



WV PHOTO



WV PHOTO

Demonstrators in Portugal demand freedom for Saldanho Sanchez, editor of Maoist paper, *Luta Popular*, arrested by army for printing appeal for desertion.

Stalinism in Action

Portuguese CP Allies with Spínola, Opposes Strikes



Speaker at the Maoist rally in Lisbon's Rossio Square.

WV PHOTO

FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT

LISBON, June 9—The provisional government installed May 16 by General Spínola and the Movement of Armed Forces is a stopgap measure to preserve capitalist rule in Portugal. Despite the inclusion of representatives of various bourgeois center parties and the two largest workers parties, Communist and Socialist, already in its first days the new regime has been facing a grave threat to its continued existence. The Portuguese working class, suddenly released from half a century of stiff repression under the Salazarist dictatorship and now permitted to freely organize and to hold meetings for the first time, seized the opportunity to bring forth its grievances.

Factory and office meetings led to demands for higher wages, better working conditions, shorter hours, workers' participation in industry and an immediate end to the colonial wars. Soon strikes spread to the telephone system, railways, airlines, post office and public utilities. Workers at Lisbon's biggest shipyard, Lisnave, occupied the plant, calling for a doubling of wages and workers control. Plants belonging

to Firestone, International Telephone and Telegraph and Timex were struck and occupied by workers demanding big wage raises, as well as the removal of at least part of the management accused of complicity with the "fascists" of the old regime.

The situation reached a high point in the last week of May when the city of Lisbon was paralyzed by a transit strike and the bakers walked out. Workers marched and demonstrated under red banners, hammer-and-sickle symbols and signs proclaiming "Down With Capitalism!" The country was placed in the throes of a pre-revolutionary situation with the working class defying the provisional government's urgent appeals for "calm" and order. For a period of days the government was incapable of stemming the long pent-up discontent of the working masses.

In the last days of May Portuguese workers undertook an offensive which could have led to a revolutionary mobilization of all the exploited masses. But the movement did not reach the point of dual power, characteristic of a revolutionary situation. What was lacking was a revolutionary leadership capable of raising the necessary demands to transform the massive seething dis-

continued on page 10

Canada: NDP Must Break with Liberals...4

Shea (left) and attorney Evserhoff following announcement of verdict.



DAILY NEWS

Killer Cop Acquitted in New York

Spectators in the Queens courtroom gasped in disbelief as a verdict of "not guilty" was returned in the murder trial of police officer Thomas Shea on June 12. The acquittal was an outrage—a blatant demonstration of the class and racial bias of bourgeois "justice," and of the vicious arrogance of the guardians of "law and order" toward the population they supposedly protect. At no point was there any doubt that the cop had cold-bloodedly murdered a defenseless 10-year-old black youngster.

"You Black Son-of-a-Bitch!"

At 5 a.m. on 28 April 1973 Shea, on plainclothes patrol in the predominantly black neighborhood of South Jamaica, jumped from an unmarked car to confront 51-year-old black mechanic Add Armstead, who was on his way to work with his stepson Clifford Glover, screaming "You black son-of-a-bitch!" Young Glover was shot in the back by Shea as he and Armstead fled in fear of being robbed and assaulted.

The jury—all white males except for one black female probation officer—found "reasonable doubt" as to Shea's guilt because of the possibility that he had seen Glover pull a revolver, as he claimed. Thus Shea shot a fleeing child in the back supposedly "in self defense"! The cop's story was patently false. No gun was ever found near the scene of the murder, though the area was thoroughly combed in search of one.

Moreover, Shea claimed he had stopped Armstead and Glover as possible suspects in a taxi holdup, described in a police alarm broadcast as "two male Negroes in their early 20s." He testified that he ignored their age and height and never looked at their faces because, "I was just looking at their skin."

Defense lawyer Jacob Evserhoff's presentation dripped with racist bigotry and innuendo. In his summation he shouted to the jury at the top of his lungs: "Add Armstead is not stupid. He is not a sad, pathetic, 51-year-old worker. He is a clever, clever, man who takes 10-year-olds out on the street at 5 a.m. to do whatever he does." According to the 11 June *New York Post's* account:

"Add Armstead plays dumb for you' Evserhoff went on, dropping his voice to shade his words with scorn. Is 'the testimony of a man of this type and of this ilk,' he asked, 'to convict a policeman of murder? in South Jamaica? (voice rising) at 5 a.m.?'"

Replace the Cops with Workers Militias

The acquittal of Thomas Shea is an unspeakable atrocity against all work-

ing people and minorities. The unadulterated racism in this case was so gross that the setting could easily have been the Deep South of thirty years ago. And once again we see demonstrated and condoned the growing tendency of the bourgeois judicial system to reduce itself to simple "cop justice": the functions of judge, jury and executioner are carried out on the spot according to the arbitrary whim of trigger-happy armed savages.

Despite an openly racist defense this animal has now been turned loose on the streets again although he still awaits departmental trial for the pistol-clubbing of a 14-year-old boy outside a bar in March 1972. The news of Shea's release produced a wave of anger which rapidly spread through the black sections of Queens. The following night riots broke out with crowds numbering as many as 300 to 400, and the area was flooded with cops. (Similar outbreaks followed the original murder incident last year.)

The ruling class should have been terrified to death of the consequences of pulling such a "miscarriage of justice." Unlike ghetto riots, easily put down by the heavily armed police and armed forces, and even desirable at times for the bourgeoisie in order to maintain a useful level of "racial strife," united action by the labor movement can effectively put an end to such arbitrary "cop justice." The failure of the trade-union movement, including allegedly "progressive" unions with a high percentage of minority members such as District 65 or Hospital Workers' Local 1199, to take any action relegates the seething discontent of the black masses to expression in desperate and self-defeating ghetto outbreaks, as opposed to effective, organized struggle against their oppression.

Neither the police review boards pushed by liberals nor the "community control" of the police favored by various fake radicals can effectively control the cops, who are, after all, the hired guns of the capitalist class. Racially united workers militias can keep the streets "free from crime" far more effectively than the graft-ridden, drug-trafficking, murderous police, whose real job is to protect the interests of the ruling class. And by further uniting the working class in the struggle to overthrow capitalism this demand will hasten the day when the cops, like Nixon and the bourgeoisie that employs them, can be swept from power and brought before a real jury, not of their peers but of their victims, for judgment. *Dissolve the police—for racially united workers militias based on the trade unions!* ■

Shachtmanite Hypocrisy:

The RSL and Workers Democracy

In its *Torch* No. 11 (6-20 June 1974) the Revolutionary Socialist League (RSL) devotes a full page to a sanctimonious and thoroughly dishonest "Open Letter to the Spartacist League" which alleges that the SL "disrupted" an RSL forum held in Detroit on June 8. The "Open Letter" is a pathetic attempt to whitewash the anti-democratic and provocative conduct of the RSL.

About twenty supporters of the SL attended the RSL forum, along with perhaps an equal number of RSL supporters and a handful of independents. The *RSL Torch* alleges that "Through prolonged and repeated heckling, baiting and shouting—making it impossible for any other speakers to be heard—your supporters finally succeeded in forcing a physical confrontation and their own expulsion from the forum." This is a shameful distortion, and nonsensical to boot. It should be obvious that, given the balance of forces, had the SL had any intention of disrupting the meeting, the meeting could not possibly have taken place. What did happen was that after protesting the RSL's bureaucratic limitation of speakers during the discussion period, the SL succeeded in walking out of the meeting despite the physically provocative conduct of the RSL.

After the RSL main speaker had given her long presentation, SL supporters as well as others in the audience raised their hands to participate in the discussion period. Despite the large number of SLers present and wishing to speak, only two SL speakers were recognized by the chair. After an RSLer from the audience was called upon for the second time when others who had raised their hands still had not been recognized, one of the SLers who protested this flagrant violation of workers democracy was immediately grabbed by RSL leading spokesman Bruce Landau and told, "If you don't shut up you'll go out on a stretcher." In the midst of general confusion an SL supporter stood up to announce that the SL was leaving the meeting. Apparently anxious to escalate the confrontation, RSLers attempted to drown out this announcement with clapping, and an SL comrade was grabbed by two goons. When other SL comrades sought to move to his defense they were grabbed by RSLers in the audience. Finally the SL succeeded in leaving the meeting hall.

It is laughable for the RSL to now pat itself on the back for its alleged "great restraint," and ludicrous to charge that the SLers who protested the suppression of their views "tried to take control of the meeting themselves." But what is most absurd is the RSL's attempt to foist off on the working-class movement a new "theory" of workers democracy. The *Torch* treats us to an exposition of this "theory": "The sponsoring organization may decide to allow opponent tendencies to speak at its forums. If so, it will also reserve the right to decide how many representatives of those tendencies may speak." This is simply absurd! Supporters of the Spartacist League have the same rights as any other member of the working-class public. If the RSL wishes to hold politically monolithic harangues in meeting halls it is free to do so, but it can hardly claim that the "discussion periods" of its "public forums" partake of the principle of "workers democracy" when RSLers who have already spoken are recognized in the discussion while SLers who have not spoken are not.

Nor is this bizarre "theory" a local aberration. In Los Angeles the RSL has announced that only two SL supporters will be permitted to speak in any

RSL forum regardless of how many SLers are present wishing to speak. In Chicago the SL was compelled to walk out of a forum where the RSL insisted on allowing only one oppositional speaker from the several groups present and then moved to physically exclude a member of the Revolutionary Socialist Group who protested this fraudulent "interpretation" of workers democracy. In Detroit the SL had previously sent a formal protest to the RSL over similar incidents.

Political cowards will always seek to hide behind bureaucratism and ultimately physical intimidation. The rotting corpse of the Workers League stands as a harbinger of things to come for the RSL. The Workers League, having stifled all internal political life and consistently "protected" its membership from exposure to external criticism by excluding opponent tendencies from its "public" meetings, is now left with the empty shell of an organization as the vast majority of its experienced and leading cadres have dropped out into apolitical cynicism. Unable to defend its positions in free and open political discussion, the RSL seems anxious to embark upon the same voyage of ever more blatant bureaucratism.

In contrast, the Spartacist League is justly proud of its long and unblemished history of defense of workers democracy. In the Detroit area, for example, serious militants will recall the SL's vigorous efforts to bring about a united front of all left groups to defend salesmen of left periodicals against UAW bureaucrat goons following the Mack Avenue wildcat. The Detroit SL was also the initiator of a united-front demonstration in defense of the imprisoned far-left militants in Chile. The Detroit SL is currently engaged in a vigorous campaign to defend Progressive Labor supporters at Wayne State University against administration harassment. Such examples give the lie to the *Torch's* claim that the SL is interested simply in "invoking [workers democracy] in its own defense." But let us make this clear: we are interested in invoking workers democracy on our own behalf too. We reassert the right of our comrades to participate in forum discussions on an equal footing with everyone else. ■

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Bi-weekly of the Spartacist League

Editorial Board:

Liz Gordon (chairman)
Jan Norden (managing editor)
Chris Knox (labor editor)
Karen Allen (production manager)
Joseph Seymour

Circulation Manager: Anne Kelley

West Coast Editor: Mark Small
Southern Editor: Joe Vetter
Midwest Editor: Steve Green

Published by the Spartacist Publishing Company, Box 1377, G. P. O., New York, N. Y. 10001. Telephone: 925-8234.

Opinions expressed in signed articles or letters do not necessarily express the editorial viewpoint.

Oppose Zionist Expansionism!

Israeli Trotskyists Call for Hebrew/Arab Workers Revolution

Editors' Note: The following is a leaflet distributed by the Spartacist nucleus in Israel at a June 5 demonstration in Jerusalem protesting the Zionist occupation of Arab territories in the 1967 war.

As every year since the 1967 War the left groups are holding a demonstration against the occupation [of Arab territories]. But this year the demonstration is taking place against the background of a governmental crisis, already several months old, the results of the recent [October] war and the efforts to arrange an imperialist deal.

The last elections for the Knesset, which took place in December 1973, proved that the Ma'arakh [the coalition of the Zionist "labor" parties] has been weakened—receiving only 54 representatives (in the previous elections they received 56)—and the strength of the Gahal [the rightist Zionist bloc headed by Menachim Begin] increased. This vote reflected a lack of confidence in the government, which was seen as inefficient in organizing the war. The governmental crisis is occurring under pressure from American imperialism to retreat from the Sinai and from the Syrian Heights.

The usual partner of the Ma'arakh for its coalition governments, the Mafdal [the National Religious Party], prefers not to participate in the new Rabin government but rather to set up a "wall-to-wall" coalition with the Likud [a rightist bloc which includes the Gahal]. As in 1956, under the pressure of American imperialism to retreat from the "Third Israeli Kingdom" (Ben Gurion's expression), the present line of division between the different wings of Zionism runs between those who accept retreat under U.S. government pressure (to be sure, giving up as little territory as possible)—the wing represented by Rabin and his possible partners in the next government, the Independent Liberals and the Civil Rights Movement (the liberal bourgeoisie)—and those who oppose any kind of retreat, the Likud-Mafdal, who pin their hopes on the replacement of Nixon by the Meany/Jackson wing of the Democratic Party.

The Terrorist Action at Ma'alot Pushed the Jewish Masses into Begin's Arms

The terrorist action at Ma'alot, for which the DPFLP [Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine] took responsibility, was the result of a desire to hit at the present imperialist deal, and that after Hawatmeh declaring three months ago his desire for a "peace" (i.e., capitulation to imperialism). This action pushed the Jewish masses into the arms of the Gahal and gave the Israeli government an excuse for its mass murder in the Palestinian camps of Lebanon.

As Leninists, the international Spartacist tendency of course opposes the imperialist deal and supports the right of self-determination for the Palestinian Arab nation. But a new reactionary war could not obtain the right of self-determination for the Palestinian Arab nation; only a proletarian revolution in the Near East under the leadership of a multi-national Bolshevik party [can accomplish this].

As Leninists we are prepared to give military support to the Palestinian masses, even when they are temporarily under petty-bourgeois leadership, if this leadership will undertake independent struggle against the Zion-

ist state or the Hashemites, or the other Arab states. But we cannot defend in any way measures such as hijacking or murdering of children—even when the Israeli government has a heavy responsibility in this matter as well, by refusing to exchange the political prisoners for the children. Not even the Israeli government's vicious mass murder in the Lebanese Palestinian camps can provide any retroactive justification for the terrorist action at Ma'alot.

The War and the Israeli Left

The new situation, in which the Egyptian bourgeoisie has become a serious competitor with Zionism as the keeper of imperialist order in the area, must lead to repercussions not only among the supporters of Rakah [the pro-Moscow Communist Party] who believed in the myth of a "non-capitalist road" in Egypt, but also among all militants of organizations such as Matzpen (Marxist), Matzpen (Tel Aviv) and Struggle, which consider themselves revolutionary while holding the oversimplified theory that the Zionists are the imperialist fortress in the area against the Arab nations. This theory is used to help them justify their support to the Arab bourgeoisie in the last war. Among all the left groups only Workers Alliance (Vanguard) correctly defined the character of the last war as a reactionary war on both sides. But this fact is explained as a result of being influenced by Zionist pressure instead of that of the Arab bourgeoisie. This was proved by its refusal to adopt the internationalist position of turning the reactionary war into a civil war, turning the Jewish workers against Zionism and the Arab workers against the Arab bourgeoisie. By this act [the Workers Alliance] proved to be part of the same camp of those who block the way of the working class to reach Marxism.

Pacifist Illusions and Anti-Fascist Hysteria

The new situation in the area, which has resulted in the growth of pacifist illusions on the one hand and the strengthening of the [rightist] bourgeois Gahal party in Israel on the other, has caused the left groups to oscillate between chasing after pacifist illusions and hysteria, seeing the danger of fascism everywhere. No matter to which side they are pushed, they are serving the Rakah and the petty-bourgeois leadership of the Palestinian and Jewish protest movements.

Rakah is connected with the Russian bureaucracy, which believes that "peaceful coexistence" is possible with imperialism, and has as its perspective support for the Zionist wing which agrees to go to the Geneva talks (Ma'arakh). It leads the anti-fascist hysteria, arguing that whoever opposes the imperialist deal is responsible for the fascist danger in Israel.

But Gahal is not a fascist party, and its strengthening is the reflection of the increasing hold of the Zionist bourgeoisie over the Zionist petty bourgeoisie. There is no fascist danger today in Israel. Fascism, a movement of petty-bourgeois despair, can appear only in a situation of social crisis, not merely a governmental crisis as now in Israel, in a situation in which the working class is advancing but blocked by its traitorous leadership. In such a situation, the petty bourgeoisie turns to fascism against the working class.

We need only recall that [Jewish



DAVID RUBINGER

Israeli Premier Yitzhak Rabin

Defense League leader Meir] Kahane's slate received only 0.8 percent in the elections to be convinced that there is no fascist danger in Israel. What is more, if there were a fascist danger, no wing of Zionism could stop it, only the independent mobilization of the working class, only the workers militias could play this role.

The Struggle group has since the war remained firm in its Stalinist politics by supporting the new imperialist re-division of Palestine as "a step forward." So also did Matzpen (Tel Aviv). The Matzpen (Marxist) group is connected with the revisionists of the United Secretariat, which for years has tailed after Nasserism and the petty-bourgeois Palestinian leadership (Hawatmeh) as part of the strategy of petty-bourgeois guerrillaism. (Guerrilla war is certainly not the proletarian path.) With the appearance of the Jewish protest movement, under the leadership of Moti Ashkenazi and with the slogans of "Ministerial Responsibility" and "Removal of Those Responsible for the Failure," [Matzpen (Marxist)] jumped onto this bandwagon.

Tailing after the leadership of this petty-bourgeois movement, it published the shameless leaflet entitled "Moti, Be Careful," in which it spread illusions

about the possible "progressive" character of the movement instead of struggling sharply against the protest movement leaders in order to bring potential militants into the revolutionary movement (which requires propagandizing the full revolutionary program). Why should any sane person join a grouplet like Matzpen if he can be a member of a mass "progressive" movement?

The political line which guides this group [Matzpen (Marxist)], expressed in its action proposal for the June 5 demonstration [against the occupation of Arab territories], is cooperation with the liberal bourgeoisie (Moked, Ha Olamhaze) utilizing the argument of the "fascist danger." This line is, of course, the line of the "anti-fascist front," i.e., the popular front. The only reason why [Matzpen (Marxist)] does not already have support for or entry into a popular front on its record is the political situation in Israel and not its political line. It is a fact that it accepts the [Front Communiste Révolutionnaire] in France as a model, while the [FCR] supports the popular front of Mitterrand.

The Workers Alliance (Vanguard) is doing its part to spread pacifist illusions by publishing the leaflet "Let's Hear the Voice of the Youth for a Truly Just Peace Between Nations." This Stalinist formulation hides from the working class the fact that peace is possible only after the working class takes power. In the center of its propaganda is the organization of a reformist labor party and a democratic constituent assembly as the solution to national oppression, an approach which is nothing but open Menshevism implying the possibility of a bourgeois solution to the national question.

Lately, it has jumped into the swamp of "Arab revolution" theories, the horse whose tail it is grabbing being Habash (PFLP) in contrast to Matzpen (Marxist) which was tailing Hawatmeh [DPFLP]. These two "Trotskyist" groups together are ready to spread any kind of illusion, but not to raise the central issue of the unification of the working class against the state power. Behind the pacifist illusions that the left (from Rakah to Vanguard) is spreading hides the danger of a new war that no kind of halfway measures, no kind of class collaboration will be able to avoid. Only the united struggle of the Arab and Jewish working class under the leadership of a multi-national proletarian vanguard party, which will take power in all the Near Eastern countries and which will build a Near Eastern socialist federation as a part of a socialist world, can put an end to

continued on page 5



BLACK STAR

Palestinian refugee camp

NDP Must Break with Liberals

On May 8 the minority Liberal Party government of Canadian Prime Minister Elliot Trudeau was toppled when it lost a vote of confidence in parliament by a vote of 137 to 123. Joining hands to bring down the Trudeau government over the issue of the 1974 budget were the Canadian Tory party, the Progressive Conservatives and the small social-democratic Canadian labor party, the New Democratic Party.

New federal elections for the Canadian parliament are scheduled for July 8, and pose the question of what attitude communists should take toward these elections, and especially toward the candidates of the NDP.

The last federal elections in Canada, which took place over 18 months ago, presented the New Democrats for the first time in their history with the balance of power in parliament. The Liberals won 109 seats to the Conservatives' 107 and the NDP's 31 in the 264-seat House. The NDP, true to its reformist, social-democratic perspectives, promptly entered into a tacit alliance with the Liberals, trading its support to the Trudeau government for minor concessions on such things as welfare spending, price controls on oil, etc.

All along the aim of the NDP was to

maneuver for petty reforms, while proving its respectability to the bourgeoisie by not bringing down the government. As NDP leader David Lewis candidly remarked,

"You cannot condemn the government for some of those things that you feel you ought to condemn it, in a way in which you'd like to do it, when you're refusing to vote it out of office."

—*Labor Challenge*, 10 June 1974

In fact, the only occasions on which the NDP opposed the Liberals were those instances when it was clear that the Liberals and PCs would vote together, thus allowing the New Democrats to vote against the government for purposes of publicity and image-building without bringing it down. Hence the NDP broke with the Liberals to oppose a measure granting tax concessions to corporations, over a bill dealing with housing mortgages and legislation breaking the railway strike (after the NDP collaborated in drafting it!).

The NDP Must Repudiate Its Bloc with the Liberals

While the NDP has been busy over the last 18 months in keeping Trudeau

in power, it has also been replenishing its campaign chest and preparing for new elections at a time when it could hope to increase its relative weight in parliament. Thus the NDP vote of May 8 reflects not a repudiation of class-collaborationist coalitionism, but is simply a maneuver by Lewis and Co. to improve their position in striking up a new bargain with the bourgeoisie.

This is clearly revealed by the NDP's current campaign. The NDP proudly presents its record as a model of "making Parliament work," pointing to minor concessions allegedly "squeezed" from the Liberals, such as slightly increased old age pensions and family allowances, an income tax cut, controls on foreign investment, an export tax on oil and a bill requiring publication of sources of campaign contributions ("Look What the NDP Has Squeezed Out of Parliament," NDP 1974 campaign pamphlet).

While the NDP's "corridor coalition" with the Liberals has not been the focus of an organized opposition within the Canadian labor movement, there is, nevertheless, widespread disgruntlement with Lewis' craven capitulation to the Liberals. Indicative of this was the

opposition of NDP MP (Member of Parliament) John Rodriguez, from the nickel-belt riding in Northern Ontario, to the NDP-Liberal coalition. Rodriguez twice broke party discipline to support motions condemning the government (*Toronto Globe and Mail*, 5 June 1974). In addition, reflecting a more general disgruntlement with the NDP, the number of local unions affiliated to the party has tumbled from 809 to 743 over the past two years.

The Spartacist League urges a policy of conditional opposition to the NDP in the current elections until such time as the NDP repudiates its past practice of entering into a tacit coalition government with the Liberals. While it is true that the NDP has not formed an electoral bloc with the Liberals and is in fact running candidates against the Liberals, it is equally true that it is doing this in order to better its parliamentary position against the Liberals—only in order to be in a better bargaining position to form a new tacit coalition. (If Lewis is successful in his maneuver and significantly increases the number of NDP seats he might even be able to force Trudeau into a coalition government, an authentic popular front between bourgeois and workers

Letter to an RMG Supporter:

Origins of the "New Mass Vanguard"

[Dear Comrade,]

Since being back in Toronto I've had a chance to reread Mandel's pamphlet "The Leninist Theory of Organization" with a view to corresponding with you about our discussion of it. In this letter I'll try to outline my conclusions.

Lenin's theory of organization is the theory of the necessity of the creation of a party of professional revolutionaries, welded to the proletariat, with the political programme of the proletariat—revolutionary Marxism. Lenin holds that this party must raise its programme in every partial struggle of the working class, and other oppressed sections of society; and fight for hegemony for itself and its programme in those struggles.

"... our task, the task of Social Democracy, is to combat spontaneity and to... bring [the working class movement] under the wing of revolutionary Social Democracy."

—V.I. Lenin, *What Is to Be Done?*

Although Lenin's theory of consciousness clearly understands that the working class is composed of many different layers, with differing levels of political consciousness, there are only two essential categories in his theory of organization—the party and the masses. The struggle for proletarian revolution is precisely the struggle of the revolutionary party for the leadership of the masses.

Mandel, however, in "The Leninist Theory of Organization" has a *fundamentally different* model of the working class. He describes three distinct categories: the party, the advanced workers, and the masses.... It is the intermediary category of "advanced workers" which is peculiar to Mandel's analysis.

"... The category of advanced workers... is a function of their distinct historical origin, as well as their distinct position in the social process of production and their distinct class consciousness..."

—E. Mandel, "Leninist Theory of Organization," p. 30

"Without the conscious intervention of advanced workers, who inject transitional demands into the workers' struggles, there can hardly be the experience of revolutionary struggles on

the part of broad masses. Without the spreading of transitional demands on the part of a revolutionary vanguard, there can be no possibility of advanced workers influencing struggles in a truly anti-capitalist sense."

—*ibid.*, p. 18

Mandel's third category ("advanced workers") is an entity distinct from both the party and the rest of the class, with its own "distinct class consciousness," over which hegemony must first be won in order to be able to win the working class to revolutionary action. This conception lays the basis for the theory of the "new mass vanguard" or the "broad mass vanguard" or whatever its current designation.

Elsewhere in his document, however, Mandel also makes more "orthodox" formulations. For instance, in discussing the Bolsheviks' successful seizure of state power, we read that: "... the crystallization of a revolutionary workers cadre schooled in two decades of revolutionary organization and revolutionary activity was instrumental in making this decisive strategic turn [the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat] a success" (*ibid.*, p. 12).

But what was the role of the distinct social grouping of "advanced workers" with their own "distinct class consciousness" in all of this??

The Leninist conception of the centrality of the struggle for programmatic clarity in the revolutionary movement is based on the understanding that to the extent that one's programme is not that of revolutionary Marxism it is bourgeois.

"Only snort sighted people can consider factional disputes and a strict differentiation between shades of opinion inopportune or superfluous. The fate of Russian Social Democracy for very many years to come may depend on the strengthening of one or another 'shade'."

—*What Is to Be Done?*

(No comment is required on the recent withdrawal of the RMG [Revolutionary Marxist Group] from the scheduled debate with the Spartacist tendency here in Toronto.)

Mandel does not share this conception. Rather he implicitly holds an "empty vessel" theory of programme

to be true for the "advanced workers"; i.e. to the extent that its "distinct class consciousness" (programme) is not Trotskyist it is "incomplete." Thus Mandel tells us that a revolutionary's orientation towards "advanced workers"... should be to try to spread some transitional demands among them. A Leninist orientation towards those workers is to wage a hard political struggle to win them to *our* programme, the Transitional Program, while engaging in joint activity with them to fight for the immediate needs of the class. (Mandel however, unlike Lenin, considers those who believe that "only those who accept our doctrine are revolutionary" to be "extreme sectarians" ("Leninist Theory of Organization," p. 13)....

The Spartacist tendency does not try to "fuse" with "the advanced workers" (or the "new mass vanguard") as a blob. Rather we seek, through hard political struggle, to polarize these heterogeneous layers and win the best elements to our programme (i.e., to incorporate them into our party). Mandel and the USec [the fake-Trotskyist "United Secretariat of the Fourth International," of which the RMG is a sympathizing organization], however, in their constant search for some instrument of revolution *besides* a Trotskyist party (the Communist Parties, the [Algerian] FLN, Castro, the [South Vietnamese] NLF, the New Mass Vanguard, etc.) seek an "organic union" with the advanced workers. This is reflected in the different types of trade union caucuses which are supported by the Spartacist League/US and the RMG. Compare our article "Class Struggle in the Phone Company," *Women and Revolution* No. 5 with B. Smiley's article on the Post Office in *Old Mole* No. 10.

In real life "advanced workers" are not at all a homogeneous layer but concretely are composed of Stalinists, Maoists, Social Democrats, trade unionists, etc. The role of Trotskyists in relation to these elements is to seek to split elements of them from their false programmes and construct a Bolshevik leadership—not [as Mandel suggests] to be helpfully suggesting "transitional demands" to them in order that the "broad mass struggles" can

be extended "beyond the level of immediate demands":

"The development of revolutionary class consciousness among the broad masses is possible only if they accumulate experiences of struggles that are not only limited to the winning of partial demands within the framework of capitalism. The gradual injection of these demands into mass struggles can come about only through the efforts of a broad layer of advanced workers who are closely linked to the masses and who disseminate and publicize these demands..."

—"Leninist Theory of Organization," p. 17

This is *not* the Leninist method of winning the masses to revolutionary class consciousness. The "gradual injection" of "transitional demands" is really only the old economist s--- dressed up in new "Trotskyist" clothes. Trotskyists do not suggest "appropriate transitional demands"—we raise the communist programme for our era—the Transitional Program. We seek to construct a revolutionary leadership for the working class by winning the most advanced workers to that programme. As a comrade in the RMG recently remarked to me: "The Transitional Program is not a tool kit—it's a tool!" When Mandel ridicules "those who learn by heart a list of such demands culled from Lenin and Trotsky" he is talking about those who raise the Transitional Program. Instead of having to get by on the stale, old Transitional Program Mandel is prepared to dish up some of the "new" and "creative" Marxism that brought us Castro the "unconscious Marxist," i.e. the "creative" liquidation of the Trotskyist programme in favour of tailing whatever motion already exists.

Our criticisms of Mandel's pamphlet demonstrate both our fundamental political differences with the United Secretariat over the role of the Trotskyist party in making proletarian revolution and the profoundly revisionist character of that entire rotten bloc which is the USec.

If you reread *What Is to Be Done?* and compare it to the "Leninist Theory of Organization" I'm confident that you will conclude that whatever the merits of Mandel's theory of organization, it is not Lenin's.... ■

Tom

Oppose Zionist Expansionism!

Israeli Trotskyists Call for Hebrew/Arab Workers Revolution

Editors' Note: The following is a leaflet distributed by the Spartacist nucleus in Israel at a June 5 demonstration in Jerusalem protesting the Zionist occupation of Arab territories in the 1967 war.

As every year since the 1967 War the left groups are holding a demonstration against the occupation [of Arab territories]. But this year the demonstration is taking place against the background of a governmental crisis, already several months old, the results of the recent [October] war and the efforts to arrange an imperialist deal.

The last elections for the Knesset, which took place in December 1973, proved that the Ma'arakh [the coalition of the Zionist "labor" parties] has been weakened—receiving only 54 representatives (in the previous elections they received 56)—and the strength of the Gahal [the rightist Zionist bloc headed by Menachim Begin] increased. This vote reflected a lack of confidence in the government, which was seen as inefficient in organizing the war. The governmental crisis is occurring under pressure from American imperialism to retreat from the Sinai and from the Syrian Heights.

The usual partner of the Ma'arakh for its coalition governments, the Mafdal [the National Religious Party], prefers not to participate in the new Rabin government but rather to set up a "wall-to-wall" coalition with the Likud [a rightist bloc which includes the Gahal]. As in 1956, under the pressure of American imperialism to retreat from the "Third Israeli Kingdom" (Ben Gurion's expression), the present line of division between the different wings of Zionism runs between those who accept retreat under U.S. government pressure (to be sure, giving up as little territory as possible)—the wing represented by Rabin and his possible partners in the next government, the Independent Liberals and the Civil Rights Movement (the liberal bourgeoisie)—and those who oppose any kind of retreat, the Likud-Mafdal, who pin their hopes on the replacement of Nixon by the Meany/Jackson wing of the Democratic Party.

The Terrorist Action at Ma'alot Pushed the Jewish Masses into Begin's Arms

The terrorist action at Ma'alot, for which the DPFLP [Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine] took responsibility, was the result of a desire to hit at the present imperialist deal, and that after Hawatmeh declaring three months ago his desire for a "peace" (i.e., capitulation to imperialism). This action pushed the Jewish masses into the arms of the Gahal and gave the Israeli government an excuse for its mass murder in the Palestinian camps of Lebanon.

As Leninists, the international Spartacist tendency of course opposes the imperialist deal and supports the right of self-determination for the Palestinian Arab nation. But a new reactionary war could not obtain the right of self-determination for the Palestinian Arab nation; only a proletarian revolution in the Near East under the leadership of a multi-national Bolshevik party [can accomplish this].

As Leninists we are prepared to give military support to the Palestinian masses, even when they are temporarily under petty-bourgeois leadership, if this leadership will undertake independent struggle against the Zion-

ist state or the Hashemites, or the other Arab states. But we cannot defend in any way measures such as hijacking or murdering of children—even when the Israeli government has a heavy responsibility in this matter as well, by refusing to exchange the political prisoners for the children. Not even the Israeli government's vicious mass murder in the Lebanese Palestinian camps can provide any retroactive justification for the terrorist action at Ma'alot.

The War and the Israeli Left

The new situation, in which the Egyptian bourgeoisie has become a serious competitor with Zionism as the keeper of imperialist order in the area, must lead to repercussions not only among the supporters of Rakah [the pro-Moscow Communist Party] who believed in the myth of a "non-capitalist road" in Egypt, but also among all militants of organizations such as Matzpen (Marxist), Matzpen (Tel Aviv) and Struggle, which consider themselves revolutionary while holding the oversimplified theory that the Zionists are the imperialist fortress in the area against the Arab nations. This theory is used to help them justify their support to the Arab bourgeoisie in the last war. Among all the left groups only Workers Alliance (Vanguard) correctly defined the character of the last war as a reactionary war on both sides. But this fact is explained as a result of being influenced by Zionist pressure instead of that of the Arab bourgeoisie. This was proved by its refusal to adopt the internationalist position of turning the reactionary war into a civil war, turning the Jewish workers against Zionism and the Arab workers against the Arab bourgeoisie. By this act [the Workers Alliance] proved to be part of the same camp of those who block the way of the working class to reach Marxism.

Pacifist Illusions and Anti-Fascist Hysteria

The new situation in the area, which has resulted in the growth of pacifist illusions on the one hand and the strengthening of the [rightist] bourgeois Gahal party in Israel on the other, has caused the left groups to oscillate between chasing after pacifist illusions and hysteria, seeing the danger of fascism everywhere. No matter to which side they are pushed, they are serving the Rakah and the petty-bourgeois leadership of the Palestinian and Jewish protest movements.

Rakah is connected with the Russian bureaucracy, which believes that "peaceful coexistence" is possible with imperialism, and has as its perspective support for the Zionist wing which agrees to go to the Geneva talks (Ma'arakh). It leads the anti-fascist hysteria, arguing that whoever opposes the imperialist deal is responsible for the fascist danger in Israel.

But Gahal is not a fascist party, and its strengthening is the reflection of the increasing hold of the Zionist bourgeoisie over the Zionist petty bourgeoisie. There is no fascist danger today in Israel. Fascism, a movement of petty-bourgeois despair, can appear only in a situation of social crisis, not merely a governmental crisis as now in Israel, in a situation in which the working class is advancing but blocked by its traitorous leadership. In such a situation, the petty bourgeoisie turns to fascism against the working class.

We need only recall that [Jewish



DAVID RUBINGER

Israeli Premier Yitzhak Rabin

Defense League leader Meir] Kahane's slate received only 0.8 percent in the elections to be convinced that there is no fascist danger in Israel. What is more, if there were a fascist danger, no wing of Zionism could stop it, only the independent mobilization of the working class, only the workers militias could play this role.

The Struggle group has since the war remained firm in its Stalinist politics by supporting the new imperialist re-division of Palestine as "a step forward." So also did Matzpen (Tel Aviv). The Matzpen (Marxist) group is connected with the revisionists of the United Secretariat, which for years has tailed after Nasserism and the petty-bourgeois Palestinian leadership (Hawatmeh) as part of the strategy of petty-bourgeois guerrillaism. (Guerrilla war is certainly not the proletarian path.) With the appearance of the Jewish protest movement, under the leadership of Moti Ashkenazi and with the slogans of "Ministerial Responsibility" and "Removal of Those Responsible for the Failure," [Matzpen (Marxist)] jumped onto this bandwagon.

Tailing after the leadership of this petty-bourgeois movement, it published the shameful leaflet entitled "Moti, Be Careful," in which it spread illusions

about the possible "progressive" character of the movement instead of struggling sharply against the protest movement leaders in order to bring potential militants into the revolutionary movement (which requires propagandizing the full revolutionary program). Why should any sane person join a group like Matzpen if he can be a member of a mass "progressive" movement?

The political line which guides this group [Matzpen (Marxist)], expressed in its action proposal for the June 5 demonstration [against the occupation of Arab territories], is cooperation with the liberal bourgeoisie (Moked, Ha Olamhaze) utilizing the argument of the "fascist danger." This line is, of course, the line of the "anti-fascist front," i.e., the popular front. The only reason why [Matzpen (Marxist)] does not already have support for or entry into a popular front on its record is the political situation in Israel and not its political line. It is a fact that it accepts the [Front Communiste Révolutionnaire] in France as a model, while the [FCR] supports the popular front of Mitterrand.

The Workers Alliance (Vanguard) is doing its part to spread pacifist illusions by publishing the leaflet "Let's Hear the Voice of the Youth for a Truly Just Peace Between Nations." This Stalinist formulation hides from the working class the fact that peace is possible only after the working class takes power. In the center of its propaganda is the organization of a reformist labor party and a democratic constituent assembly as the solution to national oppression, an approach which is nothing but open Menshevism implying the possibility of a bourgeois solution to the national question.

Lately, it has jumped into the swamp of "Arab revolution" theories, the horse whose tail it is grabbing being Habash (PFLP) in contrast to Matzpen (Marxist) which was tailing Hawatmeh [DPFLP]. These two "Trotskyist" groups together are ready to spread any kind of illusion, but not to raise the central issue of the unification of the working class against the state power. Behind the pacifist illusions that the left (from Rakah to Vanguard) is spreading hides the danger of a new war that no kind of halfway measures, no kind of class collaboration will be able to avoid. Only the united struggle of the Arab and Jewish working class under the leadership of a multi-national proletarian vanguard party, which will take power in all the Near Eastern countries and which will build a Near Eastern socialist federation as a part of a socialist world, can put an end to

continued on page 5



BLACK STAR

Palestinian refugee camp

parties—in which he can "squeeze" even more.)

By adhering to a perspective of coalitionism, the NDP effectively throws up an absolute barrier to adopting any policies opposed to the interests of its bourgeois Liberal allies.

But for Lewis and Co., coalition with the Liberals acts as a buffer, protecting the NDP brass from demands by the ranks to carry out policies in the interests of labor. To any serious demand for a class-struggle policy they would logically reply, "But that would be unacceptable to our coalition partners and would bring down the government." And they are right. It is for this reason that popular fronts, even though often accompanied by an upsurge in mass struggle, tie the workers to the class enemy and represent a barrier to the emancipation of the working class instead of a step forward. This is the tragic lesson of Chile.

Militants in the Canadian trade unions must take up the fight to pass motions in their locals demanding that the NDP repudiate its past practice of coalitionism as a condition for labor support in the elections. Only those NDP candidates who repudiate and promise to vote against the NDP-Liberal "corridor coalition" should be given labor support in the current election. While the NDP remains dependent upon the unions for both electoral and financial support, its practice of coalitionism undercuts the very principle of independent working-class political action.

LSA, RMG Call for Votes to New Democrats

Two ostensibly Trotskyist organizations in Canada, the League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière (LSA/LSO), sympathetic to the reformist Socialist Workers Party in the U.S., and the Revolutionary Marxist Group, sympathetic to the SWP's factional opponents within the "United Secretariat" (the European majority of Mandel and Frank), both urge a policy of "critical support" to the NDP in the elections.

At the same time, while neither of these two tendencies has in the past found it expedient to comment upon the NDP-Liberal bloc in their respective presses, both now denounce this coalition in a ritualistic manner. Hence, after sarcastically wondering why the NDP "was so proud to be the sole prop of the Liberals," the RMG hastens to add, "But one should not judge these gentlemen on the basis of past associations alone" (*Old Mole Election Special*, June 1974).

One can easily understand why the RMG would not want to judge the NDP "on the basis of past associations alone"—because if you judge from the New Democrats' actions in the last year and a half, then the RMG is in effect calling for votes for a new "corridor coalition" or worse! But where is the evidence that the NDP leadership has in any way changed its orientation and broken from the Liberals and coalitionism? There is none. Lewis' intentions to continue in this path are blatantly obvious from his campaign, which is based on his achievements in "squeezing" Trudeau for the last 18 months.

The LSA for its part is more graphic:

"In the federal parliament, the NDP caucus kept the Liberals in office for a year and a half. They supported increases in the price of oil; they called on railway workers to obey the government's strikebreaking law; they voted for legislation to maintain the army and police forces. They subordinated the independence of labor to 'making parliament work'—while even Lewis admits that big business, not parliament, rules Canada."

—*Labor Challenge*, 10 June 1974

But for the LSA this is simply a "mistake." Hence they have written a long article on "Why NDP Erred in Supporting Liberals."

Both the RMG and the LSA are running candidates in the current elections. What is striking is the similarity of the programs of these two factional opponents within the "United Secretariat," and the fact that these two affiliates of

the purportedly "democratic centralist" USec (the LSA is the official section, the RMG a sympathizing organization) have maintained an utter silence about each other's campaigns.

The RMG, of course, tries to project a "leftist" image. "For the Working Class There Are No Parliamentary Solutions!" bellows the *Old Mole Election Special*. But the electoral program of these international partisans of "armed struggle" turns out to be no more than a hodgepodge of militant trade-union demands spiced up with a few slogans lifted from the Transitional Program, capped by the RMG's vague "maximum program"—a "revolutionary transformation of Canadian society" and the need "to re-orient the labour movement towards socialist objectives: that is, the exercise of political power by the working class and the creation of a socialized, planned economy" (*Old Mole Election Special*, June 1974 [original emphasis]). To top it all off, the RMG issued an election disclaimer dissociating itself from the Stalinist varieties of "socialism" in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, while curiously "neglecting" to add that it stands for unconditional military defense of the deformed workers states in the face of imperialist attack. RMG candidate Bret Smiley justified this at a press conference, stating that defense of the USSR was not "posed" at this time and justified the disclaimer by pointing to Toronto's large East European population who would misunderstand the call for socialism. The most generous thing that can be said of this young man and his close supporters is that someday they will likely be prominent leaders in the NDP—à la Willy Brandt.

Amusingly enough, the RMG's ostensible rivals for the mantle of Pabloite revisionism in Canada, the LSA, managed to come up with an electoral program, which while not qualitatively different than that advanced by the RMG, was nonetheless in some aspects to the left of the RMG's. Thus, the RMG speaks vaguely of the need to "re-orient the labour movement towards socialist objectives," just like any self-respecting Sunday socialist of the Second International. For Lenin and Trotsky the demand for workers control was a slogan to mobilize the

workers for a struggle leading to the seizure of power. But for the RMG, workers control means only "No automation without full disclosure of the plans to the workers before implementation" and "Workers veto power over speed-up, changes in production technique and automation." The LSA, however, at least calls for nationalization of chemical, communications, food and transport industries under workers control.

Yet the political bankruptcy of the LSA is evident in its call to "Elect an NDP Government," when it is perfectly aware that the current leadership of the NDP is firmly committed to the policy of forming a coalition government with the bourgeoisie; is firmly committed to subordinating the independence of the labor movement to "making parliament work." The LSA call for an NDP government committed to socialist policies is not a call directed at exposing the NDP as an obstacle to the realization of the socialist revolution, but reflects the illusion of the LSA that the road to socialism lies precisely through an NDP government "committed to socialist policies." Indeed, the LSA reduces the Transitional Program to approximately the same watered-down formulae advanced by the RMG in the hope that they will prove acceptable to any "left-wing" members of the NDP and aid in pressuring a rotten right-wing social-democratic party to the left.

But in spite of the programmatic eclecticism and opportunist intent of both the RMG's and LSA's electoral campaigns and in spite of their advocacy of support to the NDP in the current elections (notwithstanding the NDP's policy of coalitionism with the Liberals), the SL urges a policy of highly critical support to the candidates of these formations in the current Canadian elections as they represent an attempt to present an alternative, wretched to be sure, to the explicit class collaboration of the NDP.

One thing at least, these fake-Trotskyist groups do demonstrate: the utterly unprincipled character of the Mandel-Hansen "United" Secretariat and the urgent necessity to construct an authentic Canadian Trotskyist organization, section of the reborn Fourth International. ■

Continued from page 12

...UAW Convention

Edith Fox to the convention, called for union reform and support for the Farm Workers. However, it also endorsed CLUW (Coalition of Labor Union Women), which is both highly bureaucratic (headed by former UAW vice president Olga Madar) and anti-Farm Worker (in order to appease the Teamsters). The Fox group called for "30 for 40" and a labor party in its convention election campaign, but dropped both of these demands in its campaign for local office, during which it joined forces with an incumbent financial secretary whom it had earlier criticized.

Phony Brotherhood Demonstration

A demonstration was called on the first day of the convention, ostensibly by the Brotherhood Caucus, which is currently in power at Fremont General Motors, and the UNC. This was strongly supported in a special "auto supplement" of the *Call*, paper of the Maoist October League. However, when they found that it was backed by "radicals," most of the UNC and Brotherhood leaders boycotted the demonstration. About 100 picketed.

According to the *Call*, one of the purposes of the demonstration was to raise the issue of layoffs. The *Call* supplement opposes Woodcock's demand for quotas on foreign imports, despite the fact that the Brotherhood leadership itself actively supports reactionary protectionist legislation!

This reflected a growing split in the Brotherhood. The elements supported

by the OL cling to the conception of the Brotherhood as a "people power" opposition, when in fact the latter is simply a bureaucratic clique which no longer has need of the hypocritical "left" image that got it elected. The Brotherhood played no active oppositional role on the convention floor.

The demonstration was more of a side show than a serious opposition because of its lack of any real programmatic alternatives. The organizers of the demonstration refused to allow supporters of the Spartacist League to join the line, giving no grounds other than hostility to the Spartacist League itself.

It was left to the CMUAW to provide meaningful programmatic alternatives. Members of the Committee picketed with signs calling for a union hiring hall to combat racial and sexual discrimination, for international working-class solidarity instead of import quotas and a workers party to fight for a workers government. The Committee also supported the demand for a break with the Histadrut, and called for victory to Arab and Israeli workers.

CP-Backed Caucus Votes for Woodcock

The Auto Workers Action Caucus, a newly-formed grouping backed by the Communist Party, demonstrated conclusively that it is not any kind of opposition but a servile pressure group. In opposing Woodcock's three-year term proposal, Caucus chairman Lasker Smith pointed out specifically that he opposed the proposal but not the leadership. In the elections for officers, both Smith and Norman Roth, President of Local 6 (Melrose Park, Illinois) and another AWAC leader, voted for the "Woodcock Team"! ■

Continued from page 3

Israeli Trotskyists...

the national oppression as well as break the bloody chain of reactionary wars.

The National Question and the Permanent Revolution

Despite the reactionary nature of the Israeli state, it is clear that there exists a group with a common culture, common political economy and territorial concentration which fulfill the Marxist criteria for a nation. Recognizing the right of self-determination for the Hebrew-speaking Jewish nation (not all the Jews in the world) is necessary to any democratic solution of the national question.

The Palestinian nation must not pay the price of the tragedy of fascism in Europe, just as the Hebrew-speaking nation must not pay the price of the Zionist crimes. Two nations with the same equal rights exist in the same geographical territory. Any denial of the equal rights of the two nations only aids the spread of the nationalist poison.

Socialists must call for a bi-national workers state as part of a multinational socialist federation of the Near East. But we cannot force this solution. The Arab and Jewish masses must be convinced that this is the correct answer. And although Leninists must argue that a solution of two separate workers states would be foolish and even reactionary, in the case that the masses choose a solution of two different workers states we would support this as well. It is clear that in such a situation the Jewish workers state would be smaller than the present Zionist Israeli state.

At the same time Jewish workers have a special responsibility, since their ruling class is responsible for the oppression of the Palestinian masses, to demonstrate solidarity with their Palestinian brothers through a political struggle against the reign of colonialism, racialism, religious nationalism and territorial expansion. Any kind of economist approach which avoids this struggle is the best help that socialists can give to the Zionists or Arab nationalism.

We must struggle against Arab nationalism to the same extent as against Zionist nationalism. As Leninists we understand that the nationalism of the Palestinians is a deformed expression of opposition against national oppression, but any kind of nationalism is reactionary because it hides the cutting line between the classes, between the oppressors and the oppressed. Any kind of support for Arab nationalism is simply supporting the oppression of the Arab masses by their rulers.

The conclusions of the theory of permanent revolution are completely clear in the Near East. There is no national solution under capitalism; a truly democratic solution for the national oppression, not only of the Palestinians but of the Kurds and the blacks in south Sudan, is possible only under a victorious proletarian revolution. The struggle against national oppression must lead to a revolutionary overthrow of capitalism. Any other approach, in the name of any kind of "tactics," is no more than a barrier to the revolutionary path of the international working class.

DOWN WITH REACTIONARY ZIONIST AND ARAB NATIONALISM!

FOR THE MULTI-NATIONAL BOLSHEVIK PARTY OF THE NEAR EAST!
FOR THE REBIRTH OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL!

FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION THROUGH THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION!

FOR THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION OF THE PALESTINIAN ARAB NATION AND THE JEWISH HEBREW-SPEAKING NATION!

FOR A BI-NATIONAL WORKERS STATE IN PALESTINE!

FOR A MULTI-NATIONAL SOCIALIST FEDERATION OF THE NEAR EAST!

18 May 1974

Vicious RU Attack on Union Militants

Maoists in a Muddle

Rumors are flying fast and thick among U.S. Maoists nowadays. Two years ago one group would accuse the other of "waving the Red Book against the Red Book." Now that the compiler (Lin Piao) of the good book has been unmasked as a secret agent of "Soviet fascist social imperialism" and a purveyor of Confucius Thought, the pages of the Maoist press, particularly the *Guardian* and *Revolution*, are filled with charges of "PL mentality" and of outright Trotskyism.

What is going on? It would be difficult for even an insider to figure out, since the Stalinist idea of political "discussion" consists of boundless innuendo and slander. Rather than political struggle to draw the line between revolutionary Marxism and various reformist and centrist fakers, the heirs of the liquidator of the Communist International prefer more "edifying" methods: denunciations of opponents as "cop agents" and physical violence against those who are out of step with the General Line.

Judging by public polemics and the statements of recent defectors from the Revolutionary Union (RU) in particular, the current vitriolics apparently center on three crucial issues: when and how to build the vanguard party, the Leninist position on black nationalism and the fundamental lines of communist work in the trade unions.

These are central questions for serious revolutionists. The fact that U.S. Maoists have been functioning for years without a serious discussion of them is an indication of their political bankruptcy and thoroughgoing opportunism. But this is not the heart of the matter. More revealing is a recent comment by the RU:

"...it must be stated frankly that at this point in the development of our movement, there is a certain amount of pessimism and demoralization.

"This seems to stem primarily from the fact that many of us have learned through experience that it is easier to read Marxism-Leninism than it is to apply it to developing the revolutionary movement....

"...Have all of us made many mistakes, some of them pretty serious? We certainly have. Have we been plagued by a tremendous amount of sectarianism in our ranks that has made unity a hard thing to achieve? We certainly have. Have we also been plagued by opportunism of all stripes that has succeeded somewhat in confusing some people and has also made unity hard to achieve? Yes, we have."

—*Revolution*, May 1974

The RU's Fake Left Turn

It is this demoralization which is driving several of the Maoist groups into a frenzy, producing a dizzying merry-go-round of changing political positions. Most affected has been the Revolutionary Union, which has suffered a recent split by most of its black members (reportedly in the direction of the Black Workers Congress). In the complex jockeying between the October League (OL), RU, BWC, Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization (PRRW), Communist League (CL) et al., Avakian & Co. are attempting to take up relatively left positions. For instance, recent issues of *Revolution* have published articles critical of the trade-union bureaucracy, against black nationalism and for the creation of a Leninist party now.

A couple of years ago Avakian would have denounced such positions as "Trotskyite" and "racist." Today the RU proclaims "it is essential to establish the vanguard Party as soon as possible" (*Revolution*, May 1974). But in 1970 it argued that "work to begin building the united front should not wait for the formation of a Communist Par-

ty" (*Red Papers* No. 2). In *Red Papers* No. 1, the Panthers were the vanguard; today "all nationalism is nationalism," and a bourgeois ideology besides.

What has happened to produce such reversals is that Avakian & Co. have been outflanked to the right by the Klonsky Family's October League. The RU's lack of success in worming itself into the labor bureaucracy is due only to its brainlessness at opportunist maneuvering. Its new "left" positions simply reflect the verbal militancy displayed by any out-bureaucrat until he latches on to a "piece of the action." Moreover, they have nothing to do with the RU's cravenly reformist practice. Thus the RU criticizes the OL for the latter's support to Arnold Miller, who is currently crushing mine workers' wildcats and enforcing gangster Tony Boyle's sellout contract. But at the time of the Mine Workers' elections in December 1972, the RU gave "critical support" to Miller!

Another example: the May issue of *Revolution* contains an article mildly critical of pro-Meany "UFW leaders" (who do you suppose they might be?). But last summer when it counted, the RU did exactly *nothing* to oppose Chavez' criminal liquidation of the farm workers' strikes. On several occasions it attempted to get SL supporters, who did criticize the UFW tops' defeatist policies, expelled from picket lines (see "Meany/Chavez Abandon Strike, Turn to Boycott," *WV* No. 30, 12 October 1973). The RU's "opposition" to the Meany/"UFW leaders" policy is just so much toilet paper!

The RU's "Support" for Workers Democracy

When the Revolutionary Union was itself undemocratically prevented from handing out a leaflet stating its position on the Equal Rights Amendment (it opposes the ERA) at a Chicago International Women's Day demonstration this March, it suddenly discovered that:

"...each participating organization in a coalition has the right to disagree with certain slogans, demands, etc. and to put forward these disagreements during the event itself, probably in the form of a leaflet, as long as it is done in a way that doesn't disrupt the overall unity of that event."

—*Revolution*, April 1974

However, lest anybody jump to the conclusion that these Stalinists had suddenly rediscovered Leninist principles of a united front ("unity of action, freedom of criticism"), a gang of RU goons recently assaulted five members of the Militant Action Caucus, an opposition group in the Communications Workers of America (CWA), after an RU-dominated rally for women's rights in San Francisco on June 1. These militants' "crime" was to have handed out a pro-ERA leaflet! A MAC leaflet later described this vicious assault:

"As we left the demonstration to return to the afternoon session of the CLUW [Coalition of Labor Union Women] conference, we were followed by about 20 or 30 people. There were only five of us. Hearing shouts from behind, we turned around. RU supporters and people from the Committee for Better Working Conditions viciously began tearing our literature out of our hands and shoving us down on the pavement. Serious injury was avoided *only* because a number of people from the demonstration saw what was happening and ran to defend us. A Stanford campus worker received minor injuries; two *Workers Vanguard* salesmen were hurt, one seriously. Vern Bown, a well-known speaker at RU sponsored rallies ... and a member of ILWU Local 6 bit off the ear lobe of one of our defenders. This savage mutilation gives an accurate idea of the savageness of the attack. The police arrived and attempted to arrest a black man who

had joined in the defense effort. Thus, the RU attack almost gave the cops another victim to subject to Operation Zebra-style harassment. After arguing with the cops for a few minutes we secured his release. At the afternoon session of the CLUW conference there was general horror at the assault, which some participants in CLUW had witnessed, and almost everyone at the afternoon session signed a petition protesting the attack.

"...CWA members know that we are not pacifists. Union members have a duty to defend themselves and their un-

porarily dropped its attempts at intimidation and slunk off with its tail between its legs (see "Fremont UAW Upholds Workers Democracy," *WV* No. 32, 9 November 1973).

Political Bankruptcy Leads to Gangsterism

The RU's "left" posturing and thug attacks are the expression of a frenzy growing out of its own internal turmoil. RU-brand Maoism can hardly be satisfying to any halfway serious revolutionary militant these days: support for "peaceful coexistence" with Nixon, the murderer of hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese; apologies for the "anti-imperialist" butchers in power in Ceylon and Pakistan; support for the Arab bourgeoisies who are now hobnobbing with Kissinger; occupying the Statue of Liberty for a few hours to demand, in effect, Nixon's replacement with the arch-conservative Ford; and fighting to retain the University of California Criminology School in Berkeley!

In the unions, having been rebuffed by the Chavez regime in the Farm Workers and the leaders of the Brotherhood Caucus at Fremont UAW, the RU now warns against giving support to "opportunists out of office." Yet it has no intention of organizing the necessary political struggle in order to replace the present hidebound reactionary union bureaucracy with a truly revolutionary leadership.

Its contradictions and political bankruptcy may lead the RU zigzagging from disaster to disaster along the path to oblivion, but its supporters would do well to avoid hastening its demise through inexcusable hoodlum attacks on its political opponents, which will not be tolerated by the workers movement. ■




Bob Avakian

ions against gangsterism, scabs, police attacks on picket lines, and against all forms of company attack and strike breaking. But inside the workers movement discussion, not physical violence, must be used to resolve disputed questions and make decisions...."

The Spartacist League calls on all tendencies in the workers movement to sharply condemn this thug attack against union militants. (The RU assault was denounced by the Socialist Workers Party in the June 21 *Militant*.) A good example of how united action can put a stop to such anti-labor hooliganism was given by Fremont, California, UAW members last year. During the summer and fall of 1973, supporters of the RU-backed newspaper *Bay Area Worker* repeatedly harassed and on several occasions attacked salesmen of *WV* and the Workers League's *Bulletin* outside the Fremont GM and Milpitas Ford auto plants. However, after the third such attack, the members of UAW Local 1364 (Fremont) voted overwhelming for a resolution affirming the right of all "labor-socialist" groups to sell and distribute literature at the plant. With its gangster-like behavior roundly condemned by the workers, the RU tem-

SUBSCRIBE!

\$1/4 issues



Available from:
SPARTACIST PUBLISHING CO.
Box 1377, GPO, New York, N.Y. 10001

Phone Workers and the '74 Contract

WEDNESDAY, June 26
8:00 p.m.
Wayne State University
UCB—Hillberry

Guest Speaker: KATHLEEN BURNHAM
CWA Local 9415
Oakland, California
Militant Action Caucus

DETROIT

Auspices: SPARTACIST LEAGUE
Phone: 921-4626

Hot-Cargo Military Goods to Chile! Labor Out of the AIFLD!

One way in which the Socialist Workers Party and Communist Party attempt to direct Chile protests exclusively toward winning over bourgeois public opinion is by refusing to raise anything beyond even the most minimal liberal demands. Immediately after the coup last September, the CP and various Chile Solidarity Committees which it leads focused their protests around calling for intervention by the United Nations and U.S. non-recognition of the junta. Aside from the utterly reformist perspective implied by such demands, they are patently absurd—relying on an imperialist den of thieves to discipline one of their number, and calling on Nixon to rebuff the military dictatorship he helped place in power!

The SWP, which claims to oppose popular fronts such as Allende's class-collaborationist UP coalition, never mentions this in its Chile defense activities. Instead, all Chile work is conveniently liquidated into a wholly owned subsidiary, the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners (USLA), which never raises anything more frightening than a call for cutting off aid to the junta. Going beyond the demand of freedom for all victims of the generals' repression, this slogan purports to be a means of combatting the Pinochet regime. However, it leaves unanswered the fundamental question of which class can put an end to such bonapartist dictatorships. The implicit perspective behind the demand for cutting off aid to the junta, when raised in the absence of any explicitly revolutionary slogans, is that of toppling the Chilean butchers by pressuring Nixon.

For Independent Working-Class Action

In contrast, the Spartacist League has raised the Marxist perspective of a *working-class* defense of the endangered Chilean militants. Thus, while uniting even with bourgeois liberals to demand the release of the junta's prisoners (among them high-ranking military officers), the SL also raises demands of "No Popular-Front Illusions," "For Workers Revolution in Chile" and "For a Trotskyist Party in Chile."

In its Chile defense work the SL has placed particular emphasis on the "far-left" prisoners and calls for "hot-cargoing" of all military supplies to Chile, as well as demanding that labor break from George Meany's CIA-backed "American Institute for Free Labor Development." The AIFLD has been active since 1962 in setting up anti-communist unions in Latin America with U.S. government and corporation money.

The purpose of such demands is not

to create the illusion that the Chilean junta can be overthrown by outside protests nor to engage in moralistic yet ineffective trade boycotts (such as the UN "embargo" of Rhodesia). Rather, we seek to realize concrete goals which would aid Chilean workers while emphasizing the need for independent working-class struggle as the only real alternative to Pinochet & Co.

The demand for labor action to prevent the delivery of military goods to the junta has been raised by Chilean workers themselves. In an appeal which was smuggled out of Santiago and published in the French CP newspaper *L'Humanité* (9 January 1974) underground militants call on their working-class brothers and sisters around the world: "The Chilean people calls on port workers to refuse to load arms and munitions to be used against their brothers, the workers of Chile" (see "No Arms for the Murderous Junta!").

In the U.S. the call for labor action against the reactionary junta was raised immediately after the coup by the Militant-Solidarity Caucus of the National Maritime Union. In a resolution printed in a supplement to the M-SC newspaper, the *Beacon*, this class-struggle union opposition group demanded:

"RESOLVED, that the NMU membership at this September N.Y. Port meeting go on record as supporting Chilean workers against the military junta, through such appropriate measures as economic and other assistance to Chilean workers' organizations and political refugees, and a boycott of Chilean ports."

—reprinted in *WV* No. 29,
28 September 1973

British Workers "Black" Arms to Chile

An indication of the powerful potential impact of efforts by militant unionists to undertake labor action against the junta is the recent partially successful agitation by left-wing British Labour Party and trade-union leaders to impose a "black ban" on military goods for Chile. In order to prevent a revolt by Labour backbenchers in Parliament (130 of whom had signed a petition calling for a total ban of arms exports), the government was forced to announce on March 27 the cancellation of economic aid, a ban on new arms contracts and a review of existing military contracts with Chile (*Manchester Guardian Weekly*, 6 April).

However, two weeks later Foreign Office Secretary James Callaghan announced the government would deliver four ships (two frigates and two submarines) which had been previously

ordered. Callaghan's excuse was the need to uphold contractual obligations in order not to jeopardize orders for military equipment from other Latin American countries (Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela have current orders totalling \$485 million), the loss of \$121 million due for the Chilean ships and the fact that the Chilean order had been placed some years ago (*Le Monde*, 12 and 17 April).

This decision was protested by a leading Labour left winger, Minister of Industry Eric Heffer. Even more important was the action undertaken by shop stewards of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers (AUEW) at the Rolls Royce plant in East Kilbride, Lanarkshire. After the recent elections the Rolls Royce workers had sent telegrams to AUEW headquarters and the Labour Party demanding that they implement Labour's call for an arms embargo (issued when it was in opposition last fall). Then, shortly after the March 27 announcement, Rolls Royce stewards announced a black ban on any work on eight Hawker Hunter aircraft engines which had been sent by the Chilean military for overhauling (*Militant* [London], 10 May; *Workers Press*, 15 May).

Under pressure from a militant rank and file, AUEW president Hugh Scanlon was forced to back up this initiative; the union's national council passed an emergency resolution requesting that all work on arms and military equipment for Chile be ended. The order was implemented by workers at one Clydeside shipyard who immediately stopped work on the two frigates. At that point the British Defense Ministry hired scab labor to finish the job and one of the ships was turned over to the Chilean ambassador on May 25, in a ceremony marked by strict security measures. (AUEW members at another yard, however, voted not to stop work on the submarines, concerned that they might face unemployment as a result.)

SL Initiates Picketing of Chilean Ships

In the U.S. there has to date been no significant union action against the Chilean junta. However, outraged by the murder of six longshore labor leaders by Pinochet's butchers, the San Francisco dockers local of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) passed a resolution last November calling for a boycott of Chilean shipping:

"Local # 10 goes on record to boycott all goods and cargo to and from Chile until such a time that the junta or government in Chile restores full rights to the trade unions, their membership and leaders and until the junta permits

Appeal from Chilean Workers:

"No Arms for the Murderous Junta!"

The Chilean people, its women, its youth, its children, call on the workers and democrats of the entire world to prevent industrialists and governments from delivering arms and munitions to the criminals.

The Chilean people calls on port workers to refuse to load arms and munitions to be used against their brothers, the workers of Chile. The generals have assassinated the labor leaders of the port of San Antonio: Nestor Rojo, Samuel Munez, Armando Jimenez, Guillermo Alvarez. Other dock workers were shot in Antofagasta and Iquique.

In the name of the 100,000 shot in the greatest premeditated genocide in Latin American history, the Chilean people calls on workers and democrats of the entire world to repudiate the usurping junta and to vigorously condemn its crimes.

No arms to Chile! Not one single bullet for the assassin generals! Not one single tank, not one single helicopter. No arms of any type for the fascist tyrants, murderers of the Chilean people!


We must prevent the blood of the Chilean people from being further spilled by the dictatorship!

—reprinted in *Política Obrera*,
2 February 1974

a delegation of trade unionists from the U.S. to visit Chile and determine for themselves the status of the unions and their members in Chile. We refer this matter to the International and the Coast Committee with a strong recommendation for positive action."

The Bridges leadership and CP supporters in the union have ignored the Local 10 resolution, effectively turning it into a dead letter. Yet it is their own comrades and co-thinkers who are being murdered in Chile. Six dockers' union leaders are shot in Chile; CP head Corvalán is brought to "trial" in Santiago—and CP supporters in the ILWU do nothing! The defeatist and counterrevolutionary character of Stalinism could not be clearer.

The SL gives critical support to the ILWU Local 10 resolution and calls for its enforcement. A total embargo of trade with Chile was a correct and necessary step in the immediate aftermath of the coup. Today, however, it cannot substantially aid efforts to overthrow the junta. A more selective boycott halting all military supplies bound for Chile could be imposed with considerable impact. But even if the Local's call for a total trade boycott could now be interpreted in a moralistic or utopian manner, its implementation would certainly be an important demonstration of international proletarian solidarity.



CWA's Militant Action Caucus and Militant-Solidarity Caucus of NMU call for labor action against Chilean junta.

Clothing Workers' Strike Wins Nothing

The recent eight-day strike by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers against the Clothing Manufacturers' Association (producers of men's and boys' suits, sport jackets and topcoats) is the union's first industry-wide strike in over fifty years, as well as the U.S.' largest strike (involving roughly 150,000 workers) in many months. The Amalgamated strike represents in a concentrated form all the pressures now besetting American workers—conditions of runaway inflation and recession; the special oppression of black, Spanish-speaking and women workers; increasing industrial imports; and an entrenched, conservative bureaucracy confronting an economically desperate membership.

For the clothing workers this unprecedented strike was an attempt to reverse more than half a decade of falling real wages. But for the Amalgamated leadership the action was a device now commonly employed by bureaucrats feeling pressure from below: a quickie walkout to cut the edge of rank-and-file militancy, and then a settlement for minimal gains that could have been negotiated with no strike at all. (The spring 1973 Rubber Workers' strike is a similar case.)

The originally stated bargaining goals were \$1.10 per hour, spread over three years, plus a cost-of-living escalator clause. If this had been won, clothing workers would have partly recovered the wage cuts suffered through the last two contracts. As it turned out, the strike settlement was for \$1.00 (roughly 9 percent a year, or less than the current rate of inflation) with a cost-of-living adjustment only in the third year and with a maximum of 10 cents. At best this pact freezes clothing workers' wages well below what they were making a decade ago; more likely, however, is that their wages will continue to fall as inflation out-races the money increases.

Poverty-Level Wages

The women sewing-machine operators in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers (ACW) and International Ladies Garment Workers (ILGWU) are the poorest section of unionized industrial labor. Largely black and Spanish-

speaking, many of these women are the sole support of large families and probably earn less than the official government poverty standards. Situated in a relatively competitive industry, facing increasing imports and with many non-union shops, apparel manufacturers are committed to poverty-level wages.

Fearing that a wage offensive would drive its organized shops either out of business or out of the union contract, the Amalgamated bureaucracy has for many decades accepted near-sweatshop-level wages. The apparel trades are, in fact, the home town of the sweetheart contract. (ACW leaders pioneered binding arbitration in the 1920's.) Never having faced a serious internal opposition, the union's leadership from Hillman to Finley has not even pretended to try to maximize its members' incomes.

Rather its goal has been to maintain a high enough rate of exploitation—and, therefore, low enough wages—to ensure "healthy" industry profits. This is common knowledge in the labor movement. As a *New York Times* (6 June) editorial on the strike commented:

"...the average of \$3.50 an hour in the clothing industry is far below those in steel, autos and most other manufacturing industries, a reflection in part of the Amalgamated's recognition that the competitive position of companies operating under union contract, and therefore the security of their workers' jobs, would be jeopardized if wages ran too far ahead of non-union shops."

(The *Times* is wrong to attribute the ACW "restraint" in wages bargaining in the tailored clothing contracts to non-union competition. This particular industry, unlike other segments of apparel production, is 95 percent union-shop.)

The clothing workers have never had a cost-of-living escalator in their contracts. During the 1950's and early 1960's, small wage increases kept slightly ahead of inflation while leaving clothing workers at the bottom of the industrial working class. However, when the Vietnam war inflation began in 1967 real wages began to plummet. The 1971 contract, which continued this pattern, produced the first major crisis



Picketing workers in N.Y. during recent ACWA nationwide strike.

DAILY WORLD

for the union leadership since the early 1930's.

Philadelphia 1971: The Dam Cracks

The 1970-71 recession hit the men's tailored clothing industry fairly hard. Trying to offset bad business conditions, the Amalgamated leadership of Potofsky and Rosenblum negotiated a contract that was a new low even by their abysmal standards. There was to be a 60-cent wage increase over three years, all of six cents more than the wage gain in the 1968 contract. In return for this munificent sum the union gave up all control over automation, allowing a major cutback in the employment of cutters.

This time the ranks exploded. A major wildcat began in the smaller cities of eastern Pennsylvania. Busloads, mainly composed of cutters, spread the strike to Philadelphia, the second largest center of the industry. Many, if not most, of Philadelphia's men's suit factories were shut down. As many as 2,500 enraged clothing workers picketed the local Amalgamated headquarters for more than a week. Forced to call a special meeting, Anthony Cortigene (head of the Philadelphia local) was well protected by goons as he attempted to convince the angry membership that it was a good contract given the economic conditions. Nevertheless, he was shouted off the platform.

In the absence of a strong organized opposition, the strike petered out after a week. The June 1971 walkout changed

the attitudes of the more union-conscious Amalgamated members, yet did not and could not pose an immediate threat to the entrenched International machine. Nonetheless, for one tense week a union leadership which has always been more concerned about satisfying the Hart, Schaffner and Marx stockholders than its own members was forced to regard the face of class hatred.


The Bureaucracy Against Black and Spanish-Speaking Women

The American labor bureaucracy is divided from its base not only in terms of interest, but increasingly in terms of social composition as well. The Internationals' leaderships consist of older white males (the average age of the AFL-CIO Executive Board is roughly that of a World War I veterans association) facing a membership that is distinctly younger and with a much higher percentage of minorities and women.

This social isolation of the bureaucracy from the ranks is particularly pronounced in the Amalgamated. Whereas most union bureaucracies originated in the 1930's, the ACW leadership—Hillman who died in 1946, Potofsky and Rosenblum who retired within the past two years—came out of a strike in 1910! The Amalgamated bureaucracy is so divorced from the ranks that the current leaders, Murray Finley and Jacob Sheinkman, were never clothing workers but rather labor lawyers who chose careers as union functionaries. The top echelons of the union are largely Jewish, reflecting the early ethnic composition of the industry, while local leaders in the main East Coast centers tend to be Italian.

The membership is itself sharply divided between the skilled male cutters, who are Italian and to a lesser extent Jewish, and the black and Spanish-speaking female sewing machine operators. The cutters are the most union-conscious; it was they who provided the backbone of the 1971 wildcat. However, the cutters have generally supported the old Hillman-Potofsky regime, partly out of traditional loyalty and partly for reasons of ethnic solidarity.

The apparel trades have the single largest concentration of black and Spanish-speaking unionized women workers in the U.S. and are, therefore, a focus of the relationship between this most oppressed layer of the proletariat and the labor bureaucracy. The poverty-level wages and extreme class collaboration of the Amalgamated are solidly rooted in racial and sexual oppression. This oppression is reflected in the political and cultural backwardness of the sewing machine operators, who have to date been unable to generate from within their own ranks any significant opposition to or even pressure groups on the bureaucracy. In turn, the more union-conscious, militant cutters have not appealed to these minority women workers or seen their potential as an enormous reser-



DAILY WORLD

New York clothing workers picket Amalgamated headquarters in Union Square in 1971 to protest sell-out contract.

voir of combativeness against the worst kind of business unionism.

Finley and Sheinkman have used the strike to project an image of a renovated militant leadership. Actually, the fact that there are new top officers for the 1974 contract negotiations is essentially an accident of biology (Potofsky and Rosenblum couldn't arrest their own aging), although the 1971 rebellion may have helped push the old boys out. Finley (former head of the Chicago local) and Sheinkman (ex-chief counsel of the union) are the long-time lieutenants and hand-picked successors of the ancient Amalgamated regime.

In fact, both played a major role in negotiating the 1971 contract. Nevertheless, Finley/Sheinkman have to be more sensitive to rank-and-file sentiment than Potofsky/Rosenblum, who probably thought they owned the Amalgamated and that its membership worked for them. While the previous leadership would have negotiated the same terms in 1974 without a strike, Finley/Sheinkman let the militants hit the bricks for a few days to blow off steam before selling them out.

Falling Production and Conglomerate Takeovers

Like the 1971 sellout contract, the recent equally wretched strike settlement has been justified by the bureaucracy on the grounds of poor economic conditions in the men's tailored clothing industry. With falling real wages, the result of sky-rocketing prices in necessities like food and fuel, there is naturally less demand for semi-luxuries like men's suits. According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census (*Current Industrial Reports*, Series M23B), suit production dropped from 18.5 million in 1972 to 16.8 million in 1973. With declining production in a relatively competitive industry, profits likewise fell. Dun and Bradstreet reported that in 1973 the men's clothing industry operated, on the average, at a loss (*New York Times*, 5 June).

Faced with impending bankruptcy, many of the older manufacturers of men's suits have sold out to conglomerates. During the past several years major suit manufacturers who have folded include Joseph H. Cohen, which was taken over by Rapid American; J. Schoeneman, taken over by Cluett; and Peabody and Joseph & Feiss, bought out by Phillips-Van Heusen. Each of these acquiring firms is among the top 500 U.S. corporations in manufacturing or retailing. Thus the firms manufacturing men's tailored clothing definitely do have the financial resources to grant large wage increases from their more profitable (often non-union) operations.

However, the conglomerates offer enormous resistance to such wage increases and have the material means to do so. They can take a long strike affecting only a fraction of their total production and are readily willing to close down an unprofitable or merely inadequately profitable line of business. Thus the entire trend of the apparel industry, particularly men's tailored clothing, is to weaken the bargaining power of the unions.

Import Competition and "Yellow Peril" Chauvinism

During the past fifteen years the U.S. apparel industry has faced major import competition from the Far East. Domestic production of men's suits peaked at 21.2 million in 1969 and has fallen sharply since then, while suit imports have increased steadily. Consequently, the major political activity of the ACW and ILGWU over the past decade and a half has been to lobby for quotas on clothing imports. By collaborating with the reactionary non-union Southern textile magnates, the apparel trades were able to pressure the Kennedy administration into imposing a quota on cotton goods.

However, the effect of this legislation has been largely dissipated by the increasing use of synthetic fibres. Since the passage of the cotton goods

quota, the Amalgamated's protectionist lobbying has been singularly unsuccessful. Up to now the American ruling class has not been willing to damage its Far Eastern client states, like South Korea and Taiwan, or to worsen its relations with Japan for the sake of a marginal section of U.S. capitalism. (Protection from import competition for key U.S. industries like steel and auto is quite a different priority.)

Having failed thus far to expand import quotas through lobbying, the Amalgamated and ILGWU bureaucracies have carried out major "Buy American" campaigns appealing to the worst kind of "yellow peril" racism. For example, the Amalgamated frequently pickets stores selling Far Eastern suits, claiming they are produced under "unsanitary" conditions.

Japanese apparel unions have repeatedly appealed to their American counterparts to negotiate a common stand on international trade. The Amalgamated has turned down all such appeals out-of-hand, thus encouraging the Japanese unions to look to their own capitalist class for "protection." United with the strong Japanese labor movement, there is a solid basis for an international clothing workers union which could significantly raise the wages of workers throughout the Far East. The Amalgamated bureaucracy, however, rejected the policy of international class solidarity, relying instead on political collaboration with the clothing and textile companies and on chauvinist demagoguery.

Nationalize the Clothing Industry Under Workers Control!

An essential difference between revolutionary socialists and both the present reactionary union bureaucracy and many of the reformist fake militants who seek to join it is that the latter believe the present system can produce limitless wealth and allow ever-increasing benefits for the working masses. In reality, the economics of capitalism in its period of imperialist decline mean that trade-union struggles, however militant, cannot in the long run prevent falling wages or unemployment.

The structure of the U.S. clothing industry, its international noncompetitiveness and the increasing dominance of conglomerate ownership make it virtually impossible to reverse the low-wage system and attain more normal industrial wage levels through purely union activity. When a group of capitalists claims that anything above poverty-level wages will drive them out of business, the labor movement must have but one response—nationalize that industry, without compensation, under workers control!

There is another important reason why we call for nationalizing the U.S. clothing industry: in contrast to the national chauvinist bureaucracy, a class-struggle union leadership must energetically oppose import protectionism and call for an international clothing workers union. Demanding import quotas effectively allies the labor movement with its own capitalist class and against the working people of other countries, ultimately leading to wars over markets and spheres of exploitation. But the economic benefits of free trade must not come at the expense of American workers. Only by nationalizing the clothing industry under workers control will it be possible to answer the legitimate fears of U.S. clothing workers that free trade will result in massive unemployment for them.

Thus in every respect a program for victory, even in a single strike such as the clothing workers' recent walkout, requires a perspective of taking the struggle beyond the narrow limits of capitalism. Only by creating a society in which the interests of the international working class are dominant, not the profits of a handful of greedy parasites, can the needs of those who produce the wealth of society be met. ■

Continued from page 7

...Chile

In February the Spartacist League set up a picket line in front of a Chile-bound ship at the San Francisco docks. Sympathetic ILWU longshoremen halted work on the ship until a business agent arrived on the scene and ordered them back. More recently, the SL initiated a united-front committee which organized a picket of the Lykes Brothers ship *Gulf Trader* as it was loading cargo for Chile in New Orleans on May 23. A rank-and-file leader of International Longshoremen's Association Local 1419, Irvin Joseph, was one of the first endorsers of the demonstration. However, Joseph is also seeking election as president of the Local. Soon after a committee leaflet appeared listing the endorsers (among them several local labor leaders), Joseph began to talk of disavowing his signature. The reason: the leaflet mentioned the "head of the Chilean Communist Party" as one of the prisoners being held by the junta.

Militant Action Caucus Protests CIA-Backed AIFLD

A second demand which can serve to focus labor protest against the Chile coup is to call on U.S. unions to break from the "American Institute for Free Labor Development." The AIFLD, headed by AFL-CIO chief George Meany, has been one of the main conduits for funneling CIA money into Latin America. Although ostensibly a labor "leadership-training" organization, its board of directors includes representatives of 22 corporations, including ITT, Grace Line, Kennecott and Anaconda Copper and the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Since the election of Allende in 1970, Chile has been an important focus of the AIFLD. Not the unions, however, but the "professional associations" (*gremios*, or guilds) drew the attention of the U.S. government-financed "labor institute." One of these, the "Confederation of Chilean Professionals" (CUPROCH), supported the truck owners' and merchants' work stoppage in October 1972 and again in August of last year. CUPROCH may well have been the conduit through which thousands of CIA dollars were funneled into Chile in mid-1973 in order to support the truckers' "strike" which helped set the stage for the military coup. Since the coup the U.S. has sought to aid the generals by setting up a pro-junta "Chilean National Workers Confederation"; both its president and vice president are former AIFLD graduates.

A class-struggle opposition group in the Communication Workers of America, the Militant Action Caucus of Oakland, California, Local 9415, has sought to publicize the pernicious role of the CIA-backed union-busting AIFLD. A MAC leaflet (14 May) points out that CWA president Beirne "was the brains behind the idea of AIFLD and its treasurer." The Caucus introduced a resolution calling on the CWA to withdraw its support from and participation in the Meany/Beirne/Rockefeller/CIA "labor institute" at the April

meeting of Local 9415 but it was narrowly defeated. The resolution will also be brought to the CWA convention in Kansas City this month.

For a Class-Struggle Opposition in the Unions

As shown by the examples of the ILWU leadership's refusal to implement the Chile resolution of Local 10, New Orleans ILAer Joseph's maneuvers to avoid being tainted with "communism" and CWA-head Beirne's participation in the AIFLD, the struggle for labor action against the Chilean military dictators must be linked to a struggle against the sellout union bureaucrats (and aspiring bureaucrats) at home who consistently sabotage the struggle and promote the treacherous policies of class collaboration.

The MAC in the Communication Workers and the M-SC in the National Maritime Union are examples of the kind of class-struggle opposition groups which must be built. Instead of merely banding together all disgruntled elements in a lowest-common-denominator "opposition" or "rank-and-file" caucus, these groups base themselves on a program whose demands seek to generalize the struggle for a new leadership in the trade unions into a general working-class offensive against the capitalist system. Fighting to obtain the release of Chilean union militants from the junta's jails and for independent labor action by U.S. unions to support this demand is an integral part of the emancipation of labor. We call on all serious union militants to take up this necessary struggle. Hot-Cargo All Military Supplies to Chile! Labor Out of the AIFLD! ■

SL/RCY Public Offices

BAY AREA

Wednesday }
and } 1:00-6:00 p.m.
Thursday }
Saturday } 2:30-6:00 p.m.

330-40th Street
(near Broadway)
Oakland, California
Phone 653-4668

NEW YORK

Monday }
through } 3:00-7:30 p.m.
Friday }
Saturday } 1:00-4:00 p.m.

260 West Broadway
Room 522
New York, New York
Phone 925-5665

REVOLUTIONARY LITERATURE

WORKERS VANGUARD

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

includes SPARTACIST Enclosed is \$5 for 24 issues
 Enclosed is \$1 for 6 introductory issues

order from/pay to: Spartacist Publishing Co./Box 1377, GPO/NY, NY 10001

Portugal...

content into a direct contest for state power.

Communist Party Fronts for Spínola

Most responsible for the failure of the development of a revolutionary situation was the treachery of the Portuguese Communist Party. The PCP has gone a step further than its counterparts in other capitalist countries in its never-ending search for alliances with "progressives" to prop up a policy of "peaceful coexistence." In Portugal, the CP simply *pretends* that it has found a liberal to ally with—the "anti-fascist" General António de Spínola, volunteer in Franco's armies during the Spanish Civil War and author of "pacification" practices in the Portuguese colonies which involve total annihilation of the population of zones under rebel control.

When Spínola formed his provisional government to serve as a public relations front for the "Military Junta of National Salvation," he included Alvaro Cunhal, head of the PCP, as minister without portfolio and CP union leader Pacheco Gonçalves as labor minister. The inclusion of the PCP in the popular-front phantom "provisional government" was a carefully calculated maneuver on the part of the bourgeoisie: the Communists were the only working-class party which maintained any semblance of continuity during the long decades of repression. From its vantage point of influence among the working masses, the PCP would lend credence to the new government and could be used as a means of containing the workers. As labor minister, Gonçalves' job would be to persuade the workers to abandon strikes. And during the recent strike wave he carried out this job most faithfully.

Stalinists Say No to Strikes

The PCP newspaper *Avante!* of 31 May ran an editorial condemning the strikes as adventurist acts of saboteurs (the left), directed not against the employers but against the government, hindering the process of democratic development!

"The strikes of the Lisbon transit workers, the bakers, the CTT and others together with management and alarmist rumors aimed at disorganizing the transportation and public supplies, fuel supplies and other pivotal sectors of the national economy, allow us to detect and bring to the light of day who is interested in sabotaging the normal development of our democratic process, who wants to create a climate of panic, of tension and crisis and who tries to create artificial focuses of popular discontent and thus undermine the political front formed in the wake of April 25."

(Cunhal later said that it was actually the *monopolies* who "tried to provoke a strike movement whose consequences were directed against the government" [*Diário de Notícias*, 8 June].)

On June 1 the Intersindical—Communist controlled labor federation—organized a mass demonstration in Lisbon to repudiate strikes. The demonstration drew about 10,000 and, needless to say, PCP banners proclaiming "não a greve pela greve" ("No to Striking for the Sake of Striking") and "For



Sign says, "Timex Strikes the Hour of Freedom."

an Offensive Against the Provocateurs and Reactionaries" were ubiquitous. The crowd chanted "Vigilance of the Working Class!", "Down With the Reaction!" and "Out With the Provocateurs!"

At the end of the march CP Labor Minister Gonçalves addressed the crowd. He denounced the "confusion and maneuverings of the forces of 'reaction'," called for a line of "realistic" trade-union action and warned against the "opportunism" and "adventurism" which lead to a "division of democratic forces." He said that "we cannot forget that our economic heritage left by the fascists is heavy" and therefore "we need, above all, to use responsibly and continually our political rights."

Workers Defy Provisional Government

Although the PCP was successful in herding most of the striking workers back to work and the general euphoria of the first weeks following the coup has died down, the situation here is nowhere near "back to normal." The Portuguese people, forbidden to openly express political opinions for a period of fifty years, continue to discuss politics with high intensity. Socialism is now a word on everyone's lips and each day at least one of the numerous bourgeois dailies carries a debate on the question of socialism for Portugal. A new exposure of members of the PIDE (Salazar's hated political police), tacked up on the central post office wall, was surrounded by a changing crowd for an entire day. As an anti-colonial demonstration marched into Rossio Square, scores of spectators immediately appeared to listen attentively and shout their support.

While the Intersindical back-to-work demonstration, played up in the newspapers, drew a crowd of 10,000, it was actually much smaller than expected. A demonstration around the demand "Immediate and Total Independence for the Colonies," initiated two weeks earlier by groups to the left of the Communists, drew a crowd of equal size.

Striking workers from a number of

factories—Timex, auto, chemical, Olivetti, electricity and railway among others—continued their plant occupations beyond May 31, in defiance of the CP's pleas for patience and assertions that the Portuguese economy could not withstand their demands. A militant from the Timex plant which was occupied for over three weeks, told *Workers Vanguard* that the strike weapon was a right which had to be defended at all costs and that Timex workers were not willing to return to work before their demands had even been discussed!

Working-class demonstrations continue; there are two or three in front of the Ministry of Labor every day, while CP Labor Minister Gonçalves hides behind the curtains of his office, later to meet with representatives of the demonstrators and negotiate away their demands. In a demonstration centering around the demand for higher wages, workers from the J.J. Gonçalves auto plant chanted "fascista" and "bandito" outside Minister Pacheco Gonçalves' office, hardly an expression of confidence in this supposed representative of the working class! Another day workers from the Timex factory demonstrated under banners proclaiming "Down With Capitalism" and "The Timex Clock Strikes the Hour of Freedom."

While the government has established a minimum salary of 3,300 escudos (\$135) per month, claiming this is the most the poor economy can withstand, it recently awarded pay raises to members of the armed forces whose salaries were already two times that of an industrial worker and three times that of an agricultural laborer!

Junta Moves Toward Crackdown

On June 1 Spínola told *O Seculo* that with the establishment of the State Council "the political structure which will orient the country toward a new Constitution was completed." The Council will be a "fundamental organ of Portuguese democracy" with the functions of "equilibrium, security and modernization." Therefore ends the "phase of military pronouncements and the return to a legitimate climate of institutions."

Despite these hollow, demagogic references to "normalcy" and "democracy," Portugal continues to be wracked by tensions and the government is acutely aware of this fact. One young army officer told *Workers Vanguard* that there is dissension within the armed forces and opposition to Spínola's policies regarding the colonies. Reportedly, at a military unit in Tancos a meeting of more than 100 soldiers passed a resolution declaring that the colonial liberation war was a just struggle and asserting that they



General Spínola in Guinea-Bissau.

would refuse to embark for the colonies, whatever the pretext.

Despite the frantic pace of his endless meetings with foreign diplomats (including the ambassador from Chile's reactionary military junta) and leading capitalists who have paraded through his office to welcome the new regime, Spínola has found it necessary to go on national tour to consolidate regional military detachments and warn the Portuguese people of "the forces of anarchy." His line is completely indistinguishable from that of the CP (which is to say that the Stalinists' line is indistinguishable from that of the generals): Portuguese workers must be "realistic" in their demands. In a visit to Tomar he told a large crowd that:

"The emotional climate of the first moments is past, the time has arrived for a collective coming to their senses by the Portuguese people, who ... must coldly reflect on the economic reality of the country in which we live, under pain of heading toward a crisis of unemployment with its dramatic train of privation and misery. ... I am convinced that the Portuguese people will choose the sure path, repudiating the empty words of the false heralds of liberty."

Many people here already believe that the voices of the "false heralds of liberty" will not be tolerated even as long as three more weeks. Indeed, with the strike wave behind him and the servility of the Communist Party proven in action, Spínola has already begun his crackdown on the left. A demonstration of some 1,000 outside the Estrela Military Hospital to demand the release of Pedro Peralta, a Cuban army captain captured in Guinea while aiding the PAIGC rebels, was dispersed with tear gas and the clubs of mounted policemen.

Then on June 7 Saldanha Sanchez, the editor of *Luta Popular*, newspaper of the Maoist "Reorganized Movement of the Proletarian Party" (MRPP) was arrested in the middle of the night at his home. The particular excuse given for his arrest was that *Luta Popular* had reprinted a communiqué of the "Popular Anticolonial Resistance" which called for "desertion in mass and with arms [by] members of the Armed Forces mobilized for Africa" (*O Seculo*, 8 June). While the release of Sanchez is of crucial importance to the entire left and is an obvious point of unity, the sectarian MRPP refuses on principle support from any other organization.

The Communist Party, for its part, is showing signs of trepidation about its exposed position as a left cover for a government which has already begun to demonstrate that it is violently opposed to working-class interests. Thus the editorial of *Avante!* (7 June) moved slightly from a position of wholeheart-

A Trotskyist Perspective on:

The Portuguese Coup and Africa

NEW BEDFORD/FALL RIVER:
Southeastern Mass. University
SMU Administration Building
Room 233

THURSDAY, JUNE 20 12 noon

Speaker: JAN NORDEN
Editor, *Workers Vanguard*

BOSTON:
Boston University
Terrace Lounge
George Sherman Union

FRIDAY, JUNE 21 7:30 p.m.

edly lauding the military "Junta of National Salvation" and stated:

"In Portugal some essential liberties exist. But a democratic regime does not yet exist. The situation is transitional. A platform exists—the program of the Movement of the Armed Forces victorious on 25 April—for the solution of emergency problems, for the liquidation of fascism and the preparation of free elections. But the solution of the great national problems is outside the circuit and possibilities of the actual alliance of government forces."

The conclusion, however, is still the same:

"In the actual conditions, we put before the Portuguese people a clear alternative: consolidate the freedoms, follow the democratic process to the realization of the elections of the Constitutional Assembly, or the victory of 25 April will be endangered, and we will have a new dictatorship, eventually even more violent."

Independence for the Colonies!

At this moment, the Spínola government is feeling the most pressure from the situation in its African colonies. Negotiations with both the PAIGC (Guinea-Bissau) and FRELIMO (Mozambique) broke down over the fundamental issue of independence. The rebels are so far holding out for complete independence while Spínola refuses to grant it. As Samora Machel, president of FRELIMO put it, "Independence is not negotiable. What can realistically be negotiated are the means to reach independence" (*O Primeiro de Janeiro*, 4 June). At home, Spínola faces pressures within the government and the military for a speedy end to the colonial war which consumes 50 percent of the state budget.

In recent days Socialist Party leaders have declared that they would leave the government if the negotiations failed. But failure to these "socialists" doesn't mean failure to grant immediate independence, but simply failure to get rid of a costly and unpopular war. SP Foreign Minister Mario Soares, the government's "ambassador to the colonies," stated:

"We are disposed to concede independence, but we have compatriots in these territories, we have legitimate interests there. No one can hope that a responsible government [would] abandon 500,000 of our people in Angola and 200,000 in Mozambique without satisfactory guarantees. We ask other African countries [Rhodesia and South Africa] that they help us protect our compatriots and our legitimate interests."

—*Diario de Lisboa*, 1 June

A military defeat in Africa and the loss of Portugal's "legitimate interests" would be a large blow to the Spínola government. The Portuguese economy depends heavily on invest-



WV PHOTO

ments in and privileged trade relations with its colonies, without which it would have to depend solely on a tiny and poorly developed territory. The agitation of various Portuguese "far left" groups around the slogan "Immediate and Total Independence for the Colonies" corresponds to a key task for the Portuguese working class. However, support for independence does not imply political support for the African "liberation movements" as the vehicle for lifting the oppression of the colonial masses.

The Maoist MRPP, as well as most other groups to the left of the CP/SP, support these movements unconditionally. The supposed Trotskyists of the International Communist League (LCI—a pro-Mandel sympathizing organization of the "United" Secretariat) claim to criticize them because "they have no real program" and "make only vague references to socialism." Yet this is certainly not evident at their public demonstrations where the LCI marches under the slogan, "Viva PAIGC, MPLA, FRELIMO." The only road to liberation for the colonial masses is through the building of a vanguard workers party which, leading the peasantry and in close coordination with the workers movement in South Africa and Portugal, carries out a socialist revolution. Communists must place no confidence in the petty-bourgeois nationalists who, what-



WORKERS PRESS

Top: Workers of Gonçalves auto factory demonstrate outside labor ministry. Sign in center reads: "Attention! Careful! Bosses Like Ours Foment Fascism." Bottom: Workers at Lisnave shipyard near Lisbon during plant occupation in May.

ever their "vague references to socialism," simply want to set up their own capitalist states.

The Portuguese Left

In Portugal, some say that the government has "a big eye." On one side it has the PCP to watch the workers and on the other the SP to watch Europe and the colonies. The Portuguese Communist Party is repeating once again the same role Stalinism has played over and over again for the last fifty years. Under the guise of a "united front against fascism" or "popular front" it sought to maintain a "unity of democratic forces" (i.e., with the "progressive" generals and capitalists) and to block the advance of the working class, while branding the left as "saboteurs" and "agents of counterrevolution." It was this same policy that paved the way for the Vichy government in France and Franco's victory in Spain.

The PCP was permitted to assume such a role through lack of a clear revolutionary alternative, with the rest of the left in disarray. Instead of simply labeling the PCP an "agent of capitalism" as does most of the Portuguese "far left," socialists must call on the Communists to take power in their own name. Without the military to hide behind, the CP will stand exposed before the working class and it will be possible to break its stranglehold on the masses.

The Maoist MRPP, the largest organized force to the left of the CP/SP, calls the Communist Party revisionist, but the MRPP slogan, "The People Will Win," is hardly different from the PCP's "unity of democratic forces" and leads to the same holding back of working-class struggle. Thus during the huge strike wave of the end of May,

when the Portuguese working class was in a political offensive against the government, the MRPP actually tailed behind the workers, trying to organize around the sole economic demand of a 40-hour week!

The Portuguese ostensibly revolutionary left suffers terribly both from being a very young movement and having had to operate in clandestinity. Thus many groups have had little chance to develop a program through open political struggle and practice. Typical is the situation of the League of Unity and Revolutionary Action (LUAR), a great proportion of whose members were just released from prison. The LUAR states that its program is "the fight for socialism" but it has hardly any idea of how to go about it.

In the face of past isolation in clandestinity and fear of future repression, the Portuguese "extreme left" is now panicking and trying to put together a false unity. The LCI, LUAR, Proletarian Revolutionary Party (PRP), the Maoist Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Unity (URM-L), the "Groups for Immediate and Total Independence of the Colonies" (CIC) and the "Socialist Rank-and-File Committees" (CBS) are trying to cement a unity based on "immediate and total independence of the colonies," "rejection of CP opportunism and working-class betrayal" and "socialist revolution as the only means of liberating the Portuguese proletariat." But what is needed now is not some broad "far-left" unity but the forging of a Bolshevik party which, having absorbed the lessons of Lenin's and Trotsky's struggle against the betrayals of the social-democratic and Stalinist reformists, is capable of putting forward a Marxist program of working-class independence from the bourgeoisie and of leading the masses forward to the struggle for power. ■

Spartacist Local Directory

BAY AREA	Box 852, Main P.O., Berkeley, CA 94701 (415) 653-4668
BOSTON	Box 188, M.I.T. Sta., Cambridge, MA 02139 (617) 282-0866
BUFFALO	Box 412, Station C, Buffalo, NY 14209 (716) 837-1854
CHICAGO	Box 6471, Main P.O., Chicago, IL 60680 (312) 728-2151
CLEVELAND	Box 6765, Cleveland, OH 44101 (216) 651-9147
DETROIT	Box 663A, General P.O., Detroit, MI 48232 (313) 921-4626
LOS ANGELES	Box 38053, Wilcox Sta., Los Angeles, CA 90038 (213) 485-1838
NEW ORLEANS	Box 51634, Main P.O., New Orleans, LA 70151 (504) 866-8384
NEW YORK	Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, NY 10001 (212) 925-2426
SAN DIEGO	P.O. Box 2034, Chula Vista, CA 92011
TORONTO	(Committee of Toronto Supporters of the International Spartacist Tendency) Box 6867, Station A, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

WORKERS VANGUARD

Local Bureaucrats Grovel—

Woodcock Reigns Supreme at UAW Convention

LOS ANGELES, June 9—The 24th Constitutional Convention of the United Auto Workers, held in Los Angeles this week, accomplished nothing beneficial to auto workers. With 160,000 auto workers still on layoff or partially unemployed despite the end of the "energy crisis" hoax, the cowboy hats, balloons, band music and starker of the convention contrasted sharply with the real situation facing auto workers.

A more accurate reflection of the dissatisfaction of most auto workers with their leadership was the controversy that raged to the surface over Woodcock's proposed three-year term of office. This proposal extended Woodcock's final term in office (he must retire at 65) to 1977, avoiding an election for a new leadership during the contract-termination year of 1976. Thus a "lame-duck" administration will negotiate the next contract rather than a new leadership which, like Woodcock himself in 1970, might have to put on a militant face and lead a strike in order to prove itself.

Woodcock decreed that there would be one speaker for and one against from each region to create a facade of democracy. Delegates did not relish having to go back to the locals with a clear record of having supported this proposal, and in at least one region no one could be found to speak in favor. Woodcock supporters such as Frank Runnels of Local 22 and Joseph Reilly of Local 906, however, took the opportunity to denounce "loudmouths" in the opposition and endear themselves to the leadership. Reilly apologized profusely for having said he would not vote for Woodcock again at the last convention, and wished he could vote Woodcock a ten-year extension!

But the democratic facade crumbled during the voting. The hand vote was evenly divided, but Vice President Pat Greathouse, who was chairing, ruled in favor of the administration until protests from the floor made him call a standing division of the house. This was also evenly divided, and Greathouse again ruled in favor.

Only a roll call vote could have resolved the question, but this would have put every delegate on record, and thus surely caused a rejection. Under the UAW's undemocratic rules, 840 delegates are required to call for a roll call vote. This number appeared to be obtained, but Greathouse ruled against a roll call. This provoked shouting from angry delegates, with many walking out. This in turn provided the leadership with the excuse it needed to end the session.

Having won the three-year term for International officers over heavy opposition, Woodcock waited until the last day of the convention, after the election of officers, to ram through another constitutional change mandating the three-year term for local officers as

well. This proposal is now being sprung on local membership meetings for ratification with little or no prior warning, by bureaucrats who are all too eager for the "stability" achieved by this undemocratic measure, which protects their hold on office.

Defending the Sellout Contract

Woodcock's opening address was very defensive, reflecting the bureaucracy's awareness of its narrow base and its sensitivity to criticism. He tried to prove mathematically that the measly 3 percent wage increase in the last contract had actually been 11 percent, by adding in past and present cost-of-living gains. However, he neglected to mention that real wages are still declining because of inflation and the lack of a full sliding scale of wages. He defended the hopelessly inadequate voluntary overtime clause, the union's "one-at-a-time" strategy barring industry-wide strikes and the undemocratic ratification procedure, all against criticism from the left.

The ratification procedure was a major issue because of the undemocratic handling of the 1973 Ford contract. While skilled tradesmen had unambiguously turned it down, thus requiring renegotiation under the UAW constitution, Woodcock had declared the contract ratified on the strength of a dubious vote of production workers which was marked by violence and many re-votes, particularly in the key Local 600. Justifying his failure to submit the contract for a new vote after partial renegotiation, Woodcock reportedly declared before the union's Public Review Board that "even if a majority of production workers had rejected the agreement, we would have signed it if we thought it was in the best interests of the workers"! So much for membership ratification rights!

Woodcock explained that the question of reaffiliation with the AFL-CIO was not going to be brought to this convention, because of sharp divisions about it on the International Executive Board. This was an open acknowledgement of a battle between Woodcock, who supports re-entry, and Emil Mazey, who is against it. It also showed the fear of Woodcock's "Administration Caucus" to risk a split at the top.

Fight Protectionism

Woodcock piously stressed "international labor solidarity" a good deal. However, this turned out to mean little more than backing the Histadrut, Israel's phony "union" which includes employers and discriminates against Arabs. The Arab Workers Caucus and various left groups (including the Spartacist League) have demanded that the UAW break all ties with the Histadrut. The atmosphere of the convention was



WV PHOTO

heavily protectionist. Bumper stickers sold privately at a booth inside the hall told UAW members, "Buy a Foreign Car and Put 10 Americans Out of Work." The Amalgamated Clothing Workers booth urged convention attendees not to buy foreign goods, while Cesar Chavez of the Farm Workers asked delegates to write their Congressmen urging them to demand the Attorney General start enforcing immigration laws and deporting illegal aliens. Chavez made it quite clear in his speech that he was against all illegal aliens, not just those brought in to scab, but even those, in his words, "working elsewhere."

Against this chauvinist background, and against the International Executive Board's calls for "temporary" import quotas on cars, the only answer to be found was in the Committee for a Militant UAW (CMUAW) resolution, "For International Working Class Solidarity—No Import Quotas." The CMUAW is a class-struggle grouping in Local 1364 (Fremont, California). This resolution was printed on page 145 of the proposed resolutions book, but, like 99 percent of these resolutions, was not allowed on the floor. Typically, none of the principal opposition groups represented at the convention spoke out against the official call for import quotas. (However, four different resolutions against auto imports were proposed, one of which prohibited UAW officials from driving foreign cars!)

On the overall question of how to fight layoffs the Woodcock machine had nothing to offer (beyond anti-import legislation) except support for the Mondale-Ford Bill, which provides for "studies" of the economic justification for plant closings and government financial aid to the companies. Another CMUAW resolution (entitled "Union

Action to Fight Layoffs") which had been passed by Local 1364 earlier this year called for fighting layoffs with "an industry-wide strike, linked up internationally" and "shorter hours with full cost-of-living paid, to make jobs for all." While several other opposition groups also call for a shorter workweek ("30 for 40"), typically they provide no clue as to how to win it.

Neo-Reutherite UNC

The chief opposition groups at the convention were the United National Caucus, the new Auto Workers Action Caucus and a local group, the Brotherhood Caucus of Local 1364. None of them presented any kind of credible political alternative to the Woodcock bureaucracy. The UNC is the oldest, having progressed little from the late 1960's, when it grew out of an earlier rebellion of skilled trades workers.

It is still based primarily on the skilled trades in Detroit and is still an unprincipled amalgam of would-be bureaucrats, both in and out of office. Despite the UNC's avowed call for a labor party, its co-chairman Jordan Simis, president of Local 961 (Chrysler's Eldon Gear and Axle), sported a Coleman Young (Democratic mayor of Detroit) button. His speech nominating the group's other co-chairman, Pete Kelly, for UAW president was so unpolitical that even the UNC leadership was visibly annoyed with him.

UNC delegates, numbering as many as forty, according to various exaggerated claims, were elected on left-sounding but clearly reformist programs. For instance, the "Voice of Chrysler Workers" (Dodge Main, Local 3), which was successful in electing

continued on page 5