to acknowledge it.

This is only a partial list of what we were up against at UConn. Our chapter was small and inexperienced but with a minimum of organizing we were able to put some heat on the racists. We circulated the CAR petition to ban racist theories from the classroom, and we brought students to the Faculty Senate meeting when the petition was presented there as a resolution. We held a rally against racism and sexism. We did make academic racism an issue on campus.

But we didn't go far enough and failed to take full advantage of the opportunities to build an anti-racist movement. For instance, at one point we learned that Page and Ginsberg were scheduled to speak at a closed forum on "IQ and Heredity." We leafletted the campus and invited the whole student body to attend. The racists were so afraid of public exposure that they

had the forum cancelled. We had a good issue-- to demand that they hold the forum and answer questions about their theories. But we didn't push hard enough to force them into the open and the issue faded.

One important point about fighting academic racists is that once you begin you can't afford to be less than deadly serious. Attacking them a little is no good. The racists know the logical conclusion of what we are saying about their theories-- they are Nazi goons who ought to be driven from the campuses. They organized very quickly to counterattack-- using racism and anti-communism, using the academic freedom issue as a cover, calling us left-fascists, etc. If we don't back our attacks with hard-hitting, well-documented leaflets, forums, pamphlets, etc. and convince large numbers of students and faculty that we are right about these guys we will end up strengthening their position and isolating ourselves.

Our work during the year generally suffered from lack of long range planning. We responded fairly well to crises-- such as the IQ Forum and attempts by the administration to lock us out of the Faculty Senate meetings on racism. But we sometimes went for long periods of time without any activities related directly to a good plan. Not enough people in the chapter took initiative either in developing our strategy or carrying it out. I was the main leader in SDS and largely responsible for this situation. I often had the attitude that people couldn't be won to take more initiative and responsibility and

sometimes used this as an excuse to do nothing myself. I viewed my leadership position and my membership in PL as being a "hard job" which few people would want. I didn't keep in mind what the Party is doing for the working class and what it does for each individual who learns how to join with others to fight the oppression we all face under capitalism. This hindered me from struggling with people on a good basis to do more to build SDS.

One other major weakness of SDS was our lack of strong ties with black and minority students. During the first semester, there was some strong united action of black and white students in response to two serious incidents -- the murder of black students at Southern University and an attempt by the Board of Governors at UConn to sponsor racist speakers from the KKK, the Nazi Party and other fascist groups. This was good, but we have to win black and white students to see that right now the most serious threat on college campuses is in the form of racist professors who enjoy a certain amount of prestige and respect, and are trying to gain wide acceptance for their pseudo-scientific theories of racial inferiority. I had some ties with black students but didn't do enough to get these students to participate in the anti-racist campaign and ally with or join SDS.

Another weakness in my work was my failure to see building the Party as the primary goal, especially among SDSers who will be leading the organization when I leave after the fall

semester. I set up a PL study group for people in SDS and it went very well. But I didn't struggle enough with the people in the group to actually build and defend the Party (sell Challenge, build May Day, etc.). Unless the Party grows and communist ideas become widespread, the racist ideas are sure to win. I didn't explain or realize clearly myself that revolution is the only solution to the problems we face like racism in particular.

Doug Fuda
UConn SDS, PL

THE NEED FOR POLITICAL ORGANIZING IN CLASSROOMS

Much of our party's experience among students has been in the anti-war movement. For several years there was a mass movement of students against the war. Our efforts advanced that movement and helped move it towards an anti-imperialist movement, but, at least in more recent years, we were operating in a situation where masses of people were organized in various good and bad groups and were fighting some aspect of the war in one form or another. It was probably the foremost issue on the minds of a majority of students in this society.

Right now, that mass movement no longer exists. This does not necessarily mean that we are less able to build the party or build a base for our ideas, but it does mean that we have to change our approach. We can't assume that things that worked in the mass anti-war movement will work now. For instance, in our experience at Harvard, it seems that mass agitational work has been less effective in building SDS and getting people to meetings and actions than it was before. Mass work is, of course, absolutely crucial if SDS is to have a public presence on campus, but alone it won't do. We have to look beyond it and dig deeper into the real life of the university. In the end, this means that our work among students has to be centered in the classroom.

There are several reasons for this. Actually, classroom political work should be a basis for our work with or without a mass movement. The ruling class counts heavily on colleges and universities to win us to bourgeois ideology. That, along with teaching the technology needed to operate a bourgeois state and economy are the main functions of the university. Clearly the major place where ruling class ideas are taught and often tested is in the classroom. There are millions of students in this country who will become teachers, social workers, doctors, government employees, etc.. These people can be a strong ideological support to capitalism, but they could alternatively be a strong pro-working class force against capitalism, if we reach them.

Right now, if you go into almost any college classroom in the country, you hear "teaching" about the heritability of IQ, genetic inferiority of blacks, culture of poverty, the freedoms of "democracy" and the restrictions of socialism, "workers are stupid", "students are hot stuff", "females are less ambitious, stay closer to home, etc..", "class society went out with the industrial revolution" and on and on with many variations on the same themes. Recently, a Harvard economics professor said that Marxist economics wasn't taught at Harvard because it didn't really exist; another Professor commented on a student's paper that he stopped reading when he got ~~the~~ quote from Marx because Marx and Lenin were not appropriate or accurate sources. Most people would reject this crap if it wasn't legitimized by respected "scholars". Thus universities make respectable racism, elitism, sexism, individualism, perversion and pure nonsense. The ruling class wants those millions of students to graduate and "spread the word" and carry out bourgeois policy. Thus the university plays a major role in maintaining capitalism and this is accomplished to a large extent through the classroom. It is there that we must oppose it.

Classes are also the basic activity of most students in college. People may have other interests, but, after all, classes are the reason they are in school. We have had some discussion of the need to be involved with various activities on campus such as student government, the school paper, dorm councils, departmental groups, professional associations and intramural athletics and we have made some progress in these areas, but we have underemphasized classroom work. In attacking racist ideology taught at colleges we have taken a step in the right direction. In some cases we have had campaigns in the classes of various racists such as Herrnstein, Jensen or Frank Lee, but this is still too limited a view to classroom work. Big campaigns against a particular racist professor should not be our only classroom work. We should see all of our classes, whether taught by racist creeps or by friendly faculty members as places to fight racism and bourgeois ideology and to build SDS and the party. This should include classes in languages, math and science as well as more directly political classes such as sociology, psychology, economics or political science. In bringing our ideas into the classroom, we will not only reach more people, but we will increase the respect for our party, by showing that PL is not simply an extra curricular activity that a few people take up in spare time, but a very serious organization which takes students and the content of classes seriously and fights for our line consistently.

This would mean a big change. First of all, classroom political work should ~~not be~~ just an interesting new way of meeting people and spreading our ideas. It should be the basis of our work. That means making political plans for every class that we're in. Secondly, it means taking our classes and the course work seriously. We will look like first class fools if we don't know what we are talking about. In one class, we attacked a professor for saying something that he hadn't said. Had we done the assigned reading we would have known that. ~~He~~ He pointed ~~that~~ out. Not only was it humiliating, but, more important, it led people not to take us seriously. On the other hand, in another class we obviously knew what we were talking about and had even done extra research. There were other problems with our work in that class, but at least the other students respected us, looked to us for leadership in opposing the professor with whom many had disagreements and they took us very seriously. Half the class of twenty were in an SDS study group and two are joining C-D Clubs.

Many bourgeois professors are intimidating, some have had a great deal of experience putting forward their ideas and they can throw around lots of sources and figures, but they have one insurmountable problem. They are trying to prove something that is not true. We should do enough research to be able to refute the bourgeois theories and support our own. At least we should be able to raise some doubts in the minds of the students as to the professors' wisdom. From there, people can take on the problems collectively, form study groups on various issues, write up refutations or simply key questions for the professor to answer. ~~Research~~ ^{IA done collectively} research itself can be a way of basebuilding.

Also, research that people do for their classes could often be of use to the party as a whole. There is often flexibility concerning the topics of assigned papers. This could be discussed in the clubs and perhaps done collectively with other class members. One of our club members had a paper to do on anything concerning income distri-

bution. After he was already well into his research on a fairly dull topic he realized he could have done a paper on the effect of 30 for 40 on income distribution in this country. This could have been very useful, because it is a question that often comes up when discussing 30 for 40. If we plan these things ahead of time, we could combine course work that we have to do with valuable political work.

How should we go about organizing in a classroom? Our classroom experience is fairly limited, especially in the sense of seeing Every class as a place to fight. Some courses would be harder to organize in. Classes in math or science present the most obvious problems, but, at least in Boston, there has been no experience in this field. Many people in sciences are fairly set on their future careers, so perhaps we could start discussion around the role that these careers play in the world. This would be particularly appropriate for fields like medicine, some kinds of research or city planning. The issue of racism is crucial in these fields. Some pre-meds at Harvard are already involved in MCHR. The intense competition, the racism in med school admissions, the incredible "weed-out" courses, the artificially created doctor shortage caused by the dearth of med schools, and racist human experimentation could all be issues around which pre-med students could be organized. There are doubtlessly many other opportunities that people in the sciences could come up with. If we knew more about the actual subject matter in these classes then we might be able to tie ~~that~~ ⁱⁿ more directly.

Language courses are much easier. Most language courses have discussion which can always be steered toward a good political ~~topic~~ ^{topic}. Classes in Spanish, depending somewhat on the professor and the level, can frequently be turned into virtual political discussion groups. We should look for every opportunity to do this. If we can't apply our ideas to a subject then something is wrong. Socialism will affect every aspect of our lives.

Some professors will be friendly to our ideas. This is, of course, an excellent opportunity to win over the professor as well as other students in the class. The class could make statements as a class. For instance, "students in Sociology 65, having studied Jensen's work think that it is racist for the following reasons...." In one class we helped plan a discussion of Christopher Jencks with one of his assistants. In another class, with the help of one of the assistants we got the professor, a real creep, to allow us to give a presentation. Some friendly and honest professors may put forward some racist theory. We should definitely oppose this but not antagonistically. One Afro-American Studies teacher put forward Jencks in a very favorable light in class. She changed her opinion after talking with some SDS'ers, and by the end of the semester she challenged the class to point out any important distinction between the racism of Jencks and Jensen. Another professor allowed some students, including two PLers to give a forum on why current anthropology was racist, imperialist and in general rotten, in place of a term paper.

We have had some limited experience in fighting rotten professors in their classes. Probably our most successful was last year against Herrnstein. Our main strategy was to leaflet outside of his class, ask

questions and attack him in his class, and link this up with agitation all over the campus. One thing we did was to get other existing groups involved and when the whole movement got rolling, ad-hoc dorm groups formed to oppose Herrnstein. Herrnstein and the administration counter-attacked and the struggle mushroomed. This combination of fighting in the class, linked to campus wide agitation and trying to involve a wide range of groups and individuals seems to have been quite effective.

This year we did some work in Christopher Jencks' class. This was not as successful as the Herrnstein work the year before, but we got some valuable experience and gained some support. In this class we immediately tried to meet people. The class was small and many of the students were skeptical about Jencks' theories. After about two weeks we organized a group that included about half of the class. This group put together a leaflet that we handed out in class. Because of the leaflet, Jencks devoted the whole class to a discussion of whether or not he was right. We then put out two much sharper PT leaflets and turned most of the smaller discussion meetings into discussions of Jencks' racism and academic racism in general. Because of all this his assistant who is friendly although he likes Jencks, set up a meeting where we could try to convince him and anyone interested that Jencks should be fired. The result was a stand-off.

Jencks is hard to fight because he comes on like a liberal, he doesn't go berserk at disagreement and his writing is ambiguous enough so that he can always say he doesn't mean what he says. (After presenting a forceful argument saying schools don't do anything for kids, he throws in a sentence saying not to cut school budgets.) We made some headway because we had read his stuff carefully and did some extra research but we still weren't sufficiently prepared, politically, to demolish him. Nevertheless, we promoted a tremendous amount of discussion, got to know several people on a good political basis and two or three have continued to work with us more or less regularly since the course ended. The main weakness was that we were not waging a campus wide struggle to which we could link our work in the class. Because of this the discussion was often somewhat academic and divorced from reality. Although we raised firing Jencks, it didn't mean that much because the demand wasn't backed by any real punch. The best organized classroom work can mean very little if it is not connected to a real struggle.

Another real pitfall in classroom work is timidity. This was the main weakness in the work we did in Daniel P. Moynihan's class. Moynihan's ideas are nauseating racist filth. His class was a bald racist, anti-communist apology for US imperialism. In class Moynihan was a tyrant. He is extremely skilled at ridiculing and insulting anyone who disagrees with him. He is very intimidating, so for most of the semester the comrade in the class let him put forward his crap with only feeble protests. Finally, at the end of the semester, when he got six or seven other class members together and wrote up a list of questions to put to Moynihan, it was a real success. Moynihan went crazy, he shouted, insulted people, told others to shut up, pounded the podium and called people names. Most of the students were amazed by his behavior. We hadn't really defeated him because we were so ill-informed that we didn't know how to rebut many of his arguments, but his response turned most of the students against him. But we had acted too late to take advantage of the events. Re-

search we did later showed that his theory is backed only by distorted statistics and faulty assumptions. A couple of hours in the library at the beginning of the term would have allowed us to make him look like a fool. Not only would we have turned people against him, but we would have won them to our ideas, to SDS and closer to the party.

From this experience we can draw some lessons. These are only very basic ideas developed from limited experience. Undoubtedly as we do more, these ideas will grow and change. The following is a set of suggestions presented for discussion:

- 1) Make plans before the semester starts.
- 2) Have literature about the courses that you're working in to hand out at registration and win SDS'ers and other friends to take the course if you want to make it a major focus.
- 3) Start to implement your plans the first day of classes - the semester can go by very fast.
- 4) Take the course work seriously, know what you are talking about and do extra research if necessary - work collectively with other students in the class and with other comrades.
- 5) Do lots of agitation and lit selling right away.
- 6) Be sharp in class and don't be timid - a few embarrassing mistakes is better than letting these creeps get away with murder.
- 7) Start immediately to meet and get to know other students in the class. Try to get together a group of students to meet and discuss the ideas being taught in the class and to make some plans about what to do. This might be an SDS study group including interested people outside the class, but try to get this group together as soon as possible.
- 8) Use this group or whatever you can to get other students to take initiative in the struggle in the class. THIS IS CRUCIAL. Not only does it help develop these students but it tremendously strengthens your position in the struggle. You will also be in a much better situation if the professor tries to use repression such as disciplinary letters or suspensions or failing grades. Unless you win others to take initiative, you may have lots of fireworks, but you won't consolidate other students into SDS or win them significantly closer to the party.
- 9) Finally, all of this may be relatively ineffectual if it is not linked to an ongoing, campus wide struggle.

some members of the

Harvard PL club