

Trinity College

Trinity College Digital Repository

Resist Newsletters

Resist Collection

3-31-1975

Resist Newsletter, Mar. 31, 1975

Resist

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/resistnewsletter>

Recommended Citation

Resist, "Resist Newsletter, Mar. 31, 1975" (1975). *Resist Newsletters*. 58.
<https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/resistnewsletter/58>

RESIST

*a call to resist
illegitimate authority*

31 March 1975 - 720 Massachusetts Avenue, Room 4; Cambridge, Mass. 02139 #91

Conflict in the Middle East

Noam Chomsky

(Editor's Note: The following is the first part of a two part article dealing with the situation in the Mid East, originally written for the French periodical, Le Monde Diplomatique.)

The "game of nations" in the Middle East has many players, and most of them see the stakes as very high. So high, in fact, that they will accept virtually any risk to attain their national goals. This is true of the two nations whose local conflict serves as the focal point for a complex network of interests and antagonisms, Israeli Jews and Palestinian Arabs, each claiming national rights in a single territory. It is no less true of the imperial states. The major oil producers can hardly remain aloof from the local conflict, whatever the private preferences of their ruling groups. Consequently, the structure of power in the industrial world is sure to be affected, and may even be determined by the outcome of the conflict.



It is a simple matter to sketch a "scenario" that ends with the destruction of the local con-

continued on p. 2

United Campaign for Peace in Indochina:

A Call to Action

The struggle for the liberation of the Vietnamese and Cambodian peoples has reached yet another critical period. After two years of violating the Paris Peace Agreement, the U.S.-Thieu-Lon Nol forces have suffered serious political and military defeats. The recent collapse of the Lon Nol forces in Cambodia, the withdrawal of ARVN troops from the Central Highlands, refugee movement into PRG controlled zones, and the ever widening anti-Thieu demonstrations in Saigon all point to the possibility of a cease-fire and the implementation of the Peace Accords in the near future.

Another very real possibility looms in the background; that of more direct US intervention in Indochina. We must not discount, as the Vietnamese have not, the possibility that US imperialism may lash out to defend its interests as it has done in the past. Once again, we must prepare to mobilize all those who seek an end to US involvement in Indochina. For this reason, we call on all RESIST people to take part in one very important effort now underway: the push for the complete termination of all US War aid to the Thieu and Lon Nol regimes. Present circumstances make the chances for such an important victory great if we take advantage of them.

For the past year, an extremely successful struggle to reduce aid to Saigon has been waged, with military aid cut 50% from an Administration request of \$1.4 billion, to a Congressional appropriation of \$700 million. The time has come to push for an end to all military aid to Saigon. Two moderate Senators, Mathias and Stevenson, have offered an amendment to terminate all aid by June 30 of this year. In contrast, Ford and Kissinger, and in a different way, the New York Times and Washington Post, are promoting a "compromise" plan of a three year "phaseout". Kissinger's rationale for this plan is that at the end of this time, Saigon, through the development of its oil resources, could become self-sufficient. This is unacceptable for three reasons: (1) It continues the killing for three more years without bringing things closer to implementation of the Paris Agreement (on the contrary, a developed and self-sufficient regime in the South - developed and sustained by U.S. corporations and continued aid, would carry on the war and be even more reluctant

(continued on page 3)

"MIDDLE EAST", cont.

testants or even with the century's third and final World War. The "confrontation states", Egypt and Syria (with Jordan a reluctant partner), realizing that their occupied territories will not be regained through negotiation and political accommodation, may move towards war as their only option, particularly under conditions of domestic unrest. In a state of heightened tension, Israel might strike, sensing that the issue is survival. The pattern of October 1973, is not likely to recur. Or, the government of Israel, isolated internationally and facing a worsening power balance, may find itself unable to sustain an arms race against an adversary of unlimited wealth. Under such circumstances, a pre-emptive strike may seem the only reasonable move, whatever the consequences.

To cast a wider net, consider the interests of the United States. A fundamental principle of American policy is that the incomparable energy resources of the Middle East must be under the control of the United States and its international oil companies, or at the very least, that its international competitors not gain privileged access to these reserves. With only a slight exaggeration, one might take this principle to be axiomatic. The United States will tolerate the kind of formal "nationalization" that leaves processing and distribution in the hands of the US based energy companies, but is hardly likely to accept steps that seriously challenge these arrangements. The recurrent threat of military intervention is, no doubt, intended as a mild warning to this effect.

Significant Russian penetration of the oil producing regions would almost certainly lead to general war, but quite apart from this remote eventuality, the United States is not likely to permit a new relationship between the oil producers and other capitalist industrial societies on a scale that would challenge US global hegemony. Since World War II, a primary goal of US foreign policy has been to ensure that Western Europe and Japan remain under its effective domination. This global system would be seriously threatened by significant bilateral arrangements between the state capitalist industrial societies and the oil producing states. In the aftermath of the October war, tentative steps in this direction were opposed by the United States, which insisted on a "united front" under its control. Furthermore, the US government will try to ensure that the American-based energy companies amass sufficient profits in the latter stages of the petroleum-based economy so that they will dominate the next phase (coal, nuclear energy) as well.

Suppose, then, that Faisal's successors in Saudi Arabia -- the centerpiece of the drama -- were to pressure the United States to compel Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories. If the pressure were serious, the US would have two choices: to yield, or to take control of some significant part of the Arabian oil reserves by

force, a risky move with unpredictable consequences. The United States has no standing commitment to Israeli occupation of the territories. Support for virtual annexation was a temporary policy, instituted seriously when Kissinger took control of Middle Eastern affairs in 1970 but abandoned as a guiding principle when the October was demonstrated the falsity of its major premise, that Israel's power in the region was beyond short-range challenge. At that point, with his policy in ruins, Kissinger naturally began to consider again the abandoned Rogers plan. If there is serious pressure from the oil producers, it is likely that the US would pressure Israel to withdraw, as in 1956.



How would Israel respond? That depends on the nature of the American pressure. Since 1967, Israel has adopted policies leading, quite predictably, to international isolation and total dependence on the United States, a dangerous gamble for a small power. It is in no position to resist American orders. If the US position were strong and clear, Israel would be forced to comply. But, there is likely to be a measure of disunity within the US government on the matter, and recognizing this, Israel might move to cement the American alliance, on which it now depends for survival, in quite a different way. A successful Israeli military strike might provoke the Soviet Union, and even hesitant moves or warnings on its part will bring US intervention in force, given "axiom one of world politics," as just outlined. An Arab oil embargo or production cutback might have the same result; an Israeli pre-emptive strike might even lead to direct invasion of the oil producing regions, to prevent or reverse such moves. In either case, Israel would have succeeded in restoring the American alliance, to be sure, at the risk of nuclear war. So the government of Israel might reason, faced with the alternative of withdrawal to the 1967 borders.

None of these possibilities is unlikely. Each carries the risk of destruction for Israeli Jews and Palestinian Arabs -- and if they cannot live together, then they will be destroyed together, given the context of their local conflict. The possibility of a general war is not small. As long as Israel occupies the territories taken in 1967, these and other related prospects will never be remote.

"A Call to Action", cont.

to negotiate with the PRG), (2) It grants Kissinger's argument that we should support Saigon for several more years in principle (his famous moral commitment) and that all we are really talking about are the details of how much money is necessary to do the job, (3) It is always open to new Administration aid requests due to "unforeseen" circumstances.

The Congressional situation is this. The Administration is pushing supplemental appropriations beyond those established by Congress. It is using scare tactics, attempting to blame those who oppose this plan for selling out our allies, reducing our effectiveness in dealing with other countries (Kissinger has gone so far to sight Congressional opposition to more aid to Saigon as the cause for the breakdown in Mid East talks), and setting the stage for a communist "bloodbath", reminiscent of the accusations exchanged over China's withdrawal from the mainstream of imperialist exploitation some twenty-five years ago. The resistance to these efforts has been stiff, and the phase out plan is being pushed more and more as the way out of the present impasse. The Administration wants to keep aid at \$2 billion a year during that period, a desire that has isolated them from the liberals who back the phase-out concept in theory.



The issue of the supplementals has not been decided, and it lies at a crucial juncture in the struggle for termination of military aid. If the supplementals are passed, Kissinger and Ford will be well on their way to a realization of the phase-out plan. If they are decisively defeated, anti-war forces will be in a much better position to press for the goal of zero military aid for fiscal 1976. Pressure for Congressional votes against supplementals in April is an immediate task we urge all of our readers to take up as a necessary step towards our goal. RESIST is not suggesting that pressure on Congress is the only way to stop U.S. intervention, but we do feel that at this crucial time, it is a tactic of the greatest importance. A list of important "swing votes", Congresspeople who should be pressured the most, follows;

<u>ARK</u>	<u>ILL</u>	<u>MASS</u>	<u>TEXAS</u>
Alexander	Rostenkowski	Tsonges	C. Wilson
Mills	J. Anderson	Brooke	Steeleman
Thornton	Railsback	<u>MICH</u>	Pickle
<u>ALA</u>	Hall	Ruppe	Hightower
Buchanan	Murphy	Brown	Kazen
Bevill	Percy	Dingell	Milford
Allen	<u>IND</u>	Broomfield	White
<u>CAL</u>	Fithian	Hutchinson	Pike
Johnson	Hamilton	<u>PENN</u>	Patman
Clausen	Hayes	Biester	<u>NC</u>
Sisk	Bayh	McDade	Jones
Lagomarsino	McClure	Coughlin	Fountain
Moorhead	<u>NY</u>	Eshleman	Henderson
Bell	Lent	Dent	Hefner
Krebs	Biaggi	T. Morgan	Broyhill
Ryan	Gilman	Gaydos	<u>VA</u>
Hannaford	Horton	<u>OHIO</u>	Downing
<u>FLA</u>	LaFalce	Gradison	Wampler
Chappel	Hastings	Guyer	Robinson
<u>DEL</u>	Kemp	Regula	Scott
du Pont	Zeferetti	Mottl	H. Byrd
Biden	Javits	Glenn	<u>VT</u>
Roth	<u>MONT</u>	<u>IOWA</u>	Jeffords
<u>ND</u>	Melcher	Grassley	<u>SC</u>
Young	Metcalf	N. Smith	Jenrette
Andrews	<u>UTAH</u>	<u>GA</u>	Hollings
<u>MO</u>	McKay	Ginn	<u>ORE</u>
Taylor	Howe	Mathis	Duncan
Ichord	Moss	Brinkley	Ullman
Burlinson	<u>MINN</u>	Levitas	Packwood
Randall	Quie	Landrum	<u>TENN</u>
<u>WISC</u>	Hagedorn	Stephens	Evins
Obey	<u>MISS</u>	Flynt	Jones
<u>NJ</u>	Whitten	<u>WASH</u>	Brock
Case	<u>NM</u>	Hicks	<u>KENT</u>
Fenwick	Lujan	<u>W. VA.</u>	Snyder
Daniels	Rummels	Staggers	Ford
Hughes	Montoya	Slack	<u>MAINE</u>
Patten	<u>NEB</u>	R.C. Byrd	Emery
Minish	McCullister	<u>LA</u>	Hathaway
Rodino	Smith	Long	<u>OKLA</u>
<u>MD</u>	<u>CONN</u>	<u>COLO</u>	English
C. Long	Giaimo	Evans	Risenhower
Byron			

The Easter recess is about to begin. Through visits to Congresspeople, the massive silent opposition to the war can be converted into visible public pressure to end it once and for all. Wavering votes will respond to pressure, and in this way we can set the stage for the next phase of resistance.

The United Campaign for Peace in Indochina, an umbrella organization of pacifist and anti-imperialist groups that has been involved in Congressional activity over the years, has planned a three step campaign to build pressure in favor of zero military aid. The first stage is pressure on legislators in the next few weeks to turn the tide against the supplementals. The second is a nationwide week of activity beginning on May 4th, the anniversary of the Kent State and Jackson State murders. The goal of this stage is to see that every Representative and Senator comes under direct constituent pressure to support peace through zero military aid through passage of the Mathias-Stevenson amendment. Although the specific vehicle to

STRATEGIES FOR THE SEVENTIES

THE COMMUNIST LABOR PARTY USNA

(EDITOR'S NOTE: For some time, the RESIST Newsletter has been running intermittent articles on the ideological struggle taking place in the movement. The following, by long-time RESIST person, Frank Joyce of Detroit, advocates one tendency within the movement (Marxist-Leninist). In general, the article deals with what has won growing numbers of people, including New Left veterans like Frank, to Marxism-Leninism, and in particular to the line of a new communist party, the Communist Labor Party (USNA). It also should be noted that the CLP represents a particular tendency within what has been called the "new communist" or "anti-revisionist" movement. RESIST, as well as the CLP, strongly urges readers to respond to this and all other articles.)

On Labor Day weekend, 1974, more than 500 delegates representing a number of communist organizations and independent Marxist-Leninists gathered in Chicago for what became the successful founding Congress of the Communist Labor Party of the United States of North America (USNA). (The party believes it is important to distinguish the United States of North America from other republics in the hemisphere, and the oppressed nations within the USNA state.)

Those attending the Congress included many national minorities, Negroes, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Indians from the USNA oppressed nations and peoples. There were veterans of the Communist Party (USA) and former "new leftists" from SDS and other groups. The meeting was the culmination of years of effort and struggle reaching back into the history of the CPUSA to gather together the forces sufficiently grounded in the science of Marxism-Leninism and the proletariat to make a multi-national party possible.

All those attending the Congress, including this writer, were deeply convinced of two fundamental points. First, that Marxism-Leninism represents the only ideology capable of providing the theoretical and organizational guidance necessary to defeat capitalism in its current and final stage, that of imperialism. Secondly, those attending were convinced that no organization currently existing in the USNA, particularly the Communist Party of the USA (CPUSA), is adequate, theoretically or organizationally, to the task of winning the vanguard of the proletariat to the cause of communism and thus leading the struggle to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In both of these convictions, of course, are contained a host of controversial questions and assumptions which I will try to address as best

I can in the very limited space available. Needless to say, there are innumerable others which in the confines of this article cannot even be posed.

As to the first, the necessity of Marxism-Leninism to guide truly revolutionary struggle, it is useful to re-examine the period of the 1960's. As RESIST Newsletter readers well know, the 1960's produced a mass upsurge of struggle on many fronts. In addition to the ongoing struggle of the working class inside trade unions and out, there was a mass struggle of the Negro people for national liberation and democratic rights, of women for equality, of members of all strata against the imperialist war in Indo-China and the fight to extend trade unions more broadly into the "public" sector, that is, employees of the government on all levels. Little or no ongoing revolutionary struggle emerged from the spontaneous movement of the 1960's. Nor as Lenin pointed out more than seventy years ago in What Is to Be Done, could there have been such struggle on an ongoing basis.

Let us be clear that there was no such struggle. The movements of the 1960's were guided by a mish-mash of bourgeois ideologies which included anarcho-syndicalism, revisionism (bourgeois ideology masquerading as Marxism-Leninism), pacifism, idealism, Trotskyism in numerous forms, bourgeois nationalism, "Black" and otherwise, feminism, religious mysticism, and drugs. The movements themselves were the inevitable result of the unresolved contradictions of capitalism - of spontaneous opposition to the oppression and exploitation of national minorities, women, youth, anglo workers, the Vietnamese, and others in the colonies of imperialism.

But at no time was their leadership other than bourgeois or petit bourgeois in outlook. Therefore, virtually none of the organizations created during the 1960's, with the exception of RESIST, have survived. Gone or as well as defunct are the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, Congress for Racial Equality, the League of Revolutionary Black Workers, Bread and Roses, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, SDS, the Black Panther Party, Yippies, the RAT, SSOC, OOAU, and many others. Gone are Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, Ralph Featherstone, Diana Oughton, Sam Melville, Abbie Hoffman, Eldridge Cleaver, Fred Hampton, to name just a few. And avowedly working within the system are a host of others like Julian Bond, Floyd McKissick, Rennie Davis, Jane Alpert, Marion Barry, Bobby Seale, John Froines, and many others. And for all those we can name, there are thousands upon thousands more who have taken the same roads.



Many organizations and individuals achieved the objectives they set out to achieve and more. Others became discouraged or frightened by repression and dropped by the wayside. Some, of course, persevered and remained active to the present in the spontaneous movement. Others have turned to the study and organization of Marxism-Leninism.

But basically it is clear that the struggles of the 1960's are over. They produced some victories within their own objectives to be sure. The fundamental nature of USNA imperialism, however, remains intact. Indeed, Nelson Rockefeller is alive and well in the White House.

What happened?

That conflict within capitalist society periodically intensifies is not surprising. Marx and Engels said it would over 120 years ago and they were right. But even the proletariat, let alone other strata and classes of society, such as students or youth or national minorities or the petit bourgeoisie, does not spontaneously come to revolutionary socialist ideology. Since Lenin said as much in 1905, we had an additional seventy years of proof to make the point more clearly. It is not only that the working class does not think up revolutionary ideology based on the conditions of its daily life. The ruling class under capitalism devotes huge resources, especially through its control of the state, to prevent any such thoughts from arising, and to defeating and diverting them when they do. They will use every tactic from repression to drugs to reform to do so.

Revolutionary ideology did not arise spontaneously in Russia, Vietnam, or China. It certainly will not in the imperialist countries which employ ruthless repression and/or abundant bribes to the most militant leaders who emerge. Furthermore, in the 1960's, there was only a tiny handful of people in the USNA who believed that Marxism-Leninism

was the only guide to revolutionary action. Thousands and indirectly millions, believing erroneously that the CPUSA (or worse, the Trotskyite organizations) truly represented Marxism-Leninism, were appalled by their theory and practice and thereby turned further away from Marxism-Leninism itself.

Under the circumstances, the political police, as we are learning more and more every day, had a field day. They infiltrated everything; prosecuted, confused, killed and assassinated when they felt it was necessary. Priding ourselves on our amateurishness, we were certain that our numbers and the intrinsic justice of our cause were sufficient to defeat not only the political police, but the entire ruling class as well. All we had to do was be clever enough in our tactics (we often were exceedingly clever in media oriented and street demonstration tactics such as Mayday, or the sit-ins, COFO summer, the Pentagon March, and elsewhere) and rely heavily on the Vietnamese to deliver the main blows to the imperialist monster.

We were confident that we needed neither the study of any existing body of revolutionary thought and practice, nor organization. From Port Huron on we thought it was clear that the situation in this country was an exception to any previous universal understanding about capitalism. The CPUSA, itself, after all, had said so. We learned some terms like imperialism which some thought was enough to describe what we needed to know. And if a theory was necessary, as some of us thought it was, Marcuse, James and Grace Boggs and others convinced us that we would essentially have to invent an entirely new one.

In the process, naturally, we at best managed to reinvent, often in virtually the same words, everything that had been said by the Narodniks, Kautsky, Martov, Bernstein, Trotsky, and others some seventy to eighty years ago.

Never studying much of anything, let alone Marx or Lenin, we thought we were quite original when we said things like:

-any class but the proletariat is the revolutionary class (e.g., Blacks, students, women, secretaries, youth, etc.) Besides, we shouldn't talk about classes, just people.

-a revolution can be made right at the point of production; we don't have to worry about theory or the state.

-it is enough to politicize the day to day struggle of the workers.

-national liberation movements themselves are sufficient to defeat imperialism; our main task is to support them.

-armed struggle is no longer necessary to make revolution; the bourgeoisie is so weak that a peaceful transition is possible (welcome to Chile and India).

-the workers already know enough to make revolution; if they really want to; they don't need any "intellectuals or missionaries" to tell them

(continued on page 6)

"Communist Labor Party", cont.

anything.

-the movement is everything, the ultimate aim is nothing.

-our economy is so advanced that we won't need to worry about the stage of socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat or even about the state; we can move right from capitalism to communism.

-the real key to revolution is not to unite people under any leadership; it is to let every group go for itself; Blacks for Blacks, women for women, students for students, communities for communities, etc.

-ideas rather than matter and relations of production really determine consciousness and being; therefore we must raise consciousness, then people will struggle for themselves.

-and finally, DO IT!

None of these "theories" and assumptions and many more like them worked, at least not to produce revolution. They never did and they never will regardless of the sincerity with which they were pursued. They didn't work in Ghana or Chile or India or Indonesia either.

It is not that no victories have been won. Short lived reforms were accomplished. But the major defeats for the imperialists have come from those struggles under the leadership of Marxist-Leninists, as in Korea, Vietnam, Albania, and China. Elsewhere, as in Brazil, Ceylon, Bengla Desh, Ireland, Palestine, Great Britain, and many other countries and nations, conditions for the majority of people get worse and worse. Setbacks for the imperialists in the colonies intensify attacks on other colonies and are turned into fascist offensives against the "home" proletariat.

The main trend of the twentieth century is unquestionably proletarian revolution. Imperialism is moribund and dying. But it does not wither away. And reformist ideology, no matter how sincerely intended, does not in the final analysis defeat the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and create a new basis for human society. Indeed it can as in the populist movement in the post reconstruction period, or the movement for national socialism in Germany, create its opposite; the conditions for fascism.

That does not mean that communists do not struggle for reforms. That is the very context of the class struggle. The practice and program of the Communist Labor Party clearly show that the party supports busing, the nationalization of the energy industries, free quality day care, increased public service employment, and numerous other reforms.

But as to fundamental and lasting change, the CLP is convinced that the era analyzed by Marx and Lenin, that is the era of capitalism at its highest stage, imperialism, is not over. It has

not changed into something which requires a new ideology and strategy to explain and change its motion, its development, its laws of political economy. The questions that face revolutionaries, especially in the imperialist countries, are not fundamentally different from those which faced the Russian proletariat.

This is not to say that Stalin, Mao Tse Tung, Enver Hoxha, Kim Il Sung, Ho Chi Minh, and many others have not creatively and correctly applied the theory of Marxism-Leninism to the time, place and condition in which they found themselves, or that every question is identical with those of seventy years ago. It is to say that what they applied was Marxism-Leninism, a universal science of human society and that we remain in the era of imperialism. The particularities then of the USNA are just that - the particularities which we analyze through the telescope and microscope of Marxism-Leninism to order and guide our struggle to change the world - NOT just understand it, as Marx noted many years ago.

Surplus value is still being extracted from the labor of the working class. Labor is still the source of all value. Colonies are still the recipients of capital that is seeking maximum super-profits. Class struggle continues. The material world is still the basis of human understanding of reality. Trade Unions are still merely defensive weapons of the class, and so on.

The question logically arises; hasn't the CPUSA been applying the theory of Marxism-Leninism for many years without success? The answer is no on two counts. The fact is that the CPUSA, born out of the fervor of the spontaneous working class movement of the early century and the Bolshevik Revolution, was never more than a coalition of rival factions. It included many political tendencies, ranging from anarcho-syndicalists to Marxist-Leninists. The Marxist-Leninists were never in complete control of the leadership of the Party. The CPUSA's contribution to class struggle in this country was profound nevertheless, particularly in the building of the CIO.

But to further complicate matters, the CPUSA's total adherence to the bourgeois group which took state power in the Soviet Union a few years after the death of Stalin, has rendered them even more incapable of anything other than tailing the spontaneous movement of the class or leading the working class into the arms of the reactionaries. The Soviet Union is no longer guided by Marxism-Leninism, but rather by revisionism. The same is true of the parties in Italy, France, and elsewhere. Under such conditions, the "communists" become the vanguard not of the revolutionary working class, but of the reformists.

This is of little interest to many people for the simple reason that it cannot be taken for granted that everyone or even the majority of those who participated in the movements of the 1960's was actually, even then, interested in

"Communist Labor Party" cont.

social revolution. The rhetoric of the period was misleading all along. That is to be expected when we have "revolutions" in detergents every 15 minutes on T.V. We might then, just as well call the simple desire to stop napalming Vietnamese revolutionary. Of course it is not, in and of itself.

Actually, much of the apparent anti-anti-communism of the 1960's was caused more by the absence of communists to oppose than from any sympathy for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Often this was combined with the patronizing white chauvinist view that communism was alright, or even good, for "colored people", especially if they were very far away. The opposition to the creation of the CLP prior to and since the founding Congress is only one illustration of this point.

For many, especially Anglo white males with seemingly secure, or, for that matter, insecure petit bourgeois positions, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie still seems preferable to that of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The bribery made possible by imperialist super-exploitation of the colonies reaches into the proletariat itself to deeply imbed backward, bourgeois ideology into the working class movement and especially its most bribed trade union leadership.

It is clear, however, that objectively the class struggle continues. It lacks the primary weapons of theory and organization represented by the leadership of a communist party, guided by Marxism-Leninism.

The infant CLP certainly does not claim to be leading the working class struggle at this stage. And so workers fight as best they can, hampered by years of sellout and collaborationist leadership. The class is disunited and on the defensive at this stage in the USNA.

But that can and will change; a communist party, the CLP, does exist. And imperialism is a dying, decadent, moribund obstacle to the development of human society. It is the source of war, degradation, hunger, exploitation, oppression, and misery for millions here in the USNA, let alone the billions in other capitalist countries and the colonies.

Indeed, the very setbacks imperialism suffers by the proletarian led national liberation struggles of the oppressed nations precisely force it to intensify its attacks on its own working class. The USNA bourgeoisie increasingly moves to attack the standard of living and democratic rights of the USNA working class. Its offensive is directed at attaining the "most terroristic, chauvinistic form of its dictatorship - fascism", in order to preserve its profit system.

But every successful communist struggle has started from a defensive position, from the Bolshevik Revolution to the Vietnamese struggle for

national liberation, peace, and socialism. Ours is no exception. The CLP believes that through the building of a united front of action of the working class, the fascist offensive not only can be opposed, but defeated and turned into its opposite; the successful struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

For more information about the CLP, copies of the Congress Documents (party program) and copies of the Party's newspaper, the People's Tribune, write CLP-USNA, PO BOX 3774, Chicago, Illinois, 60654.

* * *

"A Call to Action", cont.

be emphasized is this amendment, work will stress the concept of peace through zero aid, so as not to tie the campaign to any Congressional figures. If the Congressperson says publicly that he or she supports the amendment, constituents should request that they make efforts to line up other Congresspeople. If they refuse to state public support, efforts should be made to increase constituent pressure on these people. Even if the amendment is not passed, there is no doubt that such efforts would result in a reduction of whatever military aid is passed. The chances for its passage, however, are quite good, given the present economic crisis at home, the growing anti-imperialist consciousness in the U.S., the estrangement of the Ford Administration from Congress, and the setbacks inflicted on the Kissinger strategy for U.S. imperialism by the national liberation movements themselves.

The third stage would run from July to October and build on the work done during the second stage. This period will see August parliamentary and October presidential elections in Saigon (although both are illegal under the Paris Agreement). Domestically, the Congress will be considering the Fiscal Year 1976 vote on military aid to Saigon. If Mathias-Stevenson passes, this period will see us struggling against certain Administration efforts to reverse it. If it has not passed, we must intensify our efforts to pass it, culminating in nation-wide activities during the Fall. Activities leading up to that time will focus on mobilizing local support through tiger cage displays, leafletting, meetings with local civic, labor and political organizations, demonstrations, etc.

RESIST hopes that people will send us feedback on their activities, as well as linking up with the United Campaign. National coordination and communication will make our efforts all the more effective. By no means can we sit back and assume that U.S. imperialism will relinquish its hold in Indochina without a struggle. The history of the last thirty years tells us that this will never be the case. Once again, the American people must show their solidarity with the Indochinese peoples' struggle for peace and liberation.

(For more information on the United Campaign, write Indochina Program, AFSC, 160 N. 15th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19102.)

VIETNAM RESOURCE CENTER

76a Pleasant Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts
The Center is involved in research on the situation in Indochina. It has consistently provided anti-war activists, religious leaders, and Congresspeople with information that is excluded from the bourgeois press. Much of their effort is directed towards lobbying efforts to cut off aid to the Thieu and Lon Nol regimes, the withdrawal of US troops, and the implementation of the Paris Peace Agreements. This grant is for the cost of a new pamphlet entitled "Vietnam: Perspectives for Peace", which deals with the political positions of various groups within South Vietnam as well as the possible scenarios that could develop from the current situation.

1975 WOMEN'S HEALTH CONFERENCE

Box 192, West Somerville, Massachusetts
Last September, community women's health groups and women students began meeting to plan a conference that would generate strategies and alternatives to present women's health facilities, and that would organize to change health care delivery in the Boston area. It will focus on issues which affect all women seeking or giving health care and is particularly intended to open and extend communication between women in health consumer groups, women health workers, etc. Workshops will include the History of the Women's Health Movement, Women and Drugs, Home Birth, Third World Women and Maternity Care, and Hospital Organizing.

MARCH GRANTS

DETROIT UNEMPLOYED COUNCIL

13300 Mack Avenue, Detroit, Michigan
DUC was formed in December of 1974, to deal with the problems faced by unemployed workers in Detroit. Their activities range from assisting workers with money and harassment problems to organizing employed and unemployed workers around demands for more jobs and benefits. DUC engages in political education on the political and economic aspects of recessions and depressions, the means by which the imperialists seek to alleviate capitalism's periodic crises, and the function played by welfare and employment security agencies in carrying out the needs of the present system.

AFRICAN PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST PARTY

405 S. W. 8th Avenue, Gainesville, Florida
AFSP is a Black Nationalist organization which does extensive work in the Black communities of Florida around the issues of police repression, exploitation by landlords and corporations, and the struggle of Blacks for democratic rights. Through their paper, Burning Spear, they do extensive education about liberation struggles in Africa and the Mid East, and the efforts of Black and Third World people within the United States to defend themselves against racism and economic exploitation. This grant went towards an effort to mobilize community support around the issue of a young Black killed by Florida police, and the jailing of APSP leaders who were involved in protesting the incident.

PEOPLE'S TOWN HALL

PO Box 608, Huntington, New York
PTH has been involved in various facets of suburban community organizing from a socialist perspective. Their projects include legal counselling in the area of tenants' rights and housing problems, welfare organizing, action against realtors who discriminate against Blacks and other Third World people. They also operate a radical literature center and hold classes on politics and economics.

WORK, INC.

652 South East Street, Holyoke, Massachusetts
Work, Inc., is an organization based in the Spanish speaking community of Holyoke, an area that has been plagued of late by absentee landlords, abandoned and deteriorating buildings, and governmental ignorance and harassment. WI is primarily involved in buying up abandoned properties, renovating them, and renting them to Spanish speaking people in the area at or slightly above cost. All this is done with the utmost frugality, often times using old bricks and pipes from demolished buildings. WI also organizes residents against government and landlord campaigns against them. The group also operates day care centers and literature centers. This grant goes for the opening of a thrift shop and reading room.

UNIDOS BOOKSTORE

918 South McBride, East Los Angeles, California
Unidos was opened over a year ago in the Chicano community of East Los Angeles by a Chicano member of the October League and members of a Chicano collective in that area. It supplies the community with radical literature in English and Spanish, serves as a meeting place and center for UFW support work, and Sloane strike support, and houses a day-care center. In January, the American Nazis firebombed the store, destroying the building and most of its contents. The community has turned out to rebuild the store and protest the government's lax attitude about prosecuting the bombers. Prior to the bombing, the Nazis and other right wing organizations had been terrorizing the store and interrupting the various forums and activities held at the store. This grant is for rebuilding and restocking the store.