One

The draft programme calls for building various forms of workers organizations, in the plants and unions and among the class as a whole. Some of these organizations, such as rank and file caucuses, are created by the workers 'spontaneously' (without committees initiating them) to defend their immediate interests on the shop floor, to carry on struggles in the unions, and often to give leadership in strikes.

"In these organizations, as well as caucuses and other forms they do initiate, members of the Revolutionary Communist Party put forward the policy of relying on mass rank and file, and mobilizing it to fight around its own grievances in the plant and union and to link up with struggles outside the plant." (p. 30)

The draft also calls for intermediate workers organizations. They are described as "built on a more permanent basis and on a higher political level than caucuses—directing its spearhead squarely at the ruling class..." (p. 31)

In the first place, we would like to know where these caucuses are that are growing up spontaneously. We don't think this has been the case for several years—most of the caucuses that have grown up in the last few years were initiated by communists.

Secondly, the draft, although vague about the relationship between caucuses and IWOs, does tend toward seeing these organizations as separate. Our view is quite different.

Let's look at these IWOs practically. Who is going to carry out the tasks of taking major campaigns to the working class? We hope it is the advanced workers and the organizations (caucuses) that are also leading the day-to-day struggle in the shops. This is perfectly consistent with our understanding that political lessons are learned in the course of the day-to-day struggle.

So, what we are saying is yes, we need larger organizations to "apply the single spark method to take up the struggle..." (p. 31) But, these organizations will be made up of the advanced workers and organizations that are leading the struggles in the shop. This is the way to most closely link up the day to day struggle with the broader campaigns.

Right Errors and Isolation

In fact, if this is not the case we feel it will lead to right errors in the day to day struggle and isolation from the masses of workers in building the broader class-wide campaigns and struggles.

But, this is the direction that the draft programme is leading, and the direction that has led to the problems that are described in the May 1st Workers Movement (MIWM) article in the second issue of this journal. About the Fucker, Lee Mah, and Jung Sai strikes, the journal article says, "The MIWM did not consistently find the ways to take the right line on the issue and the key lessons of these struggles out to the many thousands of workers in the shops and hiring halls who did not yet actively support these strikes." Later, in the same article, they describe how they began to correct this problem. In building for the "Defend the Right to Strike—Smash the ENA" picker they "united with a number of caucuses and other organizations to build it. A general leaflet was widely distributed... In addition, some of the caucuses put out their own leaflets or newspaper articles..." But they still noted that "there had been a lot of confusion about the relationship between the MIWM and the other organizations. Even for workers and cadres who had been relating actively to both this had been a problem. They go on to say that although political they might be the same as these other organizations, the MIWM should not be seen as a "left wing labor council."

Well, in fact we feel that work should be a fairly accurate description of what the MIWM should be. Of course, not on a trade union level, but a central workers organization with many sections (caucuses) in the shops. And, if in all this the exact relationship that is practiced the MIWM was forced to adopt. As the journal article said, "only...by helping to develop intermediate forms [here we assume they mean caucuses] in key industries where they don't yet exist will the MIWM be able to direct the deep tide of the working class as a whole." And the article also says, "If postal workers at this point are more familiar with Uprising (a rank and file postal workers organization and newsletter) than with the MIWM, and if auto workers are more familiar with..."

On the line, this is no problem as long as these organizations work closely with the MIWM to strengthen their ties through common work around key campaigns and to take a unified political line to the masses of workers.

But, if we carry out "common work around key campaigns," and have a "unified political line" and hopefully are made up of the advanced and active workers from the shops, then what we are talking about is basically the same organization with the same political level, and carrying out the same tasks?

Two

In the last issue of the journal an article appeared discussing the nature of student work in the new period. Essentially it presents the experience of the RSB with a youth organization of the Party, a Young Communist League. Important political weaknesses of the line of building an "independent anti-imperialist youth movement" were brought out. This proposal has been brought out for discussion in the Brigade and has been received with tremendous enthusiasm.

One of the tremendous weaknesses brought out in the discussion of work within "anti-imperialist" student groups has been the failure to bring forward to the masses of students the political and ideological line of the proletariat. Instead, we wound up substituting for it a watering down version of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought, known popularly as anti-imperialist leadership. Communists within the student movement were hampered in their efforts to bring communist ideas to students because the Brigade, with its "incomplete" line, was built to lead the struggles on campus.

As was pointed out in the student work journal article, the student movement is prone to all sorts of opportunism and reformism. It pointed out correctly the key importance of bringing out clearly on the campus the leading role of the proletariat and the leading role of the proletarian line. The proposal to form broad-based Marxist-Leninist youth organizations was put forward as a first step towards accomplishing this task.

What does this have to do with the workers movement? I believe that similar problems exist in that work as in student work. Many different lines exist within the workers movement and many more (ranging all the way from the Trotskyites to social democrats) are out there vying to take over the workers movement and deliver it into the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Our line on the workers movement has been to build political workers organizations, both to take up the struggles in the shops and the broader political questions. These intermediate workers organizations are seen as vehicles through which communists can work to build real struggle amongst the working class and "conveyor belts" which bring workers closer to and into the party.

While to a certain degree these IWOs have been successful in building mass struggle, they have faced similar problems as the RSB as far as bringing out the leading role of communists and the question of proletarian revolution to the masses of workers. Once again, as in the student movement, the leading role of communists... Continued on page 2
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First paragraph that describes to a tee what you stand for (although we're not against defining it), but, what in practice does an organization do.

We work in a rank and file organization in a medium-sized plant. Our main activities have been building struggles against the company. We led the fight to strike for a good contract in 1974. We've built a number of smaller struggles and currently are leading the battle against layoffs. According to the draft programme, this makes us a caucus. But, let's look at the other activities of our caucus.

In putting out the caucus newsletter, as well as having articles exposing the attacks by the company (layoffs, unfair firings, and expanding the selfish union officials), we also united the active workers around having articles about the energy freeze, the UWOC Jobs or Income campaign. Building for May Day and Women's Day, we had a caucus planning committee. The article building for May Day said, "...we'll be saying that, we, the working class celebrates and sums up its past struggles and plans the struggle for the future. Workers were united around the slogan Workers United to Lead the Fight Against All Oppression. What future struggle were they talking about? How were workers going to end all oppression?

The answer we brought out by many (not all) organizing for May Day—our struggle is for a society in which the working class rules, for this is the only kind of society in which the basis for oppression no longer exists. The demonstration had a determined, revolutionary character, hundreds of fists and red flags—and hundreds joined in along the way. People were not excited just because the march was militant, but because it looked and sounded like something that was really going somewhere.

Should the IWOs be independent, anti-imperialist organizations? The draft programme describes the IWOs as being built on a "higher political level than caucuses" (as the M1WM defined itself), or that it is not "directing its spearhead squarely in the ruling class" (as the draft programme says IWOs should).

The whole point is that we don't see any contradiction between being a "political workers organization" and leading the day to day struggles. In fact we think they go hand in hand.

Two Other Points

We might add two other things. One, we definitely see our caucus as a "more permanent organization" (a characteristic the draft programme attributes to IWOs). In order for that to happen, we know we need ed some politically advanced workers to sustain the organization during the ebbs and flows of the struggle. It was not until we had considerable struggle and a core of politically conscious workers stepped forward that we were able to consolidate the caucus.

Secondly, one caucus is definitely open at both ends. It includes many more people than are united fully around everything we do. One worker is still in favor of the bosses' whole damn rip-off capitalist system." Brigade member: "Well, this isn't a position of the Brigade, but I think we need socialism, but that's my own personal position. And you know, there are some communists in the Bri-gade." How many times has this scene been repeated by cadre speaking "as members of IWO X" or by members of those IWOs who are not in a communist organization?

Recently in building for May Day in this area, work which was tremendously successful, many workers took out the line of May Day as a day when the working class celebrates and sums up its past struggles and plans the struggle for the future. Workers were united around the slogan Workers United to Lead the Fight Against All Oppression. What future struggle were they talking about? How were workers going to end all oppression?

The answer we brought out by many (not all) organizing for May Day—our struggle is for a society in which the working class rules, for this is the only kind of society in which the basis for oppression no longer exists. The demonstration had a determined, revolutionary character, hundreds of fists and red flags—and hundreds joined in along the way. People were not excited just because the march was militant, but because it looked and sounded like something that was really going somewhere.

Should the IWOs be independent, anti-imperialist organizations? The draft programme describes the IWO as being built on a "higher political level than caucuses" (the level and role of caucuses is a separate but related question). I believe the IWOs should be united around a program which calls for socialism and clearly points towards a society where the working class rules as the goal of its struggle. The IWOs should recognize the leadership of the Party and should put forward People's China as the type of society we are fighting for.

Does this mean that all the members of the IWO have to be disciplined communists? I think not. Just as in the YCL, the IWOs should run on a more lenient sort of discipline, but should clearly be vehicles for training its members in the use of Marxism-Leninism and in developing them as communists.

Is such an organization a substitute for the Party? I think not. In fact, I think it can only facilitate the Party's ability to bring its line to the working class and lead it in struggle.

As far as mass work is concerned I believe the IWOs should be involved in the struggles in the shops and outside. In the shops forming temporary caucuses or committees around shop grievances and issues. I realize that there are many differences between the workers movement and that of the students, and that the idea for a YCL among youth cannot be transplanted into the workers movement. But the thrust of that proposal has tremendous merit and the ideas and line it puts forward should be examined closely in relation to many other areas of work we are involved in.
The journal article, “Clarify Role of IWOs,” is attempting to articulate the draft programme’s formulation, making the point that the article states that the IWO must have a solid core of active members who apply these lessons to the struggles developing there. This is because the fundamental contradiction that struggle around shop issues is potentially revolutionary. In other words, the IWO needs to be stable and ongoing precisely because they are tied to the economic struggle. The IWO’s main character is that they ebb and flow because they are totally tied to the shop struggle, and the question of which class must rule. As the proposal states, “only the most thoroughgoing workers, those who have developed a class-wide organization will help both the shop struggles and the government.”

Is shop struggle potentially revolutionary? Only in the broadest sense, and in the sense of the fundamental contradiction between the working class and the exploiting class. It is not revolutionary as long as it remains solely a shop struggle, a struggle for better terms and conditions of employment. And we will not be developing revolutionary class consciousness unless the workers are trained to respond to all issues, without exception. As long as the IWOs are not solidified, no matter what class is affected. Moreover, to respond to the struggle against the particular employer, the IWOs must have a solid core of active members who are able to develop their understanding of the working class and to build real political unity. Each section will, through its representatives to the steering committee and in its meetings and meetings of the whole area-wide IWO, discuss the importance of class-wide campaigns and make recommendations on how to build struggle in a particular shop and industrial area. The M1WM article says that organizational relations between an area-wide IWO and individual IWOs isn’t that important. What’s important is that all the organizations have the same political line.

Industry IWOs

In our area there are several industry IWOs under the leadership of the RUE. All they have basically the same political line. Industry IWOs are put forward as the main way to lead the shop struggles, and the M1WM article says that they are the main way to lead the shop struggle. While the draft programme says that the IWOs will be able to lead the shop struggle, the M1WM says that the IWOs is the main way to lead the shop struggle.

The “Clarify” article says that anyone can join the IWO, but says they came from: 1) the struggle against the employers, and 2) the “spontaneity” of the workers’ movement to trade union struggle. The report says that the trade unions are not important to workers. The IWOs, on the other hand, are important to workers because they understand and implement its program. Open ended caucuses are put forward as the main way to lead the shop struggle.

The draft programme does not make clear the relation between the IWOs and the shop struggle. In fact, caucuses are just as important to the shop struggle as the IWOs. While the draft programme says that the IWOs will be able to lead the shop struggle, the M1WM says that the IWOs is the main way to lead the shop struggle.

As the proposal states, “this organization must be a fighting organization of the working class, an organization which takes up every struggle against oppression, both on the job and off, and builds struggle and brings them back into the shops, which is where the work is done.” We aren’t told if any of the Rucker’s strikers joined the M1WM or if they formed an IWO or caucus. As an example of what the draft programme is trying to say that the difference between the IWOs and the caucus is not just a matter of leadership. The IWOs needs to be able to be a fighting organization of the working class, an organization which can develop struggles in the shops if it is isolated or if any of the Rucker workers join the M1WM or if they formed an IWO or caucus.
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workers organization is not a union and it is not meant to replace the unions. In fact the organization must ardently take up the task of organizing the unorganized and into unions. It must also take up the task of building unions into militant organizations of class struggle. We can never submit to the anti-union sentiment that develops spontaneously, especially among younger workers who have had no experience but bad experience in their unions. Instead we must always come back to the struggle to make the union a fighting organization of the class.

The need for organization to fight dual unionism. We can't use dual unionism as a straw man to keep from taking up the task of building the mass anti-war movement, we summed up that we... the consciousness who wanted to fight the boss, but rather the workers organization is not a union and it is not meant to replace the unions. It must also take up the task of building unions into militant organizations of class struggle. We can never submit to the anti-union sentiment that develops spontaneously, especially among younger workers who have had no experience but bad experience in their unions. Instead we must always come back to the struggle to make the union a fighting organization of the class.
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Continued on page 4 or tickler to us. At times we promoted simply relying
on the grievance procedures and union manoeuvres, hiding the strategic view that our strength lies in that we are the stronghold of struggle of the working class. We made it almost a principle to never seize on sparks outside the walls of our plant (which is particularly fortunate since we are located near a plant that employs a large number of recently deported workers).

It is not that we did not see the importance of mass struggle, but it was seen important more from the view of a trade union reformer who sees the need for reaching the masses. Even with this prejudice, our approach did contribute to building up a strong spirit of rebellion throughout much of the plant, at times even setting into motion further struggle.

Orientation Changes

To make a long story short, this orientation began to change through the praxis-strike action in the whole organization of attacking reformism. And particularly, some sharp local struggle against some local opportunists in the organization who took advantage of the weaknesses in a roundly degenerate line on the economic struggles of the class. Their line forced us to take a long and heavy look into our past practice, and we concluded that our line on Marxism Leninism Mao Tsetung Thought to the working class movement.

We began to understand that our advances depend on whether or not we had faith in and relied on the masses. We saw that it could only be our own disarray for the workers to feel of their upsurge that prevented us from going out to the activists, help sum up the experience of the class in fighting the company and the collective struggle, and help develop the best battle plan to advance the struggle.

And it could only be our own backwardness if we failed to link this struggle to others being waged by the workers. In the nature of the irrepressible conflict between the workers and the capitalists, and try to wage every struggle so as to build the strongest revolutionary unity, consciousness and organization as part of building the decisive showdown with the bourgeoisie.

For example, three years ago a comrade ran for delegate for the International constitutional convention. He ran as an independent, promising that despite the fact that he was a worker, he would ignore the issues of speedup, discrimination, etc. More or less a reform platform (although the demands were based on the demand of the one comrade he was elected).

When the constitutional convention came up again two years later (after much struggle in the organization), and decided to choose the candidates of our department. The workers in the local became much more apparent as the struggle intensified later in the plant and many new activists coming forward kept referring to the election campaign.

Here we take minor issue with some wording in the draft program. For example, we saw that bourgeois nationalism had to solidify the positions of its labor lieutenants at the head of the union “internationals,” use these top officials as a main arm of its attack on the working class, and even use the union structure at times to siphon workers struggles and enforce labor discipline.”

This is a very important point. Our leadership is constantly trying to use the union structure (and they try to use the contract in the same way) to quell the struggles. By using these clauses our career are based on—and our task as communists is to recognize that and develop the methods for breaking those chains.

An interesting point is that even the other activists in the plant had to grapple with the fact that faced us, was the need “...to break the workers’ struggle out of the confines of the shop to the outside, to the labor lieutenants’ board, to the shop stewards, and to the workers themselves at the meeting of the labor lieutenants,” (quote from an earlier national document). We had to understand the fact that we could not limit ourselves to the rules and procedures that the bourgeoisie had come up with matter how “democratic” the procedure seems, like the union convention.

We had to assess things from the needs of advancing the class struggles and the numerical and understanding of the broad masses of workers (who were cynical about the convention, many knowing that no individual, no matter how well-intentioned, could get very much at the convention).

Leading Group Forms

A leading group of workers began to form, mainly in the one department where the confrontation (who had run and lost the delegates last time and was chief steward) worked. Small skirmishes around speedup and harassment began to get organized by members of the group and with each one, lessons were spread throughout the department.

At one meeting, composed mainly of workers from that department and a few other workers and comrades from other shifts and departments, it was decided to begin a newsletter to popularize and spread shop floor struggle and make a strong statement. It was clearly a battle against the capitalists, and that the capitalist class is always trying to find ways to keep us divided and complicating the workers struggle.

To maintain their own power the company’s discrimination against Black and minority workers was an important topic of discussion. A white worker described how it was easy for him to get a (company) appointment at the unemployment office while the white class suburbanites are being given out in the West Virginia.

A Black worker added that the system wants to keep people ignorant of these facts in order to keep us enslaved. Another worker pointed out that the so-called “anti-red” policies of the company would coerced some promotions by the capitalist system. We agreed that we would do mass propaganda if we could go through the “proper procedures” of the contract in trying to deal with the conditions we faced.

There was some concern that the newsletter should be an information sheet for the one department that the majority of workers at the meeting were more or less unionized. Resistance was soon blown away by the developing struggle. Within a week of this meeting, the comrades who were starting to run other active workers led a department-wide struggle against speedup, harassment and shop conditions. The newsletter immediately came out and was immediately distributed to workers all over the plant.

When our comrade and three other workers were fired for the second time, they walked out and a four day wildcat strike took place.

Wildcat A Heavy Blow

The wildcat was a testament to the enthusiasm and energy of the working class for struggle against the ultras. The workers at the factory started to work together and set up some kind of committee to organize the workers. It was a shot in the arm for the whole struggle.

It was discussed how we were at “war with the capitalist class,” and that the capitalist class is always trying to put the workers against each other as well as against the community. In particular, we discussed the question of the “war” our class is fighting against the capitalists. The broad masses picked up this idea enthusiastically and it gave them a strong sense of identity, to the extent, “this strike is like a war,” instead of as the “drudgery of getting through the ‘proper procedures’ of the contract, in trying to deal with the conditions we faced.”

We set out not only to put out a lively piece of agitation about what is going on in the world today, especially in our particular industry and union, but to unite with the workers, help sum up the mass struggle, but it was seen important more from the view of a trade union reformer who sees the need for reaching the masses.

We set out not only to put out a lively piece of agitation about what is going on in the world today, especially in our particular industry and union, but to unite with the workers, help sum up the mass struggle, but it was seen important more from the view of a trade union reformer who sees the need for reaching the masses. Even with this prejudice, our approach did contribute to building up a strong spirit of rebellion throughout much of the plant, at times even setting into motion further struggle.

We got bogged down in the mechanics of keeping the picket line open for 24 hours a day—instead of dealing with the tangible gains that faced us from a solid political perspective. For example, once the wildcat was on, we didn’t see the importance of building up a stronger and more constant hunger strike that was rooted in and could mobilize the broad masses. We didn’t see the importance of building on to the union line and trying to get our workers out, even though millions of hundreds of workers had been held there and it was key tactically in building the broad masses, not just a handful of activists.

We didn’t carry on, as well as we should have, the battle for that battle for the success of the strike. The struggle went beyond fighting the workers, and we were afraid of, and didn’t really grasp the importance of taking on the company as well. In particular, the Black union hawks and some social racist line coming up from the ranks of some of the more backward plant workers.

After the strike we took too defensive a posture while the company and the union leaders were using every possible tactic to “gut” the pickets. For example, the wildcat led to a “legal” strike vote that had been promised for months before the strike. Eighty five percent of the voted for the strike, but instead of struggling to develop the ways to keep the initiative in the hands of the rank and file, we hadn’t stopped and thrusted our leaders into the forefront.

Continued on page 6
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dency to improve the living and working conditions of some of the workers to say that "now that we showed these stooges through our wildcat, they’re bound to follow up on our legal struggles." The problem is that working class people often have a wrongheaded way to spread the sparks of the struggle among other workers and a key way of keeping the initiative in the hands of the rank and file following the strike.

Even with these weaknesses and mistakes, we did set out much more consciously this time to consolidate active workers and develop an ongoing plan for struggles in the near future. The newsletter that came out right before the strike continued throughout the strike and became the organ of the group of workers that pulled their strike campaign out of the wildcat.

Because of our mistakes, and the objective ebb in the struggle that followed the upsurge of the wildcat, this Newsletter is quite small, but the bias and respect of the newsletter was very broad throughout the plant.

The newsletter dealt mainly with building the struggle at the plant and in the local, as well as taking up other battles and issues important to the working class.

We began some study of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought for the first time with a small group of activists and decided back then to continue the wildcat. Some activists began to get involved in other struggles of the class (demonstration against Able and the ENA, some literary theory and etc.) and began taking up much stronger interest in the local working class newspaper.

Many of the activists in the local, while in the main still very concerned about continuing the struggle against shop conditions and the union hacks at the plant, started to focus on efforts for the whole working class and took an active interest in the whole class struggle.

The Question of IWOs

We feel that it is a crucial task of the class to build industry-wide IWOs, and to link workers up as much as possible across industry lines, and nationwide (at least within some industries in the not too distant future). It is obvious we can’t organize the class struggle in our industry from one shop, no matter how broad our base or how "advanced" our workers organization is politically. The industry-wide IWO would mainly emerge out of the struggles in individual shops, and from city-wide and nationwide campaigns of the class. At the same time, the division of the groups and the group of activists, basically boiled down to, "Do we fight this campaign as part of, and to build, the overall class struggle, or do we subordinate the overall struggle in practice, essentially drop it to the interests of getting some ‘good’ people elected?"

There are several questions raised for the IWOs. First, let us look at the question of ‘clarifying the role of IWOs’

A Real Fight

In the main, the correct line dominated the campaign, and this has laid the basis for further advances. Large numbers of workers came forward to make the election campaign a real fight. Hundreds of workers wore the slate buttons, despite company harassment. Workers painted the name of the slate on many walls in the factory, and on windows even on the line. We held several well-attended rallies in the plant parking lot where activists spoke about the need to get organized to fight, and how to build the campaign. We heard a good number of laid off workers became very active in building the campaign as well.

In the course of our campaign, the Supplementary Unemployment Benefits Fund (SUB) for our company ran out. The income of thousands of laid off workers from our plant and around the city was drastically cut. The company also tries to use this to scare employed workers into all kinds of "save your job" schemes like accepting speedup, and wage cuts. But at the same time the class can turn this into Its opposite and create a stronger basis of unity between employed and unemployed workers in the struggles against layoffs and cutbacks.

We picked up on this right away, and united the active workers to signate around the slogan, “Fight, don’t starve!” Along with the city’s UWOC chapter and workers from other shops in the same union, we held another car to car to company headquarters. This laid the basis for a stronger campaign against layoffs, and for getting an unofficial employed/unemployed committee started. It also helped inspire the active workers to make the fight against layoffs, a cornerstone of the election campaign.

The struggle over taking up May Day in the election campaign organizing committee highlighted some weaknesses. The committee was almost innumerable from the ongoing rank and file organization we had built, and in the main was composed of the most active and advanced workers. There was no brick wall between the stated aims of the election campaign, and the political message of May Day. And the key link between May Day and the struggle going on in the plant was the election organizing committee itself.

But we failed to take May Day out to the activists strongly, in part tailing behind a few workers who felt building for May Day would be "too heavy," and would hurt our chances of winning the election. These same workers generally had the worst line on the election, confining themselves to bourgeois politicking, even though the slate as a whole was based on a program of building the struggle of the working class.

Tailing behind this laid comradess to not take every opportunity to link the election campaign to building the revolutionary workers movement, fighting battles so as to win the war, and aiming toward the final goals of the workers movement—socialism and communism.

Lowest Common Denominator

Not taking up the struggle over May Day boldly enough in the committee itself was symptomatic of an "open at one end" approach—focusing working class organization at the lowest common denominator which we must continue to struggle to root out. It is also symptomatic that the slate was presented as an individual, and because we were missing the "key link," we tended to put out a weak, abstract line.

As a result, our overall May Day work was weakend, and we missed a real opportunity among the active workers to sharpen the two line struggle so as to better move the election campaign into the correct direction. This also weakened our ability to link up the struggle at the plant with the fight other workers are waging against the common enemy.

We have to build each struggle as strongly as possible, uniting all who can be united. At the same time, we have to fans all the sparks of class consciousness and link them back to class struggle and class battles being waged in the class war. By doing this we can see the embryo of an IWO in every plant-based rank and file organization, from which we work to build a far richer "single issue" or very short term forms that might be built.

The IWOs, under the leadership of the party, are the key mass organizational form in which the "whole working class will develop its movement of today into a revolutionaries workers movement that fights exploitation and all oppression in order to end wage slavery. To do this the working class must take up and infuse its strength, discipline and revolutionary outlook into every major social movement." (Draft programme, p. 33).
The two articles on IWOs in the second journal, although not written directly in response to one another, do bring out some contradictions in the work and outlook of communists and the need to clarify some points around IWOs and their proper role in day to day struggle. These articles also point out weaknesses that are diametrically related—weaknesses that are, of course, not mutually exclusive. This is because the contradictions have shown themselves in much of the work of communists generally.

"One of the articles essentially narrows the class struggle to the shop struggle, treats it as the revolutionary struggle, and negates any real need for an area-wide IWO, while it is attempting to point out the need for IWOs to be based in the shops. The M1WM article builds making the M1WM first an organizational question, presents the Revolutionary Workers Movement (RWM) as a show train for the working class to jump on, and then sloughs off the question of the relationship between the May 1st Workers Movement (M1WM) and caucuses—as long as the political line is upright, everything will work itself out. In its attempt to show how the draft programme separates the advanced workers from the shop struggles, the "Clarify" article quotes drafts the five times in each time leaves out an important sentence or paragraph that tries to link the day to day struggle with the broader struggle. In the first quote they leave out how the day to day struggle is a preliminary to a more serious discussion among the workers not only about every question of the immediate struggle but also about events throughout the world, and even around the globe. This makes it seem that the economic struggle is all the workers need to gain class consciousness. The same is done in the quote from Lenin, leaving out the part of the sentence in which Lenin says that only one aspect of the working class movement, only one aspect of the working class movement, only one aspect of the working class movement, only one aspect of the working class movement, only one aspect of the working class movement, only one aspect of the working class movement, only one aspect of the working class movement, and so on.

"The RU has already summed up that adding propaganda about socialism onto the tail of essentially trade union struggle will never develop revolutionary consciousness among the workers; that basically an organizational question of the workers' political line and leadership in struggle. If postal workers at this point are more familiar with Uprising (a rank and file post) than with the M1WM, and if auto workers are more familiar with On The Line, this is no problem at all. These organizations, the RU, the IWOs, while it is attempting to point out the need for some, but because they understood that the fight against exploitation and oppression is the unity that was developed in struggle, helping to break the struggles of the workers in Chinatown out of their isolation and showing the links between the struggles of all IWO and other sections of the working class and national oppression and the struggle of all workers against exploitation and oppression. This was more important than the handshakes at the end of a meeting.

"There was a tendency to want to have everything looking just right—families, flowers, the Lee Harman workers, for the Jing Shi strikers we have the Rockefeller workers, and so on. One of the trends in the "Clarify" article is that leaders are given the every rally and picket line while they were on strike, running the advanced workers raged, and not understanding that the leading role of the advanced Rucker workers had to be developed that strike.

"Drawing from these political weaknesses are some incomplete and incorrect organizational ideas. While political line may be, it's not to do so "It is not the name of organizations but the political line and its leadership in struggle. If postal workers at this point are more familiar with Uprising (a rank and file post) than with the M1WM, and if auto workers are more familiar with On The Line, this is no problem at all. These organizations, the RU, the IWOs, while it is attempting to point out the need for some, but because they understood that the fight against exploitation and oppression is the unity that was developed in struggle, helping to break the struggles of the workers in Chinatown out of their isolation and showing the links between the struggles of all IWO and other sections of the working class and national oppression and the struggle of all workers against exploitation and oppression. This was more important than the handshakes at the end of a meeting.

"There was a tendency to want to have everything looking just right—families, flowers, the Lee Harman workers, for the Jing Shi strikers we have the Rockefeller workers, and so on. One of the trends in the "Clarify" article is that leaders are given the every rally and picket line while they were on strike, running the advanced workers raged, and not understanding that the leading role of the advanced Rucker workers had to be developed that strike.

"Drawing from these political weaknesses are some incomplete and incorrect organizational ideas. While political line may be, it's not to do so "It is not the name of organizations but the political line and its leadership in struggle. If postal workers at this point are more familiar with Uprising (a rank and file post) than with the M1WM, and if auto workers are more familiar with On The Line, this is no problem at all. These organizations, the RU, the IWOs, while it is attempting to point out the need for some, but because they understood that the fight against exploitation and oppression is the unity that was developed in struggle, helping to break the struggles of the workers in Chinatown out of their isolation and showing the links between the struggles of all IWO and other sections of the working class and national oppression and the struggle of all workers against exploitation and oppression. This was more important than the handshakes at the end of a meeting.
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After discussing the journal article “Using the slogan ‘Jobs or Income’,” and reading the section on this in the article, we reached the conclusion on page 30 that class struggle is not in the forefront of these battles and groups like Congress of Afrikan Peopi are (they’ve been pushed)

The political confusion stems from the fact that these struggles can become revolutionary struggles gets made as an organizational error as well, in the section of the draft on unemployment on pages 30 and 31. Whereas the caucuses would take us up the day to day struggles in the shop, the IWO’s on the other hand would take up the Job’s struggle only. We do agree that slogans like “come and fight!7”

But in emphasizing the struggle for benefits against bureaucrats we made two errors. First, we’ve made a lot of right errors on other aspects of the fight for Jobs or Income. As an article on UWOC work in the second Forward to the Party stated, “building struggle around the work ‘Jobs or Income’ campaign”.

Our main error was to make benefits everything, to forget other aspects of the fight for Jobs or Income. As an article on UWOC work in the second Forward to the Party stated, “building struggle around the work ‘Jobs or Income’ campaign”.

But we should not have narrowed our demands as one of the best ways to fight the capitalists. In the struggle for benefits, the IWOs can do the best job.

In focusing totally on benefits we missed opportunities to expose the system. In particular, by not fighting the benefits we missed opportunities to involve workers in the struggle against the capitalists. We didn’t take the full implications of the demands we made.

Fighting Bureaucrats for Benefits

When the big layoffs hit at the end of ’74, we developed plans for an Income campaign. In the last year we’ve summed up that a big problem people first faced when they were laid off was getting benefits—being cut off benefits and so on. So we developed a program that we took to the plants before people got laid off, as well as to the unemployment office. We did this because we had built militant actions at the unemployment office. We had built militant actions at the unemployment office. We had built militant actions at the unemployment office. We had built militant actions at the unemployment office. We had built militant actions at the unemployment office. We had built militant actions at the unemployment office.
Three

After discussing the section of the draft programme dealing with the struggle of the working class around unemployment, a number of comrades, including some who have done work in the unemployed, agreed that this section is confusing and could be improved in several ways. In particular, we made the following criticisms and suggestions:

1. In general the draft programme jumbles together the slogans of the working class around unemployment and the crisis of unemployable demands arising out of the unemployed. Of course, employed and unemployed workers are members of a single working class with one class interest, and conditions they face come from the same source. But employed and unemployed workers face different conditions, and specific demands arise from these. If this isn’t clearly drawn out we will fall into the error pointed out in the journal article “Using the Slogan ‘Jobs or Income’.”

2. To show everything under the Jobs or Income demand is a right, it is not to educate the masses and show that the class should be united because we face the same imperialist enemy and its economic crises, and not because we have the same demand. Around unemployment and the economic crisis the draft programme raises demands and slogans coming from three places, and the concrete conditions of the unemployed—Jobs or Income is an example: those arising from the conditions of employed workers—F—unemployed, plant shutdowns and runaways: and those which speak to the need of the class to unite and fight back—Employed/Unemployed—Same Crisis. Same Fight. It is in this context that the draft programme laid out how these demands and slogans arise from concrete conditions, and how the whole working class must unite whether employed or unemployed in the fight around these conditions of them. For instance, Jobs or Income, while arising from the unemployed, must become a campaign of the whole working class. There is no such thing as a single spark method as a particular weapon of the class. We feel that this is one of the main methods used by the rulers to keep and spread the error, and that the single spark method must be more exact on what it means and what it doesn’t mean.

The draft programme states that the single spark method means fanning and spreading the struggle and through the course of this struggle developing consciousness as a conscious unity of the working class. In other words it goes as broadly as possible throughout the working class and among its allies. To build every possible struggle and build off of every spark of consciousness, to identify and isolate the bourgeoisie and its agents, and unite all struggles against this enemy.” (p. 30)

We think this points out the correct relationship between sparks of struggle and sparks of consciousness: the working class develops consciousness through the course of struggle against the bourgeoisie and its agents, and unity against this enemy.

For example, this was something we learned in the Farah strike when we saw that the correct method was to actively build the boycott and strike support through pickingeting the plant gates, making phone calls to the workers, etc., to make the strike a struggle of the whole class, and through the course of this to unfold the lessons of the strike. The method that didn’t take the boycott and strike support seriously and reduced our activity to just leafletting and holding forums tended to isolate us from the masses, held back the development of the United Front, and among its allies. To build every possible struggle and build off of every spark of consciousness, to identify and isolate the bourgeoisie and its agents, and unite all struggles against this enemy.” (p. 30)

We think this points out the correct relationship between sparks of struggle and sparks of consciousness: the working class develops consciousness through the course of struggle and unity against the bourgeoisie and its agents, and unity against this enemy.

In the article entitled “Focusing struggle in UWOC work,” which is about applying the single spark method in UWOC work, it says: “We did feel that our agitation and propaganda work was too often a case of the power company and its nancy-panky with the local politicians and business interests would make the workers angry but didn’t bother to fight for economic gains for the working class. This way of organizing the single spark method as a particular weapon of the class. We feel that this is one of the main methods used by the rulers to keep and spread the error, and that the single spark method must be more exact on what it means and what it doesn’t mean.

The draft programme states that the single spark method means fanning and spreading the struggle and through the course of this struggle developing consciousness as a conscious unity of the working class. In other words it goes as broadly as possible throughout the working class and among its allies. To build every possible struggle and build off of every spark of consciousness, to identify and isolate the bourgeoisie and its agents, and unite all struggles against this enemy.” (p. 30)

We think this points out the correct relationship between sparks of struggle and sparks of consciousness: the working class develops consciousness through the course of struggle and unity against the bourgeoisie and its agents, and unity against this enemy.

For example, this was something we learned in the Farah strike when we saw that the correct method was to actively build the boycott and strike support through pickingeting the plant gates, making phone calls to the workers, etc., to make the strike a struggle of the whole class, and through the course of this to unfold the lessons of the strike. The method that didn’t take the boycott and strike support seriously and reduced our activity to just leafletting and holding forums tended to isolate us from the masses, held back the development of the United Front, and among its allies. To build every possible struggle and build off of every spark of consciousness, to identify and isolate the bourgeoisie and its agents, and unite all struggles against this enemy.” (p. 30)

We think this points out the correct relationship between sparks of struggle and sparks of consciousness: the working class develops consciousness through the course of struggle and unity against the bourgeoisie and its agents, and unity against this enemy.

In the article entitled “Focusing struggle in UWOC work,” which is about applying the single spark method in UWOC work, it says: “We did feel that our agitation and propaganda work was too often a case of the power company and its nancy-panky with the local politicians and business interests would make the workers angry but didn’t bother to fight for economic gains for the working class. This way of organizing the single spark method as a particular weapon of the class. We feel that this is one of the main methods used by the rulers to keep and spread the error, and that the single spark method must be more exact on what it means and what it doesn’t mean.
The draft programme states, "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..." We would spread a broad campaign of the working class, around the particular spark, which there wasn't particularly sharp and where the party had some strength...
The fight against OT is one front in the fight against the capitalist class. The article is saying that we should fight OT as a tactic, the capitalists have forced us on our hands to wage militant struggle against work overtime. This boils down to the following question: Will the working class struggle for demands that benefit the capitalist class? No. It's only as a specific "weapon in the class struggle." The article is correct when it says "OT benefits the capitalist class." But that's putting it mildly! For us, as communists, don't try to drive workers to the poor house, the capitalists are already doing that. We are trying to overcome the capitalist class around demands that represent our class interests, and take up the struggle, even though it may mean an immediate material setback. As one plant the company was trying to stick the workers with an inexcusable plan. The line was to try to drive workers to the poor house, the capitalists have forced them on us to fight as a class. In the course of struggle it will mean temporary material setbacks for some workers involved, this is unavoidable. For it is only through struggle that a revolutionary workers movement will be built that can turn back the capitalists' attempt to drive us down into a manageable class to "wage its mighty power to smash the role of the capitalists and remake society to serve the interests of the great majority of the people." (full program, p. 11)

A. Will workers struggle for their own immediate interests?

The journal article is not only that workers will win, but that it is something that workers will go into that demand around laying off sanitation work. Because of the indirect sum up, what was done to correct the first errors was even worse than before. In the name of "fighting the layoffs" and "developing a fighting program" the question of line got lost or, even better, revised from the "left" "stop the layoffs" to two concrete slogans: "No NT during layoffs." This line has come out in our work at a plant where there were layoffs and a four day work week. An "emergency job" came up, and one welder worked two days a row, in all we were able to get some added services to the so-called workers in his department jammed him pretty hard about it, but the stand of a comrade in the plant was to make excuses for them, saying he shouldn't be working so much OT, but what we should do is fight for a decent wage for 40 hours, then he would have more time to work on many days. By taking this line, "Sure these layoffs are hurting us, and sure refusing overtime is one way of fighting them, but we can't expect workers to stand up and ante their hands they won't have to sacrifice in the course of that struggle." This line was to say that the better the money he was making, and that the workers were fighting for a decent living wage: and in this case, saying that was a cover for not struggling with him to stand with the class against the capitalists. The "Slog Off Work Week" and refuse OT as part of the struggle for our living wage. B. Will the working class fight for demands in their class interest even though it might mean temporary material setbacks for some workers involved?

The section of the article is saying that to work overtime is the "extra" pay, or workers will not struggle if it entails, because what was being built was the capitalist class around demands that represent our class interests, and take up the struggle, even though it may mean an immediate material setback. As one plant, while at the same time uniting with the comrade sat on his hands. This is an example of how, in carrying out the right line, the journal article is saying that there is a conflict between class interests and immediate needs, in other words, following the article's line, whenever a comrade is encountered, the comrade didn't even consider fighting against OT, because he didn't think that the workers could break through and that they couldn't sacrifice the extra money.

Six

Continued from page 10... putting forward that we consolidate our gains by building a massive campaign to kick Gallo out of the immediate community area. Where do we kick them to, any- way? Another community? Are we trying to "liberate" our community from Gallo at the expense of building an all out fight against class betrayals. The essence of this line was reflected when a worker who had come to the meeting to talk about building "a strong fighting front line." He was virtually ignored because we were too busy talking about that slogan.

The committee later pointed out that what we really needed to kick out was this narrow view of "kick Gallo out of the community." We saw that what we had to do was to take the word of the farmworkers struggle to the whole working class and spread the sparks of struggle.

We plan to now regularly take the campaign to different plants in the area as well as maintaining our picket lines, and to make a priority of such things as the "farmworkers week." We want the workers to see themselves as more than mere individuals, but as members of a class, locked in warfare with the opposing class of employers." (p. 29)
Continued from page 11

because it is so easy to see how refusing OT during layoffs would help workers, that workers would not be anxious to 
immediate results that would come from fighting OT as an 
attack on the working class as a whole.

In a sense, the workers' struggles can bring immediate 
results that is not the factor that determines if we take 
them up. The class fights for what it needs, and they are 
determined on the plant floor to ending, once and for all, 
police terror. In fact, taking up struggles that the class 
needs is the very thing that helps to create conditions to 
throw the source of all its misery, the capitalist system. 
The working class needs to stop layoffs, and it needs 
"a decent livable wage, without OT," and refusing OT is a 
tactic that the class uses in fighting for this. But it also 
needs a limit on how long we belong to the capita 
worker must be taken to be a class conscious struggle, 
it needs to break all chains of oppression by capital.

...the party of the proletariat must bring to the 
workers, through all their struggles, the understanding 
of the antagonistic contradiction between themselves 
as a class and the bourgeoisie, and consistently guide 
forces toward its final aim." (draft programme, p. 30)
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Continued from page 12

distinction to the subjectively perceived needs of individu-

dual workers. (That's why we never uphold the bour-
gee's "right" of the backward to be backward over the
crucial needs of the class as a class.) And I fail, like the article does, to discern any attempt to
ask this question amounting to not taking the stand of the proletariat in struggle.

In terms of these struggles against overtime and layoffs, we started from the standpoint of the im-
mediate needs of the particular workers, not the needs of the class struggle. And by using pragmatism instead of science we could not quite figure out a way to satis-
fy everyone's felt needs (short of revolution, of course). And so we could only half-heartedly give leadership to the struggle against what was coming down, for it was not really clear to us what we were doing fit in with our goal of revolution.

This corresponds exactly to some errors we have made in the past. Is the class struggle really made by the already existing class or that which is coming? This is a question that confronts the worker as a worker. Is the class struggle made by the already existing class or that which is coming? This is a question that confronts the worker as a worker.

It is clear from this that we have also underestimated the role of theory and science in our work. We would tend to shift from one line to another, from one group to another, this could become a good class stand, but he's not very scientific. The result of this was the absur-
distinctive line, which would be narrow, a break in the line. Of course, there’s a lot more to class stand than science, but to pit the two against each other is a nonsense.

And here’s how. One the one hand, and most im-
oritarily, without our science we cannot get involved in struggles as a class to change society. And on the other hand, we have found that it is only by grasping pro-
letarian ideology and the science of revolution that we can be consistently militant and provide leadership to struggles. To the degree that we have grasped the basics of the class and the revolutionary nature of the class struggle, we are more consistently and thoroughly militant. Line is leadership. Proletarian

class stand makes us into a material force to change the world!

V. Grasp Political Economy

As the struggle unfolded around the article, we saw that we needed a better grasp of political economy. Two questions had to be answered: one, why is overtime an attack on the working class; two, is it wrong in prin-
ciple to demand the "no overtime"?

What did political economy say about the first ques-
tion? We all knew the theory of surplus value, that for eight hours work the worker is paid much less than the value he has produced. But during overtime the situa-
tion seemed different. After all, if the capitalist has to pay his "worker overtime" didn't that cut into his profit? Wasn’t overtime just an example of arro-

ny weather pure and simple, something the capitalists would prefer not to have? Marx once said, Max, just out in Capital: “...the labour expended during the so-called normal day is paid below its value, so that the workmen are thrown out of work, given to the

struggle to limit the "working day" beyond the limits of the 24 hour day. The working class, on the other hand, constantly strives against it. (An example of how narrowly we viewed the question of overtime in the "class struggle against night work as 'unnatural'!")

In Selected Works of Marx and Engels, vol. 2, p. 179, Marx says: "A preliminary condition, without which all further attempts at improvement and im-

proving are purely surface and will not prove abortive, is the limitation of the "working day". This is an eye-

As a class stand makes us into a material force to change the world!

One final thing. This struggle over these questions has really deepened our understanding of the correct-

tness of our line on party building and dispersed our grasp of the central task at hand. It was only by starting to sum up our work in the light of the draft and journ-

tal that the original two lines in our group first came out. At this point it took a determined struggle first to even spend the time on the questions raised ("we have all these layoffs to deal with") and secondly to get down into the questions to the point where we were all pretty clear on them and united around what we feel is correct. This was a long and difficult process.

From it we have again learned the absolute correct-

ness of the statements that the correct line develops into the incorrect line and that it is this struggle between opposites—and nothing else—that moves our understanding and our work forward.

Forward To The Party!

Struggle For The Party!

No. 3
Our draft programme states: "The policy of the protonational_ans should be that the strength of
unions as part of building its revolutionary movement, and
to reduce the class struggle to the struggle for
capital of the class. In the past two years and more we have been
struggling to grasp and apply this perspective in our work among the
bus drivers of a large urban transit system. As part of this struggle to
overcome trade unionist politics established in our work over
the past year and a half.

We have found that our practice changed in the direction of building a revolutionary workers move-
ment as opposed to the more traditional trade union movement. And indeed, the
work force has come forward to fight under our leadership and the
Executive Board was "revolutionary struggle,
unity, and consciousness" of the class have
occurred.

At the same time, we must remain vigilant and con-
tinue to struggle, because we are still a ways from a
completely breaking with our former rightist and firmly
fighting the weaknesses between the old draft programme,
with the result that right errors have continued to crop
up in our work, preventing us from leading the masses into
all the advances possible under the circum-
stances.

Recently a struggle took place when the local
buses were needed in the organisation of a new Union,
branch charges against and removed from office a brother who was the only officer elected
from our slate. A lot of the bus strike workers took
part in the campaign to get this brother into the union
democratically, which could have been made but wasn't (even to our
disappointment). This struggle will also be
use of comrades in the country in furthering
discussion around the draft programme.

Running A Slate

"The working class and its party cannot base its strategy on "taking over" the unions by electing new
leaders, and it cannot restrict its struggle to the limits set by the rules of the trade unions at any given time."
(D. 31) But that, in fact, was our strategy for the first
two years of the caucus' existence. Although it was born as an ad hoc group in the realm of a big
mass struggle over service cuts which we led to "vi-
tory" with a referendum, the caucus for mobilizing
its extras first and putting a limit in the union
election and then putting out a newspaper.
The only real unity underlying the electoral slate was
the "anti-corporate" one. And the weakness of those on our slate were
their ties to the establishment, non-commital to us, and the mass movement. We tried to
build a slate which several of our candidates won minor shop shop-
and several others came close to winning seats on the city council. In this campaign, workers
who had been running on our ticket had to convince
themselves by working in the caucuses between
elections.

As a result, the newspaper was started and
it quickly became the main, and often, the sole
activity of the caucus. The basis of unity was no more
developed than it had been in the election—basically
conciliation, working conditions, and "union-
issues." The concept of the paper's "revolution" was
the concept of the workers' struggle, and the idea
of leadership for those workers who
were able to run on our ticket had to convince
themselves by working in the caucuses between
elections.
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elections.

But our strategy—that workers learn, not through
their struggle, but through endless "exposures" of
their exploiters, not through the positive building of
leadership and union bureaucrats over the coals for their
incompetence and inefficiency, but it never dealt in terms of
bourgeois ideologies.

But this "strategy"—that workers learn, not through
their struggle, but through endless "exposures" of
their exploiters, not through the positive building of
leadership and union bureaucrats over the coals for their
incompetence and inefficiency, but it never dealt in terms of
bourgeois ideologies.

Don't they give us. Or, we would still have been educating the masses.
And we did not want to educate the masses.

Instead, we put all our emphasis on building a revolutionary workers movement, and then put
out our caucus, and then put out our newspaper, which becomes a living force that advances each struggle
independently of them.

One of the first things we did to combat this was trying to build the
organisation of the workers in the local area.

But we still hadn't seen or understood a lot of our
mistakes. We were involved in our second union election
(1968) and in the same period we also began to raise among
the drivers the issue of organizing a large
strike, and the strength which we brought to
the union leaders, and the way in which we
resented against those powerful, corrupt,
employers.
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interests, we failed to lead the struggle forward around a program representing its interests; (p. 137) and in the coalition meeting came from not fully believing that the masses would take up the struggle, and they will roll over all obstacles placed in their path. "I'm not in trouble—you're in trouble." A Victory

Even so, there are differences within the movement, and a bridge to a united front around one thing only, defense of X." Third, we were ready for that kind of leadership, but we didn’t prepare for it, they’ve won half the battle, even if we save his life, he’s being attacked for—if we back off from the issue anyway.

Our experience of trying to provide Marxist-Leninist leadership to the struggle of the workers at Plant Y has been the class struggle. The dual nature of the unions as described in the draft programme—one hand, these unions today are "controlled at the top by very ... the bourgeoisie; often used as a "main arm of its attack on the working class" and who allow the ruling class to "control the struggle of the workers" through their struggle and enforce labor discipline." As the brother brought out in the Executive Board meeting, they’ve won half the battle, even if we save his life, he’s in trouble for being attacked for—if we back off from the issue anyway.

Atlantic City Demonstration—The aim in this campaign was to use the mass movement as a way of organizing, mobilizing and educating workers about the need for a new strategy to deal with the problems of the working class. The campaign was designed to be a "mass campaign"...
Nine...

Continued from page 15

The response to the demonstration was tremendous. It helped to overcome cynicism and raised people's confidence. But while it would have been possible, we made no effort to run anyone for delegate, and lagged behind in getting involved in the whole election. As a result many of the key issues were brought up with a lot of "very critically" supported. Overall we failed to make the most of the potential in the campaign for mobilizing the rank and file and raising class consciousness which helped build defense and cynicism of the workers who saw an all-bureaucrat delegating with no real action.

This stemmed from a "left" line on union elections, confusing the correct view that we couldn't rely on "pro- offensive delegates" to solve the question and only by carrying out struggle at the convention or in general, with the mistakes idea that we shouldn't not only cut our hands in the election.

The Petition

Another weakness was around the petition—most notably the struggle against layoffs (mass demotions) and the pushing of the workers to sign at the district level and the whole plant. In some cases, we didn't bring it up at all, as if it was a matter of significance. When we did get excellent response and made some new contacts, but the overall half-heartedness led to a small number of signatures reflecting a high percentage in a few pockets, but not really revealing the depth of the workers' hatred for the ENA and their desire for change. This was a real weakness which made it difficult to overcome the obstacle of defeatism among the masses.

Both of these errors were linked to weak work in mobilizing for key union meetings. On the one hand, we didn't see these meetings as important ("fortuitous" and "symbolic") and saw the masses around the issues and rallying them to carry out struggle at the meetings, as well as in the plant. As far as the demonstration itself, we didn't bring it up even at the bigger union meetings ("left" error again) and more importantly, failed to build it widely enough and overcame the doubts of some of us about the potential of the movement which attracted more workers during this period. We failed to build a strong movement yet another good union meeting and some concessions were won, with many people developing a better understanding of class struggle. But overall the central line (the union as a means of building this campaign, we didn't put much into in literature). The local meetings were important but only at the immediate concern, but also against the ENA and at times against the very nature of capitalist exploitation. This is an example of how the union as a means of building this campaign, we didn't put much into in literature). The local meetings were important but only at the immediate concern, but also against the ENA and at times against the very nature of capitalist exploitation.

The Socialists' walkout and their right to strike became a hot issue in the course of the campaign. A petition directed at building support for the miners and Filipinos was taken up with great enthusiasm because we had well received. One local backed the petition unanimously—which gave encouragement to the workers who attacked the "ins" so they can be the sellouts in the company, and including, if necessary, a walkout. While using the union as a means of building this campaign, we focused on building it among the rank and file, and linked in with the issues of the right to strike and the struggle of the workers against the capitalists, including our current fight against the particular attack and the SUB Pay.

SUB Pay—Once again, we see here that the union structure can be used to attack the workers and this struggle. Once again, the worker's group and communist leaders can use it to build that struggle. It's pretty well known that the contract gave the company a giant-sized benefit (and saved the ENA from the union). For this line, along with defeatism, "they're no lousy four week sellout, we didn't pick this up on this same issue through the grievance procedure. At one picket eight departments were represented.

One idea that crops up a lot spontaneously among the workers is the failure to overcome weakness and get involved in the struggle in the union is that "if we get Abel out (or the district director, or the local president), then we will be able to do something consistent against this attack, both in order to bring out the need to overthrow imperialism, and even to lead the day to day struggles.

For this idea leads on the one hand to linking up with and relying on opportunities to build a strategy, and the other hand, when faith is put in one of these less exposed representatives of the bourgeoisie, and the struggle leads to defeat, this idea encourages defeatism.

Overall, this idea, along with defeatism, they're so strong and we're too weak to win!-seek to be the main obstacles in getting the workers to challenge the leadership of the union. But we must overcome this on two fronts: pushing a positive view of the possibilities of victories in the fight for now important local issues, but that we don't have to wait to kick Abel out or get the ENA officially Replaced before we can take on the company and the unions. As far as the leadership of the workers have the real strength, we are part of a whole fighting class that can stand together, with or without the union on this point. "The answer lies in fighting the workers' strength against the enemy's weakness. The bourgeoisie and its agents are hopelessly divided, as long as the size of the union; the working class is made up of the rank and file of the millions of workers and the leadership is divided.
The sum up of Plant X in the first journal (p. 12) correctly describes the error that was made in the struggle around union democracy, but when it discusses why, how and which were the most important errors, it fails to discuss the struggle to which the workers failed to do a correct sum up and because of this fail to make any contribution to the struggle over the programme. Throughout the article runs an obvious contradiction, while pointing out an "incorrect line led to confusion among the workers," in "we lost hundreds of workers out of their union," it is stated that the very same time the criticism around and blames the workers for the defeated wildcat. Examples: There is a spontaneous tendency among workers to confuse the fight against the main enemy, the company, with the fight against the union hacks, and we lost hundreds of workers out of their union, according to whatever someone said. "If we flip back and forth in the "leaders" the problem. Union leaders will be jamming the workers around to wage struggle around the workers' needs and make the union officials good position to utilize the contradictions and attack the union president sell us like pigs. We're talking about the workers, and unite with those in the lower levels of the organization. The No's had it hands down and we're not gonna let them back in the concentrated form of pfogram—and by training workers in that science. And this is what we failed to grasp.

To make this back to the draft programme, we think pages 16 and 17 on practicing mass line and by training workers in that science. The original sum up refers again and again to "we . . ."..." 

Errors of Trade Union Strategy

Here are several examples which show the line of the programme that I refer above. The fact that an article was written by the communists for the local workers' paper which clearly made the union the main enemy (21) is not the whole picture, where we had several close ties but a small minority of the committee, we obtained when the contract proposal was put up for vote. Denis indicates that although we made war over the committee primary and lost complete sight of the needs and wishes of the masses of workers, it is most important to know that for several months a few workers were attending the rank and file meetings and were urged around some key contract demands which were not met in the proposed (23) in a factory, put out the second day of the wildcat by us and a few advanced workers, was the following: "We demand honest work and we're staying out till we get it. The No's had it hands down and we're not gonna let (the union president) sell us this lie. We're talking about your life and we're talking about our lives. This time we'll elect our own vote-counters."

The clear thing, the communists, did indeed have the "strike the union line," and in fact, led with that line. We did not tell the "backyard workers" but in fact, we were trying to rely on the workers. We made the union the main enemy and directed our main blow there, keeping the company off cost free and in a good position to utilise the contradictions and attack the workers.

We think there is an important lesson for the programme. The programme, says the article, "Mobility of the rank and file around a programme representing its interests and in doing so "jam" the union officials—expose the leaders at the top and all over them, break the union bureaucrats' stranglehold on the workers, and unite those in the lower layers 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."

While we wholeheartedly agree, we think it should state clearly that our GOAL is not to "jam" the union officials as such, and that if we aim our main blow at them we will be defeated as in Plant X. Our goal is to wage struggle around the workers' needs and make revolution, not to place ourselves in top union posts, which is the obvious result we would get in making the "leaders" the problem. Union leaders will be jammed (and the programme draft is correct that we must, not to only be able to expose the contradictions, but to make the workers around their needs).}

Errors of Mass Line

The original sum up refers again and again to "we told the workers." We have already seen that we had the wrong line. The error at the root of our case was the error of the "mirror image" line as described in "Class Struggles in Practice" (in the second journal, p. 12). We never fought for the line of preparing for a strike. We always flipped back and forth in our line, according to who someone or other said. So we came up with the line the workers wouldn't strike and gave up relying on them, and led directly to relying on the union hacks to build the class struggle.

This amounts to not applying Marxism-Leninism. Our job as communists is to be an advanced detachment of the working class. Mass line is not the taking of popularity polls but to systematize in the interests of the masses, determining what advanced the struggle and correspond to reality, and then retaining them back in the concentrated form of program—and then perceiving in carrying it out and with the masses to take it up as their own (which it is!!) This is the way we win the struggle to make (them conscious) and release their initiative.

Without grasping that communists have the responsibility to give leadership, we wind up thinking the masses are backwards and that we are the real heroes. The reason we can systematize the line is that we have a science to apply to those ideas, Marxism-Leninism. Mao Tsetung Thought, which workers or anybody else cannot arrive at spontaneously. Our responsibility is to put the science in the use of the working class both by summing up practicing mass line and by training workers in that science. And this is what we failed to grasp.

To make this back to the draft programme, we think pages 16 and 17 on practicing mass line and self-criticism is absolutely correct. The proposal we make is to include the flashing out of mass line which line is done excellently in the second journal. Our party programme should have every possible lesson on mass line we can get, since this is one of the most important things that must be grasped.

Before ending, we would like to say a few more things about the programme. Obviously we can say that the line of "we were correct, the masses were wrong," obscured the real errors that were made. But we don't sum up errors that are in errors—we do move it forward the struggle. The ending, talking about how the work has moved forward, is untrue, according to the very author who have since done some self-criticism on this point. The work hasn't moved forward, precisely because the real errors were never summed up. We must bring into the programme that the real need is to be thoroughly catalogued materialists because without this we will never be able to fulfill our responsibility as the advanced, conscious detachment of the working class. Grasp the Mass Line! Forward to the Party! Struggle for the Party!}

Eleven

I would like to offer some suggestions for consideration in the next section of the draft programme. Specifically, I wish to present a rewrite of the paragraph on skilled workers. I do not disagree with the line of the RU on skilled workers, but I do think that the way that it is presented in the draft does not clearly express the line as I understand it. Certainly, I think it is our programme to explain in minute detail every aspect of the party's line, it is important, however, for the programme to stand on its own and to clearly put forward its message to the working class.

My criticisms, of the draft does not clearly explain the party's line on skilled workers. And that the last sentence of this section, "With this foundation, the working class line . . .", is the program to explain in minute detail every aspect of the party's line, it is important, however, for the programme to stand on its own and to clearly put forward its message to the working class.

On page 63 of RP4 there is a paragraph that does state clearly what distinguishes skilled workers from other strata of the working class:

"By the way, the reason the labor aristocrats do not have a proletarian world outlook is not only because of high pay. Many of them make high hourly wages, but they do not work all year round, so their yearly earnings may not be that much higher than production workers (this especially true of some skilled workers in the construction trades). In contrast to production workers, many tradesmen work in much more individualized situations, which narrows their outlook. And, unlike production workers, many tradesmen are not completely separated from ownership of the means of production, a good number of them have their own tools. Because of this, their labor is not as thoroughly alienated as production workers, even though they may be bored away by foremen to some extent."

While high incomes are a main factor, two other traits are of major importance in differentiating skilled workers from other strata of the working class:

"To a second point of criticism, it comes down to a matter of all friends and enemies. This section of the programme to stand on its own and to clearly put forward its message to the working class.

I offer the following paragraphs as a possible way to correct this section of the draft:

"Finally, within the U.S. working class there are several million skilled tradesmen in the construction trades and throughout industry. Some of these workers earn high incomes; however, this is not the only thing that distinguishes them from other working class. These workers work in highly individual situations and are not completely separated from all ownership of the means of production. The majority of skilled workers form an independent stratum. And this is what we failed to grasp.

"The workers as a whole must be distinguished from the highly paid union officials, who act as labor lieutenants of the capitalist class. The workers move in order to resist the exploitation of the masses of the class, must be solidly based in the heart of the proletariat, among the workers on the assembly lines and in basic production. They are the nucleus of the party's mass line. With this foundation and unity the majority of its members, the working class and its party can and will unite as a world revolutionary.
We first, after some thorough and on-going struggle, that some sections of the draft program in the revolu-
tionary Workers Movement section need to be re-
written and, if not done so, can lead to confusion in sum-
ing up our work and lead to a reformist and not a
revolutionary party.

The first part of the section, "The working class learns through its day to day struggles," brings forth a
lot of what the working class learns, and we do agree that these lessons begin to come clearer, but what is
missing in this part is key. Lenin says, "From individ-
ual strikes the workers can and must go over to a
struggle of the entire working class for the emancipa-
tion of all who labor.

How does the working class go over? Is it enough
for us, the communists, to help them reach the point
when they understand that there is more than mere
individuals, but as members of a class, locked in warfare
with the opposing class of employers?" Can we assume
that we are "there is a temporary setback it spurs dis-
cussion among the workers as to the cause of the de-
feat," that what the workers sum up will be right? Or
can we assume that there is no bourgeois or capitalist,
constantly summing up struggle for the workers? We
think not.

By leaving this part of the section the way it is, we
leave the door open to rightism. To "go over" is a qual-
itative leap. We have to see what the workers understand
as a level of solid realization of what they are fighting and why. In the draft program, the part on the day to day struggle is separated off from the part on the ideological struggle and this is wrong.
The two have to be meshed and used together.

On the one hand we have the class struggle, which
is real and is based on the real world, teaching the
working class a lot about the system and the forces of
oppression, but what they learn is not enough to take
them to the point where they go "to fight for the emancipation of the entire working class.

As communists, being involved in battles in the real
world, we must take what the workers already know,
struggle against the incorrect, and raise the correct
idea to a higher level, take them back to the work-
ers till they grasp them as their own.

If we don't do both these things (being part of the
day to day struggle and raising the understanding of
the masses to a higher level through the course of the
to day to day), we'll end up making "left" or right errors
that hold back revolution.

Such is the case with the comrades who wrote the
two articles on the Boston busing plan in the first and second journal issues. One of the comrades said, "our tendency has been to think that if only the working class and oppres-
se in the real enemy, then we could unite and fight. Before we could unite with workers to fight, they had to agree
with our slogan, "Fight the Ruling Class! Divide and
Rule Attacks." This reflected a subjective idealistic ap-
proach to how the working class moves and learns in
struggle.

The mistake the comrades were making had been making was trying to build to the direction of the workers
and not in the real world. The key is not to negate our
subjective desires but to make them conform to objec-
tive reality and use them to help make revolution.

On the other hand, the comrades who wrote the
second article made the opposite error. They saw the
importance of putting out a fighting program but left
out the importance of bringing any Marxism-Leninism,
Mao Tsetung Thought to it. To them the mass line was
"summing up the scattered and unsystematic ideas,
putting them back out in a systematized way (a pro-
gram)..." They failed to see how dropping the slogan
"The party can only carry out its tasks by conduct-
ing the most determined fight against the ideology and
willingness to know what communists have to say
about the burning questions in our lives, and are look-
ing for the leadership that can take us out of this mess.

We feel that both these errors could be a result in
the draft program is written. The part on the
day to day struggle and the part on the ideological
struggle need to be more closely related, showing how
can't enough without the other. The working class
learns a hell of a lot every day just living in the real
world because the bourgeoisie is always exposing itself
for the leadership that is it. But without communists
constantly out in the every day battles bringing con-
sciousness and raising the perceptual to the rational,
the working class can never make revolution, not even
in a thousand years.

On The Role of the Workers Papers

Our work on the Worker has shown us the need to
advance fighting programs. In the course of the strug-
gle, we go to the masses to develop them as conscious
and directed expression of their needs, position, and
demands, and to rely on the masses to wage the
struggle.

It has also developed our understanding of the
importance and methods of strengthening proletarian
ideology in the working class, and emancipates mass.
In this process we've had to root out old period
baggage which failed to see that the working class
did and must grasp and make revolution. This bag-
gage expressed itself in the right errors of economism
and feeling watered down analysis to the workers,
"left" errors of rhetorical speeches to workers, and
failure to link the day to day struggles to the over-
allness of the working class.

We feel that both these errors could be a result in
the way the draft program is written. The part on
the day to day struggle and the part on the ideological
struggle need to be more closely related, showing how
can't enough without the other. The working class
learns a hell of a lot every day just living in the real
world because the bourgeoisie is always exposing itself
for the leadership that is it. But without communists
constantly out in the every day battles bringing con-
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The Worker is now an organ of the organization (and will be of the party). It seeks to be the voice of the working class, which can develop spontaneously and needs to be fought every inch of the way. This does not mean that we should be anti-imperialist organizations. In fact the establishment of revolutionary workers organizations city-wide, or in large cities, is a condition of the working class getting to the next level. This would be sectarian to the masses who want to fight but do not yet completely unite ideologically and politically with the communist Leninists. But we are beginning to see the enemy as the system. These organizations can be based on a very simple, democratic, everyday revolutionary practice. We can unite with the line and work on and distribute the paper. This high level of unity does not deprive us of the opportunity to bring workers into the staff, who are not yet at this understanding. To think of the paper as a weapon does not mean, first, that the working class learns primarily through struggles; and, not by editing articles; second, that it is still important, good, and necessary to involve workers for others in the same way, but not to bring the level down to the lowest possible unity; and third, that we don't want to yank workers out of the battles they are fighting into a program that is like the Worker, but want to use the Worker to build those fights. The Worker should not be the organ of an anti-imperialist, revolutionary workers organization in the future, of a area-wide or city-wide IWO. It may play an important role in bringing workers into the various forms of organization that are engaged in struggles, and to help initiate new ones, by bringing their program and spreading the ideas of the struggles broadly among the masses. At the same time, it should be directly led by the party and not by a form at a lower level, and should have an independent existence from the IWOs.
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One...

Continued from page 19 too much importance, but in which we played a role, and is not that which we are doing today. We are ignoring major struggles of the class just because we didn't have contacts in the plant, or weren't doing work there, or because we are not watching the struggles that exist in the factory. This is beginning to develop deep ties among the working classes. Once again it was a question of reviewing the old comments and addressing the real things on the mass line.

Failure to do this leads to ignoring elections, bills before city councils and Congress, etc., that are tied up with crime, sport, and developments in the news around political scandals, etc. In all of these situations we have not taken on the bourgeois line and uncovered the truth, taking a decisive stand, the proletariat's stand. The point is to take our heads out of the sand and not try to make up to the working class by answering wrong questions. We can't substitute our subjective idealist conception for the real state of things.

Also important is the spreading of proletarian culture, and the exposure of the decadence of bourgeois culture. The draft programme correctly states: "As a key part of the struggle against the bourgeoisie, the working class and its party must give full flower to proletarian propaganda and culture, while exposing and eradicating the other forms of the bourgeoisie. This is an immediate task and cannot be put off until socialism. In their daily struggles the masses of proletarians must develop the depth of understanding of the proletarian line, and it is the task of the party and its cultural workers to encourage and guide their growth and multiply the number and scope of workers committed to the perspective of the party."

We've done this by popularizing Prairie Fire's tour and printing workers' songs, etc. Some other papers have used fiction, poetry, and proletarian art. We need to take this up more seriously.

At the same time we do review of bourgeois mo- vements. This is of course necessary to expose the deception and class nature of them and sum them up from the proletariat's standpoint, and to explain what it is that makes them so attractive to the proletariat. This is the key to understanding the proletariat, and it is the task of the party and its cultural workers to encourage and guide their growth and multiply the number of workers committed to the perspective of the party."

Two...

In summing up over two years of experience working on a local revolutionary workers paper, we can point to its strengths and weaknesses, particularly around the task of growing the number of conscious revolu- tionary workers movement. The paper's main strength has been its usefulness as a tool for communists and revolutionary workers, a tool to build the working class struggle, unfolding political issues in close connection with building the practical struggles.

The weaknesses are that we've only developed a more class-conscious workers movement, giving communists a base in the class, but also it has contributed to the collective experience of the new communist movement, increasing our ability to sum up and conceptualize our knowl- edge in a party programme. The paper's main weak- ness has been its hesitancy in developing a correct leading line to unite, mobilize, and politically advance the class as a whole.

The formation of a revolutionary communist party with a battle plan for building the struggle, conscious- ness and unity of the working class will mark a new period in the work of the party. As issues become more pressing, more people began to see the paper as their own. (When the paper fell into right and "left" errors, its base did not grow.)

"Unable To Reflect Leading Line"

"However, as the conscious forces have come to develop a more advanced strategic road for the class, the local revolutionary workers paper has been unable to reflect this leading line in all its many aspects. The staff of a local paper cannot bring the concentration of knowledge and experience of a nationwide paper, particularly when the staff is made up of people on different political levels and the paper is not the organ of a party. The party can concentrate all the energy of its mistakes, analyze it with the science of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought and proletarian artistry."
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Two...

Continued from page 20

The struggle, far and away, spread as broadly as possible through the working class and among its allies. To build every possible struggle and build it off to launch new struggles. Here is the key to the seed. What is this to the “left” with a “left” tendency of de-emphasizing analysis and popularizing slogans?

The weakness in our application of the “single spark” method was that in this period of working class upsurge we often oversimplified the ability to “spread every spark of struggle” and “fan every spark of consciousness.” Limited experience of keeping the “sparks” together and studying, investigating, understanding the nature and limits of the paper and the limited resources that go with it. Limiting the content of a nationwide party paper to the need to discuss what was incorrect. More and more, the organizing function of factory literature and factory literature exposure based on analysis, striking factories because of adjusting their struggles of the class as “economic” studies how these experiences, often known in these shops, having worked in them, etc. But the correct line was primary. Workers want to know, “How can we fight back and win?” This ability to put forward a correct fighting programme will be enhanced in the new period.

The nationwide paper will not exclude the development of many other nationwide programs and agitation directed to the workers movement, to a nationwide network of nationwide and local propagandas. Efforts of the nationwide paper will be able to aid local propagandas as a whole. In many ways Revolution has played the role of a nationwide party paper. Especially in the most recent period. The revolutionary workers movement (and didn’t firmly grasp the importance of this enemy.” (p. 30)

Throughout the country, the single largest area of work of our organization—in terms of cadre size and experience with the mass struggle, is the management and organization of the workplace struggle. This is the time to pull the papers into the nationwide press. It won’t happen by itself—nobody just drifts into the mass movement. It will be a powerful weapon in the hands of the working class. Some Drawbacks

Some drawbacks, some problems, some limitations.

From the earliest Red Papers to today, we have been putting Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought, the goals of the war—and what leadership is necessary to win the war. Out of the struggles of the masses, many people began to become communists—studying the summed experience, and developing them in close relation to the other key battlefronts of the class.

Three...

Page 17 of the draft programme states: “The party of the workers of the world...” and the instrument through which the working class wields its weapons of class struggle. It forges and leads a power of class struggle. It forges and leads a power of class struggle.
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...continued from page 21

The point is that we must constantly take up the task of transforming society. Such errors of the past are serious weaknesses today, and mean defeat for the working class tomorrow. If the papers don’t move into the next period, the working class will be robbed of a powerful weapon. Let’s look at what we came from.

We see that workers and women of all races, live in the Bay Area. We are, employed and unemployed, welfare people and students. Some of us belong to the RU, a national communist organization.

We stand solidly with our class—the working class. We face serious attacks on our livelihoods—and we are fighting back—against the employing class and their representatives.

The working class is the force that can lead all the people to victory.

Black, Chinese, Asian, and other people’s fight against discrimination is crucial to all working people. There are workers of these many races and nationalities in our ranks. We stand with the Vietnamese people and all oppressed nations fighting for independence.

The Bay Area Worker reports the issues and struggles of our class. (Bay Area Worker, 1972)

This was the first: “Who We Are.” It said that this was a worker’s paper that communes with the working class and its struggles.
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Three...

Continued from page 22

In paper after paper, the significance of May Day is a topic that moves the class struggle forward. And forward means towards proletarian revolution—the only solution to the problems of the working class. Why do the papers do this? To say we don't have a movement coalition, or an alienated petty bourgeoisie—fear of the masses. They were asked the same two questions. Their fellow workers asked them the same two questions—"What kind of paper can do this? To say we don't have a movement coalition, or an alienated petty bourgeoisie?" And the workers replied, "I thought it was a communist paper."

The task of the papers is to serve as a tool in developing the mass struggle and moving up to the general level of consciousness of the working class. What is a mass paper? It is a paper to save space, read Palentine or any of the usual. The communists. The main task of a mass, fighting paper party is not to say "we're going to move up and the only way to get it is we like M-L." The correction of right errors is not a list of "left" slogans like the demagogues' papers use—a 61 hour rail and the dictatorship of the proletariat. A party paper does NOT mean an internal cadre only. Revolution is for women's oppression, or any other social question, but fight-fight is the answer in the shop. And workers fight in the shop, people—women or Blacks or petty bourgeois and students—fight in society as a whole.

This separateness of revolution from the working class struggle comes out most clearly on "revolutionary"-sounding papers. In paper after paper, the significance of May Day was not grasped. For example, from the May Issue of the Bay Area Worker it says: "Where to Aim Main Blow?" The truth is that the papers were not really communist. The paper distribution answered the question, "Is this a communist paper?" with a defensive NO. But what was it? "A workers paper that supports the RU" was the result, congression, and suspicion. The communalists have gone to the working class, taken up the life of the masses, their struggles; we have trans-
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The RSB at Harvard was initiated by an RU comrade and a few others in October 1974. Since the chapter’s formation it has been involved in a struggle around the establishment of a W.E.B. Du Bois Institute for Afro-American Studies. This Institute was won during the 1969 student strike when Black and white students united and won several demands including the addition of ROTC, the establishment of the Afro-American Studies Department (AAS), the Institute was to have been an auxiliary feature of that department with a significant degree of student control, and an All Black community, and strong links to the Du Bois Institute. In 1969 a great victory for the student movement.

The establishment of AAS did not achieve full utilization for Black people at Harvard. This would be impossible under the conditions of capitalist society. The most that could be done was to focus on the black question, to recognize that Black people do have a distinct and unique national culture that deserved consideration in the university. But it was the nature of this struggle that AAS had been under constant attack since it was established. With the deepening of the economic crisis this attack intensified.

One of the aspects of the attack was the attempt to restructure the proposed Du Bois Institute. The administration announced a plan that would turn the Institute into a post-doctoral research preserve with no Black students and no input from the community. An Advisory Board dominated by Black lackeys of the ruling class was established. Dr. Du Bois backed out, naming the ruling class was set up to implement this concept.

Before the formation of the RSB at Harvard the campus was dominated by several varieties of opportunist political organizations. The largest was New American Movement (NAM) which had been around for three years and has built up a significant mass base around its liberal/social democratic line. Several minority national organizations also existed. The strongest of these was the Organization for the Solidarity of Third World Students (OSTWS), a group which calls itself anti-imperialist. By October more and more students, both minority and white, became involved in a series of struggles.

The RSB was roused by the attack on the Du Bois Institute was a key struggle on campus. The RSB approached OSTWS with a proposal to unite around struggles against black attacks on the Institute and the harassment of AAS on the basis that these were not only attacks on Black students, but also part of an overall attack on all students. This was one of several attacks coming down and we put forward the idea of uniting to fight all as the correct strategy. We made this proposal because we felt that if we carried it we would win over the Negro Nationalists and help us to see them all as broad allies with whom we could fight.

While the RSB was known as being an All Black organization, we also put forward this proposal to all the students on campus. The draft programme states, "...the working class and its party asserts the policy of building the fight against national oppression as part of the overall class struggle of working class as a whole. This means: mobilize the masses of the oppressed nationalities into the struggle against this oppression, on the one hand, and mobilize the working and world students to support them based on understanding of the mass of students..." (p. 34).

Did our practice this year show a failure to grasp this method. At various points we held two different, incorrect lines on how to build multinational unity.

1. Unite with minority nationality organizations, but let them organize their own nationalities. 2. Put out a general call to the masses to get some more nationality people since they are all in the same place.

In the course of building struggle around the Du Bois Institute our line went through several developments. We suffered many setbacks. But by learning from our errors we were able to contribute to moving the struggle forward and deepening our understanding of how to build the fight against national oppression and how to view minority nationality organizations.

By applying these lessons we will be able to continue to build the struggle, build multinational unity, and win leadership for the proletarian line.

Several Developments

In building this struggle against the Du Bois Institute's attack on the RSB started out with a proposal to unite around struggles against black attacks on the Institute and the harassment of AAS on the basis that these were not only attacks on Black students, but also part of an overall attack on all students. This was one of several attacks coming down and we put forward the idea of uniting to fight all as the correct strategy. We made this proposal because we felt that if we carried it we would win over the Negro Nationalists and help us to see them all as broad allies with whom we could fight.

While the RSB was known as being an All Black organization, we also put forward this proposal to all the students on campus. The draft programme states, "...the working class and its party asserts the policy of building the fight against national oppression as part of the overall class struggle of working class as a whole. This means: mobilize the masses of the oppressed nationalities into the struggle against this oppression, on the one hand, and mobilize the working and world students to support them based on understanding of the mass of students..." (p. 34).

Did our practice this year show a failure to grasp this method. At various points we held two different, incorrect lines on how to build multinational unity.

1. Unite with minority nationality organizations, but let them organize their own nationalities. 2. Put out a general call to the masses to get some more nationality people since they are all in the same place.

Bundism and White Oppression

The first line, which we held most of the time, led us to unite with those organizations who opposed the struggle against narrow nationalism and reformism because we feared that this would lead to splits with these organizations and unity would be destroyed. This has reinforced our fear of struggling with minority nationality students and led us to see them all as narrow nationalists and black allies with whom we could not fight. This attitude is not only incorrect, but it is also a product of the fallacies of the RSB leadership and NAM's tailism. Some are particularly upset at having been used as bodies in the fight for the Du Bois Institute, in addition to this blatant reformism, DISC could have argued that the struggle must be fought as a Black issue primarily, that it take precedence over all other issues, and that it must be led by Black students.

Because of this many students have become critical of the DISC leadership and NAM's tailism. Some are particularly upset at having been used as bodies in the fight for the Du Bois Institute.
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key to applying the method of the draft programme of building the struggle from two sides. On the question of multinational unity in the student mass movement the draft programme says: "A more solid unity than ever before is being built between white, Black, Latin and other students, both in organizations made up of students of all nationalities, and through close ties between these organizations and groups based on minority students." Our experience is that this view is at best one-sided, positive. During the struggle around the Dubois Institute both OSMW and FFMM have played a principal, revolutionary role. Their opportunism and sectarianism towards the RSB, CFRE, and the RU have made it very difficult to build unity. Their line has been narrow nationalistic, reformist, and reflects contempt for the masses. We do not feel that our experience is broad enough to draw the same conclusion for FFMM as a national organization, or for national forms of organization in general, but it is clear that the line we originally held-to cooperate with and encourage national forms of organization as a key to building multinational unity-as an error. Such forms of organization will persist more strongly among those who are among the working-class because the material basis for unity is not as great nor the need as clear. At Harvard we faced the additional problem of the great gap between the upper petty bourgeoisie and have thus had a stronger basis for nationalism and reformism than Black youth at other campuses. In our experience, without communist leadership, national organizations of students have had a strong spontaneous appeal to Black students for their national unity. This is particularly strong when it is an anti-imperialist organization. Sometimes it has been easier to unite with national organizations with a realistic basis of unity. What holds back minority students who see the need for revolution and even for multinational unity from joining a nationalist organization? In our experience it is principally nationalism.

There is a material basis for such organizations to exist, but they have two sides: the progressive side, which we should unite with whenever possible is that national minorities are coming together to fight the special oppression they face from a broader national oppression. But, because of the petty bourgeois character of these organizations, there will be a strong tendency to see narrow nationalism which must be struggled against and exposed through relying on the masses and taking the struggle out to all students. Without meaningful and organized pressure on the part of the masses, a struggle can never be a substitute for reaching out to the masses of students, boldly putting our revolutionary perspective, and independently mobilizing the masses of minority students.

The draft programme says that "[t]he united front is not one big organization. It is not a static thing. For each stage of the struggle its own ideology, and conflict goes on between opposing outlooks-over who to identify as the enemy, who to rely on, who to unite with, etc. The proletariat through its party, fights for the leadership of its class in all mass movements, and brings to the fore its revolutionary interests and outlook." (p. 27)

This is the view we must take towards the alliance with the movements of the oppressed nationalities as well. We failed to grasp that intense struggle over political lines was an important thing in our relationship with national forms of organization. We were too timid, and often failed to move forward the program of the proletariat on how to conduct the struggle. Now that we have corrected these errors we will be prepared to continue to build the struggle.

Two...

We have been actively involved in our area in the campaign against police repression for the last year and a half—mainly centered around the police killing of a Black youth. Real breakthroughs have been made by building the campaign that has involved several thousands and reached tens of thousands of people. This campaign has demonstrated that people can organize, plant gate rallies, petitions, mass leafletting, hundreds of workers and over a thousand high school students wearing black berets, etc.

Linking the fight against police repression with the fight against national oppression from two sides has been key to moving our work forward in a revolutionary direction. On the one side, the campaign has been very important in winning workers over concretely to take on the fight against national oppression. Comrades doing work together have also learned a great deal through the campaign, overcoming many initial errors in approaching the question from the viewpoint of "Isn't this terrible that they did this to the poor kids," which got sympathy at best.

Now comes much more consistently for forward we need to fight this and other attacks on the Black masses, and take the struggle out to all students. This campaign provided the opportunity to show how as a class we must oppose attacks on Black people as a matter of principle.

In using the campaign to mobilize Black people to fight against their own national oppression, real advances have been made in pointing toward the need for mass struggle, and the role of the working class in that struggle. A diabolical relation exists between two "sides"—advances from one helping to spark advances in the other. For example, our line on the need for multinational unity between working class groups and will take up and eventually lead the fight against police repression, made real headway among the Black masses of our area. In our work we have also been very concerned through the contingents at marches, plant rallies, petitions, etc. that the working class is taking up the fight. Both in our work with the oppressed minority students and among people generally, we have also been able to expose the role of the police and the nature of the state in general.

Judging from the many articles in Revolution, it appears that building the fight against national oppression has been key to almost all the fights against police repression that we have been involved in around the country.

Questions Around the Draft

How fully does the draft programme reflect these lessons we have learned in our work against police repression? The general thrust of the section, "Build the fight against repression and bourgeois terror that part of the overall national liberation movement" (pp. 42-43), correctly sums up our experience that the police repression campaign "must be waged as part of the..." (p. 42) bourgeois campaign "must be waged as part of the revolution against...monopoly capitals"—in any form? (p. 42) The ultimate aim of our work in fighting police repression is to build the revolutionary movement, not to mobilize people's democratic rights as part of some United Form Against Fascism now, with revolution on some future agenda.

But the draft programme falls short in stating how these revolutionary advances will be made in the fight against police repression. The draft states correctly that "As the capitalist crisis deepens, as the bourgeoisie is further exposed by police repression, the masses prove the bourgeoisie is fomenting, that its policies lack the most vicious repression. Alongside of its official state apparatus it organizes vigilante-type groups to carry out its terror. In recent years masses of people have mobilized to fight these attacks, particularly police repression. In addition to building broad mass campaigns against the fight against national oppression have resulted in important advances for the revolutionary movement, in addition to building broad mass campaigns against police repression and national oppression are not made clearly.

It is not enough to say, as the section's first paragraph does, that "[t]he [ ruling ] class..." (p. 42). It is true that this view is at work in our area, as well as around the country, has shown that at least all of our work in fighting police repression has tried to have people fight fundamentally and in fighting, have objectively also been "ally" of national oppression. And more importantly, it was by building the struggle against national oppression that we were able to make our most important break-throughs in building the revolutionary movement. The fight against national oppression had to be reflected more fully in the programme.

When this latter form was originally put forward in our work team, it was rejected because it made the case that immediate contradiction intensifies, police attacks will be more widespread against the working class as a whole, and therefore the fight against police repression will not be so central to the fight against police repression.

It is true that national oppression will not be so central to our struggle as a whole, but against the Black masses. At the same time, the ruling class will continue to increase police repression against oppressed nationalities, and the fight against national oppression will always be a major focus of police repression work.

In passing to the question of multinational unity in the struggle against police repression coming down on the class with the fight of the oppressed nationalities against police repression will be made in the fight against national oppression. This is one of the many concrete ways in which the draft programme puts forward in the next sentence. "The fight against national oppression is an important direction. On the one side, the campaign has provided the opportunity to show how as a class we must oppose attacks on Black people as a matter of principle.

We saw a small example of this in our area when about 150 strikers and supporters from different strikes involved in the city council to protest police attacks on the picket lines. The committee we have been working in which is demanding the prosecution of the cop who killed a black youth, also went to the "End Police terror against the oppressed nationalities, stop police murder, brutality and harassment." (p. 34) But in the section on "The Fight Against Repression and Bourgeois Terror," the link between the fight against police repression and national oppression is not made clearly.

It is not enough to say, as the section's first paragraph does, that "[t]he [ ruling ] class..." (p. 42). It is true that this view is at work in our area, as well as around the country, has shown that at least all of our work in fighting police repression has tried to have people fight fundamentally and in fighting, have objectively also been "ally" of national oppression. And more importantly, it was by building the struggle against national oppression that we were able to make our most important break-throughs in building the revolutionary movement. The fight against national oppression had to be reflected more fully in the programme.
This paper will deal with some questions and criticisms of different aspects of the draft programme, and how it came about. It will treat only the question of national self-determination within the framework of the programme.

As an important part of this, the party suggests a struggle against narrow nationalism. This struggle is not limited to the working class, but goes beyond it. The fight against narrow nationalism is an integral part of the struggle against imperialism, and is a necessary condition for the development of the working class.

Self-determination of the Black nation: The draft programme says that the Black nation has the right to self-determination.
different class forces. In order to ally the movements of these nationalities most closely with the revolutionary working class struggle, it is crucial to rely on the masses of workers of the nationalities and bond the unity of the workers of all nationalities at the most fundamental unity. The single working class of the U.S., through its leadership, must lead the united front, in order to strengthen the unity of the workers of the American continent, and the united front as broadly as possible." (p. 28, our emphasis.)

By putting forward the need to build an Asian Contingent for May Day that would unite with people on the level of struggle, and by putting emphasis on organizing and uniting the workers of all nationalities, we lend our struggle the form of the revolutionary movement as a whole with the struggles of the oppressed nationalities.

Comrades, what the draft programme lays out is the picture of the struggles for struggle. During this period, the ruling class, pacified by the power of the Black people and bringing down racism and police, is able to build up bourgeoisie and petty bourgeois forces among them to put a brake on their struggle, and lead it into a deadlock. But because this could not in any way change the basic conditions of the Black masses, it has mainly served to intensify class contradictions among Black people, as it becomes all the more clear that the Black bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie cannot lead the Black people to liberation.

"This year's May Day was a success. In the Bay Area over 1500 people attended the march and rally. For the Asian workers who came out it really put forward the fundamental role that the working class played in leading the main role in the revolutionary movement. For the petty bourgeois forces who came out from the Asian community, it gained the way forward—that the working class is on the move and it is leading the fight against all oppression.

About 200 Asians participated in the May Day event. And though many marched with the contingents built around the seven areas of struggle, such as "Stop Police Repression," "We Won't Fight Your Imperialist War," "No Outcuts in Social Services," etc., the majority labour 150 marched within the Asian Contingent.

Wei Min She, a Bay Area Asian-American anti-imperialist organization, included the Asian Contingent (AC) and also built a Chintown Workers Committee to Celebrate May Day (CTWC). RU members play an important role in it. Wei Min She and as a committee, we were the force against police repression, and we made a lot of people know about the May Day. In the AC, we saw that by building the AC, we could reach out to the petty bourgeois forces that would not necessarily commit to the basis of building the unity of the working class. For Asian workers we tended to see them as Asians first and working class second, we would only march in the AC with their people. Therefore, the slogan "Asians Unite! Fight the Oppression of Minority Peoples" put forward by the AC in the rally was somewhat wrong. Along with the main May Day slogan, "Workers Unite to Fight Against All Oppression! Fight, Don't Stand Still!

Our influence of the Buddhist thinking was reflected in the April-May editorial of "Wei Min Bao, an Asian-American anti-imperialist organization. The Chintown Workers Committee out to May Day to join the AC, it states: "Asians in America have always struggled against oppression. But what's more we say why we are the only road forward for—in that the fight of Asian and other minority nationalities is struggling with that of the working class. And that the community—students, professionals, shopkeepers, and workers—see a lot in common with the working class. As a matter of principle, it is only by fulfilling its historical role to eliminate all exploitation, and oppression, seeing every fight, particularly the oppression of these struggles."

In practice this line comes down to objectively relying on the petty bourgeoisie. Seeing the oppressed nationalities as class allies the struggle of something different from workers of the oppressed nationalities, spontaneously diverts us away from relying on the proletariat. When we could have united the Asians who came to May Day on the basis of proletarian leadership and built a much higher level of unity, we especially placed a great deal of development by uniting them solely on the basis of nationality.

Much Different Line

On the other hand, the line on which we built the Chintown Workers Committee (CTWC) and the Chintown Workers Forum (which was held to mobilize Chinese immigrant workers to May Day) was correct. We put forward to work on the CTWC came forward not on the basis of the Asian Contingent but on the basis of the main struggle of the working class of different nationalities in merging the national and class struggles.

Concerning the merging of the national and class struggles, the draft programme lays out the following:

"The solid core of the united front in the U.S. will be the revolutionary alliance of the working class involving mass movements of the oppressed nationalities against the common imperialist enemy. The tens of millions of these nationalities who suffer discrimination feel their own interests very closely. If we have a good programme for getting across "Asians United!" instead of "Workers Unite." Through every discussion, planning meeting and speaking, we must build up unity of the class always primary.

Difficult in promoting the AC to the workers led us not to put much importance on this struggle as it is a very difficult one to draw out when the Min Min Bao staff interviewed some retired Chinese workers about their views on May Day. The Min Min Bao staff tried to draw out an Asian perspective, whereas the workers continually put forward a class perspective on May Day. What we need to do is to bring the communities and activists (involved, was that the workers had a stronger or equal part of the material conditions and the work. The leaflet of the CTWC to Chintown workers best expressed their outlook: "We've had enough of bosses telling you you can't fight. You've got no skill or you're just old women—so you'd better accept whatever we give you. It's time for us to fight back together. We are fighting against the same things we face. UNITE AND MARCH TOGETHER...tell the bosses and their government that we are fighting for strong. UNITE AND SHOWING THE BOSSES THE MUSCLE OF THE WORKING CLASS.

Discussed in the CTWC march of May Day for May Day was held around all seven areas of struggle which are going on nationwide, not just around the Bay Area. There are many more questions we can relate their own experiences to how they see the imperatives of these struggles. They learned the community spirit well from the CCW, their Chinese immigrant workers about May Day. They went out to the unemployment office and side by side with UNOCC, to people of all nationalities and publicized May Day for two weeks before the march and rally began.

Some Weaknesses

There were also weaknesses in how we built the Chintown Workers Committee, such as in the leaflet where we talked about "Building a powerful movement against all that keeps Chinese and all people down. We also committed the Bundist error of having the CTWC march as the head of the AC—implying that Asian workers should lead the struggles in the national movement instead of the entrance of the revolutionary working class, and that Asian workers have more in common in the party with the Asian community than they do with their class.

Instead of the class being in the lead in the fight against all oppression, we lumped the petty bourgeoisie with the AC. We held a backward view on how the proletariat wins over the petty bourgeoisie.

The draft programme puts forward correctly about the need and ability of the working class to win over as much of the petty bourgeoisie as possible, and neutralize those petty bourgeois forces that cannot be won over, by exposing the bourgeoisie, and mobilizing the masses of workers to build the most powerful struggle against it. But in order to do this the proletariat must lead forward its revolutionary movement with great strength as the main force in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, and carry this struggle through to make revolution. The petty bourgeoisie understands that their non-political interests as a class, the broader the sections of the petty bourgeoisie it will be able to win over.

This was precisely why the petty bourgeoisie forces—from the Asian community and outside—came out to May Day. But what did we? We tried to show our class outlook to the AC with the AC and drag them away from the leadership of the proletariat. Because our Bundists stood in the way, many of the petty bourgeois forces came out because the workers were on the move—that the struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie is the real contradiction determining all other struggles in society. Many petty bourgeois Asians—students, social workers, law students, and workers because they wanted to check out where the revolutionary workers movement was and look for direction.

A lot of work was done to get these forces out to May Day, with side effect on the revolutionary worker's agencies and campaigns. A lot more work with the correct line should have been done in getting forward and putting up with the petty bourgeoisie and immigrant population in Chintown but as many workers as possible from the entire Asian community and working class give an idea of the unity of the workers of all nationalities as the most fundamental unity." That will merge the national and class struggle.

On merging the national and class struggles, the draft programme talks about the method of "working at it from two sides."

"The youth workers told stories of beatings by the cops. Young white workers told stories of beatings by the cops, and how repression came down hardest on people of color around this campaign. At one plant Black and white workers gave over $60 to the defense fund, in part by comparing the conditions of the workers around the world. Another was a skit written and performed by the workers showing the fools and puppets of the police, the fight against deportations, and the right to strike under the banner of May Day. The march to the unemployment office and side by side with UNOCC, to people of all nationalities and publicized May Day for two weeks before the march and rally began.

Page 27

Continued on page 29
Fire...

Continued from page 27

me states;

"Economic nationalism by ending its source capitalist rule"—this is the stand of the working class, and with this stand the workers' movement will unite. The struggle of the oppressed nationalities to form the solid core of the united front.

"To achieve this the working class and its party applies the strategy of building the fight against national oppression as part of the overall class struggle and of working at it from two sides. This means: mobilizing the historic consciousness of the oppressed nation in the struggle against this oppression, on the one side, and mobilize the working class as a whole to take up this fight, on the other; bring forward the ideology of the proletariat and its common interest in fighting exploitation and all oppression; and in this way make a stand the movement as a revolutionary alliance." (In 34, our emphasis).

In our work we have viewed working on two sides as having two class stands—the stand of the petty bourgeoisie for the national struggles and the working class for the workers' struggles (which sometimes included Chinatown workers' struggles and sometimes not). Summing up our work around May Day using the programme and in the next programme we have also helped bring these in summing up other struggles we've been involved in. In these sum up, we did not find that we could resist in the organization's line of working at it from two sides.

In the Lee Mah and Jung Sai struggles of Chinese immigrants we tended to rely on petty bourgeoisie in the community for the bulk of the support on the national oppression side and at the same time we failed to see only the section of the community outside of Chinatown as the working class side of the "two sides." Even though we brought the struggle widely through the national struggles, fighting for the leadership of the struggle, but this did not result in the organization's ability to working at it from two sides.

A more important aspect of our thinking was that the national aspect of the Lee Mah and Jung Sai struggles was more revolutionary than the class aspect. Even at that time that unless we brought the fight against national oppression as being the main importance of the struggles, we would not be able to establish the national and class struggle at the same time. But the fact was, in these struggles the national and class struggles were merged. Lee Mah and Jung Sai workers with petty bourgeois forces did not build the struggle nor the leadership of the workers, but the class aspect to this struggle was not possible to unite the working class.

Another important aspect of our thinking was that the national aspect of the Lee Mah and Jung Sai struggles was more revolutionary than the class aspect. Even at that time that unless we brought the fight against national oppression as being the main importance of the struggles, we would not be able to establish the national and class struggle at the same time. But the fact was, in these struggles the national and class struggles were merged. Lee Mah and Jung Sai workers with petty bourgeois forces did not build the struggle nor the leadership of the workers, but the class aspect to this struggle was not possible to unite the working class.

When the struggle was built in such a way, building on the unity of the whole class as the most fundamental unity, mobilizing other workers throughout the area to carry on support work, arranging meetings with other workers (May 1st Workers' Movement) to share the lessons they learned in their own struggles with the Jung Sai and Lee Mah workers, the unity was broken, the struggles spawned ahead and the fight was taken on as it objectively was—class struggle.

International Hotel Struggle

In our work in the International Hotel struggle a struggle of retired Chinese and Filipino workers against the International Hotel, we have struggled to merge the national and class struggles still exist. Since our sum up of the AC, Lee Mah and Jung Sai struggles and work already done in the International Hotel, we've re-emphasized the line of seeing the fight of the tenants as at just a fight of Asians for their land and housing. Seeing this fight as that not only the tenants forward or other workers forward to take up the fight.

Many tenants were connected and many of the tenants have come forward to fight for the International Hotel on the basis of seeing their fight as a struggle of all the Chinese and Filipino workers in this country which they are a part of. The tenants' participation in the Chinatown Workers' Forum and the May Day march and rally helped some of them move forward from seeing themselves as at work only to win their struggle within this fight.

In discussing our work on May Day round the draft programme, we have learned that

the working class is the key link in merging the national and class struggle. We have learned that the national and class struggles are connected by a thousand links, that national oppression comes from class exploitation. This struggle is a lead from our struggle for the leadership of the multinational working class, and its communist, vanguard, for the leading role of proletarian ideology and no other—this is not creating the national question, but strengthening the struggle against national oppression a thousand times. (RP 6, p. 22, our emphasis).

This means we have a lot of cleaning up and struggle for. For one, we have to wash away the wrong concept of Asians as a point of unity to organize the masses around. It is a concept that came out of the old period where the national movements led by petty national opposition as a result of the rise. But the concept "Asian" or "my nationality first" is a thing of the past. The multinational working class struggle class against the future as the future of the struggle. We have to build our strength everywhere possible. We have to build the struggle of our class deeply in the US in the US, but there is no stronger roots among workers of all nationalities because it is through this way that we are going to build the unity that is going to change the face of this earth. (In 34, our emphasis).

This article was written by a member of Wo Min She, an Asian-American anti-imperialist organization and a member of the RPS. It represents the comrades' questions on national oppression, but not necessarily Wo Min She's position.

The draft programme section on "Chinese-Americans" has been explained in Part 3. "The struggle of the oppressed nationalities is a part of the struggle of the working class. Since our sum up of the AC, Lee Mah and Jung Sai struggles, we have come to understand that the relation of the class and national struggle was sharpened, as well as our understanding of national forms of organizing struggle.

A lot of questions were raised as to why the draft programme doesn't deal with "Asian-American," as an organization of Asian-Americans. We are trying to understand the correct way to successfully build the struggles of the Chinese, Japanese and Filipinos in the US as part of the overall revolutionary movement. We must look at the unity of the many forms of organizing struggle.

This question that confronts us at this time, though, as we struggle to bring the new period into being, is how we can correctly understand how to fight national oppression, basing ourselves on the material conditions that minority groups face, apply the outlook of the multinational working class and try to grasp the correct way to merge the national and class struggles.

This question is particularly important at this time because we can see that in summing up our work, uncertainty is as to the correct way to organize the masses of Chinese, Japanese and Filipino workers, and uncertainty as to the forms for drawing these forces into the revolutionary movement, has led to serious errors.

Question of Proletarian Line

These errors can be characterized by the failure to see the necessity of bringing forward a proletarian line to the struggles of the "Asians" we were working with. Develop the lines of difference from idealism in that we had the tendency to base our practice more on the petty bourgeois elements and the "Asian Movement" rather than on the material conditions of the fight of the tenants, and Philipino working people. We were not taking a firm line and consciously working to root out left Bonzarist tendencies.

This key to this question, the line, lies in firmly stick to a materialist outlook that is based on analyzing the material conditions of the "Asians," people who are overwhelmingly a part of the multinational working class, and in this way merge the national with class struggles.

Our experience with the masses of Chinese, Japane- se, and Philipino working people in the Bay Area. But on the basis of this, we think it is correct not only to use the term "Asian-American," but also to take a stand of supporting the united movements of Asian-American and not on Japanese or Philipino Americans.

In the Bay Area, only Chinese-Americans have a substantial national struggle, one that is characterized by a strong sense of community—marred only by a few areas of separation, and not seen as an entity a thousand times. (RP 6, p. 22, our emphasis).

But as we understand these material conditions better, then we'll be able to figure a conception of organizing struggle with them. The fact is, however, that there was a tendency for us to not even get into this, and instead we based ourselves on basically that these "Asians" wanted to work with all different "Asians" nationalities whatever their individualism.

Also, the draft programme points out: "Many Chinese in the US now live and work outside Chinatown with people of other nationalities, take part in the workers' movement and pair up struggles against the imperialists. This is another important factor linking the Chinese-American struggle with the national struggles with the overall class struggle." (In 40, our emphasis).

This is becoming increasingly true for "Asians" as a whole. For instance, if we look at Japanese and Filipinos we can see that dispersed communities (due to being in financial posts of work) and the separation of these communities (due to involvement and redeployment) also largely characterizes their conditions in this country.

Role of WMS

Obviously this means something for how we see the role of WMS in the future. Any national form of organization has to stem from the material conditions that the masses of that nation face. If the basis for WMS's existence in Chinatown because although the majority of Chinese in Chinatown are members of the AC and the UFW, the organization is isolated from the rest of the class in particular by language, and geography (many Chinese-American workers who work in all Chinese/Chinese speaking positions as well as other particulars of Chinatown.

In the Bay Area, however, we don't feel this is true for Japanese and Philipino Americans. In the main, "Asian-Americans will increasingly be drawn into the same kind of working class movement as the multinational U.S. proletariat, through multinational national forms in fighting national oppression and class exploitation.

This is an irreducible trend because, as the draft programme brings out:

"This is the beginning of the struggle of the oppressed nationalities is bound to merge with the working class struggle." (p. 34)

By saying this the programme understands that the basis of struggle of the oppressed nationalities has always been closely linked with the overall struggle of the working class in the U.S. But the programme is understanding this because the oppressed nationalities are, in their great majority, members of the single U.S. working class and their struggles are intimately bound up with the struggle of the entire class." (p. 34)

Because we have not fully grasped what this means, many times our work among these communities has been ingrossed by this means, and we have faced many weaknesses in terms of consciously making the links between the national and class struggles.

The nature of the "Asian-American Movement," and the consequent use of the term "Asian," is important to understand because it applies to the tasks upon which we adversely face when working on this question. Continued on page 28
towards gearing our work more consciously in the future of the work that we were doing in the communities as the most fundamental unity." (p. 28)

Objectively what this meant in practice was that we did not integrate ourselves among the masses of workers in the community, did not have a material basis of living and working in the community, and were building the struggles in the community by reifying the petty bourgeois concepts such as "Asians." And this was also true of labor unions, which in reality didn't exist.

We worked with other people around us on a forum in an attempt to develop the consciousness of the Lee Mah, Jung Sai and the International Hotel. And we were able in particular to work with a number of high school students who had some interest in the struggles through a forum or by just coming to the forum.

But although we had made some advances in our thinking as well as in practice that we began to see taking working class issues out in a mass way, we were still making some mistakes in our work. In taking issues out to only Asians "wherever they were," we weren't thinking of the leading role of the working class. We were also beginning to see the concrete conditions of this city (in particular, the conditions of Chinese, Japanese, and Pilipino Americans). And we were already feeling some antagonism to do "pull out" Asians from a multinational setting and deal with them separately.

We saw that working as a multinational setting was a necessity. For example, in one particular case we were doing a workshop in a city that has quite a large number of Chinese, Japanese, and Pilipinos in this city. And we didn't make a material analysis of the conditions of Chinese, Japanese, and Pilipinos in this city (the fact that they were dispersed, worked and lived in multi-national neighborhoods, and went to multinational schools) and therefore we didn't see the need to organize people around their being "Asian" rather than around concrete struggles that they faced at work, in their neighborhoods, and in the city.

What happened was that for a long period of time we ended up limiting ourselves to working with petty bourgeois forces, not making concrete struggles with other organizations to "the left," and at the same time not really engaging in any concrete mass struggles.

Shifted Focus

When the Lee Mah and Jung Sai struggles broke out in the Bay Area, though, we began to see the importance of taking working class issues out more broadly. We shifted our work around: Against the superficial liberal organizations, we began to try and work with the masses of the working people and bring forward a revolutionary program. (41)

Continued from page 28, and Pilipinos in this country under the term "Asian-Americans." And more importantly, it points to the fundamental error in basing work on this unity.

In the struggle to build the "Asian Movement" itself, we see a tendency to pull all "Asians" to the communists and therefore to the whole working class, building the work in a multinational way based on the leadership of the working class.

As brought out in Red Papers 6: "The common interest and unity of interests of the proletarians of different nationalities include the struggle against all forms of oppression, building the unity and leadership of the working class, and in this way merge the national struggle with the class struggle."
Six

The current cell from our organization to build a 'YCL' has been on the basis of the errors because we recognize the role of the proletariat in leading youth (and within this, students) in revolutionary struggle, but we feel that the journal article, "Student Organizing in the New Period," makes an idealist error in its analysis of why we need a YCL to move this work forward at this time.

This error is rooted in the view that what is wrong with the RSB is that it is not a revolutionary organization. The RSB is only a reflection of the political line of the RU on what are the important tasks in the revolutionary struggle. The errors of the BRIDGE, according to the article, seem to be rooted in its "inadequate" party unity rather than in the concrete decisions that arose out of the RU and that now have laid the basis for a new political line for the RU and the organization.

A materialist analysis needs to ask what are (and were) the concrete conditions and how can (and did) we consciously change them? Idealism says we can perfect ideas (BRIDGE's transformation is a question of its ideology) primarily out of time, place, and condition. What it means is that of having had a less correct ideas of the kind of student organization to build then we have now.

It's very important to answer this question correctly. If we answer that it is a question of "ideas," we will be falling into idealism, always trying to improve our ideas up in the air, in our heads -- getting our hands together first, instead of trying to use our ideas to change reality, then looking at the reality that has been made and changing our ideas to bring them into better correspondence with reality. The question is: How do we know whose ideas are ruling the world, or by changing our ideas over and over until they are more "correct"?

If we can't do this correctly, we can't understand the mistaken ideas we did have in the past (those ideas we had in the period in which we built the RU) and also those that have been made and changing our ideas to bring them into better correspondence with reality. The question is: How do we know whose ideas are ruling the world, or by changing our ideas over and over until they are more "correct"?

On the Youth and Students

In the section of the draft programme called "The Development of the U.S. has been the Development of Class Struggle" (p. 4), there is a section (paragraphs 2-6) that discusses the struggle against slavery and the Civil War. While this section correctly reveals the role of the slaves in the struggle, it does not reveal the full context of this contradiction and does not fully discuss the reasons that the working class took a leading role in the struggle against slavery. We can't do this by changing the world, or by changing the world, or by changing our ideas to reflect it, while maintaining the ideology of the working class and our own independent role. There is something idealistic about the way that we can't do this by changing the world, or by changing our ideas to reflect it, while maintaining the ideology of the working class and our own independent role.
There are two main criticisms of the draft programme's approach to students. First, the situation on the campuses today is given three aspects: 1) there is a high-level leadership of student struggles; 2) students are summarizing the lessons of the 60's and aiming their blows straight at the ruling class; and 3) that more solid unity than ever before is being built between the different nationalities.

The first part about proletarian leadership we certainly agree with. But the second part, energized with sentences like "and the student movement is on the rise again," paints a one-sided picture of consciousness among students.

The second criticism is that the draft programme doesn't lay out a complete analysis of the function of universities under capitalism. This function includes the role of the bourgeoisie and upper petty bourgeoisie, the working class, and the proletariat.

The function of universities is to produce the numbers of exploitation, education, and resistance of the American people. This error of the draft programme comes out in the way mysticism and pleasure-seeking among students after the '60's is explained. Of course the basis was in the fact that the role of struggle was not fully understood, and the ability to fight and win was being put forward to students, but it was the ruling class that was right there, coming up against the capitalist system, the drive for maximum profit, the need to spread its ideology. As the journal article says, "Schools provide the forms for socializing your youth and spread your ideological domination."

The function is shown clearly in the ruling class's sharp black on students, the bourgeois ideologies, the upper petty bourgeoisie. Lenin further says; "The Young Communist League can ask for the masses and the students for the leadership of the working class and the YCL must build an important transmission belt for the party."

In their article the comrades shy away from this critique on scattered campuses. SDS had the mass character, as the party's political work in the '60's demonstrated. Therefore, the YCL must build a mass working class organization for the youth. The YCL must try and internationally, and recognize their great contributions in this struggle, this should be brought up more concretely, the mobilizations against police repression, against war in the Middle East, and strike support.

Yet another shortcoming was the lack of analysis about how and why the student movement should be firmly tied to the Revolutionary Workers Movement. The YCL will not just "encourage students to fight other manifestations of imperialism." It will be building an organization for the student movement. This reflects something of an old period view—"bourgeois view" because it wants to maintain independence.

One final suggestion is that a demand is asked for full employment after graduation. Also, two other parts of the programme's section on youth argue in discussion. In the article in the second journal, "On Student Organizing," an analysis of the "STVU" and "Revolutionary Student Brigade" is laid out which should be incorporated in the programme.

General characteristics of youth include, vitality, innovativeness, enthusiasm and rebelliousness. This is clearly shown in the many spontaneous rebellions in high schools, colleges, and ghettoes in which youth have released their anger about their particular oppression.

The whole "youth culture" which developed in the 60's is a part of the living struggle. The working class must take this energy and move it for fighting for and building socialism because youth in the future must have the experience and political understanding to continue to fight for and build socialism.

This means, that workers cherish youth and try to teach their children to fight for and work an end to the oppression and exploitation they face, and a part similar to the second journal section on consciousness among students, the characteristics of youth, should be laid out.

Also, the fact that youth are part of the working class, and therefore face the exploitation, the working class lives with, besides the legal inequalities, police harassment. This makes the main base of the future YCL should be among this section of youth.

Something of the programme the YCL will be taking up should be laid out here—unemployment with its particular characteristics for youth, police repression, imperialist war.
For the past year and a half, our organization has stressed the need for revolutionary struggle sharply with the old period, recognizing the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat as the main practical and theoretical tasks in that new light. We feel that the Student section of the draft program of the workers. On the one hand, it doesn't give an accurate picture of the student movement of the '60s, and without that, it is unclear how the party can think about it differently. On the other hand, the draft does not give a guide to action in the new period either, and fails to show students as a potential conscious allies of the working class and part of the United Front under proletarian leadership.

To be more specific on these two major points:

The description of the student movement in the old period is compressed into the following few sentences of the draft: "...the struggle of students and the working class in the struggle against imperialism." This program section fails to make any specific contribution to the student movement of the '60s, for in making the link to the struggle of the working class and youth, the student movement of the '60s was based not only on the struggles of students and working class, but also on the Black Panther Party, from the reform and the need to overthrow the capitalist system and the need to overthrow it. This is the draft section's weakness not only in its description of the past but also in its projection of students of the new period. Furthermore, the paragraph should be expanded to reflect the struggle of the student movement of the '60s to open up higher education more to lower income young people. For the past year and a half, our organization has worked to do this, not only through putting forward the slogan "RCP's Education Revolution!" but also through building the cadre of the RCP's Youth section. This was especially illustrated in the period 1960-1970, coincidental with the "youth rebellion" when the student movement of the '60s had a tremendous impact on American society, and it should be summed up accurately in the RCP's programme. That means not only the student movement of the '60s, but also the student movement of the '60s to open up higher education more to lower income students. One final point: We suggest that the final version of this section should be expanded to reflect the student movement's role in the launching of a student section of a Young Communist League on the campuses to replace the anti-imperialist student organization we currently work in. One of the key problems with the Brigade's work was its inability to prevent students from becoming "youth" culture, which is absent in the past. Although primarily composed of youth from the petty bourgeoisie, students, and youth, this problem is very important for society, and it should be reflected in the programme.

Five

The latest issue of the journal saw a proposal for the launching of a student section of a Young Communist League on the campuses to replace the anti-imperialist student organization we currently work in. One of the key problems with the Brigade's work was its inability to prevent students from becoming "youth" culture, which is absent in the past. Although primarily composed of youth from the petty bourgeoisie, students, and youth, this problem is very important for society, and it should be reflected in the programme.

The programme should point to multinational student organizations or multinational alliances among American student organizations. This programme needs to focus on multinational student unity among students as an important problem still to be resolved.

One final point: We suggest that the final vision of the programme should unite the sections on Students and Youth, using the material in the last three paragraphs of the draft's youth section to help set the context for the discussion of students. This would be more correct, since students are a part of youth; in distinction, the political and economic desire for a life with a purpose will set the stage for a broadened view of student struggles.

In the past, the youth section's references to "youth culture" should probably be conditioned, but in any case placed firmly in the past, for students must realize that although the trappings of "youth culture" remain, they are no longer the hallmark only of "youth" capitalist marketing has lands and does not reflect the conscious and determined desires, for most young people, "youth culture" is no longer even a fancy alternative to the capitalist world.

"Machanical Description"

The problem with this history is not just one of "flushing out." The description is basically mechanistic and superficial. The drafts, and signs of the revolutionary character of the role of the students played in the '60s. Nor does it place in clear class terms why the student movement had the strength that it did or bear any relationship to the key paragraph summarizing the three important contributions which students can make to the revolution.

In these respects (as well as in the right line on future struggles, about which more below), the draft actually takes the back from the '72 "Build the Anti-Imperialist Student Movement" pamphlet, which showed the political deepening and broadening of student struggles during the '60s, as they went from demands for "Ban the Bomb" and peace to militant action against imperialist war and the role of the military in the university, from civil rights protests to active support for Black liberation struggles and the Black Panther Party, from the reform thrust of the SDS "tomick truth to power" to recognizing the nature of the monopoly capitalist system and the need to overthrow it. This is the dynamic, however. The draft instead of developing why the '60s student movement had a "tremendous impact on American society," and it should be summed up accurately in the RCP's programme. That means not only the student movement of the '60s, but also the student movement of the '60s to open up higher education more to lower income students. One final point: We suggest that the final version of this section should be expanded to reflect the student movement's role in the launching of a student section of a Young Communist League on the campuses to replace the anti-imperialist student organization we currently work in. One of the key problems with the Brigade's work was its inability to prevent students from becoming "youth" culture, which is absent in the past.

Although primarily composed of youth from the petty bourgeoisie, students, and youth, this problem is very important for society, and it should be reflected in the programme. Some students have come to "question the existing system through developing an intellectual understanding of the oppression and exploitation nature of capitalist society, though only feeling a milder dose of this oppression because of their class position. Others have been more directly, especially the large numbers of working class youth who won the right to go to school in the last 60s. Both groups are looking for answers. The Brigades could not provide them. The proposed YCL would be an organization that could.

What is important here to note is the importance of linking very closely the struggle of youth and students—for both groups can be primarily unified, united out of their common desire for a future opposed most of them in this society. The recognition of the need for a YCL on campuses came out of an examination of the problems facing the student organization in the new period—the period where the principal contradiction is between the bourgeoisie and progress. For a future that the people's movement must occur in the nature of the work done in the student movement. This change provides the opportunity for the struggles of students and youth, and youth, such as the fight against imperialist war or for open admissions. Therefore, I propose that the sections in the programme on youth and students be combined, recognizing the differences that exist but more important understanding the fundamental similarities between them and the part they will play in the future of society.

Proposed change: "The Only Future for Youth..."
That it is possible for them to do so in other mass struggles, the closing of whole schools, attacks on open admissions, and the elimination of 'third world' studies programs and other progressive curricula. We must take up the question of unemployment among graduating students as a political problem. We must build the struggle on campus to oppose imperialism. This means education and struggle around the Midwest, Southeast, and the West. We must take on the struggle, as well as battles against ROTC, recruiters and war research on campus.

More than this the working class en masse, as well as the working class as a whole, as well as the working class in the struggle itself, must be in the lead of the struggle to the extent that it is possible to do so.

That is the reason for the new mass organizations which are intermediate between the party and the masses, whether they be IWOs, UWOs, rank and file caucuses or VVAW/WSO.

The new period is not a magical solution to our problems, and proletarian leadership must not be seen so narrowly as in a new revolutionary organization within which the RCP is working to do so. To deny that it is possible for communists to provide proletarian leadership within the RSB Is to deny their role clearly and correctly apply the mass line to the struggles of the students, winning them over to Marxism-Leninism, and to provide proletarian leadership within the RSB. That analysis can only be made through a comprehensive and unsparing search on campus.

If the RSB has been able to form broad numbers of students in struggle, and to bring to the masses the correct way to advance the struggle against the system and to defend the interests of the masses of people.

The fall of a whole generation of the RSB, the errors that have been made by the Brigade and by communists working within the RSB, and the errors that have been made by the RSB, the errors that have been made by the Brigade and by communists working within the RSB, the errors that have been made by the RSB and by communists working within the RSB. The RSB has been able to build broad numbers of students in struggle, and to bring them into the movement against the system. If the RSB was able to bring to the masses of people around the line it puts forth, and showing the correct way to advance the struggle against the system and to defend the interests of the masses of people.

The analysis of those problems and to build the student movement under proletarian leadership.

The failure to uphold this distinction between mass organizations or communist organizations can lead to two types of errors, which are closely intertwined. Both are types of errors which can be avoided by the RSB. The first is the error described in the previous section. Although it fails to fully grasp it, this is the error of liquidating the independent and leading role of communists within the student movements. The second is the error of communists to apply Marxism-Leninism to the political struggle, and that many of these problems can be rectified by the RSB. The third is the error of communists to liquidate the political struggle, and that many of these problems can be rectified by the RSB. The third is the error of communists to liquidate the political struggle, and that many of these problems can be rectified by the RSB. The third is the error of communists to liquidate the political struggle, and that many of these problems can be rectified by the RSB. The third is the error of communists to liquidate the political struggle, and that many of these problems can be rectified by the RSB. The third is the error of communists to liquidate the political struggle, and that many of these problems can be rectified by the RSB.
Continued from page 33

nited students on many campuses, rather than to
break it and reach out to large numbers of stu-
dents in the spearhead of a mass student
movement.

The two-into-one character of the RSB has been
manifested in the emergence of new independent
communists, and a general narrowing of the poten-
tially mass character of the Brigade, by failing to grasp
and accept the need for the on-going development and out-
ward thrust of the organization, thereby making the RSB inaccessible
to large numbers of students.

The RSB has often been at the root of many of the Brigade’s problems. A YCL, however, while it
would solve the problem of the independent role of communists, would exaggerate these tendencies
further toward narrowsm and isolation from the masses of students that have existed in the RSB. YCL chaps-
ter at this point in time would necessarily be small
in membership, limited in the number of students
that they could attract, and hard-pressed to really engage to the students and build struggles in a broad
way.

There is a need for an intermediary organization for struggles that are not yet coming into motion against
the system, but that not yet over to Marxism-Leninism,
or the need for proletariat leadership. The jung-
ing of the RSB and the formation of a YCL would
put the party off from those students who would
look more readily join an RSB which had rectified its tendency toward narrowness.

The RSB has the opportunity to serve this function and the following way of going on:

Ties between communists and the masses of students, and will strengthen, rather than hinder, our ability to
produce an organizational form that is best equipped to provide com-

There must be an on-going organizational relation-
ship that communists have with students who get invol-
tioned in a particular struggle, but are not ready to
make the leap to Marxism-Leninism. And how mass
organizations built around specific issue would not
serve the function that a YCL at this point would have
as proletarian leadership in a formal sense. But by
would by no means guarantee that the masses of
students around the country is organized, and the
YCL still has a role to play.

No holds barred communist analysis could be pro-
vided by the independent presence of the RCP on campuses.

"Get-Rich-Quick Mentality"

The willingness to discard the RSB so prematurely, with no serious effort at the rectification of the weakness
of the Brigade, and to move on to organizations built around specific issues would not
serve the function of the RSB at this point. It was the tendency toward narrowness.

The YCL proposal in the last journal, we’ve got to ask two questions:
1) Has this analysis correct or incorrect at the time?
2) Have the conditions changed? If that position changed
is improved for the new world.

That initial analysis was ran down in the RSB pam-
phlet "Brigade in Motion", and in the draft program we repeated why com-

Students, as students, for building a YCL-type organization on cam-
puses. And for these very reasons, the YCL proposal
was a mistake to engage in struggles in their own interest that are ob-
jectively anti-imperialist, then the main thing that the
students can do is to focus their energies against the monopolies of the working class, and to
student struggle has defeated the educational cuts
in the fight against the monopoly capitalists."

That was true in the ‘70s. YCL was the beginning of our organization come out of SDS, as the draft program
points out, student anti-war demonstrations spread a hatred of the war to the most sectors of the population, and student rebellion has inflicted real
defeats on U.S. imperialism (but short the Cam-
bodias). (Programme of the YCL)

Are those formulations still true? Well, we still
recruit many of our cadre from the campuses, the
thrown the ILM at the time. In terms of the gen-
eral consciousness that the system can’t work, and
student struggle has defeated the educational cuts
that the ruling class is trying to push now. So, yeah,
the formulation was true, and still is.

Contributions to the Struggle

Now why is this important? Because it’s impor-
tant to understand that “their struggles in themselves are a vital force in the fight against the monopoly
capitalists,” (emphasis added) Students, as students,
fighting in their own interests make contributions to the struggle against imperialism, and are vital force
in the fight against the monopoly capitalists."

But that’s not the situation. And so long as
students can and will use the tools of the capital-

The YCL was the American section of the Young
Communist International (YCI). It was organisational-
ally independent of the CPUSA, and followed its pri-
cipal international line of "anti-capitalist-centralism to the YCL", which was organisations-
ally independent of the Comintern, but followed its principal line of "anti-capitalist-centralism to the
Youth Communist League". (Programme of the YCI)

So we can see that the YCL, like the Brigade, was
an organization fraught with internal contradictions. (Red Papers 6 points out, any revolutionary or-
organisation that doesn’t per se the link of the pro-
letariat must be said to be putting out bourgeois ideas, or if we look at it scientifically. It’s when we
look at the organization as an organization, that it becomes a real organization, and not just as a tool or
convoy belt toward the party, that they get a mill.

Anyway, the YCL wasn’t a fully fleshed proletar-
tarian organisation. It operated under democratic-
centralism, but it was a mass organisation. It was the ideaz organisation (Ad hoc mass org
the YCL devotes quite a bit of space to in: "The
YCL opposes the idea of ‘youth syndicalism’, which overlooks the need for leadership on the part of the working age youth."

And the Party knew that these kids were a hotbed of seething class hatred, but at the same time were still kids—looking in the direction of Marx-

So that Party had an age limit of 18, but also needed some form of organization that would be able to work with purpose and still retain “A definite youthful character (loos adapted to and understandable by the youth).” (Programme of the YCL)

And in general the talk of the YCL was education, it was a
training for ground for communists.

Conditions Still Exist?

Now we should applaud the Party’s ability to come
up with such an organization, that while riddled with
internal contradictions, answered exactly the proletar-
ian’s needs at that time. But we also have to ask
whether the conditions that gave rise to the YCL
still exist. No. Large numbers of the children of
the working class are students, the issues of working
youth are basically the same, the mass student
whole class and can be best formulated by the RCP,
and chances are we won’t get an age limit of 18 for Party membership (basing on the very existence of our organization).

And for these very reasons, the YCL proposal
doesn’t see the need for a YCL that has its life on
factory nuclei (at least at this time) but a student
group instead. The proposal says we need communist leadership on the campuses, not a kind of syndical-
ism. The YCL opposes the idea of ‘youth syndicalism’, which overlooks the need for leadership on the part of the working age youth."

And so to open the struggle around the “YCL proposal”
was a mistake to engage in struggles in their own interest that are ob-
jectively anti-imperialist, then the main thing that the
students can do is to focus their energies against the monopolies of the working class, and to
student struggle has defeated the educational cuts
that the ruling class is trying to push now. So, yeah,
the formulation was true, and still is.

And so to open the struggle around the “YCL proposal”
was a mistake to engage in struggles in their own interest that are ob-
jectively anti-imperialist, then the main thing that the
students can do is to focus their energies against the monopolies of the working class, and to
student struggle has defeated the educational cuts
that the ruling class is trying to push now. So, yeah,
the formulation was true, and still is.
Seven...

Continued from page 34

The working class's main force in the liberation movement is the development of the working masses of Black people as the main force in the liberation struggle. This is what the authors are criticizing when they say: "The RSP's weakness as an independent organization comes right out of that. We recognized that we could no longer build student struggles behind the main drive of Black liberation, and so to build independent, and to build them independent of the new main force (the working class) is to build them independent of reality."

What we need is an organizational form that subjectively recognizes that the struggles of the working class are the path to take on the basis of what's easy—the civil struggle. This is what the authors are criticizing when they say: "Our country at present practices an eight-grade wage system, distribution to each citizen is quite a bit different than the original, and what is emphasized in the original, is the achievement of that task."

Socialism is a tremendous advance over capitalism and opens the road to communism. This is owing to two reasons; one, the orientation of the class struggle is different. The class struggle in society is reflected in the class struggle within the social forces. This is a conscious struggle on the part of the proletariat, and the continuation of class struggle is the form of rule of the proletariat—the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We have got to recognize that the fact that the principal and fundamental contradictions are now the same means that we are in a better position than ever to move forward toward proletarian revolution, but it doesn't mean we should that we're on the eve of doing so.

Forward to the Party! Struggle for Proletarian Leadership in the Student Movement!
There is no disagreement in this particular section that it is necessary, in the view of the authors, to make a better life and a better future for the workers, their kids, and all of society. Knowing that they cannot work under conditions that would not allow them to live out of a job, that their work is not filling the pockets of some moneybags, will let workers feel pride in their work with their hands. The workers will be enhanced because they will not be performing some isolated task—all workers will understand the whole production process of which their work is a part, and that the work they are doing fits into society as a whole. (my emphasis)

To the authors of the rewrite, it is evidently impossible for workers to feel pride in their work under capitalism, and according to them, production is not socialized under capitalism, after all, but consists of "isolated tasks." Furthermore, it is "knowledge" that private appropriation and anarchism isn't going on that changes this, according to the rewrite, though this is put very lucidly. Still the emphasis is crystal clear.

The original recognizes the contradiction between specialized production and private appropriation in fact, but not in the way the education think there are. The original emphasizes, furthermore, that the ownership and role of the working class changes this, that it is that which will be politically appropriated, as opposed to "knowledge" in the abstract.

Role of the Class

The role of the working class, through its own actions, can turn a "voting in" the working class of a country into a revolutionary socialist revolution in that society, and out of the new society that comes out of it comes the fundamental part of building socialism. (I, of society, comes out of the results in a number of ways. The most glaring is in the analysis that will come out of the workers own actions. "Like all specialists, they [medical workers] will be politically educated and supervised by the working class, so the education think there are."

There is a world of difference here. The specialists will be educated and supervised—on this there is agreement. But will they learn? In other words, should the working class only use specialists, or should it use and remold them?

The answer of the Chinese proletarian to Liu Shao-chi was the latter, for just this "nuance" of difference turned out to be a difference between two roads in China. Why? Because when you state implicitly or explicitly that you are not going to learn, you are saying that the proletariat cannot revolutionize all of society, that its alliance with other classes is only tactical, and that such an alliance is impossible. If you wish to say that, no one can stop you. But what you are left with is the idea that the Communist party, as the Party, is the working class, and you have restoration and revisionism. You have the petty bourgeois ruling to power on the back of the workers, who feel it is impossible to "make it" under imperialism.

Another example of the same thing is the fact that the only way the authors deal with the contradiction between mental and manual labor, which must be done away with in order to achieve communist objectives, is by ignoring it. They will break down the differences between mental and manual labor, training all workers and particularly the youth to be "all-rounders." And if you wish to say that, no one can stop you. But what you are left with is the idea that the Communist party, as the Party, is the working class, and you have restoration and revisionism. You have the petty bourgeois ruling to power on the back of the workers, who feel it is impossible to "make it" under imperialism.

Another example of the same thing is the fact that the only way the authors deal with the contradiction between mental and manual labor, which must be done away with in order to achieve communist objectives, is by ignoring it. They will break down the differences between mental and manual labor, training all workers and particularly the youth to be "all-rounders." And if you wish to say that, no one can stop you. But what you are left with is the idea that the Communist party, as the Party, is the working class, and you have restoration and revisionism. You have the petty bourgeois ruling to power on the back of the workers, who feel it is impossible to "make it" under imperialism.

We feel it is important to strengthen the section "The Working Class...Struggle for the Party..." by adding after the first sentence, this one: "Making ownership of the means of production public, the working class lays the basis for eliminating any form of exploitation, oppression or class rule. At the same time, it begins to create the conditions for production to leap ahead in the material and ideological development of capitalism, and it begins to form the working class' first crucial step upon seizing power to socialize ownership of the most important resources of the economy. Without this state power and ownership there can be no socialism and no advance to communism—is this exactly what the rewrite is wiping out here, despite any other references to this.

"Reflects Something More"

The effect of the change, in my opinion, reflects something more, however. Throughout the rewrite the way socialism is presented is as a static opposite to capitalism—and on the basis that under capitalism life is terrible, and under socialism life is groovy. It follows that if you want to "make it," you have to fight national inequality. It was not too many years ago that one could gain a good life, a new life, with the "voting in" of the working class, "Those beer drinking, color tv watching slobs will never make revolution." This means that you should fight national inequality, and if it were not so, why bother with this issue? However, when you judge eminents to this, what you are saying is that socialism must be based on the destruction of capitalism as its immediate needs. You are saying comrades, that only communists have largeness of mind, are capable of dealing with the most immediate and critical task of ruling and owning. You are saying that the Communist Party will do this—until the workers catch up!

Just look where this ends you. We have the capitalists, on the one hand, who are cold-hearted, grasping parasites, using the "very organs of dead working people" (goodlord!), having a lifeless and sterile culture (selling other pictures of soup cans!), and work is a boring grinding hell. Then we have the working class, creative and vibrant, having dreams and aspirations, inspiration and will (and their kids can go to school under socialism). Big deal. Isn't it all an outrage?

And then we have the ultimate! Paragraph two tells us there is a way society "should be." As far as I know, the working class with its advanced detachment, is not living in utopiaism! There is a way society could be and will be. But this "should be" stuff is nothing but some petty bourgeois morality, making for the past when it was possible to "make it" into the bourgeoisie.

Whether we think we have to tell the working class socialism on the basis of immediate needs, on the basis of bread and butter and a groovy life, it is not just a question that arises once the working class has achieved state power and ownership of the means of production. Today it is the dividing line between whether we truly represent the proletariat, whether we truly believe that the proletariat is the main revolutionary class in this country, and whether we rely on the working class alone, with the masses of workers in struggle and lead to the first and living play of a proletarian revolution.

Forward to the Party...Struggle for the Party...of the proletariat!
We would like to make some criticisms of the way that the section on socialism and communism is dealt with in the draft programme.

The problem as we see it is that the section did not present a thorough-going materialist view in an integrated way (linking theory with practice). It didn't explain the material basis for the proletarian seizing state power and building socialism. The tasks, problems and goals in doing this are an excellent demonstration of the dictatorship of the working class. It was dealt with separate from what life is like under socialism.

The way it was written mechanically separates the tasks of the working class in building socialism ("The Working Class Will Transform All of Society") and the struggle to overcome capitalism ("The Strategic for Communist Society") from what life is like under socialism ("Life Under Socialism"). Are not the tasks of building socialism part of life, under socialism? And socialism moving forward IS the struggle for communism.

We will attempt to go through the section on socialism and communism and try to point out what we think are the errors and how they can be rectified, particularly focusing on the "Life Under Socialism" section.

Question of Why

First, the draft programme did not lay out why capitalism in creating a socialized means of production and a socialized working class lays the basis for socialism. On p. 2 the draft programme briefly skims through the history of society up to capitalism and then says: "And now it is the turn of the proletariat to overthrow the capitalist system and build a completely new kind of society." Then it goes on to say that the struggle for socialism and science and the class struggle is the reason for progress but that the development of the proletariat under capitalism makes it possible for the working class to do this... But it never explains why people will support the working class (to overtake the capitalist system and build the socialist system). What about the development of the proletariat under capitalism makes people support the working class? To get the working class to work harder? At the same time it doesn't give a fully scientific presentation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its tasks. "A dictatorship of the proletariat represents the rule of the majority over the minority. It makes possible for the first time real democracy and political freedom for the masses of people. And its purpose is not to enforce exploitation, to allow one class to line parasitically off another, but to end exploitation and discrimination. It's a dictatorship of working people, without class distinction." (p. 8)

While this characterization is generally correct, it doesn't hit at the heart of the matter. The dictatorship of the proletariat can eliminate exploitation and provide real freedom: New ownership of the means of production (the working class society as a whole). Bourgeois education disseminates its ideology and creates different privileged strata necessary to capital's survival. Socialism and education lays a basis for privilege.

How about instead of using the title "Life Under Socialism" or "The Struggle for Socialism"? In this way the introductory section deals with "Liberty, equality, fraternity" or "The Working Class Will Transform All of Society," and "The Socialism and Communist Society," and a socialized working class lays the basis for revolution and socialism so they will want to an improved life under socialism. And the other to revisionism, and bring out how the working class more in touch with how their education is being utilized by the bourgeoisie and why education will be different, and also the fact that there is fierce class struggle in fulfilling one's potential and in the work of the proletariat. The working class to produce, grappling with the obstacles and advantages, that becomes more important to them as he is able to do because he is also an appendage to a machine and a means to make somebody rich. It is through these struggles that the initiative of the workers is released, that the worker finds joy and pride in his work, etc.

Question of Education

Or take education. Although the draft programme correctly compares bourgeois education to socialist education, it is a rather one-sided, static view of education. The draft programme must draw these lines but of the motive force behind why education will be different, and also the fact that there is fierce class struggle in fulfilling one's potential and in the work of the proletariat. The working class more in touch with how their education is being utilized by the bourgeoisie and why education will be different, and also the fact that there is fierce class struggle in fulfilling one's potential and in the work of the proletariat.
On War and the International United Front

The section in the draft programme, "Fight Against Imperialist War, Wipe Out War By Wiping Out Imperialism" (p. 43), correctly states: "To eliminate war, once and for all, it is necessary to eliminate its source, imperialism, through revolution and socialism." The section also correctly states the demands of the working class and its party at this time:

1. Withdraw all U.S. forces from foreign soil and territorial waters of other countries.
2. Free all colonies in the grip of U.S. imperialism.
4. Abolish and destroy all nuclear weapons, oppose the superpowers' arms race and phony disarmament.
5. Support just wars for national liberation and revolutionary wars against imperialism and reaction, oppose all wars of aggression by imperialism and its allies, defend the socialist countries.
6. If revolution does not prevent world war, world war will give rise to revolution.
7. While the section speaks of the long-range objective of waging war by waging war, imperialism, and also puts forward the correct immediate demands, the section does not sufficiently explain the relationship between the two. It does not answer the question, "Why fight against imperialist war now?"

In taking up the fight against imperialist war, the working class must know why, how, to do it, and if it's possible to prevent a war even before revolution. The section does not speak to this second point at all. The fight against imperialist war is part of the class struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie. It is not a struggle for neutral or neutral slavery as the revisionists portray it. War is the continuation of politics by other means, and as the Chinese pointed out: "As far as the capitalist-imperialist countries are concerned, whatever they launch or profess as their aim is to pursue or maintain their imperialist interests. Imperialist war is the continuation of imperialist peace-time politics, and imperialist peace is the continuation of imperialist wartime politics."

This is why the relationship of the fight against a particular war or imperialist war in general, and to fight against imperialism, is the cause of war, is to make clear. To not clearly show the relationship separates the long-term goal from the immediate demands and can fall into reformism and revisionism by making the struggle around the immediate demands sink in themselves. A clear example of this was the Puerto Rican Socialist Party's slogan, "Bimetalism without colonies." To separate the long-range goal from the immediate demands would result in giving the working class the illusion that imperialism had changed and that these demands without revolution, either here or in the country that the demand is applied to.

"Imperialist war being a great amount of suffering to the working class because it is the sons and husbands of the working class that are used as cannon fodder by the monopoly capitalists in their attempt to maintain and advance their own imperialist interests. Although we recognize the inevitability of war, communists take up the fight against it because it is done by the monopoly capitalists in a conscious attempt to maintain and advance their own imperialist interests. Although we recognize the inevitability of war, communists take up the fight against it because it is done by the monopoly capitalists in a conscious attempt to maintain and advance their own imperialist interests. Although we recognize the inevitability of war, communists take up the fight against it because it is done by the monopoly capitalists in a conscious attempt to maintain and advance their own imperialist interests. Although we recognize the inevitability of war, communists take up the fight against it because it is done by the monopoly capitalists in a conscious attempt to maintain and advance their own imperialist interests.

The article on war in the June issue of Revolution: "The Road Ahead" section in the June Revolution article on war: "By developing this struggle against imperialist aggression and war as part of the overall revolutionary struggle, we will accomplish several things. One, we will further hinder and weaken the imperialists, and especially the two superpowers, making it more difficult for them to launch a world war. Two, we will further mobilize and strengthen the revolutionary forces; and especially the revolutionary working class, making the conditions more favorable for this country for revolution, which is the final analysis is the only thing that, along with a socialist revolution in the Soviet Union, can prevent world war. Three, if the two superpowers struggle against aggression and war, and by building the overall revolutionary struggle, if world war does break out before there are revolutions in the U.S. and Soviet Union, then the working class and masses in these two countries will be in the strongest possible position to continue and intensify their revolutionary struggles and overthrow the U.S. imperialists and Soviet social-imperialists: thus bringing much closer the day when all peoples, nations and oppression will be eliminated from the face of the earth!"
Careful study of the section of the draft programme entitled "World Wide United Front" (pp. 21-22) has convinced us that errors in describing the world situation to the U.S. working class, the fundamental error as it falls to state, is the tendency to fail to adequately distinguish the workers of the advanced capitalist countries with the struggles of the oppressed nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the context of the world proletarian socialist revolution during the epoch of imperialism.

This error is manifested in several ways—not pointing out that the struggle against superpower domination is a component part of the world socialist revolution; an inadequate definition of proletarian internationalism; an incomplete summation of the present world situation; and failing to raise, anywhere in the draft, the slogan, "Workers and Oppressed Peoples Unite!"

1) Since the victory of the October Revolution, Marxist-Leninists have held the guarantee of victory over imperialism to be the linking of the socialist revolution in the West with the national democratic revolution sweeping first Asia and today throughout the "Third World," in essence a worker-peasant alliance on a world scale. Since World War I and the October Revolution, examples of the oppressed nations has been constantly on the rise and since World War II have, in fact, delivered the main blow against the colonial system.

While the social character of the national democratic revolution remains bourgeois in that it is a mixed class movement, and we have no reason to believe that the revolution in the oppressed nations is aimed at imperialism it becomes part of the world proletarian socialist revolution. In Mao's words, "No matter what classes, parties or individuals in an oppressed nation join the revolution, and no matter whether they themselves are conscious of the point or understand it, so long as they oppose imperialism, their revolution becomes part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution and they become its allies." ("On New Democracy").

Yet the draft programme limits itself to saying "the proletariat in the U.S. has as its allies in the international arena today the great struggles of nations throughout the 'underdeveloped world' or 'Third World' for liberation from colonialism and imperialism." By not raising the question of the "component part" and by limiting the discussion of allies to the context of the United Front against the two superpowers, the draft leaves itself open to the interpretation that the masses of people in the oppressed nations are simply "ally" allies in the struggle against the two superpowers than, say, the reactionary regimes which resist superpower domination, and not the fundamental allies of the proletariat during the whole epoch of imperialism.

2) The draft defines proletarian internationalism as "the unity of the workers of all countries as one mighty force, the alliance with all struggles throughout the world against imperialism and for revolution, and the unswerving support and defense of the genuine socialist countries." There is nothing wrong in this definition, but especially in view of its place in the draft programme, it fails to adequately reflect the party and the workers to what the content of proletarian internationalism is in the United States.

Proletarian internationalism, and the definition of it, follows a paragraph describing how the bourgeoisie tries to divide the workers of this country from the rest of the international working class through slanderers of the socialist countries, "Buy America," etc. Yet in the preceding paragraph no mention is made of the attempts by the bourgeoisie to convince the U.S. workers that the working class in this country benefits by imperialist plunder of the oppressed nations, something which the bourgeoisie is using more and more to try to build public opinion for intervention and aggression in other countries (economic strangulation, etc.) now that their guile of "protecting democracy" has worn thin. During the height of the Vietnam war, for example, the dividing line of proletarian internationalism was support for the Vietnamese people; today support for the national liberation struggles aimed at the U.S. bourgeoisie remains a crucial aspect of proletarian internationalism and a way must be found to bring this out more sharply in the programme.

3) On p. 22 of the draft a one paragraph summation is given of the present world situation: "The situation in the world today is very complicated, but through all this complication and disorder two things stand out: the struggle of the working class for revolution and socialism is advancing, and uniting with all possible allies, while the two superpowers are becoming more and more isolated, and the whole imperialist system is declining." (The draft then goes on to describe the growing danger of world war.)

This summation is incomplete at best. The fact of the matter is that since World War II, the national liberation struggles have been the main force in opposing imperialism, and while that situation is rapidly changing, and is certainly not true today in the same kind of decisive and clearcut way, nevertheless it is wrong to refer to it simply as the working class "uniting with all possible allies." Perhaps what is meant is that the national liberation struggles themselves are struggles of the working class for revolution and socialism, which would be a serious error, failing to take into account two distinct stages in the revolution in the oppressed nations, and the bourgeois social character of the national democratic revolution even when led by the proletariat and its party.

4) The draft programme ends with the slogan, "Workers of the World Unite!" Nowadays in the draft the slogan, "Workers and Oppressed Peoples of the World Unite!" to be found. Comrades, this is wrong. Lenin wrote the following concerning the modification of the slogan, "Workers of the World Unite, to 'Workers of All Countries and All Oppressed Peoples Unite!'; "Of course, the modification is wrong from the standpoint of the Communist Manifesto, but then the Communist Manifesto was written under entirely different conditions. From the point of view of present day politics, however, the change is correct." (vol. 31, p. 1451) Similarly, the Chinese insisted on many occasions in their polemics with the revisionists that the slogan, "Workers and Oppressed Peoples of the World Unite!" was correct. The point is not mainly what slogan the programme should end in personality, I favor the slogan "Workers of the World and All Oppressed Peoples Unite!"

The point is that failing to raise, anywhere in the draft programme the central slogan of Marxist-Leninists throughout the world, that the question is a serious mistake. Especially given that we find it possible to raise many other slogans in the course of the draft programme (for example, "We won't scalp, and we won't starve!"). I believe that not using the slogan is a reflection of the general error made in this section of the draft.

The main thrust of this section is correct. It emphasizes the present world situation and not the past and correctly centers on in the growing threat of world war. The main deviation in the U.S. revolutionary movement on the international situation has been to almost totally ignore the confrontation of the superpowers and the threat of war and to see the contradiction between the oppressed nations and U.S. imperialism as virtually the only contradiction. No doubt these wrong views (actually a rehash of Kautsky's theory of "ultra-imperialism") I still exist in varying degrees within the RWO and those forces uniting to form the party, and the great strength of this section of the draft programme is that it truly represents a "radical rupture" with this unscientific and moralistic nonsense. Similarly, the draft is correct in not presenting the world as three contendings worlds which, in the U.S., would have the effect of telling the working class that they had something in common with the ruling class (membership in the first world).

Nevertheless, in the process of disordersing the bag page of the period the draft makes the error of not providing as clear, correct and correct a view of the international situation as the party and the working class need. We must not forget that the working class in this country has never been affected, to any significant degree, with the moralistic line on the international situation common among the rationalized petty bourgeoisie. On the contrary, the party will have to fight and defeat the influence of the bourgeois among the working class and win the workers to the understanding that "The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would virtually be a sheer fraud if, in their struggle against capital, the workers of Europe and America were not closely and completely united with the oppressed nations and millions of 'colonial' slaves acrossed by capital." (Lenin, Second Congress of Communist World Federation.)
The problem of a concrete analysis of the fundamental and principal contradictions of U.S. imperialism—this line of the draft programme represents an important advance on this front: "Increasingly united and with powerful allies in the movement," so of organised nationalities, the working class is intensifying its historic struggle against capitalism. It is the basic contradiction of capitalism, and therefore the contradiction that must drive and determine the working class and the capitalist class, that stands even more prominently at the center of the stage in U.S. today.

This formulation ends a period of confusion over what the principal contradiction is by correctly stating that it is now the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and proletariat. This formulation reflects the capacity of all those who are壓urrounding in every direction—except one, the direction of the new period—and who want to go back to the time when the struggles of the oppressed peoples, students, youth, women (or anyone else they could think of) seemed to overshadow the struggle of the working class.

However, it seems that while all attention was devoted to correctly resolving the question of principal contradiction, confusion slipped in the back door on another question—the question of what is the fundamental contradiction. Look at the quote from the draft programme again: "...the basic contradiction of capitalism, and the class struggle as a whole is not between the ownership of the means of production and the bourgeoisie, (Other examples can be found in the book 'Capital', p. 5.) The contradiction between the organized character of production and the private character of ownership. This contradiction manifests itself in the struggle of the working class and the capitalist class, that stands even more prominently at the center of the stage in U.S. today."

These and other questions will have to be resolved. What follows is a different formulation: "the basic contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie." If this is not correct, it is not clear how one can formulate the class struggle. The class struggle is not the struggle between the ownership of the means of production and the bourgeoisie. If the contradiction between these two is not the basic contradiction, then what is it? This question is not just a matter of theoretical interest. It is a question of profound political importance. The contradiction between the ownership of the means of production and the bourgeoisie is not the fundamental contradiction of capitalism. The contradiction between the organized character of production and the private character of ownership is the fundamental contradiction. This contradiction is the source of all the contradictions that arise from it. It is the contradiction between the organized character of production and the private character of ownership that is the source of all the contradictions that arise from it. It is the contradiction between the organized character of production and the private character of ownership that is the source of all the contradictions that arise from it.
In the process of reading and studying the draft programme, the question of fascism must appear to most, quite different from the line on the question that the international communist movement held when fascism was in fact the most immediate danger to the proletariat and the masses of both this country and throughout the world.

In the section on "The question of fascism," the draft programme states that: "The sections in the draft programme on the question of fascist culture (pp. 11 and 33), while containing good points, still reflect a hanging on of some form of cultural work, too. This stuff isn't much use to the working class. Culture as a weapon has to be brought out much more sharply and more clearly." Without sufficient political guidance, there has been a tendency to wax poetic on the subject, which ends up obscuring things, rather than explaining in a straightforward manner what the basic political tasks of revolutionary culture are and indicating how they are to be carried out.

Culture and the ideological struggle are put forward as if the idea of culture and the proletariat were dually useful. Against the time of fascism, when much of the real ideological battle goes on every day, as an integral part of the overall class struggle. Without culture, there is no way "...forms of art that represent the proletariat arise from and in turn serve the struggle of the masses of people" (draft programme, p. 3). Culture must play the same role as our agitation and propaganda in bringing to light and explicating the significance of all instances of exploitation and oppression, inspiring and helping the masses to unite and struggle to rid themselves of their oppressors. It must be criticized and sharpened. Culture as a weapon has to be brought out much more sharply and more clearly. The party must overcome primitiveness in the field of culture and more political leadership in the field of culture. This passage makes clear what the conditions for revolution are from a Marxist-Leninist stand. In the sections on the draft programme entitled "A Genuine Communist Party Fights For Proletarian Revolution," there is a part that says: "The immediate task of the proletariat is to fight the fascist Axis. But Browder used this to cover up the nature of imperialism and the fact that U.S. imperialism, while fighting the fascist countries, was also aiming to strengthen its position as an imperialist power."
Four...

Continued from page 42

only in cultural work, but in our other agitation as well. All are baggage that must be gotten rid of. We have to take up and use this weapon; integrate it with our struggles and hence it sooner sharper as a weapon for the foes—all of them, not just party cultural workers—and the masses to unite to save our ranks and de- feat the imperialists. To do this effectively, guidance must come from the party and the party programme.

"Proletarian literature and art are part of the whole proletarian revolutionary cause; they are, as Lenin said, dogs and wheels in the whole revolutionary machine. Therefore, Party work in literature and art occupies a definite and assigned position in Party revolutionary tasks set by the Party in a given revolutionary period."

(Mao, Talks at the Yanan Forum)

This is the stand that should come across in the party programme—and doesn’t yet—with guidance in how to carry this out.

Seven...

In the draft programme, under the section entitled "Old People—To the Bourgeoisie Useless Waste, To the Proletariat and Fully Remold Themselves Into Fighters for the Imperialists. To do this effectively, guidance must come from the party and the party programme as well."

The liveable income demand in the draft programme doesn’t cover this because it implies that this is a struggle for after you retire only. Many workers now forced to retire at 60 or 65 have to find another job "off the books" because their pensions were peanuts.

This is the stand that should come across in the party programme—and doesn’t yet—with guidance in how to carry this out.

Eight...

In the paragraph on p. 17 that begins "The party of the working class" (left column, middle), the principles of democratic centralism are targeted. This line is not specifically named. The discussion about how they move the work of the party forward is clear and concrete. Stating what the principles are will clarify how the party can build the unity of will and unity of action that’s necessary to defeat capitalism.

"The party of the working class is based on specific principles—the individual is subordinate to the organization, the minority to the majority, the lower level to the central committee. They enable it to most correctly concentrate the experiences and ideas of the masses, to formulate in this way the strategy and tactics to advance the struggle of the working class and its allies, and to carry out these policies with an unbreakable unity. These principles of organization, democratic centralism, combine the greatest degree of discipline with the fullest discussion and struggle over policy within the organization and the selection and supervision of party leaders by the party membership."

Six...

In the section of the draft programme, "Workers Unite! To Lead the Fight Against All Oppression," more than half of it deals with bourgeois-instilled ideas in the working class (aristocratic, decadence, national unity, etc.) Instead of confusingly having it put in this section, it should be more pronounced. Let there be a section, "Fight Bourgeois Ideology in the Working Class."