



Discussion Bulletin

Published by

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

14 Charles Lane, New York, N. Y. 10014

Vol. 29 No. 25
August 1971

CONTENTS

PAGE

JULY 25, 1971, LETTER FROM BILL MASSEY FOR THE PROLETARIAN ORIENTATION TENDENCY TO JACK BARNES A SERIOUS TENDENCY WHICH HAS ACTED SERIOUSLY DESERVES TO BE TREATED IN A SERIOUS MANNER AND RECEIVE ADEQUATE TIME TO PRESENT ITS VIEWS TO THE HIGHEST BODY OF THE PARTY, by Bill Massey for the Proletarian Orientation Tendency	3
JULY 30 LETTER FROM THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE TO BILL MASSEY	3
APPENDIX: CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PROLETARIAN ORIENTATION TENDENCY AND THE NATIONAL OFFICE COMRADE TUSSEY VERSUS THE PROLETARIAN ORIENTATION, by Bill Massey, Oakland/Berkeley Branch	5
IN REPLY TO "THIRD WORLD WORK AND A PROLETARIAN ORIENTATION," by Maxine Williams, Brooklyn Branch, New York Local	7
ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONS AND THE PARTY CRISIS, by the Communist Tendency	15
THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: AN INITIAL ASSESSMENT, by the Communist Tendency	26
	27
	29

Page 2 :

was blank in the
original bulletin

- Marty Dec 2013

JULY 25, 1971, LETTER FROM BILL MASSEY FOR
THE PROLETARIAN ORIENTATION TENDENCY
TO JACK BARNES

Comrade Jack Barnes
National Organizational Secretary
Socialist Workers Party
14 Charles Lane
New York, New York 11014

Comrade Barnes,

Enclosed is a letter concerning the amount of time being allotted to the reporter for the Proletarian Orientation Tendency in presenting the position of the Tendency under the Political Resolution at the Convention. We would request that the Political Committee take up this matter immediately either thru a meeting or a poll of its members. We would request that if the information in our letter is accurate concerning the fact that our reporter (for the Tendency's counter-resolution to the N. C. Draft Political Resolution) would only receive thirty-eight minutes to make a presentation of our position before the convention and not one hour or more (that is one hour and fifteen minutes) that the enclosed letter be then published as a contribution to the SWP Discussion Bulletins for the pre-convention discussion.

It is possible that there has been a misunderstanding and that the 38 minutes was not an accurate or serious proposal for the time we would be allotted in this matter, and that one hour or one hour and fifteen minutes is what our spokesperson will receive to give an adequate presentation of the position of our tendency. If this is the case then there would be no purpose served in publishing the enclosed letter in the Pre Convention Discussion Bulletins and we would ask that you file it along with

a copy of the letter telling us of the decision of the P. C. in granting our reporter the hour or hour and fifteen minutes for an adequate presentation of our views. However, we wish to make it clear, that unless this matter is cleared up prior to the end of the acceptance of contributions to the pre-convention discussion bulletins (and that we receive no less than one hour or one hour and fifteen minutes for our reporter's presentation) we want this printed as a contribution to the pre-convention discussion bulletins, for the information of the entire Party.

Let me restate the matter: If our spokesperson is denied the adequate time to present our views (the counter-resolution submitted by the Proletarian Orientation Tendency in opposition to the line of the N. C. Draft Political Resolution) to the Convention, and we consider anything less than one hour presentation time, to be inadequate; and if the decision on this matter, by the Political Committee, is to be delayed until after the close of the pre-convention discussion and the acceptance of contributions to the SWP Discussion Bulletins; then the attached letter is to be considered a contribution to the discussion and therefore printed in the SWP Discussion Bulletins for the information of the Party as a whole. In that event we would ask that this letter be also printed as an introduction to the attached (then constituted contribution to the pre-convention bulletin) letter. Thank you.

Comradely,
s/Bill Massey, Oakland-Berkeley Branch,
for the Proletarian Orientation Tendency.

Copy to: File

**A SERIOUS TENDENCY WHICH HAS ACTED SERIOUSLY
DESERVES TO BE TREATED IN A SERIOUS MANNER AND
RECEIVE ADEQUATE TIME TO PRESENT ITS VIEWS TO
THE HIGHEST BODY OF THE PARTY**

by Bill Massey for the Proletarian Orientation Tendency

It is the understanding of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency, whose interests I represent in this regard, that the spokesperson for our Tendency reporting our views before the SWP Convention to be held in Ohio in August, will receive only thirty-eight (38) minutes to make the presentation of the counter-resolution of our Tendency to the N.C. Draft Political Resolution. This is my opinion gathered in a telephone conversation with a spokesperson for the National Office of the Socialist Workers Party.

Let me first state, that this amount of time, which would be half the time allotted to the spokesperson for the N.C. Draft Political Resolution, is totally inadequate, as is any time less than one-hour.

To say that the Party protects the rights of a tendency, that is of organized political differences — and allows it to present its views to the pre-convention discussion and then to arbitrarily give it half of the time of the reporter for the N.C. Draft Political Resolution is, in my opinion, a violation of democratic procedure. During the pre-convention discussion and during the convention itself, the Party should bend over backwards in enforcing the democratic aspect of democratic centralism. In this concrete instance, we believe that the Party should give the

Proletarian Orientation Tendency equal time (or no less than one hour) with the reporter for the N.C. Draft Political Resolution, to present our views in an adequate manner. As Cannon stated in *Letters From Prison*, page 108, "Pre-convention and convention discussion should not be restricted to the policy of the NC; it should not be restricted at all." We feel that limiting the time of our presentation to less than one hour would be a serious restriction.

To give our Tendency less than equal time (or less than one hour) would be wrong for several reasons. (1) It would instill, if not reinforce the prejudice that minority views are not as important as what the NC says, therefore it is perfectly permissible to give them, in this case the Proletarian Orientation Tendency, "half time," (which is obviously not the same as "equal time") to present our views. (2) This in turn would instill the attitude that allowing a minority (the Proletarian Orientation Tendency) to speak is a mere formality instead of a vital part of Party democracy. (3) It might leave many comrades with the impression that the Convention, which is the highest body of the Party, did not get a chance to hear adequately and fairly all viewpoints and thus

did not get a chance to take a fair vote. In this regard it is well to keep in mind that what the Proletarian Orientation Tendency is asking for in this regard is a matter of twenty-two minutes (which would give our reporter one hour presentation time) or more adequately thirty-eight minutes (which would equal one hour and fifteen minutes or the same time that we understand the reporter for the NC Draft Political Resolution feels is needed to make an adequate presentation).

Cannon in *Letters from Prison* also stated:

... I am not of the opinion "that every discussion disturbs the Party." That is a slanderous echo of the petty-bourgeois opposition. To be sure, I am not very much in favor of kibitzing which leads to nothing but more of the same and drives serious workers away, and I am not very much in favor of pampering chronic kickers and windbags. But I am strongly in favor of full discussion which leads to a decision by the party whenever different viewpoints are presented in the proper season. The pre-convention period is the season. (page 108).

It is our opinion that it is the responsibility of the PC to assure a thorough political discussion prior to the convention discussion. This would naturally include the presentation of the resolution of the NC and the counter-resolution of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency. When the PC arbitrarily gives the Proletarian Orientation Tendency half the time it gives the NC Draft reporter, it is not assuring a thorough political discussion prior to the vote and is, in fact, implying that for the Proletarian Orientation Tendency, the presentation is not very important.

Let me state that we don't look upon this issue as a simply abstract one. Our tendency has conducted itself with regard to the Party in a serious manner and has fulfilled its responsibilities to the Party to the best of its abilities. There is concrete evidence of this, we think you will agree, in the following:

1. We notified the Party leadership of our intentions to submit our differences prior to the opening of the pre-convention discussion. In fact we notified the leadership, early enough for you, Comrade Barnes, to note that we had differences, in your report to the NC Plenum in mid-March of 1971 — some five months ago.

2. We put our ideas at the disposal of all the comrades of the Party at the very opening of the pre-convention discussion; we presented our criticisms of the NC Draft Political Resolution at a relatively early date in the discussion, for all comrades to see and take note; we fully spelled out what our orientation would mean in all areas of the Party's work, at a time that allowed for a full discussion in all the branches and in the pre-convention discussion bulletins. This we felt was how a serious tendency should act toward the Party.

3. Spokespersons for the Proletarian Orientation Tendency presented its views to most every Party Branch in the country. This included: the three branches in New York City; Boston; Philadelphia; Washington, D.C.; Atlanta; Cleveland; Detroit; Chicago; Minneapolis; Seattle; Portland; San Francisco; Oakland-Berkeley; Austin; Los Angeles; and Houston. Only two Party branches were omitted, and this was due to the expense and time of travel. We fulfilled

this responsibility not only to get our ideas out to the most comrades possible, but to provide the Party as a whole with a clear differentiation of the opposing views reflected in the NC Draft Political Resolution and the Proletarian Orientation Tendency. This we feel contributed to the seriousness with which comrades should treat the pre-convention discussions in our Party.

4. The majority of the material published in the pre-convention discussion bulletins has been devoted to the differences between the NC Draft Political Resolution and the Proletarian Orientation Tendency. This reflects not only how comrades look at the main questions before the Convention but it reflects what are the main questions before the Convention. This is not strange, since the Majority and the Proletarian Orientation Tendency are the only alternatives put forward in a serious manner for the consideration of the Party members. It is quite logical and just that the Convention agenda—with relation to the time allotted for the presentation of these differences—should reflect this concrete reality. To do less, would encourage an unserious attitude toward the Party and the pre-convention discussion. It would also be an injustice to our Tendency which took its responsibilities to the Party seriously and fulfilled them.

5. It is also a fact, that with the possible exception of seven comrades (in Boston) and one (in Oakland-Berkeley) the votes of the rest of the Party membership will be divided between the NC Draft Political Resolution and the counter-resolution put forward by the Proletarian Orientation Tendency. This again is not strange, since even at this late date of July 26th, no one—save possibly eight persons nationally—have been confronted with any other alternatives.

6. Furthermore, the strength of our ideas and the seriousness with which we have put them forward allows us to make a very safe estimate that some ninety (90) comrades nationally will vote for our line in their branches. This estimate is a modest figure if anything. This takes in at least 15 Party Branches. It includes members of both the Party and youth National Committees, members of several Branch executive committees, a goodly percentage of the Party's Third World cadre (15-20%), several former Branch organizers as well as youth organizers. The members of our tendency have, are and will be characterized as active participants in building both the Party and youth and participants in the movements of involvement for the Party. Not a few of these are outstanding examples in this regard, and have been for several years. The Proletarian Orientation Tendency has a real life in the Party and that as well as its ideas contribute to its being a serious tendency.

It is correct to say that democracy should be extended to every comrade or group of comrades with differences. However, it is also true, and thus a corollary to this, that democracy does not exist in the abstract but in the concrete. A serious Tendency, that treats the Party as well as its ideas, with seriousness should be extended the time necessary to present its views to the highest body of the Party and not treated like an unserious group of, to use Cannon's terms, "chronic kickers and windbags" who fail either to get their views to the Party or take the norms and traditions (in addition to the comrades) of the Party seriously.

It is not only in the interests of the Party but also of

its co-thinkers everywhere, that our Party puts a high priority on the democratic aspect of our dialectical organizational method of democratic centralism. To limit the presentation of our reporter in the Political resolution discussion to 38 minutes or less than at least one hour, would not only be a mockery it would be cause for scandal. It would make any pronouncements that we would make to our co-thinkers, seem like empty rhetoric marked "Made in the U.S. for Shipment Abroad." Further it would not only cause an unserious attitude toward fulfilling the responsibilities of democracy but it would impair the centralist side of our concepts also.

If a Tendency treats the Party in a serious manner, as our Tendency has done, it deserves serious treatment from the Party also. It is on this basis that the Party after it has voted for its positions is able to exert its moral influence in its expectation, that every comrade to the person, carry out these decisions in a disciplined manner until the next convention.

The members of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency will in the future as we have in the past, act in a loyal and disciplined manner toward the Party; we are Leninists and put no conditions on our Party patriotism. However, we are aware that the type of treatment, reflected in the 38-minute-type proposal, will undermine the Leninist concept of democratic centralism, which we pride ourselves on.

The restriction on our rights, and that is what the 38-minutes-type proposal (or any allotment of time less than one hour or one hour and fifteen minutes) would be, could only create not only in the minds of the members of our Tendency but in the minds of the Party members as a whole, a cynicism toward democratic centralism itself. This situation is not our creation and therefore we cannot take responsibility for its adjustment—we seek to change the minds of the PC members in order to avoid this type of situation.

Comrades will travel thousands of miles to participate in the decisions of this convention, we believe these decisions are of historic importance, therefore we feel that the presentations of the different points of view contained in the NC Draft Political Resolution and the counter-resolution of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency should be allowed adequate time to develop their alternate lines in a complete and comprehensive manner. To deny this would be a ludicrous injustice not only to the members of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency but the Party

as a whole, as well as the International. When you realize that what we are asking for is an additional 38 minutes (added on to the proposed 38 minutes) our request is not only fair but in the best interests of the Party. In that the Convention of the Party is once every two years and that it is our highest body—we feel our request is in order.

When you also realize that the Convention schedule could well withstand this minor change, especially since several days at the end of the convention have been set aside for an educational conference. Though important, this educational conference still takes a secondary position with regard to our Convention and its working out of our differences in coming to our decisions.

We of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency ask that the Political Committee meet and discuss this matter, taking seriously the information and views put forward in this letter. On that basis we request that they make the necessary adjustment. This would give the entire Party represented at the Convention, a chance to hear an adequate presentation of our views put forward in an adequate fashion before our Party's highest body. If the Party did not consider Conventions important enough to allow adequate presentations of ideas and differences—the federated mail-in your vote procedure of Burnham, I believe, would be most sensible. But since we rejected that un-Leninist fancy, I believe we must have an adequate presentation of the differences to aid the discussion and the decisions coming out of it.

Finally we state that thirty-eight minutes or anything less than at least one hour for the presentation of our report on our counter-resolution, would be inadequate.

We further request that this decision be made as soon as possible so as to allow our reporter to prepare the presentation before the last minute. We assume that the reporter for the NC Draft Political Resolution already has a good idea of how much time will be allotted for that presentation and thus has ample time to prepare that document's presentation. We of the Proletarian Orientation would like the same ability to prepare. Not knowing whether to prepare an inadequate-to-begin-with thirty-eight minute presentation (which is impossible to cover the material) or to prepare an hour-and-fifteen minute presentation is a serious disadvantage to the ideas that the comrade will be representing. We hope that the Political Committee will act in a responsible manner in this regard.

July 26, 1971

JULY 30 POLITICAL COMMITTEE LETTER TO BILL MASSEY

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
July 30, 1971

OAKLAND-BERKELEY
Bill Massey

Dear Comrade Massey,

The Political Committee, at its meeting today, considered your letter of July 25 on behalf of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency and the July 26 document "A Serious Tendency Which Has Acted Seriously Deserves to be Treated in a Serious Manner and Receive Adequate Time to Present Its Views to the Highest Body of the

Party." This letter is in reply to several of the points raised in those two documents.

You ask the Political Committee to guarantee that the reporter for the Proletarian Orientation Tendency under the point on the Political Resolution at the convention receive at least one hour for the presentation of your position. The Political Committee can not make such a guarantee.

The Political Committee only makes a recommendation to the preconvention plenum of the National Committee, which meets shortly before the convention, concerning the time to be allotted to various reporters under the different points on the agenda. The National Committee

then considers this recommendation, making any modifications it desires, and submits its own recommendation to the convention. The delegates to the convention make the final decision on the question of the apportionment of time to different reporters, as they do on all questions before the convention.

Thus, the Political Committee cannot guarantee what you ask of it. Consequently, according to your instructions, your letter and document are being placed in the *Discussion Bulletin*, together with this reply. In your letter, speaking for the Proletarian Orientation Tendency, you refer to the correspondence between the leaders of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency and the national office prior to the convention. We are reprinting, in an appendix, that correspondence for the information of the party.

The tradition of our party is that when there is a political division, the amount of time allotted for the reporter of a minority position compared to the time allotted to the majority reporter is not strictly proportional to the strength of the minorities as opposed to the majority. In order to provide an opportunity for minorities to present their views, more time is generally given minority reporters than would be the case on a strictly proportional basis. When the convention delegates have deemed it appropriate, equal time has been granted to minority reporters. In some instances, such reporters have been given less than equal time by the convention delegates, when this was in their opinion warranted by the concrete circumstances.

Until a few weeks ago, it appeared there would be only one minority report. However, at that time the supporters of *For A Proletarian Orientation* split into two groups, the Proletarian Orientation Tendency and the Communist Tendency. The convention may thus be confronted with three counterposed positions: a political resolution backed by a large percentage of delegates and two counterresolutions each backed by a separate minority grouping of elected delegates.

In the case of more than one minority on a given point, it has been party practice to divide among the reporters for the minorities no more time than that of the majority reporter.

This procedure is indicated for two reasons. 1) If each minority were to receive time equal to the majority reporter, then the majority would receive a minority of the time. When there is a clear majority this would mean that the democratic rights of the majority were being violated.

2) If each minority were to receive time equal to the majority reporter, this would make the ratio of time allotted to reporters compared to that allotted to the elected delegates out of balance. It must not be forgotten that the convention is above all a meeting of the elected delegates, who must have the opportunity to present their positions and fully participate in the discussion before deciding upon all the issues facing the party. There is much more before the party convention than the debate with either the Proletarian Orientation Tendency or the Communist Tendency. The delegates must make decisions under eleven major agenda points.

In your letter and document you allude to the problem which the split in your grouping has placed before the convention, but do not directly name or discuss the Communist Tendency. However when you state that "with the possible exception of seven comrades (in Boston) and

one (in Oakland-Berkeley) the votes of the rest of the party membership will be divided between the NC Draft Political Resolution and the counterresolution put forward by the Proletarian Orientation Tendency," we assume that these eight comrades (by your estimation) you are referring to are in fact the Communist Tendency.

If we understand you correctly, you imply that the Communist Tendency is not serious, and that its reporters should receive no time or perhaps little time, on this basis. You claim that you are serious in contrast to them. Should the majority of delegates determine how much time should be allotted to your tendency on the sole basis of how "serious" they think you are? Your notion of "seriousness" cannot be the basis for the division of time among reporters for the two minorities.

One of the arguments you advance for the "seriousness" of your tendency is that it has the support of members of the National Committee and of branch executives, and that it will receive (you predict) the support of a minimum of 90 members. Would you consider a tendency of 40 comrades composed of rank-and-file members only "not serious" and restrict its time accordingly?

You talk about democracy and the rights of minority views to be heard. You say that if the convention delegates should give your reporter less than an hour this would mean making a "mockery" of party democracy and would constitute a "scandal." This would not give the convention "the chance to hear adequately and fairly all viewpoints" and would prevent the convention from taking "a fair vote," you charge. It would "instill the attitude that allowing a minority (the Proletarian Orientation Tendency) to speak is a mere formality instead of a vital part of party democracy."

But what about time for the reporter for the Communist Tendency? Would you make your decision on the basis of how "serious" the Communist Tendency considered its "real life in the party... as well as its ideas"? What about the democratic rights of *another* minority than your own?

Perhaps we have misunderstood your argument. Perhaps you are requesting equal time for your reporter and equal time for the Communist Tendency reporter giving the combined minority reporters double the time of the majority reporter. We have already explained that this would be a violation of the democratic rights of the majority and of the delegates as a whole.

You assert that the democracy of the convention hinges upon the single question of how much time your reporter receives. This is absurd. There has been a record number of *Discussion Bulletin* articles printed for this convention. The *Discussion Bulletin* was open to every contribution your supporters cared to make. There was full discussion in all the branches, including presentations by reporters for the Proletarian Orientation Tendency wherever you chose to send one. We are sure the convention will grant your reporter appropriate time to present the views of your tendency before the convention, relative to the reporter for the majority and for the Communist Tendency, if it should be represented by delegates to the convention.

It is the responsibility of the delegates to insure that democratic procedures are followed throughout the convention. This includes, but is not limited to, guarding the democratic rights of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency. It also includes guarding the democratic rights of the Communist Tendency, the democratic rights of the major-

ity, and the democratic rights of the convention delegates as a whole.

Your entire letter reveals a conception of party organization alien to the party's principles of democratic centralism. For example, you say that the concept that "minority views are not as important as what the NC says" is a "prejudice." That is not a "prejudice," it is a fact. The positions of the National Committee, the democratically elected leadership of the party between conventions, are binding party policy until and unless they are altered by the national convention. This does not prevent comrades from giving critical views the attention they deserve.

You make the charge that if the reporter for the Proletarian Orientation Tendency receives less than one hour for his or her presentation, it would "make any pronouncements that we would make to our co-thinkers, seem like empty rhetoric marked 'Made in the U.S. for Shipment Abroad.'" This is a slanderous and false accusation. The convention delegates will make their decision on this question in accordance with the SWP's democratic centralist principles—principles which the SWP has always affirmed and defended in relation to our co-thinkers in other countries as well as to its own functioning.

You go so far as to warn the party that if your demand for a minimum of at least one hour reporting time should be rejected by the delegates this "would impair the centralist side of our concepts." You contend this would prevent the party—after the convention delegates have made their decisions—from being "able to exert its moral influence in its expectation, that every comrade to the person, carry out these decisions in a disciplined manner until the next convention." This is an erroneous assumption on your part.

It will not be clear until the branch votes are taken whether the Communist Tendency will win any delegates or not, nor will it be clear how many delegates the Proletarian Orientation Tendency will get. When this information is available, the Political Committee will make further recommendations to the National Committee plenum.

Comradely,

/s/Jack Barnes
for the Political Committee

cc: Barbara Gregorich
Communist Tendency

APPENDIX

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PROLETARIAN ORIENTATION TENDENCY AND THE NATIONAL OFFICE

Cleveland, Ohio
August 19, 1970

stood, in general terms, what actions constitute the formation of a tendency and what the rights and duties of a tendency are.

Jack Barnes
National Organizational Secretary
New York, New York

Comradely,
s/Barbara Gregorich

* * *

Dear Comrade Barnes,

873 Broadway
New York, N. Y. 10003
August 27, 1970

I plan to write a document for the next party convention. The document will be on the question of sending comrades into the industrial working class.

Barbara Gregorich
CLEVELAND

In regard to this document, I assume that the following actions are correct procedure: (1) corresponding with other comrades on the question, (2) circulating a rough draft of the document to some comrades before the 90-day-discussion period begins in order to submit the best-thought-out document at the very beginning of the discussion period.

Dear Comrade Gregorich,

Re your letter to Jack Barnes of August 19:

Jack is presently on vacation. The letter will be brought to his attention upon his return.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that these actions will constitute the formation of a tendency. The duties of this tendency, as defined by the 1965 Organizational Bulletin, are to engage in ". . . a principled collective effort to argue for a change in the given policy. . . ." and to ". . . present its views openly before the whole party in a responsible and disciplined manner."

* * *

Comradely,
s/Joel Britton

873 Broadway
2nd floor south
New York, N. Y. 10003

Please let me know whether or not I have correctly under-

September 21, 1970

CLEVELAND

Dear Comrade Gregorich,

I'm sorry for the delay in answering your letter of August 19. It was occasioned by the fact I was on vacation.

In response to your letter of August 19 requesting clarification of correct party procedure in the formation of an organized tendency and the rights and duties thereof:

There is little I can add to the rather detailed elaboration of party principles and practices embodied in the resolution adopted by the 1965 convention of the Socialist Workers Party on "The Organizational Character of the SWP," from which you quote part of one sentence.

I can find no sanction in our organizational principles or practices for authorizing a selective discussion prior to our regular pre-convention discussion period. To the contrary, I call your attention to the section on "Factionalism and Party Unity," from which you quote, on page 11, paragraph 2, which states:

"Concentration on private discussions of disputed issues, on the other hand, tends to give the comrades involved a one-sided view and warps their capacity for objective political judgement. Inexperienced comrades especially are made the target of such lopsided discussion methods. The aim is to line them up quickly in a closed caucus, and prejudice their thinking before they have heard an open party debate. When dissident views are introduced into the party in that manner groupings tend to form and harden, and the dissenting views tend to assert themselves in disruptive fashion, before the party as a whole has had a chance to face and act on the issues in dispute."

Furthermore, the sentence from which you quote refers specifically to "ideological" tendencies. You say you plan to write a document for the next party convention dealing with "the question of sending comrades into the industrial working class." Fine. I believe the party can profit from such a discussion conducted in accordance with our organizational norms.

However, the bare statement of the subject upon which you plan to write does not constitute a proper basis for the formation of an "ideological tendency." Whether or not your views on the subject are a valid basis for the formation of an organized tendency will be determined in the course of the discussion itself. To my knowledge no authoritative party body nor any party leader in the center, proposes to revise, let alone, abandon, our basic proletarian orientation.

It is your right to believe otherwise and to try and convince the party that you are right. But that question can best be determined in an organized discussion conducted "openly before the whole party in a responsible and disciplined manner."

Comradely yours,
s/Jack Barnes
Organization Secretary

* * *

Cleveland, Ohio
October 4, 1970

Jack Barnes
Organizational Secretary
New York, New York

Dear Comrade Barnes,

In response to your letter of 9-21-70, let me assure you that I have no intention of proceeding in the factional manner described in your quote from the 1965 Organizational bulletin. I intend neither to engage in discussions behind the back of the party, nor to draw new comrades into discussion of "disputed issues." Nor do I have any intention to "line up quickly" comrades on my views before the party convention. On the contrary, my views were openly expressed in the document which Comrade Passen and I submitted to the last party convention. And it is precisely because I am concerned with how to proceed in a correct manner that I wrote to you.

After assuring you that I want to proceed only in a manner which is consistent with the best interests of the party, let me say that I am afraid I was not precise enough in my letter of 8-19-70. In that letter I told you that I felt it was correct to: (1) correspond with other comrades on the question of sending young comrades into the industrial working class, and, (2) circulate a rough draft of the document to some comrades before the 90-day discussion period began in order to submit the best-thought-out document to the party. Your answer to this, it seems to me, is: "I can find no sanction in our organizational principles or practices for authorizing a selective discussion prior to our regular pre-convention discussion period." I did not mean to imply that I was going to begin a "selective discussion" period with dozens of comrades. My formulation was vague. The error was mine and I apologize for it.

Specifically, I intend to collaborate with five other comrades on the writing of a document. These five comrades are, of course, already in agreement with the document that Comrade Passen and I submitted to the last party convention. They feel, as I do, that another document on the subject is in order. We wish to collaborate, as I said, in order to submit the best-thought-out document to the party convention. The actual writing of the document will certainly be done by more than myself, and all who help to write it will sign their names to it. Just as Comrade Passen and I worked together last year on the document we submitted, so I wish to work together with these five comrades this year. I cannot believe that the fact that we do not live in the same city makes it incorrect for us to collaborate — via correspondence — in the writing of a document. I hope that this clarifies my intentions on procedure. If you believe that the party's organizational principles forbid this collaboration, please let me know why.

Comradely,
s/Barbara Gregorich

* * *

Cleveland, Ohio
October 5, 1970

Farrell Dobbs
National Secretary
New York, New York

Dear Comrade Dobbs,

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I wrote to Comrade Barnes, his reply, and my reply. I am enclosing these three items so that you will better understand my reasons for writing to you.

For the 1969 SWP Convention I helped to write a document on the question of sending some young comrades into the industrial working class. Events have since then further convinced me, among others, of the necessity of the party's doing this at this time. However, since the party leadership has not, to my knowledge, expressed itself formally on this question, I do not have the advantage of knowing the leadership's position. Perhaps the party leadership agrees with the document. But until the party leadership expresses itself on this question, I am reduced to inferring what it thinks. *Certainly it is not in the best interests of the party that in the forthcoming convention documents are based on inferences.*

Therefore, I would like to request clarification from you on what the thinking of the national leadership is on the question of sending young comrades into the industrial working class. Specifically, what is your thinking, and/or the thinking of other leading comrades, on the following:

- 1) In order for our party to win the leadership of the industrial proletariat, is it necessary for us to send some comrades into the industrial proletariat?
- 2) If it is necessary, what conditions must exist before we will consider such a policy on a national level?
- 3) If it is not necessary, by what method do we expect to win the leadership of the industrial proletariat?

In concluding, I wish to express the following: I hope that you regard this letter and the questions in it as a *request for clarification* of the party's attitude and not as any attempt whatsoever to begin "selective discussion." The only way I know what the party leadership thinks is by asking it or by reading its statements. If there is a written party statement on this question, please refer me to it.

Comradely,
s/Barbara Gregorich

* * *

873 Broadway
2nd Floor South
New York, N. Y. 10003
October 27, 1970

CLEVELAND
Barbara Gregorich

Dear Comrade Gregorich,

Your letter of October 5 arrived while I was away from the National Office; hence the delay in my reply.

In response to your inquiry let me refer you to recent documents setting forth the party's approach to changing trends within the working class, presented in the context of the overall objective situation. These include the political resolution adopted by the 1969 party convention, published in the November-December 1969 *ISR*; also the political reports to the 1969 party convention and the February 1970 plenum of the National Committee, both published in the July 1970 *Internal Information Bulletin*.

The point you raise about "sending some young comrades into the industrial working class" is a tactical matter. Whether or not a given comrade will be sent into industry is determined by the party on the basis of the specific circumstances in each individual case.

Comradely,
s/Farrell Dobbs
National Secretary

* * *

Cleveland Heights, Ohio
March 16, 1971

Jack Barnes
New York, New York

Dear Comrade Barnes,

We understand that the SWP 1971 Convention will begin on August 8. We would like to know the following things regarding pre-convention discussion:

- 1) Assuming that May 8 will be the first day of pre-convention discussion, if we submit our document to the National Office by April 26, will the document be printed and distributed to the branches by May 8? (The document will be about 50 single-spaced pages.)

If this is not sufficient time for the N. O. to print and distribute the document by May 8, when should we submit the document in order to have it out for the full 90-day discussion period?

If pre-convention discussion opens earlier than May 8, please let us know when it opens and when we should have the document in.

- 2) We feel that our document, which will call for the SWP to send comrades into the industrial trade unions, is a clear alternative to present party policy. For that reason, we would like to submit our documents for a vote by the Convention. Is this correct procedure?

Comradely,
s/Barbara Gregorich

* * *

14 Charles Lane
New York, N. Y. 10014
March 22, 1971

CLEVELAND

Dear Comrade Gregorich,

In response to the two points in your letter of March 16.

1) The March 13-16 plenum of the national committee decided to open the pre-convention discussion on May 1.

The national office staff is already at work preparing four initial resolutions and several plenum reports to submit to the pre-convention discussion. The comrades responsible for preparing these items for printing and mailing inform me that if your document arrives here by April 2, they are confident it can be fully prepared, submitted to the printers and mailed out to the branches for circulation with the national committee resolutions.

2) It might be useful to the pre-convention discussion for you to indicate at the beginning of your document your intention, if I understand your letter correctly, to submit this document as a line resolution to the party. The proposal for a convention vote on the general line of a document can be made to the convention by any delegate supporting such a document.

Comradely,
s/Jack Barnes
Organization Secretary

* * *

Cleveland Heights, Ohio
March 31, 1971

Jack Barnes
National Organizational Secretary
New York, New York

Dear Comrade Barnes,

I am sending the enclosed document air mail special delivery so that you will receive it by April 2. It has been triple spaced, as you requested.

We would like to request that in the printing of our document, the long quotes be typed as we have typed them — indented, block formation. This will make it immediately obvious to comrades who are reading the document whether they are reading something we have to say or something somebody else had to say.

Comradely,
s/Barbara Gregorich

* * *

14 Charles Lane
New York, N. Y. 10014
April 5, 1971

CLEVELAND
Barbara Gregorich

Dear Comrade Gregorich,

This is to acknowledge receipt on April 5 of the document "For a Proletarian Orientation" signed by you, Bill

Massey, John McCann and Phil Passen.

You will note minor editing and the deletion of one sentence for security considerations. This affects in no way the general line of the document.

Comradely,
s/Jack Barnes
Organization Secretary

* * *

Cleveland Heights, Ohio
April 26, 1971

Jack Barnes
National Organization Secretary
New York, New York

Dear Comrade Barnes,

In the forthcoming pre-convention discussion in the branches, we (the authors of "For a Proletarian Orientation") would like to present an argument in favor of our document to any branch that would like to hear us. Thus we intend to write to the organizers of the various branches to tell them that we are willing to speak on our document.

Unless we hear otherwise from you, we assume that this is correct procedure during a pre-convention discussion.

Comradely,
s/Barbara Gregorich

* * *

14 Charles Lane
New York, N. Y. 10014
May 3, 1971

CLEVELAND
Barbara Gregorich

Dear Comrade Gregorich,

It is unusual for the authors of an article submitted to the pre-convention discussion bulletin to ask the national office what the correct procedure is to inform the branches that spokespersons for their article are available. This request in your letter of April 26 and the character of your co-authored document, raises several questions that must be clarified.

Does this mean that the authors consider the document "For A Proletarian Orientation" a counter-resolution to the political resolution submitted to the pre-convention discussion by the National Committee? Do the authors consider themselves part of a tendency or a faction? Is the platform of the tendency or faction the document "For a Proletarian Orientation?"

Comradely,
s/Jack Barnes
Organization Secretary

cc: Bill Massey — Oakland-Berkeley
John McCann — Boston
Phil Passen — Cleveland

* * *

Cleveland Heights, Ohio
May 7, 1971

Jack Barnes
Organization Secretary
New York, New York

Dear Comrade Barnes,

In regard to your letter of 5-3-71, *we* do not consider it "unusual" to ask the national office "what the correct procedure is." The history of the SWP is fraught with examples of comrades who had political differences with the party leadership but who did not proceed correctly in presenting their differences. It seems to us that the splits, expulsions, cliques, unprincipled combinations, etc., in the party's history clearly point to the necessity of anybody with political differences to *proceed correctly*. Political differences must be discussed, argued, and voted on as such—those with political differences must proceed correctly in order to keep the discussion on the *political differences*, not on incorrect organizational procedures.

While the party has "how to" articles on *Militant sales*, branch finances, press conferences, etc., we do not have any such compiled information on how to proceed with political differences. Yet the questions of which path the party shall take, which program the party shall have, which tasks the party shall set for itself are the most important of all questions. It is the over-riding importance of these questions that heightens the necessity of proceeding correctly in presenting political differences. Because we want to proceed correctly and because there are no clear examples or instructions on how to do so, we must, when we are uncertain *ask* somebody how to proceed. It does not strike us as "unusual" that we end up asking the national office. It does strike us as strange, however, that instead of receiving an answer, we receive a series of questions.

In regard to the first of your three questions, we, the authors of "For a Proletarian Orientation," consider our document an alternative political line to the NC's political resolution. In her letter of 3-16-71 Comrade Gregorich said that we view our document as "a clear alternative to present party policy." We feel that the line presented in our document should be accepted by the party. Since this is a different political line than that in the NC's political resolution, we feel that comrades cannot vote for both of these documents at the same time. If this is what you mean by the term "counter-resolution," then we consider our document a counter-resolution.

Your second question is: "Do the authors consider themselves part of a tendency of faction?" When Comrade Gregorich wrote to you on 8-19-70, informing you of a forthcoming document on the question of sending comrades into the industrial proletariat, you responded (9-21-70): "Whether or not your views on the subject are a valid basis for the formation of an organized tendency *will be determined in the course of the discussion itself.*"

(our emphasis) Discussion is, at this point, less than seven days old. Moreover, we have not yet heard what the party leadership has to say to our call for a proletarian orientation.

It is, in our opinion, most likely that the discussion will reveal that a tendency should be formed. However, if and when we issue a call for the formation of a tendency, we shall issue it through the normal channels of pre-convention discussion, not in secret.

Let us assure you, once again, as Comrade Gregorich did in her letter of 10-4-70, that *we are not a faction and do not intend to proceed in a factional manner*. Why do you *insist* upon dragging the term "faction" into our correspondence? Such continual implications on the part of one in your position can only harm the party. Every time you publish correspondence in which you imply we might be a faction you indirectly encourage the readers of that correspondence to judge us on what we might be rather than on our political ideas. In an answer to Pivert, Trotsky wrote: "Patience and loyalty toward the opposition were among the most important traits of Lenin's leadership." and, "From the standpoint of Bolshevik ideas on party democracy I would consider it *an outright scandal to accuse an opponent, who happened to be in the minority, of employing 'factional' methods, instead of engaging in discussion with him over the gist of the question.*" (our emphasis)

In regard to your last question, if and when a call for the formation of a tendency is issued, the tendency's platform might be around one single document ("For a Proletarian Orientation") *or* around several documents—this is part and parcel of "letting the discussion decide."

We hope we have answered your questions. We would appreciate a quick response to our original question since we would like to write to the branches as soon as possible.

If you have published your letter of 5-3-71, we would like you to publish this reply.

Comradely,
s/Barbara Gregorich
Bill Massey
John McCann
Phil Passen

* * *

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
May 11, 1971

CLEVELAND
Barbara Gregorich

Dear Comrade Gregorich,

This is in response to your letter of May 7, 1971.

You misunderstood the first sentence of my letter of May 3, 1971. What was unusual about your request of April 26, 1971, was not the fact that you sought information on

party procedure but your desire to send to the branches representatives to speak for the resolution "For a Proletarian Orientation."

While there is no general rule governing such requests it has been our experience that only when tendencies or factions are engaged in organized political struggle around an alternative line or platform that the request to send speakers to party branches is made.

You will recall in earlier correspondence prior to the drafting of "For a Proletarian Orientation," I pointed out that "the bare statement of the subject upon which you plan to write does not constitute a proper basis for the formation of an 'ideological tendency'." Later when you raised the question of a Convention vote on your document I wrote you "It might be useful to the pre-convention discussion for you to indicate at the beginning of your document your intention, if I understand your letter correctly, to submit this document as a line resolution to the party." You did not respond to this.

Before informing the branches of your desire to send representatives of your grouping to their meetings, it was important that the questions I raised in my letter of May 3, 1971, be clarified. The branches should know as clearly as possible to what end and on what basis you wish to present this counterresolution to them. This is for clarity to which the membership as a whole is entitled, and to maximize concentration on political issues by avoiding organizational confusion and minimizing cause for grievances.

The constitution requires only that the national office print and circulate to the membership all written contributions to the pre-convention discussion. However, in order to facilitate the fullest opportunity for you to present your views to the party, and for the party to have the fullest political discussion, we are sending the enclosed letter to the branches. Please note the procedures outlined in it.

Comradely,
s/Jack Barnes
Organization Secretary

enc.

cc: Massey — Oakland-Berkeley, McCann — Boston,
Passen — Cleveland

* * *

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
May 11, 1971

TO ALL BRANCHES

Dear Comrades,

The authors of "For a Proletarian Orientation" have informed the national office that they consider that document a resolution containing an alternative political line to the National Committee political resolution. They would like to present an argument in favor of their counter-

resolution to any branch that would like to hear it.

If a branch wants to arrange for such a presentation they should write the national office. We will inform Comrade Gregorich of this request and she will communicate to the organizer the time of arrival of the representative.

The form, timing, and time limitations of the presentation is up to the branch. It can be a presentation to the branch by the representative of the Gregorich grouping or be in the form of a political debate.

All expenses for such a trip are to be paid by the Gregorich grouping, not the branch.

Comradely,
s/Jack Barnes
Organization Secretary

Cleveland Heights, Ohio
July 6, 1971

Jack Barnes
National Organization Secretary
New York, New York

Dear Comrade Barnes,

Enclosed is "Declaration of Proletarian Orientation Tendency," which I want to submit for publication in the SWP discussion bulletin.

Since we would like this declaration to be available to all branch members as quickly as possible in order to develop the most clarity in the pre-convention discussion, we request that *in addition to* publishing the declaration in the discussion bulletins, the National Office inform the branches that a tendency has been formed.

Comradely,
s/Barbara Gregorich

* * *

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
July 8, 1971

TO ALL ORGANIZERS AND NC MEMBERS

Dear Comrades,

Attached is a letter from Comrade Gregorich and a "Declaration of Proletarian Orientation Tendency" which we received today.

The branch would be informed of the "Declaration of Proletarian Orientation Tendency." It will appear in the next *Discussion Bulletin*.

Comradely,
s/Barry Sheppard
for the Administrative Committee

* * *

14 Charles Lane
New York, N. Y. 10014
July 22, 1971

Fernando Guerrero
Hilda Rangel de Guerrero
Froben Lozada

Dear Comrades,

We received the "counter draft resolution" titled "Third World Work and a Proletarian Orientation" signed by yourselves and Comrade Paul Boutelle.

We informed Comrade Boutelle that we had received the resolution, that it was about to go into the *Discussion Bulletin* and we needed to indicate in the *Bulletin* what resolution your resolution was counter to (we assumed it was counter to the Political Committee's resolution "The Struggle for Chicano Liberation"). We also had to indicate whether or not your resolution was being submitted simply by the four authors or whether it was a resolution of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency.

Comrade Boutelle told us that he had not seen the final draft of "Third World Work and a Proletarian Orientation." He said he was expecting a copy in the mail but it had not arrived. He also said he had not yet had a chance to read the Political Committee resolution on the Chicano struggle. He said he did not want this counter resolution submitted to the *Bulletin* with his name on it until he had a chance to read the P. C. resolution and your counter-resolution to see which he agreed with. He also indicated that he had been unclear as to whether or not it would be proper for him to sign your resolution with the understanding that he was indicating agreement only with ideas expressed in the sections that dealt with the Black struggle and our Black work, as he was not sure about our Chicano work and the Chicano struggle.

Comrade Boutelle now has the manuscript and he has informed us that he is in communication with you.

To avoid any possible further misunderstandings, we are asking each author to 1) inform us in writing that the use of his or her name has been authorized on whatever article(s) or resolution(s) you decide to submit to the *Bulletin*, and 2) if, "Third World Work and a Proletarian Orientation" is submitted as a counter-resolution to the Political Committee Chicano struggle resolution indicate whether it is being submitted by the authors only or in behalf of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency.

Comradely,
s/Joel Britton
National Office

P. S.

After the above letter was written, Comrade Boutelle informed us that he would return "Third World Work and a Proletarian Orientation" to us tomorrow. So as not to cause undue delay, we will proceed with the technical preparations necessary for it to appear in the *Discussion Bulletin*, but will hold it until we receive authorization from the authors to proceed.

JB

cc: Paul Boutelle
Nelson Blackstock — SWP Organizer, Oakland-Berkeley Branch
Paul Montauk — Oakland-Berkeley National Committee
Clifton DeBerry — Oakland-Berkeley National Committee
Rich Hill — Oakland-Berkeley National Committee
Barbara Gregorich — Proletarian Orientation Tendency

* * *

Froben Lozada
Hilda Rangel de Guerrero
Fernando Guerrero
Oakland/Berkeley
July 28, 1971

Joel Britton
SWP National Office
14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014

Comrade Britton,

We hereby authorize the use of our names on the Counter Draft Resolution entitled "Third World Work and a Proletarian Orientation" signed by Fernando Guerrero, Froben Lozada, and Hilda Rangel de Guerrero.

The Counter Draft Resolution "Third World Work and a Proletarian Orientation" is submitted by the authors. Since the Proletarian Orientation Tendency has not met nationally to discuss the document and since most of the supporters of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency have not read the document "Third World Work and a Proletarian Orientation" it should *not* be submitted on behalf of the tendency. To do so would not be in keeping with workers democracy practiced in our movement.

Enclosed is a copy of the cover letter submitted by the authors clearly stating that our document is counter to the PC resolution "The Struggle for Chicano Liberation". Comrade Boutelle has informed us that after extensive discussions with comrades Tom Kerry, Jack Barnes and others, he wishes to withdraw his name as a co-author of the document "Third World Work and a Proletarian Orientation". Comrade Boutelle also informs us that he will instead write his own contribution on Black work.

If there are any further questions please contact Fernando Guerrero.

Comradely,
s/Fernando Guerrero
s/Froben Lozada
s/Hilda Rangel de Guerrero
Oakland/Berkeley Branch

encl.

cc. Paul Boutelle — SWP National Committee — New York
Nelson Blackstock — SWP Organizer, Oakland/Berkeley
Paul Montauk — SWP National Committee, Oakland/
Berkeley

Clifton DeBerry — SWP National Committee, Oakland/
Berkeley
Richard Hill — Oakland/Berkeley, National Committee
Barbara Gregorich — Proletarian Orientation Tendency,
Cleveland
Bill Massey — Proletarian Orientation Tendency,
Oakland/Berkeley

* * *

Cleveland Heights, Ohio
July 28, 1971

* * *

Fernando Guerrero
Berkeley, CA
July 19, 1971

14 Charles Lane
New York N. Y. 10014

Comrades,

Enclosed is the counter-draft resolution to the "Struggle for Chicano Liberation" Political Committee Draft Resolution. The counter resolution is being submitted by comrades Paul Boutelle, Froben Lozada, Hilda Rangel de Guerrero, and Fernando Guerrero. If any question arises please contact Fernando Guerrero.

Comradely,
Fernando Guerrero

* * *

14 Charles Lane
New York, N. Y. 10014
July 31, 1971

OAKLAND-BERKELEY

Fernando Guerrero
Hilda Rangel de Guerrero
Froben Lozada

Dear Comrades,

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 28 authorizing the use of your names of "Third World Work and a Proletarian Orientation." Thank you for the clarification of the points raised in my letter to you on July 22. There was no cover letter in the envelope in which your counter-resolution arrived.

Your contribution has been set and will appear in the next *Discussion Bulletin*.

Comradely,
s/Joel Britton
National Office

cc: Paul Boutelle
Nelson Blackstock
Paul Montauk
Clifton DeBerry
Richard Hill
Barbara Gregorich
Bill Massey

Joel Britton
National Office
New York, New York

Dear Comrade Britton,

We received today the copy of your letter to comrades Guerrero, Rangel de Guerrero, and Lozada. We understand that these comrades are writing you to make it clear that their contribution is *not* a resolution of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency. In behalf of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency itself, I also wish to reply to your letter.

As we stated in our tendency declaration, the Proletarian Orientation Tendency was called around the documents "For a Proletarian Orientation," "The Meaning of a Proletarian Orientation," and "In Reply to the Party Leadership's Perspectives." We call for a vote for these three resolutions as an alternative to the NC Political Resolution. Delegates for our tendency will be elected around these documents. These documents are the documents "of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency."

Around the country, many comrades consider themselves members or supporters of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency on this basis. It would be totally undemocratic for us to now declare by fiat that these comrades must now support the counter-resolution on the Chicano struggle, which we ourselves have not even read a draft of, or any other document.

Whether or not the tendency supports any documents besides the three around which it was called will be decided at the tendency meeting in Oberlin, by the tendency members themselves, not by a few authors, and not by non-tendency members.

Comradely,

s/ Barbara Gregorich
For the Proletarian Orientation Tendency

* * *

14 Charles Lane
New York, N. Y. 10014
July 29, 1971

CLEVELAND
Barbara Gregorich

Dear Comrade Gregorich,

This is to acknowledge receipt today of your letter of July 28, 1971.

Comradely,
s/ Joel Britton
National Office

Comradely,
s/ Barbara Gregorich
For the Proletarian Orientation
Tendency

* * *

* * *

Cleveland Heights, Ohio
July 28, 1971

14 Charles Lane
New York, N. Y. 10014
July 29, 1971

Jack Barnes
National Organization Secretary
New York, New York

CLEVELAND
Barbara Gregorich

Dear Comrade Barnes,

Dear Comrade Gregorich,

The proletarian orientation tendency hereby requests that the PC, in planning the convention, set aside a room at Oberlin for meetings of our tendency for the duration of the convention proceedings.

This is to acknowledge receipt today of your letter of July 28.

The room should accomodate 50-100 people.

We have asked the convention arrangements director, Comrade Bev Scott, to set aside the room you request.

Comradely,
s/ Jack Barnes
Organization Secretary

COMRADE TUSSEY VERSUS THE PROLETARIAN ORIENTATION

by Bill Massey, Oakland-Berkeley Branch

Upon reading the contribution of Comrade Jean Tussey: "On the Discussion of a Proletarian Orientation," to the preconvention discussion, I was struck by the fact that she limited her personal attack to three of the four writers of two of the documents comprising the counter resolution of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency. I was reminded of the sentiment contained in a poem by Bertolt Brecht; *The Burning of the Books*, which express my feelings on being spared from this attack:

When the Regime ordered that books with dangerous
teachings
Should be publicly burnt and everywhere
Oxen were forced to draw carts full of books

To the funeral pyre, an exiled poet
One of the best, discovered with fury, when he studied
the list
Of the burned, that his books
Had been forgotten. He rushed to his writing table
One wings of anger and wrote a letter to those in power
Burn me, he wrote with hurrying pen, burn me!
Do not treat me in this fashion. Don't leave me out.
Have I not
Always spoken the truth in my books? And now
You treat me like a liar! I order you:
Burn me!

As I stated it was the sentiment not the circumstances
that remind me of Brecht.

A. THE STRUGGLE OF IDEAS IS JUST BEGINNING

I then thought that it might have been because Comrade Tussey was unfamiliar with me, since I was not in Cleveland. However, in reading her document, if anything is clear, it is that knowledge or lack of knowledge is no barrier to Comrade Tussey.

Perhaps, I was omitted from the attack, because Comrade Tussey, could not bear the thought that the dangerous ideas of Mc-Cann-Gregorich-Passen, had actually gone beyond the scope of her vision and escaped across the Cleveland city limits to the outside world. I use the term dangerous ideas in Comrade Tussey's sense of that term—that is ideas that conflict with what she thinks are the majority views of the Party if not nationally at least in Cleveland. The fact of the matter is that the ideas put forward by Gregorich-Massey-McCann and Passen have found supporters in every part of the country—North-East-South and West. If it is a fact that the majority of the delegates to the 1971 SWP convention do not accept these views, it will not have the decisive effect that Comrade Tussey assumes. We see the struggle to reorient the Socialist Workers Party to a proletarian orientation and thereby take advantage of the opening all too apparent in the working class sector of society, as just now beginning. We intend to follow the counsel of Cannon put forth in "Defending the Revolutionary Party and its Perspectives" when he stated on page 23: "Trotsky said that a Bolshevik is not only a disciplined man but also an independent thinking man, who will raise his point of view again and again, until either he convinces the party that he is right, or the party convinces him that he is wrong." The only change we would make in that formulation is to include women comrades in it.

B. YES COMRADE TUSSEY, THERE IS A COUNTER-RESOLUTION.

Comrade Tussey expresses amazement that the document "For a Proletarian Orientation" which was written "before they (we) saw the National Committee Draft Political Resolution" would be offered "as a clear alternative political orientation, a counter resolution until they (we) said so." Comrade Tussey is correct in assuming that a document is not necessarily a counter resolution unless it is put forward as one. However, if she read both of them, and this we are not sure of after reading her criticism, she would have recognized that the NC Draft Political Resolution and the "For a Proletarian Orientation" contain alternate political lines. While it was not until after we read the NC Draft resolution that we formally decided to constitute our position as a counter line resolution, we assumed that this would be necessary prior to that time. As Comrade Tussey, who has been around for many years, should be aware the NC Draft is only a reflection of the line and practices of the Party leadership over the past period. While it is advantageous to see the leadership's position(s) before posing an alternative line, it is not necessary since we could expect their orientation to reflect their actions in real life. It was the actions of the leadership over the past period that motivated our submitting our political counter resolution.

We have taken note of the major weaknesses of the NC Draft and Comrade Barnes Plenum report, in Comrade Lauren Charous' "In Reply to the Party Leadership's Perspectives" and "The Meaning of a Proletarian Orientation" by Comrades Gregorich-Massey-McCann and Passen. Comrade Tussey has the right to act like a formalist in this matter, we prefer not to join her in this regard.

2. Comrade Tussey reports that in Cleveland they held a discussion on both of the contested political resolutions and that 3 out of the 17 persons who spoke on the question gave support to the Proletarian Orientation Tendency—that is almost 20%. Comrade Tussey states that she does not think that Cleveland is "unique" in its appreciation of the differences. In Oakland-Berkeley nearly 50% of the speakers in the discussions support the Proletarian Orientation documents. I am very encouraged by this measure of support for our line at the outset of what I believe will be a long period of discussion and struggle for the reorientation of the Party to a proletarian orientation. The Proletarian Orientation Tendency have confidence not only in the past traditions of Bolshevism but in its future potential in conjunction with objective reality. We want a Party oriented to that reality.

C. COMRADE TUSSEY'S FAITH IN THE STATUS QUO

Comrade Tussey revealed that in her estimation "the discussion revealed that the counter resolution represents a very small tendency without prospects for growth in a party whose members understand our proletarian orientation, are actively engaged in implementing it and are already seeing tangible quantitative and qualitative progress in becoming a party of mass action."

Lets break this statement down and separate out the incorrect from the incoherent:

"the counter resolution represents a small tendency within the party." This is true in a relative sense. We amount to no more than 80 to 100 members nationally. We are almost as small within our Party as our Party is with relationship to the population of the United States. The bourgeois and petty bourgeois pedants are forever telling us and the world in general, how irrelevant we are, because our party is small. Should we therefore give up on our historic mission? We answer no to them, and no to Comrade Tussey. It is our ideas that count—they are correct today—they will bring people to them tomorrow, when they realize that we were right, in this we are certain. Anyone who would use Comrade Tussey's "method" for deciding the correctness of ideas would have placed themselves in opposition to among other things: evolution, the roundness of the earth and the ability for humans to fly to say nothing about the correctness of the conceptions of the bankruptcy of the Second or Third Internationals. One cannot judge the quality of ideas by taking a vote or a poll, unless one is a philistine.

D. OUR SUPPORT HAS ALREADY GROWN AND THIS IS JUST THE BEGINNING.

Continuing Comrade Tussey states that our tendency is "without prospects for growth." This pessimistic view may comfort Comrade Tussey but the fact of the matter is quite the opposite. Since our position has seen the light

of day, it has already grown. It has supporters in Boston-New York- Philadelphia- Chicago- Minneapolis- Detroit- Houston- Cleveland- Portland- Oakland-Berkeley- Washington D. C.- San Francisco. This list may or may not be complete but the growth indices would tend to see the growth on the ascent not the decline. Among those supporting it are to be found persons from every layer of the Party—older comrades, middle-aged comrades and youth. Workers-students-Party functionaries etc. Women and men. Black-Chicano-Puerto Rican and white comrades. Comrades active in the antiwar movement-women's liberation-the national struggles-the student movement-the labor movement-etc. All of these are Party builders and many of them are involved in building the YSA. Many have been and some are now candidates of the Party for public office. With our ideas and the make-up of our tendency we are quite confident of the growth of not only our tendency but of the Party in whose interests our tendency exists to serve.

E. TUSSEY'S PROLETARIAN ORIENTATION AND THAT OF OTHERS IN THE TROTSKYIST MOVEMENT

Comrade Tussey states that the majority is the majority because "the members understand our proletarian orientation, are actively engaged in implementing it and are already seeing tangible quantitative and qualitative progress in becoming a party of mass action." This is just one more unwarranted assumption on the part of Comrade Tussey to delude both herself and others from the reality that is at odds with the illusion that she hands out as education for the new cadres.

The traditions of the Socialist Workers Party are all on the side of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency, as our contributions have documented. In addition to this the positions of comrades in the world movement such as Comrade Peng Shu Tse are much more reflective of the orientation of Gregorich-Massey-McCann and Passen that that of Tussey-Barnes. But even further evidence is to be taken from the orientation of the Ligue Communiste, the French Section of the Fourth International, and the Ligue Revolutionnaire des Travailleurs-Revolutionaire Arbeiders Liga, the Belgian Section of the Fourth International. I draw this conclusion from the reports in our press and that of these co-thinkers. This information is somewhat restricted but I think that it is enough to show that these European comrades know what a real proletarian orientation is as opposed to the "mind over matter" orientation of Tussey.

The phenomena taking place within the Fourth International and its co-thinkers is both contradictory as well as important to take note of. On the one hand I have been a supporter of the Hansen position with relationship to party building to the situation in Latin America, but on the other hand I support the position of the comrades of the Ligue Communiste in conjunction with the "World-wide Youth Radicalization" document. I find this position on my part reflective of the reality that is taking place within the International and shall proceed to give close study to the differences emerging in our world movement. I urge all comrades to do the same.

In contrast to the Tussey school of mystification is the actual process of proletarianization taking place within

the Ligue Communiste of France and reflected in the report on the process of unification between the Ligue and Lutte Ouvriere published in the January 18, 1971 issue of Intercontinental Press. Point III of their unification agreement states:

III. The central axis of the activity of the united organizations would be to gain a political and trade union base in the working class. This would imply that the bulk of the organization's resources would be devoted to this work.

However, the united organization would operate in all sectors of the population. In each stratum (workers, youth, peasants, teachers and others), the allotment of forces would be up to the leading bodies at all levels in implementing the orientation set at the congress and the priorities established pursuant to them.

Point V of the 5 point agreement further states:

V. The development of a revolutionary base in the factories will require both the projection of an independent policy by the united organization through regular activity of its worker cells; and regular work by revolutionary worker militants in the CGT (Confederation Generale du Travail—General Confederation of Labor, the CP led union organization).

The Ligue Communiste and Lutte Ouvriere are conscious of the fact that they have often conducted differing experiments in this field. But they consider that their political agreement on the main line of this penetration work would make it possible to achieve a synthesis of these different viewpoints so as to strengthen the united organization.

The January 7th, 1971 issue of *Le Monde* reporting on the unification agreement stated:

They (the Ligue Communiste and Lutte Ouvriere) are already active in five or six hundred plants, and Lutte Ouvriere, in addition to its weekly publishes around 170 factory bulletins. (I.P. January 18, 1971 pg. 48)

In addition to the above, the report on the Second National Convention of the Ligue Communiste held on May 29-31 in Rouen, indicates that trade union work is and has been the top priority in that section since the founding conference of the Ligue in April of 1969. The giant and impressive demonstrations of the French Trotskyists in commemoration of the Paris Commune and on May Day testify that they have not lost their attraction to students interested in a revolutionary organization. These are among the most important demonstrations of the power of the ideas of Trotskyism in our history. Drawing over 30,000 and 40,000 behind their own banners, our French comrades have provided an inspiration to the world movement as a whole.

BELGIUM.

The report of the founding conference of the Ligue Revolutionnaire des Travailleurs-Revolutionaire Arbeiders Li-

ga (Revolutionary Workers League), Belgian Section of the Fourth International, is also extremely interesting in noting a view of a proletarian orientation. The report was from the sections newspaper, *La Gauche* of June 4, 1971.

The Congress consisted of various age levels, the majority of whom it must be stated, were students and youth, but there was also a good representation of workers.

The three main reports discussed at the Congress were reported as follows:

1. The proposed by-laws of the LRT, and a resolution affiliating to the Fourth International.
2. The proposed program contained the following headings:
 - I. Capitalism and the Class Struggle.
 - II. The International character of the socialist revolution.
 - III. The principal characteristics of Belgian Capitalism.
 - IV. The labor movement in Belgium.
 - V. What kind of socialism do we want.
 - VI. A strategy for taking power.
3. A report on the working class, the unions and workers' councils.

The report from *La Gauche* as appeared in the *Intercontinental Press* also stated:

Following its December 1969 congress the JGS (Socialist Young Guard) had changed into a structured national organization, and had become part of the international Trotskyist movement. Beginning in January 1970 the JGS, which until then had been a force mainly in the student movement, actively participated in the Limburg miners strike. In the upsurge of the class struggle, the JGS became involved in all the big strike actions, and it has begun to develop roots in working class. . . .

The fusing of revolutionary activists into one organization introduces a new political formation into Belgian life. Active in the struggle of industrial workers, government employees, university and high school students, this new political formations aim is to construct a mass party capable of organizing the socialist revolution. . . .

The LRT maintains that in order for the class struggle to lead to a socialist revolution, a conscious revolutionary leadership has to be organized. The LRT's objective will be the construction of such a leadership, by means of work in the factories, unions, schools and universities.

Contrast the views and actions of our French and Belgian co-thinkers with the mechanical and arid formulations of the NC Draft and its defenders like Barnes and Tussey. The comrades of France and Belgium have general rules and are carrying them out—while the leadership of the

SWP puts forth the foci theory of the university campus today and tomorrow the world.

F. MANDEL'S VIEW OF THE SITUATION IN THE WORKING CLASS IN THE UNITED STATES.

While it can be argued with some justification that the level of class consciousness is different in France and Belgium than in the U.S., and therefore there is the chance for greater opportunities in the implementation of a proletarian orientation, there is more to it than that. Our leadership has a view of the working class in this country that is out of focus with the reality. They see the working class as the same as it was in the 1950's—they fail to note the emergence of a change brought about by world and national events such as the Vietnam war—the nationalist struggles, the youth radicalization, etc. They see a working class that is fat-fifty and fair. The leadership of the SWP fails to note or relate to the large amount of Black and Brown workers in the work force, and in particular in the industrialized working class. They fail to note the change in the thinking signified by the heightening wave of economic strikes over the last couple of years. They fail to relate the fact of high inflation, the lowering standard of living and wages and the growing unemployment—among the working class. With their eyes glued on the privileged campuses (as opposed to the community colleges and junior colleges and high schools) they fail to take advantage of the new opportunities for organizing in the factories, unions and schools and universities." To which we would only add the ghettos, barrios, and the barracks.

It is in this regard that the following statement by Comrade Ernest Mandel is of interest. He made this statement nearly three years ago, it was printed in our pamphlets, yet like much material it is overlooked by our leadership.

For historical reasons which I cannot go into now, a special situation exists in the United States where the majority of the working class, the white working class, is not yet receptive to socialist ideas of revolutionary action. This is an incontestable fact.

Of course, this can change quickly. Some people said the same thing about France only a few weeks before May 10, 1968. Yet even in the United States, there is an important minority of the industrial working class, the black workers, of whom nobody can say after the experience of the two last years that they are inaccessible to socialist ideas or incapable of revolutionary action. Here at least is one immediate possibility for unity in theory and practice with a part of the working class.

In addition, it is essential to analyze the social and economic trends which in the long run will shake the predominant political apathy and conservatism of the white working class. The example of Germany under very similar circumstances shows that this can happen. A few years ago the German working class was mired in the same stability, conservatism, and unshakable integration in capitalist society as many people picture the North American working class today. That has

already begun to change. This case illustrates how a slight shift in the balance of forces, a little downslide of the economy, an attack by the employers on traditional union structure and rights can create social tensions which can change a lot in that domain. (Ernest Mandel, *The Revolutionary Student Movement, Theory and Practice*, Page 15).

G. COMRADE TUSSEY AND HER MIND OVER MATTER CONCEPTIONS OF REALITY

I think that Comrade Tussey can see that others in the Fourth International have a difference of opinion with her as to what constitutes a proletarian orientation. This is borne out by (a) Peng Shu Tse in "Return to the Road of Trotskyism;" (b) The concrete actions of the French and Belgian sections of the Fourth International; (c) The perspective drawn by Comrade Ernest Mandel as given above; (d) the logical conclusion to Comrade Joseph Hansen's "Strategy for Building a Leninist Party." All of these things impel us to the traditional and correct concept that a proletarian orientation has something to do with the proletariat and not just a state of mind or some good intentions concerning workers at some future date. We would also ask Comrade Tussey to please indicate what qualitative changes have taken place with recruitment of (1) Black and Brown workers, (2) women workers, (3) white workers, (4) GIs, (5) Black and Brown students. The change from quantity to quality is taking place I am afraid in Comrade Tussey's mind, not in the objective reality. All changes it must be remembered from quantity to quality are not necessarily of a progressive nature — this falls into that category.

H. COMRADE TUSSEY WHERE DID YOU LEARN YOUR METHODOLOGY AND WHERE IS YOUR PROOF.

4. Comrade Tussey relates that the comrades who spoke for the majority position "rejected the methodology of the document offered as an alternative." "They criticized the use of quotations taken out of historical context as a substitute for analysis of today's dynamic, objectively anticapitalist movements and the tasks of the party in relating to them." "They rejected the narrow scope and primitive concepts of the minority's orientation as a guide for action to build and proletarianize the party and to unify the working class and raise its political consciousness." They "rejected the methodology" but what methodology did they propose and what was the criticism of the methodology? "They criticized the use of quotations taken out of historical context." What quotes out of historical context? These mysterious out of context quotes were according to Comrade Tussey "a substitute for analysis of today's dynamic objectively anticapitalist movements and the party's relation to them." This statement is not only untrue but is reflective of the theoretical shabbiness inherent in the majority position. Untrue because the Proletarian Orientation Tendency has not come out against the Party's relating to the various social movements existent in society today. What the Proletarian Orientation Tendency has questioned is the manner in which we relate to them. We accept that the Party should relate to movements such as the antiwar-the national struggles-the women's liberation

movement-the student movement, etc. We have stated this to the point of redundancy. But we say that the Party should take these movements into the working class and build support and understanding of them there. With relation to the national struggles we feel that the Party has failed to engage itself in the movement as it exists — has refused to immerse itself in the movement and consequently has neglected to give the revolutionary leadership which our understanding of the dynamics of the national and the class question demand that we give. We also feel that the Party has failed to orient the women's liberation movement in the direction of the working class where it would find its most strong support. In relationship to the antiwar movement we have been critical of the Party's abstention from the building of the GI sector of that movement ever since the successful Fort Jackson events. GIs are certainly a dynamic sector and movement, even the bourgeois press testifies to this fact. They are in the main working class in composition. Yet the Party has had an abstentionist position in relating to their struggles over the past two years. It has been in this period that the amount of antiwar consciousness, and if you must use the term "objectively anticapitalist," nature of the GI struggle has become most evident, yet it was in this period that the Party moved away from its task of relating to that struggle. If Comrade Tussey wants to speak out against the party relating itself to the Black and Brown movements — by in large working class in nature and the GI movement she should say so — she should not distort our position to say that we do not wish to relate our program to them. We not only wish to relate to these struggles but wish to do so in a manner that converts them into consciously anticapitalist, that is socialist, struggles and the best arena (not the only arena) is the working class.

I. THE LEADERSHIP'S ADAPTATIONISM IS COVERED UP BY ITS SHABBY FORMULATIONS

Theoretically shabby also is the use of the term "objectively anticapitalist." While it is of course true that there are struggles that are objectively anticapitalist, the use of this term is a cover for the fact that these struggles have a very low degree of consciousness and socialist understanding. The Party has accommodated itself to the low level of consciousness of understanding in these movements and thus winds up tail-ending the consciousness of the layers involved in the struggle. Such is the case with nationalism. The Party refuses to get into the sector of the national struggle where it would come in direct contact with the industrial workers who are Black and Brown. It limits itself to commentaries of struggles taking place in society, and when it does probe into this area it does so in the most petty bourgeoisified and privileged areas: the student movement in the more prestigious universities. Generally our people try to convince nationalist students that we support nationalism. Instead we should be explaining the role of socialism and the theoretical ideas contained in the conceptions of the permanent revolution. We should be taking the transitional program into the struggles of the Black and Brown working class and using it to raise the conscious level of those struggles. This would be the linking of theory and practice. *The refusal on the part of the leadership to put into practice our theories in the areas they are meant for distorts the theory itself.*

Evidence of this can be seen in the women's liberation movement also where our refusal to direct the movement toward the working class has given birth to the use of the slogan "Sisterhood is Powerful" as a means of rationalizing that it doesn't matter what class of sisters we work with. This is also true of the student movement where our immersion has resulted in the most gross distortions of theory paraded as Marxism. Take the Worldwide Youth Radicalization document which is not concerned with Youth—it is concerned with students, in general university students, and mainly in the context of the United States not the world. The document is parochial at best. Let me give one example of the "analysis" Comrade Tussey is so gratified to see taking shape. On page 11 of the Worldwide Youth Radicalization document and the Tasks of the Fourth International, point # 6 of six points evidencing the changes in the student complexion in the last two decades reads as follows:

6) Students have stronger ties than previously with the rest of their generation in the high schools, factories and draftee armies making their radicalization a more serious matter for the rulers. Regardless of class, youth are subject to the same restrictions imposed by the norms of patriarchal bourgeois society, norms which usually prevail even in the countries that have abolished capitalist property relations. They are subject to the same discriminatory laws such as those dealing with political rights, military conscription and social restrictions. These factors help to cement the ties between various social strata of the generation.

If this means anything it is wrong. First it should state university students since it meant all students it would not include high school students in the first sentence explaining the groups that students have stronger ties with. *Second* the second sentence unlike the first states that "youth regardless of class . . ." The first sentence said "Students have stronger . . ." Students and youth are not the same, one is a category of the other and their relationship varies not only from country to country (the U. S. in comparison to India) but also within the different types of youth in a given country (for instance between white youth and Black and Brown youth) to say nothing of white middle class youth and Black and Brown working class youth. To extend the theoretical absurdity even further—between white ruling class youth and Black and Brown working class youth. The last sentence which refers to "the various social strata of the generation" do we understand that the document writers mean (a) students, (b) youth, (c) student youth, (d) student youth regardless of class, (e) youth regardless of class, (f) nothing.

J. "YOUTH REGARDLESS OF CLASS" —MISTAKE OR REVISION?

Lenin is reported to have stated that truth is always concrete so let us take this point six and concretize it with relationship to class society in this country for which the Worldwide Youth Radicalization document was written. Both Nelson Rockefeller and Paul Boutelle are fathers. Let us insert their children who are youth into this point six and see whether it is true:

6) Students have stronger ties than previously with the rest of their generation in the high schools, factories and draftee armies making their radicalization

a more serious matter for the rulers. Regardless of class, Rockefeller and Boutelle, are subject to the same restrictions imposed by the norms of patriarchal bourgeois society, norms which usually prevail even in the countries that have abolished capitalist property relations. They, Rockefeller and Boutelle, are subject to the same discriminatory laws such as those dealing with political rights military conscription and social restrictions. These factors help to cement the ties between Rockefeller and Boutelle.

Really! Is that so. Is this the shape of the new methodology of the objectively anticapitalist dynamic? If this theoretical proposition signifies anything it is revisionist in content. While you might be able to draw and educate more students with this type of analysis than with the long gone lonesome blues of Marx, Lenin, Trotsky and Cannon, what do you have when you finish the process? It is not the student youth that we mean to criticize but their teachers like Comrade Tussey who feed them political and theoretical pablum like the above, which would be condemned by any revolutionary food and drug administration.

K. THE FRENCH METHOD OF ANALYSIS ON THE YOUTH RADICALIZATION IS SUPERIOR.

In contrast to the formulations contained in the Worldwide Youth resolution, the contributions of the French comrades contained in International Information Bulletin No. 2, April 1970: "Balance Sheet of the Student Movement" by Daniel Bensaid and C. Scalabrino; and "A Contribution to the Discussion on the Worldwide Radicalization of the Youth" a resolution passed by the Political Bureau of the French Communist League; are far superior. Rather than be accused of "using quotations out of context" I would ask that those comrades who have these documents to read them or reread them and for those who do not have them, to order them from the national office. Internationalism means that we not cheer for the SWP as football fans root for the home team but that we give careful consideration to the ideas of all comrades of the Trotskyist movement. This home-team parochialism deeply affects our movement and such is a disservice to the International and the struggles in which it is involved with.

THE LEADERSHIP OF THE SWP IS SECTARIAN TOWARD THE WORKING CLASS.

Now let us return to our critic in Cleveland. She states next that "most of the Cleveland Branch membership, like that of practically every other branch of the party, was recruited from the youth radicalization described and analyzed in the Political Resolution, and educated in the principles and program of the SWP under the leadership of the present National Committee. Their appreciation of the differences between the two concepts of our proletarian orientation is probably not unique." This is true and the documents of the Tendency for a Proletarian Orientation have pointed this out time and again. Of course we stated it more scientifically than Comrade Tussey. It is not simply from the "youth radicalization" that we

have recruited most of our membership but from "the student radicalization" and the radicalization as it has occurred at the more privileged universities at that. This is also reflected in the pale complexion of our membership and hence also their class background. Our Party is overwhelmingly white and middle class. In the beginning of the radicalization this was understandable and beyond our control. But by our abstention from involvement in the struggles of the Black-Brown and white working class youth (including high school and the less privileged junior and community college students) we have maintained this disadvantageous composition. Plus we have failed to relate our program to these areas of society. It is not the principles and program of the Socialist Workers Party that were wrong but the interpretation and continuing reinterpretation and hence orientation given them by the teachers like Comrade Tussey, a National Committee member. The majority of the National Committee began as the teachers of the principles and program of the Party to the newly radicalized student recruits, but have wound up from all appearances, as those who were the taught. In other words they adapted to the orientation of the student youth rather than adapting the new student recruits to the Party's proletarian orientation. Furthering this adaptationism, the history of the lessons concerning the proletarian orientation and the question of social composition of the Party is now systematically being re-written and reinterpreted to bring the past in line with the present and painting an illusory future based on these false premises. Those who disagree are called pessimists. This adaptationism to movements as they exist rather than how they should exist (with the intervention of the revolutionary vanguard with its revolutionary Transitional Program) is the reason for our abstentionism to the Black and Brown movements and our lack of a Marxist approach to the women's liberation movement and the student movement. We as the vanguard have something to contribute to these movements in the way of theoretical leadership. The way of getting a hearing for our theories is participation in the struggles. In the Black nationalist struggles we confined ourselves to a great degree with attempting to convince the nationalist elements that we too were nationalists.

Since they were not over-impressed by this, we slowly but definitely withdrew to the role we now occupy with relationship to those struggles — that of once a week commentators. We play the same role in relationship to the largest mass movement in the United States (with small exception) the trade union movement. What is worse, and this is reflected in the NC resolution and the Barnes plenum report, we have no plans to even begin to change this role. The same thing is evident in the women's movement where we seek to be simply the best "feminists." In relationship to the Chicano movement our members are forever prattling how they are the "best builders" of that movement, overlooking the fact that we have no more than 20 persons involved in the movement as it exists and those members by and large, only seek to convince the movement of their loyalty to the present level of ideas contained in the movement. Is it any wonder that we do not draw Party cadre from these movements, what reason do we offer them to join us? Is it any wonder that there have been theoretical errors that have resulted in defeats in those movements such as in the demise of the Black Panther Party and

the setbacks to groups such as the Revolutionary League of Black Workers? Our relationship to these developments was first to give them our support in writing — and without any critical evaluation. When they did not develop as we felt they should, we again in writing criticized them with a passion. The only things we were consistent at in relationship to them was our lack of theory and our lack of participation. Perhaps if they were student groups with an on campus orientation we would have done more. But even this is not proven by facts. Our role in line with the Black Student Unions has not been better. Let it be stated that at the universities that we exist (in the main) the most privileged ones, the BSU's even in their best days were small and very open to co-optation by reformists. The fact that their members could swing from an ultraleftist to a reformist position and outlook very quickly, only reflected the area in which they existed — that is the university not the ghetto. But still what role did we play? Again, we sought to convince them that we supported all things that they supported, period. When this got us very little, we decided that we couldn't do much there and withdrew. This reality is also shaped not by a revolutionary understanding of nationalism but by an adaptationist and opportunistic understanding of nationalism. We did not attempt to heighten the nationalist consciousness of the participants of these movements to that of socialist consciousness but shied away from it for fear of rejection. We did not implement an understanding of the lessons of the permanent revolution — the relationship of the national and the class questions and struggles posing the question and struggle for socialism. We simply adapted to the "here and now." The idea that Blacks are not interested in Marxism and socialism pervades our movement. The idea that white revolutionaries cannot discuss and teach the ideas we inherited from the Marxist movement to Blacks is also pervasive. This process is of course dialectical. We lacked a certain amount of theoretical clarity ourselves, we then failed to teach or implement theory — as a result we withdrew to the safety of the critic. Opportunism finds its opposite in sectarianism.

Our involvement in other struggles and the role that we have played in them is of course related to the fact that they exist on the university campus. If they began elsewhere our participation would be that much less. We failed to recognize the Chicano movement until it showed itself on the campuses. The women's liberation movement began on the campuses and so we became involved in it — the antiwar movement also. Now it is not my contention that this was or is wrong. What is wrong is that we insist in orienting both ourselves and the movements in which we are involved to the campus and not to the larger and more powerful strata of the working class.

M. OUR RELATIONSHIP TO THE GI ANTIWAR MOVEMENT.

In the antiwar movement we have not attempted to intervene in a day to day way into the GI movement. Does this mean that we were for having our cadre enlist? No, it does not and we have never stated that we did. But for the last two years we failed to gear the movement, in which we have played a leadership role, to doing the work that could have been done to heighten the struggles of a sector of the society on which the imperialist state is depen-

dent on if it is to continue its genocidal war in Southeast Asia. This sector, the GIs, have shown a high degree of consciousness and radicalization without our intervention, over this period. To simply say that this radicalization was brought about by the large antiwar movement in the civilian sector of society is both pragmatic and commonplace. Of course, that is true to a large extent. But it has the same relationship as a leaf to a root of a tree. Cut the leaf or large numbers of the leaves and the tree still lives. Cut the root and the tree is severely damaged — cut the main roots and the tree dies. The GIs are a rather significant root in the tree of imperialism. They are the armed body of men used by the imperialists to defend its property in Southeast Asia and elsewhere — including in the last instance the Black and Brown ghettos and barrios in the U.S. Perhaps, if we could only get the government to move its military bases onto the universities it would be more practical for our intervention.

N. THE FIGHT FOR WOMEN'S LIBERATION AND THE LEADERSHIP'S RETREAT.

In regard to the women's liberation movement it is also evident that our role is to adapt that movement to the campus situation and even worse to a position more conservative than that. The changing of our movements demands from free abortion on demand-no forced sterilization, equal pay for equal work, free 24 hour child care, to that of the building of a single issue women's liberation movement for repeal of all abortion laws, is evident of this change. This is a step backward for us in relationship to the building of a women's liberation movement. But we call it a step forward. On the abortion issue it is worthwhile noting how the women's movement of France looked at this question. In an article printed in *The Militant* of April 30, 1971 (p.12) quoting a statement of 343 prominent women including members of the Women's Liberation Movement of France and the Movement for Freedom of Abortion, *The Militant* also reported on an article accompanying the women's statement in the popular French magazine "Le Nouvel Observateur" of April 5-11, 1971. It stated the position of the French movement as follows:

Free abortion on demand is not the ultimate goal of the struggle of women. On the contrary, it is only the most elementary demand, the demand without which the political struggle cannot even begin. It is a vital necessity that women claim and recover their own bodies.

Our refusal to fight and build a movement on this ground is nothing less than an adaptation to the more privileged sectors of women and society. It is a blow to the involvement of the less privileged sectors of women in the struggle for women's liberation and the struggle for the overthrow of the oppressive capitalist society. What we fought for yesterday is ultraleft today and what we fought against yesterday is most revolutionary today. "We must learn how to end a strike as well as how to begin one." Yes Comrade Tussy, we are sure that those who have learned what you have taught, understand the "differences between the two concepts of our proletarian orientation." One, our tendency's orientation, involves the proletariat; yours, the majority orientation, is indeed phenomenal and unique,

a proletarian orientation without the proletariat. Quite a feat, and the SWP attacks Comrade Livio Maitan for his "cold way" of revolution in Egypt, a concept of a revolution without the mobilization of the masses, and I assume since Hansen in his document "In Defense of the Leninist Strategy of Party Building" does not state it specifically, without the proletariat.

O. THE PARTY'S ADAPTATIONISM IS INTERNATIONAL AS WELL AS DOMESTIC.

The adaptationism of the Barnes-Tussey leadership is not confined to the United States but finds its way into international questions. Our uncritical line in support of the Castro leadership of the Cuban revolution is also a part of the same cloth. While I, and the other authors of the Proletarian Orientation, are firm supporters of the Cuban revolution, the Party's role toward that revolution's leadership was uncritical. Any criticisms we did make were so buried in qualifications as to negate any contribution they might have been to the leadership that had been at the head of the revolutionary movement of Cuba and to the Cuban masses who made the revolution. Our spokespersons and this includes those who visited Cuba in January 1969 were more certain than Castro that the "10 million (tons of sugar) were in the bag." This completely overlooked the fact that the quota had been reached without the active and conscious participation of the Cuban workers in the decision-making process. The SWP of course was qualitatively more correct than the sectarians of the Healyite variety who could not and do not recognize a revolution unless it is true in every detail to their recipe. But we acted not unlike the "friends of the revolution" that Trotsky so bitterly assailed in relationship to the Soviet Revolution in his introduction to "Revolution Betrayed."

P. THE POSITION OF THE DEMOCRATIC SECULAR STATE IS MENSHEVIK-STALINIST NOT TROTSKYIST.

In a similar manner our "appreciation" for the concept of the "democratic-secular state" put forward by Fatah in relationship to the Palestinian liberation struggle is similar in essence. We of course give unconditional support to national struggles for liberation but, and here is where the leadership of our Party goes wrong, we do not give uncritical support to the leadership or the concepts of the leadership, of these national liberation struggles. The concept of the "democratic secular state" is nothing more than the Menshevik-Stalin-Mao, concept of the "two stage" theory of revolution. That it is put forward by "honest" bourgeois nationalists does not make it any less wrong. The "honest" bourgeois nationalists of the Russian or Spanish variety received nothing but the scathing criticism of Lenin and Trotsky. Our task is not only to be the best defenders of the Palestinian movement for liberation here in the United States. It is, of course that, but we must also give it programmatic leadership and our program calls for a socialist Middle East, not a confederation of "democratic secular states." The leadership's position negates the theory of the permanent revolution.

Q. THE DISPUTES IN THE INTERNATIONAL

In relationship to the disputes in the International it-

self, it is my estimation that while I would and do disagree with the Mandel-Maitan outlook on the strategy for armed struggle and guerrilla warfare, that Mandel and Maitan have been more politically forthright and consistent in their responsibilities and practice than has the Socialist Workers Party leadership. It is they who have forced the political debate. It is they who insisted on raising the political questions. The leadership of the Socialist Workers Party is divided into two categories with relationship to the international question. The older leadership is in form "orthodox" in essence it is both provincial and parochial. The younger leadership combines these features with an arrogant disinterest.

From what I have been able to learn, I disagree with the policies of the Argentinian section of the Fourth International, the PRT and the ERP. Their strategy seems to separate them out from the masses of the working class, which is in motion, and in the end will result not only in the defeat of our section but of the revolutionary process itself. (I must frankly state that my knowledge is somewhat limited on the events in that country.) At the same time, the SWP, which also has not real orientation to the mass movements of the working class in this country, can only offer a theory separated from our own practice, to our courageous co-thinkers in Latin America.

The differences involved in the mistakes of the Argentinian comrades and those of our own leadership must be appreciated. The courage and commitment of the PRT and the ERP is inspiring but it is also, if our evaluation is correct, tragic in its outcome. The campus foci theory of the SWP leadership lacks the courage of the Latin Americans in its routinism but the end result will be just as tragic.

Of course, some will undoubtedly say that the conditions there and here are very different. I agree. This fact has a lot to do with the SWP's adaptationist direction to the conditions existent in the United States, the richest of all the imperialist states. The state with the most powerful bourgeoisie, the largest petty bourgeoisie, the most powerful working class with the least developed theoretical consciousness. These factors have come out in the pre-convention discussion in the charges by the majority comrades that the orientation of our Tendency would lead toward a "burial in the trade unions, the ghettos and barrios" or "it would be a retreat" or it "would take us away from the living mass movements." Yet we attack, from our relative safety, the comrades of the PRT for not involving themselves in the mass movements (often left unstated) of the working class. If they are aware of our Party's orientation, that could be the reason our words are not taken seriously.

R. THE SWP MUST DEBATE THE POLITICAL IDEAS — NOT SEEK TO ORGANIZATIONALY SPLIT THE INTERNATIONAL. NO FACTIONAL MANEUVERINGS INSIDE SECTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL.

One other thing is obvious in regard to our relationship to our co-thinkers is the Fourth International. This is the organizational maneuverings of the type we decried when practiced by Pablo and Pabloism. I will be specific in two instances in the recent period.

S. "DOMINGO AND PEDRO"

One is mentioned by "Domingo" as well as the letter of the SWP P. C. in their May 11, 1971 letter to the United Secretariat. "Domingo," or as he is better known, Comrade Livio Maitan, stated in his footnotes concerning the deterioration of relations between the Argentinian *La Verdad* group, which is a sympathizer group in Argentina and not the section, the "La Verdad group held its national congress without giving notice to the International, without sending the documents adopted, or the information on the debates. What is worse: a representative of the International minority was invited to attend the congress and in fact participated in it." (International Information Bulletin No. 4—June 1971, p. 7.) In the same document the P. C. of the Socialist Workers Party, in their letter protesting the "Domingo" letter, acknowledged that "the alleged 'representative of the International minority' was in actuality a member of the Socialist Workers Party who was in Argentina by coincidence at the time the underground congress was held." (Ibid p. 9).

In reply to the letter of the PC of the SWP, Comrade Livio Maitan stated:

4. The comrades of the PC who in the most distasteful insinuations with regard to me, claim that they should be taken at their word when they affirm that a member of the minority found himself in Argentina by chance at the time of a congress of *La Verdad*." (Ibid, p. 11).

I hope all comrades will have read this document. One thing is clear—that the SWP had a representative, Comrade "Pedro," in Argentina at the time of a congress of a sympathizing group to the International. The *La Verdad* group, while not the recognized section of the Fourth International, was granted that status in the hopes of unity in Argentina and I assume the International. The *La Verdad* group is also a sympathizer to the minority in the International which we as co-thinkers supported. We sent our representative to their congress. To say that it was a coincidence is to make the situation not only ridiculous but unbelievable as well. No one gets from the U.S. to Argentina in time for an underground congress "by coincidence." Livio has a very good point when he says that this matter should have been discussed prior to the sending of Comrade "Pedro" on his "accidental" mission, not after it. The *La Verdad* group did itself no good by not allowing the United Secretariat to know of its congress and by not inviting a representative of the International majority to attend, as well as the "representative" of the minority. I am sure if they had that it would have been as easy for a representative of the majority, either in Europe or Latin America (Argentina, perhaps) to "by coincidence" attend. This action on the part of the PC is an undisciplined act to the International, of which we are co-thinkers. It also shows a cynical attitude toward the concept of democratic centralism, both internationally and in Argentina. This attitude, if practiced in the SWP, would be met with swift action by our leadership. I call on the leadership to halt these types of practices in the international movement.

T. THE INVITATION TO THE LEADER OF THE IMG MINORITY—A FACTIONAL ACT?

While I support, from what I can learn, the position of the British minority within the International Marxist Group (IMG), I do so with criticisms. This is because many of their positions have similar flaws and orientation to that of the SWP. I feel, however, that the leadership of the SWP is attempting to intervene in the affairs of the IMG in an organizational way. This is evidenced by the invitation of a leader of the IMG minority to give classes at the educational conference, immediately following our national convention. These classes given by this leader of the IMG minority are on "The History of British Trotskyism] ' I find it strange that the majority section of the IMG would send the leader of their section's minority to give classes on this topic to our educational conference. If such is the case, they are certainly a most democratic minded organization. I would find it hard to believe that a leading comrade from the Proletarian Orientation Tendency would be sent by the SWP leadership to give classes on "The History of American Trotskyism" to the IMG.

If the majority of the IMG did not designate that this leader of the minority should give the classes mentioned, who did? The Party leadership's actions in inviting a leader of another section's minority, without the permission of section itself, could only be taken as factional meddling. In this case it would be a disservice to the comrades of the IMG who are attempting to build a Leninist party in Britain with the norms of democratic centralism. This type of action by the leadership of the SWP deserves a full explanation. At the same time the membership of our Party deserves to know whether our leadership has committed any other such "factional meddlings" into the sphere of the IMG. It this is the first it should be the last. If it is not—the membership as a whole is due an explanation. Any harm developing out of this type of thing could only play into the hands of the Healyite SLL in England. We must allow the British section to build itself without outside interference. Our differences would be put on the level of political discussion not organizational maneuverings.

While I have only stated two instances, I believe they point toward the worsening of the differences in the International. While all the political questions must be discussed and debated—we must remember that it is a prime task of revolutionists everywhere to do nothing that would endanger the existence of the Fourth International. While the SWP supports a minority in the International, it must have confidence in its ideas and wait until objective reality bears that correctness out. It will raise them again and again until it either convinces the International majority of its correctness or they convince the SWP leadership of our errors. This is the same manner which we the Proletarian Orientation Tendency shall act toward the SWP, which at present we are a minority in. Democratic centralism on both the national and international fields.

U. THE CLEVELAND SCHOOL OF PROLETARIANIZATION—"IF YOU WISH UPON A STAR . . ."

Now unto the remainder of Comrade Tussey's document. Tussey states that Comrade John McCann stated five years ago that the "main danger to the party was from the petty bourgeois student youth who would serve as a transmission belt for bourgeois ideas into the party.

He proposed a probationary period for any student who might apply for membership, special reading requirements and other restrictions aimed at curbing recruitment of student youth until they had been purged of their petty bourgeois backgrounds." In actuality, Comrade McCann had proposed a candidate program for the Cleveland branch in the area of party recruitment. He did this not five years ago but about two years ago, they keep branch minutes in Cleveland, I would suppose, so this is easily verifiable. Also McCann's motion failed by only one vote in the Cleveland branch. The idea of a candidate program for membership into the Party is not unique to McCann nor is the idea that recruits to the Party should read certain of our basic works. The word purged of their petty bourgeois backgrounds is used in the perjorative or editorial sense by Comrade Tussey, but it is clear that she, unlike McCann, is not interested whether or not those recruited from alien class milieus are separated from the effects of that background or not. Good, Comrade Tussey, we know where you stand—on your head—but McCann prefers not to join you or have the party of the working class join you in your "new" and "unique" position. We do not recruit to the Bolshevik movement in the same way that a carnival barker at the county fair recruits to the side-shows. We do discriminate and choose carefully those who enter into our Party. While we seek to take advantage of periods of radicalization—it is also necessary to keep from diluting the standards of our cadre conception. We have faith in our Marxist outlook and the destiny that our Party will play in providing leadership for those struggles that will be decisive, that is why we want quality as well as quantity.

Comrade Tussey unfortunately did not advise us of her own theories of proletarianization of these new cadres. Is it not true, Comrade Tussey, that you have put forth the theory that those who join our party and are disciplined and loyal to it are thereby proletarianized? Regardless of their place in society or their relationship to the means of production. I do not find this concept strange in relation to the other theories of Comrade Tussey or the SWP leadership. It is consistent. It is also wrong and contradicts the materialist concept that "being determines consciousness." But it is unique, and think of how much more quickly we can create a proletarian party—it eliminates an awful lot of the struggle involved in the more orthodox manner of Trotsky, Lenin and Cannon. On the other points Comrade McCann sees the main danger to our party not from the petty bourgeoisie but from the bourgeoisie—to put it otherwise is a slander. But slander will not stop Comrade Tussey. Let us continue.

Here is the anatomy of a slander put forward without the shame it deserves. Did Comrade McCann find greener pastures in Boston? No, he found a Party assignment, something he did not receive over the latter period of his time in Cleveland. He served as the director of the Vietnam Referendum in the 1970 elections in the state of Massachusetts and from all accounts did a quite adequate task of discharging his duties. Prior to that he had been an early participant and builder of the antiwar movement in Cleveland during 1965-1966 and 1967. In this regard he served as head of the Cleveland Committee to End the War in Vietnam. He served as *Militant* sales director in the Cleveland branch in the subsequent period. McCann was the 1968 campaign director in Cleveland at the time of the presidential elections.

These tasks in addition to giving forums, branch educationals and summer school classes. He is now a candidate of the Socialist Workers Party in Massachusetts and a member of his branch executive committee. This is not the first slanderous attack on McCann that has been brought to my attention.

I might also mention the activities of the two other comrades mentioned in Comrade Tussey's history of life in the Cleveland Branch. Comrade Barbara Gregorich is formerly a YSA organizer in Cleveland—she has served on several occasions for lengthy periods of time as *The Militant* sales director. She was also the bookstore director at other times. In 1969 she was the head of the Cleveland petitioning (20,000 signatures). In addition she has been involved in women's liberation work and gave a keynote speech on March 8, 1971 at a community college women's liberation teach-in. She is also involved with trying to get a women's liberation course accredited in one of the community colleges in Cleveland. In addition she has given summer school classes, etc. Last but not least, Comrade Phil Passen, formerly Cleveland YSA organizer and a former member of the YSA National Committee. Later he was YSA organizer in Los Angeles. He was also Choice '68 director in Los Angeles as well as a candidate of the Socialist Workers Party for Congress. One other assignment that he carried out in Cleveland was to live with Comrade Cannon. Comrade Passen has also been active in both L.A. and Cleveland in giving forums, educationals, classes in addition to serving as *Militant* director and playing a leading role in the building of the antiwar movement.

As to the other comrade that Comrade Tussey refers too, it could be one of several—so I will wait until she specifies which one she means.

W. SLANDER WILL NOT DETER US FROM OUR POLITICAL DUTIES OF BUILDING THE PARTY

When one reads and observes both Comrade Tussey's political contributions and her "inside" history of life in Cleveland, we get the picture of how a part of the pre-convention discussion is being carried out. It is common, for instance, in the Oakland-Berkeley discussion to be referred to as "sharing the views of the opponents of the SWP" or being similar to the Wohlforthites—in one instance a young comrade was told that we were "Wohlforthites." That we share none of the positions of that group—that we see the SWP here in this country and the IMG in Britain and the Ligue Communiste in France as the revolutionary parties and not the sectarian and counterfeit Workers League, Socialist Labour League or the Lambertistes—it means nothing. We have differences, therefore we must be Wohlforthites or Healyites. Those who use this method, and Comrade Tussey is a practitioner of a similar device—did not learn them from the history, traditions, principles or program of Trotskyism. We find it discouraging that this is the method of the debate—but it only confirms us in our struggle for a proletarian orientation which will displace all of this "crap." For those who have heard various horror stories about the minority or the comrades who support the minority I would say this: I have not heard one that is true. Nonetheless, if they were all true—it would not make our political positions incorrect as vice versa if we were the

models of angelic perfection that would not make everything we said therefore politically correct. Let the politics speak for itself and judge things in that manner.

Just to finish with Comrade Tussey, we will take responsibility for any people who left because they agreed with us, if you will take responsibility for all those who have left the movement who agreed with the majority. McCann-Gregorich-Passen and Massey and all the supporters of our minority tendency intend to stay in the Socialist Workers Party and continue to build the Party and carry out its tasks in whatever field we are assigned to do so. That is what we have done in the past. Comrade Tussey was aware of this with at least three of the writers. As for me—my record, like most comrades is one of consistent party building. Since I have not been attacked in print on that score, I will say no more.

X. YOU CAN WAIT UNTIL HELL FREEZES OVER— COMRADE TUSSEY WE ARE HERE TO STAY

Comrade Tussey said she has waited five or six years for the Proletarian Orientation Tendency comrades to change their minds and she says it has been, as evidenced in our documents, in vain. Keep waiting Comrade Tussey—5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 years we intend to keep fighting for the views we hold, ideas will convince us not organizational exclusion nor petty bourgeois slander. That type of thing might be effective when used by trade union bureaucrats and elements of that stripe but I am confident that it will receive short shrift in our ranks.

As to Comrade Tussey's view of what our positions are, I can only say that if Comrade Tussey is unaware that her presentation of our ideas is a complete distortion, more words would not help. For those interested, our documents exist and can be read. The points about the comrades of our tendency being uninvolved in the movements that the Party is working in is a complete lie. The report of the discussion in Cleveland leaves out one fact. That is that Comrade Tussey sat through it without saying a word. While I defend her right to be silent, I wish that she had been consistent. Her writing of a politically infantile and personally slanderous document, I see only as a means of organizationally ingratiating herself with the majority leadership, at the expense not only to our tendency but the Party itself. Whenever a party encourages this type of, I am afraid there is no other word for it, hackishness, the entire party suffers. Comrade Tussey complains about our ripping quotes out of context but she never quotes the members of the minority directly—she just interprets what she thought they said, or she takes quotes from our document but never even a full or complete sentence. Quite a dishonest method.

She then tells those of us around the country who have the nerve to agree politically with McCann-Gregorich and Passen, that we would be better off in the majority because it "has an added feature of embodying the experience of participants in earlier radicalizations of the working class in this country." I take it Comrade Tussey includes herself in this category, so I will let comrades judge this fringe benefit they will receive if they will only give up the struggle for a proletarian orientation. Also I can state that the minority is neither devoid in its ranks of having either veterans of the earlier or the later or the latest radicalizations. It is inspiring to note among other things the reception our documents have received among worker

members — Third World comrades, women comrades as well as students. We lack Comrade Tussey's participation in our ranks but we assure you that we will survive even that shortcoming. I am positive that I speak for the others in our Tendency when I say that we are confident in the power of our ideas and their relationship to reality and though today we are a minority, this is neither a permanent or an insurmountable barrier. With the rise in the class consciousness of the working class and the increasing contradictions of our main enemy — the forces of U.S. imperialism and capitalism, we of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency are confident not only of our abilities to convince, but of the Party's ability to accept the necessities of the orientation that we propose. Trotsky speaks for us when he stated:

It seems as if the new century, this gigantic newcomer, were bent at the very moment of its appearance to drive the optimist into absolute pessimism and civic nirvana.

IN REPLY TO "THIRD WORLD WORK AND A PROLETARIAN ORIENTATION"

by Maxine Williams, Brooklyn Branch, New York Local

In a recent counter-resolution on Third World work put forward by supporters of the For a Proletarian Orientation (FPO), I was amazed to see the charge that the party's abstention from Third World women's liberation is "readily evident." Have the comrades not been reading *The Militant*? Our press has given more coverage to Third World women's liberation than any other. In spite of the fact that the mass media was saying that Black women would not relate to women's liberation, and many Black nationalists brushed the movement off as a "white women's hangup," our press, our speaking tours, and our participation in Third World organizations have aided in exposing this myth.

We have also played a leading role in participating in the Third World Women's Alliance; we were also among the founders of that organization. The Third World Women's Alliance started as a semi-consciousness raising group. Although some of the women wanted to engage in mass action, many of the women counterposed such programs as food co-ops as a means of drawing new women into the movement. In essence the majority of the women became anti-mass action — indicating that they were tired of marching and that the demonstrations were useless. In spite of the relationship of forces, we were instrumental in getting them to relate to August 26. After the August 26 march, many of the women close to SNCC engaged in ultraleft rhetoric, referring to the demands as merely "middle class." Because the Third World Women's Alliance did not see masses of Third World women moving into action around feminism and because of their failure to understand the objective conditions for their lack of mass participation, their feeling of isolation led some of the women to backslide even from feminism.

Then, since some of the Third World women in the Alliance were eager to engage in struggle relating to feminism, we were able to engage these forces into the nucleus

Death to Utopia! Death to faith! Death to love! Death to hope! thunders the twentieth century in salvos of fire and in rumblings of guns.

Surrender, you pathetic dreamer. Here I am your long awaited twentieth century, your "future."

No, replies the unhumbled optimist: You — you are only the present. (The Age of Permanent Revolution, Trotsky, pg 41).

Yes Comrade Tussey — today you are the majority — but tomorrow we will be that majority. In the meantime we will both build the Party. We will see how you act as a majority and it is our advice that you also learn how a loyal minority acts, for your possible use in the future.

July 28, 1971

of the Third World Women's Caucus of the Women's Strike Coalition. The caucus, in which POW played a leading role, was instrumental in building the December 12 abortion action. Thus the claim that our work has been solely limited to the campus or a purely propagandistic level is simply not true. Third World women on campus are not divorced from the community and do not see the campus struggle as counterposed to the community. Rather we recognize that the campus can be utilized as an organizing tool of the community.

An example of this was the Third World Women's Coalition at Hunter College which supported the demand for a childcare center for the campus as well as for the community. It should not even be necessary to mention the catalytic role that students have played in bringing other forces into motion.

Because of the crisis of leadership which exists in the Black community, and the lack of any mass Black movement, our small Third World women cadre are somewhat limited in the type of actions we would like to see carried out. We must be careful in selecting the area in which we place our forces. That is why the abortion repeal campaign is so extremely important. Since abortion repeal obviously relates to the masses of Third World women, it can and will become a powerful hammer in the struggle for the right to control our own bodies. This is an area in which we can make advances in recruiting Third World women and increasing our cadre.

It should also be noted that welfare mothers at the July national abortion conference did not see the repeal campaign as being sell-out to poor women. One welfare mother mentioned in the Third World workshop that not struggling for abortion law repeal would actually pave the way for denying poor women, particularly Third World women, the right to abortion. She went on to state that welfare mothers can receive abortion through medicaid, but if

abortions are declared illegal, then they would be forced to resort to back alley abortions. We will also note here that at the National Welfare Rights convention in July there will be a workshop on abortion.

The comrades of the FPO document make the erroneous charge that the party has "not even minimally probed" the National Welfare Rights Organization. On the contrary, in antiwar actions, and in our present abortion campaign we have worked with forces within the NWRO in building coalitions and specific actions. In spite of the fact that the leadership of NWRO is male and that it is not a feminist organization, it is readily evident that the spectre of feminism has invaded that organization. An indication of this is the workshop planned for their conference on the topic, "Why welfare is a women's issue." We have sent comrades to that convention.

Women within the NWRO will inevitably become a part of the feminist movement. But there must also be a move-

ment which such women can relate to—issues that will bring new forces into motion and thereby heighten the political consciousness of those engaged in action. We feel that the national abortion repeal campaign will do just that. Third World women suffer more than anyone else from abortion laws. Since abortions are not legal, the only alternative we have is to be forced into motherhood or take our chances in the back alley. Third World Women United for Abortion Law Repeal is making it clear to the state, the church hierarchy and the racist and sexist institutions—No! You will no longer control our bodies. The revolutionary thrust behind this is evident. And no, comrades, we have not been abstaining, backsliding or hee-hawing. We have actively involved ourselves in the struggles where we have seen motion—struggles on campus and in the community which have the potential for turning this system upside down, inside out, from top to bottom.

ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONS AND THE PARTY CRISIS by the Communist Tendency

Because of the leadership's lack of political arguments, they have had to resort to attacking on organizational grounds those comrades who are in political disagreement with the party. Because these attacks have consisted of serious charges, such as unprincipled combinationism, it is unfortunate, but necessary, that we use ten minute round to answer the specious organizational charges and in doing so indicate some of the reasons that led us to form the Communist Tendency, submit a counter-resolution, and take on the responsibility of organizing ourselves into a disciplined faction to challenge the present leadership for the leadership of the party. We shall indicate some of the reasons for these steps and why they are being taken now and were not taken much sooner.

The Communist Tendency is the result of a differentiation in the left opposition that has been developing in the Party for several years. This differentiation took place with the formal appearance of a left opposition around the counter-resolution *For a Proletarian Orientation*. Comrades who were to take the initiative in forming the Communist Tendency saw at once that full support for that document was out of the question, that it could not be defended as it stood. We said we supported the general thrust of the document, its attempt "to compel the party to turn its attention to the class and to face its duty as a revolutionary organization," but we could not support its serious theoretical and political weaknesses, its total "inadequacy," devoid of real answers to the Political Committee's positions, its "parochial" rather than internationalist perspective.

At no time did we operate as a bloc, in spite of the efforts on the part of the comrades of the Communist Tendency to form a tendency with comrades of the now Proletarian Orientation Tendency. It was our intention

to bloc with these comrades on the principled basis of supporting the "general" line of their first document and to fight within the bloc as well as in the party for a political perspective that would challenge the political perspectives of the party leadership, thereby justifying the submission of the original document as a counter-resolution which, at the time and still today (even with the two additions) we cannot consider as a serious political alternative to the centrist politics of the party.

In other words, we attempted to provide the political answers to the major questions being posed: Why is it that the party is *not* oriented to the proletariat?" After all, isn't a proletarian orientation contained first and foremost in the program of the party?" we asked these comrades. Their response, while vague at first, has become clearer and clearer as the discussion has continued. Now, they state quite openly that they support the political program of the party—they are only disgruntled that the party is not carrying out that program in the right way, or rather, not in the right milieu—in spite of our objections that the party's program was in no way separable from its practice or the milieu that it was operating in and that to turn the party around, it was first and foremost incumbent upon us to take the party on politically. Their refusal to do so and thereby refusal to collaborate with us on such an undertaking brought the charge from us that the authors of the Proletarian Orientation document had centrist politics and in the course of the struggle were destined to move towards ourselves or towards the party leadership. While we hoped to win them and the comrades around them to a revolutionary program and a revolutionary internationalist perspective, in a common tendency if possible, we were prepared at all times to form a separate tendency if their criticisms did not in fact move them towards a revolutionary inter-

nationalist program and perspective. The leaders of the Proletarian Orientation did not move toward that program and perspective. They have moved toward the party leadership, and that is the origin of the Communist Tendency and is counter-resolution.

That the leaders of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency have indeed moved towards the Political Committee's political positions in the course of the struggle ought now to be clear to everyone.

We now have their Declaration of Tendency which states: "In declaring ourselves a tendency, we wish to make one thing very clear: our documents clearly support the positions taken by the SWP on the developing movements," and they then list three: the nationalist, anti-war, and women's movements. That is, they support the positions of the party leadership in precisely those areas which compromise the Party's main area of activity, in precisely those areas which compromise the Party's main area of activity, in precisely the arena of the party leadership's orientation. This made it clear to us, at least, that they have no principled difference with the party, no difference which merits a counter-resolution.

On the one hand the Proletarian Orientation comrades, "support the positions taken by the SWP on the developing movements," ie., apparently, they support the Political Committee's past, present and projected orientation. They do not say whether they have the same analysis as the Political Committee, or whether they have an analysis yet, or they have a different analysis which happens to lead to the same conclusions in all this practical activity. On the other hand they have been saying that this very same activity threatens to become a permanent student orientation, providing one "warning sign" after the other of the party leadership's persistent movement away from Leninist positions, that this very same activity has immersed the Party in an alien milieu and transformed it from a proletarian party into a party with a petty-bourgeois composition and petty-bourgeois leadership. Which hand do these comrades want us to eat out of? The hand that supports the Political Committee's orientation, or the hand that is repelled by it?

The leaders of the Proletarian Orientation apparently have only tactical differences with the Party. They must explain how that justifies a counter-resolution. Unless there are principled differences, ie. differences in theoretical analysis and differences in political program, there is no principled basis for a counter-resolution, that is, a faction.

Because of the lack of a political position, the comrades of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency have placed themselves in a most compromising position. On the one hand, they state that they are a tendency united around only one issue and that many of the comrades of the tendency have differences or agreement with the party on a number of other issues. There is nothing unprincipled about this as long as these comrades make known and vote accordingly on the other issues. But why, if the comrades are united around only one issue, do the comrades of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency submit their single issue difference (an organizational one at that) as a counter-resolution to the Political Committee's political resolution. Comrades, you can't challenge the party leadership without a political alternative! It is with this very fact that the party leadership has continually pinned you to the wall and has forced you to

adopt, formally, a political position—and the position you have adopted is the party's. But this has only placed you in deeper waters. You have now admitted that you have no political differences with the party; then why a counter-resolution? Comrades, are we supposed to think that we should vote for you because you can run, that is, administer, the party and carry out its line better than the present leadership? What proof do we have, comrades, that you will be better generals than the present lot. If we agreed with the political position of the party, we would not for one minute entertain voting for your grouping. Why should we? On what basis? (The present leadership has proven itself most capable not only of formulating the present line, but of carrying it out.) If you have differences of only an organizational, or tactical, nature, then you have *no* basis for a counter-resolution.

Even if you have *a* difference that you consider to be of a serious nature, you should form an ideological tendency which would confine itself "to a principled collective effort to argue for a change in the given policy" and not offer your difference as a counter-resolution which offers up yourselves as an alternative leadership.

You have adopted the political position of the party in order to make your document into a counter-resolution. In spite of the fact that this does not make your position any more a counter line than it was before, you have placed yourselves in an even more compromising position. No longer can you claim to be a tendency united around a single issue. The party's political position, which you have formally endorsed, must now be considered just as much a part of the cement which holds your grouping together as the original issues around which you united. This has excluded us politically from forming any bloc with you on your document as you have been forced to admit openly on the branch floor. Any comrade disagreeing with any part of the party's political program (now your political program) must disassociate himself from your tendency and cannot vote for the Proletarian Orientation resolution. We ask the individual comrades of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency: Do you or don't you have any principled *political* differences with the party? If you do, you cannot remain in a bloc with other comrades of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency and vote for their document. To do so would be to form an unprincipled bloc.

At the beginning of the discussion the leadership put some political questions to the supporters of the *For a Proletarian Orientation* document. These were distributed in violation of party procedure. When we called Comrade Wulp on his procedure, which he has yet to admit was incorrect, we were answered that our real reason in reproaching him and the leadership was to create a smoke-screen, because we were unable to answer politically. If these questions were so enlightening, why didn't Comrade Wulp submit this contribution through the normal channels of internal discussion and give the whole party the benefit of his ingenious discoveries instead of setting up his own independent publishing house in Boston? The truth of the matter is, comrades, that these questions of Comrade Wulp's did not bother the comrades of the now Communist Tendency in the least. In fact, we had beaten Comrade Wulp to the punch. We had posed many of the same questions to the supporters of the Proletarian Orientation document much before Comrade Wulp. As we stated earlier, we told these comrades that it was necessary to

outline a clear alternative to the centrist politics of the party leadership. This is the line and orientation we have followed from the beginning.

On the branch floor as well as in our document, we have not tried to conceal one ounce of our differences with the party on the international issues, as well as on the domestic ones. We, comrades, have maintained a disciplined attitude in the discussion trying to use our discussion time to best advantage to attack the party's political position in every field. In as much as we have criticized the party's politics, we have also been criticizing those those comrades of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency to decide what politics they were going to adopt to round out their so-called counter-resolution—ours or the politics of the party leadership. Thus, several comrades of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency have been forced to get up on the branch floor and differentiate themselves from our political positions. We made our politics clear. The pressure from both sides, the left and the right, have forced the Proletarian Orientation Tendency comrades to clarify their politics. We have stated on the branch floor that a proletarian orientation was first and foremost a political orientation, have proceeded with our political attacks on the party's positions, and state clearly that the party's political program is of the same whole cloth as centrism. To take the party's politics to the working class would be to take centrist politics to the working class.

Addressing ourselves to the comrades of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency, we say to you:

Comrades, you must not persist on your present rightward course. You must see the primacy of program. You must see that a simple organizational integration into the working class in itself cannot solve the party's programmatic problems, that work and roots in the class is not a panacea, however necessary, however important. You must see that the program and perspectives of revolutionary internationalism is what we must first of all be clear about. This is the way to rise up to the mastery of Marxism.

Comrades, we well end by repeating what the comrades of the Communist Tendency told you in the beginning of May: that you have in fact been "seeking to build not a tendency but a 'single-issue united front-type coalition' in the party. That "this is rotten politics." That "you win people on a program not on the basis of vague misgivings" or possible future dangers. That we regard you "too highly to abandon our politics for peaceful co-existence," that we will fight for our politics.

We urge you to consider our political criticisms carefully, to study them and see if our political criticisms do not answer the question we have asked over and over: Why is it that the party is *not* oriented to the proletariat? Is not the answer contained within the very political positions of the party which you have now endorsed? Someday, comrades you will be forced to answer these questions, if you do not continue on your present course and capitulate organizationally, as well as politically, to the present party leadership. In answering these questions you will be forced to fill the political void with either the politics the Communist Tendency has put before you or those of an opponent organization.

Comrades, we have placed before you a document which not only makes a critical analysis of the present politics but also shows how these politics are only the present link in the process of the party's degeneration. Your meager beginnings to deal with the problems of the party will lead to correct conclusions *only* when you face the present party crisis from the aspect of an historical analysis and with an internationalist perspective as we have done. "It is impermissible and fatal to break or weaken a political line for purposes of vulgar conciliationism; it is impermissible to paint up centrism when it zig-zags to the left; it is impermissible, in the hunt after the will-o'-the-wisps of centrism, to exaggerate and inflate differences of opinion with genuine revolutionary co-thinkers." (Trotsky) We, therefore, urge you to consider our counter-resolution as the only counterresolution by withdrawing your own, so together we can struggle for the life of the party.

July 27, 1971

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION:
AN INITIAL ASSESSMENT
By The Communist Tendency

Due to the pressure of time, we were unable to include in our counter-resolution an analysis of the burning questions now being debated in the international arena. Despite this, we feel that our position on these questions could be easily inferred by a careful reading and thorough understanding of our diagnosis of the International and of the party. We are, nevertheless, not satisfied with merely implying the line we feel to be correct. In order to present clearly our positions we are submitting this document. Due to the lateness of its publication, we are introducing

it only as a contribution to the discussion. Nonetheless, it should be clearly understood that the analysis presented here is the logical conclusion of the line of the counter-resolution, and is not simply a possible interpretation.

In the title of this document there is one key word — "initial." It is our belief that internationalism, like charity, begins at home but does not end there. Our movement is a world movement and the pre-World Congress international discussion is now open. We hope to be able to present to the cadres of world Trotskyism a correct polit-

ical alternative to the Tweedledum-Tweedledee choices now before them. We have no faith in either the "orthodox" SWP or in the unregenerate leaders of the old guard "Pabloites." Despite all the bitter rhetoric, neither leadership is capable of understanding the real situation or of dealing with the problems and opportunities presented by it. If our movement is ever to return to its correct course, the fight against centrist politics must not be confined to the borders of the United States, but must instead be carried into the international arena.

* * *

The leadership of the International after 1940 characterized itself by its adaptation to the petty-bourgeois leaderships in the working-class movement, which culminated in what became known as "Pabloism." The leadership of the International, under the direction of Pablo, began formally to change the traditional program to justify the adaptationism which had long been characteristic of the International's conjunctural political analysis and day-to-day practice. This took place during a period of seeming Stalinist hegemony in the working class and, therefore, took the predominant (but by no means only) coloration of being a capitulation to Stalinism. With the outbreak of the Tito-Stalin dispute, Yugoslavia was declared to have been a workers' state all along, in spite of the 2nd World Congress Theses which specifically branded it capitalist. The petty-bourgeois partisan movement was endowed retroactively with socialist qualities independent of the working class and of a revolutionary leadership. This analysis was helped along and consummated with the falling into power of the petty-bourgeois guerrilla movement in China led by the Stalinists under Mao Tse-tung. The new regimes established outside of the working class and in the absence of a revolutionary party were declared to have independently established (or to be in the process of establishing) workers' states. Thus not only were the traditional petty-bourgeois leaderships of the working-class movement endowed with a "progressive" role, but now the mass petty-bourgeois movements themselves were endowed with progressive, nay, revolutionary, socialist qualities. The adaptation to the so-called "progressive," petty-bourgeois leaderships in the working-class movement logically called into question the necessary role of the revolutionary leadership, that is, the bolshevik party. But the claim that a petty-bourgeois movement had independently established a workers' state called into question not only the necessity of a bolshevik party, but also the necessity of the proletariat itself. The petty-bourgeois masses were placed on the same historic level as the proletariat; it too was a class which could effect historic transformations in the age of imperialism; it was no longer a class which vacillated between the two major classes in society, but rather a class which could, like the proletariat, be the grave-digger of capitalism and the progenitor of socialism. From this happy discovery everything followed quite naturally.

The theory of Permanent Revolution was turned into a caricature. The heart of the theory, that is, the necessary and primary role of the proletariat, was merely discarded. But the theory was, for the sake of orthodoxy, salvaged by inculcating it with an impregnable and inexorable "logic" as the "prime mover" in place of the proletariat.

The theory was reduced to a text-book of absolute logic used to describe what had taken place, always after the fact. Revolutions were made and healthy workers' states were established by different political tendencies, and their regimes, who were *inextricably* caught in the "logic" of the permanent revolution. To be inextricably caught in this "logic" meant only that the leadership must be sincerely and honestly indignant about any and all oppression. They would then, even without being aware of the existence of the theory of the Permanent Revolution, be forced to carry out the "categorical imperatives" of the theory, which would put them into the category of being "unconscious Trotskyists." The growing potency of this "logic" was inseparable from the theoretical postulate that the balance of forces on a world scale had shifted in favor of socialism. The historical plane was now tilted so that any "sincere" leadership would quite naturally slide down the "logical" chute marked with the words "permanent revolution."

The reunification in 1963 of the sections of the International Committee with the sections of the International Secretariat, supported fraternally by the S.W.P., took place primarily because of their convergent positions on the nature of the Cuban Revolution. The analysis of the Cuban Revolution made by both factions paralleled the positions that the International had originally taken on the Yugoslavian and Chinese revolutions. This rejection of the traditional analysis of Trotskyism by the SWP marked, as we have shown, its formal transformation into a centrist party, thus permitting an ideological reconciliation with the original "Pabloites" who had already blazed the trail of deviationism leading ultimately to liquidationism.

With the analysis that Cuba had independently become a workers' state, came the concomitant idealization of the Castroite Bonapartist regime — just as the International had previously idealized the Titoist and Maoist regimes. Cuba was declared to be a healthy workers' state. Our, the SWP's approach to the Castroite leadership, as well as the International's, was no different than the International's previous approach to the Titoist and Maoist leaderships. We publicized and praised to the heavens everything we thought was good and correct and kept a deafening silence about everything else. Such a condescending approach could only lead to disaster. (This permissive child raising approach has only paved the road to coalition politics with Dr. Spock and other such pacifist ilk in the anti-war movement.) It led us to outright political support of other guerrilla movements without the slightest criticism, a fact of at least six years duration — which we would now very much like to forget.

Translating into layman's terms the theoretical aberrations above, the Cuban Revolution and possible future revolutions were explained with the "blunt instrument" theory. That is: Imperialism, for any number of peculiar reasons, had its "weak link" in Cuba. This link was so weak that it was not like the *chain* "link" of Russia, which required the Bolshevik Party to smash it; but was more like a *sausage* link, which required only a "blunt instrument," in this case, a petty-bourgeois clique leading a band of guerrilla fighters. The impressionistic and pragmatic theories of non-Leninist, non-proletarian leaderships being compelled by the "logic" of the Permanent Revolution to transform capitalist states into healthy workers' states ("healthy" in the case of Cuba because it wasn't Stalinist!) due only

to their good intentions, represents a total rejection of Marxism. They have revealed that the only "blunt instruments" involved are the brains of those who concocted the theories.

Another theoretical contribution for which the SWP can specifically claim credit is the theory of the "workers' and peasants' government." As Comrade Hansen explains it, "the key item in Cuba was the workers and peasants' government established in 1959. . . ." It was a transitional regime of "petty-bourgeois parties" which "finally destroyed the capitalist state." Generalizing from their newly formulated (*ex post facto*) theories of the Cuban Revolution, the leadership of the just recently re-united 4th International pinned all their hopes in Algeria on the new Fidel, Ben Bella. Here was the first chance the theoretical innovators had to apply their theories in action before the fact. Ben Bella's regime was baptized a "workers and peasants' government" — a "blunt instrument" on the way to establishing a workers' state. Pablo, a member of the United Secretariat, even held a post in this government. But something went wrong; the "blunt instrument" of "the workers' and peasants' government was brought down." Unceremoniously it was explained, *ex post facto*, that the transitional "workers and peasants' government" could regress back to a capitalist regime, government, state or what-have-you. It was later (five years later) timidly explained in an internal document of the United Secretariat for the 3rd World Congress since Reunification, that perhaps the Algerian government had been designated a "workers and peasants' government" "too soon." Whether it was ever a "workers and peasants' government," or how the leadership made the "mistake" of designating it a "workers and peasants' government" "too soon" — even to the point of participating in this government — or what relation this setback had to the theoretical phantasmagoria originally hatched to explain the Cuban Revolution, was never even considered in the Secretariat's "self-criticism."

The workers and peasants' (or farmers') government is not a petty-bourgeois "transitional" formation between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and that of the proletariat; it is simply a propaganda slogan for the workers' state, for the dictatorship of the proletariat. *The Transitional Program* clearly states this: "In the final instance it represented nothing more than a popular designation of the already established dictatorship of the proletariat." Moreover, *The Transitional Program* explains the reality of Comrade Hansen's line: "the Comintern. . . gave to the formula of the 'workers and peasants' government' a completely different, purely 'democratic'; i.e., bourgeois; content, *counterposing* it to the dictatorship of the proletariat." The SWP's line, like the United Secretariat's, is a Menshevik line.

The reason that Cuba became a workers' state is not because Castro fell into it through his good nature. The Cuban workers' state bears the same birth mark as the Eastern European and Chinese workers' states — "Made in the USSR." The Cuban workers' state was born deformed for the very same reason that it was born at all — the dominant influence of the Soviet Union which ensured Castro's survival, enabled economic "growth", and provided the economic model for Cuba's transformation. Workers' democracy is not on the horizon in Cuba and never will be without a political revolution. It appears that the leadership — with perhaps the Secretariat showing the

way — is preparing to call Cuba a "degenerated" workers' state. We hope they can locate Thermidor and a Stalin to personify it.

In spite of the fiasco in Algeria, the magic formula of a "workers' and peasants' government" and its precipitant, guerrilla warfare, was not abandoned. Disregarding all previous experience of Marxism, which indicated that guerrillaism was the classic method of peasant revolt, the leadership placed all its bets on the non-proletarian layers of the "third world". Unfortunately for the party leadership, in Latin America, their guerrilla chickens are coming home to roost. Immersed in a narrow, respectable legalistic movement in the U.S., they find the reality of guerrillaism horrible to behold. They try to get out of the dilemma by making a big deal out of "tactic" and "strategy." They are all for guerrillas, but only as a *tactic*. This false line can be revealed by a simple analogy. Terrorism is a non-Marxist means of "revolution", similar to guerrillaism. Are we in favor of terrorism as a "tactic" to build the party, or as a strategy? It is clear that only in a revolutionary uprising do all these means become legitimate, as a subordinate part of the over-all struggle. Then one might blow up trains, etc., only as a part of total war, just as guerrillaism becomes the peasants' contribution to the armed uprising. Guerrilla warfare can be considered a tactic only in the strategy of seizing state power, and not in the strategy of building the party.

Many comrades, recognizing the insanity of Mandel's and Maitan's line on Latin America, where their *official* Argentine section is nothing more than a southern branch of the Weathermen, react by supporting the "orthodoxy" of the SWP. It is a hollow orthodoxy and a false perspective. The SWP has no "proletarian orientation" for Latin America, just as it has none for the United States.

Their uncritical support to the Peruvian comrade, Hugo Blanco, who organized peasants exclusively, and his limited self-criticism, proves that the SWP has no intention of entering the trade unions, of raising the transitional program — especially the idea of a workers' militia. Comrade Blanco's self-criticism amounted to nothing more than raising the proletariat to the same level of importance as the peasantry and organizing it into a party with the peasantry. This "two-class party" contradicts the theory of the Permanent Revolution, since it eliminates the leading role of the proletariat organized under its own banner. The SWP has no alternative except, perhaps, Comrade Camejo's profundity that Blanco "should have been on campus."

For another proof look at the SWP of India, which is repeating Blanco's misake in West Bengal. Here, not coincidentally, we have a refutation by Trotsky, "The poor peasants of Hupeh, Kwantung, or Bengal can play a role . . . only if they support the workers of Shanghai, Hankow, Canton, and Calcutta. This is the only road for the revolutionary peasant . . ." (*Third International After Lenin*, p. 226; our emphasis)

One crushing refutation of the SWP's theories has occurred recently. The Palestinian guerrillas have paid in blood for their false policies. The SWP has adapted to these petty-bourgeois movements, and has continually, in a totally false way, counterposed "critical" and "unconditional" support. In addition it has propagated the major slogan of Fatah — the Palestinian Kuomintang — the "democratic secular state". What is a "democratic state", but a bourgeois

state? We should counterpose to this our slogan of a "workers' and farmers' government". In addition we should not tail-end these movements but instead adopt a program suitable for the Middle East, using *The Transitional Program* as a basis, and including the role of the Palestinian working class as a catalyst of the Middle East socialist revolution. The Israeli proletariat, in addition, can and must be won on a class program which would include a policy of revolutionary defeatism, and not by concessions, such as "self-determination", to their present chauvinism. The contradictions of capitalism, which will impel the Jewish workers into action, are as real in Israel as they are in the rest of the world, and flow precisely from Israel's role in the Middle East.

Our press has consistently carried an incorrect analysis of the civil war in Jordan. Comrade Langston's articles on the September blood-bath offer a perfect example of mistaking the ebb for the flow. Since the liquidation has begun our press has given scant coverage of Hussein's campaign against the Palestinian guerrillas. Apparently the leadership knows enough to keep quiet when its whole perspective is being destroyed—a familiar trademark of our press. But more important, it is unable to analyze the meaning of this defeat. Is it just "a military setback", or will it involve a long-term stabilization in the area? In fact, it is the opportunity for a revolutionary organization to intervene and prepare for the next round, instead of piously relegating to the automatic processes the revolutionary differentiation taking place among the guerrillas.

The leadership has a formally correct position against Israeli Jewish self-determination, but that is all. They, however, never consider how the democratic rights for the Jews are to be reconciled with full self-determination for the Palestinians, since this would include their right to expel the Jews. As an antidote to this we should propose an "Open the Doors" policy for all the imperialist powers, especially the United States. This would also help prevent the strengthening of Zionism by eliminating the advantages Israel receives from Soviet anti-Semitism, and

would expose the reactionary and hypocritical role of imperialism.

The failure of the leadership's analysis is no mere academic matter. Comrade Peng's position of giving critical support to the Liu faction during the Cultural Revolution was rejected. Mao, in his interview with Snow, has revealed that the basis for Peng's analysis, open civil war between the factions, was an actuality. It is now clear that Mao's victory in the Cultural Revolution was a disaster for the world proletariat. *The victory of Mao was the pre-condition for the coming open betrayal of the Vietnamese workers and peasants.* Even the leadership can attribute no other meaning than this to Nixon's forthcoming visit to Peking.

The leadership has consistently soft-pedaled the Stalinist nature of the NLF/PRG and of their program; as well as that of the Stalinist masters of Hanoi, who refuse to countenance revolution in the area, in order to "secure peace" with the imperialists. Moreover, the leadership has consistently downgraded the fact that both the "Set the date" propaganda and the "People's Peace Treaty" are creations of the Vietnamese Stalinists. Instead of branding the Hanoi and NLF Stalinists as misleaders who have seized control of a spontaneous movement in order to betray it, the leadership has made them out to be revolutionaries. Nor is the International leadership any better. It has *glorified* the Stalinists, especially Ho Chi Minh, the assassin of Trotskyists.

Both of these approaches are the very opposite of Trotskyism and must be rejected. The leadership's policy on Vietnam is only the logical extension of its policy on Cuba, on Algeria, on guerrillaism, on the Middle East, and on China. It indicates a pattern of departure from Trotskyism, despite small differences between the SWP and the United Secretariat. We will not support "Kautsky" against "Bernstein". This blind alley is not the way out. The leadership's international policies must be rejected if we are to regain our program and our heritage in order to build the World Party.

July 29, 1971