



Discussion Bulletin

Published by

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

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

Vol. 29 No. 24
August 1971

CONTENTS

PAGE

THIRD WORLD WORK AND A PROLETARIAN ORIENTATION: Counter-draft Resolution to "Struggle for Chicano Liberation," Political Committee Draft Resolution, submitted by Froben Lozada, Hilda Rangel de Guerrero, Fernando Guerrero, Oakland/Berkeley Branch

2

TOWARD A MARXIST APPROACH TO THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT, by Margaret Charous, Sandy Hall, Beth Semmer, Celia Stodola, Oakland/Berkeley Branch

8

THREE CONCRETE WAYS TO BUILD A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY, by Mary Henderson, Oakland/Berkeley Branch

22

SOME COMMENTS ON HEDDA GARZA'S WORDS AND DEEDS, by Mary Henderson, Oakland/Berkeley Branch

23

30 cents

THIRD WORLD WORK AND A PROLETARIAN ORIENTATION
Counter-draft Resolution to "Struggle for Chicano Liberation,"
Political Committee Draft Resolution, Submitted by Froben Lozada,
Hilda Rangel de Guerrero, Fernando Guerrero, Oakland/Berkeley Branch

INTRODUCTION

The national leadership today no longer has a proletarian orientation. Today the party is moving away from some of the basic tenets of Marxism. Today we are making quantity everything and sacrificing quality. Today size and influence have become everything in movements which we once considered petty-bourgeois. Today what we once correctly called a tactical turn (i.e. student movement) is slowly becoming a strategy of revolution. The national leadership feels very comfortable in its present day milieu — the petty-bourgeoisie. Today the dangers Comrade Trotsky warned about in 1939 concerning a lack of a proletarian composition and orientation, are becoming a reality. This adaptation of the national leadership to the petty-bourgeois (student) milieu is nowhere more evident than in the party's relationship to the nationalist struggles of Black and Brown peoples.

A PROLETARIAN ORIENTATION AND THE NATIONALIST STRUGGLES

Any orientation away from the industrial proletariat and the working-class as a whole is an orientation away from the most oppressed sector of the working-class — the Black and Brown masses. Our understanding of the revolutionary potential of Third World people has always been based on the interpretation of the (1) objective reality of the national oppression faced by Third World peoples and (2) their relationship to the means of production. The double oppression of Third World people has always made their struggle the most explosive and has always made it of primary importance to the revolutionary socialist movement. The struggle that Third World people have been engaged in and will participate in, due to their objective relation to the means of production and the character of national oppression, will propel them into playing a vanguard role in the coming socialist revolution.

Today we are told by the national leadership that America is undergoing a deep radicalization. We are told that this radicalization is the deepest and most profound radicalization in American history. This analysis has been used repeatedly to rationalize our involvement in the petty-bourgeois milieu and to justify our absence from the working class struggles (community, schools, factories, unemployment). The leadership will be happy to know that a part of their analysis is correct. America is undergoing a deep and very profound radicalization — a radicalization that no foreseeable event will be able to halt. The radicalization we speak of is not only taking place on the university campuses, but in the ghettos and barrios throughout this country. The radicalization we speak of has given rise to nationalism among the most oppressed sectors of the American working class. The rudimentary features of Black nationalism, which although, in many cases, developed from petty-bourgeois sectors, combined with Chicano nationalism, have penetrated the Black and Brown communities in the most dramatic anti-white, anti-capitalist expression in American history. Unfortunately, the party has not followed along a similar course.

While Black and Brown brothers and sisters are forming independent caucuses within some of the most vital unions in the U. S., while young Black and Brown (and white) GIs have gone through a tremendous radicalization in Germany, Vietnam, and here at home, the national leadership is probing the potential of gay power. While Third World people are engaging in concrete struggles for community control (i.e. ethnic studies, high schools, medical facilities) the party national leadership is struggling to gain political hegemony on the university campuses to the exclusion of doing more than reporting on and observing other struggles.

Though there is no contradiction for the party to probe the gay movement or participate on the college campus and help guide the radicalization of students, and recruit the best to our movement, it is almost a criminal act for a revolutionary party to function the way the party has in reference to the radicalization of Third World people. It may seem to some comrades that we counterpose one movement against another. However, it is not we who counterpose them. It is the national leadership's adaptation to the petty-bourgeois movements that causes them to be counterposed.

Due to the nature of the oppression that Third World people experience, our party has always maintained that their struggle will be in the vanguard of the revolution and that it must be the SWP's top priority to participate in that struggle at all levels on a day to day basis. As Comrade Trotsky bluntly stated as long ago as 1939, "If it happens that we in the SWP are not able to find the road to this stratum, [i.e. Black workers] then we are not worthy at all. The permanent revolution and all the rest would be only a lie. . . . It is a question of whether the party is to be transformed into a sect or if it is capable of finding its way to the most oppressed part of the working-class." (*Leon Trotsky on Black Nationalism and Self-Determination*, pp. 41-44.) While we are for utilizing our limited forces advantageously and strategically to recruit from the most active sectors of society, we also maintain that it is the duty of all revolutionaries (white and non-white) to aid/as much as possible this radicalization of the Black and Brown movements.

THE SWP AND THE CRISIS IN LEADERSHIP OF THE BLACK COMMUNITY

In the 1930s Leon Trotsky declared that the working class was in a crisis — a crisis in leadership. With that declaration, Comrade Trotsky summoned all serious revolutionaries to the banner of the Fourth International. The Fourth International was formed in order to *fill the vacuum of leadership* left by the Third International. Today we are told by the national leadership that there is a crisis of leadership in the Black community. When the Black community (and particularly, "Black workers who are potentially the most powerful sector of the Black community in the struggle for liberation," *DB* Vol. 27, No. 1, p. 9, Political Committee Memorandum, 1969) is in a crisis of leadership, the party feels that we should not actively engage in Third World struggles that are off the university campus. That is, when in the last two years,

a decisive sector through massive strikes and struggles (Postal, Steel, Auto, Polaroid), has indicated its readiness and combativity both against the trade union bureaucrats and the bourgeois state we are not encouraged to participate, yet, we call ourselves a revolutionary party.

Does the party lack a confidence to intervene in this 'crisis of leadership'? Does the party feel it has an inadequate program for Black Liberation? Does the party leadership lack confidence in its ability to develop cadre, to guide and lead the most vital sector of the American working-class? In other words, the party which has the perspective of politically shaping the American revolution turns its back on the Black community when it is in a crisis.

On the contrary we feel that it is of the utmost importance to:

- (1) make a more complete and thorough analysis of the present day political level of the Black community
- (2) analyze more thoroughly the different political tendencies within the Black liberation movement
- (3) Make an in-depth analysis of the uneven development between the Black masses and its present leadership or lack of leadership.
- (4) develop a programmatic outline for the party to best effectively intervene in this crisis of leadership.

The party must "redefine its priorities" and give the Black and Brown movements more serious attention. It must take complete and full inventory of its resources to be able to effectively give the support and direction that our Third World comrades vitally need. The party leadership must begin an intensive orientation to the party ranks to dispel the myth that only Third World people can do Third World work. It is time to take full cognizance of the fact that the struggle of Black and Brown people will not solely be on the university campus, but that it will take place in the communities where they live, the factories where they work and the schools which they attend. In other words, the beginning of a serious orientation toward the Black and Brown nationalities can only start with a change from a petty-bourgeois orientation to a proletarian orientation. Only then will the party maximize all its resources and cadre (white and non-white) to intervene in the nationalist struggles and the trade union struggles which have already been affected by the present dynamic of the nationalist struggles.

THE FIRST CRY OF CHICANO NATIONALISM "HUELGA"

Unlike the Black struggle, the first major development in the present Chicano movement took place in one of the most oppressed sections of the working-class. *La Huelga* has had the most profound impact on the Chicano community and on young people in particular. *La Huelga* movement was the first serious attempt to unionize the farm workers and confront the barons of agri-business. *La Huelga* movement in the Southwest and particularly California was the first successful victory in accomplishing what no other organized body (AFL and CIO) was able to do. What was the key of the farmworkers' organizing committee? What formula was devised to successfully confront the ruling-class? Cesar Chavez in 1964 came to a very simple conclusion. He realized that the only success-

ful way to organize the farmworkers was to organize along nationalist lines. This is not an unfamiliar concept, which our party, through its understanding of nationalism, has always considered to be one of the most progressive factors of the Third World struggles. Here again, we wish to emphasize that this struggle was not inspired by a university campus takeover, but on the contrary, the valiant struggle by the farm workers to this date has inspired and served as an example to all sectors of the Chicano community — most especially Chicano students.

"HUELGA", CHICANO STUDENTS, AND THE SWP

In 1964 the National Farm Workers Association began to develop services (prior to any unionizing attempts) to meet the needs of Chicanos (and in other communities of Filipinos, Japanese-Americans) such as credit unions, cooperative stores, newspapers, and health clinics. With the understanding that the oppression of the farm-worker was not only an economic one, but also a racial one, the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee saw the necessity of participating not only in the *Huelga* movement (i.e. struggles for higher wages and better working conditions, etc.) but also of becoming an integral part of *La Causa*. This proved to be of tremendous value in the Chicano community when unionizing attempts were begun.

The support that *Huelga* received from the Chicano community, and of Chicano students in particular, was one of the most significant factors in their success. The support and participation of Chicano youth had a deep radicalizing effect on the entire community. The concept of unity in action became a living reality to all young Chicanos (including figures like Corky Gonzales and Jose A. Gutierrez) — a reality which they could take pride in.

Where was the party and what was its thinking on the question throughout this time? During the period 1964-1967 the party did not have any position on the *Huelga* movement. For that matter, the party has not had a position on the Mexican-American question to this date. It seems ironical that when a section of the most oppressed sector of the working-class was fulfilling one of Comrade Trotsky's prognoses, the party had a total and unexcusable abstentionist attitude toward it. This attitude was not due to any lack of information or to any short sightedness. We feel that the party's attitude was one of total adaptation to the petty-bourgeois milieu and its movements thereof. In the Southwest, no serious work was done in the *Huelga* movement. Work that was done was of a haphazard nature with no national or regional coordination. With only a sporadic mentioning in *The Militant* of the *Huelga* movement, our participation in the formative years of the Chicano movement was nil.

Of course some comrades maintain the position that the only reason the party did not intervene in the Chicano movement until 1968 was because there was no movement to speak of. This type of ludicrous arrogance is the most despicable kind to be found in a revolutionary party. With the rise of a trade-union movement combined with a nationalist struggle, which the party had been speaking of since 1939, we were unable to intervene or even make the most minimal propaganda attempt in our press. The national leadership did not see the beginning of a new rise in working-class militancy (i.e. Chicano farmworkers) because their eyes were blinded by the new horizons that

white student militancy seemed to offer. Was it easier for the party national leadership to intervene in movements where it could readily assume leadership roles but which had no major social weight? Does the party leadership find it easier to solely lead student movements regardless of its dedication to a proletarian, a Marxist approach?

The simple fact of this matter is, that recruitment of Chicano workers, of Chicanas, and by far of Chicano students would have been extraordinarily higher had the party participated in those first few steps of the young Chicano movement. Our work in all areas of the Chicano struggle, La Raza Unida Party, the Chicano antiwar movement, could have benefited from the experiences of of cadre building in the young Huelga movement. The reputation we might have built in the Chicano movement by forming a viable left wing, that is intervening with our transitional program, or as some comrades term it, "being the best builders" within the Huelga movement, could have been one of the most valuable assets to the party in all its work and especially its work in the ranks of the Chicano movement.

Comrades, this is a case of not only "missing the boat" but of actually tripping over ones feet and falling off the pier.

THE ROLE OF CHICANO STUDENTS

Today the party is finally becoming aware of the Chicano movement. Unfortunately its awareness is not within the context of a methodical Marxist approach. The party's approach to the Chicano movement has not been one of orienting itself to an oppressed working class section, but of orienting the Chicano movement to the party's university campus approach. *Without fear of sounding pessimistic, the national leadership should be notified that less than one half of one percent (less than .005) of Chicano youth go to a four year college institution.* Yet this is the narrow arena the party wishes to orient toward. The reality is that many of the Chicano students who do go to a four year institution are the most privileged and most bourgeoisified within the community. These elements are susceptible to the most blatant petty-bourgeois diletantism. From UCLA MECHA in its ultraleft Maoist ideology, to UC Berkeley's FRENTE and its opportunist reformism. *These are some of the elements that the party feels will play a vanguard role.* Although there is nothing basically wrong in trying to approach and recruit the *healthiest and most serious* Chicano activists out of this milieu, it is totally incorrect to orient our work chiefly in this direction and ignore or subjugate two-year college and high school institutions which have repeatedly shown their militancy. This is not to say that the party has not done any work in these fields (as in the case of Merritt College) but its work has been sporadic with very little consistency or follow through.

MERRITT COLLEGE

Some of the major work the party has done in the Chicano movement has been at Merritt College. The work that the party has done in the Chicano movement, especially on campuses has met with only very limited success. To plant seeds of illusion will not in the long run help the party develop Chicano cadres that it desperately needs.

A case in point is Merritt College in Oakland and our role in the Chicano movement there. Now it is true that we do have some exceptional and favorable conditions at Merritt College when one considers that for the last two and one-half years our comrades have played leading roles in developing the ethnic studies program and implementing it. The positions that our comrades have as instructors are of the most vital importance. But unfortunately because the Oakland/Berkeley branch like all other branches across the country makes its political axis the university campus, (in this case UC Berkeley) the comrades at Merritt College have not had the backing nor resources of the branch as a whole. When one considers the role our comrades could be playing and the influence they could be exerting at Merritt College, it almost becomes a travesty. The mere fact that during these last two and one half years we have not recruited out of the Chicano Student Union nor have directly recruited out of the ethnic studies department at Merritt, due to the inability of doing consistent work on a day to day basis, should cause understandable alarm within our ranks. When one considers that the national leadership has assigned three full time comrades nationally to probe the gay liberation movement (whose Marxist relevancy has yet to be analyzed), why hasn't the national office seen the importance of intervening with similar enthusiasm at Merritt College.

To judge our effectiveness in intervening in the Chicano movement (and the Black movement) we must always use recruitment and consolidation of new members into the Trotskyist movement as one of the most vital yardsticks available to us. There is nothing wrong with patting ourselves on the back when we make highly successful literature interventions at Chicano conferences or when we have SWP Chicano candidates running for public office endorsed by Third World organizations. However, it is meaningless to consider these events "qualitative leaps forward" when we cannot follow through. When one considers that the YSA even after its intervention in the May 1970 student crisis, had a net recruitment of *one* Third World comrade during the whole year it is time to quit fooling ourselves. It is time for us to grow up. It is time to see the reality of the real world as it is — not the way the national leadership sees it. We should not assess our Chicano work and work in general through rose-colored spectacles to hide from the real world. We must consider the inability of our movement to recruit to be a symptom of shortcomings in our lack of concrete intervention in Third World work. The sole fact that we have the right program will not guarantee our leadership in the Black or Brown movements.

PROGRAM IS NOT ENOUGH— THE CHICANO MORATORIUM

This can be best illuminated with the developments of the Chicano Moratorium of August 29th, 1970. The Chicano Moratorium is probably one of the most dramatic examples of the current Chicano radicalization taking place. The perspective of building a massive anti-war demonstration by one of the most oppressed sections of the working class was of great social significance. While the so-called 1970 antiwar lull was taking place throughout the college campuses, hundreds of Chicano activists were building the largest, most militant and massive Third

World antiwar demonstrations in the country. The SWP-YSA has always understood that Third World people would eventually become part of the vanguard of the antiwar movement. It always understood that the high death rate and the racist conditions which prevail in the armed forces and Third World communities would make Third World people take an antiwar position. With this arsenal of understanding under our belt one must ask why the party played no leadership role in building the Chicano Moratorium.

We first learned of the Chicano Moratorium at the second Denver Chicano Youth Conference. Shortly thereafter, two members of the Chicano Moratorium Committee participated in the Cleveland antiwar conference in mid-June. In fact one of the three antiwar actions endorsed by the June conference was the Chicano Moratorium as proposed by the Gordon-Lafferty proposal (presumably supported by the YSA-SWP). This situation is due to the fact that the Moratorium recognized the importance of the antiwar movement that the party helped to build and is to the party's credit.

The party national leadership was also aware that the Chicano Moratorium endorsed the Cleveland Conference and was friendly. At this point the national leadership should have called for a national discussion with participation from California and other Southwest comrades on how to relate to this new antiwar development. But no political direction or, for that matter, discussion on our intervention was initiated by the national office. There was no discussion on the feasibility of sending any comrades to Los Angeles to work on a day to day basis to build the Chicano Moratorium. Both the Los Angeles and Oakland/Berkeley branches of the party had no perspective whatsoever for local action during the formative six months of the Chicano Moratorium (twenty-three smaller moratoriums taking place throughout the Southwest) or in helping to build these actions. It was only until the Aztlan tour, conducted by Comrades Camejo and Lozada, that we began to encourage Chicanos, throughout the Southwest, to attend the Moratorium. It was not until *two weeks* before August 29th that the first discussions were held to outline our literature intervention in the Chicano Moratorium. As it was stated in the "Internal Report on the Chicano Moratorium" written by comrades Lozada and Hernandez after interviewing Rosalio Munoz of the Chicano Moratorium for *The Militant*, "Political motivation for our intervention should have come from the national office, if not from the branches in the immediate area, because of the significance of such a demonstration by an oppressed national group. Because of this lack of pre-planning we are now compelled to make a last ditch effort in our intervention."

The major figures of the Chicano Moratorium Committee were at the time of the June antiwar conference hopeful that the antiwar movement could help the Moratorium with either monetary funds or by building a support action in New York August 22nd to focus attention on the Moratorium in Los Angeles. Neither of these suggestions did we seriously consider even though the Chicano Moratorium Committee endorsed the Cleveland conference and the Cleveland conference endorsed the Moratorium. No effort was made to ensure that a member of the Moratorium attend the Peace Action Coalition steering committee in Detroit because of the "unavailability of funds." Ro-

salio Munoz at the time of *The Militant* interview disclosed that they were working closely with the Puerto Ricans in the area with Gonzalo Xavier as the liason and suggested that this could be one area in which we could help by sending one or two Puerto Ricans to help mobilize this group. To sum up the party's position with the leadership of the Moratorium according to the Moratorium leadership was that the SMC and the YSA-SWP had a very poor working relationship with the Moratorium leadership with only peripheral communications. We again quote from the "Internal Report on Chicano Moratorium," "Elias expressed disappointment that in spite of our high degree of organization we seemed to be able to do so little to support the moratorium (locally). He stated that he would try to assign people from the Moratorium to work with us in an effort to bridge that gap. Munoz, on the other hand, seems to think our efforts should go toward building a support action in N. Y. which would help draw the attention of the news media to L. A. and the 29th. It is even possible that our comrades going there to ask about what we can do at this late date is, not a salve but a source of irritation as far as Rosalio is concerned."

One way to view the importance of 30,000 Chicanos both young and old, students and workers, was the way the Los Angeles ruling class reacted. The attack on the Chicano Moratorium August 29th was an indication of the bankruptcy of bourgeois democracy and the total disregard of civil liberties for the Chicano community. The paradoxical situation the SWP found itself in after the August 29th attack is one that should have never taken place for a revolutionary organization that is serious in intervening in the Chicano movement.

There we were, the only organization that had (1) any conception of why the attack had taken place and its consequences thereof, and (2) most important, we were the only organized force that had a definitive perspective of struggle against the ruling class attack. Our perspective for defensive formulations and the perspective of mass-mobilization (i.e. Sept. 16th) of the East Los Angeles barrio was of the most critical necessity for the Chicano movement at that time. But with no authority, no contacts, and with no stable communications with the Chicano Moratorium leadership, we were not able to educate clearly and accurately the leadership of the Moratorium or its followings. Our deficiency in developing contacts and building the Chicano Moratorium left us with no maneuvering grounds to fight the reformism of LUCHA or the Chicano hacks of the Democratic party.

The 16th of September demonstration did not mark a new beginning or upsurge of Chicano militancy nor did it indicate an effective response to the Los Angeles ruling class. All it showed was the Chicano community trailing behind the gubernatorial candidate of the Democratic Party. The events that transpired in Los Angeles were not just a disservice to the revolutionary program and traditions of the SWP but disservices to the Chicano movement and the East Los Angeles community.

LA RAZA UNIDA PARTY—IN RELATION TO CHICANO STUDENTS AND THE PARTY

Presently we are seeing the unfolding of events that confirm the deepgoing radicalization in the Chicano (working-class) communities and confirms the vanguard role

which they are playing. These events are the formations of the Raza Unida parties. The Raza Unida Party had its initial success in Crystal City, Texas. A combination of both high school blow-outs over racist practices and a labor struggle at a nearby Del Monte plant merged not only to politicalize but guide the predominantly Chicano community in organizing the Raza Unida Party. With the beginning initiative by Jose Angel Gutierrez and the Texas state MAYO (Mexican-American Youth Organization), Crystal City was able to conduct the first successful victory for an independent political formation.

Here we see young college students (i.e. MAYO) participating in leadership positions within the Chicano community. These participants were not confined to the college campus nor were their ideas all learned from bourgeois texts. For as in this case of Crystal City, the Texas state MAYO had conducted six previous summer work projects before helping launch the Raza Unida Party. These projects consisted of community organizing and working in organizing Huelga movements and cannery workers. This example shows that *students alone do not radicalize in a vacuum . . . just as they do not help politicalize sections of the working-class in a vacuum.* The Crystal City example not only shows the development of an independent political party, but also that students and other social layers can learn, participate and hopefully contribute to the struggles of the working class. It becomes clearer that these college students are not conducting the struggles solely as students. The success that Texas state MAYO had in Crystal was due to a large part to their struggle of common oppression, needs, and interests, to struggle with high school and Huelga activists.

Here is an excellent example of how students can learn, participate and help lead struggles. These are not struggles in which they are "sparks," or exclusive leaders, but are collectively engaged with other members of their community. That is, these students oriented toward their community and the struggle that their community was involved and used these struggles as catalysts to develop the Raza Unida Party. This event in Crystal is somehow reminiscent of what Comrade Lenin spoke of when he said that the party had to orient itself to the struggle of the working-class in order to help build and lead independent working-class organs to combat the bourgeoisie.

THE MILITANT AND THE RAZA UNIDA PARTY OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

One aspect of our Chicano work that the party has a good record in is in *Militant* coverage of the current Chicano movement. However, written articles in *The Militant* cannot be substituted for the task of concrete intervention as some people in our movement have the tendency to believe. Coverage in *The Militant* must be considered merely a tool to aid the recruitment and consolidation of cadre. In the last analysis, it will be the human material we are able to win over to the ideas of Marxism that will make the decisive difference for our party. Articles explaining our perspective for the Raza Unida Party *alone* will not recruit to our movement. It will be our capacity for concrete efforts to follow through on initial gains we make through our press, at conferences, and through regional trailblazing, that will win members to our party and to the youth organization.

With the example of Crystal City and our very good propagandist role in publicizing this event, new chapters of the La Raza Unida Party (as in Northern California) are springing up. But one thing must be made very clear. Although our press has been playing a very good role in these new events, we must understand (i.e. where some comrades do not understand) that this coverage will not assure our leadership in the mass movement of the Chicano community. Becoming a commentator of a movement is a very poor practice of Leninism.

THIRD WORLD WOMEN

Another indication of the petty-bourgeois orientation that the SWP has toward the movements of Black and Brown people is in the relationship to Third World women's liberation. No other layer is as oppressed within bourgeois society as Third World women. Their struggle will be instrumental in strengthening the nationalist movements internally. Third World women struggling against their oppression will make available one-half the human material and resources the Black and Brown communities have to offer. But just as in the nationalist struggle as a whole, our abstention in the struggle of Third World women's liberation is readily evident.

One of the most notable arenas that Black and Brown women have been struggling to date is in the National Welfare Rights Organization—an area that our party has not even minimally probed. Here the party could readily propagandize around the demands of free abortion on demand—no forced sterilization and free twenty-four hour child care centers in an area where women feel the urgent necessity of such demands. Together with our *Transitional Program for Black Liberation*, the party could successfully intervene and give the direction so badly needed and which no other organization can provide. But again the party has no perspective of directly reaching out to this sector of the oppressed, that is intervening in this struggle. Again our work is solely limited to the campuses on a purely propagandistic level. One need only recall the contribution made by Maxine Williams at the 1970 YSA convention noting the severely limited amount of work that can be done on campus and calling for the YSA to reach out into the Black community for organizations such as the Phoenix Organization of Women, a group of former drug addicts, predominantly Black and Puerto Rican women. The Black and Puerto Rican woman compelled to drug addiction by the bleak condition imposed on her by bourgeois society is hardly the woman to be found on the university campus.

CHICANAS

One of the issues that has concerned the working-class as a whole and particularly women, is the issue of education. Chicanas attending high schools and young Chicanas with children will be particularly concerned about the issues of community controlled child-care facilities, community controlled schools and bilingual education. In the case of Chicanas, the issue of labor organizing of the farm worker is also relevant because much of farm labor is done on the basis of family unit hiring.

Again we can draw upon the experience of Crystal City. According to Luz Gutierrez, one of the issues that prompted

the women of Crystal into action in 1969 was precisely the issue of education and the schools. (Not only did they participate on solely the issue of the boycotts but also eventually struggled for the right of women to participate in the principal political organ in Crystal "Cuidados Unidos" — United Citizens). In 1969 high school students and their parents waged a successful boycott of Crystal City High School. In these boycotts two of the principal spokespersons were young Chicana high school students. Many of the activists and participants in the boycott would be active in the La Raza Unida Party whose formation followed closely on the heels of the boycott. All layers of the community from the MAYO students, to the farm workers (men and women) who welcomed the TEAM (Teachers for the Educational Advancement of Mexican Americans) teachers in their homes through the boycott, to the truckers who provided bus services to the liberation classes, to the women of Crystal—parents, students and teachers, were drawn into the struggle.

However, due to the party's limited perspective in the Chicano movement little work has been done with Chicanas. The party could play a very important role in educating the Chicano movement on the woman question. It is no secret that in most sectors of the Chicano community a deepgoing sentiment against women having any kind of leadership roles exists. Here the party could be instrumental in explaining how bourgeois ideology (and especially the ideology of the Catholic church) pertaining to women tries to divide the Chicano community and tries to rob the Chicano movement of one half the community's resources (i.e. women).

But if the party is not in the Chicano movement to educate, we can hardly hope to win the confidence of young Chicano activists by playing a commentator role in *The Militant*. Nor can we leave this work to a few "specialists" in our movement and miseducate the entire party. Work in the Chicano movement must be seen as the responsibility of the entire party. However, this is not the case and as a result our recruitment of young men and women from the Chicano movement is left to the area of "general" work. Comrades, this is a sorry state of affairs for a revolutionary vanguard party.

SUMMARY

What is a proletarian orientation? First of all, a proletarian orientation is *not* a trade union fetish. It is *not* a mechanistic intervention into the trade union movement. It does *not* mean turning our backs from the college campuses, the antiwar movement or other social movements we are involved in now. *Nor* is it an orientation that will *necessarily guarantee* the leadership in the socialist revolution. But without a proletarian orientation the party *cannot* realistically speak of leading the socialist revolution.

What does a proletarian orientation mean to the party. *It means going to the most decisive sectors of American society—the Black and Brown masses and the industrial proletariat as a whole.* This perspective is one that has been held by all leading Marxists concerned with making a socialist revolution. A proletarian orientation will facilitate the development of cadres within the working class that will lead the socialist revolution. This axiom is one of the fundamental ABCs of communism.

It is time the party program for a socialist America be used to propagandize and agitate within that section of American society that will be able to do something about it. A revolutionary vanguard organization does not wait for the working-class to come to it, but the party must go into the working-class. This is not just limited to the trade union movement, but entails going to all levels of the working-class. These levels include left-wing caucuses in the trade unions, junior colleges, vocational schools, and high schools. Here the party will not only find the working class as a whole, but will find the overwhelming majority of Third World people.

Some comrades state that a proletarian orientation is anti-nationalist. This is the same type of erroneous logic that our opponents (specifically the Workers League, Communist Party, Progressive Labor) use in analyzing the dynamic of revolutionary nationalism. This ill-conceived logic is predicated on the notion that *nationalism* (i.e. that of oppressed national sections of bourgeois society) *somehow develops in a vacuum and derives its strength from some undefined source.* This ill logic presupposes that *nationalism of the oppressed has no roots in the working-class and can be artificially separated from the class struggle.* This type of thinking has nothing to do with Marxism nor shows any understanding of the permanent revolution. As the "Freedom Now" Black struggle resolution, Oct 1963, p. 9, states, *"Nationalism itself is an empty vessel which can be filled with vastly different contents. The nationalism of Chiang Kai-shek is the opposite of that of a Chinese Communist revolutionist or a Fidel Castro. Militant Negro nationalists can have wrong ideas and petty-bourgeois illusions. Negro Marxists have to imbue the nationalist sentiments and struggles of their people with a revolutionary, scientific, anti-capitalist content and direction."* [emphasis ours]

In the developmental process of the Marxist movement, the question of the relationship of the working-class to oppressed national minorities which are subjugated by the bourgeois states has caused a great deal of misunderstanding and misconceived ideas. It was not until the theory of the permanent revolution that a final concretized and definitive Marxist analysis was made on this important question. The permanent revolution (which has been proven within the context of the colonial people, China, Cuba, Korea) has conclusively shown that an oppressed national minority cannot win its struggle for democratic rights without going over to a socialist revolution. This concept is fundamental to our understanding of why Black and Brown nationalism is revolutionary.

Marxists have always been precise on the question of what constitutes a "revolutionary" struggle. Our understanding is not based on bourgeois pragmatism nor any other formalist approach. Marxism is predicated on philosophical materialism. That is, it perceives society and components of society in definitive relationships to the means of production. This is why Karl Marx did not need to see an upsurge of the British working-class to write *Das Kapital*. Nor did Leon Trotsky need a Watts Rebellion to formulate the dynamic of revolutionary nationalism in 1938-1939 for the SWP. This is why there *must be a distinction between radicalizing elements in society and revolutionary elements in society.* This is why Marxists can understand the revolutionary dynamic of the working-class and of Black and Brown nationalism without the

benefit of mass upsurges.

People who fail to understand these concepts fall prey to the most despicable type of opportunism and vulgarizations that exist in the vanguard party. These comrades who slander the members of the minority (i.e. the ideological tendency "For a Proletarian Orientation") with the allegation that the minority is anti-nationalist and, in some extreme cases, with the allegation of being racist, have denied the Stalinist parties good material. There is no place for these type of tactics within the ranks of the Trotskyist movement. If this is the type of political cadre building that the party has developed in the last ten years, that is, to teach cadre to answer political questions with crude vilifications of "racism," then this alone should indicate that the party should review its educational institution for young comrades.

This document and the criticisms that are set forth with are made to help build the party. We feel that only a proletarian orientation—an orientation toward the working-class and toward the Third World communities—is the only orientation that a revolutionary socialist party can have. History (i.e. lessons of the Shachtman-Burnham petty-bourgeois opposition) has shown that a proletarian orientation is a decisive question. We feel that the Black and Brown movements and the working-class movement as a whole is a decisive question for the party. If the

party leadership has new ideas or new modes of party building, then the rank and file must be made aware of them.

It is ironical that the lessons that were learned from the Shachtman fight must today be defended by a *minority* within the party. This is also true of the basic premises of Marxist methodology. It is foolish for one studying the alphabet of Marxism to proceed beyond the ABCs without first learning these fundamentals.

Today the party has the new blood and new energy to effectively carry the proletarian banner. Today we are crossing a new threshold of American Trotskyism. Today with new resources we stand ready to make effective gains and to consolidate these gains for the coming American socialist revolution. These gains will mean absolutely nothing if the party sacrifices its program and proletarian orientation in order to be able to exert mass influence. The party must take its new resources and attempt to penetrate the Black and Brown proletariat and the industrial proletariat as a whole. Again, what was correctly a tactical turn, which has reaped many benefits for the party, cannot be turned into a strategy of revolution. The radicalization that prompted the party to orient to students has now reached into the Black and Brown communities and is slowly penetrating the working-class as a whole. It is time for the party to turn its attention directly to the working class.

TOWARD A MARXIST APPROACH TO THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT

By: Margaret Charous, Sandy Hall, Beth Semmer, Celia Stodola
Oakland/Berkeley Branch

INTRODUCTION

The concept of sisterhood is a political theme which runs through both the PC Draft Resolution, *Toward A Mass Feminist Movement*, and the Women's Liberation Movement Report to the recent SWP National Committee Plenum by Betsey Stone. This concept is also an underlying theme of the party's work in the women's liberation movement today. In explaining that sisterhood is a political concept, Comrade Stone went so far as to state:

We believe sisterhood is a real and powerful thing. But it doesn't mean the same as friendship, and it doesn't mean an end to political differences between women of different backgrounds and classes. It doesn't mean, for example, that someone who works as a maid has any great love for the woman who employs her. What it does mean is that, whether they are conscious of it or not, *these women do have certain political objectives in common, because of the fact that they are both oppressed as women.* (p. 11, emphasis added)

The occupation of domestic is one of the most degrading, humiliating and oppressive jobs in society. Today, nearly fifty percent of all private household workers are Black women. Moreover, as Comrade Maxine Williams pointed out in her article, "Why Women's Liberation Is Important To Black Women," these women face the double exploitation of doing drudgery in someone else's home as

well as taking care of their own households. Oftentimes, their own children are left at home, uncared for, while they earn money taking care of the employer's children. On the other hand, virtually the only women in this society with the financial means to employ others to perform the monotonous, stultifying task of housework are privileged white women of the petty-bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie.

We believe that the party's view that a common bond of sisterhood links the maid and her employer is incorrect. We believe that it is fruitless to look for unity between maids and their employers. Just as the workers must struggle against their foremen and the labor bureaucrats; just as the struggle for national liberation will proceed in opposition to many privileged Blacks and Chicanos; so too, we can expect that in the struggle for women's liberation, the maid and her employer will be divided along class and national lines. While it is true that there can be short-term agreement on specific actions between such women, the reality of class and national oppression under capitalism precludes any long-term or programmatic agreement. Class demands such as sliding scale of wages and hours, and national demands such as Third World control of the Third World community, obviously divide such women. Even within the women's liberation struggle, such demands as an end to job discrimination, equal pay for equal work, and *free* abortion on demand—no forced sterilization, relate directly to class and national interests, which override women's common interests as a sex. The leadership's attempt to gloss over these class

and national divisions—perhaps most starkly expressed in Comrade Stone's appeal for unity between upper class white housewives (members of NOW, perhaps) and their hired Black maids—is an indicator, a warning sign, of the present direction of our women's liberation work, a direction which leads away from the working class and a class analysis. Moreover, the direction of the party's work is out of tune with objective reality. Reporting of the November 1969 Congress to Unite Women in New York, Comrade Williams, in her same article, stated that:

The middle-class mentality of some women in the movement has also helped to make the issue of women's liberation seem to be irrelevant to Black women's needs.... There was also little attempt to deal with the problems of poor women, for example, the fact that women in Scarsdale exploit black women as domestics. (pp. 9-10)

Rather than promoting unity, this issue threatened to split the Congress. This is an example of what we mean when we say that class and national interests of women override their interests as a sex.

The concept of sisterhood is further expressed in the PC Draft Resolution, *Toward A Mass Feminist Movement*:

The truth is that women are at the same time both united by sexist oppression and divided by class society. *There is an objective basis for a unified struggle of women of different nationalities and classes because all women are oppressed as women by capitalism.*

Sisterhood is powerful because of this universal female oppression, and this is the basis for the existence of an independent non-exclusive mass feminist movement, with an anti-capitalist logic. (p. 11, emphasis in original and added)

There are two concepts embodied in this quote which underlie the analysis of women's oppression under capitalism as put forth by the Political Committee. Although we shall deal with them at greater length at a later time in this document, let us briefly outline them. They are: 1) regardless of class background, all women are oppressed as women, and therefore, this common oppression forms the basis of a sisterhood which transcends classes, and 2) that this sisterhood justifies our attempts to build a multiclass unity in the struggle for women's liberation.

This approach signifies a lack of theoretical clarity regarding an analysis of women's oppression, and in fact, moves away from a Marxist class analysis. Given the alien class composition of the women's liberation movement, this blunting of our Marxist analysis, at times, results in an adaptation to the pressures of this milieu. The effects of this are twofold. First, this results in incorrect strategy and tactics for the women's liberation movement, such as the present nature of the work we do in the abortion movement. Secondly, this results in a lack of theoretical clarity, such as the call for self-determination for women. There has been confusion on this question even on the part of leading comrades. In an article entitled, "New York meeting hears panel on abortion issue," in *The Militant*, the following was reported: "Ruthann Miller, SWP candidate for comptroller, claimed for women the same right of self-determination as for Afro-Americans and the Vietnam-

ese." (Feb. 20, 1970, p. 14) Not only does this miseducate our own cadres about important theoretical concepts, but those we are trying to reach with our ideas as well.

The necessity of rooting ourselves in the Marxist method becomes the more pressing as we enter the decade of the seventies and the party continues to expand its women's liberation activities. At the Oberlin conference, Betsey Stone stated in the "Summary Remarks on our Coming Tasks in the Women's Liberation Movement" the following:

At this time, we are in a position, with the number of women cadres we have, to significantly affect the development of the women's liberation movement from its inception. We can play the same decisive role in this movement that we have played in the antiwar movement. (Activists Panels, 1970 Socialist Activists and Educational Conference Reports, Vol. 1, no. 1, p. 3)

If what Comradé Stone says is correct, then we want our political intervention in the women's liberation movement to help forge the strongest links possible between the women's movement and the working class struggle. We must continue the traditions and ideas as forwarded by Lenin when he said: "This well also give us a basis for examining the woman question as part of the social, working-class question, and to bind it firmly with the proletarian class struggle and the revolution." (*On the Emancipation of Women*, p. 110) Any attempts which fall short of this goal will have severe repercussions on the course our party takes in this area of work and will lead away from the working class, especially one of its most oppressed layers, the proletarian women.

While we view the presentation of a counter-resolution to the PC Draft Resolution, *Toward A Mass Feminist Movement*, as a very serious step, we see this step necessitated by the dangerous direction our party has taken in this important area of our work. Moreover, the PC Draft Resolution is inadequate and insufficient in laying out a theoretical analysis of the woman question. As a whole, both the PC Draft Resolution and the plenum report by Betsey Stone are not written from a Marxist class perspective but rather from an impressionist point of view. In this epoch, the death agony of capitalism and imperialist decay, the epoch of the sharpest polarization of class forces, the line our party leadership presents to the membership for ratification tends to blur the very class lines which exist in capitalist society. We are concerned not only for our own party but for the women's liberation movement as well. The leadership of our party is not arming the revolutionary vanguard with a Trotskyist political perspective for its intervention into the women's movement. Like the authors of the document, "For a Proletarian Orientation," we too see that our party today is at a crossroad. It can continue on its present course, or it can attempt to begin to reverse the process at work within our party—a process which is eroding the Marxist traditions upon which our party was founded. The party can choose either one of these perspectives—there is no middle ground. We view our counter-resolution as an extension of the political line of the tendency formed around the call "For a Proletarian Orientation," and stand in solidarity with its political orientation.

SECTION I: THE ROOTS OF WOMEN'S OPPRESSION

As Marxists, we realize that the strategy and tactics we propose must be rooted in an understanding of the concrete social relationships of society. In this case, the strategy and tactics proposed for women's liberation must relate directly to the material basis of women's oppression and the form which this oppression takes under capitalism. Many questions must be answered: What are the roots and history of women's oppression? What is the relationship of women's oppression and class oppression? How can women's oppression be ended? What function does the oppression of women serve in class society, especially under capitalism? What is the function of the nuclear family and the woman as worker under capitalism and does this function differ among the classes?

It is only on the basis of a comprehension of social reality that revolutionaries can hope to change that reality. We can say with assurance that this task is not a simple matter. Rather, it is very complex and particularly difficult to deal with. For our own predecessors not only did not write comprehensively on the woman question, but almost all their works deal with pre-capitalist or pre-modern capitalist society. These works are certainly useful in providing a beginning for our own analysis; however, they do not provide a thorough analysis of the oppression of women today. The job of the party today is to complete and work out a materialist analysis of the oppression of women and from that analysis, to construct our tasks in the women's liberation movement.

The party's approach to the women's liberation movement has been the opposite of this. From our early intervention two years ago up to today, the party's concerns have not grown out of a theoretical understanding of the woman question, but rather out of a desire to "get involved," "to embrace," and "to lead" the movement. We are not opposed to leading the women's liberation movement, but without a Marxist perspective the party may well lead both itself and the women's movement into a quagmire of reformism and subjectivism.

The present document, *Toward A Mass Feminist Movement*, continues the same method. Proceeding from an evaluation of many of the present forms of women's oppression and schematically linking this up with Engels' writings on the family, it attempts to lay out our position on the woman question. Insofar as this document is the product of close to two years of active work in the movement and is supposed to present an initial theoretical analysis of the movement—it is deficient. Little or no consideration is given to a Marxist analysis of the roots and history of the status of women and their relationship to class society.

Comrades should contrast the approach of the party today with the intensive discussions around the Black liberation struggle that took place with Trotsky and Johnson. At that time we proceeded with a careful deliberation and full understanding of our position. The documents published in the early '60's, such as the 1963 *Freedom Now* resolution—even though they merely updated our past understandings—showed a greater concern for theory than the leadership does today with respect to the women's liberation movement. This lack of concern for theory has already begun to manifest itself in our work and will grow in its effects in the future. The problem is all the

more serious inasmuch as at the present time, the women's liberation movement primarily encompasses women of the petty-bourgeoisie. While it is true that capitalism oppresses all women as a sex, the very fact that this movement is taking place outside of the camp of the decisive, historic class—the working class—necessitates that the razor edge of our Marxist tools be made all the more sharp. An active orientation towards and participation in this movement must be rooted in an understanding of how capitalism oppresses women and how the women's movement can best help destroy that system. Furthermore, our strategy must be built around those whose forces can be mobilized into struggle and who have the potential social power to make a socialist revolution.

While the writers of this document make no pretense of being able to accomplish the mammoth task of producing a comprehensive analysis of women in today's society, we would like to briefly discuss some of the important factors that must be considered when mapping out a political perspective for the women's liberation work of the party.

Marxists see the oppression of women as older than capitalism. In fact, the oppression of women is as old as class society and private property. The evolution of the oppression of women has its roots in the historic development of the spheres of production and reproduction. As Engels noted in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*:

According to the materialistic conception, the determining factor in history is, in the final instance, the production and reproduction of the immediate essentials of life.... The social organization under which the people of a particular historical epoch and a particular country live is determined by both kinds of production: by the stage of development of labor on the one hand and of the family on the other. (New World Paperbacks, p. 5)

Primitive communal society was a society based on scarcity. Through these thousands of years of pre-history, humanity knew no class divisions; monogamous nuclear families did not exist as we know them today. There was an equality based on every member of the society working and every member sharing the bare subsistence that was equalled out. As the productivity of the society increased, it became possible for a small number of people to live on that surplus which existed beyond the bare subsistence level without being producers themselves. Out of the appropriation of this surplus eventually evolved the first ruling class in a long line of progressively more advanced class societies.

The history of how women lost equality in human society covers thousands of years of our existence on this planet. It includes the development of a division of labor, many different family forms, the evolution of private property, class relations, and a state to enforce those class relations.

Although the domestic realm was originally of primary importance or at least equal to other areas (such as hunting and gathering), as productivity increased, the areas in which men participated, especially herding, became the more crucial productive forces in society. This development of herding and more extensive agriculture was

precisely the realm in which a surplus developed. Thus, as private property developed, it became the dominant realm. As Engels stated:

In the collision of the newly-developed social classes, the old society founded on kinship groups is broken up; in its place appears a new society, with its control centered in the *state*, the subordinate units of which are no longer kinship associations, but local associations; *a society in which the system of the family is completely dominated by the system of property, and in which there now freely develop those class antagonisms and class struggles that have hitherto formed the content of all written history.* (*Origin of the Family . . .*, p. 6, emphasis added)

In primitive society, then, both the production and reproduction of life were equally determining factors of human existence. With the further development of productive forces, three interdependent processes take place: first, the influence of the reproductive sphere of life devolves from the kinship groups to the nuclear family; second, a new society is created where the state becomes a locus of control; and third, the influence of the nuclear family is completely dominated by the state and private property in which women exert little power. In contradistinction to primitive society, where production and reproduction co-existed on equal footing, in modern class society the sphere of production—which is to say, private property and the state—gains dominance and becomes decisive.

These processes have had a central role in shaping the history of humanity. They explain why it is that the class struggle and class antagonisms not only dominate social reality, but actually form the "content of all hitherto written history." It is the ability of these forces to "freely develop" under the new society that ultimately leads, under capitalism, to the polarization of class forces on a world scale and poses the socialist revolution as the task of the proletariat. These processes explain the class nature of the state and its relationship to the system of private property. Lastly, they point out that the role of the nuclear family is dominated by the class system. This in turn indicates that the role of the family, and consequently of women, is ultimately shaped by their social class and differs among the classes.

This becomes clear by considering the history of the family itself. The evolution of private property demanded a mode for passing this property from one generation to the next, but the primitive communal matriarchal family system, based on earlier material conditions and property relationships, did not provide the patrilineage nor did it assure definitive knowledge to the father that particular children were really "his."

Thus, as private wealth was accumulated by a few men, it became necessary for them to institute and enforce strict monogamy on women in order to insure that they would know whom their own biological children were and in order to pass this wealth on to their children. This overthrow of "mother right" marked the enslavement of women. It is well to note here that in early class society this enslavement of women was primarily concentrated among the ruling classes. With the exception of a few "freedmen," all those outside the ruling strata (men and women) were enslaved by the ruling men as a class and not within the family system. Thus, when we talk of the

role of the family in the context of early class society, we are primarily talking about the propertied ruling classes, for it was only these classes who had to be concerned about paternity and inheritance.

The passing of property to legitimate heirs and perpetuation of that class in a broader sense was the main function of the monogamous family in early class society, whereas the role of the family is as entrenched and as important in the proletariat today as in the ruling classes. The institution of the family plays a far more complex role than in previous class society. Today, the family within the working class plays a different role than in the ruling class. In the working class, the family serves as an instrument for further exploitation of the entire working class (women and men) and benefits the whole ruling class (men and women) rather than serving primarily as a system for inheritance.

Historically then, the oppression of women comes from changes in the sphere of the material conditions governing society, and it is these conditions, which in the final analysis, are decisive. Because the oppression of women springs from these material roots, it affects women of different classes in qualitatively different ways and to quantitatively different extents. The oppression of ruling class women, and even of the more privileged women of the petty-bourgeoisie, is vastly different than that of working class women. The emancipation of working class women in fact, is not only part of the general class struggle but will take place in the face of *opposition* to ruling class women. Lenin was very clear on this point:

. . . true emancipation of women is not possible except through communism. You must lay stress on the *unbreakable connection between women's human and social position and the private ownership of the means of production. This will draw a strong, ineradicable line against the bourgeois movement for the emancipation of women.* This will also give us a basis for examining the woman question as part of the social, working-class question, and to bind it firmly with the proletarian class struggle and the revolution. (*On the Emancipation of Women*, p. 110, emphasis added)

Lenin saw that the class question was inextricably linked to the woman question. He called for forging the strongest links possible between the working class struggle and the women's movement. He drew a line against the bourgeois movement for the emancipation of women. This is why the party today must try to direct and link the women's movement to the class—that is, to the Black and Brown national struggles, the trade unions and the anti-war movement.

There are three general reasons why Lenin felt so strongly about the relationship of the women's movement to the broader class struggle. First, Lenin saw that the oppression of women was rooted in the nature of class society. Only by ending private ownership of the means of production could women be liberated. The conclusion Lenin drew from this was that the full liberation of women was a task of the socialist revolution. Inasmuch as it was the proletariat that would make the revolution, Lenin saw quite clearly that the struggle for women's liberation was tied directly to the struggle of the whole proletariat for emancipation.

The second reason that the women's movement must be strongly linked to the class struggle lies in the nature of women's oppression. As we have stated, class divisions are the deepest and most important divisions in society today. In general, the interests of individuals lie with their social class. The oppression suffered by ruling class women does not change their fundamental loyalty to and desire for the privileges of their class. Furthermore, many of the most degrading and oppressive aspects of their situation can be ameliorated by their class position. That is, ruling class women, with their maids, comfortable homes, economic security and the like, are spared the "unpleasantness" of worrying about equal pay and job opportunities, child care, the subsistence of the family and free abortions and forced sterilization. While their lot may be alienating, they are not exploited nor do they suffer the oppression of their working class counterparts. The demands for liberation voiced by privileged women of the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie primarily consist of granting them the democratic rights necessary for them to actively exercise their class prerogatives—to sit on corporation boards, to take part in the inner councils of the Democratic party, etc.—that is, in being free to take part in the oppression of the working class women and men. We are not against ruling class women having their democratic rights. We recognize that any denial of democratic rights to any sector, even of the ruling class, ultimately affects and endangers the rights of the working class itself. Furthermore, the struggle to extend certain rights to ruling class women helps expose the nature of our society and its class character.

However, the fight for the liberation of the majority of women, who are members of the working class, is quite a different struggle. This struggle involves dissolving the corporation boards, smashing the Democratic party—in short, ending the privileges of the ruling class and overthrowing the institutions of capitalist society, and thereby providing for the real needs of all people. In the final analysis, the struggle for equal pay and job opportunities, for free child care, for free abortion on demand—no forced sterilization, is a struggle which can be led by the mass of women who are directly affected by these forms of oppression—working class women.

Lastly, for the women's liberation movement to gain real social power it must be firmly tied to the working class. Third World women and other women workers and working class women compose the largest segment of the population. They also have the most direct ties to the class and to production. The movement of working class women for their liberation is directly tied to many class and national questions, moreover. For example, the struggle of working women for equal pay or to organize unions can serve to catalyze actions by other sections of the class in the trade unions. The victories won by Third World women stimulate and advance the whole national struggle.

If the working class holds the key to the future, then the first precondition for the liberation of women is their re-introduction into the productive life of the country. As Engels stated:

The democratic republic does not do away with the opposition of the two classes; on the contrary, it provides the clear field on which the fight can be fought out. And in the same way, the peculiar character of the supremacy

of the husband over the wife in the modern family, the necessity of creating real social equality between them, and the way to do it, will only be seen in the clear light of day when both possess legally complete equality of rights. Then it will be plain that the first condition for the liberation of the wife is to bring the whole female sex back into public industry, and that this in turn demands the abolition of the monogamous family as the economic unit. (*Origin of the Family*, p. 66)

And again:

We can already see from this that to emancipate woman and make her the equal of the man is and remains an impossibility so long as the woman is shut out from social productive labor and restricted to private domestic labor. The emancipation of woman will only be possible when woman can take part in production on a large, social scale, and domestic work no longer claims anything but an insignificant amount of her time. (*Origin of the Family*, p. 168)

Lenin, too, expressed similar thoughts:

To effect her complete emancipation and make her the equal of the man it is necessary for housework to be socialized and for women to participate in common productive labor. Then women will occupy the same position as men. (*On the Emancipation of Women*, p. 69)

In the final analysis then, to be liberated, women must become fully integrated into the work force and the job market and this in turn, necessitates the rationalization and socialization of the functions of the family. Not only will the reintroduction of women into productive life directly begin to undermine the structure of the nuclear family, but moreover, this process can impart decisive social weight to the women's liberation movement. With the growing contradictions of the capitalist system as manifested in one of its more pernicious aspects, inflation, we are seeing a growing number of women forced into the labor market to supplement the family income. Modern-day technology and scientific advancement can render much of the old-fashioned drudgery of housework obsolete. Thus, the time spent in the maintenance and preservation of the household need not be as great as it used to be. The fact that more women are having fewer children and that the time spent in child-rearing has been reduced, again gives women added time. For many of these women, productive work outside the home is sought as an alternative. In the Third World communities, the number of women who are heads of households and who *must* work to support their families, is also increasing.

The fact that the fundamental contradictions of capitalism are spurring these processes, means that the party must be prepared to utilize them to their fullest. While we should be prepared to mobilize as many women as possible into action against their oppression, the key to the real liberation of women lies with those of the working class—Black, Brown and white. It is time for our party to reorient to the working class, not tomorrow or at some unspecified time in the future, but now.

SECTION II: THE OPPRESSION OF WOMEN TODAY

Why and how does capitalism oppress women and what

relationship does this oppression have to the class divisions of capitalist society? To answer this question we must understand two basic factors: 1) the role of the nuclear family in capitalist society; and 2) the role of women in the labor force, that is, as direct participants in social versus private labor. These two major factors are of course interrelated and interdependent and they are also quite complex. That we are going to be able to make only the most cursory explanation should be obvious. Hopefully, this will be sufficient however, to point out some of the most glaring weaknesses of the document presented by the PC, *Toward A Mass Feminist Movement*.

A. *The Family in Bourgeois Society*

The family arose to facilitate the development of class society and in the advanced state of class society, capitalism, it continues to play a primary role in maintaining the status quo of that society.

The function of the family of the ruling class continues to play very much the same role as it did in earlier class society, that is, the preservation and perpetuation of existing class lines and the passage of wealth from one generation to the next legitimate heirs; it provides for the accumulation of wealth by the individual families who are in competition with one another but who stand as a class against the proletariat. Capitalist society, however, has wrought a change in the family system. For the first time in history, the monogamous nuclear family has been extended to all classes in society; it is more universalized than in any previous society. It is the contention of the authors of this document, that the function of the family within the working class is to intensify the exploitation of the class as a whole, to reap greater profits to the ruling class and to stabilize capitalist society. Of course, the greatest and most overt part of the burden for this superexploitation must be borne by women of the class.

Let us examine some of the functions the family provides for the capitalists.

1) Women perform private labor in the home (that is, she is not producing for exchange). Yet, her labor is obviously necessary to the society since it provides for the maintenance and reproduction of the proletariat. That is, she rears and socializes the children who will make up the next generation of workers. She provides meals, maintenance of adequate clothing, shelter, etc. for the present generation of workers. The capitalist thus gets away with one wage for the work of two. This is even true when the woman works outside the home since she still continues to carry the major burden for the first activity. In fact, according to recent studies, the average woman spends 59.6 hours per week on housework in addition to her job outside the home. This leaves the working woman approximately 78 hours a week to sleep, eat and do anything for herself in the area of recreation or education. However, women are having on the average, fewer children today and most of the work which she does is inefficient and technologically outmoded, and of course, it does not provide for anywhere near the best education and care of children that is possible given the scientific advancements and technology that is available in today's society. And of course, this work is extremely limiting on the development of women as full human beings.

2) As an economic unit, the family plays an important stabilizing role in capitalist society. Because of the economic dependence of the mother and children on the father, he is limited in the degree to which he can withhold his labor, as for example, in a strike. Thus, the family serves to limit wage demands and other demands for better conditions by the working population as a whole. The woman's economic dependence on the man tends to make her fearful and emotionally dependent; thus, the family becomes the best breeding ground for the backward and conservative ideology of the ruling class. Each family is a separate economic unit and by its very nature, competitive with all other individual private families. This atomization of the working class helps stabilize the class and isolate its members one from another. It also tends to enhance consumption and what Marx called the fetishism of commodities. Since the woman is not paid for her labor within the home in a society based on exchange and wage labor, her labor is not viewed as work nor is it viewed as particularly important. Thus, the inferior status of women leads to a strong feeling of lack of self worth and makes women particularly susceptible to commodity fetishism. The phenomenon of "keeping up with the Joneses" is a good example of this.

Of course, other institutions reinforce the family and the oppression of women and this is directly related to the role of women in the family. For example, the church with its hypocritical morality has been used to reinforce the enslavement of women in the home; the educational system teaches women from their earliest years to prepare for their role in the family and by tracking them into feminine studies and occupations, limits their job opportunities beyond even the direct occupational discrimination. Most importantly, it is the role in the family which makes possible the double exploitation of women on the job.

B. *Women and the Work Force*

The number of women workers has been steadily increasing since 1950. In June of 1971 women workers numbered over 31 million. The increase over the past twenty years has been so great that women are now 40% of the work force, and are now a higher percentage of the work force than at any other time in the twentieth century. Even the percentage during World War II when women comprised 35% of the work force has been surpassed by 5%. This trend is expected to continue. In the last decade, two-thirds of all newly created jobs have been filled by women.

The reason for the growth in the number of women workers has been two-fold. The first reason is the fields of work that have opened up in the last twenty years. The rise in women's employment has been paralleled by the expansion of services available to individuals and society as a whole, such as in the fields of health, public and private social services, education, personal services, as well as the computer field. The automation of processes in factories and stores, and other businesses has expanded the need for technical and clerical personnel.

The second has been the need for women to provide additional income for their families. Because workers' wages have not kept up with the rising cost of living, millions of women have been forced to go to work to

keep the family income above the poverty level. Even before the recent inflation, brought about in large part by the Vietnam war, families were finding it hard, if not impossible, to live on a single income.

Until the last twenty years, married women comprised a minority of working women. Now, 58% of working women are married and comprise over one-third of all married women as compared with only 14% in 1940. This represents an increase of almost 12 million in a twenty-seven year period, a rise of 279%.

The reasons for the growth of the participation of married women in the work force is the same as for women in general. It is clear that economic necessity, not necessarily individual choice is responsible. This is shown by the fact that 84% of wives in the labor force had husbands whose incomes were under \$7,000 per year in 1967. Some 41% of these working wives had husbands with incomes under \$5,000.

The severity of the economic situation has brought a great increase in the number of working mothers with children under 18 years of age. Between 1940 and 1967 the labor force participation rate of mothers increased about two times more than the labor force participation of all women. In 1940 only 9% of all mothers with children under 18 years of age worked outside the home. By 1967 this proportion had increased to 38%. This was far higher than the increase of women in general.

Even more striking is the fact that since 1960 the rate of participation in the labor force for mothers of young children has increased faster than for other mothers. In 1960 only one-fifth of mothers of young children under six years of age had entered the labor force, but by 1967 this figure had increased by a rate of 50%.

As we would expect, these changes are most visible in the Third World community, where a much higher percentage of non-white women with children under 18 years of age work. Most importantly, 42% of non-white working women had children under 6 years of age while only 25% of white working women did.

Non-white and white mothers of young children find a severe problem in working because of the lack of adequate child care facilities. The United States is the only industrialized country in the world which does not have a system of publicly supported day care centers for children of working mothers. In 1966, only 2% of all children of working mothers were in any kind of public day care centers.

It is important to know exactly what role women play in the work force in order to understand the ways in which they are utilized as a reserve army of labor. The wide disparity that exists between the concentration of men and women workers by type of work has contributed to the difference in the rate of growth of their employment, in the relative number working part-time or part-year, and in their earnings. The fact that women are highly concentrated in white collar and service work—the fastest growing types of work in recent decades—accounts in part for the substantial rise in the number and percentage of women in the labor force. The employment of a relatively large segment of all women wage earners in service work and the low-paying categories of white collar work—jobs that are often part-time or part-year, accounts to some extent for the fact that women are more likely than men to work less than a full week or less than a full

year. Similarly, the difference between the average earning of men and women is affected by the greater concentration of women in the low-paying white collar jobs and service jobs.

About 34% of all employed women are clerical workers. This category includes 3.3 million stenographers, typists and secretaries. The second largest group is service workers—16% of working women are employed in this field. Almost another 15% are operatives, chiefly in factories and another 15% are professional and technical workers. The majority of women in this field is made up of non-college level teachers, registered nurses and medical and dental technicians. Some 7% of all women workers are sales workers while another 7% are private household workers. These six major occupation groups are where most women wage earners are concentrated.

The diversity of employment of men and women is also illustrated by the varying proportions women are in the different occupational groups. As might be expected, adult women accounted for 98% of the private household workers in 1968. They also predominated among clerical workers where they held 73% of those jobs. In only one other major occupation group were women the majority. That group is service workers where women were 57% of all workers. Women were 39% of professional and technical workers and 40% of all sales workers and also 25% of all manufacturing employees.

In manufacturing, industries are divided into durable and non-durable goods. The non-durable goods plants claimed 57% of all women factory workers. The industries where women participated in great numbers were garment, textiles and food processing. In general non-durable goods manufacturing is less stable and pays lower wages than durable goods.

In durable goods manufacturing, the industry having the highest proportion of women is electrical equipment and supplies where women are 39% of workers. Women are almost exclusively hired to do the light assembly work. The electrical industry has the lowest average wage of any durable goods industry, probably due to the presence of large numbers of women.

The types of jobs non-white women hold vary somewhat from those held by white women. Whereas three out of five white women were engaged in white collar work in April of 1968, almost half of non-white women workers were in the service field where intermittent or part-time work is common. On the other hand, approximately the same proportion of both non-white and white women were employed in blue collar work in April of 1968.

One-fourth of all employed non-white women were private household workers and approximately another fourth were service workers outside the home, during this period. Non-white women made up 45% of all private household workers and 20% of all service workers. The third largest group of employed non-white women was clerical workers—17%, followed by operatives, also 17%. Traditionally, a much higher proportion of non-white than white women are in the labor force due to the fact that economic responsibility for maintaining the family often falls more heavily on the non-white women than on white women. About one out of 14 non-white women in the labor force was unemployed as compared to one out of 25 white women, and also non-white women were somewhat more likely than white women

to work at part-time or part-year jobs.

Partly as a consequence of channeling of women into low paying jobs, partly as a result of unequal pay for the same work, the median income of women is far less than that of men workers. In 1955, the median income of full-time women workers was 64% of men; by 1965, their median income had dropped in relation to men, being slightly under 60%. Non-white women tend to fare slightly better in relation to Black men, but make only three-fourths as much as white women.

The gap between the income of non-white women and white women is largely due to the greater concentration occupationally of non-white women in low-wage and low-skilled jobs. Another factor is their geographical concentration in Southern states, where incomes are lower than in other regions of the country.

An estimated 3,689,000 women were members of national and international labor unions in the United States in 1966. This was an increase of 276,000 since 1964. Almost one out of every five union members in 1966 was a woman. Almost one out of every seven women in the nation's labor force as compared to one out of every four men workers, belonged to a union. The relatively low proportion of women who are union members reflects the industries in which they work. The largest number of women in the labor force are clerical and service workers and thus are in occupations where union organization is less extensive than among blue collar workers of the manufacturing industries. In a survey conducted among 190 unions in 1966, 140 indicated that they had women members. The highest membership figures for women were reported by unions which have collective bargaining contracts in industries that normally employ large numbers of women. About 18% of all women union members, for example, were in two unions in the apparel industry. These were the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (ACWA). Other unions that reported a sizable female membership were the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, The Retail Clerks International Association, the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, and the Communication Workers of America.

In addition, there were relatively large numbers of women in several big industrial and transportation unions, although women represented only a small portion of their total membership. This group of unions included automobile and machinery manufacturing.

The role of women as workers falls into two variations of the reserve army of labor concept. The first of these is the more classical form, such as witnessed in the industrial manufacturing field. The rate of women's participation in this field is dependent on the labor needs of that sector. With large increases in production, there follows an increase in the number of women employed and in classic form with the least downturn in productivity, women are among the first to be drafted into the rolls of the unemployed.

Within the framework of this first variation another pattern is to be discerned. In industries such as garments, textiles, and food processing, where a large percentage of the work force is comprised of women, there is also the frequency of regular lay-offs and seasonal employment patterns. It is because of the fact that women are

kept in reserve that they are hired in these fields as a cheap and readily available source of labor.

The second variation is less orthodox, but today more widespread in its practice. With the huge increases in the white collar and service industries over the last twenty years there has been a steady increase of women in the work force brought about by the increasing role of these industries in the processes of growth. Both because of the need for low-wage labor and the fact that much of the work is part-time or part-year, women are a favorable commodity for exploitation in these fields. In the clerical field, we again repeat, women comprise 73% of the labor force and are, by and large, in the lowest paid jobs in this field. At the same time, it is worth noting once more that women comprise 57% of the work force in the service industries and again occupy (along with non-white men) the largest and the lowest paid work strata in this field. It is here that we will note that these industries, unlike those in production or manufacturing, prefer to hire women because of the cheapness of the labor cost and the availability of a large supply of willing labor for tasks that are less than full-time or full-year. In periods of recession, women in these fields are not necessarily the first to be fired nor are they subject to replacement by male workers. We can expect to see a further increase in the hiring of women for these fields in the future. It must be stated that it is only because of the whole history of restrictions on the entry of women into the work force that this phenomena has arisen. It is safe to assume that if women had equal access to work in other fields and industries that they would shun this field as do the large number of white male workers. It is also true that employers would not prefer to hire women into these occupations if the cost of labor for women was equal to that of white male workers. It is within the confines of the unfolding reality as described here that the contradiction between the whole mythology of the role of women as the wife-child producer and raiser-homemaker becomes posed.

This gives rise to the need for such solutions as are only to be provided by free 24 hour child care centers and a socialization of the tasks of housework and food preparation. At the same time, with the large increase of women into the work force and out of the position of domestic servitude with its social atomization, a leap in consciousness is being brought about by the fact that women are now becoming aware that while they are allowed to be employed, it is only in fields that pay them the least in relationship to wages, stability, social meaning and opportunity for advancement. This is already giving rise to actions that demand the eradication of this situation. Women are not moving to return to their positions of housewife but are taking actions that can best be aided and described by the fight for equal pay for equal work as well as equal job opportunities and advancement. This further will call for the demand of jobs for all and the sliding scale of hours and wages. Until this point in history, class society has shaped women to its needs and desires. We are now entering the period where women will begin to shape society to their needs and desires. This is a task that revolutionary Marxists have not only analyzed starting with the issuance of the *Communist Manifesto* but which they have advocated and struggled for. They can and will do no less in this period which

will, within the broad confines of the struggle for the socialist revolution on the part of working women and men and their allies, culminate this process and begin the period when humanity will write its own history.

SECTION III: REVOLUTIONARY STRATEGY FOR THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT

The struggle against the economic oppression and exploitation of women in our society as well as against their general status of subordination in the institution of nuclear family, which has been outlined earlier, involves working for fundamental changes in the structure of capitalist society. The strategy we propose relates to this basic consideration and sets a basis for drawing both working women and working class women into the struggle for their liberation. The campaigns to which we give priority — on both a propagandistic and agitational level — reflect our understanding of women's role and position in class society. The party's role in the women's liberation movement must be to extend its perspective of *mass action* around demands of a transitional nature. This will not only raise the general level of political consciousness of the masses of women, but also, these demands can help pose a serious challenge to the ruling class. Furthermore, the struggle for and eventual winning of these demands will help undermine the basic pillars of class society. The major question, then, is the raising of demands which relate to women's needs, draw women into struggle, and challenge the institutions of class society. Many of the demands which have arisen in the women's liberation movement already form a basis for this type of strategy.

Free Abortion On Demand — No Forced Sterilization

In contradistinction to the party leadership, we see that the fight against the sexual oppression of women must be based on the call for Free Abortion On Demand — No Forced Sterilization, and *not* on the call for Repeal of All Abortion Laws. We see that the party's fight for this demand — both in our press and in our mass work — is necessitated by several concerns. First, we must be in the forefront of helping to break down the image, as well as its real basis, that the women's liberation movement is white and middle-class. This is a priority if we are to involve Black, Chicana and Puerto Rican women in the struggle for women's liberation. This demands that we actively educate and agitate around the demand of no forced sterilization, a demand to which the Third World community is sensitive, and rightly so. Secondly, if we are to relate to the needs of the masses of women in this country, then the demands we raise must be relevant to them. It is our contention that nothing short of free abortion on demand can materially affect the needs of working women, and especially women in the Third World communities. This of course, brings up the whole question of socialized health care. As inflation continues to spiral, the party can expect to have less and less difficulty in convincing the working class that socialized health care is indeed in their interests.

Recently, the party leadership has virtually dropped the call for Free Abortion On Demand out of its desires to organize women around Repeal of All Abortion Laws. This turn undermines our ability to reach precisely those

women the revolutionary vanguard party must relate to. Our party leadership rationalized its "new turn" towards the call for Repeal of All Abortion Laws for several reasons. First, the party leadership justifies this new turn on the basis that it has the potential for drawing into action the largest numbers of women. Certainly, the task is to mobilize the greatest numbers of women possible; however, the party leadership has not adequately proven that more women could be mobilized around the demand of repeal of abortion laws instead of around free abortion on demand. Furthermore, it goes without saying, that the number of people that support a demand at any particular moment is not the decisive criterion revolutionaries use in this regard. In the early days of the antiwar movement, we entered many coalitions and agitated around the call for immediate withdrawal. Even though mass sentiment was against us, we held by our position to educate the American people, so that today, the *majority* of people support this demand. To do less in the abortion movement will run the risk of diverting this important struggle in a reformist direction.

Second, the argument that fighting for abortion repeal is not unprincipled, misses the point. The fight for few reforms is unprincipled, if we mean by that, the fight does not cross class lines. What differentiates revolutionaries from reformists is not only *what* they struggle for, but *how* they wage the struggle. The approach of Trotskyists to social issues is not merely to fight for legalistic reforms but to raise the mass consciousness and to deepen the challenge to the capitalist ruling class. This is why we raise transitional demands and use our press as an educating tool. Regrettably, even in this area, our party has begun to drop its call for free abortion on demand — no forced sterilization. The editorial of the July 16, 1971 issue of *The Militant* said the following:

The experience of the New York law has clearly demonstrated that legalization of abortion is necessary to relieve women of untold suffering. Now what is needed is a network of inexpensive abortion clinics and free referral services to increase the availability of abortion to all women. (p. 6, emphasis added)

For the mother on welfare, for the woman in the ghetto or the barrio, abortions must be *free*, not just legal and inexpensive. After all, dentists are legal too, but would the party call for inexpensive dental clinics or free ones? The fact that the party has dropped the call for *free abortions* even in our own independent press is not justified by our participation in the abortion repeal movement, and can only be explained by the party leadership's conscious adaptation to the most backward elements in the women's liberation movement. This is all the more serious since the abortion struggle is the major campaign of the party in women's liberation work.

While the party leadership has declared that our turn to abortion repeal is a new turn in our abortion work; in actuality, this is only the logical culmination of the work the party has been doing in the arena of the abortion struggle for the past year. Actually, as far back as last year, the party began to revise its ideas on the abortion struggle. In a *Militant* article entitled, "Demand Repeal of Abortion Law," (March 13, 1970, p. 6) the following was said: ". . . It is beginning to be realized that any

reform short of repeal would still discriminate against poor people. . . . " Is it possible that our party leadership really believes this? Anything short of free abortion on demand will discriminate against poor people! In addition, we must not sow illusions by advocating solutions that are not really solutions at all. For the privileged woman with adequate financial means, repeal of all abortion laws would simply remove a stumbling block in her way; for the working woman, and especially those with families to support, the situation remains unchanged.

Active in groups such as the Michigan Organization for Repeal of Abortion Laws (MORAL) and People to Abolish Abortion Laws (PAAL), the party has succumbed to the alien class pressures exerted by groups with essentially a reformist conception of social change. The more privileged women who form the basis of such groups are mainly concerned with legalizing abortion since their economic and social position frees them from the threat of forced sterilization and the inability to pay for abortions. Of course, there are many dividends to be gained through work in the abortion repeal movement. To the extent that laws discriminatory to women are challenged, we can help expose the sexist nature of capitalism. However, we must enter these coalitions not only on the basis of being their active builders, but also with the perspective of educating the membership to our political line. It is our task as revolutionaries to extend the fight for repeal of all abortion laws, that is, from its legal basis to its social one, for free abortion on demand — no forced sterilization. Only when we extend this fight can we help pose a fundamental challenge to the institutions which oppress women. As we have pointed out, the party leadership is not using our press to play the important role in educating women to this idea.

At the basis of the party's call for repeal of all abortion laws is their belief that "sisterhood," which means unity in common action by large numbers of women, "is powerful." To advance this fundamentally classless slogan illustrates the party's lack of understanding of social power and social weight. Just as the leadership imparts undue social weight to the student movement, so too, it sees the current women's liberation movement as an embodiment of decisive social weight. While any large gathering of individuals can demonstrate a certain degree of "power," it is only mobilizations around transitional demands or demands with a transitional nature that can raise serious political challenges to the ruling class. But the winning of these demands is dependent upon the active participation of the mass of working women, third world women, and women of the class.

Underlying the party's analysis of the necessity of abortion, is an idealist conception of this basic, democratic right. This is epitomized in the formulation, "the right of women to control their own bodies." Even if free abortion on demand — no forced sterilization were granted tomorrow, women would still not control their own bodies. Women cannot have full control over their own bodies under capitalism any more than an assembly-line worker controls her own life. As long as wage-slavery and the general exploitation of the working class exists in society, then control over one's body is nothing more than a petty-bourgeois conception of freedom. As long as the time clock governs our existence, then it is the capitalist class which has control over our bodies. We propose that

the party instead raise the formulation of "the right of women to decide whether or not to bear children." This means an adequate and early sex education; free and easy access to birth control information and safe methods of birth control; and free abortion on demand — no forced sterilization.

Free, 24-Hour Child-Care

Because the part played by women in productive work has been restricted by their role in reproduction and in the nuclear family, we see the necessity for the rationalization and the socialization of the functions of the family. Moreover, the rationalization and socialization of these functions corresponds to the real needs of the masses of women in our society — freeing them from the fetters of household drudgery. This means: a) free, 24-hour child-care available to all; b) socialized food preparation and service; c) socialized maintenance of residences. These, as a whole, of course, are a direct attack on the nuclear family as an economic unit — one of the pillars of class society. We recognize that adequate services of such a character cannot be achieved under capitalism. The struggle for the liberation of women, if it is to succeed, must be in the context of the conquest of power by the working class. We must be in the vanguard of helping women free themselves from the chains of domestic slavery.

Equal Pay and Job Opportunities

The struggle to fully integrate women on an equal basis in the work force has taken on immense significance with the entry of masses of women into the job market. The demands for equal pay for equal work and equal job opportunities present a fundamental challenge to the economic interests of the ruling class and the social institutions of capitalist society. The struggle for these demands by women will help the development of unions among unorganized women, promote union caucuses, and, in general, stimulate militancy among women workers. Moreover, the granting of these demands by the capitalist class intensifies the contradictions of the capitalist system as a whole and becomes the basis for further struggles by the working class. For the ruling class, the satisfying of these demands is only possible by either decreasing the amount of surplus value extracted from the work force as a whole or by reducing the wages of one section of the class (primarily male workers) to pay for the increase given to women workers. The first alternative is incompatible with the interests of the capitalists and is thus unacceptable as any long-term solution. The second alternative increases the combativity of the working class in general. The attempts by the ruling class to make the working class pay for these rights through inflation and unemployment brings up the question of full employment and guaranteed wages. As in the ending of race barriers within the class, the ending of sex discrimination forms an immediate basis for unified class action around transitional demands such as a sliding scale of wages and hours. The attainment of equality by women would also serve to heighten the struggle by Blacks, Chicanos and other oppressed nationalities for their democratic rights. Lastly, with the reintroduction of women into the productive life of the society, the nuclear family will be further undermined as a social and economic unit.

These demands not only relate to the needs of the mass of working women, but also provide a basis to mobilize them in actions which pose a fundamental challenge to capitalism. Moreover, as the recent strike by the workers of the telephone company illustrated, this demand is coming into greater prominence in union struggles

In addition, other demands for economic freedom and improved job conditions include full, generous maternity leaves and benefits; the extension of protective legislation to men; guaranteed jobs at union wages; preferential hiring, training and upgrading of women; and full compensation at union rates during periods of unemployment.

In short, the task of the women's liberation movement is to mobilize all women in struggle around demands of a democratic and transitional nature. We must help fight to keep the women's liberation movement non-exclusionary, democratically-run, and open to all women who support and wish to participate in action. We see that the proletarian party must play a specific role in relationship to this movement; that is, we must work to both extend and deepen the women's struggle. The party must direct its energies toward building support for the movement among the decisive mass of women — Third World women and women workers — as well as building support in the high schools, junior colleges and universities. We must deepen the struggle by raising the political consciousness of women in the movement and by propagandizing around a revolutionary perspective.

SECTION IV: THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT TODAY AND THE SWP

The general radicalization taking place today and specifically, the rise of the women's liberation movement, takes place amidst the growing contradictions of the capitalist system and its inability to relate to the needs of the masses of people. The growing gap between the scientific and technological potential of capitalism and the fact that the ruling class does not choose to make available its resources to the masses of people, only serve to heighten these contradictions. Historically, any radicalization of the working class has generally been preceded by a radicalization of the petty-bourgeois and intellectual currents. Suspended between the two historic and decisive classes of capitalist society, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the petty-bourgeoisie, and particularly its student sector, are afforded a certain vantage point from which to observe the contradictions of the capitalist system. Their added leisure time, which derives from their social position, further enhances their ability to perceive society's ills and to propose solutions. Thus, the student rebellion against the imperialist war in Indochina, against the racist oppression of Blacks, and now their participation in the rising women's liberation movement, all relate to the basic contradictions of capitalism.

These contradictions of the capitalist system then, led to the rise of the women's liberation movement as part of this process. It is not surprising that the women's liberation movement grew out of this same student milieu. The initial stages of this movement were catalyzed by the reaction of radicalizing women active in the antiwar and

civil rights movements, to the blatant male chauvinism within the New Left student movements, particularly within SDS. Sensitive to society's ills and anxious to articulate their sentiments, these women were again cast in the traditional roles of women in our society — typing, giving support to their male counterparts, and performing the unrewarding, tedious and routinist task of back-room work. Frustrated and thwarted by male chauvinism, these New Left women began to search for alternative forms of organization as well as questioning the role of women in our society. This represented a positive step within the broader radicalization and served to indicate its deepening character within the student milieu.

Although the capitalist system bestows its oppression on all women in society, at the present time, the women's liberation movement has not transcended this campus base. Thus, the masses of women, the women of the working class and the Third World communities, remain, by and large, unaffected by the women's liberation movement.

Because the women's liberation movement is petty-bourgeois in composition, we *must* be cognizant of this composition and the effects it can have on the general orientation of the women's liberation movement. The composition of this movement means that the demands on revolutionary socialists in this movement are all the more sharp. We must intervene in the movement not only to recruit its healthiest elements, but moreover, to insure that the movement orient its major concerns and priorities to those women who will play the strategic role in the liberation of women, the proletarian women. Historically, any movement which fails to reach the only class capable of making and leading the revolution, will dead-end. Moreover, movements based on and in the petty-bourgeoisie have a vacillating and ephemeral character — vacillating between the camps of the two historic classes and flowing in and out of existence because of their lack of real social organization. The women's liberation movement today is no exception. Unless this movement transcends its present identity and composition, it will tend to become more and more a breeding ground for the expression of the psychological alienation of the middle class, whose life is divorced from the realities and struggles of the working class, rather than an effective movement for social change.

If these aspects predominate the development of the women's liberation movement, they will only serve to demobilize and derail it. Moreover, the overglorification given to these trends by our party help reinforce the more subjective aspects of this movement and not develop its healthier ones. Let us trace these salient features of the development of the women's liberation movement. One of the first forms the women's liberation movement took was the organization of consciousness-raising groups. Growing out of a reaction to male chauvinism in the New Left movement, consciousness-raising became a major alternative form of organization to the male-dominated radical left. Thus, as an initial stage in the development of the women's liberation movement, the appearance of consciousness-raising groups was to be expected.

Consciousness-raising is not a new idea, and like all phenomena, it has contradictory aspects. Insofar as it helped women to recognize their identity under capitalism and insofar as it served to point out that the individual problems faced by women in society were not really individual, but social, consciousness-raising has played a

positive role. On the other hand, inasmuch as consciousness-raising focuses on the psychological oppression of women, it generally becomes a breeding ground for the expression of the alienation and soul-sickness of middle-class women.

While the subjective reactions to sexism do indeed have a real basis in objective reality, feelings and emotions cannot be a substitute for an objective and scientific analysis of reality. The reaction to the psychological oppression of women under capitalism is valid and it is real, but if the women's liberation movement does not develop beyond this level of struggle it will remain confined to a small sector of the population. Small groups cannot relate to the needs of the mass of working women, whose day-to-day concerns are wrapped up with job conditions, child-rearing, economic subsistence of the family, and other such concerns. Moreover, the interests and activities of these groups do not form an organization vehicle for the liberation of women. It is our task as the vanguard party to help broaden and deepen this development beyond these initial stages of organization.

The personalized and subjective approach to male chauvinism and to sexism as developed through consciousness-raising groups, is manifesting itself in the party's uncritical stance towards this conception of feminism. This is well expressed in a *Militant* article entitled, "Meaning of Feminist Consciousness," by Debby Woodroofe:

A panel of feminists discussed perspectives for the women's liberation movement at a session of the New York Region Socialist Educational Conference here Nov. 21. . . . Panelists were asked whether they felt living with a man was contradictory to a feminist consciousness. Brownmiller [N.Y. Radical Feminists] responded, 'Everything we do is contradictory, isn't it? It is traditionally the woman's role to pacify and smooth over relationships. As feminists,' she added, 'we don't want to do that anymore.'

[Ruthann] Miller said she felt that 'when women find their energy being drained from the women's liberation movement into holding a relationship with a man together, then there is an obvious contradiction.'

Expressing the position of the Feminists, Myers said her group encourages women to leave men as a first step toward their liberation. 'We can't find equal relationships with men,' she added. 'It's a political relationship in this society. When he stands there before you, he has the whole male sex lined up behind him.' (Dec. 4, 1970, p. 15)

Taking place at a Socialist Educational Conference sponsored by our party, this would have been a perfect opportunity for us to expose the moralistic conceptions of social change as forwarded by members of the panel. That this was not done can only attest to the tacit endorsement of these ideas by the party leadership. It is our obligation as revolutionary socialists, during situations as described above, to counter this non-class approach with a Marxist analysis of society. Not only do such ideas provide a false conception about how women's liberation will come about, but these types of attitudes and ideas can only hinder the entrance of working class women into our organization.

Paralleling these ideas is the party leadership's premise that the gay liberation movement poses a fundamental challenge to the nuclear family and as such, is a major revolutionary movement. In a recent *Militant* article, Comrade Gus Horowitz, in his analysis of the gay liberation movement, went so far as to state: "Thus these new movements are not unimportant or peripheral to the *socialist revolution* but at the *center of its advance*." (May 28, 1971, emphasis added) While we unequivocally support the right of individuals to their own sexual preferences, and while the four authors of this document opposed the former party policy of exclusion of homosexuals from membership, we strongly disagree with this supposition. This premise is an extension of the non-materialist conception of social change cited earlier. The process of the dissolution of the family is already somewhat in evidence; and this process will be further accelerated with the development of the class struggle in the United States. As the objective need and basis for the nuclear family further diminishes, its strength as one of the pillars of capitalist society will be further undermined. Only with the reintroduction of women into social labor and with the rationalization and socialization of the family's functions as an economic unit, can we hope to envisage the destruction of the nuclear family, and not by tacitly endorsing the idea that the first step towards women's liberation is to leave one's husband, companion, etc. This utopian idea can only gain credence among the alienated middle-class women and can only serve to divorce us from those we want to reach — the working class women.

The uncritical stance towards these idealist notions further indicates that our party is moving further and further away from a traditional Marxist class analysis of the oppression of women under capitalism. The party, like the whole working class, is under the constant pressure of bourgeois ideology. We must not allow ourselves to become influenced by this one bit, but rather must conduct an unremitting struggle against bourgeois influences. The adaptation to bourgeois methodology that is beginning to discard our class analysis, not only goes contrary to the fundamentals of Marxism, but to the traditions of our party as well.

The traditional position of our party to the Woman Question was excellently articulated by Comrade Evelyn Reed in a discussion bulletin entitled, "The Woman Question and the Marxist Method," written in 1954. It is well worth the time to quote lengthy passages from this bulletin for two reasons. First, we believe the party membership should be educated in the historic Marxist position of our party — a task of which the party leadership is noticeably negligent. Secondly, the party membership must be aware of the past position of the SWP on the Woman Question so that it may be in a better position to critically evaluate its present one.

As Comrade Reed correctly pointed out:

. . . *The class distinctions between women transcend their sex identity as women.* This is above all true in modern capitalist society, the epoch of the sharpest polarization of class forces.

The Woman Question cannot be divorced from the class question. Any confusion on this score can only lead to erroneous conclusions and setbacks. It will divert the class struggle into a sex struggle of all women against all men.

Historically, the sex struggle was part of the bourgeois feminist movement of the last century. It was a reform movement, conducted within the framework of the capitalist system, and not seeking to overthrow it. But it was a progressive struggle in that women revolted against almost total male domination on the economic, social and domestic fronts. Through the feminist movement, a number of important reforms were won for women. But the bourgeois feminist movement has run its course, achieved its limited aims, and the problems of today can only be resolved in the struggle of class against class.

The Woman Question can only be resolved through the lineup of working men and women against the ruling men and women. This means that the interests of the workers as a class are identical; and not the interests of all woman as a sex.

Ruling class women have exactly the same interest in upholding and perpetuating capitalist society as their men have. The bourgeois feminists fought, among other things, for the right of women as well as men to hold property in their own name. They won this right. Today, plutocratic women hold fabulous wealth in their own names. They are completely in alliance with the plutocratic men to perpetuate the capitalist system. They are not in alliance with the working women, whose needs can only be served through the abolition of capitalism.

Thus, the emancipation of working women will not be achieved in alliance with the women of the enemy class, but just the opposite; in a struggle against them as part and parcel of the whole class struggle. (Discussion Bulletin A-23, October 1954, pp. 28-29, emphasis in original and added)

It is our contention that this analysis of women's oppression is basically correct, and that this is the only analysis which flows out of an understanding of modern capitalist society, the death agony of capitalism. Where does the party leadership stand today on this analysis? Where does Comrade Reed stand today on this approach to the women's liberation movement?

The passage we have just quoted from Comrade Reed's discussion bulletin, "The Woman Question and the Marxist Method," relates to the cosmetic controversy raised in the SWP in 1954. These introductory remarks served to put that discussion in the context of a class analysis. These remarks also formed part of Comrade Reed's article, "Sex Against Sex — Or Class Against Class," included in the first four editions of her pamphlet, *Problems of Women's Liberation — A Marxist Approach*. Central to the analysis of the struggle against women's oppression held by our party in 1954 (and through 1969, that is, through the fourth edition of Comrade Reed's pamphlet), is Comrade Reed's assertion that:

Thus, class against class must be the guiding line in the struggle for human liberation in general and women's liberation in particular. Only the revolutionary victory over capitalism, led by the working men and women and supported by all sections of the oppressed, can release women from their subject status and give them a better life in a new society. This assertion of Marxist theory and policy has been confirmed by the experience of all the victorious revolutions over the past century — from Russia to China and Cuba. Whatever their shortcomings, the improvements these revolutions

made in the conditions of women were achieved not through a sex war but through a class war. ("Sex Against Sex — Or Class Against Class?" emphasis added)

In the fifth, "new and enlarged" edition of the pamphlet, *Problems of Women's Liberation*, an article entitled "Cosmetics, Fashions and the Exploitation of Women," replaces the earlier article to which we have just referred. Aside from the change in title, this fifth edition *omits* the entire introductory remarks to the cosmetics question — remarks which formed the basis of analysis of this controversy, and from which we have quoted at length. The manner in which this new and updated article was revised from the first four editions to the fifth, raises some grave questions about the change in analysis that our party is developing towards the Woman Question. That this preface was deleted, or "selectively edited" out of the fifth edition is another one of those warning signs that our party is in the process of moving away from a tradition class analysis. It is our conclusion that this was necessitated by an attempt to avoid any conflicts and embarrassment between the party's past position on the Woman Question and its present orientation to the women's liberation movement.

Finally, as we have already pointed out, the recent decision to replace the demand Free Abortion On Demand — No Forced Sterilization with the slogan Repeal of All Abortion Laws, as well as the substitution of "inexpensive" abortion clinics for free ones, reflects the same pressures of an alien class exerted on the party. This turn in a reformist direction signals that the abortion groups the party has been working with such as MORAL and PAAL have exerted their politics on the SWP, rather than the SWP pulling them in a revolutionary direction. This is also indicated by a change in priorities and the party's growing hesitancy to raise the other demands of the women's liberation movement.

SECTION V: OUR TASKS IN THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT

The PC resolution states one *central* task for women's liberation work and six subsidiary ones. The central task is: ". . . working with other women to inspire and educate around the central political importance of the abortion fight, and building a nationwide abortion movement which can have a real impact and win significant victories for women." (p. 18) The other tasks are work in Third World women's groups; work in campus, high school and city-wide groups; educating around the war; use of election campaigns; use of educational activities and press; and integration of feminists into our movement and politics. These tasks may appear comprehensive at first glance, but from our point of view they are insufficient and in certain instances incorrect.

As was stated in Barbara Gregorich and Phil Passen's latest contribution to the preconvention discussion, "On Our Tasks in The Women's Liberation Movement": "Both the opportunity and necessity exists for the party to make its central task to intervene and to organize the women's liberation movement around the three demands of Free Abortion on Demand — No Forced Sterilization; Jobs for All, Equal Pay for Equal Work and Equal Job Opportunities; Free 24-Hour Child Care Centers." (SWP Dis-

cussion Bulletin Vol. 29, No. 15, p. 21) In our opinion, the party's central task should not be focused solely around the repeal of abortion laws, but should be to educate and agitate around all three demands that have been put forward by the women's liberation movement. One of these demands alone will do little to explain why women are oppressed and what steps are necessary for their liberation. However, all the demands together can play this role — and, as the party itself was pointing out just a few months back, nearly all women in this country can agree with at least one of the demands, although they may not agree with all three.

Furthermore, struggles are being waged around the issues of job opportunities and equal pay for equal work, which affect thousands of women. On June 11th of this year *The Militant* reported:

From 1964-1971, \$30 million was found due to almost 80,000 employees, nearly all of them women, through legal actions taken under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Complaints from women workers are running double those of last year, and last year was double those of 1969. Against the 234 lawsuits filed for equal pay, there were decisions in one case resulting in payment of more than \$900,000 plus \$100,000 in interest to 2000 women employees, and in another case of \$126,000 plus \$24,000 interest to 176 women and 26 men.

These struggles raise the opportunity for us to educate about the system which forces 40% of the work force into the lowest job categories and which discriminates against these workers because they are female.

Free, 24-hour child care centers are continuing to become a major issue also. Our comrades in Cambridge are in the process of getting signatures to put a child care referendum on the ballot next November. The UAW at its 1970 convention passed a lengthy resolution calling for child care centers and equal job opportunities. One has only to take cognizance of the number of working women with young children to glimpse the kinds of opportunities for drawing millions of American women into struggle. Comrade Stone stated in her 1971 Plenum report: "Child care is another issue we have helped to organize around, especially in fighting for child care centers on the campuses." (Internal Information Bulletin, No. 2 in 1971, p. 7) It is all well and good that our comrades have been organizing for child care on the campuses but it should be obvious that there is a greater need for child care facilities and a social basis of power to demand those facilities, among women of the working class in this country.

These demands — equal job opportunities, equal pay, free child care, and free abortion on demand — no forced sterilization — are demands that affect nearly every woman in this society. Especially affected by them are the women who work for a living, 38% of whom have children, and the many more who would work if they could find adequate child care facilities for their children. These are concrete problems of immediate concern facing working women every day of the year. It is our task to be in the forefront of these struggles, educating and leading in mass action the working women and working class women whose lives are so deeply affected by the inequities of capitalism.

We want to make it clear, however, that we are not in opposition to working in single-issue coalitions for legalization of abortions that appear; but to become the

main initiators of these coalitions and not to fight for the correct slogan of Free Abortion on Demand — No Forced Sterilization, is another matter. It is not that "legalize abortions" is an unprincipled demand — it's just wrong for this period and this context.

The PC resolution does state that one of our tasks is the building of Third World women's liberation groups. It is our contention that the party has not actually begun this work in any real way, and cannot do so in a serious manner until it orients toward working women in the ghettos and the barrios. Maxine Williams, author of the Pathfinder pamphlet "Black Women's Liberation," wrote:

What is hampering it the women's liberation movement now is not the fact that it is composed of mainly white, 'middle-class' women. Rather it is the failure to engage in enough of the type of actions that would draw in and link up with the masses of women not yet in the movement, including working and Third World women. Issues such as day care, support for the striking telephone workers, support for the laws which improve working conditions for women and the campaign to free Joan Bird are steps in the right direction. (pp. 10-11)

Our role in the women's liberation movement should be to see that the struggles are linked up with Third World and working women, by going into the factories and to other work places of the masses of women, and by educating the campus groups, especially those in the high schools and the junior colleges, of the necessity to link up with their sisters in struggle. There are innumerable pieces of evidence that show how closely the Third World women's struggles are tied to the more general working class struggles. In 1966, 61% of all Black married women were in the work force, with nearly one-fourth of all Black families headed by females. The major demands of the women's liberation movement are *more* relevant to Third World women than to women on the campus. These women couldn't afford an abortion even if it were legal. These women suffer the most from lack of child care centers, forced sterilization, job discrimination, and the school tracking system. As Comrade Maxine Williams further points out in her article:

Today at least 20 percent of black women are employed as private household workers, and their median income is \$1,200. These women have the double exploitation of first doing drudgery in someone else's home and then having to take care of their own households as well. Some are forced to leave their own children without adequate supervision in order to earn money by taking care of someone else's children. (p. 7)

Welfare mothers, a majority of whom are Black, are now having to wage a battle against attempts to deprive them of their welfare benefits if, after three children, they do not submit to involuntary sterilization. At the same time, they cannot receive a free abortion if they so choose.

In order to take full advantage of the opportunities that exist and to build a strong, viable women's liberation movement, we must take our demands, not just to the campuses, but to where the need and sentiment is most strongly felt — among the masses of the working and

Third World women. This means working within the trade unions wherever possible and within women's caucuses where they exist. We should use any available opportunities to raise the demands of the women's liberation movement and to turn the economic struggles into political ones. This will also open new avenues of reaching working class men and convincing them of the importance of the demands of women. It must be pointed out that a victory for women workers is a victory for the entire working class while a defeat for women workers is a defeat for the class as a whole. One of the tasks of the party is to educate the working class that sexism, like racism, is not in their interests. Only by fighting together can the struggle be pushed forward. Even the male worker who is the sole breadwinner can be convinced of the need for free abortion on demand and free 24-hour child care centers by reminding him that it is his paycheck that must pay for a babysitter and for medical services for his wife. And of course, if his wife has to work, a large portion of her paycheck will have to be spent for child care. In the event of a pregnancy, they will both suffer from medical expenses and unfair regulations around maternity leaves and benefits. As we discussed earlier, victories in equal pay can deal a concrete blow to the ruling class.

The large proportion of non-unionized women cannot be forgotten either -- for without an organization to fight for their demands -- they are the ones hit hardest by job discrimination, lack of maternity benefits, low wages and intolerable working conditions. This is what constitutes oppression at its fullest -- this will be the real source of revolutionary feminism. Already, there have been some increasing moves toward unionization in this country, the most notable being the growth of AFSCME. Where these struggles are occurring we should be involved to raise the

demands of the women's liberation movement as well as those of the labor movement, demands such as union democracy, rank and file control, and the like.

Even though our primary focus will be the working class women, we should continue our work on the campuses, especially on the high school and junior college campuses. We must take our proletarian orientation into the campus groups and educate the women around all the demands as well as around the importance of bringing working class women into the struggle. This means orienting away from consciousness-raising groups and towards mass actions which can reach out to and link up with the masses of working and Third World women. Also, we should fight for the extension of various vocational and trade classes to women. We can play a leadership role on the campuses in initiating women's studies departments.

Other groups such as welfare rights organizations and consumer movements should be investigated where they exist. We should find out the kinds of demands they're raising, who is in the leadership, the kind of support they're getting, etc. Organizations like these could be fruitful arenas of work since they often include Third World women, and other working women or working class housewives.

Finally, we must use our press and election campaigns to the fullest extent to educate the masses of women on these questions, to deepen the ongoing struggles, and to win women to our revolutionary socialist ideas. Through our press and election campaigns, we can link the struggles of women to other struggles around the world and point out that none of these can be really attacked without attacking the root cause of them all, class society -- and in this case, the capitalist system.

July 21, 1971

THREE CONCRETE WAYS TO BUILD A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

By Mary Henderson, Oakland/Berkeley Branch

There are many concrete ways to build a revolutionary party. I am going to deal with three very important areas of recruiting and at the same time raising money. These are forums, tours, and the sale of our press.

First I want to deal with forums. Weekly forums are a very effective way of both keeping the branch in the black financially and at the same time recruiting. But this must be done with consistent forums held every week. This past year was the first time in several years that the Oakland/Berkeley branch held forums regularly every week. It paid off both financially and by drawing new people around to our ideas. Out of the twenty-six forums held over a nine month period we brought in over \$864, and netted for the branch some \$450. Considering that we had not held this type of activity for some time in this branch meant that we were ahead financially \$450 over the nine month period.

But this money did not fall out of the trees by itself. It took consistent hard work on the part of the branch as a whole, and in particular, on the part of building and maintaining an effective forum committee. This committee was set up consciously trying to involve all areas of work. There were both older party comrades and YSA comrades working on it. A comrade from Cal and one from the women's liberation fraction also worked on this committee. While we could not draw every area of work onto the

committee itself, we specifically kept in touch with fraction heads so that when something came up we were on top of it. One good example of this was the struggle on Merritt campus to keep the campus from moving into the Berkeley Hills. Because we moved quickly we were able to have a symposium of a number of students who were actively involved in this struggle.

Forums that were very successful were ones around the women's liberation movement, the Middle East, special guest speakers such as Robert Allen and Frank Kofsky, and those forums that dealt with issues around our campaign, where we would have our candidates participating either in a debate or a symposium.

We found that symposiums and debates contributed to building the most successful forums.

The committee rotated getting speakers and doing followup work on the speakers, thereby giving each comrade experience in this area. We found it proved most profitable to send out confirmation letters to every guest speaker and also to followup with a telephone call the day before the forum. The phone calls take care of any anxieties of whether the speakers will show up or not.

For publicity we did extensive posting in certain areas, leafletting, placing free column ads and free radio spot announcements. For a particular forum we would pay for an occasional ad, although we did not make a habit

of this. This was done when we wanted to reach the black community for a specific forum. Also during the Berkeley campaign we were able to get much free publicity through our candidates issuing statements about an upcoming forum in the *Berkeley Gazette*. As for mailing lists we kept them paired down each month so as not to be sending out announcements to people who were no longer interested. We also issued press releases of forums which featured well known speakers or which dealt with a hot issue, such as when Standard Oil polluted the Bay.

Another area which was dealt with conscientiously was that of contact work. It is very important that certain comrades keep on top of this work so that our contacts will want to come back next time. There is nothing worse for a stranger to come into an unknown place, although drawn there by a certain motivation, and not have anyone talk to him or her. Chances are that person won't come back a second time. It is therefore vitally important that comrades do not congregate by themselves and talk about "in" things while there is a potential recruit sitting by his or herself.

It is also very important to hold these forums continuously week after week so that contacts will feel that there is something doing on Friday night which interests them. This is a way of building our periphery. On the other hand, if forums are held sporadically contacts tend not to come back.

The second area of work I want to discuss are tours. Over the past year or two we have been able to build a number of tours that have both helped recruit and raise funds for the party. What we have done in the past is only minimal compared to what we can do during this present period. For one thing we are going to launch our 1972 election campaign. There will be any number of candidates available in each locality to have tours set up for. In addition there are any given number of comrades in local areas who have developed and can speak effectively on the women's liberation, antiwar, Black and Chicano movements, as well as other topics. Many areas have set up speakers bureaus advertising our Marxist speakers.

One reason that these tours have become more successful, is that honorariums can be gotten for any number of speakers. In the past we looked at it as a windfall if one of our party leaders or presidential candidates could pick up \$50 or so. But times have changed. Budgets are now set up in various campus departments to cover all kinds of speakers.

This is why it is so important to prepare a tour schedule well in advance. The best chances are in the fall when different groups are just getting their money. This is the time when the biggest honorariums are given. A good example of planning ahead is the national office having sent out

tour schedules of Andrew Pulley and Linda Jenness for the fall. We must do more of the same, even if the speaker will be available in the winter or spring. If the areas know by the fall what speakers they can present to the colleges for honorariums the bigger the honorarium will be. If, on the other hand, you have to start organizing in the spring for a tour, chances are there won't be a dime. This was proven with the tours this spring. It was like milking a dry cow.

Consistent organizing for these tours must be done if we are to gain the most out of it that we can. That means necessary correspondence as well as advertising the speakers well in advance. There should also be followup correspondence just before the speaking engagement is to take place so as to fill any loop holes that are left hanging.

If we build these meetings as effectively as possible we will be able to recruit many contacts to our ideas.

The third area I want to discuss is our press, which is the backbone of our movement. With it we are able to reach the most number of people with our program. It is therefore extremely important that we make the widest use of it possible. This is one of the keys to our recruiting. In order to take the most advantage of our opportunities we must organize effectively. Each branch should have a sales committee to stay on top of the situation. The committee should seek out places to sell, be aware of all campus meetings and watch the local newspaper ads. One of the most difficult, but necessary jobs of the committee is to see that every comrade is selling. This takes consistent phoning each week, to keep the comrades conscious that they should be out selling our press. All comrades should also keep their eyes open for new areas to sell. At every regular outside meeting, be it antiwar, women's liberation, or some other area of work, comrades should always take the *Militant* and the *ISR*.

One important duty of the sales committee which is sometimes overlooked is that a firm track of the money coming in should be accounted for as well as the number of *Militants* and *ISRs* signed in and out. If there is a sign out sheet available near the literature it makes it easier to keep track of both the literature and the money. If a comrade does not sign back in, you can track that comrade down. It is very important to keep a firm hand on the financial situation of the *Militant* and *ISR* sales since this is considered a break-even item in the branch budget, but will certainly put the branch in the red if not dealt with in a businesslike manner. Keeping the branch out of the red financially in this area is also another motivation for selling out the bundles of *Militants* and *ISRs*. For every paper or magazine left on the shelf to grow stale, some money has to be taken from another area of the finances to make up for the deficit.

SOME COMMENTS ON HEDDA GARZA'S WORDS AND DEEDS*

Mary Henderson, Oakland/Berkeley Branch

Building a cadre is a primary task of a revolutionary party that has set out to build a combat organization which will lead the working class in the struggle against the capitalist system. Without a cadre there could be no party to carry out this struggle, there would only be the ideas. The Socialist Workers Party has striven to educate and make a leader out of every single comrade, male and female alike. We aim to be a whole party of

leaders so that we can carry out the task that is before us.

Hedda Garza, in her document "For a Better Relationship Between Word and Deed" (vol. 29, #9), tells us that women have had a difficult time emerging as leaders within the party; and are just now emerging due to the women's liberation movement. I feel that this is not so. For many years there have been female leaders in the

party. If you look around you will find many female comrades who were leaders long before the women's liberation movement came to the fore. The party has the same standards today as in the past concerning what constitutes a leader. We are not about to change those standards now.

Whenever a comrade has been overlooked, male or female, this has always been brought to the attention of the party and corrected.

What the women's liberation movement *has* done in the past two years or so is to make female comrades aware of the capabilities they already have, and what they can offer the movement. This is clearly shown in the fact that so many women today are rapidly developing in every area of work. They feel selfconfident in what they can do and achieve. I think that every comrade who looks around in his or her local branch will see many concrete examples which attest to this.

Another point that Hedda makes in the same document that I have to disagree with is that dealing with man-hating and the effect it has on the women's liberation movement. She states:

"Many young women are losing interest in the Women's Liberation Movement (although not in the liberation of women) because of this extremism that many YSA and party comrades endorse and publicly embrace." (Vol. 29, #9, p. 19) This extremism that Hedda is talking about is man-hatred.

While it is true that there is manhating within the feminist movement, many times in extreme form, it has not been a roadblock to interesting women in the feminist movement. A concrete example of what has developed in the women's liberation movement is that of Female Liberation, which has had a healthy growth on the Cal campus at Berkeley.

Because of our correct line we were able to go onto this campus where there was a complete void in the feminist movement and help to build a healthy viable force which has made feminism visible at Cal. Female Liberation brought out of the nooks and crannies women who had been thinking along the lines of feminism, but were

not actively involved in the movement. Because of its viability, Female Liberation was able to fight for and win one of the highest operational budgets of any group at Cal. It also received a budget to set up a women's liberation library within its own office.

During the AFSCME maid strike at Cal, the AFSCME leadership approached Female Liberation for active support because of the particular issues involved around the job and wage discrimination of women.

Female Liberation was also instrumental in building the women's contingent on April 24 at which it marched under its own banners. It was also actively involved in raising funds to send representatives to the recent NPAC convention, in its efforts to fight against the war in Vietnam.

As for the abortion issue, Female Liberation put forth an abortion referendum at Cal which won the highest vote in the Cal student election this spring. The referendum called for free abortions at the campus hospital. The vote was some 3,000 for free abortions and 900 against. Also the struggle for getting funds for the most recent abortion conference has shown that women in every level at Cal were interested in this issue.

The issues that Female Liberation has taken positions on shows the breadth of this movement. Besides the three main feminist demands, they have called for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam; defended the *Daily Cal* against attacks by the university administration this spring; and fully supported the AFSCME maid strike.

This organization is not free of women who conduct manhating, but this has not stood in the way of building an organization which has taken correct positions every step of the way in building an effective feminist organization. In the summer there is always a lull in campus activity. At Cal there has been a big turnover in women who have become interested in the feminist movement. While some women have left for the summer and plan to come back next fall; other women interested in feminist ideas have come around Female Liberation.

July 18, 1971