

Sue Johnson

1975

&  
Lew Williams

THE JOINT COMMITTEE FOR EVENTS ON THE OCCASION OF THE 25th ANNIVERSARY  
OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SUM-UP 1974

PART I: Lessons from the 1974 Experience of the Joint Committee

PART II: Criticisms of the Revolutionary Union, Wei Min She, Bay Area  
Worker, Wei Min Bao

Submitted by the Sub-Committee to the Co-ordinating Committee

Sunday, February 2, 1975

Draft by Paul Rockwell

INTRODUCTION

This paper is being written by the Joint Committee for Events on the Occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the Founding of the People's Republic of China for the purpose of sharing with the friendship and general progressive movements some of the lessons we have learned from our experience in working on the 1974 Joint Committee.

We have divided this report into basically two sections. In Section One we attempt to explain the nature and basis of unity of our Committee and the events we put on this year. In Section Two we bring out some criticisms which we have of the methods of work of the Revolutionary Union, Wei Min She, Wei Min Bao, and the Bay Area Worker in this year's Committee. We make these criticisms reluctantly but feel that the practice of these organizations in the Joint Committee has been objectively divisive and destructive, and that they should be made public so that others in the friendship and general progressive movements can learn from them.

PART I

WHAT IS THE JOINT COMMITTEE FOR EVENTS ON THE OCCASION OF THE 25th ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA?

The Joint Committee for 1974, like its predecessor coalitions and committees in previous years in the Bay Area, is an integral part of the friendship and progressive movements in the Bay area.

1971 was the first year that China's National Day was celebrated in Bay Area wide activities. That year many organizations and individuals, including most of the progressive organizations in the Bay Area and members of the Bay Area U.S.-China-Friendship Association, joined together and formed the Joint Committee to Celebrate October 1st, which put on a successful event that drew more than 300 persons to the Veteran's Auditorium.

In 1972 another Joint Committee to Celebrate October 1st was formed which also included many progressive organizations and individuals, including the San Francisco-U.S.-China Friendship Association. This time more than 2,000 persons joined with the Committee to celebrate China's National Day at Masonic Auditorium.

In 1973 the two coalitions formed. One was the Friendship Week Coalition which united around one principle--Friendship Through Mutual Understanding. The other was the Joint Committee to Celebrate October 1st, united around three principles--Friendship between the Chinese and American people, the normalization of relations between the U.S. and the PRC, and Education about Socialist China. The two coalitions together were responsible for week long events which drew thousands of people together to learn about China and to celebrate China's 24th Anniversary.

At the end of 1973 the two coalitions met and agreed on the need for greater co-ordination and communications between the coalitions and the possibility of merging the two coalitions in 1974. It was agreed at that time that a small co-ordinating committee, selected of representatives of both coalitions would be responsible for calling together a meeting in 1974 to discuss the events for the coming year.

## THE JOINT COMMITTEE 1974

2.

The San Francisco U.S.-China Friendship Association took the initiative in 1974 and called together a meeting of individuals and organizations involved in both 1973 coalitions as well as new people and groups. These meetings were designed through open and democratic discussion to plan for the events of 1974.

Many different ideas and proposals came forward and after prolonged and often heated debate the General Body voted to constitute itself a coalition united around the following operational principles:

"The name of this group shall be called: Joint Committee for Events on the Occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the People's Republic of China. Principles of Unity. The following principles of unity were adopted by the general body and are the basis of membership in the Committee:

- 1) Promote friendship between the peoples of China and the U.S.
- 2) Support the normalization of relations between China and the U.S. based on China's 5 principles and the Shanghai Communiqué;
- 3) Encourage people to be informed about the People's Republic of China.
- 4) Build both the Friendship Fair and the Evening Celebration at the Masonic Auditorium on the same level and appealing to as broad an audience as possible.
- 5) Membership in the Joint Committee is based on agreement with the spirit and content of the principles of unity.

Relationship With Local Events: The General Body also agreed that affiliation with the Joint Committee by local groups should be based on agreement with the above listed 5 points of unity. It was further agreed that local groups should have flexibility and autonomy in the planning of programs but that they should not violate the principles of unity. Concretely, it was agreed by the general body that local groups should try to send representatives of the Publicity/Finance Committee so as to facilitate co-ordination of publicity and finance?"

Active participation on the coalition required acceptance of the five principles. A simple endorsement required only agreement with the first three.

The Joint Committee in uniting together around these principles of unity hoped to be able to build a broad and unified friendship movement, including both progressive and revolutionary organizations and individuals as well as any new persons and organizations interested in building friendship with China. We hoped to be able to educate ourselves and the people in the Bay Area about China, the truth about China and the socialist society she was building. We hoped to support the normalization of relations between China and the United States. And we wanted to promote friendship between the peoples of China and the U.S.

We also agreed that all the events, both the centralized ones as well as local ones, should be united on the same principles and appeal to as broad an audience as possible. We did not preclude any organization or individual within the Joint Committee from putting on events around China independent of the Joint Committee. In fact, we encouraged it.

For our internal functioning the Joint Committee wanted to function in democratic fashion and therefore the Joint Committee included within its principles of unity that "membership in the Joint Committee is based on agreement with the spirit and content of the principles of unity."

Organizations who had opposed the Joint Committee 1974 principles of unity during the debate and discussion were asked explicitly if they could work with the principles as they existed and help build the events. All the organizations and individuals agreed.

Also this year the Joint Committee wanted especially to draw in more working and Third World people. Towards this the Joint Committee encouraged the formation of local committees, in particular ones which would be directly focused on local events in specific communities.

THE EVENTS

This year the Joint Committee put on two centralized events and many local events. The local events included one at San Francisco Chinatown which drew more than 1,000 persons to a four hour long program featuring talks about China as well as cultural presentations in a park. There was a day-long event in San Jose which included a day-time fair which featured colorful booths about many aspects of China as well as an evening program which included many speakers just returned from China and an educational and inspiring color slide presentation. A successful Fair drawing hundreds of people was held in Oakland. There were events put on in numerous college campuses including Berkeley, Laney College, and San Francisco State. There were also special exhibits in all the branches of the San Francisco Public Libraries and Schools. There was a talk presented jointly with the Bay Area Humanist Society.

In reviewing the local events the Joint Committee felt that they were a positive step to increasing decentralized events around China so that broader sections of the population can be drawn into the Friendship Movement at their places of work, school and in their communities. Although this year was a positive step in this direction the Joint Committee feels that its work in this respect is still deserving of criticism. We did not pay as much attention to the local events as we should have. We as a Body took the attitude that the local events were the responsibility of the local committees and did not offer the help and assistance we should have. Consequently activities originally planned for the Black and Japanese communities in the Bay Area were cancelled because of the inability of the local groups, on their own, to put on local celebrations as well as fulfill their commitments to the centralized events. We feel that the form of the local events--decentralized events focused on particular communities, schools, or places of work--is an important one which should be utilized more frequently and in a better way to broaden and deepen the Friendship Movement.

The two Centralized Events of the Joint Committee were the Friendship Fair held at Galileo High School and an Evening Event held at Masonic Auditorium.

The Friendship Fair at Galileo was not well attended. This was due to basically two factors. The first factor was late publicity. Publicity in the East Bay area did not go out until a few days prior to the event. This was due to errors made by the East Bay Publicity Committee. The second factor was poor location. In previous years much of the attendance for the Fairs was accounted for by people passing by the area who were attracted by the displays. The Joint Committee as a whole accepts the responsibility for this and we feel that this was caused by the lack of experience of the individuals involved in publicity as well as lack of foresight in seeking a location. This year the San Francisco Park and

Recreation Department, instigated by the local Kuomintang, undertook to block the ability of the Joint Committee and any of its local committees to rent public parks. The Chinatown Committee was able to obtain Portsmouth Square only after threat of a lawsuit with the Park and Recreation department. The Joint Committee had originally planned to hold the Fair at Washington Square Park. The Park and Recreation Department turned down that request on the pretext that we would hurt the grass. (however, two months later the Columbus Day Fair was held in the park with ferris wheels and merry-go-rounds firmly planted on the grass.) The Joint Committee, because we had not planned prior to that time on this possibility, left the obtaining of a site until too late to fight it. In other words, we fell into the trap of the delaying tactics of the City Park and Rec. Department. And our own lack of experience of knowing how to secure a good sight quickly was no small part of the problem.

Although the Fair was not well attended, the Joint Committee felt that the program put on that day, as well as many booths, were definitely educational, informative and interesting. The Fair carried out well the intentions of the Joint Committee--to put on events which combined a lively and interesting style with educational materials about China. Although the program was very good and the booths on the whole positive, there were shortcomings to the content of the Fair as well. For example, a positive feature was the providing of a planned childcare. An example of one shortcoming at the Fair would be the small number of women in the programs.

Hashish pipes were displayed in one booth. In another presentation Confucian sayings were used in a demonstration of Chinese calligraphy. These serious errors showed that the Joint Committee should have worked more closely with its invited guests and member organizations so that errors such as this would not have occurred. However, the Joint Committee did feel that the overwhelming content of the Fair was positive and reflected the essence of Chinese life and society today.

The evening celebration at Masonic was well attended. In fact we reached more people this year than in past years. This was in marked contrast to other parts of the country where celebration events were noticeably smaller. Masonic was packed to overflowing. Around 3,000 persons attended the celebration. The enthusiastic audience was composed of many progressive individuals as well as many new people attending China friendship events for the first time.

The Joint Committee speaker was well received as she gave a statement which had been previously discussed and approved by the entire committee. Everyone felt that she presented the aims and purposes of the Joint Committee well. The Joint Committee chorus which sang "The Masses" in three languages--English, Chinese, and Taglog--the Bay Area Progressive Musicians Association who presented an original piece based on Kuo Mo Joo poem, and the Chinese Progressive Association's presentation of the four minute exercise were all enthusiastically received.

Ben Seaver, from the American Friends Service Committee, Carmelita Hinton from the U.S.-China Friendship Association, and especially Owusu Sadaukai from the African Liberation Support Committee were also enthusiastically welcomed by the audience. Ben Seaver brought to the evening a sense of continuity with the past friendship with China work done before many members of the audience were even born. He made clear that what we were doing this year was a continuation and extension of the work he and many others have done for over half a century--building friendship between the Chinese and American people.

Carmelita Hinton brought greetings from the national U.S.-China-

5

Peoples Friendship Association and represented well an organization whose existence had been worked on for so long by many in the audience and whose founding was applauded by everyone. Omsu Sadaukai explained to all of us what China means to African and other Third World peoples around the world and here in the United States. China, according to Sadaukai, represented the deepest aspirations of the oppressed peoples everywhere for justice and equality. He began and ended his speech on the theme of China's great slogan: "Countries want independence, nations want liberation, and people want revolution."

Felix Green was the key-note speaker and although everyone in the audience had immense respect for his work on China in numerous books- and films, many were disappointed by what he said. His speech did not focus primarily on China but instead veered towards the topic of the progressive movement in the United States. In his statements about his trip to Africa he made unfortunate statements interpreted by many as racist about the African people. ???

In summarizing the evening event the Joint Committee felt that on the whole it was tremendously positive, both in the number and broadness of the audience as well as the program itself.

The activities of the 1974 Joint Committee represented, on the whole, a step forward. We reached large numbers of people with what was for the most part an accurate picture of KChina today. Outreach to numerous classrooms, communities and work places furthered the cause of friendship with China. Within the coalition itself, organizations with widely different outlooks and perspectives worked together, engaging in principled struggle which brought productive results. These positive achievements were remarkable in light of serious provocations which came from within the joint Committee itself. We are firmly convinced that these problems could have been avoided, and the discussion which follows is offered in the spirit of learning from our experience and taking steps to prevent similar problems from arising in the future.

## PART II

CRITICISM OF THE REVOLUTIONARY UNION (RU), WEI MIN SHE (WMS),  
HAY AREA WORKER (BAW), AND WEI MIN BAO.

In the beginning of the year's work, there was a series of general meetings during which all the participating organizations and individuals were encouraged to present their ideas and proposed plans for the coming year. At the second general meeting, the RU, WMS, BAW, and WMB presented the following proposal. The proposal called for two levels of outreach and for a division of responsibilities:

*"Today the importance and possibilities of building U.S.-China Friendship on a people to people basis are great. The present world situation is marked by great turmoil, intensifying contention between imperialist powers and increasing struggles of colonized and semi-colonized peoples of the world. As Mao Tse-Tung said in his 1970 statement, the danger of world war is very great in the period ahead. All this re-emphasizes the tremendous importance of building U.S.-China Friendship. War is not in the interest of the masses of people of the world.*

*At the present time the U.S. has taken a more "positive" posture towards China as part of their current international strategy. But, of course this posture could change very quickly because it depends not on any real desire for peace and friendship, but on the interest of the U.S. government. This emphasizes the importance of building U.S.-China Friendship on a people to people basis.*

*This is the context in which we see building U.S.-China Friendship events this year. We feel that the work around this year's events should be carried out on two levels.*

<sup>1</sup>THE FRIENDSHIP FAIR. The first level being the Friendship Fair, taking advantage of the current "positive" posture of the U.S. towards China and going all out to build broad based understanding and Friendship between the American and Chinese peoples, based on the principles of unity of: 1) Friendship through mutual understanding; 2) Normalization of state relations between the U.S. and China.

The Friendship Fair provides an excellent opportunity to unite people from various backgrounds who wish to promote people to people friendship. This can range from workers, students, professionals, and businessmen, and people from political organizations.

The Fair will encompass three main aspects: (1) booths, exhibits, and displays on various aspects of Chinese society today, Chinese arts and crafts, dry goods, etc., 2) lectures and slide presentations on Chinese life, i.e. workers, industry, health, acupuncture, comparisons between "old and new" China or "what the American and Chinese people have in common"; 3) cultural programs, such as music, folk dances, contemporary Chinese songs, and maybe scenes from modern Chinese dramas.

Hopefully, this Fair will be a weekend affair and should be held in a centralized in-door location, most likely a large auditorium with access to nearby small rooms. An in-door situation will eliminate weather considerations and booths need not be dismantled at the conclusion of the opening day--a necessity if held outdoors.

" THE OCTOBER 1st CELEBRATION. The second level program being the Oct. 1st Celebration, based on the objective nature of the event, being the 25th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, it would be on a higher basis of unity.

As the American economic crisis deepens, the American people will be looking for positive alternatives, which China is an example of. This year's October 1st celebration would provide the medium to explore pertinent questions such as: 1) China's role in the Third World/U.N. Special Sessions, 2) History of U.S.-China relations and why it is necessary to build U.S.-China Friendship according to the world situation; 3) The question of war and peace and China's view on the question; 4) Socialist construction, China's non-exploitative policy of self reliance and how China, through this social system, is aiding other underdeveloped countries develop on their own efforts independent of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

"THE DECENTRALIZED PROGRAMS AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE MAIN PROGRAMS. During the last year's Friendship Week Activities, many "decentralized" events were conducted by many groups in the community and schools. This year we feel decentralized local events should be encouraged and left to those planning them. They need not be required to be part of the overall coordinating committee, but the event should be coordinated through publicity as far as times and places are concerned. Help from the overall body should be extended to anyone interested.

"We feel that the relationship between the two events should be clearly defined, both organizationally and politically, so as to avoid problems that existed last year. Last year there were a number of problems, one being some people viewing the Friendship events and the October 1st Celebration as being in competition with each other, another being the feeling of the Swim Coach that he had been gotten to participate in the October 1st event on a pretext, because he did not have prior knowledge of the nature and context of the event. We feel that these weaknesses can and must be overcome. First we feel that there should be two separate committees for the two events, because of the objective difference in the nature of the two events some groups may only want to participate in one and not both events. There should be overall coordination between the two events as far as joint publicity and seeing the two events as complementary and not in competition. Secondly, we feel the literature put out should accurately reflect the content of the programs."

This proposal of RU-WMS-BAW-WMB was rejected by a large margin. Those who voted for it were:

- two independent individuals
- RU-WMS-BAW
- Trishu Newspaper
- Asian Community Center

Those who voted against the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB proposal were:

- Eight independent individuals
- Black Workers Organizing Committee
- American Friends Service Committee
- Getting-Together Newspaper
- Chinatown Committee to Celebrate October 1st
- I Wor Kuen
- Medical Committee for Human Rights
- Kew Dawn Newspaper
- Liberation School
- San Francisco State Asian Student Union
- October League
- San Jose State Asian Student Union
- Asian Student Union U-C Berkeley
- J-Town Collective
- U.S.-China People's Friendship Association

There was one abstension.

While this proposal was rejected by the Joint Committee by an overwhelming majority, RU, WMS, BAW, WMB continuously tried to reintroduce the essence of their position, in one form or another, during the course of the Joint Committee's work. In support of their proposal, the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB made several arguments which have great significance for the future of the friendship movement. A summary of these arguments follows.

RU-WMS\*BAW Argument

To begin with, RU-WMS-BAW-WMB argued that there are different levels of consciousness and different people have to be approached on different levels. The Oct. 1st Celebration, they claimed, "presupposed a pro-socialist view"; it would very likely alienate or turn off masses of people who could not relate to the idea of another country's national day or appreciate its political significance. At the same time, RU-WMS-BAW said, October 1st provided an opportunity for leftists to "take responsibility to answer certain questions facing the anti-imperialist movement in the U.S." For this reason the celebration and the friendship Fair should be pitched at different levels and directed at different audiences. The Fair would focus solely on the theme of friendship and gear itself to a mass audience, while the October 1st celebration, aimed at a left audience, would pitch itself at a "higher level" and address various political questions. Separate principles of unity and separate committees would be required

for each event. Specifically, the Friendship Fair would omit the Joint Committee's third principle of unity (education about China), the assumption being that this principle would alienate the masses and its omission would draw more people into the friendship movement. The RU-WMS-WMB-BAW maintained in essence that the least political event draws the most people. In a similar vein the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB argued that a separate committee would be needed to put on the Friendship Fair. It would, they maintained, be difficult for a coalition composed of so many communist and anti-imperialist organizations to reach out to middle forces in the friendship movement.

Those who disagreed with the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB proposal made a number of arguments in opposition to these. In summarizing them, we should point out that these were not the arguments of a homogeneous group. The constituted majority on the Joint Committee included both Christians and Marxist-Leninists, as progressives with many different outlooks. Some of the points raised in rebuttal to the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB proposal were made by different organizations and individuals and did not reflect the opinions of every person on every point of the majority. However, we have tried to use as much as possible only those points which reflected a general consensus among the majority of organizations and individuals.

In arguing against the "two-level" proposal, the majority of groups and individuals maintained that because October 1st was historically and politically significant to the broad masses of people it should be celebrated in a mass way. Organizing both events on the same level, the Joint Committee could unite the left, win over the middle and advance the friendship movement as a whole under the principle of "uniting all who could be united." It was pointed out that the October 1st event last year had been endorsed by many organizations which were neither pro-socialist nor anti-imperialist, despite the RU-WMS-WMB-BAW claim that such an event presupposed a pro-socialist view. It was also felt that the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB had misconstrued the third principle of unity as making a pro-socialist viewpoint a condition of participation in the Joint Committee, when in fact nothing more was involved than the recognition that China was a socialist country. As for answering special questions facing the anti-imperialist movement, it was pointed out that participating groups and organizations had been encouraged to put on programs of their own design consistent with the principles of unity, but reflecting the special needs and outlook of community or organization in question.

The logic of the two-level proposal drew criticism from a number of people who felt that, in essence, it denied anti-imperialists an open role in the friendship movement. Many anti-imperialists in the Joint Committee did not like the idea of keeping their politics a secret. They rejected the assumption that middle forces were inherently

anti-communist and turned off by leftists, and they resented the implication that left forces were inherently doctrinaire, sectarian, and incapable of working with middle forces. The majority of groups and organizations felt that the coalition had a responsibility to reach large numbers of people but to do it in a political, principled and honest way.

The majority of organizations and individuals expressed confidence that the three principles of unity--friendship, normalization of relations, and education about China (including China's status as a socialist country)--formed a sound basis for political unity which could reach out to broad numbers of people. Many groups expressed enthusiasm at the idea of holding friendship events in Third World communities and on campuses based on these principles. It was felt that the RU-WMS-BAW-WMS proposal to remove the third principle from the friendship events was keeping political ideas away from the masses.

The RU-WMS-BAW-WMS had maintained that education about China need not be explicitly carried out at the Friendship Fair, since culture presentations and the theme of friendship would convey the same thing implicitly. While it was generally agreed that friendship and culture were "political" by implication, the majority of groups and individuals could see no point in excluding verbal presentations about China. It was felt that a combination of verbal and cultural presentations would present most clearly the revolutionary content of China's history and her achievements as a socialist country.

Theoretically, the matter should have been resolved when the Joint Committee voted to reject the RU-WMS-BAW-WMS proposal. Unfortunately, the argument did not end with the vote, but continued for the life of the coalition. The implications for the Joint Committee, in terms of its ability to carry out its work, proved to be quite serious. If the Joint Committee was to function smoothly, the principles of unity, once adopted, obviously had to be binding on everyone who chose to participate in the coalition. This was not to say that different organizations or individuals could not hold on to their own ideas, but only that they should not continually reintroduce their own ideas in such a way as to disregard the majority decision and disrupt its effective implementation. Every group in a coalition whose line does not exactly coincide with its own faces the same choice: whether to stay in the coalition, leave it, or ask the coalition to make some kind of compromise. The choice depends on whether the principles of unity are acceptable.

Every group and individual participating in the Joint Committee was given the opportunity to express any misgivings about working in a coalition based on the five operational principles listed above. RU-WMS-BAW-WMS were asked explicitly whether they accepted the five principles and whether they could in good faith work with them. At the time they responded that they would give them their "whole-hearted support."

The operational principles of the Joint Committee were established only after the principles of unity were adopted by everyone. The publicity committee, the fair committee, the programs committee--all the committees were set up by the general body. Meetings were always open. The Joint Committee encouraged all of its members to join the sub-committees and volunteer for positions of leadership and take on responsibility. The committees were given the authority to make important decisions regarding the content of leaflets, who would speak at the programs, the time and place of events. Although final authority rested with the general body, the Joint Committee did not want the mass assemblies to become bogged down in long debates over every issue or problem that arose in the practical work of organizing the events. The trust placed in the work-committees flowed directly from the principles of unity and the fact that everyone appeared to agree with them.

Throughout the actual work of the Joint Committee, however, the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB consistently disrupted the work by trying to reintroduce their defeated proposal in various disguised, sometimes technical forms. At the actual events they went ahead and implemented their own plans and programs, sometimes in direct contradiction to the programs planned by Joint Committee work committees in which they themselves had participated. It culminated in a final summation meeting where the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB justified their behavior in the coalition and labelled the Joint Committee's principles of unity as the "bourgeois line" of a few organizations and their own actions in opposition as righteous rebellion. They invoked slogans like "the right to rebel" and "going against the tide" to justify their actions.

The best way to weigh the implications of this behavior is to examine concretely how the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB functioned in the Joint Committee--in the different work-committees, at the events themselves, at the sum-up meeting which followed.

#### The Fair Committee

In their proposal the RU-WMS-WMB-BAW had suggested that the Fair be carried out on a "lower level" than the evening program. With friendship and normalization of relations as the basis of unity, they saw the fair as the "broadest" event--one that would attract primarily people who could be united around the principle of friendship but not around "bringing out the significance of the Chinese revolution from an anti-imperialist standpoint." Thus the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB wanted only cultural programs and comparisons of life in old China with life in new China, and no explicit political points at the fair.

Having failed to win the rest of the Joint Committee over to this position, the RU-WMS-WMB-WMB tried to implement their defeated proposal in another way. They suggested splitting the Friendship Fair itself into two levels, with the speakers indoors and the cultural programs outdoors. In arguing for this suggestion within the fair committee, they claimed it would "let the masses choose what they want to see."

In fact it would have simply reimposed upon the fair a distinction between cultural and political programs which the rest of the Joint Committee had already rejected as inappropriate. The job of coordinating indoor and outdoor programs for the convenience of the people attending the fair, giving the best possible exposure to all the different presentations, thus became the focus of a renewed political debate. Under the pretext of giving them "free choice", the people attending the fair were to be encouraged to see only those aspects of the Fair which the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB wanted them to see.

The Joint Committee had hoped to broaden the outreach potential of the China celebrations through local events, organized around the three principles of unity, in the various Third World, working class and other communities. The RU-WMS-BAW-WMB hoped to broaden it by keeping the politics of the Friendship Fair "implicit." Inside the Fair Committee they called for a two-day Fair in order to allow as many people as possible to come. Since a two-day program would have reduced the time available for local events in the crucial week prior to October 1st, the idea was rejected. Not satisfied with this decision, the RU-WMS-WMB-BAW challenged the decision-making authority of the fair committee in a general meeting. The general body was obliged to go through the entire discussion process which had already taken place inside the fair committee, with identical results.

Technically, of course, the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB were within their rights in re-raising the issue at a general meeting. However, they exercised their prerogative in this regard so continuously and so systematically that it was difficult for the various committees to take the kind of initiative they should have in making and carrying out decisions. Moreover, each time it happened a general meeting would be bogged down in time-consuming and needless debate. A challenge to committee decisions naturally carried with it the implication that the committee was violating the operating principles of the coalition on some way. All that ever came of such challenges, however, was a rehash of issues which the body had long since decided.

After not helping with contact work or cooperation in terms of contact lists during the first few months of the fair committee's work, the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB called for a postponement of the fair under the pretext that a location had not yet been found. The practical effect of such a decision would have been to sever the Fair from the October 1st program, which, conveniently, happened to coincide with the RU-WMS-WMB-BAW's original proposal. The decision of the Joint Committee at the very outset had been that all events should be related to October 1st. Once again, the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB had found a way to reintroduce an essentially political question on what appeared to be purely technical grounds. Once again, there was a long and frustrating debate which did not alter the original decision of the Joint Committee.

When it became obvious that the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB positions could not carry through the general meetings of the Joint Committee, the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB resorted to packing the Fair Committee meetings. In certain key committee meetings, the RU-WMS-BAW brought a number of people, most of whom had never actively helped plan the Fair but who voted on issues that affected the success of the Fair.

The actions of the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB within the Fair Committee were representative of their overall attitude towards the Joint Committee and their attempt, after failing in the re-introduction of their original proposal, to prevent the Joint Committee from carrying out its tasks and fulfill its goals.

#### The Program Committee

The obstructive work of RU-WMS-WMB-BAW followed the same pattern in the program and publicity committees as it did in the Fair Committee.

The struggle over an Afro-American speaker was a case in point in the program committee. The program committee suggested an Afro-American speaker for two reasons: to speak on Chinese foreign policy especially in regard to liberation movements in Africa, and to involve more Afro-Americans in the friendship movement. Owusu Sadaukai, former chairperson of the African Liberation Support Committee, was suggested. However, RU-WMS-BAW said it would be better to have "a worker" speak. They posed the idea of "a worker" against a very specific suggestion for a Black speaker who was well known in the Black community so as to draw more Black people to the events. This idea of "a worker" was never introduced over and against any of the other speakers such as Felix Greene, Ben Seaver, Carmalita Hinton. The "worker" was posed only in opposition to Sadaukai, an Afro-American (himself a worker and leader of labor struggles in Monroe, North Carolina.)

While the debate around an Afro-American speaker was not a particularly long or decisive struggle, it reflected on RU-WMS-BAW-WMB hostility to the policy of broadening the friendship movement, especially where Third World people were concerned.

#### Publicity Committee

RU-WMS-BAW-WMB tried to re-introduce its rejected position within the publicity committee as well. At the outset, a member of the Bay Area Worker volunteered to work on the invitation letter. The first Draft was criticized by the publicity committee because the letter failed to mention that there were many local events taking place under the Joint Committee. The letter also failed to give enough information about the evening event at the Masonic Auditorium. By ignoring the existence of the local events, RU-WMS-BAW-WMB neglected the importance of reaching out to Third-World and working class areas, as some of the local events were trying to do. The Publicity Committee stated many times the importance of local events, that they would greatly broaden the pro-China movement by reaching new people.

After criticism of the initial draft, another draft was written. However, the two errors had not been corrected, and worse, there was an addition to the first principle of unity written in. The principle "friendship between the people of the U.S. and China" continued to read that through friendship there will be world peace. The member of RU put in this idea on her own, reflecting RU's particular position on the meaning of friendship. Finally, someone else took over the responsibility of writing the invitation letter, which was approved and sent out. But re-writes delayed the mailing for two weeks.

When initial attempts to re-introduce the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB position in new forms failed, RU-WMS-BAW-WMB continued to delay the technical work of the publicity committee. They did little postering and leafleting, held back contact lists, volunteered for none of the preparation and pasteup of the leaflets, calendars, posters, and educational brochures, and took no more than 500 leaflets to the East Bay. In San Francisco they volunteered for several leafleting and postering assignments and then failed to carry them out. At the same time they subjected the educational brochure, which explained the principles of unity, to constant criticism. After the brochure had been drawn up and accepted, the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB raised doubts about it at the general meeting, touching off another long, wrangling argument. The general body placed the responsibility back on the publicity committee. But as a result of the delay, the brochure came out late and lost much of its mobilizing effect.

The delegation of responsibility to work committees to make decisions and implement policy flowed from the unanimous acceptance of the principles of unity. And those who honestly agreed with the principles of unity generally found the Joint Committee structure fair and democratic.

In the later period of publicity work, RU-WMS-BAW-WMB packed a publicity meeting, attempting to divide the Fair and Evening event, breaking the unity of the Joint Committee. RU-WMS-BAW-WMB argued that, as events were drawing to a close, the only way for people to participate in the Joint Committee now was through booths at the Fair. Therefore, they said, the outreach should merge with the Fair program committee, which was doing the outreach at the Fair.

Most people saw this approach as a break in the unity of events. The Fair and Evening event--as a matter of principle--were under the same principles of unity on the same political level. To say that the only way people could participate was through the Fair was, in effect, pushing the defeated line in the publicity committee. The Publicity Committee had made a decision to inform organizations and individuals of all possible ways they could participate in Joint Committee events--building the program, selling tickets, putting up posters, inviting speakers or performers to their own communities, through booths at the Fair, joining committees and

planning events, through local events. There was still plenty of work to be done, especially in the publicity committee. RU-WMS-BAW-WMB argued, however, that church groups, and other such organizations would probably participate in the booths, but would not want to participate in any type of planning or decision-making. Again, this argument implied that the masses could not participate in any political way, but only through culture--a particular argument that was overwhelmingly rejected at the beginning of the year.

In all the work committees, the methods of work and behavior of the RU, WMS, BAW, WMB were distressingly consistent. They would first try to introduce their ideas through some disguised form. For example: to sever the Fair from a link to October 1st under the guise of not enough time. Or to fight for the predominance of the Fair over the local events under the guise of the technicality that more people will know about the Fair after the 1st day and therefore there should be a two-day fair.

After that was defeated they would then resort to bringing it up to the general Body for tedious and prolonged debate. After the General Body reaffirmed the original decision of the work committees and refused to allow itself to be drawn into prolonged and unnecessary debate which turned off new people and held up the work of the Joint Committee, the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB resorted to packing selected committee meetings.

When all these various raises were defeated, the disruptive and unprincipled tactics of the RU, WMS, BAW, WMB culminated in their attempts to put on their own events in contradiction to the events planned beforehand by the Joint Committee as a whole.

In the Fair itself, the RU, WMS, BAW, WMB planned a complete program for a classroom at Galileo High School and posted the program at Galileo the day of the Fair itself without consulting beforehand with the Fair Committee as a whole. Furthermore, these programs were planned at the exact same time as the planned activity of the Fair Committee. This action was condemned by the majority of organizations and individuals within the Joint Committee as an outright attempt to disrupt the existing program of the Fair Committee, a program ~~which~~ which RU, WMS, BAW, WMB had every opportunity to have input into.

On the evening of the Masonic Celebration the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB unilaterally took it upon itself to change the content of the song to be sung by Prairie Fire (an RU affiliate) from a 'friendship' song which was defined by the RU to be at a "lower" level to a song about 'workers in China,' which was defined by the RU to be at a "higher" level. The RU-WMS-BAW-WMB took this step because they claimed that the whole content of the evening celebration was 'anti-imperialist' and therefore this new song about workers was more appropriate to the occasion. The program manager,

previously designated by the Program Committee, to represent the Joint Committee on the night of the event itself, explained patiently to the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB that the original song should be sung because the Program Committee, which had gone over the lyrics that night beforehand, would not have the time to listen to a new song one hour before the program was to begin. She stated that the RU, WMS, BAW, WMB should respect the collective decision of the Program Committee, which included the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB, and go ahead with the planned song. The Prairie Fire singers shouted profanities at her and other Program Committee members and threatened to do whatever they wanted. When the time came to do the song the Prairie Fire singers went ahead and substituted the new song.

As the Prairie Fire singers came on the stage, RU, MS, BAW, WMB members on security deserted their security posts in various parts of the auditorium and crowded into the downstairs aisles, apparently for the purpose of preventing anyone from stopping this blatant act of contempt.

At the conclusion of the song the Prairie Fire singers upon leaving the stage told the program committee members outside that they were exercising their "independence and initiative" and along with a few profanities told them that they (Prairie Fire) would deal with them later.

These actions were disruptive and destructive and they were all undertaken in the most arrogant and contemptuous manner.

SUM-UP 1974

Everything culminated in the Summation Meeting.

At this summation meeting, held October 27, 1974, RU-WMS-BAW-WMB reasserted its original two-level line, criticized the Joint Committee and defended its own practice within the Committee.

In their sum-up, RU-WMS-BAW-WMB did not mention the local events, except one--the October 1st celebration at Portsmouth Square. RU-WMS-BAW-WMB took a position against celebrating October 1st in a mass way in Chinatown, even though more than 1,000 joined the event this year. RU-WMS-BAW-WMB claimed that the Chinatown celebration of China's National Day could give the FBI the impression that Chinese people are a "fifth-column" in the U.S.

RU-WMS-BAW-WMB took a pessimistic attitude to the work of the Joint Committee as a whole. They argued that the friendship movement was set back this year because of an incorrect line as expressed in the principles of unity. They claimed that attendance at the Fair was low because the politics were sectarian. It was the presence of the third principle, RU-WMS-BAW-WMB argued, which drove the masses away from the fair.

At the same time, RU-WMS-BAW-WMB argued that the evening celebration, where the turnout was admittedly very large, tricked people into coming. The large turnout was

was no credit to the political line of the Joint Committee. The publicity, RU-WMS-BAW-WMB claimed, was misleading and "sucker-baiting." It did not prepare people for "anti-imperialist" presentations.

The majority of those present at the sum-up meeting took issue with almost every point of the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB evaluation of Joint Committee work.

First, it was noted that RU-WMS-BAW-WMS hardly referred to the local events at all and made no mention of any local events in their written evaluation. This suggested that RU-WMS-BAW-WMB not only underestimated the importance of the local events, many of which were held in Third World and working class communities for the first time, but deleted positive aspects of Joint Committee work in order to foster a pessimistic atmosphere in the Joint Committee as a whole. The RU-WMS-BAW-WMB position on the Chinatown celebration seemed absurd to most organizations and individuals, who rejected the "fifth-column" argument about Chinese people. Many people felt that the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB approach to the Chinatown celebration--especially the "fifth-column" argument--reflected on the outlook of the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB as a whole and went beyond Portsmouth Square. The question was not whether the FBI views Chinese people as aliens in the U.S., but whether RU-WMS-BAW-WMB views Third World communities as alien to the friendship movement as a whole. It seemed that in every instance RU-WMS-BAW-WMB denied or neglected the importance of reaching out to Third World communities, and their approach to local events such as Portsmouth Square was a derivative of their general attitude toward Third World people. Most groups felt that it was entirely appropriate for Chinese-Americans to commemorate October 1st. Nor was there anything wrong with Asian-American expressions of solidarity with socialist China. In fact the celebration at Portsmouth Square tended to confirm the Joint Committee position that October 1st could indeed be celebrated in a mass way--a position which RU-WMS-WMB-BAW refused to accept.

Second, there was no evidence that the Third Principle drove anyone away from the Fair. It was doubtful that people saw the principle in the leaflets and posters and said: "This is too red for me." It was noted that the political line in the publicity was the same for the Fair, the Program and local events, where turnouts were broad. So as far as turnout goes, the Fair seemed to be an exception.

Third, the Joint Committee rejected the "sucker-baiting" charge regarding the evening program. It seemed that the Joint Committee could do nothing right in the eyes of RU-WMS-BAW-WMB. If the turnout was low, the line was wrong. If the turnout was large, the people were tricked. Actually, the large audience at the Masonic, like the large turnout at Portsmouth Square, confirmed again that October 1st could be celebrated in a mass way.

Many suspected that a difference over the correctness of the principles of unity lay in back of these arguments. In the final committee meetings which proceeded the general sum-up, RU-WMS-BAW-WMB had denied any intention of violating those principles. They had made similar denials during the frequent arguments which arose in the course of the Joint Committee's work. They complained that charges of obstructionism were unfair. They argued that the problems at the Friendship Fair, in particular, were the result of poor coordination and bureaucratic problems. Other fair committee members, noting that the classroom presentations set up by RU-WMS-BAW-WMB had been scheduled to conflict with speakers whose appearance RU-WMS-WMB-BAW had opposed, were skeptical.

By the end of the general sum-up meeting, however, the cat was out of the bag. Where they had originally claimed innocence of any violation of the principles and policy of the Joint Committee, the RU-WMS-BAW now openly admitted it and strongly defended their behavior. Their speakers declared that the "dominant line" (as they called it) was wrong and "to rebel is justified." On the subject of the Masonic Auditorium program their written statement to the meeting stated, "Owusu and Frarie Fire were high points of the evening and they should be commended for going with the masses and 'against the dominant line.'\* RU-WMS-BAW also argued that the committee structure was bourgeois and bureaucratic and as a result RU-WMS-BAW-WMB had a right to go over the heads of the existing committees and do as they pleased at public events put on by the Joint Committee.

Many people were surprised to hear this we-are-rebels line stated openly at the sum-up. They were surprised because, for the most of the year, RU-WMS-BAW-WMB had claimed that they accepted the principles of unity and heatedly denied any charge that they were obstructing the policies of the Joint Committee. The RU-WMS-BAW-WMB introduced their "right to rebel" idea only after their "rebellions" had occurred. To the majority of the organizations and individuals in the Joint Committee, this only tended to confirm the view that the RU-WMS-BAW-WMB presence in the coalition had been unprincipled all along. The RU-WMS-BAW had secured a place for themselves in the Joint Committee, and even for themselves in the programs, by concealing their full position until it was too late to do anything about it.

At the end of the general sum-up, the general body voted to continue the discussion and resolution of many points in the Co-ordinating Committee. Subsequently a Coordinating Committee meeting was held which included most of the organizations and individuals that had participated in the Joint Committee throughout the year.

Most of the groups present stated that the views of RU-WMS-BAW-WMB made principled struggle impossible. In fact, the RU representative stated openly at that meeting that it was impossible to work together and that we should all go our separate ways. However, most of the organizations and individuals present point out that that meant that there would be two friendship-with-China movements in the Bay area.

---

\* Owusu Sadaukai did not disagree with the policy or line of the Joint Committee, nor did he view his own speech as an act of "rebellion" in any way against the Joint Committee. In fact, the Joint Committee placed Sadaukai on the program against the wishes of RU-WMS-BAW-WMB.

They argued that we had a duty to the masses of people in this country and to friendship with China movement to try to find common principles that we can work on and common principles of what constitutes principled struggle and debate. Further, most present felt that RU-WMS-BAW-WMB should examine in a serious way their statements and actions as presented both at that meeting and throughout the year's work. The majority of groups and individuals felt that RU-WMS-BAW-WMB should accept the criticism leveled by the Joint Committee and attempt to change for the good of the movement.

The meeting culminated in a long debate about whether or not a summation for the year should be written. Again RU-WMS-BAW-WMB stood alone against everyone else. Everyone else agreed that a summation should be written detailing our work this year, the lessons gained and the errors committed so that others may learn from our advances and our errors.

### CONCLUSION

While everyone agreed that the work of the Joint Committee was on the whole positive and a step forward for the friendship movement, a new set of questions emerged by the end of the year, questions whose resolution will have profound implications for the direction of Friendship work in the coming year. What constitutes principled and unprincipled behavior in a coalition? How far should organizations go in pushing their own line when principles of unity have been established? Should principles of unity be binding on every group within a coalition? Should any groups go beyond the method of persuasion when it does not get its way?

What are the implications of the line of RU-WMS-BAW-WMB regarding the "right to rebel" against principles of unity? Is this a proper line within the friendship movement? Is it likely to unite the friendship movement or to factionalize it? Will new organizations want to work in a coalition where the principles of unity, where the plans and preparations for given events, can be reversed by unilateral decisions of a small group? Will this line invite principled groups to join the friendship movement, or will it draw only those faction-lovers who try to destroy coalitions they cannot control?

The Joint Committee tried to answer some of these questions this year. We feel that what constitutes principled behavior in a coalition is to--while retaining your right to your own viewpoints--to respect and abide by a given set of guiding principles after principled struggle and debate have taken place. We see no other way that groups of individuals and organizations can come together in this period of many divergent lines and viewpoints to work on anything if this simple principle is discarded.

We believe that organizations and individuals have the right to present their own lines. In fact they have a duty to do so. But at the same time, we feel that once principles of unity and a certain path has been decided upon for a given period of time for a given project, no organization or individual has the right to push its own lines and plans in surreptitious or even open ways which would undermine the purpose of the coalition itself.

We believe that coalitions exist for specific purposes, based on specific principles and that organizations and individuals that feel these principles are so incorrect that they cannot work within them should not join those coalitions.

The Joint Committee for Events on the Occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the Founding of the People's Republic of China has written this report to contribute in whatever way we can to the friendship and progressive movements in this country. We are open to any comments or criticisms you may have. We are especially interested in hearing the viewpoints of the organizations and individuals which are working in the Friendship movement today.