The following is a response to an article submitted for this issue of the journal on the international situation. The editors of the journal felt the article submitted should be responded to, and assigned one candidate to write the response, which begins below. (The article submitted, to which the following is a reply, begins on page 3.)

The article in this journal sharply criticizing the line of the Draft Programme (DP) on the international situation and the world wide unite front tries to replace proletarian internationalism with a line that must be characterized as "uphold international bourgeois democracy." At the heart of this whole criticism is the disagreement with the basic line of the DP that: "The working class of all countries faces the task of building a united front, on a world scale, aimed at the ruling classes of these two superpowers, while at the same time uniting all who can be united within each country to continue the battle for socialist revolution" (my emphasis). In opposition to this, the authors of the criticism, in spite of their claims to the contrary, place the struggle for proletarian revolution in conflict with the world wide united front and in fact liquidate the "battle for socialist revolution.

At the foundation of all this is the fact that the criticism is rooted not in the outlook of the working class—dialectical materialism—but in idealism and bourgeois logic (metaphysics). Although the criticism, charges that "The DP does not proceed 'from the actual world situation taken as a whole and from a specific analysis of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world.'" It is exactly the fact that the DP's line on the international situation is based on the stand of the working class and a class analysis of the forces in the world wide united front that most vexes the authors of the criticism. (Apparently they are even disturbed by the fact that the DP points out that the socialist countries as a whole are the allies of the proletariat in the U.S. and other countries!) The criticism covers itself with scattered phrases maintaining that the working class—specifically in Europe—must not rely on the bourgeoisie in the struggle against the superpowers, that the working class is the leading force, that it must struggle for socialism, etc., etc. But the criticism proves the struggle of the working class as the main force in the international struggle. It denies, in essence (though, of course, not in words) that countries are divided into classes and that bourgeois forces rule the non-socialist countries. The authors of the criticism, in the name of the united front against the two superpowers, deny the decisive role of the masses of people, and reduce the working class to a subordinate role to the bourgeoisie; a tail wagged behind the bourgeoisie dog.

**Line on Europe**

This stands out most sharply in their line on Europe, specifically West Europe. First they claim that "All these components of the Wwii (world wide united front) have a material interest in bringing down their main enemy, both superpowers." (Emphasis in original) This bourgeois logic (metaphysics) of the two superpowers (and other areas) have contradictions with the two superpowers, that in certain ways they resist domination by the superpowers, and that the proletariat must make use of these contradictions and support this resistance, without however giving unconditional support or subordinating half to these bourgeois classes—all this is certainly true. But do these authors really expect us to believe that the ruling classes of Europe have "a material interest in bringing down" the two superpowers? To replace them with—what socialism under the rule of the working class?

Further, the authors of the criticism say that the struggle of the of the working class in Europe is "for an independent Europe and for socialism," and more, that "the capitalist revolution in Europe can only be achieved through building the united front against both superpowers." "While it is certainly true that the working class in the European countries should build the united front against the two superpowers, what our authors are saying here comes down to the line that it is only through the fight for independence that the proletariat will be able to advance to socialism. However much they may deny it, our authors are projecting a two-stage struggle in Europe—first for independence, in which the proletariat unites with the bourgeoisie but struggles for leadership, and then, emerging out of this stage, the second stage struggle for socialism.

And our authors have determined this to be the case now, even under the conditions when there is not yet a war in Europe. If the working class is confronted with the actuality of such a war—and the likelihood of this is growing—the DP will have to deal with this situation, this necessity, in accordance with the actual conditions (more on this shortly). But while the working class must prepare for future developments, it is not the task of the communists to impose future possibilities onto the present situation and一团on the working class necessity which does not presently exist.

What lies at base of our authors' line is that they think the communists should give up on winning the workers in Europe—and the French and other workers from the revisionist parties which hold considerable sway in the working class—a number of European countries—on the one hand, and that they—on the other should rely on the bourgeoisie of these countries to "win" the workers on the basis of "national interest."

**Question of NATO**

In case there is any doubt about the line of our authors, look at what they say about NATO. First they admit that: "At this point the U.S. is the overlords in NATO," but then they hasten to add that "in case of an attack by the SU NATO is the only defense organization Western Europe has." Then they say that with regard to the case of NATO's involvement, there are two possibilities—either "Europe kicks the U.S. out of it and takes charge, or builds up its defense organization independent of NATO." The second solution seems the more likely one.

Our authors refuse to face up to a third possibility—-that the U.S. will maintain, even strengthen its domination in NATO and that the war in Europe will not necessarily take place as a "war of liberation" by Europe against the two superpowers, but as a war between two imperialist blocs, headed by the two superpowers (NATO vs. Warsaw Pact). In such a case—and it is certainly a real possibility—what would be wrong with the working class in Europe taking the stand of "turning the imperialist war into a civil war" in the European countries themselves? After all, as our authors pointed out, "a war between Imperialist Great Powers... or in alliance with the Great Powers is an imperialist war... And in this war 'defense of the fatherland' is a deception, an attempt to justify the war." ("A Childhood of Marx", Vol. 2, pp. 47, emphasis Lenin's) Unlike our authors, I am not attempting now to determine the actual character of the war, but only pointing to possibilities that they avoid and pointless out that in different concrete conditions the character of the proletariat must be different, even though its basic principles and its long-term goal remain the same. In any case, no possibility with regard to the war can be used to liquidate the class struggle and the goal of socialism, and to preach reliance on the bourgeoisie as our authors in fact are doing.

But there is something even more fundamentally wrong with their line and specifically with their reasoning around NATO. They argue in substance, that so long as the Soviet Union maintains its military strength and alliances in Europe, to struggle to break up NATO "is to invite the SU to take over and make the situation even worse that it is now." What they are saying is that in the prelude of the threat...
One...

Continued from page 1

of Soviet attack against Western Europe (they don't even deal with the possibility that the U.S. imperialists might launch an attack to the Eastern Europe in the final analysis of which the super-powers will gain-the West!), the only thing that West Europe is closest Western Europe to rely on is NATO--really? U.S. official admits is even "the overlord" in NATO. Where do the masses of people figure into all this? Simply--they don't.

The Stalin himself is "Economic Problems of Socialism" (written in 1951-52) summed up the basis of WW2 and the change in its character after the invasion of the Soviet Union. The authors of the criticism turn things upside down--the U.S. imperialists built up Germany's economy "with a view to setting up a recovered Germany against the Soviet Union, to utili

ize her again as a bulwark against Bolshevism," and Britain directed her forces in the first place against the Anglo-American bloc. But when Hitler Germany declared war on the U.S., the Anglo-American bloc, far from joining with Hitler Germany was compelled to enter into a coalition with the USSR against Hitler Germany. (my emphasis) "Downpour," Stalin pointed out, "the struggle of the capitalist countries for markets and their desire to crush their competitors is more to be feared than the contradictions between the capitalist camp and the socialist camp." (my emphasis)

"Relying on the U.S. imperialists"

The use of the February, 1946, quote from Stalin, like the whole thrust of the criticism, is merely an attempt by the authors to promote reliance on the bour

gee and its allies as "defense" against the U.S. imperialists as "defensive" to the Russian social-imperialists and to demonstrate why the character of the war against Germany is different from that against the fascist Soviet Union.

To cover themselves the authors try to use the fact that China, as a socialist country, can state relations in a certain way and makes certain agreements with non-socialist governments in tactics to advance the cause of imperialism. The authors make use of con

temporary contradictions and unite all possible forces, on a world scale, against the superpowers. The authors try to use the fact that different parties in different countries should follow exactly these actions of China. As we are to believe our authors these agreements and other similar actions of the U.S. imperialists do not mean that the U.S. imperialists really cares nothing about the world revolution, does not actually support the revolutionary struggles of the working people in the underdeveloped countries, has no interests of its own, does not wish to change the present world system and alignment of forces, and is not concerned with the achievement of socialism in other countries. Exactly the opposite, of course, is the case.

Our authors even quote from Mao Tse-tung's 1946 statement on the international situation, but do not quote--or base themselves on--the essential thrust of Mao's 1946 statement. "The forces of reaction are definitely preparing a third world war, and the danger of war exists." Mao begins in this article. In this situa

tion, as noted earlier, the Soviet Union was making certain compromises with the U.S., Britain, and France. But, Mao Tse-tung adds, "the fact does not mean that the people in the countries of the capitalist world should follow suit and make compromises at home. The people in these countries should continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions." (Vol. 4, p. 67)

The whole statement of the Soviet Union is a "united front against fascism" with the Soviet Union taking the place of Germany in WW2.

Stalin Statement

This is the real point of their use of the quote from Stalin, that WW2 "assumed from the very out set the character and world character of a ruling-class war". This statement was made by Stalin in February, 1940. While I do not pretend to know all the ins and outs of the struggle of that time--both on the part of the Soviet Union in the international arena and within the Soviet Party itself--it is clear that at that time the Soviet Union was attempting to unite against the imperialists and to maintain certain agreements that had been made with the U.S.-British bloc, while the U.S.-British bloc was attempting to encircle and threaten to attack the Soviet Union.

This situation it may have been very difficult for Stalin to say, "Well, as you know the Second World War arose out of the contradiction of the imperialists for world domination and began as a war between imperialist band

dits." Lenin pointed out that it is sometimes necessary to make compromises with bandits--and it is not always so simple or useful to curse bandits as bandits under such circumstances. Mao Tse-tang criticized the infantile "left" line that demanded, during the formation of the anti-Japanese United Front, that if the Chinese communists made agreements with bourgeois "leaders" then, "we must call him a counter-revolutionary at the same moment." (see "On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism," Vol. 3, p. 164)

But, whatever the particular circumstances, and the necessity of making concessions to the West in order to avoid war, it is evident that the Soviet Union was clear about this: the task of the international proletariat was to defend the Soviet Union. Similar circumstances could arise in the future--and the only thing we must arm the workers in this country with the understanding that the international proletariat must regard and defend the struggle of the workers in the Soviet Union as ours. But, as it is said before, it is not the task of communists to impose future possibilities onto the present situation or impose necessity onto the present if it does not presently face. And at all times the working class and its party must constantly analyze the actual situation and always remain flexible and be prepared to determine its policy not by mechanically applying what was done in the past--and certainly not by basing itself on what might happen in the future--but to determine what will advance the overall struggle against the given actual situation.
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"...what the DP means when it says that "In this conflict (my emphasis) the proletariat supports them against the super-powers." The DP points to making use of contradictions and uses the contradictions between the Western imperialists and their domination over the super-powers, which, again, apparently angers our authors, for they lash out with the flimsy "left" cover that the DP is just supporting the imperialists ruling the developed countries in their drive for profit. But the working class must not stop its struggle against its own ruling class for socializing the developed capitalist countries, even at the same time as it mobilizes the masses for the superpower aggression in any form and prepares for its own tasks in the coming world war with the growing possibility of a world war, with Europe as the main battlefield.

Again, as to who is really covering up the class nature of the bourgeoisie of Europe, note how our authors say, "We must not be swayed by the counterrevolutionary opportunists when they try to make deals with the SPs, when they attack the Third World countries if they attack the "developed" capitalist countries only. This is Kautskyian all over again, trying imperialism as just opposition of the Third World and not the system of capitalist exploitation in its advanced and final stage, which is always attacking its own people in various forms, not the least of which is its war as its arm of repression and dictatorship--and which must and can only be overcome by the working class.

Sporadic Tendency

Here, in the U.S., it is especially crucial for the working class to support the world wide struggle against both superpowers. But, at the same time, the party of the U.S. working class must not just oppose and expose the aggression of the U.S. imperialists, while putting this in the overall context of opposing all superpower aggression. The spontaneous tendency, among the masses in this country is not to understand and recognize the aggression of the superpowers, and to follow the line of the U.S. ruling class that the Russians are THE aggressors and U.S. actions are "defense against aggression.

In today's world, the U.S. wants to maintain the present status quo, which favors it in the final analysis as a superpower and means that all the masses of the world want to change the present status quo in accordance with their own interests. The Russian rulers, in a fundamentally different way, want to maintain and ensure their own imperialist interests, also want to change the present status quo. This makes the international situation more complicated, because the masses of people rise up against U.S. imperialism--which still has the largest "sphere of influence"--the Soviets attempt to move in to take over, and they even try to take advantage of the desire of the masses for change and revo

tution to instigate and control movements for their own purposes.

The stand of the working class--keeping in mind always the goal of socialism--must be to support every genuine struggle for socialism and to oppose all superpower interference, domination and aggression, whatever form it takes. But the present situation of the Russian social-imperialists in particular, opens the door to the line that any attempt to change the world status quo must not mean to strengthen the Soviets. This, unfortunately, is what the line of our authors comes down to, a line that in essence downplays with that of the U.S. imperialists.

The real fact is that our authors sincerely downplay the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism and actually deny the movement to organize the masses to use NATO and other means to carry out domination and aggression and to use them to strengthen the Soviets. The lines of their criticism is not a line of opposing the two superpowers, and especially as a line for the party of the U.S. imperialists. The line of our authors simply reflects the anti-internationalist desires to say the least. It is not a line of relying on the masses, not a line that supports and enhances the struggle for proletarian revolution in the capitalist world.

The authors of the criticism turn things upside down in saying that the DP does not rely on the working class but openly back the imperialists. In fact, it is the authors of the criticism who, at base, realize the fundamental failure to believe that the working class, led by its party, can see through the deception of the imperialists and can be mobilized to fight in its own class interests.

The Gov't. The Revolutionary Communist Party
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Continued from page 2 of the USA at its very foundation must be based on the outlook of the working class and uphold for the sake of the interests of the proletarian world. This is especially crucial at such a time when the party is being formed in the situation where on the one hand the danger of world war is once again superimposed on the very nature of the imperialist system is growing, and, on the other hand the struggle of the international working class is at a standstill with all possible allies, is broadening, in the face of the contradictions and dangers, toward the goal of socialism and ultimately to socialism.

The Revolutionary Communist Party must not go by the way of Browderism, it must not degenerate into renegades of imperialism. This is a life and death question for our class.

The present world situation is characterized by contradictions and conflicts among different countries-both economic and military.

The pro-Danish bourgeois wing of the National Liberation Front (NLF) of South Vietnam has been weakened and crushed. The U.S. imperialism has been forced to seek a new policy of relations with the DRV. This is a sign of the improvement of the situation in South Vietnam. This is a victory for international communist movement.

In the capitalist world, the contradictions and conflicts among imperialist countries are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the socialist world, the contradictions and conflicts among socialist countries are also growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the Third World, the contradictions and conflicts among the national liberation movements are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the revolutionary movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the working class parties are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international communist movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the communist parties and communist movements are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international working class movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the working class parties are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

These contradictions and conflicts are growing day by day. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international communist movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the communist parties and communist movements are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international working class movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the working class parties are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international communist movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the communist parties and communist movements are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.
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In the international communist movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the communist parties and communist movements are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international working class movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the working class parties are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international communist movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the communist parties and communist movements are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international working class movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the working class parties are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international communist movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the communist parties and communist movements are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international working class movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the working class parties are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international communist movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the communist parties and communist movements are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international working class movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the working class parties are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international communist movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the communist parties and communist movements are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international working class movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the working class parties are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international communist movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the communist parties and communist movements are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international working class movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the working class parties are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international communist movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the communist parties and communist movements are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.

In the international working class movement, the contradictions and conflicts among the working class parties are growing. The revisionists are trying to use this conflict to recover their lost positions. They are trying to bring about a new balance of power which would help them to follow the so-called "peaceful coexistence" policy.
Continued from page 3

oppress their own people and the Third World (although to a much lesser degree than the SPs).

The EEC is a good example of this contradictory situation.

While the EEC's main aspect at this time is progressive, its main aspect at this time is not to be confused with the fact that it is in the interest of the working class. The EEC is a good example of this contradictory situation.

The general crisis of imperialism—inequality, unemployment, etc.—sparks these battles against the rule of capitalism, but in fact it means increased exploitation of the European proletariat and peasantry due to decreased export of capital to the sources of raw material (generated by inflation, unemployment, etc.)

The Second World is an example of this contradiction. In this situation there exists a real basis for a united front against the SPs of the Second World and the Third World, because the bourgeois, the Muslims, and the people in the two intermediate zones for two worlds share common interests. (PI No. 45, 1975)

How do these united front affect the policies of the proletariat around the world? Is it not just a particular form of policy which is advocated by China, or some people claim?

By no means! This WUFE is in the interest of the proletariat and the vanguard of the whole world. It is not a struggle against the SPs but in a sense a struggle for advancing proletarian revolution. In this unity of the proletariat it is against hegemonism of the superpowers and for national independence (and in this only), it is also a component of the unification of the forces of the world proletariat.

All these components of the WUFE have a material interest in bringing down their main enemy, both SPs. In all countries the proletariat must take the lead in building this united front which consists of all forces which oppose the two SPs and all their lackeys.

Today, we must take the idea of imperialism and colonialism very seriously. The national army, which has just altered itself in the working class movement. This loosens its grip on the social democrats and revisionists which will have a large influence in the working class movement.

More and more revolutionary communist parties and organizations are being built along the line of building a united front against both SPs in Europe. There is a consensus that the SU at this time poses the greatest threat to peace.

The general crisis of imperialism is an important aspect of the modern world crisis. It is not just a problem of the Third World; it is a worldwide crisis. It is not just a problem of the Third World; it is a worldwide crisis.

Third World

As signified by the great victories in Indo-China, by the uprising in Indonesia, by the Indonesian rebellion in Indonesia, by the oil boycott of the Arab countries, and last but not least by the struggle to unify the Third World, there is a very narrow difference between the Third World and the Western world. The Third World countries are standing in the foreground of the struggle against SP hegemony. They are striving to identify with the masses on their continents.

Countries like Albania, Rumania and Yugoslavia are standing in the foreground of the struggle against SP hegemony. They are striving to identify with the masses on their continents. These countries have written into their constitution that it is prohibited to surrender to any foreign invader. In short, they have written into their constitution that there is no longer any German nation and that the SU is their friend forever.

Workers and soldiers in the Third World are fighting for their survival, for their lives in their countries, against the national interests of their countries. The world is their home.

The EEC is a good example of this contradictory situation. It is just finding out about the law that wherever there is warfare there is also a trade war. The Second World is just finding out about the law that wherever there is a trade war there is also a war for national independence (and in this only) .

The Second World and the Third World have no common interest. They are two different world economies, and there is no way to compromise with either.

As to the question of military strategy, the general line of the world proletariat against the SPs is constant. The Second World, because of its size, can never be the leading force, but the Third World can.

The Second World can never be the leading force, but the Third World can. The Third World is in a united front which consists of all forces which oppose the SPs and all their lackeys.

By no means! This WUFE is in the interest of the proletariat and the vanguard of the whole world. It is not a struggle against the SPs but in a sense a struggle for advancing proletarian revolution. In this unity of the proletariat it is against hegemonism of the superpowers and for national independence (and in this only), it is also a component of the unification of the forces of the world proletariat.

All these components of the WUFE have a material interest in bringing down their main enemy, both SPs. In all countries the proletariat must take the lead in building this united front which consists of all forces which oppose the two SPs and all their lackeys.

Today, we must take the idea of imperialism and colonialism very seriously. The national army, which has just altered itself in the working class movement. This loosens its grip on the social democrats and revisionists which will have a large influence in the working class movement.

Eastern Europe

The situation in Eastern Europe is in some respects similar, although in an overall sense it is certainly the fact that the SU still has a much better grip on its colonies than has the West.

The Second World is a good example of this contradictory situation. In this situation there exists a real basis for a united front against both SPs in Eastern Europe. There is a consensus that the SU at this time poses the greatest threat to peace.

By no means! This WUFE is in the interest of the proletariat and the vanguard of the whole world. It is not a struggle against the SPs but in a sense a struggle for advancing proletarian revolution. In this unity of the proletariat it is against hegemonism of the superpowers and for national independence (and in this only), it is also a component of the unification of the forces of the world proletariat.

All these components of the WUFE have a material interest in bringing down their main enemy, both SPs. In all countries the proletariat must take the lead in building this united front which consists of all forces which oppose the two SPs and all their lackeys.

Today, we must take the idea of imperialism and colonialism very seriously. The national army, which has just altered itself in the working class movement. This loosens its grip on the social democrats and revisionists which will have a large influence in the working class movement.

In this situation there exists a real basis for a united front against both SPs in Eastern Europe. There is a consensus that the SU at this time poses the greatest threat to peace.

By no means! This WUFE is in the interest of the proletariat and the vanguard of the whole world. It is not a struggle against the SPs but in a sense a struggle for advancing proletarian revolution. In this unity of the proletariat it is against hegemonism of the superpowers and for national independence (and in this only), it is also a component of the unification of the forces of the world proletariat.

All these components of the WUFE have a material interest in bringing down their main enemy, both SPs. In all countries the proletariat must take the lead in building this united front which consists of all forces which oppose the two SPs and all their lackeys.

Today, we must take the idea of imperialism and colonialism very seriously. The national army, which has just altered itself in the working class movement. This loosens its grip on the social democrats and revisionists which will have a large influence in the working class movement.
Two...

Continued from page 4

countries and peoples are resisting this. As things stand today, in view of the NAA, there is only a limited defense organization Western Europe has—and a very shaky one at that. What role NATO will play in the emergency that may come is anybody’s guess. If it falls out of it and takes charge, or builds up its defense organization independent of NATO. The second solution seems impossible.

Whatever happens, the European proletariat can never rely on NATO, whoever runs it. It works class against class, but against its own class and its own army. However, as long as Western Europe lacks an effective defense organization, to demand to dissolve only NATO would be to make the situation less complicated than if it was now. Therefore the general demand must be for the abolition of both the NATO and the imperialist bloc. The first case would be to play the game of one or the other SP.

World War 3

While it is important to struggle to prevent WW 3 by making revolution, it is also important to be prepared, because the nature of the alliance would be the attitude of the European proletariat towards WW 3. First, we are opposed to it, and second, we are ready to fight. The slogan of the working class is: “The war must be ended, not by the West but by the workers of the world.” The situation is complicated, but in a case of this kind, the main point is not the form and the sequelae, but the point it is a case of how to prevent the war and how to win the war.

As any socialist knows, the struggle between the two imperialist blocks (NATO vs. WP) must be opposed no matter who starts it because it serves imperialism. As Lenin points out: “The war against the imperialists is a war against the whole imperialist camp.” (The State and Revolution, p. 60.) It is the struggle of the working class against the imperialists, which includes all the workers of the world, from the workers of the countries of the West to the workers of the countries of the East.

A new imperialist war would be unjust; resistance would be just. This would apply especially after the military defeat, when the people of Europe would be engaging in a war of national liberation against both SPs. This war waged in the interests of the people of Europe and the people of the world would be a just war which must be supported. The task of the proletariat is to turn this war of liberation, should it happen, from its appropriate moment into a war of liberation of their own bourgeoisie and make socialist revolution.

In either case, whether revolution prevents war or war brings about revolution, the correct strategy in an overall sense is the united front. Although it is a very complicated situation, the alliance would be the attitude of the workers of the world, the workers of the world and the anti-imperialist revolutionaries, which has many features that are different from those of the past. (PR No. 21, 1977, p. 5.) “To carry on a war or a war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie, a war which is a hundred times more difficult, protracted and expensive than the old kind of war between states, and to refuse beforehand to maneuver, to utilize the conflict of interests between the imperialists, to conclude agreements and compromises with possible (even though temporary, unstable, vacillating and conditional) allies—is this not ridiculous in the extreme?” (Proletarian War Commune, 1915.)

Learn the Lessons of WW 2

To learn from the past is a guide to the future. What is there to learn from WW 2? The DP sums it up this way: the competition between the imperialists which guarantees peace to WW 2 also gave rise to WW 2, but “with the German invasion of the USSR in 1941, WW 2 changed. It was no longer just a battle for the souls among the imperialists. It became a battle for the defense of the future.”

Stalin, who was a close participant of the situation then, summed it up quite differently: “The Second World War differed from the previous wars in one very important characteristic from the first. It was born in mind that before attacking the Allied countries the major fascist states—the German, Italian, Japanese—had already destroyed the last remnants of bourgeois-democratic liberties at home and established there a cruel totalitarian regime, trapped upon itself, in the center of one of the most powerful and free development of small countries, proclaimed as their own policy the seizing of foreign territory, and shouted from their pulpits that they were aiming at a world domination and the spreading of the fascist regime all over the world, and by seizing Czechoslovakia and the central regions of Poland, the Axis Powers showed that they were ready to carry out their threat to invade all the freedom-loving peoples. In view of this, the Second World War, unlike the First World War, assumed from the very outset [our emphasis] the character of an anti-fascist war. It was not only the defense of the tasks of which was to restore democratic liberties. The unity of the Soviet Union into the war against the Axis Powers established socialist realism and really anti-fascist and liberating character of the Second World War.” (Stalin, speech Feb. 9, 1946, in meeting of years.

The CPC, which participated in the war fighting the Japanese, also sums things up differently than the DP: “The anti-imperialist struggle between the two world anti-imperialist forces and German-Italian-Japanese fascists, a just war [our emphasis] on a scale unprecedented in the history of mankind.” (PR No. 20, 1978.) In an earlier statement, the CPC summed up WW 2 as follows: “The history of the Anti-Fascist War makes us more strongly conscious that the world must be saved from a new war. The whole world is the main arena.” (Proletarian War Commune, 1915.)

This also means full support for the struggle of the workers of the world, to support their imperialist ruling classes. As the CPC states, “The people of the world pursued another policy, which of course also amounts to selling out revolution. These statements reveal several important differences with the position of the DP:

1) From the very outset, the war against the Axis was a war of national liberation. The proletariat supported the attacked countries and encouraged them to resist. This also found expression in the foreign policy of the DP.

2) The “imperialist camp” did not form a monolithic block, as the DP states. We must always, as Mao says in “On Contradiction,” study the particularity of the subject and possibilities of the world proletarian revolution.” (Proletarian Revolution and the Second and Third Worlds)

3) The Second and Third Worlds are of importance to the world proletariat. The DP recognizes the importance of the Second and Third Worlds only in the context of the struggle against the two SPs. We must oppose the European imperialists when they try to make deals with the SPs, when they try to defend the revisionist line of the SU. (Th is is true in a general sense—it is not the case in many countries in WW 2. We ought to analyze these cases separately, and not make a general statement.)

4) We must support the unity of the Second and Third Worlds which is being realized in some instances.

We must expose the particular danger the SU poses at this time toward peace in Europe and never cease struggling against our own SP.

The fact that we single out one SP in one area or particular situation does not mean to give up the struggle against both SPs. We must continue to struggle against both SPs. We must not see the SU as a melting pot, as the DP states. We must not see it as an objective force that can be used to suppress the SPs. We must use the SU as an objective force that can be used to suppress the SPs.

The demands for withdrawal of U.S. forces must be raised together with the demand for withdrawal of troops of the SU. (This is true in a general sense—it is our task to determine the particularity of a given situation and adjust our demands to it.) This is especially true in this case, at this time, at this point. All our demands are for withdrawal of both SPs and not just “ours.”

This also means full support for the struggle of the people who work for socialism in the countries of the world.

In this, the SU, as the DP states, is the primary enemy while the other is secondary. Vietnam is a case in point, as well as Portugal, which also shows that the SU is primary in its relations with the working class of the countries of the world.

Continued on page 6
main force (our emphasis) combating colonialism, imperialism, and particularly the superpowers. (Tong Hao-qing) Another, of course, has to see that the "wheel of history" turns towards socialism and communism and nowhere else. Third World, the main force, the workers of the world and the socialist countries are the leading force.

Second World

How does the DP see the Second World and its position between the Third World and the imperialist world? It doesn't analyze the relationship between the Second and Third World at all and therefore entirely misses one important conclusion which the OP states that "the two (developed countries) drive for profit brings them into conflict with the two SPs, and in most cases set up a struggle against each other. This statement is false and turns the real world upside down. Why?

1) Today it is the drive of both SPs for superprofits, their policy of subjugation and plunder, aggression, even against their own "allies," and this struggle against this result is the "conflict." Do the two capitalist SPs of the Second World have profit in mind? Of course, how could it be otherwise? They will never change their color! But does the proletariat support Second World's drive in its own profit and in fact take the stand of the lesser imperialist countries in trying to grab a bigger share of the profit pool? Surely! As China Ente pointed out in laying out the line of the CPC at the 10th Party Congress, "On the international front, the proletariat must uphold proletarian internationalism, strengthen our party's consistent policies, strengthen our unity with the proletariat and the oppressed peoples of all countries (our emphasis) subjected to imperialism, subjugation, subversion, intervention, control or bullying and form the basis for the international working class against apartheid, spiritism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and in particular against the hegemony of the two superpowers—the U.S. and the U.S.S.R."

Isn't the formulation in the DP making a mockery of the WWUF? By telling our workers to support the other "enemy" class they have done for many years? The DP fails to distinguish between essence and form, it does not bother to go beyond the appearance of things. What is the difference between the two SPs (both SPs)? It is the struggle for independence, national liberation and socialist revolution. These struggles are different in the sense that the bourgeois democracies are made up of different class forces, but their main aspect—despite all the contradictions within this united front—is that they weaken the world-wide anti-imperialist system and advance proletarian revolution on a world wide scale. And that is why—and for no other reason—the people of all the countries support these struggles.

So the proletariat does not support the Second World countries for or that matter the Third World countries in their revolution for world-wide proletarian revolution (the "exploitation") (DP, p. 21). As a matter of fact, it struggles against it on a daily basis in its class struggle with us.

2) To formulate the nature of the struggle going on in the Second and Third World today purely on the basis of his analogy—i.e., if you get a big chunk of the pie is indeed a slander against the people of these countries, which indeed are the main force in carrying out this struggle. Does anybody believe that a people's war in Africa is not carried out by the people of those countries and that is in their very interest? Don't we, for example, know that the people for an Independent Europe must not be led and carried out by the people of those countries? To deny all this, as the formulation above does, is denying the people, the history, which the people at all times are the heroes and not some leaders.

In sum, the analysis of the Third World, does not correctly see the material forces operating in the Second World either.

WW3

The WP talks about the danger of WW3 and points to the two possible causes of the crisis: war or war will give rise to revolution. What does the DP suggest we should do about preventing war or making revolution? The DP does get it right in a concrete way in the immediate period, other than struggling directly for socialist revolution in the U.S. As the DP points out, it is necessary for us not only to carry out the revolution here but also support the revolution in the Third World countries because they deny the essential connection and do not organize the struggle against imperialism in this country. If the WWUF is not based on the class struggle in one's own country it is poison, it will be a fraud to confuse one-sided to the class struggle on a national level.

4) The DP fails to point out that the developing countries "constitute a revolutionary motive force, propelling the wheel of world history and the
The question of war is one of the sharpest of the new Revolutionary Communist Party must deal with, and that is our latest document does an excellent job in telling forward the basic orientation of the party concerning war and how the proletariat takes up this struggle in a way to abolish war forever—by ending the source of war today-wage slavery and building socialism in its place.

The main strength of the OP is to put these questions right at the point of view of the proletariat and not some classless view of "peace loving forces," or worse, from the point of view that the bourgeoisie, while they may sometimes make their main support point the Shah of Iran or NATO to oppose social imperialism, this correct strength is more clearly shown by the class relations of the world as expressed in the 21-22 when the main allies of the U.S. working class in the Front against the two superpowers is the proletariat of the world, particularly the imperialist countries; and secondary allies are the peasants all over the world.

One Minor and Two Major Points

The OP correctly points out that the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries have contradictions with the superpowers. This way of laying it out—from the point of view of class analysis—is already definitely right and is more fully argued in an earlier report, better at the present time than three worlds, etc. The problem with this point in this report comes correctly applying it to the question of war, serious shortcomings come out. We shall see later.
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One Minor and Two Major Points

Starting from a basically correct orientation and standpoint, there are several areas where the DP could be improved. I would like to go into one minor point of this report that is somewhat involved with the law of uneven development; second, the basic attitude toward war in different times and in particular the question of opposing socialist countries; and third, the question of an "antiwar movement".

Firstly, concerning the cause of war and uneven development, there is the crucial point that causes war comes out. The OP correctly points out that the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries have contradictions with the superpowers. This way of laying it out—from the point of view of class analysis—is already definitely right and is more fully argued in an earlier report, better at the present time than three worlds, etc. The problem with this point in this report comes correctly applying it to the question of war, serious shortcomings come out. We shall see later.

One Minor Point

One Minor and Two Major Points

Starting from a basically correct orientation and standpoint, there are several areas where the DP could be improved. I would like to go into one minor point of this report that is somewhat involved with the law of uneven development; second, the basic attitude toward war in different times and in particular the question of opposing socialist countries; and third, the question of an "antiwar movement".

Firstly, concerning the cause of war and uneven development, there is the crucial point that causes war comes out. The OP correctly points out that the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries have contradictions with the superpowers. This way of laying it out—from the point of view of class analysis—is already definitely right and is more fully argued in an earlier report, better at the present time than three worlds, etc. The problem with this point in this report comes correctly applying it to the question of war, serious shortcomings come out. We shall see later.

One Minor and Two Major Points

Starting from a basically correct orientation and standpoint, there are several areas where the DP could be improved. I would like to go into one minor point of this report that is somewhat involved with the law of uneven development; second, the basic attitude toward war in different times and in particular the question of opposing socialist countries; and third, the question of an "antiwar movement".

Firstly, concerning the cause of war and uneven development, there is the crucial point that causes war comes out. The OP correctly points out that the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries have contradictions with the superpowers. This way of laying it out—from the point of view of class analysis—is already definitely right and is more fully argued in an earlier report, better at the present time than three worlds, etc. The problem with this point in this report comes correctly applying it to the question of war, serious shortcomings come out. We shall see later.

One Minor and Two Major Points

Starting from a basically correct orientation and standpoint, there are several areas where the DP could be improved. I would like to go into one minor point of this report that is somewhat involved with the law of uneven development; second, the basic attitude toward war in different times and in particular the question of opposing socialist countries; and third, the question of an "antiwar movement".

Firstly, concerning the cause of war and uneven development, there is the crucial point that causes war comes out. The OP correctly points out that the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries have contradictions with the superpowers. This way of laying it out—from the point of view of class analysis—is already definitely right and is more fully argued in an earlier report, better at the present time than three worlds, etc. The problem with this point in this report comes correctly applying it to the question of war, serious shortcomings come out. We shall see later.

One Minor and Two Major Points

Starting from a basically correct orientation and standpoint, there are several areas where the DP could be improved. I would like to go into one minor point of this report that is somewhat involved with the law of uneven development; second, the basic attitude toward war in different times and in particular the question of opposing socialist countries; and third, the question of an "antiwar movement".

Firstly, concerning the cause of war and uneven development, there is the crucial point that causes war comes out. The OP correctly points out that the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries have contradictions with the superpowers. This way of laying it out—from the point of view of class analysis—is already definitely right and is more fully argued in an earlier report, better at the present time than three worlds, etc. The problem with this point in this report comes correctly applying it to the question of war, serious shortcomings come out. We shall see later.

One Minor and Two Major Points

Starting from a basically correct orientation and standpoint, there are several areas where the DP could be improved. I would like to go into one minor point of this report that is somewhat involved with the law of uneven development; second, the basic attitude toward war in different times and in particular the question of opposing socialist countries; and third, the question of an "antiwar movement".

Firstly, concerning the cause of war and uneven development, there is the crucial point that causes war comes out. The OP correctly points out that the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries have contradictions with the superpowers. This way of laying it out—from the point of view of class analysis—is already definitely right and is more fully argued in an earlier report, better at the present time than three worlds, etc. The problem with this point in this report comes correctly applying it to the question of war, serious shortcomings come out. We shall see later.

One Minor and Two Major Points

Starting from a basically correct orientation and standpoint, there are several areas where the DP could be improved. I would like to go into one minor point of this report that is somewhat involved with the law of uneven development; second, the basic attitude toward war in different times and in particular the question of opposing socialist countries; and third, the question of an "antiwar movement".

Firstly, concerning the cause of war and uneven development, there is the crucial point that causes war comes out. The OP correctly points out that the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries have contradictions with the superpowers. This way of laying it out—from the point of view of class analysis—is already definitely right and is more fully argued in an earlier report, better at the present time than three worlds, etc. The problem with this point in this report comes correctly applying it to the question of war, serious shortcomings come out. We shall see later.

One Minor and Two Major Points

Starting from a basically correct orientation and standpoint, there are several areas where the DP could be improved. I would like to go into one minor point of this report that is somewhat involved with the law of uneven development; second, the basic attitude toward war in different times and in particular the question of opposing socialist countries; and third, the question of an "antiwar movement".

Firstly, concerning the cause of war and uneven development, there is the crucial point that causes war comes out. The OP correctly points out that the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries have contradictions with the superpowers. This way of laying it out—from the point of view of class analysis—is already definitely right and is more fully argued in an earlier report, better at the present time than three worlds, etc. The problem with this point in this report comes correctly applying it to the question of war, serious shortcomings come out. We shall see later.
continued from page 7

least delayed and fought on more favorable grounds. Revolution in the U.S. would most likely prevent this immediate war—or so change its nature (it would become an attack on a socialist country) in order to resolve a different question. What is at stake is that it is not clear again how the fight against war is part of the revolutionary struggle. Here is how the DP lays the groundwork.

"To eliminate war, once and for all, it is necessary to eliminate its source, imperialism, through revolution and in the broadest possible movement that struggles, the working class and its party in the U.S. raises the following demands: Withdrawal..."

The phrase "as a vital part" is not sufficiently clear. The struggle against war will be one of the key struggles leading to the socialist revolution. It will be one of the very main forces in bringing down the bourgeoisie. Further, the struggles of the working class against war along the lines of the demands listed (strengthening the police on defending socialist countries) will be a key part in rallying other classes to see social revolution as the concrete solution to their problems. The masses of people, especially the working class, hate war. They suffer the miserable war years, they do the fighting and dying. This unites the forces for the working class leading the struggles against war as a powerful thrust against monopoly capitalism for only through destroying monopoly capitalism can war be ended forever.

The anti-war feelings of the masses is also the social base for those "peace" movements. If the working class does not lead the fight against war—either the petty bourgeoisie, or more likely the bourgeoisie, will just jump on it, which then will not have a movement against war which will be a social movement, broadly including all classes—but based mainly in the working class. The reason this must not be and can be true of the future. It is important to describe this social movement against war as a key force for "peace" and for the IWW demands. This formulation could lead to denying the importance of the social movement against war and could cause the petty bourgeoisie to pull the petit-bourgeoisie against war.

Danger of War Very Real

It is true that petty bourgeois moralists and utopian Socialists will only offer passive war in general, and that if you actually tried to build an "anti-war" movement today it would attract only petty bourgeois for the "peace" purist as "peace" movements. If the working class does not lead the fight against war—either the petty bourgeoisie, or more likely the bourgeoisie, will just jump on it, which then will not have a movement against war which will be a social movement, broadly including all classes—but based mainly in the working class. The reason this must not be and can be true of the future. It is important to describe this social movement against war as a key force for "peace" and for the IWW demands. This formulation could lead to denying the importance of the social movement against war and could cause the petty bourgeoisie to pull the petit-bourgeoisie against war.

The danger of war is very real. It is only possible to mobilize and mobilize the work on the "anti-war" movement as a whole to the masses. The whole question of war will be a key part in rallying other classes to see social revolution as the concrete solution to their problems. The masses of people, especially the working class, hate war. They suffer the miserable war years, they do the fighting and dying. This unites the forces for the working class leading the struggles against war as a powerful thrust against monopoly capitalism for only through destroying monopoly capitalism can war be ended forever.

The anti-war feelings of the masses is also the social base for those "peace" movements. If the working class does not lead the fight against war—either the petty bourgeoisie, or more likely the bourgeoisie, will just jump on it, which then will not have a movement against war which will be a social movement, broadly including all classes—but based mainly in the working class. The reason this must not be and can be true of the future. It is important to describe this social movement against war as a key force for "peace" and for the IWW demands. This formulation could lead to denying the importance of the social movement against war and could cause the petty bourgeoisie to pull the petit-bourgeoisie against war.

The danger of war is very real. It is only possible to mobilize and mobilize the mass on the "anti-war" movement as a whole to the masses. The whole question of war will be a key part in rallying other classes to see social revolution as the concrete solution to their problems. The masses of people, especially the working class, hate war. They suffer the miserable war years, they do the fighting and dying. This unites the forces for the working class leading the struggles against war as a powerful thrust against monopoly capitalism for only through destroying monopoly capitalism can war be ended forever.

The anti-war feelings of the masses is also the social base for those "peace" movements. If the working class does not lead the fight against war—either the petty bourgeoisie, or more likely the bourgeoisie, will just jump on it, which then will not have a movement against war which will be a social movement, broadly including all classes—but based mainly in the working class. The reason this must not be and can be true of the future. It is important to describe this social movement against war as a key force for "peace" and for the IWW demands. This formulation could lead to denying the importance of the social movement against war and could cause the petty bourgeoisie to pull the petit-bourgeoisie against war.

The danger of war is very real. It is only possible to mobilize and mobilize the masses on the "anti-war" movement as a whole to the masses. The whole question of war will be a key part in rallying other classes to see social revolution as the concrete solution to their problems. The masses of people, especially the working class, hate war. They suffer the miserable war years, they do the fighting and dying. This unites the forces for the working class leading the struggles against war as a powerful thrust against monopoly capitalism for only through destroying monopoly capitalism can war be ended forever.
Five.

Continued from page 6

The tryckist deviation, which denies the law of uneven development and existence of any contradictions other than that between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, insists that the state policy of socialist states should be the same as the supposed programme of the parties in the imperialist countries and should be oriented to the practical assistance of armed proletarian revolution, immediately, everywhere, and without "impute" allies. The opposite error, the Browderite deviation, calls for the liquidation of the domestic revolutionary programme and the adoption in its place of the state foreign policy of the leading socialist states.

The past has shown that without a correct orientation toward the component parts of the international united front, the working class and its party can become confused and suffer real setbacks in the face of rapidly changing international events. The American party which oriented its domestic program in the last 30s around the international struggle against fascism, was thrown into confusion when the Soviet Union signed the non-aggression treaty with Germany. The Chinese party, which changed quite well the Soviet Union signing a similar treaty with Japan at the same time that the CPC was leading the armed struggle against the Japanese invasion of China. Later the American party was seeking actively to repress all working class struggles and struggles of national minorities in the name of the war effort, while the Chinese party was forcefully pushing demands for the people's livelihood in order to strengthen the ability of the masses to resist the Japanese army. Recently we have seen the attempt by some so-called communist groups to put forward the state foreign policies of the People's Republic of China, particularly China's attempts in the UN and international conferences to unite other states against the superpowers, as the sole essence of the "International United Front." (For background comrades and friends should re-read Teng Hsiao-ping's speech to the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Raw Materials and Development, where the First, Second, Third World description was first put forward.)

"Upper and Lower Teeth"  
The point is that the state foreign policies of the socialist countries and the revolutionary programmes of the revolutionary masses of workers parties are both components of the international united front. They fit together like the upper and lower teeth; be tween them they do not constitute a class system. But they are not the same thing. This distinction also raises the importance of building the widest possible movements of friendship for the socialist states. These movements hold up the shining example of socialism and the working class in power, and they defend the leading components of the international united front by restricting the bourgeoisie's ability to mobilize the masses for war against their states.

But, further, these movements must be constantly explaining to all of the people the role these states play in the world and it is especially important to win people to the correctness of the foreign policies of these states at times when reaction attempts to portray these states as acting in opposition to the interests of the masses, or when they make tactical compromises to advance the overall programme. (Remember how PL and the SWP aspelled the Vietnamese for "selling out their Party")

UNITE THE MANY AND OBEAT THE FEW, BUILD THE INTERNATIONAL UNITED FRONT!

Six.

Article "Two" on War and the International United Front in Journal No. 3 is incorrect in the line that it takes to oppose the DP's line on fascism, pp. 42-43. It falls into the error of raising the contradiction between oppressed nations and the superpowers to obscure all the other contradictions in the world today. This view advocates that the proletariat give up its role as leader of the world-wide United Front and tail behind the other social forces.

How does Article "Two" do this? First, it criticizes the DP for not recognizing the national liberation struggles as part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution, by failing to distinguish between the masses in the oppressed nations and the reactionary regimes which resist superpower domination. This is not true. Over five paragraphs on p. 21 are used to clearly lay out the contradiction in the struggles in the Third World.

Next the DP is criticized for an inadequate definition of proletarian internationalism because it doesn't say the principal contradiction in the world is that between the proletariat and the capitalists in the imperialist countries. Again wrong. The world situation of one of change and flux. Defense of the socialist countries in the event of world war or support of revolution in capitalist countries, depending on the changing world situation, could be the cutting edge of proletarian internationalism.

Whatever, the main internationalist duty of the U.S.A proletariat is to make proletarian revolution in the U.S.

The third point of the article is that the DP gives an incomplete summation of the world situation because it doesn't say the principal contradiction in the world today is between the national liberation struggles and the superpowers. It would be incorrect to identify a contradiction as principal today because of the rapidly changing world situation. Our analysis of what is principal would be shaky at best and even if it was right could be wrong tomorrow.

Finally, the slogan, "Workers and Oppressed Peoples, Unite!" is proposed to replace "Workers of the World, Unite!" A quote from Lenin and that the Chinese used this slogan against the revisionists are used as arguments. First, the quote from Lenin is horribly misinterpreted. Lenin said the slogan, "Workers and Oppressed Peoples, Unite!" was correct for communists to use addressing the "peoples of the East." The Chinese comrades used the slogan in opposition to the revisionists in conflict over the national and colonial question. They never replaced "Workers of All Countries, Unite!" as the general slogan. The slogan proposed is correct and could be used on the national and colonial question but a communist would never use it to replace "Workers of the World, Unite!"

The general error Article "Two" makes is to break with a scientific Marxist-Leninist analysis of the world situation and puts forward the subjective moralism of the petty bourgeoisie.

WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE! FORWARD TO THE PARTY!

Eight.

Article Two in the "Other Articles" section of Journal No. 3 is incorrect in the line that it takes to oppose the DP's line on fascism. pp. 42-43. It falls into the error of not seeing the way to fight fascism is by taking up that fight as part of the overall revolutionary struggle. This view advocates that the proletariat give up its strategic aim of revolution. The first, the article says that the "draft programme states that the only way to make revolution is to make proletarian revolution." The DP does not say that. It says, "the only way to prevent fascism for now is to make revolution."

The third point of the article is that the revisionist line says "Don't struggle, you might start a world war. A single spark can start a holocaust," etc. Also, in terms of the UF itself it's not that there's a positive side (it can temporarily prevent war and a negative side (it increases the danger of war). The UF is not a 50:50 line. It only advances the struggle of the working class and its allies, whether there is a war or not; i.e., it can temporarily prevent war, but even if there is war, it will put the working class in a more favorable position in terms of its own struggle, and in terms of the weakness and isolation of the imperialists. The UF is the working class, and weakens and hurls the superpowers. Again, not making this clear means putting forward that the interests of the struggle of the oppressed nations and countries are in contradiction with those who don't want a world war.
Since the DP has come out there has been much struggle around the question of IWOs, their relationships to the day-to-day struggles in the plants and their overall role in social struggles. The goal of this struggle is to achieve a better understanding of the current situation that faces the working class and what must be done to promote the struggle of the workers has grown much deeper. But not deep enough. The line put forward in the DP and the latest document on the IWOs does not and will not promote the struggle of the working class because it starts not on the basis of uniting with the actual struggles of the working class but contradicts workers' wishes and desires of what ought to be. This failure to do a concrete analysis of concrete conditions has led to two serious errors: 1) incorrectly emphasize the role of the building of organizations of workers to resist oppression, which is not the primary aspect at this particular time; and 2) fail to understand how IWOs must be developed out of the actual struggles of the working class, specifically how it is incorrect at this time to build area-wide IWOs that have no organized sections in at least several important shops.

In the DP on p. 31 workers who are the backbone of the IWOs are described as "workers (who) are conscious of the oppression not only in the shops and unions, but also in many other battlefronts against the bourgeoisie—for example, police repression or imperialist aggression and war."

Which of the two aspects, "leading the day to day struggle against the bourgeoisie" or "building of the organization of workers to resist oppression," is the one that we must emphasize and build on at this time?

From the above, it has become summed up in the DP and the latest document, and from our own experience, the aspect that we must emphasize is the leading aspect of struggle against the bourgeoisie, that there is to be a struggle against the bourgeoisie, that in the context of building the fight of the working class against the ruling class.

In the section on the IWOs never emphasizes this aspect, but instead only talks about the advance in consciousness in terms of taking up broader struggles, the struggle against oppression of "all of the people," instead of uniting with the actual struggles of the workers at this particular time, concentrating their demands into a fighting program, dealing a material blow to the enemy, and sparking the struggle of the workers involved to their sisters and brothers and in broad as wide as possible.

"Not In A Context?"

We, the authors of this paper, don't emphasize the implicit aspect because we think the workers are a narrow bunch of people. The struggle against all oppression is a fight for tomorrow.

Workers in this country have some general feelings about what is wrong with all of the problems and misery. They know that the capitalists that own their company are not the only enemy; they know from their experience in life, that the most important of this society does not lie down at work but varies degrees everywhere else. In short, the aspirations of the workers are not just for a dime an hour more, but for a better life and to themselves and for all people getting ripped.

But the workers are not in a context to link as broadly as we can; they are involved in a struggle for survival, to eat, to be housed and to have clothes on their backs, a struggle that is determined at any particular point by the objective conditions of degree of consciousness of the workers and their sense of organization.

The workers fight back in the best way they know how. Based on struggling for the tactics that get results and move their struggle forward. As we correctly say in the DP and the latest document, "the present struggles of the workers is against the bourgeoisie in general and the middle class in particular, the bourgeoisie and their allies (employers) associations around wages and benefits, working conditions, against speed-up and layoffs, and against police repression and all forms of oppression."

These are the actual struggles of the working class against individual employers, that we must in the main PROSCOE. These are the struggles that the IWO section in the DP must be based on, and must emphasize.

To help in this struggle and to offer our own two cents worth, we would like to submit the following

On the IWOs

R e-write of the IWO section in the DP. It is the product of much discussion, mainly around the questions developed by the national leadership of our organization and our own experience. The journal articles also helped a lot.

Suggested Rewrite

Suggested re-write: start p. 30, right-hand side, paragraph no. 1.

"As this process develops, the workers, especially the most advanced, begin to see the struggle on the job in a different light. The movement of the workers and how to fight him becomes clearer. The struggle on the job becomes a part of a much larger struggle, union brothers and sisters and fellow workers become class brothers and sisters, the struggles of other strata and oppressed people in society begin to be viewed in relation to how they weaken the common enemy and how they unite the forces of the people. The struggle for a living wage and a decent life begins to become the struggle to wipe out the source of all exploitation and misery in society, the ruling class of capitalist blood suckers, the class that runs everything in its own narrow interests.

"The party of the proletariat must unite with these advanced workers to consolidate politically and organizationally their tremendous先进s in consciousness by forming a workers organization that is more permanent anti-imperialist organization. An organic part of the fight to build this class struggle and in turn becomes the basis for the class struggle to roar on, at a still higher level. An organization whose purpose is not just to win the battle against the bourgeoisie but to see the need to aim their blows squarely at the ruling class.

"These workers organizations are intermediate between the party and the trade unions. They do not compete with the trade unions for members, they are not the sections of the party in the plants. Their role in society is to unite with and help lead the actual struggles of the working class in the mines, mills and factories. Their main aim is not to win a struggle against individual employers (or employers) associations around wages and benefits, working conditions, against speed-up and layoffs, and against police repression and all forms of oppression, but to unite the workers in the struggle. To do a concrete analysis of concrete conditions has led not only in the shops and unions, but also in many other battlefronts against the bourgeoisie—for example, police repression or imperialist aggression and war."

While across the country many workers of this type have come forward and while through the course of struggle and the summing up of struggle by communists, they have seen and from what the DP and the latest document sum up as the current situation, we feel we must immediately move to the growth of a struggle and to begin to develop the working class struggle and in tum serves as the basis for the class struggle. The Party's activity must consist in promoting the working class struggle. The Party's task is not to concoct some fashionable means of helping the workers, but to join with the workers' movement, and to fight it, to assist the workers in the struggle they themselves have already begun to wage.

Struggle Against Individual Employers

At this particular time the workers are mainly struggling against individual employers. In the main our organizations have been run on broad front and has gone into the plants to join with the struggle to see how to get the workers to develop and promote their own strength, to develop and promote their own struggle and to simply affiliate our organizations, specifically what is the relationship between the workers as a stratum and towards establishing plant and industry-wide organizations as branches of the area-wide organization. In some cases this will mean affiliating already existing organizations in plants and industries, or at least of many of the workers active in these organizations, to the area-wide organization as branches of it.

Disagree with this formulation. From what we have seen and from what the DP and the latest document sum up as the current situation, we feel we must build plant and industry IWOs as a necessary step in building towards an area-wide IWO. Concretely, it is necessary to build organizations like M1WM that have no organized sections in the particular plants or industries in the area. In a question of developing our line, organizations and tactics on the basis of applying the experience to the concrete conditions that we face. At the latest document, in Lenin's work on p. 17, "The Party's activity must consist in promoting the working class struggle. The Party's task is not to concoct some fashionable means of helping the workers, but to join with the workers' movement, and to fight it, to assist the workers in the struggle they themselves have already begun to wage."

How Must the IWOs Develop?

The latest document on p. 21 goes a long way in overcoming some of the problems in the DP. We agree with the statement that these organizations can play this role [build the UFAI] only if they are rooted in the plants and other work places and play a leading role in the struggle there. This is the only way the major struggles arising in the area, or the country as a whole, applying the 'single spark' method and as the Programme states, 'mobilize masses of workers and develop them into campaigns of the working class.'

The latest document further lays out in the next paragraph, "If these organizations are not rooted in the plants and do not lead struggle there, then there is no way they can mobilize masses of workers around broader struggles that affect the whole class. On the other hand, if these organizations do not take up these broader struggles and mobilize the masses of workers as a whole around them, then they will not play their full role in helping to develop the struggles and consciousness of the workers as a CLASS."

The final form of the IWO section in the programme of our party reflects this understanding. But while the latest document does make advances over the DP, it still falls short because it has a wrong understanding of how to set up these area-wide organizations, specifically what is the relationship between the workers as a stratum and against area-wide and single plant and industry IWOs. On p. 31 the latest document states that trade unions or organized along industry lines, that the DP reflects the actual organization of the workers in production is the main thing that up. That it is important, is to develop workers' organizations that are organized along industry lines, and to link these with area-wide organizations. Our aim should be to work towards establishing area-wide organizations as branches of the area-wide organization. In some cases this will mean affiliating already existing organizations in plants and industries, or at least of many of the workers active in these organizations, to the area-wide organization as branches of it.

We disagree with this formulation. From what we have seen and from what the DP and the latest document sum up as the current situation, we feel we must build plant and industry IWOs as a necessary step in building towards an area-wide IWO. Concretely, it is necessary to build organizations like M1WM that have no organized sections in the particular plants or industries in the area. In a question of developing our line, organizations and tactics on the basis of applying the experience to the concrete conditions that we face. At the latest document, in Lenin's work on p. 17, "The Party's activity must consist in promoting the working class struggle. The Party's task is not to concoct some fashionable means of helping the workers, but to join with the workers' movement, and to fight it, to assist the workers in the struggle they themselves have already begun to wage."

Struggle Against Individual Employers

At this particular time the workers are mainly struggling against individual employers. In the main our organizations have run on broad front and has gone into the plants to join with the struggle to see how to get the workers to develop and promote their own strength, to develop and promote their own struggle and to simply affiliate our organizations, specifically what is the relationship between the workers as a stratum and towards establishing plant and industry-wide organizations as branches of the area-wide organization. In some cases this will mean affiliating already existing organizations in plants and industries, or at least of many of the workers active in these organizations, to the area-wide organization as branches of it.

What has been accomplished is that we have developed some single plant IWOs and some industry IWOs. We have seen a spread of IWOs in local plants and in individual plants and industries (or individuals in those) to our area-wide IWO.

Case Seems Closed

It seems like the case is closed on how to build area-wide IWOs. This is wrong because the only real model there is at this time as these area-wide organizations as branches of the area-wide organization is much that has to be summed up about this organization before it is used as the example for anything. In fact, we have seen how important an IWO in plant x to workers in plant z, the workers in plant z want to know what we are doing and how they can start doing these. How do we relate to these workers? Nowhere in the latest document are these questions answered. It is assumed that area-wide organizations now exist, that they are leading the masses of workers in struggles, and that the working class is moving towards an area-wide and single plant and industry IWOs (or individuals in those) to our area-wide IWO.
One...

Continued from page 10

sack advanced workers (and communists) out of the struggles, lead the vanguard, that is very little to mobilize the masses of workers to take up the broader struggles in society.

MIW has summed it up, and others in the journal have summed it up, that MIW is external to the real heat of the class struggle. This is no great revelation because we have traditionally thought that the main struggle of the workers is (against individual employers) then you are elongating yourself to an external force.

In the MIW article in the second journal the comrades sum up that "the main strength of MIW has been that it has been the vanguard of advanced workers from different shops and industries. These workers have united with communists to take important issues and struggles to the workers. Last..." The comrades have summed up, that "the May 1 Workers Movement has been actively involved in a number of important struggles including worker electronic strike, the struggles of Asian immigrant workers in San Francisco's Chinatown, and a campaign against police repression."

No one will deny that it is not a good thing to bring workers together to sum up the struggles that they have been involved in, and we have to do more work to get them involved in the struggles against police repression. But the question arises—how are we taking up these struggles, are we relying on the masses of the workers, are we constantly summing up the lessons of the struggle pointing the way forward to revolutionary actions?

Workers learn through their day to day struggles. They learn everything including the need to go up against the bosses but the real class of capitalist pigs that their bosses belong to. Workers start getting a pretty good idea of what they are up against.

MIW doesn't even start to answer the question of how. How could it—it plays no role in the learning process. It is summing up the actual struggle of the workers, MIW "brings important issues and struggles to the entire working class..." Instead of forming an advanced workers organization and building the struggle in the context of eliminating the ruling class, MIW proclaims "that it's workers against bosses. We have to get together as a class and take the offensive against our common enemy."

We should all learn from the comrades' sum up that it has brought together a solid core of advanced workers (and communists) out of the main struggles of the workers is at (against individual employers) and its lessons to other workers but as an external force it has not been in a position to play a decisive role in the level of struggle and the concrete conditions and it is not a position to teach the masses of the workers anything. The failure of MIW to sum up and promote the actual struggles of the workers eliminates the basis to make links to the need to take up the broader struggles against all oppression. As it is out in the open in the DP p. 32, "These demands (demands of the working class to defend its standard of living) represent vital questions around which the masses of workers are fighting today. And as important as they are, they deal only with effects of capitalist exploitation and oppression. The struggle for the demands is to eliminate the cause—the capitalist system itself. To do this it is necessary to fight the effect to get to the ease—utilize the forms of struggle of building the struggles into future showdowns with the bourgeoisie."

Organizations like MIW that have only an external relationship to the actual struggles of the workers, that have no organized section in the shops, fail to promote either the day to day struggles of the workers or the overall fight against all oppression.

Two...

The struggle for the party has brought us sharply the important role of the struggle towards workers movement and the United Front Against Imperialism under proletarian leadership. We have been involved in a number of struggles against police repression, the Rucker workers movement has been actively involved in a number of important struggles, including the Rucker workers movement..."

No Interest

We have no interest in building IWOS as external to the real heat of the class struggle and there is nothing to be gained by leading the advanced workers in that direction either. We can't see how the MIW can teach the advanced workers that make up the backbone of anything when it is not in a position to teach the masses of workers anything.

The failure of MIW to sum up and promote the actual struggles of the workers eliminates the basis to make links to the need to take up the broader struggles against all oppression. As it is out in the open in the DP p. 32, "These demands (demands of the working class to defend its standard of living) represent vital questions around which the masses of workers are fighting today. And as important as they are, they deal only with effects of capitalist exploitation and oppression. The struggle for the demands is to eliminate the cause—the capitalist system itself. To do this it is necessary to fight the effect to get to the ease—utilize the forms of struggle of building the struggles into future showdowns with the bourgeoisie."

Organizations like MIW that have only an external relationship to the actual struggles of the workers, that have no organized section in the shops, fail to promote either the day to day struggles of the workers or the overall fight against all oppression.

Trying to Develop an IWO

We have had some experience in trying to develop an area wide IWO in a small industrial city. This city has been the scene of many conflicts between the workers and the bosses in the area. There have been very militant strikes and wildcats which often erupted into battles with the local cops and the courts. Workers in this city have been involved in campaigns against police repression, but conditions in one or two of the plants, rank and file militancy has not been built up in one of the shops (there have been some short lived rank and file caucuses).

In summing up this experience we came to the conclusion that forming an area wide IWO would be the best way to take the fight to the bosses and would provide the basis to build organization in the shops and to unite a much broader group of workers in the struggle. But we felt that it seemed to be: there we had contact with many advanced workers who led struggles against their bosses and these workers and the struggles that they led were very well known and these workers worked in the main shops in the area. Furthermore, because this was a small town (where workers have just up and left town that there weren't any IWOs or revolutionaries around), we could call these workers together, lay out what we thought was right, have some discussion and then pull together an area wide IWO.

The position we laid out to the workers that came to the first meeting was very much like that in the latest document. We stressed in the meeting that: what we need was an organization of workers that fought back against the capitalist that built the day to day struggles in the shops to be able to stop the struggle and to prevent attacks on us by the capitalists and their government. But we correctly stressed the in-plant aspect of the programme, laying out as if this kind of action works, that these struggles are the ones that we must in the main promote and that we must unfold the broader struggles in society around these.

But also like the latest document, we were wrong on exactly where to go with these workers. We saw the situation as one of not applying the form of an "area WO with this group of advanced workers instead of seeing the need to build actual functioning organizations in the shops as a start in the process of forming an area wide IWO.

Concrete Analysis

We failed to make a concrete analysis of the situation, instead of applying the form of an area wide IWO with this group of advanced workers instead of seeing the need to build actual functioning organizations in the shops as a start in the process of forming an area wide IWO.

We should all learn from the comrades' sum up that it has brought together a solid core of advanced workers (and communists) out of the main struggles of the workers is at (against individual employers) and its lessons to other workers but as an external force it has not been in a position to play a decisive role in the level of struggle and the concrete conditions and it is not a position to teach the masses of the workers anything. The failure of MIW to sum up and promote the actual struggles of the workers eliminates the basis to make links to the need to take up the broader struggles against all oppression. As it is out in the open in the DP p. 32, "These demands (demands of the working class to defend its standard of living) represent vital questions around which the masses of workers are fighting today. And as important as they are, they deal only with effects of capitalist exploitation and oppression. The workers talked about what was going on in their shops, laid out what they thought should be done to build the struggle and asked us and the other workers what we thought. The workers were saying yeah, we got to build the struggle of the working class and yeah, it's more than the fight against our boss, but that's the fight we are in right now and these are the questions we must come to grips with to move it forward. We were saying yeah, we got to build the struggle in the shops, but it's a much broader question than just one shop. We were saying yeah, we got to build this area wide IWO, then we can build the struggle in the shops. The workers wanted to form organization that would develop the struggle socially and we in-organize organizations that would rip the advanced workers from the struggle and put in a secondary position building and promoting the specific campaign of the workers. We were slow to learn this lesson, in fact only really began to shift it up when advanced workers stopped coming to IWOs or when workers didn't see them as important and their time could be spent better doing other things.

In this experience we have come to see much more clearly that organization must "serve the purpose of developing the struggle," that we must start from what exists and not from a blank slate. We have seen that even in a small town (without tests) this same law applies, and in fact it applies even to a single plant on department or a plant. Organization must be based on the level of struggle and the concrete conditions and it must promote (in a participant) in the actual struggles. In this light our task is to unite with the actual struggle against all oppression, to unite with the actual struggle.
Continued from page 11.

Three

by unifying with all social forces fighting imperialism the working class develops consciousness of its own historical role as capitalist's "poodle." (DP, p.33)

"Correct and Incorrect Aspects"

Around these points we see some correct and incorrect aspects. The weakness is: "Correctly shows that the class is engaged in sharp day to day struggles and that these struggles are potentially revolutionary. However, as "B" points out, in doing this "Correctly" essentially "narrow the class struggle to the shop." (p.7) It does this because the people who write "Correctly" don't seem to understand and never brings out the crucial importance of the working class as a class taking up the struggles of all people against imperialism. In doing this the door is left open to the thinking that a class conscious revolutionary workers movement can be built out of shop struggles with a help from broader struggles. This is, of course, incorrect. Article "5" correctly brings out this criticism of "Correctly" and the importance of involving workers taking up broader political struggles. However, in doing so "5" loses its impact. It talks about what the people who write "Correctly" themselves are doing which is: "the great important of communists rooting themselves in these struggles and with this as a basis winning the class to take up these struggles." (p.7) But which is gettin' out is that the day to day struggles are the main way workers are fighting against imperialism and that the working class is against empire. "5" leaves open the important question: "why are these struggles important and why are they important for the working class?"

Understanding this, the next question is what is a revolutionary development? "5" states that we must do to be correct is to state "more clearly the need for organization to be developed as sections of the people against imperialism it can't and doesn't bring out the importance of areawide IWOs as an organization of the whole working class, taking up such broad struggles and mobilizing the working class as a class to take up these struggles." "Correctly" limits the areawide IWOs to being a left labor council only really interested in building and leading day to day struggles in the individual shops and in doing that the article actually liquidates the need for areawide IWOs as an organization of the whole class.

Article "5" correctly criticizes "Correctly" for this error. However, "5"'s lack of orientation once again comes out when speaking of IWOs. This becomes clear in the last paragraph of "5" when speaking of the DP section on IWOs it states that all the section must do to be correct is to state "more clearly the need for organization to be developed as sections of the people against imperialism it can't and doesn't bring out the importance of areawide IWOs as an organization of the whole working class, taking up such broad struggles and mobilizing the working class as a class to take up these struggles." IWOs must be built in a revolutionary way and that only by rooting themselves in the day to day struggles IWOs able to win the class to take up the broader struggles. Without this understanding, without this orientation, we can't know why sections of IWOs must be built in the shops, nor will we understand the importance of building the day to day struggles in the shops.

We believe that the latest document answers the errors in each of these articles and puts forward the correct line on the role of IWOs when it states, "If these organizations don't come out in the workers fight and its not possible to develop the leadership that we have take up a struggle to broaden struggles by bringing them out in a living way that the root of all these struggles is the fundamental contradiction of capitalism."

But rooted in these day to day struggles, IWOs must do more. They must "apply the single spark method to take up every major struggle of all sections of the people, against the ruling class, mobilize masses of workers in these struggles and develop them into campaigns of the working class." (DP, p.31) Often times the struggle being sparked will differ depending on the importance of winning the struggle, the political lessons the class as a class can learn from it and its possibility of sparking other struggles. At this time, for example, we will see IWOs paying particular attention to developing important struggle against increased exploitation in one plant or industry into struggles of the whole working class. That is because at this time, by moving ahead these struggles, which the working class is mainly engaged in and which are getting consistently sharper and broader, to victory, we can get the lessons in the course of these struggles and by sparking other struggles off of them, the IWOs under the party's leadership to see the revolutionary workers movement make its greatest strides forward. Of course the IWOs must also "spark" other struggles of all the people against imperialism when the party sums them up as important battles.

Question of Organizational Form

To carry out these important tasks, IWOs must have the correct organizational form. In general, we believe IWOs should be built in plants and industries as sections of a city or areawide IWO. The shop sections would pay particular attention to roosting themselves in the day to day struggles, and of course would be essential in bringing any "spark" to or from the masses at the shop. The areawide IWO would be made up mainly of these different plant and industry sections (though individual workers could also join) and would certainly help build the struggle in the individual shops, but in a way the areawide IWO must be greater than the sum of its parts. It must be an organization of the whole class, not a federation of sections or a left labor council. In practice, that means that under the party's lead the areawide IWO must not only help develop struggle in the individual shops but must an overall role, actively "spark" the most important struggles of all sections of the people against imperialism into struggle of the whole working class. Only in this way can the areawide IWOs play their full role in building a revolutionary workers movement and the UFAI under proletarian leadership.

Around the questions of role and organization of IWOs, the two articles' lack of understanding of the revolutionary workers movement and our orientation within that becomes manifested again. "Correctly" mentions the areawide IWO once and when it does it says that the sections of the IWO in the shop will build the day to day struggles.

This is all well and good, in fact, crucial, but since "Correctly" didn't understand the importance of the working class taking up the main struggles of all sections of the people against imperialism it can't and doesn't bring out the importance of areawide IWOs as an organization of the whole working class, taking up such broad struggles and mobilizing the working class as a class to take up these struggles. "Correctly" limits the areawide IWOs to being a left labor council only really interested in building and leading day to day struggles in the individual shops and in doing that the article actually liquidates the need for areawide IWOs as an organization of the whole class.

The DP should sum up openness as a characteristic of IWOs and clearly state that IWOs must lead the day to day struggles in the shops while their overall role is to apply the single spark method to every major struggle. In the last section of the areawide IWOs we have learned from our work in developing an IWO in a large manufacturing plant. Our group has had IWOs for more than a year, it has developed out of struggle and has played a key role in many struggles and led some others. Included in these struggles have been a struggle against job elimination (including demonstrations of up to 150 workers), a department slowdown, a struggle against individual employers (including the group which has been built for May Day, a regional action at the international union's constitutional convention, the April 26th rally at ATU, etc.) We have worked around the miners' strike, work around police repression and around the Midwest.

Through the course of all this we have found that workers have come forward based on the fact that the group has been taking up struggle and not based on any program, political line. In fact some have come forward in spite of disagreements with our political line. One worker would reject the local workers paper as "commie propaganda" but when the IWO took up a struggle against the denial of SUH day during the miners' strike, this worker linked up with the group and in the course of struggle, this worker came forward and seriously went over the DP when it came out. We also had some similar experiences around taking up the struggle against job elimination.

Our group doesn't have a statement of principles at this time. But we have written a newsletter that it is open to anybody who wants to fight against the company and for the working class. And when any indication of what this group is it will probably include a statement like that. Also in practice that has been how people come forward. This has been the case and he group has tried in all our struggles to direct the blow against the ruling class, which is not to say that there haven't been errors along the way. For our development, some of the members of the group have objectively been below the political level of the group though they did relate to our activity pretty good.

Day to Day Struggle

We also found that the basis for us winning workers' day to day struggles is that we linked up with the day to day struggles in the shops. If we just put a pretty good newsletter, we wouldn't be much of a threat. The best mistake of what this group is it will probably include a statement like that. Also in practice that has been how people come forward. This has been the case and he group has tried in all our struggles to direct the blow against the ruling class, which is not to say that there haven't been errors along the way. For our development, some of the members of the group have objectively been below the political level of the group though they did relate to our activity pretty good.

The DP does imply that the IWOs must take up the day to day struggles in the shops by saying that they must be based there, that the primary struggle of the working class is against individual employers or employer associations, and saying that the IWOs take up every major struggle. But it must go beyond that to explicitly stating that the IWOs must take up the day to day struggles in the shops.

In fact given our experience and the development of the oris and stepped up attacks on the working class, it is correct for the latest document to lay out taking up the day to day struggles in the shops as the area of concentration of the revolutionary workers movement.

There also seems to be some confusion on just what is a revolutionary struggle. Article "Four" in the "IWO" section of the last journal says it's wrong to say that shop struggles are potentially revolutionary. Well, our experience has been that when properly carried out, struggles around shop issues can be revolutionary. We can bring out the irreconcilable antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie off of the shop floor. We could bring out how, "long as the bourgeoisie holds state power it will continue to attack and attempt to corrupt every gain won by the working class."

The error comes in when we limit ourselves to working solely off of the basis of the economic struggle. Then Continued on page 13.
Continued from page 12

Three...

The DP states that IWOs "must be based mainly in the plants and other work places," but does not say what this means. Our practice in the working class uniting with workers who were active in the plants and building organizations to those struggles, has shown that it is crucial to understand what it means to be based in the plants.

In the last several summers comrades at company X have united with the workers in their day to day struggle in the shop and have tried to bring in other struggles outside the plant. We have built a multi issue caucus that most workers look to as leading the fight back. We have advanced the workers' struggle against the employer, and also have involved some workers in the broader political campaigns of the class. Most workers in the company because they saw how we were leading the struggle in this shop. We found however, the major of separating the two, of flying the workers in from other battles to create a struggle in a trade unionist way, or just building the campaigns. We did not understand how to correctly link them.

We were able to get several workers involved in the Throw the Bum Out campaign based on their desire to take an active role in the battle of Richard and the shop and shop stewards. But we did not take the major lessons of the campaign back into the shop and apply them to the struggles going on in the shop itself. We did however, see the importance of the role of the workers left behind that they didn't see the campaign as part of their struggle, as something meaningful to their lives.

We built the campaign end we built a multi issue campaign. A similar campaign for the movement to get Richard reinstated, but we did not bring the lessons of this campaign back into the shop and carry on the struggle going on in the shop.

We did not bring the importance of the right to strike, and what the effects of us having an unwritten ENA were. We did not take up the campaigns as the task of the IWOs, but we divided them from the day to day struggle of the workers. We also thought that only an IWO could "single spark" these campaigns. We put all this together and said that we had an IWO, one with a couple of people who were only not actively involved, in other struggles outside the plant, and didn't show the key demands of the struggle to the workers organization is a multi-issue caucus, one that depends on the rank and file, and (mobilizes) it to build new struggles. And through the course of this IWO, we can and must lead the day to day struggle of the workers. We also thought that only an IWO could "single spark" these campaigns. We put all this together and said that we had an IWO, one with a couple of people who were only not actively involved, in other struggles outside the plant.

Second, the "Clarify" article tends to individualize the role of the IWOs, and unite all struggles against this enemy. (DP. p.30)

Two Articles

Two articles in the second journal speak to this question. "Clarify Role of IWOs..." and "Lessons of the May 1 Workers Movement." We believe the "Clarify" article is fundamentally correct, because it speaks to the need for the IWOs to relate to the workers today night, to build the day to day struggle, not by going to meetings or demonstrations. By relating with the workers, the IWOs will see what the struggles of the class and applying it to the lessons of the campaigns we can advance the struggles in the shop, building them in a revolutionary way, build class consciousness and unify of the workers. Through its own practice and the work of communists the class will gain the important of the campaigns and take them up.

What is an Advanced Worker?

Third, the "Clarify" article has an incorrect line on what is an advanced worker. The article says that IWOs must be open ended in order "to involve workers who are not politically conscious as well as advanced workers." What are advanced workers but workers who come forward in the fight, whether around one issue or many? We believe the "Clarify" article rules out the organization's correct line on advanced workers: "To us, the advanced worker is one who has the respect of the workers for whom they come when they are in trouble and need to discuss their problems, whom they rally around when they face a collective problem and who provides leadership in struggle." (RP 6, p.53)

The point is not to quibble over definitions, but to

remember these the efforts we had made and the summation we had popularized about this. We must insist on the officials, and this helped that struggle succeed.

What we have summed up from all of this is that it is not enough to just be "people at the top in the shop, and other work places." The IWOs must actively lead struggle going on by uniting with it and bringing in and applying to it the lessons of the broader, political campaigns. The working class learns through its day to day struggle, not simply by going to meetings or demonstrations. By relating with the workers, the IWOs will see what the struggles of the class and applying it to the lessons of the campaigns we can advance the struggles in the shop, building them in a revolutionary way, build class consciousness and unify of the workers. Through its own practice and the work of communists the class will gain the important of the campaigns and take them up.

"Single Spark" Method

We were based in the plants, and we were trying to "single spark" the major struggles of the shop outside the plant, building the broader political campaigns of the class. But by separating these campaigns from the day to day struggle of the workers out of the shop and into the campaigns and did not bring the lessons of the campaigns to the workers and took the struggle back in the plant. As a result of this the workers were not able to make use of the campaigns to advance their day to day struggle, and through this to learn their correctness, and importance and take up the campaigns as their own.

The DP says the overall role of the IWOs is "to apply the single spark method to take up every major struggle, of getting at the root of the problem based on the ruling class, mobilize masses of workers in struggles and develop them into campaigns of the working class." It does not talk about "single spark" struggles developing in the plant, although in explaining the single spark method the DP says we should "seize on every spark of struggle and build as much as possible and build off of it to launch new struggles." This also tends to separate the role of the IWOs and just to day to day struggle of the class.

We correctly single sparked some lessons learned in a shop struggle to get a janitor reinstated. We had been fired for speaking up for an upworker, who had been a struggling class conscious and for grasping MLMTT as their own. That is because of their objectives and actions. The shop stewards must be brought out, either in this section or the RCP section or the UF section.
Four...

Continued from page 13

sell that workers are advanced in their relationship to their fellow workers and their day to day struggle. It is on the basis of this struggle that advanced workers come forward. To fail to see this is to fail to see the importance of the day to day struggle to the class, how it is this struggle that we must strive to unite with and lead, and unite especially with those workers taking a leading role in that struggle.

We believe that the "Lessons of the May 1 Workers Movement" is fundamentally incorrect, because it doesn't see bringing the campaigns to the day to day struggle and that this is how the IWO leads that struggle. It talks about bringing workers out of the shop to demonstrations, but not how the lessons of those struggles were brought back into the shop and applied to advance struggle going on there.

To sum up: The working class learns through its day to day struggle, and the organizations of the working class must learn this struggle. IWOs must unite with and lead the struggles in the shops in a revolutionary way, bringing in and applying to it the lessons of the broader political campaigns, and in the course of this winning workers to take these campaigns up as their own. In this way they can help build the struggle, class consciousness and revolutionary unity of the class and its leading role in the UF, and through the work of communists many of the most advanced among them will develop into communists and join the party.

Five

In our area some comrades have been summing up our work and struggling over the role of the IWOs and their relationship to the shop caucuses and shop struggles. Through this struggle we decided we did not have the basis to build a citywide IWO at this time. And we feel that the formulation of the DP on IWOs has some important weaknesses—it builds a wall between the caucuses and IWOs by pitting them against each other, with IWOs on a "higher political level"—"directed" against the ruling class.

And the shop caucuses on a lower level, dealing with the day to day struggle against exploitation and oppression in the shops.

The M1WM sum-up in Journal No. 2 basically unites with the same line. The article, "Clarify the Role of the IWO," puts forward correctly that "the struggle of the working class around shop issues and around broader campaigns must be linked both politically and organizationally." The line of backing the IWOs on the "vital campaign" instead of the shop struggles will tend to create a small band of revolutionaries, ready to fight on all fronts, but isolated from the masses of workers.

In one shop comrades have been leading a caucus for several years. The caucus has a history of struggle in the shop around contracts, layoffs, firings, discrimination and against union busters, including putting up candidates for union office. And from the beginning workers who are the core of the caucus have become involved in other, broader struggles, including IWD, May Day, Farah, TBO, etc.

And these broader struggles are part of the regular work of the caucus in the meetings, newsletter, etc.

As the DP correctly puts it, the size and activity of this type of organization ebbs and flows, depending on the struggles being fought and the work of comrades. A meeting of shop caucuses in one shop had 88 workers, while an in-shop meeting during a shop struggle might be 30 or more. But the core, the members who are solid both in and off, are advanced workers who see that the fight in their shop is part of the overall class struggle against the bourgeoisie. They fight in the shop as well as linking up with other struggles. These workers and this caucus would fit the description of IWO in the DP—not a politically low priority organization.

We had developed a tendency to downplay the day to day struggles in the shop, "rate" the "broad campaigns" above them. This showed up in the amount of attention the organization gave these struggles, the relative low priority given these struggles in the workers paper, and our initial line on the IWOs. Because of this tendency, we do not now have the basis for creating a solid IWO.

The M1WM report in the second journal seems to share some of our incorrect line and that in the DP on the IWOs. The sum up states that "In applying the 'single spark method' it is important for communists and active workers to the workshops IWO as the main political lines of key struggles. Back into the shops and apply these lessons to the struggles developing there." This is certainly the case. As the comrades and advanced workers must also bring out the political lessons of the struggles in the shops as the DP sums up in "The working class learns through its day to day struggle." It is wrong to separate these tasks politically. If this "clarify" article puts it, "the various industrial sections of the IWO (sub) be firmly rooted in, and leading the day to day struggles in the plant."
"One of the most basic principles of this revolutionary science is that the masses are the makers of history and that the vanguard, or so-called leaders, emerge from and in service to the struggle of the masses of people. The masses, in their millions, in their daily experiences in class struggle, in action and in the experience of all kinds, amassed great but scattered and unsystematic knowledge. Understanding this, the party of the working class, in leading the class, applies the mass line. It takes these scattered and partial experiences and ideas, and by applying the science of revolution, summarizing them up, makes them into a whole that corresponds to the development of society and will move the class struggle ahead. The party retains these concrete experiences and ideas, unites them, and becomes a tremendous material force as the masses take them up as their own and use them to transform the world through class struggle." (CP, pp.16-17)

In summing up our work in an unorganized industry, and in light of a particular discussion on the orientation of the party, we feel some basic errors in applying the mass line have been holding back our work. "But lying at the foundation of all these struggles are already waging. We joined up with a couple of leaflet at one because it summed them up, concentrates what is correct, what our workers don't want to do anything. What we should have said was that the workers didn't want to be removed from the day to day struggle and come to our meetings we felt we had everything to tell them and they had nothing to tell us. We became discouraged when the masses didn't think to see (although we did have a lot of contacts who we lost because of reasons stated above), and some of us even said the workers didn't want to do anything. What we should have said was that the workers didn't want to be removed from the day to day struggle. And while he is just the kind of person we want to unite with, his parting remark was "I'm sorry to disappoint you."

"Beginning To Grasp" We are beginning to grasp that we must learn from the masses and "investigate broadly," that ML is the science of the masses and their struggle, that the masses are the true makers of history and are struggling daily "even if it is only angry outbursts or writing on the wall." As the leftist document says on p.18, "If we fail to recognize that in the daily struggles of the workers lies the potential for the revolutionary movement of the working class, then we fail to foster that potential to develop into a reality. If we do not actively and militantly lead those battles then in no way can we lead the class to win the whole war."

Were we have correctly applied the mass line, we have brought workers forward and developed the struggle. We had a cafeteria boycott against rising "lunches". We decided to take up the issue of unemployment insurance. Publicity committees should favor the strike? Isn't it only organizations of the class and exposes the role of the hacks. The importance of WINNING is that it is the living example of the strength of the working class, the power of unity and organization; it cuts through the defeatism of capitalist propaganda and builds the independent organization of the class and exposes the role of the hacks. There are, of course, lessons from defeat as well as victories and these must be summed up... but the purpose of summing them up is to inspire and gain us more victories in the future.

In the struggle of the workers are seeking the best leaders of the working class and educate the whole class in the tactics of struggle and convince the workers of the possibility of winning not only the day to day struggles but the broad political struggles as well, and train our cadre and the class for the final revolutionary struggle ahead.

The DP correctly lays out that the greatest part of working class struggles are in the shop around day to day demands, that it is sectorial and "left" if we underestimated the importance of these struggles in the process of raising the understanding of the class. The bourgeoisie surrounds the working class with its propaganda of defeatism and individualism, with its philosophy of "you can't beat city hall." It divides the workers along national, cultural and sexual lines. It uses the union bureaucracy and the trade union to bring about a split in the workers. IT IS NOT ENOUGH FOR COMMUNISTS TO BE BOLD IN TAKING UP THE STRUGGLE, WE MUST LEAD THE WORKERS IN WINNING!

A strike vote comes up... Is there a question that communists should favor the strike? Isn't it only the company foot soldiers and scabs that would oppose such militant action? Such reasoning is not the way a Marxist looks on any workers struggle. We must weigh the possibility of winning against the risks and consequences of losing. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the company and the strengths and weaknesses of the workers? When we decide to take up an issue, for example a strike, we must pay attention to every detail. Is the main thrust...how to organize it. Can we use the companies' competition to weaken the company, who are our allies, how do we rally other union and working class support?

Every strike must be mobilized and given specific tasks. Committees to aid strikers to get food stamp, to fight for unemployment insurance. Publicity committees to reach the rest of the class and the public and to tie up the company products. Attention must be paid to strikers with large families and with debts--to aid them in getting over the hard times. The families of the strikers must be reached, auxiliaries organized. Legal assistance in case of arrest. We must pay attention to EVERY worker. Solicit the leadership around a militant course of action; isolate the company hangons on, guard against the maneuvers of the hacks... No detail is too small. Our party must show leadership in all phases of the struggle.

The importance of WINNING is that it is the living example of the strength of the working class, the power of unity and organization; it cuts through the defeatism of capitalist propaganda and builds the independent organization of the class and exposes the role of the hacks. There are, of course, lessons from defeat as well as victories and these must be summed up... but the purpose of summing them up is to inspire and gain us more victories in the future.

In the struggle of the workers are seeking the best leaders of the working class and educate the whole class in the tactics of struggle and convince the workers of the possibility of winning not only the day to day struggles but the broad political struggles as well, and train our cadre and the class for the final revolutionary struggle ahead.
The section of the DP on trade unions inadequately characterizes the role of lower level union leadership. Add the following to the program, p.31, top right-hand column before the first full paragraph. That is, following the sentence that ends with "this is the policy of the proletariat and its party in the unions."

"The union 'hacks' at the local level, local presidents and business agents, are members of the petty bourgeoisie. As such they will oscillate between uniting with the working class and compromising with the bourgeoisie or even siding with it against the proletariat. Today many of the union officials at the local level are sellouts. Because of their close relationship with the workers they must some degree be responsive to their needs and demands or else be out of office. This is the basis for winning them over. But because of their class position and because of pressure from labor trustees at the top, it will not be a simple one shot struggle to win them to stand with the working class. For the immediate time ahead, this will be a process of jamming them again and again to defend the hands of the workers and to organize the unemployed."

The party should take up this struggle not to simply maintain the democratic right to have unions, but because the working class needs unions as a defense against the bosses, and losing them strips the workers of their leverage to resist the capitalists. The attack on the unions is an attack on the growing struggle of the working class.

In summing up, we have the unemployed and un­employed and building an Employed/Unemployed Committee (EUC) at our plant, we've come to see the importance of uniting them. On this, too, we see that the basis for uniting workers at the shop with unemployed workers in UWWOC was that we had the same demand. Only the donne for unemployment checks on time. UWWOC in our area had a dual struggle around getting the checks out on time and out shot a number of plant shutdowns, not to mention layoffs, to cut down on their inventory. When workers didn't get their unemployment checks after the shutdown, there was considerable spontaneous struggle around this-going to the union, petitioning, and the compensation offsets to demand the checks.

We correctly linked up with this struggle and tried to lead it forward and build organization in the course of this. But our errors caused many setbacks. One of these errors was in saying to the workers that our unity with unemployed workers was just that they too were fighting for their checks. We didn't unfold around the struggle the real unity between employed and unemployed, that we're members of the same class being oppressed and exploited by the same enemy.

At one joint meeting of workers from being focused struggle around getting the checks out on time, and out shot a number of plant shutdowns, not to mention layoffs, to cut down on their inventory. When workers didn't get their unemployment checks after the shutdown, there was considerable spontaneous struggle around this-going to the union, petitioning, and the compensation offsets to demand the checks.

We correctly linked up with this struggle and tried to lead it forward and build organization in the course of this. But our errors caused many setbacks. One of these errors was in saying to the workers that our unity with unemployed workers was just that they too were fighting for their checks. We didn't unfold around the struggle the real unity between employed and unemployed, that we're members of the same class being oppressed and exploited by the same enemy.

At one joint meeting of workers from UWWOC and the EUC, the workers themselves in informal discus­son before the meeting began, spoke of this unity, the ways the capitalists try to divide us. The speedup com­ing right along with the layoffs, and the need to unite to fight all of these attacks. But as soon as the "official" meeting began the discussion was dropped and all we talked about was wanting our checks and how to build the picket line we were calling for. We substituted our own backward ideas for the correct ideas the workers were putting forward. Instead of "Employed/Unemployed-Same Class, Same Fight," we were saying "Employed/Unemployed-Same Demand, Same Fight."

Worker Fiend

In the course of this struggle an active fighter in the caucus, a worker from the workshop, told us that the checks was fired. When workers from UWWOC came out to the picket line at the plant as part of the fight to get him reinstated, he said he didn't bring out to the workers in the plant why they were there, since our only unity was in fighting for unemployment checks, for jobs in UWWOC and/or better. But better than we did that the unity of employed and un­employed workers is that we're one class fighting the same enemy, not that we're fighting for our checks.

We also narrowed the fight to one for money, never mind the layoffs and plant shutdowns. We did not want the "Jobs or Income-40 hours work, or 40 hours pay," but what the hell does that mean? We never built struggle around concrete demands like "Stop the Layoffs," "No Short Work Weeks," or "No Plant Shutdowns." In fact, what we came down to saying is you can't really fight the job struggle as well for some money, while we've laid off.

One petition we circulated at work said, "We, the overworked, underpaid, and mistreated workers at [Plant A] are FIGHTING MAD! At Christmas we were forced on lay-off by the company and still many of us have not got our unemployment checks for it. Now, the bloodsuckers at [Plant A] have laid us off again. Brothers and sisters, at [Plant A], will we let this go on? Hell no! We demand: 40 hours work or 40 hours pay; Cut the red tape, we want our checks and we want them on time, and hire adequate staff, more unemployment compensation clerks."

We really questioned they right to lay us off any time they need to.

Or how about this from one of our leaflets: "[Plant A] is speeding up the work, doubling rates, working us overtime and getting really for another lay-off—and we'll just be working monthly again for the same compensation checks, just like millions of unemployed workers are now. We better fight for our checks since we can't avoid work layoffs. Also, "We're not interested in fighting each other for jobs. We're interested in uniting employed and unemployed workers to fight together for our checks on time!" Not once were we interested in the jobs, but we're not interested in fighting the capital­ist for jobs, either.

We didn't grasp this initially. As we discussed around petitions calling for the formation of an EUC "in our union to fight against layoffs and for a living income, paid on time, for all periods of unemployment," we were able to carry forward the fight for jobs, in unity with the unemployed and with UWWOC in particular.

We didn't grasp this initially. As we discussed around petitions calling for the formation of an EUC "in our union to fight against layoffs and for a living income, paid on time, for all periods of unemployment," we were able to carry forward the fight for jobs, in unity with the unemployed and with UWWOC in particular.

The section of the DP on trade unions inadequately characterizes the role of lower level union leadership. Add the following to the program, p.31, top right-hand column before the first full paragraph. That is, following the sentence that ends with "this is the policy of the proletariat and its party in the unions."

"The union 'hacks' at the local level, local presidents and business agents, are members of the petty bourgeoisie. As such they will oscillate between uniting with the working class and compromising with the bourgeoisie or even siding with it against the proletariat. Today many of the union officials at the local level are sellouts. Because of their close relationship with the workers they must some degree be responsive to their needs and demands or else be out of office. This is the basis for winning them over. But because of their class position and because of pressure from labor trustees at the top, it will not be a simple one shot struggle to win them to stand with the working class. For the immediate time ahead, this will be a process of jamming them again and again to defend the hands of the workers and to organize the unemployed.
In the course of struggles for the new party, our collective, which is concentrated in basic industry in a major center of production, has taken up how we have made up our mind that police repression campaign to the working class. We are convinced that much of our work in this campaign was marked by serious right errors and that the manifestations of class strain are the form of the reaction. These errors came from an incorrect class orientation. And we feel that similar errors were made in Article "Two." We've changed our mind and individual line. Yes, one way that national oppression comes down is through police repression and terror in the communities of the oppressed nationalities. And if our point of view is that of the oppressed nationalities our line would be that the struggle against police repression must be seen as part of the struggle against national oppression, as the writers of "Two" are saying.

The key point of view is that of the working class, our line would be that of the DP: "They [bourgeoisie] maintain a state of police terror in the ghettos of the oppressed nationalities. They carry out repression in all working class communities... This repressive apparatus (the state) is maintained directly by the bourgeoisie and its party, but also enforces the rule of the bourgeoisie over all the classes and groups in society..."

Ways of concrete struggle... the need for multinational unity and that the working class must and will take up and move the struggle forward. In order to move headway with showing how the working class is taking up their struggle ("they're such good people, these workers!"). Our task is to base ourselves among the working class, take up the struggle from that point of view, and in the course of that win a large number of the oppressed nationalities, racial minorities, and masses of people generally. This "eventually leads" stuff doesn't make it. With a correct line and orientation the working class will be leading the struggle. With an incorrect line and orientation the working class will never lead.

"Two" says, "Our line is that of taking up the struggle against police repression campaign problems of orientation and political line led to important setbacks in our overall work. The problem of orientation led to taking up an incorrect line in the working class campaign is the only truly revolutionary class and that we must base ourselves at the point of production-led to pulling ourselves out of contact with the movements and into the communities. Many comrades spent dozens of hours a week canvassing these communities, ring doorsbells, going into stores, leafleting, poster-pasting, etc. During this period of time we were much less able to stay on top of the day to day struggles going on in the streets. We were much less able to build the campaign at the point of production as part of the overall struggle.

What communities did we go out to? Our city is a very segregated one–there are very few communities that you could call multinational. In the name of teaching ourselves we've ignored and intensified our efforts in the communities concentrating almost exclusively in Black and Latino communities. So the "communities," which flowed from a particular piece of organization, served to cover a Bundist line–that the struggle against police repression should be taken up as part of the struggle against this particular organization. Why didn't we go out to white working class communities? In incorrectly thinking that the main tendency in our work was liquidation of the nationality question, we were unable to recognize and root out some of the reactionary ideas we had, like the line in "Two" which says "that almost all cases of police repression have objectively also been examples of national oppression." In other words, white workers don't face police repression. We found out that this line doesn't cut much ice with white workers.

White Workers Fighting Back

In spite of our line, we've found out recently that white workers do face police repression and have been fighting back against it. In one incident recently a group of 75 white youths met and barricaded their school against cops and in one instance of the many attacks on Black people as a whole. "This is a Bundist line," as pointed out above, and completely misunderstood and worked against the working class. The working class doesn't run around like missionaries taking up the struggles of other classes and strata. We were saying that as part of building the revolutionary movement. This should be reflected more fully in the program.

practicable. We couldn't show from this example! We couldn't show how as a class we must deal with the bourgeoisie, build socialism, and move on to communism. The immediate aim of our work is to build the struggle, class consciousness, and revolutionary unity of the working class and its leadership, which can't be picked up. Not to understand this leads to rightism in our work, as it has with these comrades.

We feel that the police repression campaign problems of orientation and political line led to important setbacks in our overall work. The problem of orientation led to taking up an incorrect line in the working class campaign is the only truly revolutionary class and that we must base ourselves at the point of production-led to pulling ourselves out of contact with the movements and into the communities. Many comrades spent dozens of hours a week canvassing these communities, ring doorsbells, going into stores, leafleting, poster-pasting, etc. During this period of time we were much less able to stay on top of the day to day struggles going on in the streets. We were much less able to build the campaign at the point of production as part of the overall struggle.

What communities did we go out to? Our city is a very segregated one–there are very few communities that you could call multinational. In the name of teaching ourselves we've ignored and intensified our efforts in the communities concentrating almost exclusively in Black and Latino communities. So the "communities," which flowed from a particular piece of organization, served to cover a Bundist line–that the struggle against police repression should be taken up as part of the struggle against this particular organization. Why didn't we go out to white working class communities? In incorrectly thinking that the main tendency in our work was liquidation of the nationality question, we were unable to recognize and root out some of the reactionary ideas we had, like the line in "Two" which says "that almost all cases of police repression have objectively also been examples of national oppression." In other words, white workers don't face police repression. We found out that this line doesn't cut much ice with white workers.

White Workers Fighting Back

In spite of our line, we've found out recently that white workers do face police repression and have been fighting back against it. In one incident recently a group of 75 white youths met and barricaded their school against cops and in one instance of the many attacks on Black people as a whole. "This is a Bundist line," as pointed out above, and completely misunderstood and worked against the working class. The working class doesn't run around like missionaries taking up the struggles of other classes and strata. We were saying that as part of building the revolutionary movement. This should be reflected more fully in the program.

practicable. We couldn't show from this example! We couldn't show how as a class we must deal with the bourgeoisie, build socialism, and move on to communism. The immediate aim of our work is to build the struggle, class consciousness, and revolutionary unity of the working class and its leadership, which can't be picked up. Not to understand this leads to rightism in our work, as it has with these comrades.

We feel that the police repression campaign problems of orientation and political line led to important setbacks in our overall work. The problem of orientation led to taking up an incorrect line in the working class campaign is the only truly revolutionary class and that we must base ourselves at the point of production-led to pulling ourselves out of contact with the movements and into the communities. Many comrades spent dozens of hours a week canvassing these communities, ring doorsbells, going into stores, leafleting, poster-pasting, etc. During this period of time we were much less able to stay on top of the day to day struggles going on in the streets. We were much less able to build the campaign at the point of production as part of the overall struggle.

What communities did we go out to? Our city is a very segregated one–there are very few communities that you could call multinational. In the name of teaching ourselves we've ignored and intensified our efforts in the communities concentrating almost exclusively in Black and Latino communities. So the "communities," which flowed from a particular piece of organization, served to cover a Bundist line–that the struggle against police repression should be taken up as part of the struggle against this particular organization. Why didn't we go out to white working class communities? In incorrectly thinking that the main tendency in our work was liquidation of the nationality question, we were unable to recognize and root out some of the reactionary ideas we had, like the line in "Two" which says "that almost all cases of police repression have objectively also been examples of national oppression." In other words, white workers don't face police repression. We found out that this line doesn't cut much ice with white workers.

White Workers Fighting Back

In spite of our line, we've found out recently that white workers do face police repression and have been fighting back against it. In one incident recently a group of 75 white youths met and barricaded their school against cops and in one instance of the many attacks on Black people as a whole. "This is a Bundist line," as pointed out above, and completely misunderstood and worked against the working class. The working class doesn't run around like missionaries taking up the struggles of other classes and strata. We were saying that as part of building the revolutionary movement. This should be reflected more fully in the program.

practicable. We couldn't show from this example! We couldn't show how as a class we must deal with the bourgeoisie, build socialism, and move on to communism. The immediate aim of our work is to build the struggle, class consciousness, and revolutionary unity of the working class and its leadership, which can't be picked up. Not to understand this leads to rightism in our work, as it has with these comrades.

We feel that the police repression campaign problems of orientation and political line led to important setbacks in our overall work. The problem of orientation led to taking up an incorrect line in the working class campaign is the only truly revolutionary class and that we must base ourselves at the point of production-led to pulling ourselves out of contact with the movements and into the communities. Many comrades spent dozens of hours a week canvassing these communities, ring doorsbells, going into stores, leafleting, poster-pasting, etc. During this period of time we were much less able to stay on top of the day to day struggles going on in the streets. We were much less able to build the campaign at the point of production as part of the overall struggle.

What communities did we go out to? Our city is a very segregated one–there are very few communities that you could call multinational. In the name of teaching ourselves we've ignored and intensified our efforts in the communities concentrating almost exclusively in Black and Latino communities. So the "communities," which flowed from a particular piece of organization, served to cover a Bundist line–that the struggle against police repression should be taken up as part of the struggle against this particular organization. Why didn't we go out to white working class communities? In incorrectly thinking that the main tendency in our work was liquidation of the nationality question, we were unable to recognize and root out some of the reactionary ideas we had, like the line in "Two" which says "that almost all cases of police repression have objectively also been examples of national oppression." In other words, white workers don't face police repression. We found out that this line doesn't cut much ice with white workers.

White Workers Fighting Back

In spite of our line, we've found out recently that white workers do face police repression and have been fighting back against it. In one incident recently a group of 75 white youths met and barricaded their school against cops and in one instance of the many attacks on Black people as a whole. "This is a Bundist line," as pointed out above, and completely misunderstood and worked against the working class. The working class doesn't run around like missionaries taking up the struggles of other classes and strata. We were saying that as part of building the revolutionary movement. This should be reflected more fully in the program.
Seven...

Continued from page 17.

class struggle, essentially as the principal contradiction between the ruling class and the whole working class becomes ever sharper) to divide the class while the national oppression takes on more intense forms.

Shared examples are the games played with the poverty-stricken, the black rebellions of the late 1940s, the N.A.A.C.P. starting in the late '50s: token benefits granted to Black communities while adjacent communities with the same oppression received elaborate "quota" and "affirmative action" programs that did almost nothing to improve the position of the workers. This was repeated when, while working employers with the excuse to offer white workers they didn't hire: "we have to hire Blacks (or Puerto Ricans, or Mexicans, etc.), they're not as productive."

"no jobs exist. And, of course, the recent examples of building the schemes of the ruling class clearer than ever that they have no national consciousness and that the blind in their pocket (or closing the school door) belongs to the workers and petty bourgeoisie of all the other nationalities.

An example of this type of maneuver by the ruling class was the government-sponsored seniority changes in the Black departments at the end of the war. One of the few big mills that had employed large numbers of Black workers prior to World War 2, our plant has a history of blatant national oppression. This was a period when conditions and pay were all or almost all Black. Skilled and high paying units were generally all white. (In early days, immigrants of all nationalities had been imported to break through the discrimination. Locker rooms and bathrooms were separate (in some cases up to 5-6 years ago) and many departments were completely segregated, and the Black workers lived side by side, but in separate units" with wide pay discrepancies. All of this was reinforced by the union seniority system (you lose seniority if you transfer to a better unit) and the active cooperation of the union officials.

On one hand, there was a fierce struggle against this. The "Steel and Shipyard Workers for Equality" (SWFE) of 1943-45 was formed in the heat of the growing civil rights movement. While many court suits were filed, and some of them gained important victories, the main thing was actually happening was the company jockeying jobs around (the "gift" of being able to transfer to a better worker in a white unit with no pay reduction.

Seniority is something the workers have fought for your job, what we must fight for is simply stronger measures against discrimination.

Well, really dropped the workers in the face, and the old pattern was: workers mix and those still stuck in the rotten jobs. A rap which we were able to sum up that a very serious aspect of the fight against the order must be the fight against all the class.

We began to see that the main thrust of what the company was trying to pull was not concessions to the fight against discrimination, which was what they didn't do far enough. In fact, the concessions were practically non-existent. While the main thing happening was the company getting jobs around pretty much at will in order to create turmoil in the ranks of the workers--all at basically no extra cost, since labor discipline was so high up on the "gift" of being able to transfer to a better job in a white unit with no pay reduction.

Seniority is something the workers have fought for a long and hard. Basically to smash company favoritism and discrimination, and deprive brown nosers of promotions for services rendered. While we must fight for the most fair and non-discriminatory system (in this case, plantwide seniority) company attempts to undermine the trade unions are completely an attack on the basic fighting strength of the workers.

Faced with a no-strike deal, staffahl, and desmor­

continued on page 20.
In the course of summing up the work in our area on the local workers newspaper, we have come to essentially new conclusions as indicated by the DP and other documents about the papers. We think that the party's approach to newspapers should be quite different from that used in the past. In fact, we think an even more major change is required than that called for in those documents.

Specifically we are recommending that the party launch a mass distribution, workers newspaper. Secondly, that a more analytical publication also be produced. This proposal is a change from the past in several ways. First off, we are proposing a party newspaper, not an "anti-imperialist" paper. Secondly, we are proposing a nationwide, not a regional, affinity edited newspapers. However, local areas, who have the resources, could also produce local supplements to insert in the national paper.

Our local paper was formed just as the organization in this area was beginning. We had a very primitive idea at that time of how to build this revolutionary workers movement. Also because of geography and organizational primitiveness, we were isolated from the rest of the organization. Our line was muddied, and filled with rightism, economism, "workerism", two-level work, and especially Latin-Bundism. We tried to build up a workers organization around the newspaper, but ended up failing, both as a real revolutionary newspaper, and as a workers organization.

In the wake of the struggle against Bundism and economism in our area, we analyzed the newspaper. One of the many problems we discovered was the combining and confusing of program and ideology. We have summed up that an intermediate workers organization (IWO) must be united around a program, not an ideology, and that it must be open at both ends, with communists working to increase the political understanding of other members of the IWO (and others as well) through the course of struggle.

We discovered that no matter how hard we tried, we could not put out a newspaper that was not a "marketplace of ideas" without uniting around a program and ideology, and as a result the local members of the IWO (and others as well) would come out of the struggle with a more primitive understanding of the world, and the struggle.

"What do we want?" is the basis for a newspaper, the "How do we get it?" is the program. We must make the party's program a living, breathing program, that is constantly being developed by the party and its workers. We must have clear, simple, consistent language, that is easy to understand, and easy to communicate. We must have a clear, consistent program, that is constantly being developed by the party and its workers. We must have clear, simple, consistent language, that is easy to understand, and easy to communicate. We must have a clear, consistent program, that is constantly being developed by the party and its workers.

We must make the party's program a living, breathing program, that is constantly being developed by the party and its workers. We must have clear, simple, consistent language, that is easy to understand, and easy to communicate. We must have a clear, consistent program, that is constantly being developed by the party and its workers. We must have clear, simple, consistent language, that is easy to understand, and easy to communicate. We must have a clear, consistent program, that is constantly being developed by the party and its workers.
Continued from page 10

local, regional, and national campaigns and work. What the paper prints would depend not so much on the task itself, though this may be a group of workers vs. my boss in my town. Wouldn't a...
I believe that the question of culture has been dealt with to some degree both mechanically and ideologically, in the DP, and talent document, as well as in the last journal article.

I think the sentiment of the journal article is correct in that we haven’t really understood the importance of the role of culture in building the revolutionary proletariat movement.

I don’t believe that the proletariat is taking culture home. And that comrades haven’t really grasped the concept of culture as a weapon to be used at a sharp edge.

I particularly agree that there has been a tendency to fall into seeing the forms (song, theatre, etc.) as a separate affair from the content (line), and along with that the attitude of “... but we’re only entertainers.”

I think that the journal article is correct to state that culture must be critical, politically honest unadulterated in the same way as we criticize and sharpen our other agitation.

But it does not point out the particular problems in developing culture at this time.

"Negative Results"

In the past most of our errors have come from not clearly seeing the correct relationship between theory and practice, and in some cases a failure of theory.

Mainly it has given rise to a situation where we have an incorrect orientation and class stand in culture. In many cases the situation has been to fall flat on our face, with the concept of "Culture is icing on the cake." Our approach has been to leave it to show who wants to do it, who feels it is a particular political task, and who wants to do what. Who wants to do it? Who would have the most fun? Of course not.

Yet this is what boils down to, what we are seeing. People just don’t seem to like culture the way they like things. A candle lit for themselves and gives the impression that our struggles are simple singing songs.

Another problem is that some comrades, myself included, have taken part in writing movement style, “in crowd” type of songs to get together/When we unite and fight back/We can drive out the trash. But the draft does not draw out enough the problems of explaining exactly "how" we develop culture in this way. We don’t talk about the culture we are doing to explain the process of taking culture to the working class.

Anyone who has been to a Prairie Fire performance knows the trouble of this. No one does all these because as the introduction to their book says, “songs... take a stand with the working class, point out the enemy... and an equal right at its rotten heart.” They help the masses to "sum up [their] own experience," and of course the struggle of struggle. They help the masses to "sum up [their] experience" and struggle. But the draft does not draw out enough the process of taking culture to the working class.

A problem that goes along with these errors, which in some cases is the same, is that the struggle to get the best comrades to do the work. There has been some subjectiveness around this and it comes from the ideology that anyone who wants to do it should do it. It means that not understanding that people with the best technical ability, along with class stand and a good grasp of theory, should be put forward. Understanding this is part of understanding the correct line on cultural work.

All these errors are self-indulgent. But where do they come from? From the bourgeoisie. They are not only general for the whole culture but also cultural workers. The bourgeoisie is an attitude where we have a particular attitude and other comrades.

Some Advancements

We have made some advancements in cultural work, but without a doubt our work is still not advanced enough to meet the need of the masses that it has originated. I think it means that taking culture to the working class is taking it home.

Therefore, the most important thing is that we must pay attention on the airs of a veteran for the masses and the play the "hero,... the more you try to peddle such stuff to the masses, the less likely they are to accept it. If you want the masses to understand you, if you want to be one with the masses, you must make up your mind to undergo a long and painful process of education.

The point of all this is struggle for correct orientation: struggle to develop an understanding of culture that will move the day to day struggles forward. I feel that if these questions and others are not brought out and resolved, the process will not be a mechanical process to culture. This is my criticism of the article in the last journal issue.

In the DP section on "Struggles Under Socialism," when we talk about culture we should speak to the fact that in that period we will resistively struggle with "established" culture to help develop an understanding of the working class. As Mao says, "Our literature and art workers must shift their stand; they must gradually move their feet over to the side of the workers through the process of going into the very midst of them.

I think that the DP’s internal documents could be developed further to present an understanding of culture. In the DP section on "Struggles Under Socialism," when we talk about culture we should speak to the fact that in that period we will resistively struggle with "established" culture to help develop an understanding of the working class. As Mao says, "Our literature and art workers must shift their stand; they must gradually move their feet over to the side of the workers through the process of going into the very midst of them.

It means not understanding that people had many years of practice, and has developed some skills to be able to pervert the forms developed by the bourgeoisie...

This understanding is correct, and must be deepened considerably. Not only the DP, but the whole document gives a good guide to what is wrong in the past tendancies, and is not enough to develop and develop cultural work. This is especially important as it is an essential part of the struggle, a part we cannot do without. "Culture is the weapon of the masses, a cultural army, which is absolutely indispensable for uniting our own ranks and defeating the enemy." And it is also especially important as it is a part of the struggle that we have not developed very far and which we have not greatly grasped as integral and necessary to the revolutionary struggle.

There have been attempts at developing cultural work in the past, but these have always been a part of a program—such as IWD, May Day, etc. And this approach has the advantage of giving it political guidance from the organization, as opposed to the independent guidance from different comrades involved based on their individual group of line.

This has been an important advance, yet there are still many weaknesses. The main strength is that we want to go about it as a political task, more than before. We understand, to a degree, that culture is not just something you add a lot of culture at a program to keep from getting too boring. But we have not yet developed as full a grasp as we need of culture as a weapon to advance and sharpen our struggle.

A large part of what we have yet to do is to root out the confusion of dealing with the question of audience.

These publications play a role in this struggle. These publications are primarily tools for advancing political work. They must be developed and advanced and adapted to the conditions of the masses, with its own bourgeois content, and its own bourgeois ideas about what constitutes culture anyway.

"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 ripping out the poisonous weeds of the bourgeoisie. This is an immediate task and cannot be put off until socialism, (DP, p.33)"

This understanding is correct, and must be deepened considerably. Not only the DP, but the whole document gives a good guide to what is wrong in the past tendencies, and is not enough to develop and develop cultural work. This is especially important as it is an essential part of the struggle, a part we cannot do without. "Culture is the weapon of the masses, a cultural army, which is absolutely indispensable for uniting our own ranks and defeating the enemy." And it is also especially important as it is a part of the struggle that we have not developed very far and which we have not greatly grasped as integral and necessary to the revolutionary struggle.

There have been attempts at developing cultural work in the past, but these have always been a part of a program—such as IWD, May Day, etc. This speaks to the question of audience. Of course it is important to have a particular task of audience, and this speaks to the question of audience. Of course it is important to have a particular audience, and it is not just a question of giving it political guidance from the organization, as opposed to the independent guidance from different comrades involved based on their individual group of line.

This has been an important advance, yet there are still many weaknesses. The main strength is that we want to go about it as a political task, more than before. We understand, to a degree, that culture is not just something you add a lot of culture at a program to keep from getting too boring. But we have not yet developed as full a grasp as we need of culture as a weapon to advance and sharpen our struggle.

A large part of what we have yet to do is to root out the confusion of dealing with the question of audience. These publications play a role in this struggle. These publications are primarily tools for advancing political work. They must be developed and advanced and adapted to the conditions of the masses, with its own bourgeois content, and its own bourgeois ideas about what constitutes culture anyway.

Question of Audience

The main way that culture is still taken up here is as part of a program—IWD, May Day, etc. This speaks to the question of audience. Of course it is important to have a particular task of audience, and it is not just a question of giving it political guidance from the organization, as opposed to the independent guidance from different comrades involved based on their individual group of line.

This has been an important advance, yet there are still many weaknesses. The main strength is that we want to go about it as a political task, more than before. We understand, to a degree, that culture is not just something you add a lot of culture at a program to keep from getting too boring. But we have not yet developed as full a grasp as we need of culture as a weapon to advance and sharpen our struggle.

A large part of what we have yet to do is to root out the confusion of dealing with the question of audience. These publications play a role in this struggle. These publications are primarily tools for advancing political work. They must be developed and advanced and adapted to the conditions of the masses, with its own bourgeois content, and its own bourgeois ideas about what constitutes culture anyway.
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we're looking for perfection, we aren't going to try shutting up the cultural workers in a hothouse. We have to rely on the masses. That time somebody had written a song and sang it at a party, asking for criticisms. They listened to what people thought, then went in another room and worked on it for a while. A week later, they came back and the line had immensely improved. But there were still some weaknesses, they asked for criticisms again. They essentially decided to start the song over. The line was probably correct, but the next one they wrote, they insisted on perfection before they would even lift any one heart. In summing it up, however, they feel that the first was much more correct—they had a much better basis for deciding what to do with the song when they took it to the masses and asked for criticism.

The point is, as Lenin says, "Think of the pressure exercised on the development of our painting, sculpture and architecture by the factories and mills of the socialist court, as well as by the same, the fancies of the aristocrats and bourgeoisie. In a society based on private property the artist produces goods for the market, he needs buyers. Our revolution has lifted the pressure of most of this proleptic state of affairs from the artists. It has made the Soviet State their patron and protector. Every artist, and everybody who wishes to, can claim the right to create freely according to his ideal, whether it turns good or not. And so you have the ferment, the experiment, the chaos.

"But of course we are Communists. We must not put our hands to the plow lest chaos foam at it as please. We must cautiously try to guide this development, to form and determine its results..."

"Art belongs to the people. It must have deep roots in the broad mass of workers. It must be understood and loved by them. It must be rooted in and grow within the realities of the new and developing proletarian culture..." (found by Clara Zetkin in Reminiscences of Lenin, International Publishers edition, p. 12, 13.)

This is the spirit of the latest document when it says "The Party must take this up as a key front in the class struggle, encouraging and guiding the growth of proletarian culture and, through its leading bodies, turn up experience in this field and develop and gain an army of cultural fighters." This is certainly correct, and this guidance must be based in understanding of the one Lenin makes in the Draft Resolution (first earlier reference), "Not special ideas, but Marxism." And the party must give leadership to cultural workers in this regard.

How Best To Do It?

But what we have to understand better is how this can best be done. The whole thrust of the DP and latest document around culture is that it is a necessary weapon in the overall revolutionary struggle. It is certainly correct to have a division of labor between cultural workers and other areas of work, but what bothers me is that the tendency in the past has been, even where the correct general guidance is given locally, to separate cultural work too much from the overall work.

Another point in Lenin's Draft Resolution is "Proletarian culture must be the logical development of the store of knowledge marxists have accumulated under the yoke of capitalist, landlord, and bureaucratic society. All these roads have been leading, and will continue to lead us to proletarian culture, the same way as political economy, as the science of truth, shared by Marx, has shown us what human society must arrive at, shown us the way to the class struggle, to the beginning of the proletarian revolution." Again, Article "One" in "On The Role of the Workers' Pajazas" in Journal No. 3 speaks to this when they say that "Workers' Pajazas are important because it is a question of creating the proletarian culture." This shows, the task is twofold—to expose the deception and class nature of them and sum them up from the people. We have already discussed the first part, but on the contrary, assimilated and fashioned everything of value in the more than two thousand years of the development of human thought and culture.

"In the spirit of revolution, in the spirit of the people who are fighting for their revolution..."

The sections of the DP on proletarian culture, on pages 11 and 33, don't really talk to the working class and tell them what proletarian culture is. Unless you're already a part of the class struggle, you don't really get the whole story. If you come from the class struggle, like Prairie Fire did in some of their articles, I think you would have more to say, then you'd be asking, 'so, what is proletarian culture?' Is it some whole new art form? What do you mean by that? Is it the exact opposite of bourgeois culture? Is it another of the culture that's around—is it all to be destroyed, or what? And in that context, you get the impression that what we have now is bourgeois culture, and that there is no unity between the existent bourgeois culture and our own. This is wrong. Within the existing culture lies the cultural work which have been ripped off and distorted by the bourgeoisie to turn it to their own interests. We want to build on these aspects and turn them into weapons against the bourgeoisie.

Comrade Mao speaks to this in "Talks at the Yenan Forum on Literature and Art" when he says, "We should take over the rich legacy and the good traditions of the rich cultural work there on that basis."

The only problem we clearly see is that a genuine knowledge and transformation of the culture created by the cultural workers in the past is needed, and we need to create a proletarian culture. The latter is not cutt-

out from thin air; it is not an invention of those who call themselves experts in proletarian culture. That is all nonsense. Proletarian culture must be the logical development of the store of knowledge marxists have accumulated under the yoke of capitalist, landlord, and bureaucratic society. All these roads have been leading, and will continue to lead us to proletarian culture, the same way as political economy, as the science of truth, shared by Marx, has shown us what human society must arrive at, shown us the way to the class struggle, to the beginning of the proletarian revolution.

"In the spirit of revolution, in the spirit of the people who are fighting for their revolution..."

The sections of the DP on proletarian culture, on pages 11 and 33, don't really talk to the working class and tell them what proletarian culture is. Unless you're already a part of the class struggle, you don't really get the whole story. If you come from the class struggle, like Prairie Fire did in some of their articles, I think you would have more to say, then you'd be asking, 'so, what is proletarian culture?' Is it some whole new art form? What do you mean by that? Is it the exact opposite of bourgeois culture? Is it another of the culture that's around—is it all to be destroyed, or what? And in that context, you get the impression that what we have now is bourgeois culture, and that there is no unity between the existent bourgeois culture and our own. This is wrong. Within the existing culture lies the cultural work which have been ripped off and distorted by the bourgeoisie to turn it to their own interests. We want to build on these aspects and turn them into weapons against the bourgeoisie.

"In the spirit of revolution, in the spirit of the people who are fighting for their revolution..."

The sections of the DP on proletarian culture, on pages 11 and 33, don't really talk to the working class and tell them what proletarian culture is. Unless you're already a part of the class struggle, you don't really get the whole story. If you come from the class struggle, like Prairie Fire did in some of their articles, I think you would have more to say, then you'd be asking, 'so, what is proletarian culture?' Is it some whole new art form? What do you mean by that? Is it the exact opposite of bourgeois culture? Is it another of the culture that's around—is it all to be destroyed, or what? And in that context, you get the impression that what we have now is bourgeois culture, and that there is no unity between the existent bourgeois culture and our own. This is wrong. Within the existing culture lies the cultural work which have been ripped off and distorted by the bourgeoisie to turn it to their own interests. We want to build on these aspects and turn them into weapons against the bourgeoisie.

"In the spirit of revolution, in the spirit of the people who are fighting for their revolution..."
We believe that the comrades who wrote Article "One" in the "Other Articles" section of the third journal are incorrect in not considering the contradiction between the bourgeois class and the proletariat as a fundamental contradiction of capitalism. We believe it is correct to speak of this contradiction as fundamental.

In "On Contradiction" (written in March 1949, in his "Report to the Third Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee, p.2, our emphasis), Mao states that Marx "discovered that the basic contradiction between the socialized character of productive force and the bourgeoisie is the fundamental into socialism. In his "Report to the Third Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee, p.2, our emphasis")

We think that the error of dividing working class youth from students is related to several errors in the section on students in the DP. The DP lays out the three important contradictions students make to the struggle for proletarian revolution:

1. Because they have the opportunity to study and work to the problems of society, many, especially in the course of struggles, tend to become middle-class intellectuals, join the party and take part in the new found weapons to the working class, which in grasping this science can change the world between the students as a group spread the struggle against imperialism and revolutionary fervor among the masses of people, as was the case with the civil rights and anti-war movements. And third, their struggles in themselves can not for the struggle for the monopoly capitalists. (p.47)

2. In the old period, when the working class did not have the power to take the lead, the primary role of students in aiding the struggle for proletarian revolution was to be Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought and to spread them to the Young Pioneers. But now the class will soon have its party, and it, more than any group of students, will be the main force bringing in and adding new forces to the Young Pioneers. As more and more it will be the workers who will come forward, out of struggle, to grasp MMLM, join the party, and take it out to their class.

Advancing the Struggle

We feel that the main role students will play is in advancing the struggle against imperialism, both spreading the struggle against imperialism and revolutionary fervor among the masses of people and in their own struggles "against the monopoly capitalists." It will be their struggle, not their ability to take MMLM home, that will be primary. We also must understand the importance of the struggles of students. The DP says that "the bourgeois higher education opened up something more... because it needed more managers, technicians, and professionals." (p.47) We, on the other hand, think that the struggle for socialism. This tendency was particularly strong in the '60s when the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat was most acute.

Furthermore, that contradiction remains fundamental into socialism. In his "Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventeenth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China," held in March 1945, our great leader Chairman Mao pointed out that after the victory of the Chinese Revolution, the basic contradiction of Chinese society was "the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie." (Three Major Struggles on China's Philosophical Front, written by the Revolutionary Mass Criticism Writing Group of the Party School under the CPC's Central Committee, p.2, our emphasis)

So, in summing up, we can see that Chairman Mao and the CPC think it correct to speak of the contradiction between the proletariat and bourgeois as the fundamental and basic contradiction of capitalism and socialism. It is correct because the root of all the contradictions, of all the struggles that go under capitalism and socialism, and that it is only the working class, the only thoroughly revolutionary class because in being the main socialized productive force the working class in direct opposition to the bourgeoisie and private accumulation can overthrow the bourgeoisie, resolve the contradiction between socialized production and private accumulation, and revolutionize the whole society.

Communists must grasp this truth and arm the working class with it. That is that the contradiction between the proletariat and bourgeoisie is at the root of all the contradictions, of all the struggles that go under capitalism and socialism, and that it is only the working class, the only thoroughly revolutionary class because in being the main socialized productive force the working class is in direct opposition to the bourgeoisie and private accumulation can overthrow the bourgeoisie, resolve the contradiction between socialized production and private accumulation, and all exploitation and oppression once and for all.

To deny that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is the fundamental contradiction, is, in the final analysis, to deny the leading role of the working class in the fight against all forms of oppression and to deny that the fundamental contradiction between socialized production and private accumulation will be solved by the proletariat overthrowing the bourgeoisie and then under socialism represing the bourgeoisie and carrying on the sharp struggle against the forces of bourgeois society.

To deny all this could lead to serious errors. Under capitalism it could lead to ideas that the working class is not key, that perhaps someone else will lead the fight for socialism. This tendency was particularly strong in the '60s when the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie was not pronounced.
Three

In describing the crises under capitalism (p. 1 of the DP and p. 9 of the latest document), it is essential that these crises themselves, the reasons they happen, why they lead to increased exploitation of the working class at home and expansion abroad, and why they intensify as history moves forward, be presented correctly. We can all agree that these developments are a function of the inherent laws of capitalism and are an inevitable part of its historical development. The incorrect view which is counterposed to this correct perspective is that the capitalists are just greedy. That they only want more for themselves. The logical conclusion of this is that they have choice and freedom as capitalists to decide how and to what extent they will exploit the working class and make profits for themselves. This line extended says that production, the economy and ultimately the historical development of capitalism is a function of the free will of the capitalists. This is pure and simple Kautskyism.

The DP and the latest document are essentially correct in their line on this question as it is comes down around fighting the attacks on the class at the point of production as principal or layoffs and UGCW work in that this is where the bourgeoisie will try to increase its profits in a crisis. The line is also correct in so far as it presents the principal aspect of monopoly abroad as seeking areas for investment as opposed to merely searching for new markets. But in the discussion of crises under capitalism there is uncertainty which if not sharpened will lead to Kautskyism in our work. The uncertainty is around the question of the falling rate of profit as the law behind the capitalists’ search for higher profits, increased exploitation of the working class, and the historical intensification of the crises under capitalism.

In the DP it says (p. 1): “Under the capitalist system, production only takes place if those who control production, the capitalists, can make profits from it. And they can make profits only by warning it out of the workers, and constantly pushing their wages down to the lowest level. Why do the wages of the workers have to be constantly pushed down to the lowest level? Is it because the capitalists are greedy and want more, more, more? No, it is because there is a falling rate of profit under capitalism and if they don’t keep up their profits, the falling rate of profit will catch up with them and they will lose out.” Further on in the DP the same problem arises: “Capital chased after the highest rate of profit, as surely as iron is drawn to a magnet—this is a law beyond anyone’s will, even the capitalists’ and it will continue in force so long as society is ruled by capital” (p. 11). Again the question arises, why is capital drawn to the highest rate of profit? Is it because there is a magnetic force between the two? No, it is because the capitalists are threatened by a falling rate of profit which spells their doom if they do not stay far ahead of it as possible. One aspect of the falling rate of profit, i.e., competition, and the crises of over-production, is correctly presented in this section of the DP. However, there is another aspect which is fundamental in the long term development of capitalism which ensures that each crisis, as it is faced by the bourgeoisie, sets the stage for a successively more intense crisis. This aspect lies in the relation between variable and constant capital. Variable capital (i.e., labor) creates value. Constant capital (i.e., tools, machines, raw materials, etc.) does not create value, but only adds all (raw materials) or a fraction (machines, etc.) of its own value to each product. As capitalism develops, production becomes increasingly constant capital intensive. There is great expansion in the productive forces, so the volume of profit grows, but there is a constant decline in the rate of profit, i.e., units of profit realized per unit of investment. The fundamental reason why crises under capitalism are not mere periodic ups and downs that can be patched up temporarily is because there is this falling rate of profit. In his book Political Economy, A. Leonidov says, “In order to save themselves from this tendency [the falling rate of profit], capitalists establish enterprises in backward countries where hands are cheaper, trying thus to increase their profits, to keep the rate of profit from falling” (p. 140). Leonidov further states that “the tendency toward a lower rate of profit still exists and exerts a powerful influence on the entire development of capitalism. This tendency toward a decrease in the rate of profit greatly sharpens the contradictions of capitalism. The capitalists try to counterbalance the falling off of the rate of profit by increasing the exploitation of the workers, which leads to a number of contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The fall in the rate of profit becomes the struggle within the camp of the capitalists.” (p. 139)

This same weakness in the explanation of the capitalists’ search for greater profits is found in the latest document. As was stated, the tasks ahead are correct and do not reflect a Kautskyist line, but the discussions of crises and crises of over-production are aspects but fundamentally the falling rate of profit pushes the capitalists to seek higher profits, expand abroad, and intensify the exploitation of the working class. To not be clear on this only sows confusion and eventually leads to Kautskyism, revisionism and reformism.