

STRUGGLE INSIDE GUARDIAN BUREAU

We are four persons who helped form and were active (one was in leadership) on the Guardian Bureau in Boston. We all left the bureau in 1975. We are writing this letter to show how the Guardian now covers for the revisionists and also to expose the lies about the history of the bureau contained in the June Guardian Sustainer newsletter article, "How Guardian Bureaus Work."

To the Guardian, our crucial struggle on the bureau over political line was "a number of growing pains. . . dominated by self-appointed polemicists whose sole contribution to the bureau was their attempt to engineer a revolt against New York." This cannot cover that we had one of the most active bureaus in the country; and that to consolidate its present rotten positions, it had to silence the Marxist-Leninist forces within the bureaus, particularly Boston.

The first of us was replaced in the spring of 1975 as bureau coordinator after taking the stand that the Guardian must recognize that capitalism has been restored in the USSR and that there can be no unity with the revisionists.

REVISIONISTS RUN SHOW

Another of us belonged to the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee and had originally supported Silber's "qualified support" for the Havana Conference on Puerto Rico. After a number of months, he learned that revisionists were running the show and how Silber was completely isolated. Despite the fact that the majority of us felt that Silber (speaking as the Guardian) was incorrect for not opposing both superpowers for real Puerto Rican independence, New York editors told us that participation on the PRSC was an individual matter unrelated to the Guardian line. This bureau member was later expelled by the New York editors for stating his views, and more so, for stating that this line must be taken to the masses.

At this point, it was becoming clear that the Guardian was quickly but secretly consolidating a revisionist line, as could be seen in the Guardian line approving Soviet

aggression in Angola in November 1975. But when the editors came to Boston in the fall of '75—to silence the opposition—they managed to duck our questions of party-building, showed contempt for our taking factory jobs, and said that our work in mass organizations (like US-China Peoples' Friendship Association) was irrelevant and unimportant to them.

For all of us, the struggle over line in the desegregation battle in Boston was the



Guardian's Silber tries unsuccessfully to spread revisionism to Marxist-Leninists.

glaring example of the Guardian's bedding with the revisionists. On the bureau, we had studied the Afro-American question for months and all but Jay Steele and John Trinkl were won to the Marxist-Leninist position of upholding self-determination for the Afro-American nation in the South. Further, we came to see that the crisis in Boston was caused by national oppression and imperialism.

Counter to this was the line that has come to dominate in the Guardian: Racism is now the "key issue." This even allowed opposition to busing (not the "key issue") to be posed in some articles, eclectically. Steele always wrote about "poor Black victims," saying the problem was white workers and their backward ideas. This is a repeat of the CP position, with a few critical words about the NAACP.

This line goes hand-in-hand with the Guardian's failure to editorially support the anti-segregationist march in Boston last Sept. 13. Our bureau supported it with ver-

bal support from New York editors. But all-out support did not come from N.Y. when it turned out that Prairie Fire and other opportunists the Guardian is now wooing were not going to be in the march.

The Guardian now is a newspaper building a small capitalist enterprise, not building revolution. Accordingly, decisions are made by bourgeois centralism, by experts who own the paper. Bureau members are "stringers" for production. "Talented writers" have replaced Marxist-Leninist fighters who are rooted in the factories and working class. At every turn, the editors put production in command, pushing news coverage and by-lines at the expense of class struggle. They leave the working class and oppressed nations and nationalities organizationally defenseless against the savage attacks of imperialism, despite all their breast-beating about opposing

"our" imperialism.

The Guardian treachery comes to a head in regards to the efforts around the Organizing Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Party. While slandering the people who are uniting around the real party-building process as "dogmatists," they are leading their readership to a federationist party affiliated

with—or at least with "working relations" to—the revisionist CPUSA and, in the process, winning over as many Trotskyists as possible.

All genuine Marxist-Leninists and anti-imperialists must take a stand against these glossy "independent" radicals who are opening the door for the revisionists. There is only one movement for liberation, and they are not part of it.