Longshoreman Speaks Out

"When you add everything up we are even further behind than before the contract wage gains"

LABOR DAY 1969
NIXON, MEANY PLOT WAGE CURB

BY DAN FRIED

While government economists and the "experts" from the world of big business and banking argue as to how, when and how much the roaring inflation will be stopped - one thing is for sure, it's still hitting the working man hard in the pocket book. The official consumer price index rose at the rate of 6% in July. Food prices, which affect the workers more than any other budgetary item rose by 1% in July, with fresh fruit and vegetable prices 1.6% more than in June.

UPI and World Report, expressing the consensus of government and big business economists say that prices will continue to rise into 1970 while unemployment will continue to rise from the current 3.9% with a figure of 4% as a new "floor".

What this means for the working class is that Mr. Nixon will step up his measures to stem the inflation in order for the capitalists to reverse the balance of payments deficit in a world where each capitalist nation is fighting for its share of the market. This means that as inflation continues, the bosses and their men

BERNADETTE DEVLIN IN AMERICA

Woodstock - who paid piper?
LAUNCH WEEKLY BULLETIN DRIVE

To Raise $5,000 By November 1st.

Workers League Is Formed to Drive Bulletin to U.S. Labor and Youth Movements

Dr. William Kolakowsky, a member of the Polish Communist Party, and the Executive Committee of the Communist League of America, have formed the United Workers Bulletin Office to publish 'The United Workers Bulletin,' a weekly publication, to be distributed throughout the United States. The Bulletin will be a newspaper for the working class, written by workers for workers, and directed at the issues faced by the working class today.

The Bulletin will cover a wide range of topics, including the struggle against imperialism, the fight for workers' rights, and the need for solidarity among workers around the world. The Bulletin will also feature articles by leading revolutionaries and activists, as well as interviews with workers from around the country.

To support the publication of The United Workers Bulletin, we urge you to make a donation today. Your contribution will help us to reach a wider audience and ensure that our message reaches those who need it most.

Please click here to make a donation.
BERNADETTE AND THE BRITISH TROOPS

BY PAT CONNOLLY

Fresh from strutting from the barri- cades, Bernadette looked like a modern Joan of Arc. Miss Bernadette Devlin, member of Parliament from North Ireland, flew into Kennedy airport on an errand of mercy, and in a hall of publicity.

Miss Devlin is here to raise a million dollars. She was asked to go to North Ireland as a “Catholic” problem, and on this basis is appealing to Irish-Americans, the Vatican, a few “home-less” priests and the Papal Curia for “peace” from the liberals and priests leading the civil rights movement. At the same time, Protestant youth were fighting the police, and attacked and looted Protestant shops, despite the determination of Paisley and his right wing supporters.

Paisley represents the right wing of the Ulster Unionists. His party does in the U.S., got his training in fact in Wallace country. He attended the nation’s most prestigious school for reactionary preachers in North Carolina, Bob Jones College. Today Paisley uses his reactionary training to encourage and encourage the hatred between Catholics and Protestants in the Irish working class.

DIVISION

Miss Devlin presents the struggle as a class struggle. While it is true that the basic democratic and civil rights of the Catholic community are being denied by the ruling class, the civil rights for English workers is that of Ulster’s population, has been conducting a vigorous struggle to win an elementary democratic right to abolish social and economic discrimination.”

This is not a word about the working class! Not a word about the necessity for unity between Catholics and Protestants workers! Not a word about the kind of program necessary to unite workers for the struggle to abolish social and economic discrimination.”

WIDOWED

None of the revisionists have raised the demand for the immediate withdrawal of British troops. They all accept the role of the British troops as arbiters between the Catholics and Protestants, the idea that the British army is there to protect the Catholic workers and to preserve order and calm. Make no mistake about it—the troops are there to preserve order—“law and order” based on the oppression of Catholic and Protestant workers, and the continued rule of the capitalist class.

The revisionists in the U.S., such as the Communist Party, have given no unqualified support to the struggle to win a socialist movement in America, “Bring the troops home and send them to Mississippi”, capitulating completely to the liberal civil rights leaders such as Martin Luther King, who spread the illusion that the American government which was pursuing an imperialist war in Asia would act to protect Negroes in Mississippi. It is like sending a wolf to be a sheep. It is consistent with their policy of turning to anyone but the working class, for the solution to problems facing the working class, anything to avoid the question of the independent mobilization of the working class.

UNIT

The unity of the working class is what is required first of all in Ireland. The formation of common defense guards by Catholic and Protestant workers in Belfast projects after bitter street fighting provoked by the Paisleyite reactionaries is one step. In Derry workers from the Protestant Irish Street district and the Catholic Cross Street district have organized common defense guards against attacks by Paisleyites and provocateurs. 9,000 shipyard workers in Belfast and 2,000 factory workers near the docks have met and agreed that there will be no fighting along religious lines.

The unity of the class around a socialist program is what is required to defeat the Unionist government and prepare the struggle for a united socialist Ireland. The first demand to fight for such unity is the unconditional call for the withdrawal of British troops from North Ireland. The Special Powers Act must be repealed, and all political prisoners freed. Disarm and disarm the Specials! Immediate nationalization of the banks, the land, and industry, under workers control! For a workers and Farmers Government!
WOOSTOCK RETREAT TO SWAMP OF IDEALISM

BY LUCY ST. JOHN

From the Isle of Wight in England to Tenino, Washington in the U.S.A., the frenzied middle class has been "doing its own thing". At the Woodstock Rock Festival, 400,000 youth indulged themselves in a virtual quagmire of mud, rock and drugs. Those most "high" about these "rock fairs" are not the participants but the forces behind the Pied Pipers--the capitalists. This is why every instrument of the capitalists, from their press to their police force have been pushing with enthusiasm. They have good reason, we might add.

Last year thousands of youth converged on Chicago to confront the politicians. This year many of the same youth turned from politics, from any fight against the war, to the biggest escape yet--to sleep in an LSD state.

REACTION

This is no accident. This turn away from politics is a reaction on the part of the middle class to the deepening crisis in the capitalist world, and to the decay of the social order. This reaction is not unique to our times. The decay of every social order--slavery, feudalism, capitalism, produces a series of decadent cults, "philosophies", and corruption. You have only to go back to your history books to study the decline of ancient Greece and how they found orgies equivalent to Woodstock.

This decay is the result of the break down of the old, outdated system of production. It is reflected in the breakdown of the ideological cement--philosophy, religion, morality and political beliefs which held the society together and was used to justify the mode of production--the exploitation of the working class.

This is the meaning only of the orgy at Woodstock but the orgy at Martha's Vineyard.

BREAKDOWN

Chicago marked the demise of reform--the traditional political position of the middle class--the political outcome which has historically tied the working class to the capitalists in "peace". The transmission belt for reformism into the working class is the middle class. The breakdown of the middle class and with it reformism lies the basic material relations in capitalist society--the struggle between the employer and the workers.

The beginning movement of the workers throws the middle class into confusion and fear. The middle class protest movement and all the confrontations on the campuses, all the SDS "book waving" has not stopped the increasing attacks by the capitalists on the working class or the students. This movement finds itself politically bankrupt and whole sections of it have now put forward the slogan of "non-violence" or "no guilt on the Chicagos".

This section of the middle class is running away from the clash between the two major class lines. They seek a solution in the "individual", in their "feelings". They live in the illusion that they will find the answer inside themselves. This is idealist rubbish! "Newswear" puts it very well: "Woodstock made a turning toward not unlike the impulse that produced the best generation of the Eisenhower years, this youth from politics into the sanctuary of their youth and their senses."

They begin not with a materialist outlook but an idealist one--that human nature is not socially produced but can be changed by changing individuals. This leads to the logic of idealism which is solipsism--I alone exist and exist only through my perceptions. This is where drugs come in. They offer hallucinations and purely individual sensations and solutions to the "identity crisis" within yourself and not within the society that in fact imposes this identity. Rather than changing anything these "individuals" are reduced to animals. The youth who went to Woodstock are living a dangerous illusion. In an extensive interview with the New York Times one young participant from a comfortable middle class home said: "I just had a feeling that, wow, there are so many of us, we really are powerful. It's always felt like a minority. But I though, wow, we're a majority--it felt like that. I felt here's the answer to anyone who calls us nerds or losers."

This is the bankruptcy of an outlook based on "feelings". The middle class has found particularly the middle class that flocked to Woodstock has no power, absolutely none. The illusion that the youth is really something more than despair--it is the pathetic protest of the frustrated middle class that seeks to run away by escape. All those thousands that flocked to the rock fests cannot alter the image of capitalist society. The festivals are an escape route for those who reject the revolutionary role of the working class.

BUSINESS

Underneath all their pretenses of non-conformism is the desire to keep things as they are--to defend this system. As one youth put it: "I really think that after all of us graduate, you know, there will be one thing, to be business. Business is business and we will be running the business." The "something" these youth were "demonstrating for" was all the absolutely rotten filth and decay of capital and society--"freedom" and "peace". The fact is that when reality in the form of rain hit that San Francisco dream up in Woodstock, it turned into one big mudhole, so much for dreams!

The illusion that was posed at these fests is really the alternative of the capitalist class--to drug the youth and prevent them from taking up the fight to overthrow this system. This is why Newswear put it: "Sellers hawked their wares openly...Police did collar a few of the most flagrant pushers but mostly they stood by and watched."

The "cultural revolution" is bought and paid for by the youth. It is not for the hard cash they get, but for the destruction of the struggle against their system. The Pied Pipers are only a part of the pestilence of decay but to keep it around.

Youth has a vital role to play in the revolutionary struggles but they must be part of a disciplined party which bases itself on an objective and scientific analysis.

BY TIM WEIRFORTH

NEW YORK--The complete political bankruptcy of the American trade union bureaucrats was paraded out in open day. All he see at the recent Central Labor Council meeting which endorsed Procaccino for Mayor.

In case of lesser evilเกษม good, raving mad, Harry Van Ars-
dale and Victor Gothenbaum fought it out over the issue of which candidate was the least anti-labor. No one had a good word to say for their own candidate. It he added bad words to say about the other nominee.

The discussion centered on which of the candidates had thrown more labor leaders into jail. The Procaccino supporters recalled that Mayor Lindsay had jailed the leaders of the Transport Workers Union, the Sanitation union and the United Federation of Teachers. In addition it was noted that he had urged parents and students to cross the picket lines in the recent teachers strike.

As if to answer these accusations Martin Morgenstern of the Social Service Employees Union jumped to the aid of Gothenbaum and Lindsay. While not denying Lindsay's record of public relations, he added that Mayor Wagner had jailed leaders of the SSEE and the Governor Rockefeller folliver had jailed Jillian Roberts of District 50.

CRÉW

The only conclusion to be drawn from all this is that both the Demo-
crat and Republican parties are the tools of the bosses and aid the bosses by jailing leaders of striking workers.

This leads to the inescapable further conclusion that the whole crew gathered together at the Central Labor Council, including some who have spent some time in jail, are as guilty as the Demo-
crat and Republican candidates. magazine has for so long bolstered these parties by refusing to use labor's strength to build its own power.

It must also be noted that both Victor Gothenbaum and his friendly side-
deck, Martin Morgenstern, are tied to the Daily World, "noted the signif-
icant progress their unions made in recent negotiations with the Lind-
fords."

In the same publication of this 'progress' is the squee contract which will progressively liquidate 1,000 jobs in the garment industry, but not to mention removing every safe-
guard over working conditions for those who remain. It is about time the SSEE rank and file decided decisively with this character.

The question, quite putable, is Mayor Lindsay may win the election, we sug-
gest the workers keep track of the following одиноги who have been doing their best to get this jailing of unionists back into office.

First the former, now mayor: of District 37, the re-
presentative of the bulk of Mayor Lindsay's employees. Next comes the friendly flunky and now Organizing Director of SSEE. Then we have Leon Davis and the whole crew which runs Local 1889 Drug and Hospi-
tal Employees who have been rooters of Governor Rockefeller for so long. Not to forget we have out that great "progressive " Harry Foner, President of the Industrial Workers Union, and even a business agent from Mother Goose: Operators Local 306, Steve D. Intullo,

Foner supporters of Republican Lind-
sey by seeing their efforts as an "anti-Procaccino drive". It just so happened his "Procaccino drive" takes the form of urging a vote for Republican, strike busting Speaker of the House James W. Foley, Mayor Lindsay.

Class conscious workers have nothing but scorn and contempt for both Martin Morgenstern-Foner and their Communist Party boosters.

On the Chicago dock scrawled in huge letters is the slogan "Impeach Mayor Lindsay!" We say this is a very good slogan. The reason is that whoever replaces Lindsay will need impeaching as well. The only way forward to improve the working class, the whole class of bosses and politicians, by building our own party based on the unions.

Labor Bureaucrats Support Strike Breakers

Reprinted with permission of the Daily World From the Daily World, its veteran labor cor-
respondent George Morris, and the Communist Party, for which they speak. Those people, who claim to be "communists" and "socialists", cover for the same people.
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France demolished feudalism in the Great Revolution and established the unalloyed rule of the bourgeoisie in a classical purity unequalled by any other European land. And the struggle of the upper strata of the bourgeoisie against the ruling bourgeoisie also appeared here in an acute form unknown elsewhere. This was the reason why Marx not only studied the past history of France with special interest, but also followed her current history in every detail, stored up the material for future use and consequently was never taken by surprise.


TO SUBMIT the special features of a particular country’s development to Marxist social analysis is to recognize that they are the national expression of a world process.

Without such a study, which reveals both what is peculiar to a particular country and what is common to all countries at a particular stage of economic and social development, it is not possible to prepare to intervene in the class struggle. Those who ignore the lessons of history and refuse to relate the present events to them are bound to be taken by surprise.

French history has proved this over and over again since Marx’s day, most recently of all, of course, during the General Strike of May-June, 1968.

In these articles it will be possible to do no more than deal in outline with some of the lessons of French history, particularly those of the Cézanne period since 1958. However, it is necessary to take the study back to the great turning point in French history, the 1789 Revolution which brought the bourgeoisie to power and thus proved decisive for the subsequent development of the country.

In the years of revolution, which opened up in the Spring of 1789, the bourgeoisie abolished the old feudal order based on the dominance of the landed nobility, overthrew the monarchy and deprived the Church of its lands and temporal powers.

This took place as a complex process in which the more moderate middle-class leaders were constantly being pressed further than they wanted to go by the peasant’s radical actions and the eruption of the urban masses onto the scene.

Deep divisions and bitter internecine conflicts broke out within the new rising class which were settled by the revolutionary tribunals and the guillotine. Even the most radical wing of the bourgeoisie, the Jacobins, were essentially defenders of property who, while at certain stages having to call on the masses, were unable to satisfy their demands.

A point was reached, therefore, at which the Revolution had to go back, finding a basis which corresponded to the material needs of the main sections of the property-owners and once again leaving the masses politically impotent. The final consolidation of the bourgeoisie state and the new property relations took place under Napoleon Bonaparte’s rule (1799-1815).

Continuing and completing a task which the monarchy had been too bound up with feudal institutions to carry through, Napoleon established a highly-centralized state apparatus as the instrument of bourgeois rule. In its basic features the French state today directly continues the form it assumed at this time.

The bourgeoisie needed a strong state to consolidate its power and safeguard its property after a period of revolutionary upheaval and uncertainty which brought it into conflict with all the European states. This state directly confronted the hypothetical “individual” of bourgeois theory as a result of the destruction of the old institutions of feudalism—the guilds and corporations, the juridical powers of the nobility, the secular authority of the Church. State offices were now “colonized” by the new ruling class on the basis of the career open to talent.

In the course of the revolutionary years the property of the Church, emigré nobles and enemies of the revolution was confiscated and auctioned. Bourgeois purchasers and speculators piled up great fortunes. Further opportunities for enrichment arose through speculation, hoarding scarce goods, contracting for the army and the like. The great bourgeoisie dynasties of the 19th century were established on this foundation of legalized plunder.

From the fortunes made at this time a new class of great capitalists took shape, the forebears of the ‘business magnates’. Families’ said, in the 1930s, to control France’s riches.

But the revolution also had taken place before France had taken many strides towards industrialization. The wealth of the bourgeoisie consisted mainly of real estate and liquid resources used in the financing of trade and government. The industrial wing of this class was still weak. Moreover, it was greatly handicapped not only by the slow development of the home market but also by British industry’s dominant position in the world market. Industrial development in France, starved of capital in the first part of the 19th century, lagged behind Britain and was then to be rapidly overshadowed by Germany.

Contrary to the intentions or interests of the bourgeoisie the peasants in and after 1789 had made their own revolution. Needing the peasants as a
Some features of French capitalism

Nevertheless, industrial development did make headway at a steady rate throughout the 19th century. Even so, France remained well behind Britain in aggregate industrial power and lost her leading position on the continent to Germany round about 1880.

Down to 1914 a rapid transformation took place in some sectors of the economy, especially in heavy industry. New mining areas were opened up; a modern steel industry was established; while in engineering and other technically advanced industries there was significant progress.

French industry tended to be weighted down by the existence of numerous small, often archaic units. Exports were mainly of the higher quality commodities rather than cheap, mass-produced articles for the rapidly-growing markets in the less developed areas. Unquestionably a country of advanced industrial capitalism in 1914, France was facing growing difficulties in maintaining her relative position on the political scene.

The last part of the 19th century saw a remarkable export of French capital, mobilized by the big deposit banks which were established in this period. The source of these funds was, to a large extent, the rentier middle-class and peasants whose nature has already been described. There were rich pickings for the banks and financial houses in handling loans to foreign governments and other big borrowers. The Paris Bourse thus became second only to the Bourse of London in international finance.

French foreign lending was much more directly political than that from London. The government exercised control over the direction of such lending, seeking to shape it according to foreign policy needs.

After the period under Napoleon in which France had attained European hegemony, the Second Empire (1852-1870), and the reopening of French productive power brought about the big setback of the Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871). The French ruling class had in the process retreated back to the status of a second-class power.

To remain in the power game, to acquire the colonies which appeared absolutely necessary for economic expansion to proceed, French diplomacy had to find allies to compensate for France’s growing relative weakness.

Two possibilities presented themselves: an alliance with Germany, some form of continental coalition which could one day directly challenge both Britain, the main imperialist power, or an alliance with Britain against Germany, whose government was taking out a claim for European hegemony.

The French have delineated the main differences between foreign policy orientation in the epoch of the French Revolution. The choice was an uncomfortable one. As a result of her policy, France in the new German Empire had acquired two of France’s richest provinces, Alsace and Lorraine. It was an uncomfortable position to make an alliance with Germany acceptable to a public opinion on the left.

On the other hand, 'periodic Albinon' was France’s hereditary enemy and rivalry was kept alive during the territories of other colonies in the late 19th century. The French diplomacy sought the development of an alliance with Russia—also an enemy of Britain and with Germany which confronted Germany with the threat of a war on two fronts.

In the name of the Russian Alliance, dating from 1874, that保存ed the French republicanism, money for the banks, were poured into the financing of the Russian military and administrative machine.

A crisis emerged from Germany, now building a huge sea fleet and making a bid for world power, provoking the dominance situation changed. Britain and France drew together over the common interest, settling the terms of a treaty and the alliance, the two powers moving closer, despite the standstill in the race to arms. After the First World War was declared, with France’s centre of an anti-German coalition, not only without a standing doubt in the minds of some members of the ruling class.

Effects of the First World War & the depression

When the first imperialist war came, it struck the French bourgeoisie at the most. The eastern and northern departments were especially hard hit. Two-thirds of heavy industry’s capacity were over-run by the German army or in the rear zone. The strain on German power was enormous. France could obviously ‘aim high’; stand up to that German power without Britain and then the United States.

The shock of the war and the revolutionary tremors which followed it depressed a deep crisis in the economy of the bourgeoisie from which it has never recovered.

Continued industrialization during the war increased the weight of the proletariat or French socialists, while war inflation weakened large sections of the middle class. Class conflicts already taking shape on the surface was spurred up for the industrial proletariat before the war, assumed now a still more antagonistic and political character. Despite her position in the victor camp at the end of the war, but the extent of this weakness was conceded for over a decade. The 1920s, when the French economy sparked off by the reconstruction of the devastated areas financed by government loans and bank credits, continued as part of the world boom which was politically.

But while industry grew, with its weight the middle class, the franc had to less than a fifth of its pre-war parity. When it was stabilized in 1926 and 1928 it was undervalued in terms of other currencies, which enabled the tourist trade an advantage in foreign competition and enabled France from the full extent of the world depression, the French capital from the pound devaluation in 1931.

TheToe of the Great Depression felt the effect of the depression with full force. The fall in exports and tourist earnings were the worst in the franc at its new rate evaporated, heavy and stiffened the back of the heavy industries, and even the service industries, the extreme of stagnation from which it was not really released until the 1950s.

All the old-fashioned features of the French bourgeoisie surfaced again, and found themselves, and sharp conflicts took place within the capitalist class.

In 1929 an agrarian movement was formed as well as the most advanced, tried to bid the price of wheat as a means of raising government support. French production was cut by 50%, which meant that even the smallest capitalist economy was beginning to recover.

In France, however, in late 1935, some signs of recovery began to appear it was too early to draw firm conclusions of a crisis of social crisis which raised the spectre of a new revolution before the shakers and demoralized bourgeois. A period of time was against this background that the May 1936 elections brought to office a Front Populaire government immediately confronted by the mass strikes and the call of the CGT for a working class determined to see its situation redressed.

This situation revealed the extent to which the French and the Communist Party had passed to the fringe of the social order. The intervention of its secretary, Blanqui, and the efforts of the Communist Party apparatus were needed to bring the strike movement under control and prevent it taking a revolutionary direction.

The 1936 betrayal, conscious or unconscious, of the concessions which were made to the working class and by the fashion in which they were made, with the support of the CP, did nothing to overcome the newness of the ruling class.

The rise of Nazism in Germany confronted men again with the problems of the pre-1914 era. The close relationship with Britain had been given up very to suspicion and rivalry. At the 1920s and the British government (footing) the American Naval Agreement) seemed ready to make concessions to the Hitler regime.

Within the French ruling class the old differences over foreign policy remained, with Soviet policy was made by a right-wing government, but large sections of the right preferred an accommodation with Germany, distrust Britain and feared, possibly, a European revolution at home which had narrowly been avoided in 1836.

Hence, in the latter part of the 1930s the French bourgeoisie suffered a growing crisis as a result of the general deterioration of confidence. The economy was running down and essential investment was neglected. There was no recovery from the depression even after re-armament had begun. Confidence in the franc remained so low.

The view that subjection to Hitler’s plans for Europe was going to be ‘communism’ gained ground, not so much from a belief in the more or less imminent of a new war, still more disastrous for the population of the Popular Front, the previous one, was a predominant factor. For the ruling class it was coupled with the fear that it could not confront the inevitable outcome: the unleashing of re-

French re-armament and diplomatic preparations coincided with the upsurge of the Nazi Germany was therefore half-hearted. Substantial sections of the capitalist class and the middle classes found they could not stand the confidence in victory and preferred a settlement at any price.

The breathing space of Munich was
Some characteristics of the working-class movement

IT IS VERY necessary at this point to describe certain features of the French working-class movement.

The growth of a modern industrial proletariat in France was influenced by the preservation of a large peasantry, the existence of many small-scale units and the slow emergence of advanced, large-scale enterprises.

Socialist ideas entered France at an early stage, but began to influence the working class by the 1830s, at a time when trade unions were illegal. These ideas were then taken up in small-scale enterprises, i.e. by skilled artisans largely working under the old conditions. There was an attraction to Utopian schemes for preserving the small workshop type of economy which were opposed to the advance of modern factory discipline and organization, and, of course, to Marxism, made up an important component of the working-class movement. In the 19th century and was a basis, later, for syndicalism.

The French class struggle in the middle decades of the 19th century assumed an extremely sharp character. Trade unionism was virtually excluded by the law. Working-class action thus took a mainly spontaneous, but political form. Workers made possible the overthrow of the restored Bourbons in 1830 and the downfall of Louis Philippe in February, 1848.

The conflict which rapidly ensued between the bourgeois republicans and the workers demanding a social republic led to the 'Boulangist Days' in which thousands of Parisian workers were massed by troops and middle-class volunteers. The Commune of 1871 repeated the same drama on a still larger scale.

In other words bourgeois and workers came to grips in bloody struggle which left indelible marks on class relations.

The development was, in its own way, paradoxical. The French proletariat was numerically weaker and less concentrated in factories and big enterprises than England, but at the same time it was more politically conscious and had acquired a rich revolutionary tradition. In short, it was less reconciled to the bourgeois social order; its organization took a political rather than a trade union form.

On the other hand, its small workshop character and more highly-skilled workers led to its petty bourgeoisie, at least to that part which was in the Jacobin tradition.

Further, the French proletariat was very heterogenous. It was recruited slowly from the peasantry over a long period. Many members had no links with the new working class. Newcomers to towns often aspired to join the 'bourgeoisie' and regard their position as wage earners as the nearest. For such sections, therefore, the level of class consciousness was low. Only where there were mines or large industrial areas, was there a more homogeneous and class-conscious proletariat able to form independent organizations and provide a basis for working-class political parties.

Assisted after 1884 by legal recognition of trade unions the French labour movement then began to take on its modern character.

Unlike the situation in Britain, however, the Socialist Party and the trade unions developed on independent lines. Both were weakened as a consequence. The pre-1914 Socialist Party, a union of small trade unions with tendencies towards parliamentary campaigning and was much influenced by middle-class radicalism, Free-masonry and the whole environment in which the politicians and intellectuals moved.

Distrust of politicians and of the bourgeois state gave French trade union spokesmen a very special character. The Socialist Party, 1914 known as syndicalism. Independently of politics, syndicalism took root, which, while seemingly revolutionary, could quite well become reactionary.

The syndicalists claimed to be working for the overthrow of capitalism through strikes and sabotage. Their aim was a general strike in which the workers would take control of the factories. In fact the Confédération Générale du Travail (C.G.T.) formed in 1910 feared a bureaucracy which had no real intention of carrying out such programmes. In any case the unions were numerically weak and appealed mainly to the more skilled workers in the small-scale industries.

In 1914 C.G.T leaders, with a few honourable exceptions, placed themselves at the government's disposal in carrying out industrial mobilization for the war effort. In the same way the Socialist Party leaders joined the 'National alliance' of workers and bourgeois patriotic leaders in the 'national front' units in the First World War as ministers and supporters of the government.

These betrayals prepared the way for the split in the French labour movement in the years which began to appear in the later stages of the war, and which was accelerated at the Socialist Party Congress at Tours in 1920, where the majority proclaimed the formation of the French Communist Party. The trade unions also split, with a minority voting against the central leadership and the majority remaining faithful to the old-line C.G.T. leadership.

During the war and in the 1920s important changes began to take place in the French proletariat. The war, the economic problems in the former agrarian regions. Many new recruits—former peasants and farm labourers, including many women—were brought into the working class. This was a period in which the balance of power between the trade union organizations and the employers and the trade unionists who had acquired.

Because of the slow growth in the French working class and the heavy death toll of the First World War, systematic attempts were made during and after the war to recruit foreign workers for French industry and construction work. These immigrant workers, mainly from the poor peasantry of neighbouring countries such as Italy and Spain, or from still further abroad such as Poland, were not easy to organize because of language and other difficulties.

However, since they were the most exploited in society, there was little chance of them being attracted to socialist organisations for the more conservative trade unions.

As the composition of the French proletariat changed, the socialists, the opportunities for the Communist Party decreased. Although the C.G.T. leaders tended to shun class struggle, the Communist Party was strong on the bloc of the C.G.T., in the 'National fellowship' of 1914. The Communist Party tended to attract the southern or more conservative elements, except in a few areas, like the northern coalfields, where there was a strong communist element. These social changes probably explain the difference in character between the Communist Party's ability—despite its decline in the 1920s—to establish a strong working-class base in the following decade.

As a result, by 1936 it was able to appear as the principal working-class party in many of the main industrial areas and to establish a strong position in the advanced industries and big factories. In other words its strength lay in the strategically important sections of the class.

By 1939-40, historical responsibilities and the consequences of its betrayal in 1936, 1944-1945, 1958 and 1968 are, therefore, formidable, and a serious section will be taken up later.

When the Germans invaded the 1939-40 winter was followed in the Spring by the Pateroff offensive, the French Army, and its British allies had no reply. Apart from some isolated units the retreat was complete, and rout, not through lack of material, but because no serious preparation had been made for the kind of war which the German Wehrmacht fought and because there was complete demoralization through all sections of the civil and military command.

Within a very short time, therefore, the French government decided to ask for the Armistice and the French People were forced to assume the armed forces under the command of the German High Command. The ‘Popular Front’ parliament elected in 1936 (the Communists, of course, were for the most part in prison or in flight).

Under the ageing First World War military, Philippe Pétain, the Republic gave way to ‘the French State’, the old bourgeois device of ‘Liberty, Equality and Fraternity’ was replaced by ‘Vive le Peuple, Viva la Família and Fatherland’.

The great majority of the French bourgeoisie now staked its future on the collaboration with Germany praised by the Vichy regime of Pétain and Lavrullier who devoid of all principle and patriotic duty, preserved and upheld the identity of the ‘French State’, as it was now called, as the embodiment of their total, i.e. the possibility of a complete German takeover.

In other words, most of the bourgeoisie, whatever their political position, decided to ‘realism’, i.e. the certainty of a German victory and the actual occupation of French territory, to opt for a settlement with Germany. Only a small minority at first remained firm.

The gesture of the almost recently promoted Brigadier, Charles de Gaulle, who fled from London, an alternative—continued resistance. The Popular Front and the Allied victory—seemed largely symbolic. In fact, de Gaulle offered an alternative way of preserving the continuity of the state and of bourgeois rule should Germany be defeated.

Outlawed by the Vichy regime, with whom de Gaulle had nothing in common, de Gaulle’s claim had no legal basis until, by actually assuming control of the state power, he was able to reinforce it.

The experience of the defeat, the Armistice and the Occupation brought further divisions and tensions into French society. For sections of the bourgeoisie it continued to be a profitable time; they lived well and were safeguarded against revolution. To the end Pétain was greeted by large and enthusiastic crowds wherever he went. However, he confronted a threat from those who wanted to set up a full-blooded fascist regime on Nazi lines, the out-and-out collaborators and, to a growing extent, the armed opposition of the resistance groups.

The Allied invasion and the ‘liberation’ was accompanied by partisan activity, largely under communist command, which was ultimately successful in expelling the Wehrmacht and against the collaborators.

It took on the aspect of a civil war in which, as the old authority crumbled, the partisan bands became potentially contenders for power. Everything depended, in fact, upon what policy the Communist Party—and the Soviet Union—would pursue. There could be little sentiment that since, after initial hesitations, the Communist Party...
recognized. He built up very methodi-
cally the means to effect a smooth transition from Vichy institutions to those of what was to become the Fourth Republic.

He was extremely conscious of two dangers: that France would become an Anglo-American satellite or a Soviet Republic. The task he set himself was to bring into operation the alternative which he had held out since his June, 1940 appeal of preserving bourgeois state power on the basis of national independence.

In fact, because this also suited the needs of the Soviet bureaucracy, he was able to enlist the support of Stalin against Anglo-American political pressures, in his April, 1940 appeal to use the resources of the Vichy CP leadership to stifle the partisans' revolutionary energies. This inestimable service to the French bourgeoisie made him quite suddenly, considering his previous obscurity, a very powerful bureaucrat.

Anyhow the situation of the French bourgeoisie, as well as of its state and its economic and social function when de Gaulle took over. In fact he gave up, and went into retirement, before it had extricated itself fully from its predicament.

The post-war crisis of the bourgeoisie

At the end of the war the French bourgeoisie had been the last to receive the brunt of the German occupation. It had been the last to be reoccupied and thereby the last to be dispossessed of its political and economic power. The bourgeoisie, therefore, was able to start the process of restoring its power and authority as soon as the war ended.

Even with aid the problems were so severe and the ground lost so great that recovery seemed painfully slow. It was, however, soon apparent that the mid-1950s, to see the old prewar trends of stagnation still predominate and the breakthrough to modernization be delayed. The home market into the 1950s and the balance of payments suffered from chronic weaknesses.

Despite a succession of devaluations the franc remained over-valued and exports suffered. The war in Indochina was a further drain. The different bourgeois factions taking the role which was characteristic also by attempts to cut taxes and controls. With the elections for the Assembly, de Gaulle was in the wings, and the election campaign was to be the key to the new government.

Troops of the "French colonial army" withdrew from Hanoi in October, 1954 following the defeat of French forces by the Viet Minh at the battle of Dien Bien Phu.

The decline of the Fourth Republic

The short-lived "Mitterrand" France government, able to achieve some success, was forced to make concessions to the working class in order to get their support. He was one of the few politicians to understand the importance of the Fourth Republic without being discredited. In the elections of the time the "left" leader remained a powerful force.

The elections marked a shift to the extreme left, and the electoral body of Mitterrand and the Communist Party quickly proceeded to the achievement of their aims, by the passing of special powers for the arms industries, which were supported by the Communist deputies.

Hence the Fourth Republic moved to its climax, the two possible dangers of proletarian revolution or the revolution of the bourgeoisie implicit in the situation. This was the situation that was envisaged by de Gaulle’s accession to power in 1958.

The opposition to the Algerian war grew, and the modernization and intellectual and middle-class groups of the bourgeoisie, who had focused their efforts towards a formal opposition and refused to issue a clear statement to stop the war.

The growth of the movement, however, had profound effects. It was a major change in the decline of the Fourth Republic. The growth of the French economy during the 1950s was partly due to international expansion: France’s position, relatively strong, showed increasing attacks by the politicians to satisfy the demands. The elections for the Assembly, however, had the result that the end continued to be shaky and overvalued on the foreign exchanges.

The August 1955 strikes and those of the summer of 1956 showed a sharp division in the production classes, the labor shortages were the result of growing overvalued on the foreign exchanges.

Since the 1950s the situation has been closely involved with the policies of French foreign policy, with the decay in Indochina and Algeria. The tension of the Fourth Republic was the result of the economic needs of the army. The French state in Algeria had acquired a more or less a monopoly position in the economy and these needs became increasingly self-confident at the same time that the working class were becoming increasingly discontented.

The economic situation has continued to worsen as the crisis of the Fourth Republic moved to its climax, the two possible dangers of proletarian revolution or the revolution of the bourgeoisie implicit in the situation. This was the situation that was envisaged by de Gaulle’s accession to power in 1958.

To be continued in future issues.
bridges plans sellout on container contract

By Jeff Sebastian

SAN FRANCISCO -- After many months of secret negotiations the ILWU leadership has finally come before the ranks with a recommended container freight station agreement. This proposed contract will not solve any of the problems facing longshoremen. In fact, acceptance of these proposals will go a long way towards legitimizing the long range plans of the shippers for attrition, wage cuts and civil war between employers and Teamster union members.

Bridges hopes to prepare mass betrayal tomorrow by administering another poison pill today. He accepts as fully legitimate and inevitable all the massive changes the employers want to bring about and his main problem is negotiating enough short term concessions to avoid any mobilization or preparation of the ranks for a real struggle.

At the heart of the proposed container station contract is the agreement that the once flourishing stuffing and unstuffing containers is longshore work and will be performed by ILWU members in the ILWU's stuffing station facilities to be constructed on or adjacent to the dock areas.

All other longshoremen who have been performing container stuffing work will be excluded from such work in the future. The new agreement will coat the employers nothing. Any advantages gained by longshoremen will come directly out of the hides of other workers.

CONCESSIONS

These "concessions" have not been gained for nothing. In return for the right to perform these jobs the ILWU has actually taken the unparalleled step of agreeing to a wage cut. Container station workers or unit laborers who work at the docks may receive several dollars a day less than regular longshoremen, an actual wage cut of over 6%. In addition the differential for night work will be slashed to a third instead of 50%.

Bridges is right in saying the two other concessions are to be made on vacation benefits. These are no small concessions, but actually self-set a wage cutting precedent in an area that promises to become the major source of longshore jobs in the near future.

This is not all. Operations of the container freight stations will vastly alter the sort of working conditions that have been won on the docks.

Freight stations will operate continuously with a stable force of regular employees rather than workers dispatched from the hiring hall. With each job, this inevitably lead to a real drive on the part of the employers to undermine the power of the union by introducing speedup through a standardization and routinization of conditions of work. Many of the fine controls that the dockers related to onerous work, flexible breaks and the power of the workers over their working conditions will be fought for all over again as the employers fight to bring about a factory style working atmosphere.

This agreement in no way covers military cargo and full loads coming directly from the factory. It is no doubt that as the container companies start to take over transport more and more cargo will be packed at the actual factory into containers for shipment, thus eliminating many longshore jobs. In other words under the cover of defending hundreds of jobs Bridges is really handing the employers all they need to go ahead and decimate the union in the near period. There is absolutely no provision to defend even these container station jobs against layoffs and the effects of factory stuffed containers.

Dockers must be absolutely clear on the real meaning of these proposals. The shippers are to be allowed to automate the docks as they please, eventually turning the loading and unloading of ships into a fully automated procedure conducted by a few men working with container equipment. In return for this longshoremen are offered the prospect of a wage cut and work at container stations which will in no way alter the real threat of the decimation of longshore jobs.

To accept this agreement is to take a giant step towards legitimizing this entire perspective. This is the logic of the original M&M agreement carried to its ultimate betrayal.

TEAMSTERS

As if this were not bad enough the proposed agreement now brings into the open with renewed fury the prospect of out and out war between the ILWU and the Teamsters Union. Already the IBT is threatening to shut down the entire West Coast rather than face the loss of thousands of jobs. The Bulletin has warned for a long time of the danger of this sort of civil war between the unions. Already the agreement to accept a wage cut at the container stations is a fruit of the gross bureaucratic shortsightedness. The reactionary Bridges leadership has absolutely no perspective to deal with this.

The Workers League is fighting for a real alternative to these rotten labor betrayals. We say the road of acceptance of wage cutting and attrition is the road to defeat. Harry Bridges says that the only alternative to their brutal betrayal is to fight to maintain the status quo. That is a lie, a bureaucratic lie from one who has absolutely no confidence in the power of the rank and file.

The ILWU must throw this proposed container station agreement back into the faces of Bridges and his friends in the FMA. Bridges must be given orders that the rank and file intends to see it to that not a single job is given up and not a penny is given over to the FMA.

The Teamsters union has said that it will shut down the West Coast before it sees thousands of Teamster jobs eliminated. Now is the time to forge a fighting alliance with these workers to present the FMA with an absolutely solid united front of opposition. No power on earth can stand up to the might of the longshoremen and Teamsters fighting together.

ACTION

We propose that the ILWU take action to bring about an immediate conference with the Teamsters Union. Not only on the wages issue but also on the crucial question of halting the constant meeting of bureaucrats but an open conference for representatives of the rank and file. The purpose of this conference must be to present the FMA with a united program and the threat of a real alternative to the Teamsters. The guaranteed must make it absolutely clear that they do not propose to lose a single job or a single penny of wages. Only the workers have the right to the benefits of containerization.

The FMA must be forced to agree that no single cargo handling job will be eliminated. Every teamster and every longshoreman presently employed on the docks must be guaranteed a job with elimination of jobs through attrition. Any reduction of work to be handled with a reduction in hours at no loss of pay. The question of allocation of these jobs to be a matter of negotiations between the two unions, that is all.

This program for unit struggle is the only alternative to the pernicious capitulation proposed by Harry Bridges.

VOTE NO ON THE CONTAINER FRONTAGE AGREEMENT
NO JOB CUTS NO WAGE CUTS
FOR ILWU-IBT UNITY AGAINST THE FMA

SF Teachers Fight "Soul On Ice" Censorship

By Jeff Sebastian

SAN FRANCISCO--At the time this is being written Local 61 of the AFT is calling an emergency meeting to prepare a strike of San Francisco public school teachers.

The issue which is the stand of Max Rafferty and the head of the S.F., Board of Education, threatening the livelihood of any teacher who dares to use the book 'Soul On Ice' for the ethnic studies program. This was one of the texts recommended by a teacher's committee preparing a program in black studies. The teachers regard this as a violation of their right to academic freedom.

It is very significant that such an issue has set off this strike. It is an indication of how deeply the teachers are alienated and the mass worker submerged in the reactionary swamp of Black Studies and adaptation to black nationalism. This is also very apparent in some of their other demands calling for funds to conduct continuing education in order to meet the needs of minority students and demanding that principal participatory role in the school should be to foster a cooperative School staff, and ability to positively project the school within the community.

REACTING

It is clear that the teachers are reacting to attack particularly by the nationalists by swallowing whole all the reactionary rubbish of community control. They also see that the teachers in their panic are performing the real issues that they are still city workers to be obscured with middle class reformism.

Real issues are the financial crisis in education that is making impossible any gains in the quality of education and working conditions for teachers. Since their strike last year San Francisco teachers have experienced every gain taken away and attacked. Class sizes are violated, grievance procedures are a farce, the strike of last year has been illegal, and this year the teachers received an actual wage cut with a raise that fails to meet the rise in the cost of living.

The teachers have raised these questions in their demands but have allowed the real issues to become trapped in their efforts to seek solutions through such schemes as black studies programs. It is not that we are opposed to the right of academic freedom but rather that the teachers have permitted themselves to be railroaded into a situation in which they fight for the right to control a reactionary and bankrupt school system.

We are entitled to ask how the schools in this decaying society possibly succeed in 'positively projecting the school within the community' when, as the newspapers were forced to admit several days ago, 30,000 qualified applicants have been refused admittance to State Colleges for lack of places and funds. We say that the road of acceptance of wage cutting and attrition is the road to defeat. Harry Bridges says that the only alternative to their brutal betrayal is to fight to maintain the status quo. That is a lie, a bureaucratic lie from one who has absolutely no confidence in the power of the rank and file.

The ILWU must throw this proposed container station agreement back into the faces of Bridges and his friends in the FMA. Bridges must be given orders that the rank and file intends to see it to that not a single job is given up and not a penny is given over to the FMA.

The Teamsters union has said that it will shut down the West Coast before it sees thousands of Teamster jobs eliminated. Now is the time to forge a fighting alliance with these workers to present the FMA with an absolutely solid united front of opposition. No power on earth can stand up to the might of the longshoremen and Teamsters fighting together.
a brooklyn longshorman speaks out

(CONTINUES ON PAGE 15)
hospital bosses threaten layoffs, cuts

BY A HOSPITAL WORKER

NEW YORK—On August 29, St. Mary’s Hospital in Brooklyn and Knickerbocker Hospital in Harlem announced that they may close down for lack of funds. Already there have been large cuts in city hospital services this past year, especially at Harlem Hospital, where despite protests the cuts went into effect. The hospitals warn that there will be more shutdowns in addition. Both Israel, Bronx-Lebanon and St. Vincent’s have already slashed the number of people that will be allowed to use the clinic services which will throw even more people onto the poorly equipped and understaffed city hospitals.

At both Israel the bosses are preparing to lay off a section of the clinic workers and rumors are circulating that layoffs are imminent in other hospitals. At Gourmeneur, a clinic for the Lower East Side affiliated with Beth Israel, the bosses are threatening a cut of 96 jobs. This small clinic is the only Health Center to serve a large, home-conscious worker’s area and was only put into operation a year ago.

FREEZE

All hospitals have instituted a job freeze so that workers who leave for any reason will not be replaced. Working conditions are deteriorating as workers are expected to take on the extra work of replaced personnel. The freeze worker said that the men in his department are doing the work of three people. At the same time Beth Israel has raised its emergency room fee from $7.50 to $8.00.

One thing should be clear to every worker. The hospitals face a financial crisis due to the shortage of funds and plans are being implemented to make the workers pay for this crisis.

RALLY FIGHTS HARLEM HOSPITAL CLOSING

The hospital workers of 1199 and the city hospital workers of DC 37 are organizing to keep the hospitals open. The hospital bosses are planning to cut 1,000 jobs in order to cinch their profit margin. The hospital bosses are threatening the jobs of the workers in order to make the hospitals more profitable.

Lindsay Flies With Bristol-Myers

NEW YORK—Mayor Lindsay’s trip to the Far East as an envoy for a drug company doing business with the city should come as no great shock to those concerned with the union’s fight. Kind of thing is common practice, confirmed by the information that both New York’s Senators regularly fly on corporate planes.

What makes this incident of greater interest, however, was the destination and purpose of the Mayor’s trip. He was flown to the 12th annual convention of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference held in Harlem, South Carolina. Lindsay made a major speech at the convention. And even though he was the guest of a firm doing business with the city obviously violates the city’s own so-called Code of Ethics. SCLC President, Ralph Abernathy was quick to come to the Mayor’s defense. “We were extremely pleased,” said Abernathy, “by the Bristol-Myers Company’s last-minute offer of transportation to the Mayor’s party.”

QUEST

Why was Lindsay the guest of honor at the SCLC convention? Charleston was the scene of the recent long hospital strike led by Local 1199, part of the United American-Uniform Workers, Local 1199 in New York. The SCLC played a big role in Charleston and in eventually securing the workers without victory in the drive for union recognition. The official version is that “souls power” was the key to the strike. But the strike was not won, precisely because the union relied on preachers like Abernathy and liberal politicians like Lindsay.

Lindsay’s policies are very clear. He represents an important section of the capitalist class, as his chumminess with the Bristol-Myers bosses shows. On behalf of the bosses, Lindsay says to the minority workers, “Support me, ally yourself with me and what I represent. Your allies are liberals like myself, not the trade unions, not the white workers, not the skilled workers.”

At a time when all workers are under attack and when Lindsay as Mayor of New York has to lead this attack, he is logically all for equal power, he is for any policy or tactic which divides the working class. The one thing he is not for is the power of the working class.

Lindsay was present in Charleston and Abernathy defends his private plane trip by arguing that the working class together, along with so-called liberal union leaders like Davis of 1199, to the Far East to the bosses. The black hospital workers of Charleston as well as all hospital workers and other unions throughout the country can only succeed in their struggles by fighting against the bosses, not from Lindsay, and for unity with the labor movement. SUBSCRIBE NOW
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LINDSAY FLIES WITH BRISTOL-MYERS

On the Brooklyn Waterfront

The criminal and callous shutdown of hospitals must be stopped. The union must begin the fight now for socialization of medicine to end the outrageous fees, the sky rocketing costs, the shoddy medical care for the poor. Only free medical care for all with an expansion of health services can solve the health crisis in the interests of the working class.

LONGSHOREMAN: Yes, a labor party is a must. But I don’t see much prospect of it coming out of the ILA, and if it did Scowlo would probably try to kill it by being President. You have to begin with forming “clubs” among the rank and file to fight on the economic issues and little by little bring in the understanding about a labor party. It’s a long battle in the ILA to build a real rank and file movement. You can’t go it alone. When you go out on an issue you’ve got to have rank and file support.

Today it’s a lot easier to talk radical in the union or to be openly against the war in Vietnam. A lot of guys who would have just called me a communist a few years ago don’t know what’s wrong now because they are so disgusted with the way working conditions are on the docks and other things in the country are going.

BULLETIN: Lindsay, Rockefeller together with all the Democrats and Republican politicians in Washington who have “concerns” about the Taft Hartley against the ILA, have shown over and over that they are on the side of the bosses. How do you feel about the proposal that it is necessary for ILA members together with the rest of the labor movement to form their own party, a labor party controlled by the rank and file?

LONGSHOREMAN: Of course, I’m in favor of that. But you have to have the union bosses on your side as well. It’s not that simple. It’s big time.
SOVIET DEFECTOR KUZNETSOV NEVER Fought STALINISM

ANDREI D. SINATSKY

BY FRED WOELKER

The imperialists and all their spokesmen and defenders are building up the latest Soviet intellectual defect. Anatoli Kuznetsov, the younger brother of Andrei Kuznetsov, was asked for asylum while on a trip to London several weeks ago, and then promptly changed his name to A. Anatoli.

The press is deliberately covering up the tremendous difference between the highly publicized pro-Western defectors like Kuznetsov and Stal- tin's daughter, and the fighters against Stalinism in the USSR, such as Vladimir, Dolgushin and Yegorov. According to the imperialists, these are all traitors, who have betrayed the Soviet dictatorship. Some have simply been lucky enough to get out of the country.

This is a vicious lie from beginning to end. We are confident that none of those fighting in the USSR in order to defend the gains of the October Revolution want any sympathy from those who are murdering revolutions all over the world. The difference between Kuznetsov and Daniel, between Atliyeva and Litvinov, is a class difference. There is no sharper difference possible.

PRO-IMPERIALIST

Kuznetsov and Atliyeva are openly pro-imperialist. They never lifted a finger against the bureaucracy within the USSR. It is precisely among these most conservative and cowardly elements, who can remain a part of the bureaucracy for many years, that the imperialists recruit their defectors.

Let there be no confusion. Kuznetsov and Atliyeva were a part of the bureaucratic caste, of its intellectual retinue and hangers-on. Militants like Litvinov and his comrades have always been against the bureaucracy and that is precisely why they are languishing in jail and exile.

Kuznetsov's record is so bad that even liberal writer Lilian Hellman felt obliged to criticize Kuznetsov. Clearly bureaucratic has nothing to fear from people like this, but everything to fear from those who place themselves on the side of the workers and the poor. Nationally by taking a principled stand and defending the true history of the Soviet Revolution and Leninism against the Stalinist betrayals.

It is not enough, however, to place oneself against the bureaucracy of the imperialist party through which it is developed and is absolutely necessary if the sacrifices of the Soviet intellectual dis- aided are to be carried forward. This is the task of the International Committee of the Fourth Interna- tional.

This was inadequate and was voted down by a large majority of the committee. My opposition the bargaining committee reluctantly has now pled- ged that it will not accept any less than between 40% to 50% over one year.

MILITANCY

Because the leadership was start- ing from the strength of the company and the strength of the union they put them in a position as leaders but as intermediaries between the company and the employees union. The only demand that holds water is that if Northern Electric cannot assure its employees living for its employees it and its parent company should be national- ized. This is why the bargaining com- mittee over the new contract is of necessity a political one. With the fight for the contract it is necessary also to take the struggle for the nationalization of the telephone indus- try in Canada and the election of an NDP government.

The next few months are crucial for the rank and file to have on their minds and their unions to increase the militancy shown at the contract meeting to show the firms and the unions to be prepared for a fight to the finish.

Trudeau Plans Wage Freeze, Attacks on Unions

The new austerity measures an- nounced by Trudeau marks a stage in the economic policies of the Liberal party. Austerity is now to be a permanent part of Canadian economic policy.

Since last year alone the reserves of the Canadian Government fell by almost $1 billion. The government must now take action to stabilize the economy.

Trudeau also plans to freeze wages through the Prices and Incomes Commission. This measure was first introduced by the Wilson government in 1945. There has been proof that the Prices and Incomes Board has been incapable of freezing prices or that it had no intention of freezing prices because its sole purpose was to freeze wages.

The labor movement must realize that these measures of Trudeau re- present a new stage in the struggle for higher wages. Now more trade union militancy is not enough. Trude- au is creating the conditions under which the trade union movement will be bound hard and foot to the capita- list state, under which for every deal that is made there will be unemployed workers to take its place.

It is clear that Trudeau has been preparing the ground for a long time. The attacks on the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) has been an example of the strategy of ruling class to attack the labor movement as a whole. First comes Trudeau's anti-labor action as the case of CUPE where they took away the right to strike and forced a company union and then follow up with these new anti-labor conditions. Obviously the govern- ment is setting a precedent for the rest of the unions.

A struggle must be taken up in- side the civil service unions immedi- ately against any redundancies. Strikes preparations must be made. The civil service employees must not be al- lowed to be divided against themselves.