This is the first of several issues of the special journal on the programme of the party. The purpose of this journal is to provide an important forum for discussion and struggle around the programme, among members of the RU and all potential party members. The title "Forward to the Party! Struggle for the Party!" was chosen to emphasize both the immediacy of the task of forming the Party and the fact that bringing the Party into being very soon means consciously struggling to carry out that task.

The key link in this is the discussion and struggle around the programme. Focusing on the draft programme proposed by the RU, to achieve a qualitative higher level of ideological and political unity as the very basis of the party. As the introduction to the draft programme states, "Centered around developing the eventual party programme, the struggle and struggle can make use of past and present experience to serve the future. We hope and fully expect this struggle will enrich and deepen the revolutionary programme of the party to be adopted at the founding congress of the party."

The more thoroughly this discussion and struggle is carried out, by all future party members, the more the programme will be deepened and enriched, the greater the unity of the whole party around it, and the more powerfully the party will be able to lead the working class toward its revolutionary goal.

The articles in this first issue of the journal deal with the section of the draft programme, "Build The Revolutionary Workers' Movement," and with the basic class stand of the party as expressed in its programme. Each of the articles has the approach of taking a part of the programme, dealing with the revolutionary workers' movement and the basic class stand, and summarizing work around this.

None of these articles represents the line of the RU; none has been approved (disapproved) by leadership bodies of the RU on any levels. Instead, these articles represent the summations of particular RU members based on their study of these specific points of the draft programme and their own summation around them.

These articles should serve the purpose of "getting the ball rolling," encouraging others to write summations and/or criticisms, questions, etc. around the draft programme in response to the points covered in these first articles, or other points of the draft programme.

In the future issues of the journal other articles submitted from readers of the journal—RU members and others—will be printed the way they are submitted, except for changes which the editors feel are necessary to make possible the clearest expression of the points being made in the articles. As one example, the subheadings in the articles in this issue were added by the editors to make the reading of the articles easier.

Carrying out the task of forming the party now, and actively building the party "from the bottom up," means that ALL potential party members must actively take part in the discussion and struggle around that draft programme that will establish the basis of unity for the party. This journal is one important form for broadening and deepening that process, and we urge readers of the journal to make full use of it in that light. Forward to the Party! Struggle for the Party!

---

**Summing Up South African Coal Struggle**

In reviewing the work of the communists, particularly comrades of our organization, in the campaign that began last spring to stop South African coal imports, some lessons about the nature of work with trade unions—particularly so-called "progressive" unions—stand out.

It is important to sum these lessons up at this time, on the one hand because if we are to move forward to the new party and a new period of work among the masses, we must consciously sum up our mass work in the light of developing a correct political and ideological line for the programme and the party; and secondly, because the work of this campaign is not over and other so-called "communist" forces, the October League in particular, are still churning on the erroneous "progressive" line and are daily working in the future to spit this rubbish out on the mass movement.

A fundamental error underlying the work we did in the campaign until recently, was in our political line towards the issue. In the beginning we basically accepted the essentially protectionist line that the United Mine Workers (UMW) officials put out under the thin veil of some squawking protests about "slave-like" conditions in South African mines.

On April 22, 1974, a UMW memorandum concerning the coal was written by Tom Bethell in Washington, D.C., Arnold Billing and others from the UMWA, to quote from the memorandum: "Arrangements are currently being made to bring substantial quantities of low-sulfur steam coal into the United States from the Republic of South Africa. This move on the part of the South African coal industries requires a strong response on the part of the UMWA, because it takes jobs away from American miners and because coal is produced in South Africa under conditions very close to slave labor." (emphasis ours)

The memorandum then outlined the specific plans of the UMWA officials parties for the coal contract, discounted the situation of the South African coal industries and the "labor situation in South Africa," and ended up with this statement: "It is clear, however, that..."
Coal...
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The UMW stint is not the only coal import issue facing U.S. industries. As many miners as it would take to dig an equivalent amount of coal is part of a system of imperialism which oppresses both South African and American workers. The UMW's statement about U.S. corporations' "professed commitment to the development of our domestic coal industry" is a hollow gesture and open to the totally reactionary protectionist bourgeoisie and its party. To bring an end to the oppression and exploitation that both suffer we must clearly identify the system of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie itself is the enemy, inside and outside the unions. To seize on every spark of struggle, fan and spread it as broadly as possible and link it up to the struggles of the masses of workers around the world. To build a "picket line" that we raised early in the campaign, that "The importation of this coal is an increased attack on the mining class as a whole." It is clear that the Southern Company is part of a system of imperialism which oppresses both South African and American workers, and come home to do their exploiting. The imperialist solution turns into its opposite, paving the way for more extensive and destructive class wars and leading to a situation where the mass movements are driven out of the importation of coal. The UMW memorandum is blatant: it calls on the imperialists to participate in the class struggle. The UMW officials are threatened by the purchase of coal from a country which operates a highly exploitative economic system...which we owe allegiance to. It is clear that the Southern Company is part of a system of imperialism which oppresses both South African and American workers, and come home to do their exploiting. The imperialist solution turns into its opposite, paving the way for more extensive and destructive class wars and leading to a situation where the mass movements are driven out of the importation of coal. The UMW memorandum is blatant: it calls on the imperialists to participate in the class struggle. The UMW officials are threatened by the purchase of coal from a country which operates a highly exploitative economic system...which we owe allegiance to. The thing that all these tactics have in common is trying to build a struggle from the top down. It is clear that if we could just find some liberals or progressives to unite with the "communists," then we could get support from them and they'd come to our rescue. Then we'd have to go down "cooperation." Instead, we should see the struggle to be built by going deep among the masses with political campaigns and organizing workers and a struggle for their right to organize. In fact, it is up to us to go to the masses and unite with them in building the struggle for the social revolution and take the initiative in building a "picket line" that only seek to plop off the masses' struggles anyway.

We communists have a duty to analyze the issues before the masses from our own independent MarxistLeninist perspective. This includes analyzing come-to-call "facts" promulgated by the imperialist officialdom. We basically swallowed hook, line and sinker the view that the coal would affect miners' jobs. This shows the weakness of the way that imperialism functions in the real world—and not just in our minds during study classes.

Single Spark Method

One of the methods we should have taken up more deeply, which would have helped unite us away from the path of relying on unions official and the union apparatus is the "single spark method." As the Draft Programme says: "The answer (to dealing with the 'two-headed' monster in the daily battles of the working class) lies in uprooting it with a consistent policy of principled struggle against the systematic weakening...The method of the proletariat and its party is to mobilize the masses of workers to take matters into their own hands and struggle to sweep away the apparatus of combat against the enemy, inside and outside the unions. To seize on every spark of struggle, fan and spread it as broadly as possible and link it up to the struggles of the masses of workers around the world. To build a "picket line,"

If we had taken the issue deeply to the masses, essentially in the one-to-one contacts that comrades and others had among the mines and job elsewhere. We failed to develop the organizational forms of working-class struggle that could independently of union officials and without increasing the imperialist conscious- ness and action around the issue. The initial mistake in political line—around the question of the imperialist officialdom and its apparatus—was because we took up the stand that the miners' jobs were being attacked, and because we fell into some pragra- maticism about the fact that we had to win the struggle. As for the issue, we failed to grasp how our role was to broaden the struggle and make it a question before the working class as a whole.

In preparation for the February conference to or- ganize the coal campaign, the October League raised the line that the coal import represents "an attack on the moves for democracy and organizing efforts of the UMW." At the conference itself, the OL raised the slogan "Southern Co. scabs on U.S. and South Af- rican coal," saying that the coal "opens us a poten- tial source of coal to weaken any strike action and willingness to the South African coal conference in February. In continued on page 3...
file and in the form of file, we were able to tum the bureaucrats: they were caught between the mass sentiments of their own rank and file which were running high, and our concrete proposal for actions that the masses wanted to take up. In that situation they were forced to call out the rank and file to the May 22 demonstration. And at that point we were able to maintain some independent role— with our own programme, pickets, signs, and speakers. But immediately after this the UMW officials began backsliding. Was our role then to continue to try to reach the rank and file “through the union officials,” when they were running from the issue as fast as they could? Or was our duty to go to the rank and file themselves, who had already taken up the issue, and unite with the progressive and revolutionary aspects of their consciousness (the rudiments of class solidarity with the struggle in South Africa) to combat the backward baggage of “protectionism” that some of them carried? In addition, shouldn’t we have gone out broadly to other sections of the working class and begun to unite the class as a whole around the issue?

Expose Traitors and Roll Over Them

The Draft Programme says: “As an important part of its overall struggle, the working class will fight to organize unions, to unite the mass of workers in unions in the common battle against the capitalist class and exploiters, to make unions militant organizations of class struggle, and to replace agents of the bourgeoisie with true representatives of the proletariat in union office. ... But the working class and its party cannot base its strategy on ‘taking over’ the unions by electing new leadership and it cannot restrict its struggle to the limits set by the trade unions at any given time (emphasis ours). The policy of the proletariat and its party is to build its strength in the unions as part of building its revolutionary movement... Mobilize the rank and file around a program representing its interests and in doing so ‘join’ the union officials—expose the traitors at the top and roll them over, break the union bureaucrats’ stronghold on the workers, and unite with those on the lower levels of union leadership who can be won to stand with the working class—this is the policy of the proletariat and its party in the unions.”

We had an opportunity to begin to do just that. But we failed to expose the traitors at the top when it became both possible and necessary, and to roll over them by developing our own methods of reaching the workers. They are all agents of the bourgeoisie within the workers’ movement... The trade unions in this country, especially the big coal companies, are not built by the rank and file, but by the struggle and sacrifice of millions of workers. In the face of the mighty upsurge of the ’50s the coal unions, unlike the industrial unions, made concessions—and prepared to take them back.

Applying Analysis to UMW

We have to apply this same analysis to the UMW and in particular to the so-called “reform” or “progressive” officials like Arnold Miller. What does this mean? First of all, it means that all the trade unions today are in the hands of the bourgeoisie, through their agents.

The view of the communists towards the “progressive unionism” movement that Arnold Miller is connected with, is that what is really progressive about this movement is not some individuals who run into office (no matter how “honest” some of them may be), but the militancy and action of the thousands and thousands of the rank and file workers. We tac---

The trade unions in this country, especially the big coal companies, are not built by the rank and file, but by the struggle and sacrifice of millions of workers. In the face of the mighty upsurge of the ’50s the coal unions, unlike the industrial unions, made concessions—and prepared to take them back.

...The Union Mine Workers union is objective-
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and advance this understanding. We didn't go off in a corner and with the more advanced workers take potshots at the old workers and make teasing remarks about them. Instead, our caucus tried to build actions aimed at the company and all the time put the union leaders up against the wall with their own people.

For example, the union heads were collaborating with the company in stalling negotiations to demoralize the rank and file and weaken the momentum that had built up for a strike. They were practically incom unado and refused to hold a meeting to discuss the demands.

The foremen were slating the aisles in pairs looking for saboteurs, spreading rumors, and the people were demoralized. We got into the situation with the caucus and put out the call for mass meetings of the workers to make plans. In all, well over one quarter of the 1st and 2nd shift turned out. We reaffirmed the contract demands we had been putting forward and decided to confront the union heads to force them to have a meeting with the workers.

Besides running the soldiers' lunch and giving them indignation, many workers saw how the union heads were trying to win the workers around their arguments with the bargaining committee.

They also learned through their united action more about their own strength, and recognized the need to jump into the broader struggle.

The demands for the contract itself were summed up finally in this manner as well, through in-shop, lunch-time meetings.

Dividing the Class

Our mistakes came when we substituted our thoughts for those of the people. For instance, when we began to plan for the struggle we started to get the hang of it as following a particular class in categories and rating them in the struggle. This led us to come up with special demands and roles for, let's say, the Black workers or the younger workers.

For example, we felt that Black workers should fight for contract language that hit on the extra hard times they were facing because they were oppressed. We felt that the purely general issues were too narrow and no one, including the Black workers, saw it as an issue for the contract.

Instead of trying to figure out how to unite the class in struggle we were treating it like it was made up of different special interest groups.

We5 failed to apply MLM—we failed to grasp the fact that the material basis of unity, the common exploitation by the capitalists, was the basis for the workers' unity. We were trying to create the distinct categories that MLM teaches us should be handled.

We were too narrow and no one, including the Black workers, saw it as an issue for the contract simply because it fit their demands. Instead of trying to figure out how to unite the class in struggle we were treating it like it was made up of different special interest groups.

We also failed to apply MLM—we failed to grasp the fact that the material basis of unity, the common exploitation by the capitalists, was the basis for the workers' unity. We were trying to create the distinct categories that MLM teaches us should be handled.

The second reason we fell into this dividing error was that we didn't go to the people first for the demands. This is not to say that we don't raise special demands, but really whatever we win they will take away. Really the class struggle is the only way to gain gains.

We learned, through their united action more about their own strength, and recognized the need to jump into the broader struggle.

Unemployment Work

Another important example is of how people learned about the whole system through day to day struggle is our work around unemployment. Over the last year with the energy freeze we raised the broad general slogan, "Stop the Layoffs!" without any other fighting demands. So the reaction we got from the people was, "Yeah, that sounds like a good idea," or "That was a real good idea."

Our line in practice was that the most important thing we have to do is take the broad political lines against the-incomplete tradition, rather than understanding that the masses learn through their struggles and that the broad political lines become much more meaningful and important to people as they are involved in the struggle against their exploitation.

This basic idea left in the face of the Marxist theory of knowledge. As a result people got a few good ideas from the leaflets and some participated in the TTB plant committee. This is what was left. Recognizing our past mistakes, this year the caucus developed a fighting program around the layoffs. There has been some discussion about questions relating to unemployment, such as seniority, harassment, as well as linking these fights to the overall UWOC demands.

This year, instead of just passing out leaflets, the masses have been mobilized. We formed an employed/unemployed committee to fight not only against the company, in the fight against layoffs, and build unity with others like UWOC fighting around unemployment, but also to include members of our caucus as well as other workers who were coming forward to fight the unemployment.

The work of the employed/unemployed committee was powerfully supported by the union bureaucrats from the jump. Our first action was to put out a leaflet detailing our demands—no more overtime during layoffs and honor the seniority system in the layoffs.

The people were mobilized by the leaflet and the company and union bureaucrats were caught unawares. At this next union meeting they refused to allow discussion of our next plan, a mass informational picket line in front of the plant. At the same time they carried on an intensive red-baiting campaign. These actions sparked a storm of debate in the plant about our organization and communism, and the layoffs struggle itself. Some workers who "didn't want to know" from us before, actively participated in the discussion. The employed/unemployed committee tried to set up a meeting with the house office to present our demands. With the approval of the bargaining committee chairman, he refused to see us. The next day members of our caucus, mostly laid off workers, went into the plant to force the sellout chairman to go to the company with us. He refused and a huge amount was followed.

Workers, overhearing, came to join in jamming this back. He was "saved" by the personnel director who came huffing down the aisle, screaming to fire everyone who came into the plant off their shift.

The next day we went in again to force a meeting. Some workers from our floor and some others laid off workers went into the head of the company refused to come out of his office. We went in after him, jamming into his office. He was so scared he called the cops, who arrived minutes later just as we left after the office.

Excellent Lessons

All this struggle provided a practical living lesson of the role of the cops and union sellouts in supporting the company's exploitation.

Before, people summed up that "you can't fight city hall," that the company was too strong. Now, after the plant, discussion centered on how to fight. "Did you see how scared that personnel guy was?" said one worker. "I thought he was going to pass out." Instead of "what's the use?" people were saying, "That's the kind of action we need more of around here. It's really that workers' afraid of who." The next week, the entire first shift stopped work when the company called a worker back from layoff out of union revenge.

In the course of developing the struggle and class consciousness, the draft program states, "Members of the Revolutionary Communist Party..." (in the caucus) the policy of relying on the rank and file... "we... try to develop the life of these organizations and to create a new..." (through this whole process, active fighters for the class will continually come forward, and unite to lead struggle, and make the movement of the people form will develop into communists and join the party.)

To do this we unite with the advanced workers to lead the workers to the unique role of the party as the "advanced workers" in order to carry out our political tasks.

The concept of an "advanced worker" is not mechanical but means the workers who come forward to fight and lead others. Though they may not have a very developed understanding of the system when they first combine forward, the core of our caucus has been made up of those who have come forward, and unite between the struggles of our class and that the problem is the system. Some active workers who have not grasp these links are more on the fringes of the caucus and come forward for the "short term." This is not static, as some workers may come forward in a particular struggle and stay for a while. Of course, the development of these advanced workers is not a spontaneous thing but will develop only by relying on and leading these advanced workers with day to day battles and by linking these struggles with the overall class struggle and the struggle for revolution.

Part of this is to try MLM with these workers and thus arm them with the science that will light the way for revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The point here is not to artificially divide the class with the idea of creating a "special" group. This is solely on the workers with a heavy rap or the ones who will fight, or neither—has been a constant source of discussions of our caucus. The most important point is to rely on the initiative of the advanced in leading the struggle and to consciously develop these fighters into fighters for the whole class.

No To Baggage

In the overall struggle in the plant in the last years a number of things have come to have clear that we have summed up. We have come to see that the work class has been struggling against its exploitation ever since its existence. Workers have summed up and learned certain things in these struggles.

This fight continues and is intensifying today. As future members of the Revolutionary Communist Party, we understand the importance of being at the center of the working class struggle at this time. Our own experience and MLM has shown us that only by going to the center of these struggles and leading them will the revolutionary workers' movement continue to grow and move forward.

These day to day struggles by our class against their exploitation, if led by our party in a correct manner, will only bring closer the fall of the bourgeoisie and the rule of the workers. The struggle...
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glots are battles in our overall war with the ruling class. They can serve to weaken our enemy and build our movement.

Our job is not to sit on the sidelines and watch and criticize for being too narrow, or to criticize the workers for being too backward. Our job is not to put our subjective hangups on the workers and artificially divide the class or substitute what we think is important.

We say No! to this baggage. The working class learns through its day to day struggle. We will continue to go into these struggles, help lead them and give light to them by linking them up with the overall revolutionary workers' movement and our fight for socialism.

As the draft programme states, "The party of the proletariat must bring to the workers, through all their struggles, the understanding of the antagonistic contradictions between themselves and the bourgeoisie, and consistently guide the struggle to its final aim." ■

Class Stand Key In Boston Busing Struggle

The key question for communists in the Boston busing struggle is: what class stand do we take in the fight? The answer is clear in theory. But in practice, applying the correct class stand has been a difficult process.

The bourgeoisie attack not only its ranks, but the other strata as well. In this way, it sees also the stratification of society and the monopoly capitalists who rule it. It is able to turn the desperation of the ruined workers for being too backward. Our job is not to help their fight or serve its interests. For instance, in Southie we hear increasing talk of how all the school boycott has done is to lead to more youth street crime.

The rulers have responded with intensified attacks on the school boycott. Some still do. ROAR was the only organized force offering to lead resistance to the attacks on the schools and neighborhoods of the city. They do all they can to misdirect this resistance and turn it against the working class.

In Southie especially, working through the Home and School Associations, they have established many social forces into the field of battle. The ruling class is faced with a worldwide crisis which is bringing new forms of organizations and expansions of nationalities. They have sought to divide the working class and the struggles of the oppressed nationalities. They have tried to rally the working class and other people to their banner. In the absence of a revolutionary, communist party, ROAR has had some temporary success, while the narrow nationalists have remained isolated from the masses.

Continued on page 6
Further expose the role of the bourgeois nationalists.

The point of all this is that the bourgeoisie has been able to play upon the contradictions among the people and to build up to some degree its agents in order to mislead the working class and oppressed nationalities. But the working class is learning in the course of the day to day struggle who its friends and enemies are. "With the aid of the party, it seems that none of these other class forces can represent its interests." (p. 33)

The role of communists. The Boston busing struggle clearly shows how the absence of a revolutionary communist party has held back the struggle of the working class. We need a communist party that is based on the outlook of the working class and relies on the masses.

Our efforts to develop a program for the day to day struggle of the working class for education and equality in Boston have revealed certain tendencies which must be struggled against as we move forward to the party.

Our main weakness was our tendency to underestimate the working class and to look to other strata for leadership in the struggle. We tended to adopt the outlook of the petty bourgeoisie and especially to view things from the perspective of the Black bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie.

Ignoring the historical development of the single multinational U.S. working class, we didn't grasp that we are in a new period when the principal contradiction is once again between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat—when that contradiction is more influencing than ever by every other contradiction in society. We didn't understand what it means to say the proletariat must lead. This held back work in several ways.

Initially, we correctly summed up the busing plan as an attack by the bourgeoisie. This was in part due to discussion with several workers, Black, Latin and white, who either had kids in school or had themselves gone through the Boston schools. We did not see, however, that this was primarily an attack on the working class.

Further, we didn't understand just how important education is to the working class.

Our failure to see the busing attack in the context of the struggle of the working class for better schools and against discrimination resulted in a one-sided acceptance of the bourgeoisie's terms. We put forward the slogan, "People Must Unite to Smash the Boston Bus Plan," but put the working class in a defensive position by not seeking the most favorable ground on which to fight.

Main Error

But then for a while it was "freak out city," as our "old friends" from the moral movement mounted their attacks on the working class and on our line. The roar from the left: "The real and working class is racist" caused us to look over our shoulders to our petty bourgeois past and to lose sight of the future and the class.

Our main error in this period was to look to the bourgeois nationalists for leadership. Some of us began to think maybe the thing behind the school boycott was white workers' racism. We struggled over whether Southie was built on "privilege" and thus should be smashed. But then for a while it was "freak out city," as our "old friends" from the moral movement mounted their attacks on the working class and on our line. The roar from the left: "The real and working class is racist" caused us to look over our shoulders to our petty bourgeois past and to lose sight of the future and the class.

We need a communist party that is based on the outlook of the working class for education and equality in Boston and to expose Garrity and the Gillette Co.'s "falsification of the facts" with leafleting, picketing, rallies, marches and murals. We have taken them to particular fights—like Kerrigan (BSC pig) and Rachel off out at Boston State College, to throw the Nazis out of Boston, to expose Garrity and the Gillette Co.'s role in the busing plan and to kick the cops out of Hyde Park High and get the parent groups back in.

A clearer grasp of the proletarian class stand is being developed in the mass struggle and in turn is releasing the initiative of communists in leading the masses in struggle.
Lessons from the Farmworker Struggle

We began in the farmworker movement in Salinas in 1971, a variety of early farmworker movements. Unions and Farmworkers Union had hit a mark high. The year before had seen the victories in the grape fields after years of strikes and boycotts, and the victory in the lettuce fields, a result of the massive strike of 1970.

Organized labor stood at over 40,000 and the future for the strike was bright. The fields were built with activity and optimism for struggle, part of the rebellion and class hatred unleashed by the Salinas general strike which was well on its way to overthrowing imperialism in the country, in the Northwest, in Florida's citrus and so on. It was seen, in the heat of struggles in California. The UFW felt the question of organization. Where to organize next? How long would it take to organize the country's farmworkers?

The UFW was a high point in the struggle which began six years before when Filipino grapeworkers in Delano struck growers, demanding higher wages. The strike in 1966, the state and the national labor program with Mexico was ended. Though the growers opposed its ending, they had to take advantage of the massive salinas strike and the acrimonious relations that was in the city. We related to the fields that which could popularize the struggles of workers in the fields and learn from it. This much we understood.

Pacifism, Moralism

One of the first incorrect tendencies in our thinking was the pacifism today. The movement is not really "Cesar," not really militant. This amounted to taking the pacifist and moralist line put out by the United Farm Workers' leadership as a class wage, as a value, as though it were the beginning and end of the farmworker movement.

The actual struggles, and the militant attitude of farmworkers themselves, helped us to overcome this view, and we began to grasp the significance of farmworker struggles. The movement class. Farmworkers have a tremendous amount of class hatred for their oppressors and are constantly struggling to win the concessions they have a long and rich history of struggle.

Most farmworkers come from oppressed nations, particularly in Latin America, have a great deal of perceptive experience and knowledge of imperialism as a worldwide system. Mexican people, as well, have a rich history of organizing struggles extending into this century which is part of their culture and tradition. Farmworkers in recent years have waged massive struggles against the growers, the state and the system.

Failure to grasp this well led to a second incorrect tendency, a night. View that the UFW leadership was basically correct. Farmworkers were just doing everything under the existing conditions to advance the movement as it existed. They would strike, but with certain forces with the bourgeoisie because the growing trade movement class overall was too weak, and they did so only in order to play on contradictions among the bourgeoisie.

Experience in struggle proved this assessment incorrect. In fact, the leadership of the UFW are the agents of the bourgeoisie. The farmworker movement who have and will continue to fight against the spread of revolutionary consciousness among farmworkers in order to keep the struggle within bounds acceptable to the bourgeoisie.

This does not mean that the UFW has not played a progressive role. The movement and the workers that otherwise could not have been sustained, in developing the boycott as a weapon, of spreading to masses of people understanding the role and character of farmworkers, as well as helping to arouse farmworkers as participants in the trade union struggle. But to see only this side, and not to see the line of the union of putting the movement at the tail of the bourgeoisie, would leave us blind to the fact that as imperialism decays and the struggle against it mounts, the revolutionary line would become more and more an obstacle to advancing the farmworker struggle against attacks, and a roadblock to advancing the farmworker movement into a powerful section of the revolutionary workers' movement.

Had this tendency not been struggled against, summed up in the course of our experience in the exposed workers' movement as a whole as summed up by the Revolutionary Union, it would have led us to become not militants, but mystics and demagogues. We would have been left incapable of understanding the real condition of workers in America, or of capable of waging a struggle against the restrictions of trade union ideology. We would have seen workers in various industries as just one element in a larger system.

But this general knowledge had to be deepened. Grasping how to apply the theory of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions of the farmworker movement had to come through experience, struggle, summing up of experience, etc. There were no manuals on the subject of farmworker organizing in the period of the final fall of imperialism to go by, and reliance on an understanding of just the general conclusions of Marxism-Leninism would not do. We had to get involved in the struggle of the workers in the fields and learn from it. This much we understood.

Two Lines Develop in Practice

In the spring of 1972 a comrade and an advanced worker put together the first issue of the Worker of the Salinas Valley. The intention was to develop a paper which could popularize the struggles of working people in the area, to unite workers in common struggle. Its first issues reflected the grasp of things that had been developed by the UFW, a left, essentially a left trade union (vaguely anti-imperialist) paper which was distributed largely through the union, including at times by shop stewards to various union crews.

The staff of the paper took a position in opposition to the union's line for the first time around the struggle against Proposition 22, the last of the major battles against anti-union legislation in California. In that campaign, the UFW leadership was to the attack on the union, while it bolstered the campaign of George McGovern for president.

The Worker also came out after correcting some initial incorrect ideas in opposition to both Nixon and McGovern, pointing out that both represented the ruling class despite their supposed differences. If McGovern sounded more "friendly" to farmworkers (or to the Vietnamese fighting for liberation) it only amounted to some slight tactical differences on how best to defeat the farmworker movement (and carry out the imperialists' policies in Indochina). The loss of 1972, especially the McGovern campaign, and its preparatory campaign to beat down the union struggle using the Teamster Union as one of its clubs. Communists understood with some progressivism proposals and links to build an organization to support farmworkers in upcoming battles.

Our approach was to go out actively to other workers in the area, particularly in the sheds and canneries, with a class line. In this we opposed the union's line that we should organize a group of liberal supporters who could hold press conferences once in a while to speak out on the latest outrages of the Teamster and growers. More than five thousand leaflets were distributed around the Valley calling on workers to support the farmworkers as part of the struggle of the class against the bourgeoisie.

A petition campaign demanding the Teamster Union leave the farmworkers' boycott union was held in an overwhelmingly farmworker area, mainly among non-farmworkers. A militant demonstration was held at the Teamster office and included a few Teamster pickets next to the anti-boycott pickets of a white truck driver who joined the line as he saw it driving by. The committee also put out a pamphlet summing up the history of the farmworker movement, Si Se Puedi.

Great Potential

In order to mobilize working people and other pro-people groups in the cities, we made contact with communists in the Bay Area and Los Angeles. Other support committees were formed, and it soon became apparent that the potential to gain an active bloc of workers for farmworkers was a real possibility with a militant class line.

The committees began developing support, the UFW launched a vigorous attack on the committees, claiming they were attempting to usurp the union, take over leadership of the farmworker union, make money off the movement, and other lies. In this attack they united with AFL-CIO hacks; and were sided by the Communist Party and other opportunists. The attack on the effort to mobilize support was like being dosed with cold water—a sobering experience. We were forced to develop our analysis of the situation and recognize the weakness of the union leadership, and all the lies. We had believed that the possibility of the great masses of workers mobilized to support the farmworkers was an illusion. We would welcome it, or if not welcome it at least accept it. We were wrong.

Connected with our lack of firm understanding of social democracy as an ideology that defends the bourgeois (with a "progressive" cover) was a failure to grasp the need to rely on the masses. We had been put instead to rely on a lot on lower level union officials who...
the murder of Naji Darwish, a Yemeni worker who
worked for the Central Valley grape growers. While
linking up the big struggles going on in the fields
with a worldwide movement to end the imperialist
domination of the world, they decided that the murder
of a brother would not stop or slow down the fight.
But spur people’s determination to carry forward the
strike.

Communists Join Struggle

Communists joined in the ongoing struggle in the
fields. In addition we attempted to put forward the
more advanced line of the AWU, which opposed the
connection between the immediate fierce struggle
and the developing workers’ movement, pointing out
the need to consciously build a movement against
imperialism.

In Salinas, a May Day rally was organized by a
committee made up of radical growers, farmworker
support group, The Worker, and a number of
active farmworkers including veterans of the
Division of the Revolutionary Union (which was
started by strikers). The May Day rally, which drew nearly
400 workers from the fields, canneries and local factories,
put forward the idea that without a struggle against
other classes the battle against oppression was
meaningless. This included the Farah struck, Mexican-american canny workers who
were fighting against company and union discrimination
and Indian peoples in their struggle against the
Shah and U.S. imperialism.

A local theatre group put on a theatre exposing the
treachery of the Teamster bureaucrats and growers
and pointed out the connection between the struggle of farmworkers,
and the growers in the cities. A speaker from The Worker summed up some of the
ongoing struggles and pointed out the situation
people face can only ultimately be solved through revolution
to overthrow imperialism.

Throughout the struggle, thousands of caravans of
workers, students, and others, mainly from the
Bay Area, were organized to support farmworkers’
struggles. These caravans were a new type of colony of
the U.S. So workers come here because monopolies like Safeway, Bank of
America etc. have to capitalism. It championed the same chauvinist campaign against
farmworkers that was never discussed, nor
the workers on the basis of class solidarity. The UFW

Workers Fight Back

In the middle of April the growers had launched
their head-on assault on the union in Coachella,
taking Teamster guns at shock troops backed up by
the courts and county sheriffs. One hundred and fifty
farmworkers from Salinas (called the Division of the
North) helped launch the strike. In spite of massive
arrests, deaths and the brutal treatment of workers fought
back vigorously. Within a week the local court was
forced to withdraw its injunction, dropping charges
against workers who had not been involved from the
beginning, many of these were Mexican-American, and
graped the real significance of what had happened, nor
were they in a position to really strongly support us.

It became apparent that it was not the growers,
courts, and cops who were “alright,” but the masses
of farmers mobilized to fight. They literally fought
through all direct assaults and forced the cops and
the growers to withdraw their injunction. Within a
week the local court was forced to withdraw its
injunction, dropping charges against workers who
were not involved from the beginning, many of these
were Mexican-Americans, and grasped the real
significance of what had happened, nor were
they in a position to really strongly support us.

It became apparent that it was not the growers,
courts, and cops who were “alright,” but the masses
of farmers mobilized to fight. They literally fought
through all direct assaults and forced the cops and
The bourgeoisie of course had its representative in
the form of the AWU. It was a tremendous victory for farmworkers in resisting
the bourgeoisie’s union-busting plan. A number of resolutions passed at the end of the convention,
many of which came from the floor, in support of woodcutters,
possessed the fascist junta in Chile, in support of miners
in Sweden, for liberation of the Palestinian people, for
liberation of the workers of the world, and in support of
Nagi Darwish, a Yemeni worker on

The bourgeoisie of course had its representative in
the form of the AWU. It was a tremendous victory for farmworkers in resisting
the bourgeoisie’s union-busting plan. A number of resolutions passed at the end of the convention,
many of which came from the floor, in support of woodcutters,
possessed the fascist junta in Chile, in support of miners
in Sweden, for liberation of the Palestinian people, for
liberation of the workers of the world, and in support of
Nagi Darwish, a Yemeni worker on

Continued from page 7 where we leaves off the
bourgeoisie’s union-busting plan. A number of
resolutions passed at the end of the convention,
many of which came from the floor, in support of
the organizing work and the support of the
united farmworkers and the Campaign for a
New International. The AWU leadership promoted the same collaboration
ist ideology that the AFL-CIO and other workers’
unions fought against.

Continued from page 8
Continued from page 8

unable to do anything but hope for a kind hand from “men of good will” (the bourgeoisie).

In opposing this line we not only pointed out the litany of anti-imperialist films on Latin America, songs, literature, and music. This rally—relentless against the ruling class—vs. the union’s line of reliance on the bourgeoisie and rally brought enthusiasm and some hints of a broad struggle among Montemart’s employees. Retail Clerk members, for example, referred to the struggle as a way of breaking out of the restrictions the union attempts to impose. This committee, made up of between 20-30 active officials and could advise them when they were violating union rules but would not make decisions for them. The boycott, though minor, had a noticeable effect. It led to a broadening out of the weekly boycott meetings and contributed to arousing greater enthusiasm and spirit for the boycott itself.

The boycott came under heavy attack from the bourgeoisie and their agents. A court injunction limiting picketing of several hundred stores carrying Gallo wines was obtained. The workers under the leadership of the committee responded by organizing a demonstration to oppose the injunction. Leaflets were distributed to local neighborhoods, schools and places of worship, calling on support to defend farmers’ right to boycott. The injunction linked up this injunction with one against the workers who were violating union rules but would not make decisions for them. The boycott, though minor, had a noticeable effect. It led to a broadening out of the weekly boycott meetings and contributed to arousing greater enthusiasm and spirit for the boycott itself.

As an important part of its overall struggle, the union leadership agreed with the existence of a rank and file boycott committee, they of course had a different view of it than the workers. For the officials it was a good thing to have a rank and file committee that could do the organizing work and lead the meetings, as long as the line of the committee was that which could who do any decisions or plans they didn’t like while directing the workers.

The leadership’s position towards the rally was to head up the boycott. Though it was not an official rally, the idea was that out of it would come, and that from then on he would have the leading position, and in a better position to fight the leadership agreed with the existence of a rank and file boycott committee, they of course had a different view of it than the workers. For the officials it was a good thing to have a rank and file committee that could do the organizing work and lead the meetings, as long as the line of the committee was that which could make any decisions or plans they didn’t like while directing their way.

The boycott committee, made up of between 20-30 active officials and a few rank and file members, of whom no more than two or three crossed the picket line. The impatient and spirit for the boycott itself.

A march of 400 workers and students over 400 people, mostly farmworkers, some students and other workers as well. The action overall pointed to imperialism as the enemy to unite and fight. The final speech of the rally by an RU member also pointed out the need to unite the entire working class, not only to fight the immediate struggles, but eventually to overthrow the imperialist class and build a new society, a step that the Chinese people, for instance, had already taken.

Stop Forward

On all the preparation and the rally itself marked a step forward in bringing revolutionary politics to workers who were recently organized.
Lessons...

Continued from page 9

As part of the union local leadership went around bad-mouthing the rally, though not publicly. It spread the idea that the action was adventurist—since so many farmworkers had attended, many of them union members, the rally would be identified with the union and would lead to greater repression (especially because of the RU speech and because Marxist-Leninist literature was sold at the rally). They worked on a weakness of the rally, that few workers outside the fields showed up to it. They did this from the point of view of, "See, it's really hopeless to try and unite the working class."

Apple Strike

"But the class struggle itself provides the basis for the working class to cast away illusions and cast aside the front men of the bourgeoisie who promote them. These social democratic agents of the imperialism will be exploded and dealt with as enemies, as the working class, led by its party, a mobilized for its immediate解放—a class struggle—to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat, socialism, and communism.

The decay of imperialism forces the bourgeoisie, in a desperate attempt to save itself, to viciously attack working people as they attack farmworkers not because they "believe their own propaganda" that farmworkers are a threat to them when they are not, as Cesar Chavez stated in a recent speech in Modesto, but because they cannot survive without increasing the burdens they place on the people.

In the tomato fields around Stockton and in citrus orchards in Yuma, Arizona, workers fought back vigorously against these attacks, waging two of the larger battles that swept California and parts of Arizona from the spring through the fall of '74. In many if not all of these battles, workers without papers, the object of attack by the bourgeoisie and the leadership of the UFW, fought in the front ranks. Such was the case in Watsonville, in the apple orchards.

The apple strike at Buak Co. was significant, not because it was a huge battle—in the scheme of things it was a skirmish—but because of important lessons that were made: the failure of the strike was the statement that the struggle for justice to just the immediate gains (and this with the strategy of pressuring the bourgeoisie to come through with favorable legislation), communists put forward a line that linked up the strike with the larger struggles against the ruling class.

This included pointing out that "illegal" are a part of the working class, and more than that, they are victims of imperialist domination of their homelands. This line was not just rhetoric—it played a material role in building morale and therefore helped sustain the struggle. Also it proved to be the most effective line in influencing a number of people to work out of the fields.

Through the strike itself, through the struggles around line, and through discussions that took place throughout the strike, a number of workers began to see their struggle as part of the class struggle. The restrictions shown up in their path, whether the social democratic leaders attempted to keep them in place, were not enough to prevent some workers from developing class consciousness. This was a modest but important development.

Since the struggle itself does provide the basis for the working class to cast away illusions, it is no wonder that social democrats and all traitors to the class always seek to discourage struggle, even to claiming that farmworkers can't win strikes and therefore they are hopeless and some other form of struggle must be found—not in addition to the strike, but instead of it. But since workers will fight back against oppression, social democrats within the struggle always seek to keep them in the narrowest bounds, opposing class consciousness, treating revolutionary ideas like the plague.

Break Through Obstacles

Ilusions cannot be cast away automatically, spontaneously—even because the bourgeoisie is continually promoting them. Therefore communists must unite with the workers and help them break through the obstacles thrown in their way—fight for the immediate needs—work to unite the class—struggle to build a revolutionary movement against the money.

The work over the years in the farmworker movement has had its advances and setbacks. Even in the aftermath of the Buak strike, with the role communists played in pushing forward the struggle, did not prevent us from being attacked, which created some division in some workers' minds—especially over our stand on "illegal," but also on "what these communists are up to."

But these difficulties must be seen in the context of the advances made. Those difficulties will be overcome in time. The development in our work, as in the workers struggle itself, is upward, and it is certain, despite difficulties that lie ahead, that communists persist in carrying out a revolutionary line, rely on the masses, oppose incorrect ideas and promote correct ones. We will succeed in building a revolutionary movement among farmworkers as a powerful section of the revolutionary workers' movement as a whole—one that will overthrow imperialism and create a new world.

Long live the revolutionary movement of the working class! On to the Revolutionary Communist Party!
Stand For and With the Workers-
In Their Day to Day Struggles
And in Making Revolution

To take the stand of the working class—this is something that as communists we constantly strive for in everything we do. But how to do that, how to uphold the outlook of the proletariat is no sure thing, especially since there has been, for so long, no vanguard party of the working class, and because of that; many of us have come to Marxism-Leninism from the “movement,” bringing with us enough petty-bourgeois baggage to fill a small leather trunk.

But we have made advances, and these advances have come as a result of us going to the workers, learning from them and deepening our understanding of what Marxism-Leninism applied to the concrete conditions of our society and time.

The main work our collective is doing, the work in basic steel, has reflected this advancement. But this hasn’t come without a lot of struggle and a lot of getting rid of wrong ideas. And what we’ve found is when our ideas didn’t correspond with reality, the masses of workers wouldn’t buy into it, they’d look at us about all the time, if we’re willing to listen and learn from them.

As May Day of last year approached, those of us in the RU, the active and advanced workers that were working closely with us and other revolutionary-minded people were going out all over the city building for May Day. Those of us working in the mills had begun to do agitation around May Day, stressing how the working class is fighting every day and the war against the bourgeoisie.

And last year our work in the steel industry was an important thrust of May Day, with the event being held in the neighborhood right by the mills and the fight against the anti-strike deal, the EMA, being an important part of the march and rally.

While many working class people were in the process of trying to get a better understanding of what our experience in the mills had been, the strengths and weaknesses of our work there and how to best move it forward. We had been active in some of the struggles going on, had won some amount of respect from some of the advanced and intermediate workers. But we really weren’t linking these struggles to others that the working class is fighting every day and the war against the bourgeoisie.

In talking about these errors that we were making we talked about making sure we didn’t get “bogged down” in the struggles that were going on in the mills. And there was a lot of struggle going on.

Left and Right Errors

At that time the capitalists were in the midst of a big productivity drive. Guys were getting antsy for looking the wrong way, we were getting fired for the stand that the working class learns through struggle. We shifted, spontaneous meetings took place, petitions were brought in, but didn’t put forward anything other than call for more meetings until some foremen. What we told them is that we wanted to fight this too, and if they would only get involved with May Day and help lay the overall struggle, it would move forward the struggle in the shop.

Actually, in essence it came down to saying, “later for your struggle. Get involved with May Day and maybe later we could do something about these day to day struggles.” In reality, it would have gone into that struggle, provide leadership for it, link it up with the other struggles that the class was waging and May Day. We could have really made a breakthrough in the work in the mill and in building a powerful May Day.

But we hadn’t yet understood the importance of the exploitation and oppression of the working class suffers daily, and the importance of what the working class learns through their struggle against this. We still tended to look at things through the eyes of the “movement.”

Such a couple of examples generally characterized our work around May Day, and consequently, while it was an overall advance and a spirited and militant event, only a small number of workers came out from the mills. But out of this, and out of struggling and learning from other members of the RU, we really began to see more clearly the importance and the relationship between the battles that the working class is fighting every day and the war against the bourgeoisie.

We were able to do this because, from the beginning, even though our work contained many errors, we tried to base ourselves on the working class. While some forces in the movement were busy chasing after trade union leaders, begging these “reformers” to help them “move these backward workers to the left,” and while others were issuing “proclamations” at the gates while making sure not to get their hands too dirty, we understood that it was the proletariat that was key, that was the thoroughly revolutionized class, the only class that as a class could grasp and apply Marxism-Leninism.

Since that time we have been making a lot of advances around our work in the mills. Through studying and learning from the working class we have been better able to apply Marxism-Leninism, build and lead struggle and build greater multinational unity.

Through the course of uniting with various struggles that have broken out in the different mills and shops in the plant, we’ve been able to pull together a plant-wide organization that bears itself on the struggles that steelworkers are presently fighting and links them up with other important struggles of the working class. At the same time we’ve been much bolder at taking up the question of developing communists from among the workers and have made advances in this.

We have much to learn and much incorrect thinking to rid ourselves of. But if we stand with the working class, if we unite with them and help give leadership to the struggles that they are already waging in and day out, we will strengthen our class, weaken the enemy and move closer to revolution. In looking at the importance of these struggles, the Draft Programme correctly points out:

“In these struggles, the workers begin to throw off the false false position of the employer from their necks, to raise their heads. And in raising their heads they are able to see farther and more clearly. The face of the enemy and the forces fighting him begin to come into sharper focus. This gives rise to vigorous discussion among the workers not only about every question of the immediate struggle but also about problems throughout society and the world. Through all this the workers begin to see themselves as more than mere individuals, but as members of a class, locked in warfare with the opposing classes of employers.”

At the present time, in looking at our struggle, two things are clear. One, that the “radical” movement of the 60s, the movement of the old period, is fading into the twilight. But secondly, and most importantly, the working class today is coming forward—as a social force in the neighborhood and in the mills and in building a powerful May Day. Through the course of uniting with various struggles that have broken out in the different mills and shops in the plant, we’ve been able to pull together a plant-wide organization that bears itself on the struggles that steelworkers are presently fighting and links them up with other important struggles of the working class. At the same time we’ve been much bolder at taking up the question of developing communists from among the workers and have made advances in this.

We have much to learn and much incorrect thinking to rid ourselves of. But if we stand with the working class, if we unite with them and help give leadership to the struggles that they are already waging in and day out, we will strengthen our class, weaken the enemy and move closer to revolution. In looking at the importance of these struggles, the Draft Programme correctly points out:

“In these struggles, the workers begin to throw off the false false position of the employer from their necks, to raise their heads. And in raising their heads they are able to see farther and more clearly. The face of the enemy and the forces fighting him begin to come into sharper focus. This gives rise to vigorous discussion among the workers not only about every question of the immediate struggle but also about problems throughout society and the world. Through all this the workers begin to see themselves as more than mere individuals, but as members of a class, locked in warfare with the opposing classes of employers.”

At the present time, in looking at our struggle, two things are clear. One, that the “radical” movement of the 60s, the movement of the old period, is fading into the twilight. But secondly, and most importantly, the working class today is coming forward—as a social force toward the building of a revolutionary communist party; in the struggle to lead the fight against the oppression it along with other classes and strata in society suffer at the hands of the capitalist system—and as a class to lead its allies in overthrowing the capitalist system and build a new society.
Workers at Plant X wildcat in November 1974, a week before the strike action was expired. The plant was shut down for a day and half the 750 workers stayed out. Communists were in leadership of the strike, but in the absence of a clear lead among the workers. The company took advantage of this, crushed the strike quickly and moved to smash the workers’ struggle there altogether. More than 100 were fired, the company came down hard on the rest of the workers with a campaign of harassment and intimidation. What was the condition at Plant X and why was it ripe for struggle?

1. Wages tremendously depressed in relation to the rest of the city—$3.50 per hour.
2. Intense speedup in the plant (coinciding with the development of monopolies in the industry over the last 15 years. In cut-throat competition for their survival, their drive to increase the exploitation of the workers.)

The wildcat of Puerto Rican and other Latin workers (who in response to their oppression were active in fighting company attacks). The company saw the need to fight and the labor traitors stood as an enemy, the company, with the fight against union hacks taking on the character of a protest against the union.

As Mao said, “At certain times in the revolutionary struggle the contradictions are so sharp that the favorable conditions and so constitute the principal aspect of the contradiction and the favorable conditions constitute the contradiction.” The conditions at Plant X were favorable. However, “favorable conditions can be transformed into difficulty if the revolutions make mistakes.”

The bosses and the workers are locked in constant battle for their survival. Failing to bring us clearly that the capitalists are driven by the laws that govern their system, we contributed to the illusion that capitalists can reorder their priorities to meet the needs of the workers. We did not deal with the legitimacy of the union. The workers were active in fighting company attacks, but at many crucial points we did not provide them with leadership, did not fight for the correct line to lead the struggle forward.

For example, at the meeting where we planned the wildcat we did not put forth the need for striking. If a number of workers were afraid that we didn’t have enough support to pull it off and argued for a job action (leading up to a strike to vote on the contract), Others were for a protest against the switching of the vote. We did not deal with the legitimacy of the union. We did not have enough with those who saw union treachery as the main problem. We failed to see how crucial it was to consolidate workers around the correct line of “strike the company, not the union.”

Role of Communists

Our mistaken view of the class struggle was also reflected in our attitude toward the communists. There was an open communist in the committee. In this mass organization we limited the role of communists to being the most militant fighters rather than also educating workers to the revolutionary interests of their class. The shop paper, initiated by communists and meant to play a leading role, had no spokesmen on the committee. We were successful in banning the flames, actually involving hundreds of workers in struggle, summing up their needs, and developing programmatic unity. But at many crucial points we did not provide them with leadership, did not fight for the correct line to lead the struggle forward.

In the struggle at Plant X, the workers did not give up the fight when they were fired. Where there is a temporary setback, it spurs discussion among the workers as to the cause of the defeat. Advanced workers, along with the communists, summed up that it was an incorrect line that set us up for defeat and that the bosses are all powerful.

Role of Communists

We had an incorrect understanding of the fundamental contradiction in society, which leads to an incorrect strategy on any front: factory struggle, organizing a strike sharply in the relation of the class struggle to the trade unions. It led to battling the union hacks as a stepping stone to their end—demoralization of the workers in practice, relying on the union to take up the class struggle.

Because we left the struggle within the bounds of the trade union, we made negotiated primary and vacillated on the question of the strike. We started out with a position to make strike preparations—that it was necessary to strike in order to win a decent contract. But through the course of the struggle we failed in the view that you use the strike as a last resort—workers use the strike as a defensive rather than an offensive weapon.

In the history of the company, there has never been a strike. An example from our shop newspaper: “Does the [paper] think there will be a strike at [Plant X]? We can’t say for sure. If we can’t win what we need... then we will strike.” And from a leaflet put out by the committee: “If the company refuses to give us what we need we can say no and go on strike... We think [Plant X] workers have a good chance to win a decent contract because we’re better organized and because this big monopoly of which Plant X is a part wants to avoid a strike.”

How this vacillation came down in practice is demonstrated dramatically by events at the union contract meeting. Several hundred workers stood up to applaud when a shop steward, a communist, spoke out against the contract. We asked the workers to turn it down, called for more negotiations.

And later, when the majority of workers realized they had won the vote (by body count) and began to chant “strike!,” the strike, strike! We had led the workers to take over the meeting, since at that point the union officials had no control and the workers were ready to move into battle against the company.

Organize a Wildcat

At the contract ratification meeting the majority of workers voted NO. All hell broke loose when the union president switched the vote and announced that the contract was accepted. Workers wanted to fight, so we organized a wildcat for the next day. This anger was turned on the union hacks because the workers saw the need to fight and the labor leaders stood as an obstacle.

At the heart of this struggle was the fact that the contract wasn’t enough to live on for the next three years. The money they would have had to remove this obstacle by relying on our own strength, mobilizing the workers and fighting the company. Our line should have been: “We rejected the contract, as we’re walking.” The immediate thing put forward by some of the workers was to demand a re-vote. The communists visited the shop, tried to mobilize the workers but didn’t succeed, didn’t succeed for a clear line of fighting the company, so the wildcat took on the character of a protest against the union.

A new position came up: “No bosses, no work!” ’The workers’ struggle into a struggle for union democracy. It forced many workers to abandon the strike when union officials failed to show up to negotiate with the wildcaters. If you shoot the beast in the eye, you kill both heads. We struck our blows at the union hacks and let the company off free.

This obscured the face of the enemy and made it impossible to organize and win the strike. We confined them to small union bounds and made the struggle for reforms the principal thing. As the draft programme states: “The policy of the proletariat and its leadership is clear in the unions and of building its revolutionary movement and not to the immediate struggle to the struggle for control of the unions.”

In summary:

1. The correct strategy would have been to “mobilize the rank and file around a program representing its interests and in doing so four empires” (i.e., the union officials—expose the traitors at the top and roll over them, break the union bureaucracies’ stranglehold on the workers...)

2. “The method of the proletariat and its officials—expose the traitors at the top and roll over them, break the union bureaucrats’ stranglehold on the workers...” The method of the proletariat and its party is to mobilize the masses of workers to take matters into their own hands and wage a blow for blow struggle against the enemy, the union, the bosses.”

SUMMING UP A SERIES OF LOCAL