

SWP

discussion bulletin

Published by the
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE
NEW YORK 3, NEW YORK

Vol. 24, No. 23

June 1963

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
1. What Makes Phillips Run? by Tom Kerry.	1
2. The SWP and the Negro Struggle, by Fred Mazelis.	6
3. Amendment To P.C. Draft Resolution: "Preparing for the Next Wave of Radicalism in the United States", by Shane Mage, James Robertson and Geoffrey White for the Minority.	14

20¢

WHAT MAKES PHILLIPS RUN?

by Tom Kerry

The acid test of the word is the deed! Life itself has provided us with the opportunity of applying this acid test to the ultra-radical phrasemongering of the Phillips-Wohlforth faction. In the windy verbosity of "The Decline of American Imperialism and the Tasks of the SWP," we were given the "word." Now, in the shape of an "independent" election campaign conducted in his Local Union Phillips has provided us with the "deed." I must say that the disparity between the two is startling! So much so that I am moved to say to Comrade Phillips: What you do speaks so loudly, I can't hear what you say!

The "Decline and Tasks" blueprints for the party a whole series of primary ...principal...foremost...main...chief... and paramount...tasks. Occupying front rank is the foremost principal primary "task" of colonizing young comrades in the unions of the mass production industries. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that it is possible to carry this "task" into action. The question that immediately arises is: What would be the role and function of a comrade so colonized?

We are informed by "Decline and Tasks" that "objective conditions" are preparing "the development of class struggle militant formations in the unions."

We are told that in carrying forward this task, time is of the essence, for the building of such a left wing formation "cannot be done from the outside nor by sending inexperienced comrades into the unions at the last moment."

We are admonished that our Labor Party slogan "must be taken off the 'propaganda' shelf, become once again prominent in our press, and utilized in all aspects of our concrete work in the class." (my emphasis)

Very good! Now how did Phillips apply this line under the concrete circumstances of an election campaign in his own Local Union in which he ran for office --and was elected -- running as an "independent?"

1. You can scrutinize with microscopic care his election campaign material, that put out under his own name as well as by his supporters, and you will find no hint, not even a suggestion, of the Labor Party slogan.

2. This "error" of omission is compounded by the fact that Phillips announced to the Detroit branch that he was giving "critical" support to the top candidate of the opposition against the Local Union administration, who in his published biographical sketch, boasts of being a Precinct Delegate of the Democratic Party.

3. Each of the contending slates in the election and each of the "independent" candidates were allotted space in a special election edition of the Local Union newspaper, to set forth their election platforms. Phillips' "programmatic" statement was completely indistinguishable from that of the rest of the aspiring pie-cards. His central slogans were: unity and progress. His line: support the good guys against the bad guys. His appeal: elect an "honest" man. How does this ward-heeler approach serve to provide what "Decline and Tasks" avows as our central aim -- to provide "the organizing spark for large scale rank and file movements?" Perhaps Phillips can explain! I confess that I can't.

4. How was it possible for Phillips to run for union office on this kind of a platform without serious objection by the branch? The fact of the matter is that the branch was not advised of his candidacy nor consulted about his program. The branch was confronted with an accomplished fact and when the comrades tried to call Phillips to order he resorted to the transparent subterfuge of accusing the branch leadership of "harassment" because of his minority views in the party political dispute.

The Local Union of which Phillips is a member is unique in the labor movement. For a number of years the Local and its leadership were the spearhead of the opposition against the top bureaucracy in the International Union. For the past several years the Local bureaucrats made their peace with the top skates and functioned as collaborators with the machine. This engendered opposition moods and movements which culminated in the organization of an opposition caucus which, in the last Local Union election, contested the election with a candidate and program that rallied the support of the militants in the Local. The opposition was narrowly defeated in a fierce struggle in which the incumbent bureaucrats pulled out all stops in an anti-Negro and red-baiting campaign so scandalous that the violent reaction impelled the promulgation of measures to ban a repetition of such practices.

Because of the history, background and tradition of the Local Union its members enjoy a large measure of formal democracy. Members running as candidates in Local Union elections are free to express their views and publish their program for circulation to the ranks. Each candidate is given the opportunity of publishing a programmatic statement in the special election edition of the Local Union paper. Caucus formation is the rule -- not the exception, as in most union organizations.

With the defeat of the opposition in the last election the caucus disintegrated. Individuals shifted from one caucus to another. Programmatic lines were obliterated. Meanwhile the discontent of the ranks continued to mount as the unsolved problems multiplied and became more acute. So long as they confined the struggle to the Local Union level the militants were in a blind alley. There is no way out so long as the top bureaucrats retain their stangle-hold on the union apparatus. The situation was rotten ripe for the injection of programmatic clarity and the posing of the real problems as a prerequisite for beginning the reconstitution of a genuine left wing formation.

Unfortunately, neither Phillips nor any of the other candidates even posed the problem let alone offered a programmatic solution. In our view there can be no talk of a genuine left wing formation that doesn't embody at least three minimum requirements:

1. The demand for an end to the Labor-Democratic party coalition and the formation of an Independent Labor Party based on the trade unions. There can be no fundamental solution to any of the major problems confronting the American working class so long as labor remains bound to the political parties of the capitalist class.

2. The demand for a sliding scale of hours, or, as popularized in the union movement, 30 hours work at 40 hours pay. It is amazing. In all of the election material issued by Phillips there is no mention of the 30 for 40 slogan. True, in one of his many leaflets, Phillips casually refers to the 30 hour week. In his "programmatic" statement published in the special election issue of the Local Union paper Phillips doesn't even go that far. He refers, instead, to the struggle for the "shorter-work-week."

This is a deliberate evasion of the issue! Every labor skate, from Meany on down, is on record "for the shorter-work-week." Reuther, McDonald and their ilk, are for the "flexible" approach to the shorter-work-week by such gimmicks as longer vacations, earlier retirement, appeals to Kennedy to amend the wages and hours law, etc., etc. Not too long ago, the opposition at a UAW convention was compelled to distinguish itself from Reuther's "flexible" approach by sharply counter-posing to it the more "rigid" 30 for 40 demand. It is incumbent on any left wing formation worthy of the name to expose the fraud of the "flexible" approach to the shorter-work-week and to pillory as betrayers those who lend credence to the Meany, Reuther, McDonald fraud.

3. The demand for genuine Negro equality in the unions against "tokenism" which cannot be achieved without a fundamental correction of the discriminatory practices bred into the very structure of the unions.

True, with this sort of a program, it is extremely doubtful that Phillips could have been elected. But, so far as I am aware, it has never been our aim in the unions to aid or abet the ambition of aspiring pie-cards to elbow their way to the unions fleshpots. Our strategic aim in the unions is to forge a genuine left wing formation capable of challenging and displacing the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class and of converting the unions into revolutionary instruments of struggle for workers power. Our tactics must be subordinated to this strategic aim and can nowise be in contradiction to it.

This concept of "union work" was drilled into our movement from the beginning by our great Marxist teachers. Trotsky often warned that the unions provided a veritable culture medium for the virus of opportunism. The trade-union bureaucracy is honeycombed with ex-radicals of every hue! Trotsky therefore emphasized and re-emphasized the necessity for strict policy control over all trade union members, especially over union functionaries and aspiring union pork-choppers.

In our struggle with the Cochranites we characterized the Cochran wing as opportunists who were adapting themselves to the more conservative layers in the unions, the privileged high-seniority aristocracy who fought as militants in the 30's but who succumbed during the years of prosperity-reaction to the lure of the union fleshpots.

Freed from the restraint exercised by the party the "leader" of the Youngstown Cochranites quickly elbowed his way onto McDonald's "staff." The Detroit Cochranites in the UAW abandoned all pretence of doing revolutionary political work in

the unions and plunged into the swamp of union "politics" up to their eyebrows. Some of them have "made the grade." Others are trying with might and main to do so. All "discovered" that adaptation to the reactionary bureaucracy was the open sesame to union pelf, place and privilege.

Examine your course, Comrade Phillips. Your present course leads inexorably into the opportunist swamp. You can't deliver on the election promises made in your campaign literature, and you know it! You can only serve to discredit yourself and --in the process -- to discredit the party. Let me quote you what you said in your lengthy document "Decline and Tasks". It appears that you have already forgotten what you wrote:

"Conscious formations of the working class do not spring up automatically. Conditions sometimes are overripe for such developments for a considerable period of time prior to the developments occurring. Then, once organized, the workers bound forward at a pace that startles the empiricist who has no understanding at all of the development of the class. However, it can be stated that precisely in organizing the dissatisfaction of the union ranks our own cadres can play an important rôle. Even a handful of comrades with a correct orientation and rooted solidly in a union can be the organizing spark for large scale rank and file movements. Certainly the experience of our party has verified this time and time again."

Read it again, Comrade Phillips -- and then tell us how you reconcile the deed with the word!

June 1963

END

THE SWP AND THE NEGRO STRUGGLE

by Fred Mazelis

The PC draft resolution on the Negro Struggle contains much that is correct. In its general line on nationalism and separatism, and on the need for a labor-Negro alliance for complete victory over Jim Crow, the draft reaffirms our traditional views. Even more important, the draft proposes a turn toward increased participation in the Negro struggle. With these sections of the draft the Reorganized Minority Tendency is in substantial agreement.

There are, however, a number of serious weaknesses in the draft, weaknesses that are not subordinate to the central line but which strike at the line and seriously weaken it. Because our approach is not strictly counterposed to the general line, but seeks the elimination of serious weaknesses, we felt that amendments would be the most correct form in which to present our views. This is why the Political Committee representative of the minority abstained on the draft resolution with the explanation that the disposition of amendments we would present could change our vote. In other words, acceptance of the amendments would result in our supporting the resolution.

We do not aim to correct every formulation which is not as clear as it might be. We are presenting substantive amendments, the acceptance of which would make necessary some general editorial work on the resolution as a whole.

In this discussion article I will try to explain my views and thus motivate the amendments which are being presented by the minority.

The weaknesses of the draft fall into several main sections. The section on the Southern struggle does not receive proper emphasis. Whether the resolution was written before Birmingham or not is not the point. It should now attempt to draw some of the lessons of Birmingham.

Secondly, the resolution ignores the role of class in the Negro movement, the need for a new working class leadership of the movement as a transitional form to the Negro-white leadership of the mass revolutionary party, and it minimizes the need for criticism of the various tendencies in the Negro movement.

Our third major proposal is a strengthening of the section in the resolution which proposes increased activity in the Negro movement. It is our proposal that this turn be extended to the South, and that it be regarded as one of the major tasks of the party.

The Southern Struggle

The events in Birmingham point up some key lessons for the Southern struggle. These lessons include: 1). There is an increased involvement of the masses, including the most exploited layers of the Negro proletariat, in the struggle; 2). The struggle is not confined to a small part of the segregation system, but tends to assume a very wide scope, battling for economic and political demands; 3). Birmingham shows very clearly

the need for organized self-defense guards among the Negro freedom fighters to strengthen their position against the racists and to avoid the uncontrolled violence and useless bloodshed such as took place in Birmingham. Birmingham thus shows concretely how the non-violent dogma of the pacifist leadership does not prevent violence, but in many instances actually leads to it; 4). In Birmingham a tendency to transcend the leadership of Rev. King was shown. The readiness of this leadership to betray the struggle was also exposed more clearly than ever before. Birmingham must be seen as a part of the growing pattern of mass upsurge and the growing mood of no reliance on the federal government, with a spreading distrust of the pacifist leadership. The opposition to the pacifist leadership is still very scattered and unorganized.

The articles written from Birmingham by New York Post columnist Stan Opotowsky illustrate the mass involvement in the struggle as well as the tendency to go beyond the King leadership. Although we cannot subscribe to all of Opotowsky's analysis, especially where he exaggerates antagonisms within the Negro mass and pits sections of the workingclass against one another, there is much which is very valuable in what he writes. Opotowsky wrote the following on May 13 from Birmingham:

"Why did they riot, especially the day after white Birmingham finally agreed to come to terms? Birmingham's latest and most shocking explosion into violence was triggered by the bombing of a Negro-owned motel and the home of the Rev. M. L. King's brother. But behind the immediate impetus for yesterday's outbreak was the little-understood resentments of that section of Birmingham's Negroes which is so far down in the economic scale that it feels no sense of victory and expects no stake in the newly-made agreements. To delve into the true why of Birmingham's bloody riot one must first understand who the rioters were. They were not the fresh-faced youngsters who paraded so solemnly for justice last week. They are not those parents who stood proudly by as they saw their children off to jail. No, instead they are Birmingham's dispossessed, and the truth is that they will remain non-privileged even when the new day dawns... The steam has been building in these people for weeks. It was they, not the demonstrating children, who were targets of hoses and dogs. By tacit agreement between police and integration leaders, the children were fairly well protected as they marched... So the non-privileged decided to make it a fight of their own."

A New York Times dispatch from Washington on May 14 shows the real position of the capitalist government on the Birmingham struggle. President Kennedy and the Attorney General are reported to have expressed concern about Negro extremists. They expressed apprehension about the results of a failure of the non-violent movement. The capitalist government has its interests very much bound up with the King leadership.

Concerning the tendency to transcend the King leadership, this is what Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, said about the Birmingham situation on May 19, as reported in the New York Times;

"If there is an incident there (in Birmingham), I shudder to think what will happen because they will not -- the great rank and file will not -- accede to the fine discipline of King."

Wilkins went on to say that he thought troops were needed in Birmingham, but it certainly seems that he wants them because he is afraid of the Negro masses, in addition to being afraid of the racists.

On May 22, the Times reported, "The president of the SCLC has been under increasing pressure in the last two days from his younger, more militant followers." The younger more militant followers within the SCLC leadership are in their turn reflecting, we can be sure, the radicalization of the masses.

A long analytical article in the May 26 issue of the Times includes as one of the forces by which the Birmingham agreement had been brought about: "A decision by moderate Negro leaders to accept something less than they had demanded because emotional forces they had unleashed appeared to be getting out of control."

These are some of the indications, which pervade all of the reports from Birmingham, of the fact that the pacifist leadership was losing control of the mass movement. This is not to say that the middle class leaders do not still play a very important role. What is important to recognize is that Birmingham shows the increasing difficulty with which the leaderships are managing to keep things in hand. The masses are close to drawing revolutionary conclusions on the present leaderships.

It is precisely because of the great potential of the struggle right now and the great contribution to the struggle which Marxists in the South could make, teaching as well as learning, that we should orient toward sending qualified comrades to do work on a long-term basis in the South. The Southern struggle is reaching an entirely new, more advanced level. The role of revolutionary leadership is especially crucial in this period. We are not so small an organization that we cannot spare several of our cadres to assist in the building of a revolutionary leadership in the South. We do not suggest that we go down there proclaiming ourselves the revolutionary leadership. This would ignore our isolation from the struggle. We do say that we should be there, even with a small number to begin with, to assist in the building of a militant leadership. We should be in the South, with essentially the same approach we are suggesting for the North, building and participating in the movement at all levels, and participating in and aiding the radicalization of the masses with the ideas of revolutionary socialism, for which we should expect to find a friendly response.

The present struggle in the South can be traced back to previous struggles in the North, such as the March on Washington movement and the riots in Harlem and Detroit. There is a deep connection between the developments in the North and South. The center of action has now shifted to the South, but we see that it is having repercussions in the North, and it will shift back to the North and be decided there. It is only because the struggle is now going on at such a high level in the South, and not because it is going to be decided there or is primary there, that we propose a subsidiary orientation toward work in the South.

In relation to the slogan of federal troops to the South, we must take a very cautious attitude. The troops slogan is not admissible in all circumstances simply because it can be used to embarrass or expose the government. Such a slogan can be used when it is a matter of protecting some school children in a desegregation case from racist mobs. It is an entirely different matter when the Negro masses are taking the initiative in a broad struggle, such as in

Birmingham. Under these circumstances, we should expect the troops to contain the struggle. Thus the troops slogan is transitional in some instances, raising the level of consciousness of the movement, and not transitional in other instances, such as Birmingham. The emphasis in the Birmingham struggle, what we should be stressing, is no reliance on the federal government. The troops slogan does not fit in with this purpose.

This raises a question about the call on the government to deputize the Negroes for self-defense in Birmingham. This is not quite the same as the troops slogan, since the government cannot very well turn this into a means of controlling and containing the struggle. But, in line with the emphasis on self-reliance, we should be stressing the self-arming of the Negroes in defense guards, with a deputization distinctly in the background if it is to be mentioned at all. If deputization is to be raised, it should also be stressed that the Negroes shouldn't rely upon it and wait for such an action by the federal government before taking steps to defend themselves.

The question has been raised as to whether, if troops were sent to Birmingham, they could do anything but take the side of the Negroes. That is, that they would find it politically impossible to suppress and contain the struggle. A New York Times dispatch from Birmingham on May 13, in discussing the Kennedy Administration's attitude in the Birmingham crisis, sheds some light on this:

"The Administration view is that until the rioting the Birmingham police were maintaining a reasonable degree of order."

In other words, when the Negroes were being beaten, the President was satisfied. When the Negroes retaliated, he became very upset. The article goes on to say about the government's attitude:

"...it does not want to see the Negroes themselves bring such violence to the city that federal troops would be needed to restore order."

Kennedy spoke on May 12 of not wanting to see the agreement sabotaged "by a few extremists on either side."

If the federal government is willing to express itself in these terms, we cannot afford to have any doubt that if forced into a corner, troops would without hesitation be used to contain the struggle. Up to a certain point we can say that Kennedy is not eager to send troops to Birmingham just as he is not eager for compulsory arbitration of strikes which hurt the capitalist class and the economy. But if he feels he has little choice, he may take such action. We must explain this possibility and warn against it.

Should we be for the troops slogan in Birmingham so that the masses can learn a lesson about the role of the federal government? Our movement has never advocated this kind of costly lesson. Telling the truth to the workers and the Negroes means explaining the role of the federal government and the troops. While we do not advocate that the movement renounce the protection of federal troops in all cases, or the exposure of the government by making specific demands upon it, we should stress that the specific slogan should be used with great caution, never relying on the federal government and never paving the way

for the containment of the struggle. This is the way Robert Williams approached the question of demanding things of the government.

The Role of Class in the Negro Movement

The Negro movement today is for the most part led by the Negro petty bourgeoisie. We must intervene in the movement to show the inadequacy of the existing leaderships and point to the need for a new leadership of the Negro movement. In doing this we must nevertheless fully support and participate in the movement as it now exists, and we must support all of the correct criticisms made of the old leaderships by the more militant sections of the movement.

We should not pose ourselves as the alternative leadership necessary for the Negro movement. Because we are a predominantly white party and because we are largely isolated from the struggle, this would be a dangerously sectarian and paternalistic demand. But if we do not pose the need for a new militant leadership, we will be making the opposite error and leave the door open to adaptation to the existing leaderships.

This is why the concept of proletarian leadership of the Negro movement is so important. As against the inadequacy of the existing leaderships we pose the need for a militant workingclass leadership, a leadership which, whether it has decided upon the separatist or integrationist path or hasn't decided upon either yet, sees Negro liberation as something to be achieved by militant struggle, and looks toward an alliance with the workingclass as a whole. A militant workingclass program in many of its essentials was developed by Robert Williams in the struggle in Monroe. We should point to Williams as an anticipation of the new leadership.

This kind of leadership should be looked upon as a forerunner of the Negro-white leadership of the mass revolutionary party which has yet to be built. We should make the analogy with the colonial revolution and point to the utter hopelessness of some class other than the Negro workingclass leading the Negro struggle.

Part of our work in the movement, advocating and helping to build a new leadership, must be to explain the problems and dangers posed by certain tactics, such as supporting government decertification of discriminatory unions, and changing seniority rules especially as regards layoffs. We must show that these tactics, though they appear to be practical and helpful in the immediate sense, greatly endanger the basic alliances which must be strengthened and created where they do not exist. The Negro movement must not wait upon the labor movement in the struggle for equality, but it also must not disregard or write off the labor movement and the common interests of the entire class.

Somewhat along the same line, we must relate the need for a labor party to the desires of the Negroes for independent political expression. It is correct to see the importance of an independent Negro party, but we should emphasize that such a party link itself to the labor movement and to the demand for a labor party if it is created prior to a labor party. This is part of the process of linking the struggles of the Negro and the white workers.

The 1939 convention resolution on The SWP and Negro Work, in advocating the formation of a new Negro mass organization, says the following:

"It will be an organization in which the masses of Negroes

will be invited to participate on a workingclass program corresponding to the day to day struggles of the Negro workers and farmers. "

This is essentially the same concept in somewhat different form. I see no development, no objective circumstances which invalidate the concept of a workingclass program for a new Negro movement or a new leadership within the movement as now constituted.

The 1948 convention resolution, Negro Liberation Through Revolutionary Socialism, says the following on the policy of the SWP:

"Party members participate in these Negro organizations, as in all others, as revolutionists. Our main purpose in them is the mobilization of the Negro masses for revolutionary action. The party applies here too, the principles of its program, which presented with patience and flexibility, will find a ready hearing among the proletarian and semi-proletarian Negroes. The party wages unceasing struggle against the Negro petty bourgeois leadership, the same type of struggle as it carries on against the union bureaucracy. It strives for an unambiguous militant program, based on the needs and readiness for struggle of the broad masses. It seeks to replace the vacillating, reformist petty bourgeois leadership with a militant leadership, fighting on the principles of the class struggle and in the closest alliance with organized labor and the Marxist revolutionists. "

The present draft doesn't handle these questions as adequately as the 1939 and 1948 Resolutions. There have been indications, particularly in the New York branch discussion of comrades forgetting these fundamental points, which makes it all the more important to handle them.

We advocate a workingclass leadership of the movement and a critical approach in our intervention for the same reasons the earlier resolutions do. It is by no means inevitable that the correct leadership will appear. The application of the permanent revolution to the Negro struggle means that the struggle tends to transcend bourgeois limits and is therefore receptive to the Marxist program and workingclass leadership. It does not mean that the revolutionary development within the movement is automatic.

The need for criticism is stated very well by the 1948 Resolution. The draft neglects this, especially as far as the Muslims are concerned, and also in not explaining the need for a workingclass leadership of the independent Negro struggle.

The Militant has been especially remiss in not clearly exposing the betrayals of the pacifist leadership. A much sharper line on this was needed in the Birmingham crisis. The criticisms, when they were made, were not given much stress. In this respect Muhammed Speaks has been more forthright than the Militant.

We must come to grips with the concept which seems to be gaining a great deal of currency in our movement, that the Negro struggle is being automatically and irreversibly radicalized, and that our intervention is therefore not crucial.

In the New York branch discussion on the draft resolution several comrades expressed the idea that criticism of the various tendencies was not a good idea at this time, and that any critical attitude amounts to paternalism and will inevitably be regarded as paternalism.

This concept is just as incorrect for the Negro struggle as it is for any section of the mass movement or for the colonial revolution. The turn to the Negro movement proposed in the document could turn out in practice to be an adaptationist turn, if this tendency is not countered.

The tendency to adaptation is clearly evidenced in relation to the Muslims. The draft says very little that is critical of the Muslims. Many comrades have made it clear that they think the Muslims deserve only praise and no criticism. We think the Muslims deserve both praise and criticism.

We must very clearly say that the line of the Muslims has been improving over the past year, that it takes a less sectarian line toward the concrete struggles of the masses, that it puts forward a militant line of self-reliance and self-defense in the struggle against racism. The growth of the Muslims reflects the growth of the new mood of self reliance among the Negro masses. We must be clear on the progressive aspects of nationalism, but we must also be clear on the reactionary or utopian aspects of the Muslim program, such as the proposals for a separate black sector of the economy, the building of a black bourgeoisie, and the writing off of the white workingclass. The Muslim program remains a confused proposal for a bourgeois solution to Negro liberation. We must explain that the Muslims do not yet clearly see the relationship between capitalism and Jim Crow. We must patiently explain the incorrectness of writing off potential white workingclass allies, whether the movement desires separation or not. Only if we take this positive but at the same time critical line towards the Muslims as well as other other militant tendencies in the movement, will we teach as well as learn, and thus help to build the new militant leadership of the Negro struggle.

Our Tasks in the Movement

As far as the turn to the movement that is proposed in the draft, especially in the section on the role and tasks of the SWP, we regard this as an important step forward. If the proposal of increased activity is seriously carried out, the party can gain a great deal. The present isolation from the movement is a more serious problem than the danger of adaptation to the existing leaderships in our work in the movement, although the latter problem definitely exists and is reflected in the weaknesses in the draft resolution.

Our work in the Negro movement is closely connected with work in the mass movement as a whole. Our tendency proposes a turn toward the Negro movement within the context of a general turn, with increased work in the union movement, among the unemployed, and among the Negro and Spanish-speaking peoples. We believe this orientation is dictated by current developments in the U.S. At all times we should seek to maintain roots in the class as deep as possible. In the present period we have an opportunity to deepen our roots, which have been severely and progressively weakened over the past 15 years. The possibility of stepping up our work in the Negro movement is especially apparent; the desirability of our participation in the radicalization process in the Negro movement is very clear. Comrades who do not agree on the need for a turn to the mass movement as a whole may agree on the need for increased work in relation to the Negro struggle.

We, for our part, welcome any proposal, though it coincides only partially with our own. In this case we think it is a serious mistake to ignore our role in the South, and not to put the increased activity in the Northern Negro movement within the context of a broader turn as our resolution, The Decline of American Imperialism and the Tasks of the SWP does. We hope that the partial turn envisaged is not lost in the shuffle if the party does not make a fundamental turn toward the mass movement as a whole.

Within this framework, we think it is important to strengthen this section of the resolution. It should be stated that civil rights work must be one of the primary tasks of the branches and of the party as a whole. It is important that the Militant address itself more directly to the Negro masses themselves, instead of concentrating only on the existing radical milieu. Muhammed Speaks in this respect sets a good example of the wide coverage of the Negro struggle and the hardhitting style directed toward the masses that we should be including in our paper. In this sense we should strive to make the Militant read more like Muhammed Speaks and less like the New York Times. It goes without saying that we should have regular sales and distributions of our literature in the Negro community, where our ideas are having and will continue to meet a friendly response.

In working in the movement, we do not give all organizations equal emphasis. We must examine each local situation concretely and give most attention to those organizations which reflect the organization of the Negro workingclass. This is another way of working to forge the alliance which will achieve the goals of equality and socialism.

June 11, 1963

END

AMENDMENT TO P. C. DRAFT RESOLUTION:

"Preparing for the Next Wave of Radicalism in the United States"

by Shane Mage, James Robertson and Geoffrey White for the Minority

Substitute the following for the entirety of paragraph 41:

41. A) Our mass work, linked with a general propaganda offensive, is an indispensable part of our preparation for the next wave of radicalism in the United States. Our aim is to prepare for the successful transition from propagandistic modes of work today to the building of a mass revolutionary party and to vying for leadership in the class struggle in the following period. Of pivotal importance is the ability of the party to solidify its general gains from current work by laying down and strengthening its roots in the mass movement.

B) In the Negro movement, North and South, there are today real opportunities. In the North our spearhead should be based on a combined approach. We aim to work with organizations selected on the basis of their militancy in particular localities and regions; we are also involved in supporting the Committee to Aid the Monroe Defendants (CAMD). This kind of activity should be coupled with such direct involvement as sustained mass sales of appropriate issues of the press in the Negro ghettos and making vigorous and sharply directed campaigns during elections. We will then ourselves be in a position to become involved in and grow from new stages and turns in the struggle. An example of such a turn is that promised by the Philadelphia mass picket line for Negro jobs at construction sites. As regards the South today, we are witnessing from afar a great mass struggle for equality. Our separation from this arena is intolerable. The party should be prepared to expend significant material resources in overcoming our isolation from Southern struggles. In helping to build a revolutionary movement in the South, our forces should work directly with and through the developing left-wing formations in the movement there. A successful outcome to our action would lead to an historic breakthrough for the Trotskyist movement. Expressed organizationally, it would mean the creation of several party branches in the South for the first time -- for example, in Atlanta, Birmingham or New Orleans.

C) In maintaining its orientation to the working class as a whole, the party must steadily seek to make or find opportunities to recreate Trade Union fractions at selected spots across the country in industries important to the class struggle. Moreover, every party branch should develop contact with the most important unions and factories in its area; for example, through regular, long-term press sales, and accompanied, where possible, by direct electoral campaign approaches.

D) Unless the party is able to create and develop nuclei in the broader layers of the working class movement in this preparatory period, it will be condemned to sterile isolation or an accelerating political degeneration in the face of the certain upsurges ahead in the class struggle. Thus the party's taking hold today in the mass movement is a necessary pre-condition for going forward on the morrow in the historic mission of leading the working class to power. These primary considerations must be kept in mind in deciding the division of labor between mass work and general party activity.

June 12, 1963.

END