NATIONAL LONGSHORE STRIKE THREATENS

Letters From a Seaman------------- Vote Morrissey Ticket! -----

As the 80 day 'cooling off' period invoked against striking East Coast longshoremen at the end of September draws to a close on Dec. 20, chances are that once again, the militancy of the dockworkers will force the I.L.A. leadership to call a strike. I.L.A. President Thomas Gleason has urged a rejection of both variants (two and three year contracts) put forward as the 'final' offers of the New York Shipping Association. At the same time threat of a West Coast strike looms as well.

There is no doubt that the government will bend all efforts, as it did in response to the Sept. 30 strike, on behalf of its common aim with the stevedoring bosses of containerization-automation-modernization of cargo handling, at the expense of the longshoremen. This process is well on its way already on the West Coast. Of course, both the industry and the government recognize that they can reverse the U.S. balance of payments deficit if they can cheapen exports by cutting overall shipping costs through containerization which in the long run would eliminate not only longshoremen's jobs but entire ports as well as jobs in trucking and other areas of transportation.

The biggest danger facing the East Coast longshoremen now is that the I.L.A. leadership, despite the militant sounds it has been making, will go for a deal, perhaps based on higher wages and fringe benefits, accepting the stevedoring firms' offer of a 40 hour week work guarantee, while at the same time ALSO accepting the conditions placed by the bosses on this 40 hour week offer. We know that this is what has taken place on the West Coast where only some of the labor force has this job protection while the bosses are free to do with the rest of the force as they see fit.

The employers have made clear that their offer of a guaranteed annual income of 2,860 hours (40 hours a week) is made ONLY with the proviso that 'work rules are revised' and 'abuses eliminated'. The implication, of course, is that after the bosses decide how many men will do how much work, where, when and how (revising work rules and eliminating 'abuses to maximize productivity) then only then there can be a 40 hour guaranteed income.

The bosses offer also leaves open the possibility that not only will new workers and casual labor be employed without any guaranteed income, but that the owners will be free to limit employment at or even phase out of existence any of the smaller ports from Maine to Texas. The contract offer of the New York Shipping Association is made on behalf only of the ports of New York, Baltimore, Boston, Hampton Roads and Philadelphia.

The only kind of deal that longshoremen can make which will not be used against them is an agreement that the dockworkers and not the bosses or superagen-
CON ED STRIKE
---THE LESSONS---

Charles F. Luce, President of Con Ed, expressed his views on the recent strike in a speech to the New York Chamber of Commerce on December 5th. His remarks give us a clue of what the bosses are planning for the future. Luce proposed that an anti-union law like the Taft-Hartley be passed to cover workers in government as well as in the private sector. Under such a law, union democracy is threatened. Let us examine what the New York Times reported:

"The Legislature, Mr. Luce said, should reexamine the legal machinery under which the anti-union provisions of the Taft-Hartley are being carried out. He suggested that the lawmakers consider whether the 'duly elected' leadership of the unions should be given final authority to decide ramifications to their respective 'organisations'..."

We have been warned. We couldn't ask for a clearer warning of the kind of attack the bosses have in mind to prevent the rank and file of the trade unions from engaging in struggle for their demands. They intend to use the democratic right to strike and to call workers to take to the streets. Mr. Luce seeks for the bosses' own control over the union's affairs. Isn't that Con Ed with strikes guaranteed to affect the public interest? He suggested that the bosses consider whether the 'duly elected' leadership of the unions should be given final authority to decide ramifications to their respective 'organisations'.
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NIXON PLANS RECESSION

BY FRED HUELLER
Any illusions retained by American workers in the incoming Nixon Administration are going to be quickly dispelled. Through the election campaign, and in the weeks since his victory, Nixon has made quite clear the kind of policies he has in mind.

Nixon's plans to deepen recessionary policies are no secret. His advisers are openly contemplating whether a 'temporary' 5% unemployment rate will accomplish the goal of significant improvement in the trade balance and the balance of payments, along with smaller inflation. In the 1957-58 recession unemployment mounted at first, while inflation continued. Now Johnson has publicly warned Nixon that a repetition on a more serious level of unemployment plus inflation is threatened. If you aren't careful, we're on your verycdaly, you will throw so many workers out of jobs that greater unemployment, total political unrest will result.

We don't want 'the bosses' fighting the bosses for 'bargains for workers' for 'precious jobs', says Johnson. He doesn't say of those who own productive capacity or of the low level of unemployment at present competition for jobs is intense and thousands of new jobs in the mass production industries are being killed by automation.

BUST

Another coup in this official adviser to Nixon, Arthur F. Burns, made the statement which may have more than Johnson's later comment. Burns warned that inflation was the most serious problem and that it was not checked "an economic bust may become unavoidable."

Meanwhile the Labor Department has announced that wages continue to rise much faster than labor productivity in the third quarter of 1968, thus continuing the increase in unit labor costs which began to rise early in 1965 and has continued since. This is a very serious point of the increasing pressure on the rate of profit. At the same time as workers' real wages have

WEST GERMAN DEMONSTRATORS DENOUNCE REVIVAL AS "BETRAYAL OF THE GERMAN WORKER"

in preventing the flight of shipping to foreign flagships by demanding union protection and wage parity for all foreign seamen and portworkers.

The flight to save jobs and conditions throughout the maritime industry is more and more a fundamental political fight. The plan of the government and shipping moguls to cut costs was the primary goal of the bosses' unions. The workers of the maritime industry unions are still in their infancy. Without the government intervention, including Taft-Hartley and possible new legislation to meet 'national emergencies', the ship owners are lost.

The support of the labor-bureaucracy and men like Thomas Gleason to the Democratic Party thus becomes one of the biggest gifts these union leaders give to the bosses. It is clear that the only way that labor can really fight itself in face of the government-employer attack is to break completely with the Democrats and organise its own independent labor party.
JOSEPH CURRAN, NUI HEAD

A very significant battle against the entrenched bureaucracy of President Joseph Curran is shaping up in the National Maritime Union. The focal point of this battle is the higher position of some of the major national officers and local Port Agents of the NMM. The election, which will be held during January and February under supervision of the Department of Labor, is of great importance in the fight against bureaucracy.

But perhaps the cloud of government intervention has its unintended silver lining in the case of the forthcoming election. The Stoddard of pent-up opposition to the leadership is the so-called 'Morryship' group of the NMM District 6, whose leaders have been fighting for the new elections for some time. They have been standing up to the most reprehensible acts of intimidation and blackballing by the Curran machine, and it is time for the NMM to stand up to the Curran machine.

The election of these men can be an important step in the development of a political and economic program, worthy of the NMM. There is no doubt that the Curran machine is the only hope for the future of the NMM. The Curran machine has its roots in the labor movement, and it is the only hope for the future of the labor movement.

The labor movement is on the rise, and the Curran machine is the only hope for the future of the labor movement.

Dear Editor:

The following appears in the latest issue of "Labour News," the organ of the International Longshoremen's Association of the Pacific Maritime association. It has been long considered a model agreement which sets a precedent which would serve the labor movement.

To the Editor:

BRIEFS' SELL-OUT ROLE -- ON THE GULF TANKERS

Two letters from a seaman

(Thirty-two letters were received from members of the ILA on the subject of the "Eureka")

The following letter was received from a member of the ILA on the subject of the "Eureka":

"The ILA is a good labor union, and I have no doubt that it is doing its best to fight against the Curran machine. It is the only hope for the future of the labor movement.

Dear Editor:

I do not agree with all of your political positions, but I admire your hard work and dedication. I really read your paper for your trade union news, and I encourage other members of the ILA to read it as well.

I have been with the ILA for five years, and I am a member of the ILA.

I wish I had the ability to describe a seaman's job to people who are interested in a career in the ILA.

I hope that the ILA will continue to fight against the Curran machine, and that it will continue to do its best to fight against the Curran machine.

Walter Winchell in his syndicated column, predicts a new age of labor warfare. The ILA feels that the pressure from the NMM and the ILA is increasing.

One thing is certain. There are many members of the ILA who are very concerned that the ILA is not doing enough to fight against the Curran machine. There has been too much talk of the ILA's role in the labor movement, and too little action. It is time for the ILA to start taking action.
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HOSPITAL WORKERS FIGHT BACK

SPECIAL TO THE BULLETIN
MINNEAPOLIS -- Hospital workers in Minneapolis and St. Paul, organized into the Hospital and Nursing Home Employees Local 113, A.F.L.-C.I.O., are looking ahead to the re-opening of their contract next March 1.

The three thousand members of this union represent a potentially very powerful force. They are the sole bargaining agent for all twelve private hospitals in Minneapolis and all six private nursing homes in St. Paul, plus several large nursing homes in the area. In Minneapolis all organized hospital employees, except nurses and engineers, who have their own unions, belong to IL 113. In St. Paul, even the engineers are included in the local. Moreover, IL 113 is closely linked with the strong labor movement in the Twin Cities through its membership in the coordinated bodies of the unions, the Minneapolis Central Labor Union and the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly.

Yet despite the union's obvious strength and favorable strategic position, wage rates and conditions of work remain perhaps the worst in the unionized sector of the Twin Cities. Under the existing contract, starting wages are $8.87 an hour and only after 24 months of steady employment is the rate increased to $9.60 per hour.

Ninety per cent of the total work force is composed of women. The hospital bosses have taken full advantage of this by imposing a wage differential between men's and women's rates. Thus they constantly play the two groups off against each other. In virtually every hospital women have been increasingly assigned to 'men's work', without getting men's rates. Only in Minneapolis' St. Mary's Hospital have a firm core of militant shop stewards with the support of the workers demonstrated how to fight the hospital's attempts to chisel away at this section of the contract.

Burdens

Hospital work is among the hardest in the world, as anyone who has ever worked in a hospital or nursing home knows. The bosses have taken complete advantage of the service aspect of hospital work. Wage rates are so low it is difficult to attract and keep qualified help. This puts a double burden on the regular force. First they have to break in and assist a never ending chain of new employees. Second, because the hospitals are so often understaffed, the experienced workers are under tremendous pressure to speed up and intensify their work so as not to cause suffering to the patients. This is a terrible unfair burden the hospital workers have thrust upon their workers.

Burden
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AND this burden is one that must be confronted in the pending negotiations.

Carle notes the long-time head of 113, Norman E. Carle, has offered no leadership to the men and women workers who have seen their wages drastically cut by inflation. The majority of these workers have had to seek other work to have steady deteriorated. What is the point of dealing with employees in words when a program that can seriously challenge the union can be made by simple changes in the routine of the interests of the workers is not at the same time advanced?

Carle asks the members who have suggestions for changes in the contract to write them down and mail them to him for his examination. What kind of leadership is that? Real leaders must draw up a program that will really foster the best interests of the new employees. The program must put the fight for higher wages and increased benefits at the top of the list.

7. Increased fringe benefits of all kinds: vacations, holidays, etc. Benefits must equal those enjoyed by union with the best contracts in the area.

8. An annual contract. No more three years freezes!

9. To raise these demands is clearly not enough. The workers must be provided for in the consequences. The union must meet the workers. The public must be informed of the consequences.

THE NEED FOR ORGANIZING

The needs of the workers are clear and must include at least the following demands:

1. $1.00 a week minimum as well as those of the 1199 workers in New York City.

2. A cost of living escalator clause.

3. Equal pay for equal work. No more division of men and women workers!

4. Cost of living bonus and all new benefits to apply to present employees. An end to the division between active and retired workers!

5. Improved selection and supervision of work conditions by union committees. Enforcement.

6. A decent hospital and medical plans. Those who care for the sick must be adequately provided for.

7. Increased fringe benefits of all kinds: vacations, holidays, etc. Benefits must equal those enjoyed by union with the best contracts in the area.

8. An annual contract. No more three years freezes!

9. No raises should be given without the agreement of the workers.

10. To raise these demands is clearly not enough. The workers must be provided for in the consequences. The union must meet the workers. The public must be informed of the consequences.

BY A HOSPITAL WORKER

NEW YORK: The National organizing campaign Local 1199 is gaining momentum throughout the country. The union is now organizing hospitals in Detroit, South and North Carolina, Florida, Philadelphia, Connecticut and Baltimore. This organizing campaign, reported from the Annual Convention of July 1968, is a direct outcome of the 1968 July contract struggle when the workers forced the hand of the hospital bosses and won a $100 minimum wage. This show of solidarity and strength made an impact on workers and members of District 65 in NYC take up this demand but telegram were received from hospital workers all over the country asking to be organized into 1199.

This is not just a task for the leadership. Every rank and file union member has a responsibility to help in the campaign. All leadership should become involved in the campaign. If there is little rank and file participation in this the understanding of the importance of this drive will be completely lost. The experience gained by the workers will be invaluable to 1199.

But this campaign is not taking place at a time when the unionists must face the problems facing the union. On the contrary there is a repressive atmosphere confronting the labor movement that is reflecting the crisis of the system itself. The struggle.

Despite although it has not been exclusively fought by unionists there has been talk of possible expulsion of 1199 from the AFL-CIO.

Edward Godfrey, Director of the Organizing Campaign, has stated that there can be expected friction with the RWD 1199, the international union of 1199.

The successful organizing drive represents a tremendous victory for the dues-paying members and the basis for a stepped up fight against the bosses, a fight to take the victorious struggle for the $100 a week minimum further. The rank and file must take on the fight to make sure that Davis and the bureaucrats do not allow this to be dissipated by using the organizing drive to avoid the real conditions of work and working conditions, and as an excuse to split the labor movement, and to maneuver with Meany.

While the 1199 organizing drive represents a tremendous step forward in uniting workers, the organized and unorganized, at the same time the trade union movement is being faced everywhere with deepening divisions between black and white workers. While the bureaucrats have launched campaigns against the drive, they have completely capitulated to those forces which have attempted to split the labor movement by breaking the black workers from 1199.

Davis and the bureaucrats and the currency refused to support the teachers and capitulated to the demands of the Right to Control" and dual unionism. At a demonstration by bureaucrats at Van Arsdale's office during the teachers strike, Theodore Mitchell, a vice president of 1199 said, "those who are black and Puerto Ricans and Hispanic will set up our own labor movement," a statement which also received the endorsement of the Internal Labor Union.

Leister Roberts, general organizer for District 65, 1199's sister union said, "If we have to split the labor movement and split our force..."

Clearly, this is what the bosses and the government fear. The Ford Foundation and all the politicians are behind the demands for "community control" to divide and weaken the powerful trade union movement and divert the workers from the real fight against their employers. But Meany and what follows, dual unionism for black workers, represent the same tactic. Rather than fighting against it, it is accepted as a reality that cannot be changed.

While Davis poses as the "progressive" labor leader, he plays the same role as Shaker whom he attacks, in splitting the labor movement. The bosses have absolutely refused to take up the struggle for the Negro people and has encouraged the backward prejudices of the workers in the UFT. At the same time Davis has channelized the fight for the Negro workers, supports the reactionary position of the black nationalists.

Neither of these leaders represents the interests of the unity of black and white workers, the fight against racism, and against the government by the entire trade union movement. The rank and file, the labor movement taking up the fight against racism, for the demands of the workers for jobs, job training, upgrading, decent housing and a future as an integral part of the fight of the union movement.

1199 ORGANIZER SPEAKS WITH HOSPITAL WORKER III: HOGYEM, M.J.
Many Theories of Marxism

Part One — Primitive Accumulation

By Tim Wohlforth

The construction of the revolutionary party in the United States is primarily a theoretical project. Precisely because of the great potential of the American working class, and because the very future of world capitalism will be decided ultimately on American soil, the United States has become the center for every form of theoretical activity, revisionism, every attempt to create a new movement that could challenge the most fundamental theoretical constructs of the world working class.

This is where Marxism/Marxism; Ernest Mandel, discredited in Europe, tours America speaking before large audiences; obscure Euro-Marxist, writing about a profound, obscure Indian guru clutches his Air India ticket to the states, etc. Too with our Marxist loyalists and metrical materialists, and, as we shall see, we even have a few home grown ones, too.

One major reason for this growth of revisionism in the United States is the fact that the Marxist movement in the United States from the pre-World War I Socialists through the early Communist movement through American Trotskyism and Mandel revisionism has been dominated by an anti-theory pragmatism—a concern with what ‘works’, with narrow hows and whys rather than why. In other words, perhaps the most obvious Marxist philosophical and the study of the Marxist method. At a time when we need to put to bed and not away, when world capitalism is more and more an independent system, where decisions on Wall Street, Beijing, whatever, affect workers in all corners of the globe, at such a time when an international outlook is indispensable to American revolutionaries and to Canada, to enter a huge bust between theoretical thinking in America and Marxist development of Marxist thought in Europe becomes increasingly more important.

Trotsky's death, the 125 year international struggle for Marxism and workers power. The result is a direct challenge to all the most fundamental theoretical constructs of the world working class.

The last year has seen the emergence of a political tendency from out of the New Left, the SDS Labor Committee led by L. Marcus. Marcus is probably the most powerful of the pieces of Marxist theory abstracted from the whole 125 year international struggle for Marxism and workers power. The result is a direct challenge to all the most fundamental theoretical constructs of the world working class.

NEW LEFT

This problem is particularly acute with the new generation of radicals intellectuals who likes to call itself the ‘New Left’ or the ‘Movement.’ This new generation has developed its interest in socialism under conditions of an almost complete break in the continuity of Marxist thought and the struggle to build the Marxist party.

This movement has been primarily with the Socialist Workers Party, which after Trotsky’s death abandoned any serious attempt to develop Marxist theory and thus a revolutionary party, and therefore has been unable to bring to the new generation of radicals the struggle of the Third and Fourth Internationals and their theoretical conquests. This task has fallen upon the shoulders of the Workers League which as part of the International Committee of the Fourth International emerged from the SWP in 1964 after a principled struggle for the very fundamentals of Marxism the SWP leadership had abandoned.

When it comes to the central question of bridging the gap between the pragmatic American socialist tradition and the continuity of the international Marxist movement, Lynn Marcus stands foremost in between. He picks bits and pieces of theory from Marxist traditions, in particular from Rosa Luxemburg, develops these in a one-sided schematic way, with the result of throwing out what is a crucial canister manner some of the most important theoretical conquests of the world working class.

PRIMITIVE

Let us take a look at the ‘Marrow’ method as revealed in his latest theoretical writing, ‘The History of Capitalism’ which he has recently submitted to the League for discussion. He begins with a theory of ‘primitive accumulation’ which he attributes to Rosa Luxemburg. Marx developed this concept to explain the origins of capitalist accumulation. In its earliest most barbaric form, the capitalist rather than paying workers for their labor time at a rate equal to what was required for a worker’s subsistence actually paid workers below this level with the result of the surplus laborers. The workers were constantly replenished with peasants from the countryside forced to seek work in factories as new资本主义 countries broke up the old feudal relations on the land (enclosures in England for example). This way the capitalists accumulated super-profits which were reintroduced in more manufacturing leading to the swift early growth of capitalism. But, Marx pointed out, such barbaric conditions were not sustainable and the capitalist fighters of the long run and as capitalism matured the general tendency for wages to equal the subsistence level of the working class emerged.

Marcus correctly points out that as capitalism matures its internal contradictions emerge particularly in the form of the falling rate of profit (though in typical fashion he makes this central point in the long run). The capitalist is forced to mechanize more and more to increase the amount produced per worker (productivity). But as profit in the price of wage labor (wage-capital) is reduced, tends to a general expropriation for the fall in rate of profit to fall threatening the total profit and thus the system itself.

IMPERIALISM

Imperialism plays an important role in the capit- alists’ attempt to overcome this problem. Here Marcus reintroduces the concept of primitive accumulation asserting that the capitalist offsets the falling rate of profit within the major industrial countries through primitive accumulation in the colonial countries.

However an imperialist emerges emerged was a tendency of the capitalist to take advantage of the category determined by the actual class relations between workers and capitalists and by the general level of technology and the cultural level required for a particular level of technology. Thus a worker in a colonial country involved in an extractive industry making sugar, coffee, etc., may be able to subsist on $600 a year, a worker in Europe on $3,000 a year, a worker in the United States may need $6,000 a year minimum to subsist. The capitalist takes advantage of this differential in order to make super-profits in colonial countries and can in this way offset the other level of profits in the United States.

DISTORT

To call this process ‘primitive accumulation’ is to distort the word out of all meaning, to include under one term different social and economic processes of the different stages of development of capitalism. It is an example of imposing a formal scheme on the complexity of capitalist development which ignores the real processes going on in capitalism, and simplifies reality through distorting it. As Trotsky once said, this exceedingly important something from our formula because it doesn’t seem to fit in to our scheme, then tomorrow this element can well overturn our whole scheme.

CREDITS

But let us probe this question even deeper. It would appear that all the capitalists have to do solve their problems and make fantastic profits is to heavily invest in the colonial countries, build major industries there and reap profits back in the home country and the subsistence levels existing in those countries. In fact this solution appears so ‘obvious’ that cannot all the capitalists do not do so. He can only conclude that it is a matter of their stupidity and if only they were as smart as he then their problems would be solved. Thus in this document he states: "Granted they have an alternative ‘on the books’ in the form of ‘development’ to the world project. Thus, far, however, as we see in the Alliance for Progress and the rash of parliamentary cretins’ exhibited by Senate and House action on foreign aid proposals, there has been almost no real correlation between design and implementation.

In fact, only a short white spot Marcus was convinced that this was precisely what the capitalists were up to. In his ‘Third Stage of Imperialism’ he claimed that what the Vietnam war was really about was an attempt by the capitalists to turn Vietnam into a rice bowl, this rice would be shipped to India to feed Indian workers who would be put to work and a new model, a new stage of development in India. Needless to say this simple schema is on the face of it, ridiculous. The vast coalition that went into the war could have just as easily been used to finance grain shipments from the overproduction in the ’60s in Canada to the Sudan. There is no simple ‘economic determinist’ explanation for Vietnam. The capitalists understood that what they were fighting in Vietnam was revolution, revolution which threatens not simply rice production in Vietnam but capitalism’s survival throughout the world.

REVOLUTIONARY

But to get back to the main point—the capitalists cannot simply set up modern automated factories in the jungles of Latin America or the rice paddies of Asia. Modern capitalist technology requires a whole cultural development and this in turn means a raising of the working class to a subsistence level equal to that in Europe. It means a whole complex system of exploitation, a complex system of exploitation, a complex system of exploitation, a complex system of exploitation, a complex system of exploitation. There is no simple ‘economic determinist’ explanation for Vietnam. The capitalists understand that what they are fighting in Vietnam is revolution, revolution which threatens not simply rice production in Vietnam but capitalism’s survival throughout the world.

Such a revolutionary technological and cultural transformation means in the first place the destruction of the super-profits presently enjoyed by the capitalists got from the extractive industries in colonial countries, the advantages all capitalists receive from the wage labor they pay for products from the colonial countries, a complete social upheaval in land relations, the destruction of the old social classes and capitalism. As Trotsky pointed out in his theory of permanent revolution the capitalists are no longer capable of such revolutionary changes, precisely because of the emergence of the working class. The political force capable of carrying through a social upheaval started by the capitalists to a socialist conclusion—the workers movement. Thus to Trotsky the failure of the capitalists to initiate a ‘Development Decade’ was neither a matter of stupidity nor cretinsm but was due to objective material conditions, Marcus, of course, has failed to inform the SDS Labor Committee of the Workers League of the vindication in actual life during the Russian Revolu- tion, and the decades of struggle during which
the Fourth International fought for this position against the world Stalinist movement. Marcus offers an analysis of the current confusion in theoretical development is broken; only hollow schemes remain in an attempt to cover up his theoretical nakedness.

**ECONOMIES**

But let’s give Marcus this much credit—he does his very best to get every bit of mileage out of his one formula. He is very much like a medicine man with his Dr. Marcus Snake Syrup which will cure the common cold, cancer, broken legs, and is even a good love potion. This infernal propaganda is his best attempt to murder the millions of Jews by the Nazis as a rational economic policy of price control. The historical record is that Israel used their race theory as an excuse to put millions of Jews into slave labor. When they worked the Jews were not paid for their labor power left in them, they simply sent the coal and gas chambers to save the cost of upkeep for unproductive workers. It is not only Jews but millions of non-Jewish foreign workers were enlisted for forced labor; 2) millions of Jews were sent to death camps to replace Jews; 3) to forced labor and for Jews in that period it was considered a lucky break to be sent on forced labor rather than directly to the gas chambers; and 3) like a number of the policies of the Hitler regime rather than adhering the German economy there was greatly increased voluntary movement of necessary technical and other resources the German demands in the war; the bourgeoisie tolerated Hitler in order to get a political advantage. But paid a high price for his dictatorship. Barbaric cultural manifestations have material roots and economic motivations. The workers and the capitalists of the working class but to go from this to some economic determinist schema and the above mentioned barbarity as an explanation is not to desert Marxism for the simplification determinism which caused Engels to comment in exasperation to the effect of save from the Marxists.

**EUROPE**

If this were not enough when we reach the end of World War II Marcus tackles the very important and crucial problem of the growth of heavy industry in the rebuilding of the Western European economies making much larger profits than were possible in the U.S. because of lower wage levels prevalent in Europe. This, too, is called "primitive accumulation" to the effect that we are dealing with some backward country but major industrial countries whose economy, technology, and culture is the same as in the colonial period of capital development. These are countries with a high level of culture, a literate and skilled working class, and a large internal market which had been deprived of consumer goods for two decades of repression and war. The only real primitive accumulation to the working world today is Marcus' primitive accumulation of theoretical nonsense in this document.

But even this primitive accumulation nostrum we still have only a one-sided understanding of the way in which the current capitalist crisis in the Western world is being solved methods the capitalists used in the 1950's to make the boom possible. It is true that capitalist investment in the Western world is needed to help the American capitalists offset the general tendency for profit to fall in America. But it was not the only factor and the American bourgeoisie was forced to introduce into American mass production industries a degree of exploitation seen nowhere else in the Western capitalist countries. Thus they raised productivity by an intensive increase in the employment of workers. The workers were driven to increase the value of the actual cost. The increase in the actual costs of the American production, which is preparing an extremely exploitative situation in basic industry since the capitalists are no longer capable of paying their workers in an increase which is significant in the living standards of the workers. Since Marcus ignores this process it is understandable that he is not able to see the real state of work in the basic industries today. The idea of union movement today he ignores the mass production in favor of concentration on the profit motive that would work in the basic industries. But the very center of the American capitalist system lies in this relationship between the mass production industries in basic heavy industry and the powerful unions in the industry like the UAW and the Steelworkers.

Then there is a third mechanism employed by the capitalists to the ability to temporarily hold off the working class of the loss of value allowing the creation of a good deal of fictitious capital and the making of profits on the basis of this capital. In particular the acceptance international trade even when there are four dollars abroad for every one dollar in gold at current prices have given the American capitalists a tremendous edge in capital expansion and in offsetting the effects of the falling rate of profit. This is not something Marcus has mentioned allowed for a general growth of the world capitalist system and a constant growth of economic output. The role of the European workers are advancing at a much slower pace and sometimes even show a reverse tendency then conditions a few years ago. Labor costs, that is to actually reduce the level of wealth of the class through class struggle is no longer there and the European capitalists feel the same profit pressures as do American capitalists. But this is with the labor costs, that is to actually reduce the level of wealth of the class through class struggle is no longer there and the European capitalists feel the same profit pressures as do American capitalists. But this is nothing out of the question for social revolution is out of the question. This is why we say we have now entered into the period of the world revolution—this is the meaning of the French developments not mentioned in Marcus' history project.

We have not by any means exhausted all the aspects of understanding capitalism development being prepared for preparing the revolutionary movement for the tasks today within the context of the current development. Marcus fails to see that simplification notions of 'primitive accumulation' only lead to confusion and theoretical one-sidedness.

Our Marxist analysis on the other hand, only sketched here, shows us that we are in an entirely new period, a new world, a new world that will be in basic industry in Europe and America and will lead to a fundamental confrontation between the imperialist workers and the imperialist corporations in the United States with the capitalist state—and America's state apparatus is without a doubt the most powerful apparatus on earth to dominate man—no mere arbitrator but the major instrument of the capitalists in their war against the workers.

**PART TWO -- TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM AND THE STATE**

If Marcus' economic theories are characterized by a one-sidedness, a formal schematism, this method when applied to the question of the political program around which to advance still more clearly the blatant class legislation and an abandonment of all the most fundamental conceptions of the Marxist movement. Marcus is one of the bitterest critics of the Stalinist system, Marcus proposes a "reform" of the Stalinist system, Marcus proposes a "reform" of "an immediate national employment policy of abolishing unemployment and poverty." The reason is that he requires new investments of about $100 million a year leading to an annual growth rate in the national income. We can see that the same policy to Western Europe, Japan, and other relatively advanced sectors," he concludes, "we have the basis for really solving poverty in the advanced sector and cracking the massive poverty crisis in the underdeveloped region.

We will focus on one such issue: the capitalist crisis before him his whole political policy unfolds. The problem of course is to mobilize "primitive accumulation" so that the restructuring of the policy and in this way we will have socialism. Since the aim of the policy is the eradication of poverty, we of course develop demands aimed at the poverty section of the population and not the industrial workers and this becomes the basis of the social democratic program. If this whole approach brings back memories of the New Deal this is for good and sound reason. The New Deal was a clear case of another era. How happy he would have been in the old FDR brain trust!

This is the real point included in his schema that is very misleading of modern society—the class struggle. The capitalists have their own plans and programs; the working class has its own plans which are not always compatible. The working class have the power and will use this power to the best of their ability to carry through their solution. The capitalists will go in the direction nationally is to drive back the working class, rob the industrial workers of the gains they made in the 1930s, lower their level of subsistence, and restore profitability. This cannot be done peacefully but requires a struggle to defend the results of past economic action -- the unions and mass workers parties 1938 Transitional Program as a "recipe book", take Marcus. "We need a full turn about the working class to come to an understanding of the concept of the 'vanguard' of the working class."

We will turn both to the period of the first five years of the Comintern and to the Trans- "Trotsky wrote in the same vein: "Marxists do not delude the working class with suggestions that any major gains can be made when the entire contradictions of the capitalist class remain in the hands of the capitalist class, a struggle must be waged to preserve every advance already made, and in the course of this struggle, there must be built a movement which can overthrow the capitalist state... But a revolution can be taken very seriously; outside of the perspective of the conquest of political power by the working class, nothing else is possible. These slogans lose their meaning and even become reactionary, justifying the existing leadership and the existing order.

This in essence gives us an understanding of the concept of the transitional program as the early Communists and Trotsky saw it. This concept is exactly the opposite of Marcus". He insists that a transitional demand must be "technically feasible in terms of existing forms of institutions". But communists begin with the
needs of the working class, not the outmoded forms of capitalist economic structure. They are fundamentally tied to the one hand real needs of the class and on the other hand CANNOT be achieved within the existing forms and dynamics of the capitalist market. The purpose of the demands is to take the working class through a struggle through which the major capitalist institutions, structures must be OVERTURNED and a new state created. Thus Marxus is actually transforming the demands into something very opposite -- into reform demands limited by the existing capitalist structure. In no way does he take this step from the structural reforms of Mandel-Kautsky.

But Marxus does not stop here. He carries the capitalist state to the extreme heights of the modern state. He confronts the problem of what happens if the state -- that is the establishment of socialism in the United States -- does not come as a result of the critical question of establishing the power of the working class and destroying the power of the capitalist class. Rather it is the question that there be no disruption in the economy during the transfer of power. He writes in the spirit of Nixon's somewhat with Johnson in this post-election period. And in fact his conception of the working class coming to power differs little from Nixon and Johnson's "orderly transfer of power".

ORDERLY

"In order to maintain the essential continuity of production and distribution," Marxus informs us, "we will have to expropriate the great capitalist institutions, banks, Federal Reserve System, U.S. Treasury, etc., and lay the basis for new institutions that will effect the orderly transfer of the power structure." This is the method of expropriation of capitalists will not be simple, but certainly it is necessary and is the only conceivable means to bring about the transformation of the system. The method of expropriation of capitalists will not be simple, but certainly it is necessary and is the only conceivable means to bring about the transformation of the system. The method of expropriation of capitalists will not be simple, but certainly it is necessary and is the only conceivable means to bring about the transformation of the system.

The central problem and the theoretical and practical basis of the working class movement first focused in the Communist Manifesto, deepened in the 1970s in the light of the Paris Commune, carried out in life in the October Revolution of 1917, finally summed up by the Fourth International for decades, confirmed again in life in Hungary in 1956. All this is simply thrown out the window by L. Marcus, the new theoretician of the peaceful road to socialism with its "orderly transfer of power".

The very heart of what he is saying is spelled out in the simple parenthetical statement "exempt under the most exaggerated conditions of the working class movement, through the several thousand year history of class rule, we can state not as a possibility, not even as a probable outcome, the most certain thing that no ruling class will willingly and peacefully give up its power. When confronted with a serious threat, the only thing it will do is to resort to all "democratic" formality and use brute force, terror, and the totality of the most means of destroying the ruling class and suppress the working class. Is the American bourgeoisie an exception to this rule? Just

Finally we come to the question of the party. This is where all of our other ideas fall at the very heart of what is wrong with Marxus theoretically, politically and in every real sense. In the Congress he has summed up the time Marxus finishes with this concept absolutely nothing is left of the very rich theoretical and practical history of this question from the days of the First International to the Fourth International. Lenin once wrote about a Bundist who was...
revolutionary party." Perhaps it could be just as "advantageous" to reform the party. In the whole history of the Marxist movement we have never seen a vague conception of the party. In fact Marx and the Mehrabkhanis themselves would have recoiled from such a formulation and denounced it vehemently as liquidationism.

We, in turn, cannot conceal the seriousness in addition to his efforts to ingratiate himself with the prejudices of the New Left students. The only plausible conclusion that one can arrive at is qualified 'to take over the tasks of government from the present ruling class.' But Dr. Marcus argues that we need to get rid of the White House and show nobody how efficiently one can run the government. The White House is not a building, it is defended by a million troops which can be airlifted to the spot in a few hours; these troops are armed with the most modern weapons. Why do we need to defend working class interests when we suggest that before you get your seat on the Federal Reserve Board you will need to destroy the state power of the capitalists. And this task requires something more than a vague 'organised institution of mass forces.' It requires a concrete, disciplined combat party, steed in struggle and prepared for the ultimate revolutionary struggle for power. Yes, Dr. Marcus, we repeat; CONSCIOUS organizations must not be made up of a 'political party' and the 'party.'

Another side is that while men like Marx and Lenin placed considerable emphasis on the early stages of the construction of the party and made major contributions to the construction of the party at later stages they always, always viewed their tasks as participation in the construction of a workers party. From the very earliest moments in their party building activities they fought for the party to be a party of workers, saw the necessity for themselves to become integrated in a workers party, insisted on workers not only being members of the party but playing a leading role in the party at every level, and their strength came from the party space at all times in the worker section of the party.

Even that very first beginning of the party Marx specifically mentioned the intervention in the League of the Just, was an intervention into a group of workers not the creation of a separate organization. Moreover, it was an organization of prosperous men and all of which he could create his 'intellectual cadre.' When the unification fell through because of Spartacist's hostility to being a part of an international movement Marcus waged a quicky faction fight in our organization and up and joined Swedish SWP. He then joined the Workers League (now called the American Committee for the Fourth International) on the principle basis of agreement on the nature of the SWP, to the point the party, committed, is a part of the party, committed, and of the general strategy for fighting to build the movement as part of the Fourth International. Soon thereafter our organization entered into talks with the unity negotiations with the Socialist League and Marcus became an active supporter of this unified organization which he had in confidence with L. Marcus' ability to administer the Federal Reserve System.

TRICK

To deny that a party is 'the party' is thus a theoretical assault on the very foundation of history and program both as stated and as exemplified in practice. To write off all formations of the party as not 'the party' is a theoretical assault on the very foundation of the program. 'The Party' is in a new Old left trick used to hide the fact that the New Left is not 'The Party' nor can be, theoretically, precisely because of its programmatic bankruptcy.

Marcus seeks to bolster this position by citing the Marxist teaching that the Party is "the" party. Against these formations are not 'The Party' precisely because their programs are rotten through and through, because their claims are false. Marcus claims that no formation in the United States 'even acknowledges the importance of a concrete analysis of the current economic situation; none has a real program nor is capable of developing a relevant transitional program.' Oh, L. Marcus, we claim that the Workers League has a concrete analysis of the current economic situation, it has a program capable of developing a relevant transitional program but has developed only one superficially 'to your tax and and political understanding.' The Party and we challenge you to dispute this by showing us what is fundamentally wrong with our program.

We in turn note that you do not represent 'The Party.' We believe you absolutely correct in not making that claim. This is our position because our program is revisionist and reformist to the core.

but Marcus has more to say about his conception of a party. To him the revolutionary party is 'a self-determining group of revolutionary intellectuals.' This intellectual conceptions of participation being a part of the mass struggle gets the workers to 'actively support' it. At the point where a significant vanguard of the movement of intellectuals gets involved in these intellectuals as a real alternative choice' such a cadre grouping can be considered a party.

The Marcus position is reminiscent of the history of the revolutionary party internationally. He cites as examples: 'Marx and Engels intervening to change the direction of the 'League of the Just', Lenin in the early years in Petrograd, Luxemburg in the Polish and German labor movement, etc.' But this is not good for revolutionaries. But intellectuals like Marx, Engels, Lenin, Luxemburg and Trotsky made critically important contributions to the development of the revolutionary party. The working class on its own because of its cultural poverty as well as the general conditions of existence of the proletariat, has to be trained in order to be conscious could not have developed the level of consciousness Marx and others brought into the working class. The working class is all true and correct but like much that is true and correct it becomes false and incorrect if it is posed, as Marcus poses it, as the relation between the workers and the intelligensia. It is in fact only one side of this relationship.

WORLDS

The winning over of the intellectual to the working class requires a conscious battle against the atomistic method, patience, a step by step, coordinate middle class individualism to the discipline of a proletarian party, a destruction of the egoism, and prissiness and meddlesome role it plays in society the middle class intellectual so much cherishes.

Marcus's position is that all others who enter the party (that is jarred by Marcus's new 'intellectual cadre') bring pragmatism and narrowness of thought with them also. There can be no concessions to the social democratic backwardness and of the party also. But in fighting for the theoretical development of workers within the party their role is not to make the party an instrument of thinking while with the intellectual it works the opposite way. Also the very conditions of life of the intellectual and the party committee makes it illusion that he can have power separate from numbers and cohesion. He joins the party precisely because he wants to be able to change the party and for the struggle is not an idea to him but his life. What is required is the exact opposite movement as with the intellectual for his life to become conscious --for the class struggle to be an idea, that is theoretically understood, as well as his life.

We must conclude with Marcus' own political history for this he tells no one and herein lies the very basis of the confusion in his theoretical thought. Marcus spent the war years in the Swedish SWP. He existed in that party on the basis of an unaligned agreement--the SWP would not try to influence the party. Marcus and Marcus would not try to change the SWP.

Then to Marcus' credit he made an attempt to change the party and get Marcus in and out of the SWP. He then joined the Workers League (now called the American Committee for the Fourth International) on the principle basis of agreement on the nature of the SWP, of the point the party, committed, is a part of the party, committed, and of the general strategy for fighting to build the movement as part of the Fourth International. Soon thereafter our organization entered into talks with the unity negotiations with the Socialist League and Marcus became an active supporter of this unified organization which he had in confidence with L. Marcus' ability to administer the Federal Reserve System.

Marcus' programmatic understanding requires us to organize as a part of a world movement and as a disciplined formation, Marcus' programmatic understanding demands of him that he organize a loose propaganda group which he did. He did this because he was an organization which will have in confidence with L. Marcus' ability to administer the Federal Reserve System.
SUPPORT FOR SHERWOOD GROWS

As we go to press we have learned that the trial of Robert Sherwood, a member of the Toronto Branch of the Workers League, has been postponed until December 23rd. Sherwood is being charged with violating the Canadian Immigration Act (section 501) for not divulging an arrest record upon his entry into Canada in 1967.

The conviction which was not reported resulted from arrests in civil rights demonstrations in Chicago, arrests also involving Martin Luther King, Jr. and Dick Gregory. The charge is considered a "punishment of the spirit" of Illinois, not a felony. The prosecution is a direct result of the publication of the United States which went to Canada after facing with trumped up draft delinquency charges.

In New York City on December 2nd, a meeting of the National Committee to Defend Robert Sherwood was set up to organize his defense and to encourage similar committees in presently being established in Canada.

BY A DC 9 MEMBER

NEW YORK-Gov. Rockefeller has decreed that the penalties of the Taylor Law are to be applied in full measure to the hospital workers who struck four medical hospitals, Creedmore in Queens, Maclean State on Welfare Island, and the Brooklyn State Hospitals for a ten day period in October.

The workers acted to ensure that they would be represented by the union of their choice, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Council 50, and to prevent Rockefeller from again carrying through contract negotiations with the Civil Service Employees Association, the company union of his choice, for the 124,000 state employees.

Thirteen workers at Bronx State Hospital, initially suspended, were reinstated. There had been complaints from both the hospital workers of any charges, only because the workers at that hospital there were on strike.

These workers have, however, been "reassaigned" at the behest of the hospital authorities on the charges. At Manhattan State Hospital, three workers were reassigned pending on similar charges. Lillian Roberts, State Mental Hospital Organizational Director for AFSCME, Council 50, is presently serving a thirty day jail sentence and has been fined $250, the maximum penalties allowed under the Taylor Law. Robert Tulsi, president of Creedmore, Local 69, is now serving a thirty day jail sentence, and has been fined $25.

Council 50 will lose its does check-off "privileges" at state medical hospitals.

THREAT

In the absence of organized resistance by the unions, the door is opened to the prosecution of teachers, sanitation workers, firemen, social service workers, and all city workers—and not only for striking, but for job actions as well. In the face of this threat, not only to public service workers, but to the entire labor movement in the State, the business as usual complacency of the labor bureaucracy is a reflection of their incompetence and downright treachery to the workers.

The legal tactic for District 50 requested bail pending appeal of the sentences against the union leaders, not only on the basis that they were responsible people who could be sure to serve their sentences at the proper time, but also that they were going to stand up in court and engage in wildcat strikes such as those of the Bronx State Hospital Workers.

Jerry Wurf, international president of AFSCME, instead of posing a united front of the entire labor movement in the state, set alone of city and state public service workers in their own defense, unites the stage workers, and declares them to be "insidious." The only "actual" Council 50 projects that far are that VRA will renew its suspensions to the Commissioner of the Department of Labor.

Council 50 has achieved its goal in recruiting workers in the New York metropolitan area, and in the large upstate cities. They have organized approximately 50,000 workers who function as psychiatric attendants, nurses’ aides, dietary workers, and maintenance workers. In the New York area, an estimated 60% of these workers are black and Puerto Rican. In the state as a whole, 65% of hospital workers are from these minority groups. Many of these workers are not required to perform skilled specialized duties, and earn approximately that is. The specially oppressed black and Spanish speaking workers.
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the negro, nation and marxist theory

BY LUCY ST. JOHN

The reactionary role played by black nationalism in the South is being recognized through the growth of deepening divisions within the trade union movement between white and black workers. The Workers Union, founded at the teachers' strike as well as the formation of organizations like DRUM in the U.W. The reaction of white and black nationalism is being given a Marxist cover by revisiting southern tactics.

The Socialists Workers Party had been a leading capital to black nationalism on the basis of the discussions with Trotsky on the Negro question during the period 1927-29. We have published a number of books of the title 'Leon Trotsky on Self-Determination and Black Nationalism.' The SWP has taken the analysis as the 'incorrect concept' of this discussion along with a complete distortion of Lenin's work on the question of self-determination of nations to completely adapt to black nationalism.

LENIN

It is necessary therefore to go back not only to Trotsky's discussion but to the development of Marxist theory on the question of self-determination of nations particularly as done by Lenin.

Lenin in his extensive writings on the national question was attacked on two sides - one by Rosa Luxemburg who denied the identity of Jewish national question under all circumstances and Otto Bauer and the Bundists who advocated the slogan of 'cultural autonomy'. Lenin in his discussions with a method, he differentiated between the historic-economic and the philosophical theories of the national question. He attacked the conception of approaching the national question by 'solving nationalities' or inventing abstractions or telling a people that it had to be approached by examining the historic-economic-conditions of the national movement. He stated that the question of national emancipation of Marxist theory is to examine the question in determining the historic-economic-conditions of the specific features in relation to the particular country.

In all Lenin stated that the question had to be considered from the standpoint of the class struggle and that the slogans for self-determination must be compared with the interests and politics of classes and not with 'meaningless general principles, declamations, and phrases.' Lenin pointed out that demands for democracy, including the right to vote, is only a small part of the general socialist world program. In individual cases, the part he said must be determined by the concrete-national conditions. However this does not in any case mean that you throw out democratic demands as self-determination. The revolutionary movement in one country may be an instrument of the clerical or 'nationalist' monarchists of another country. If so, we must be careful in particular, not to throw the baby out with the bathwater, for example, not to demand the same equal rights for all people, or to demand the right to vote for all people, or to demand the right to vote for all people, or to demand the right to vote for all people. If so, we must be careful in particular, not to throw the baby out with the bathwater, for example, not to demand the same equal rights for all people, or to demand the right to vote for all people, or to demand the right to vote for all people.

CULTURE

Not only did Lenin reject the conception of the Jewish national question and protest against national autonomy, he also stressed the need for the Jewish workers to work within the framework of the general socialist movement, and to take an active part in the struggle for the liberation of all the oppressed nations.

Lenin pointed out that the slogan of 'cultural autonomy' was not a slogan for 'cultural autonomy' but for the international culture of democracy and the world-wide working class movement. 'It is that all liberal-bourgeois nationalism is from the same corrupting influence on the working class, and that the slogan of the bourgeoisie pursues the policy of splitting the workers, the working class, into the liberal-nationalist bourgeoisie which means the demand for the 'unconditional unity and complete amalgamation of all the working class nations' and the slogan of the bourgeoisie, which is the bourgeoisie of the bourgeoisie and the working class organizations, trade unions, co-operative, consumers, educational and others.

FRAUD

Lenin called 'national culture' a 'bourgeoisie fraud,' and 'the slogan of the bourgeoisie fraud was the enemy of the proletariat.' He said that those who advocate it are any nation and that the slogan of the bourgeoisie is an attempt to split the working class, and the working class, into the bourgeoisie of the bourgeoisie and the working class organizations, trade unions, co-operative, consumers, educational and others.

In order for capitalism to develop in the U.S., it was necessary as Lenin puts it to 'grind down' national divisions in order to develop a cohesive and unified nation. The Negroes never have developed in the U.S. if each national minority had been allowed to set up its own state, to maintain its separate identity, to form a state made up of nationalities is the result of her historic belatedness.' It was absolutely necessary for the American people not only to abolish slavery but to assimiilation the Negro people into class society.

The Negroes were assimiilated into class society, into the productive process, at the same time it was necessary to continue the discrimination of the Negro through racism to divide the working class.
HOLDS CONFERENCE

outlook on all levels within the League. This is nothing more than a reflection of the pressure of the petty bourgeoisie.

An extensive discussion was also held on the Negro question—particularly in relation to the misconceptions put forward by Trotsky in his articles and the elements of the SWP to turn these misconceptions into a reaction-
tory adaptation to black nationalism. The article on this page by Lucy St. John reflects this discussion and marks the beginning of our theoretical critique of this critical question. Future issues of the BULLETIN will carry more material on the conference including the International and Economics reports.

Over and over during the conference it was emphasized that every aspect of party work must be centered on the BULLETIN. The fight for the BULLETIN is the very center of the fight for the party and for the world Trotskyist movement. The Political Committee has now decided to expand the paper to 12 pages and to conduct a campaign to triple paid circulation by this Fall and at that time launch the BULL-

ETIN as a weekly paper.

The Negroes today do not exist in relation to the capitalist class as a separate nation but rather as a class. They are doubly burdened not only with class oppression but racial discrimination so that they share more proportionally in unemployment, crime, disease and poverty, etc. This is the case is revealed in the struggles of the Negro people not historically for a separate nation but for political, economic and social equality. The nationalist movements in this country beginning with Garvey have never been supported by the Negro people as a whole. All these movements were the mentors of the demand for a separate nation.

We say that the demand for self-determination for the Negro people is a reactionary demand - that it legitimizes the racial division, the 'ghetto' and aids the bourgeoisie in maintaining racism, that it divides the working class.

TROTSKY

It is within the framework of these discussions of the national question within the Marxist move-
mement and the historical political conditions of the United States and from the standpoint of the class struggle, that we approach Trotsky's dis-
cussion on the Negro question. The Workers League contends today that Trotsky's conclusions in this discussion were basically incorrect. Trotsky was indeed a genius but not a god.

Trotsky in this discussion contended that the SWP should support the demand for self-determina-
tion 'if the Negroes themselves want it.' At the same time he stated that the Negroes are 'a race and not a nation.' He said the SWP must not be obligated to the Negroes to become a nation; if they are, then that is a question of their consciousness, that is what they desire and what they strive for.' He saw the demand for a black state as a ‘sign of moral and political awakening' and as a 'trium-
phant revolutionary step.' In his approach to the question of whether the Negroes are a nation, Trotsky appears to be relying on a totally sub-
jective and non-political basis of analysis as he puts it 'their feelings and their impulses', rather than an objective analysis.

Trotsky at the time admitted that he had very little information on the Negro in the United States. His statements are far from definitive on the question of the Negro revolutionary. Trotsky at the time was concerned primarily with turning the SWP around and forcing it to take up the struggle for the Negro cause, about which they had literally ignored. Trotsky's conclusions appear to be based solely on the need for the SWP to turn to that struggle without a clear analysis of the historic, political, and social role of the Negro in the U.S. We believe that Trotsky was wrong in seeing this demand as a revolutionary step; in that period as well as today it meant the dividing of the work-
ing class. Trotsky realized that the demand could have this effect if black and white workers had been united in struggle. Nowhere, nowhere, we repeat, does Trotsky call for black nationalism or in any way advocate cultural nationalism.

SWP

Today the SWP has taken every ambiguity and incorrect conclusion of this pamphlet in using it to give a cover to the most reactionary ideas which serve one purpose and one purpose only and that is to divide the working class and thus ail the capitalist class.

Their method and their conclusions have ab-
solutely nothing to do with Marxism, with Trots-
kyism. Today the question of self determina-
tion for the SWP has become an abstract principle, a moral principle, abstracted from the class strug-
gle. The right of self determination of nations has become the ‘right’ for groups to control their destroy or more crudely their right to ‘do their own thing’ if that is what they want. What it boils down to in practice is that if you are black you are never wrong and can never be corrected—whatever you want is good and you are right. The Negro people cannot be given leadership as part of the working class by the revolutionary party.

The logic of this position should be clear and was brought home at the TBA convention when the TBAers were addressed by a Black Panther who told them they were not the revolutionary party, that the Black Panthers were the only revolution-
ary party and he was applauded. Accordingly, the SWP should distance tomorrow. What the SWP has done is to raise the conception of an abstract, moral right above the class struggle and the needs of the working class and the revolu-
tionary party.

Black nationalism is nothing more than a mo-
dern version of cultural nationalism. The SWP has never defended theoretically the idea of the Negroes as a nation although they give lip ser-
cvice to it. It is even admitted that the Negro was ‘totally stripped of the culture and values acquired on the African continent.’ What black nationalism is calling for is the reversion, turning back the wheel of history, to the times when the Negroes lived under tribalism, reviving a primitive culture. This as Lenin points out is the most reactionary form of nationalism. The demand for ‘blackification’, Afro-American su-
nuniony and control of educational institutions only perpetuates the segregation of black and white workers and continues the ‘ghetto.’

CAPITALISTS

Today every black capitalist and petty bour-
gougeois has taken up the demand for black cul-
ture. Black capitalists such as Jesse Jackson are seen as the friends of the black trans-
port workers.

Today the Ford Foundation has become the hero in the fight for black control of the schools, pouring millions of dollars into community control while the workers the teachers become in the eyes of the nationalists the enemies. As Lenin said cultural nationalism draws the workers closer to the bourgeoisie.

Black nationalism has served to split the work-
ing class. This is exposed particularly within the trade union movement. Where white and black workers have joined in struggle against the bosses as in the UAW and the Chicago Transit strike with the intervention of the nationalists, this unity has been broken with the demagogy of black capitalism, black is beautiful. Rather than amalgam-
gating the working class in a united organ-
ization, the nationalists call for separate organ-
izations, separate unions. In every single in-
stance, black nationalism has served to divide the working class. We say that black nationalism is absolutely against the interests of the black workers that it will only lead them to defeat.

The Workers League stands today 100% against black nationalism in all its forms. We say that the key to the class struggle must be the unity of the working class, unified in trade unions, in the revolutionary party. Racism cannot be fought through black nationalism which is a di-
version for black workers to keep them from fighting their class enemy the capitalist class, economically and politically. Black nationalism only aids racism: it prevents the mobilization of black and white workers against the system of which racism is an inherent part.

There is no separate solution for the Negro people outside of the struggles of the world work-
ing class. There is no separate program. This Trotsky made clear. The fight against racism and every form of discrimination must be combined with the class struggle as a whole. The fight for equality, for black representation must become an integral part of the fight for socialism. The Workers League rather than accepting the divisions created by capitalist society and adapting to them calls for the organizations of the working class to take up the struggles of the Negro people and to unite the class politically in the fight to create a political arm of the entire working class, black and white, a labor party.

The struggles of the workers in the United States cannot be separated from the struggles of workers all over the world. The struggles of the workers and students in France last spring pointed the way. In the next period the struggles in the working class, particularly in Europe, will give tremendous impetus and leadership to the working class, both black and white, in the U.S. Black workers will see that their brothers are the workers in France, England, Italy and not the black capitalists or the Ford Foundation.
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Teachers Key to SF State Victory

By Deborah O’Connell

The struggle at SF State has reached a critical stage. It is a struggle not of the proletariat against exploitation, but a struggle for education and the right to develop one’s full potential. This struggle is not only an attack on the bourgeoisie, but an attack on the educational system itself.

The antagonists in this struggle are the students and the administration. The students are fighting for the right to education, while the administration is trying to maintain control and prevent any kind of student autonomy.

The students at SF State have formed a strong united front against the administration. They have established a Strike Committee, which has been coordinating the activities of the students during this period.

The administration has responded with a series of tactics to try and break the momentum of the students. They have tried to divide the students, to weaken their resolve, and to discourage them from continuing the struggle.

But the students have remained strong and determined. They have shown that they are willing to fight for their rights and that they will not be intimidated.

The struggle at SF State is not just a battle between the students and the administration. It is a battle between the working class and the bourgeoisie. It is a battle for the future of education and the future of society.

The students at SF State have demonstrated that they are capable of organizing and fighting for their rights. They have shown that they are willing to make sacrifices and that they will not give up until they have achieved their goals.

The struggle at SF State is not just a struggle for the students at SF State. It is a struggle for all students, and for all workers. It is a struggle for a better future for all.

The students at SF State are not alone in their struggle. They have the support of workers and students around the world. They are not alone in their fight for education and for a better future.

The students at SF State are fighting for a better future. They are fighting for the right to education. They are fighting for a better society. They are fighting for a better world.

The students at SF State are not just fighting for their rights. They are fighting for the rights of all students. They are fighting for the rights of all workers. They are fighting for the rights of all people.
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