New York State Workers Set June 16 Deadline

THREATEN STRIKE AGAINST LAYOFFS

CONGRESS BREAKS RAIL STRIKE!

Ceylonese Trotskyists Jailed!

We have just learned that the leadership of the Revolutionary Communist League, Ceylon section of the International Committee of the Fourth International, has been jailed by the reactionary Bandaranaike government. Those arrested are Comrades Wakamibua, Sirasa Jayasuriya, Kirthi Balasuriya and Wilfred Pereira. Also arrested is LSSP MP V. Nanayakkara and Maoist leader Shanmugathasan.

The Political Committee of the Workers League condemns this traitorous action and demands that all working-class organizations immediately send statements of opposition to the: Ceylon Embassy, 2148 Wyoming Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C.

Open Letter To Joseph Hansen

What we think

From The Bottom Of The Barrel

In this column last week we noted that the Socialist Workers Party turned a statement on the attacks of MPI upon the Workers League into a vehicle for its own slanders on the Workers League.

We concluded: “We say that bringing up the Tate Affair again is a sign that the SWP is planning a further move to the right and more cover-ups of the Malcontents. We warn SWP and YSA members that more slanders are to come.” We did not have long to wait! This week’s Intercontinental Press, edited by Joseph Hansen, devotes some four pages to a slanderous letter by a certain Harry Turner who with three supporters publishes a mimeographed monthly newsletter called Vanguard Newsletter. Editor Hansen, of course, has no agreement with Turner except on the question of hatred of the Workers League and the International Committee of the Fourth International.

Hansen is a practitioner of a particularly unprincipled method of polemics. It is based on the theory that in a battle throw any object one can get a hold of at the opponent. This may be all right for a street brawl but principled polemics should not be conducted as a street brawl.

All that happened was that Turner together with Harold Robin presented a discussion on possible unification of their group with the Workers League. The discussion was held but effectively broken up when (Continued On Page 6.)
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BY MELODY FARROW

On May 9th a group of left-wing militants were savagely attacked by members of the Communist Party while they were organizing Unions and Jeune Revolutionnaire to workers at La Courneuve.

Helene Fargier was hospitalized along with five other members of French Trotskyist movement after vicious attack by Stalinists.

The 100,000 workers who own the company called the company of the factory and walk out unless the company renews its contract with the workers.

A year after the Organization Communiste Internationnal (OCI) initiated a 4,000 strong meeting to stop the new frame-up trials in Czechoslovakia.

STRIKE

The strike movement began on April 29th when 82 specialized workers at the Renault plant in Mals won strike after four weeks of negotiating for a wage increase. For four weeks the CGT, the Stalinist-controlled union, made no effort to settle the strike.

The strikers put forth the demand that they would not return to work until the 5,000 workers who have occupied the plant.

The militancy of the OCI and the AJF led the workers calling on all Renault workers to strike. The strike did everything to prevent us from moving in the right direction.

May 4th the Renault workers at Flins and Sandouville went on strike. May 5th was the last day workers at the big Renault plant in Billancourt called for a strike and 1500 workers demonstrated in the factory. The next day, despite the strikers' call for a referendum, 30,000 workers occupied the Billancourt plant.

The Communist Party threw itself into a panic in its newspaper and accused the government of "barricading the way" and threatened to "guarantee workers' rights.

There is no revolutionary battle worth fighting to change.

The Political Committee of the OCI has issued a declaration saying that "Workers, youth, militants:..." (Continued on Page 2)

SHEPPARD & WORKERS LEAGUE

By CYNTHIA BLAKE

MINNEAPOLIS—White collar unionism thinly veiled with orthodox Marxism and third with slander characterized the YSA educational conference held here recently.

As the revisionists desperately seek a political justification for their liquidationist program, they were forced to charge the entire schedule of the conference after all publicity had been released.

The opening session still dealt with women's liberation but Saturday sessions, even "Is There a Ruling Class?" and "History of the American Movement," were revised to deal with "Building a Revolutionary Party" and "The Theory of the Permanent Revolution."

Barry Sheppard

Workers League

Barry Sheppard (Continued on Page 2)

SPECIAL TO THE BULLETIN

Labor Victory In British Elections

The Labor Party, which lost the General Election last June, won a total of 2,000 seats while the party of power, the Conservative's, won 351 seats.

In London, Lord won control of 21 of the 32 boroughs in the Greater London Council and won 97 out of 140 seats for the Tory Prime Minister's home district and Harrow, a traditional Tory stronghold, lost to Labor.

DETERMINATION

The massive vote for the Labor Party expresses the determination of British workers that they will stand up for their standards and rights against Tory attempts to drive down wages and destroy their rights in accordance with the Industrial Relations Bill.

It also indicates that important sections of the middle class, also hit by the crisis, are turning against the Tories.

TORIES

The Tories had pledged to reduce inflation but have failed in their 1976 budget and unemployment is soaring.

The workers vote Labor, not out of a love for Harold Wilson but because they clearly understand their position with which they can fight.

The Socialist Labor League has consistently campaigned for the unions to call a General Strike and force the Tories to resign and re-elect Labor under socialist leadership.

This struggle will expose the reformist Labor Party and pave the road for a revolutionary struggle to overthrow capitalism and prepare for socialist revolution.

EMBRACE

Sheppard moved on to discuss the building of the party through "creative application of theory" in daily situations. Even the "creative" application of theory has been a political success. Sheppard comments that "embarrassing oneself is a genuine struggle...whether or not we completely understand it..."

Other groups like the Workers League are too embroiled in their nationalism and feminism as revolutionary so they cannot understand this. Sheppard says, "Next we will be asked to embrace political identity...the order that our understanding of it should not be abstract."
NYJury Frees Black Panthers

BY A BULLETIN REPORTER

NEW YORK—All thirteen Black Panthers here, accused of conspiring to bomb department stores and murder vigilantes, have been acquitted on all twelve counts. The jury, which had five blacks and one Puerto Rican on it, took just one hour and a half to reach their verdict.

Applause and shouts of "Power to the People!" filled the courtroom as James Fox, the jury foreman, pronounced not guilty fifteen times. As Justice Murtough and John Phillips the prosecutor who had accused the group of a "conspiracy to harass society and the power structure" consented to a joint statement the Panthers and the workings class embraced. It was a victory for the Panthers and the working class. It strikes a blow for mass struggles to save the Panthers and other revolutionary organizations as terrorists in order to wipe them out.

The verdict sharply exposes to masses of workers that these are political trials, that the Panthers are being systematically framed for their struggle against the capitalist system.

BIAS

The jury, composed of many working class people, overcame Judge Murtough's blatant bias against his defendants and his instructions that they should consider the flight of Michael Talbot and Richard Moore to Algeria as "consciousness of guilt."

Joseph Garry, a postal clerk, said: "There just wasn't enough evidence." Another juror, Fred Hills, called the conspiracy trial "disgusting" and said it was "a large lasso to bring in people for so many things."

The prosecutor's case rested solely on the testimony of three undercover agents who claimed they heard the Panthers plot bombings. There was not one other witness to confirm this and no material evidence was ever revealed.

LIBERALS

The word liberal is being cynically used by the liberal capitalist press as well as civil rights and other reformist organizations as proof that revolutionaries can indeed get a fair trial in the United States. Jeff Greer of the NAACP stated last week in an interview on all sides that it is possible to get a fair shake within the system.

The New York Times adds: "The outcome of this trial in New York also exposes as a fraud the Pan-African Nationalist oratory about the fascist nature of justice in America." Barely containing their hatred of the Panthers the Times praises the jury for not making it a political trial when it was the representatives of "justice" that sought to turn it into one.

It was the "fair," judicial trial of an agreement, a successful rising of a community in jail for two years on completely phony charges, and for their bail at $500,000 each. Even Atif Shakur, who was pregnant, was given a bond of $250,000 on bail until the last weeks of the trial.

As one of the Panthers said "It wasn't the system that freed us, it was justice." The release of the Panthers can mean only one thing to Nixon, Mitchell and the entire capitalist class: in order to continue their campaign against socialist and other militant groups they must place complete control of the judicial system in the hands of the bosses.

In preparation for war against the working class, the capitalist class now launch new attacks on the jury system. This has already begun. In Washington thousands of youth were arrested and thrown in detention camps without being charged.

Growing Movement To Free Hoffa

BY OUR LABOR CORRESPONDENT

On May 10, Teamster Frank "The Boss" Hoffa lost an appeal in Federal Court to serve his five and eight year sentences for mail fraud and jury tampering currently instead of consecutively.

Hoffa already has been in jail for over four years and has been turned down several times for parole, most recently last month. It was believed that if he had won the right to serve the two terms concurrently he might have been released successfully in winning parole almost immediately. The court decision indicates that he will have to serve perhaps 4 or 5 years more in jail.

Hoffa had stated previously that if he had no chance of release soon he would step down and not put Hoffa up for re-election this summer.

He has now asked, however, for 30 days in which to decide whether to run for re-election. This request, made to the Teamsters' Executive Board, is based on new legal moves in the jury tampering conviction. One of the key witnesses the government has that he was coached and pressured by the Justice Department to testify against Hoffa.

The government would like nothing better than to see Hoffa step down as Teamster President and thus make highly unlikely any future "comeback." The reaction from the bosses is to run for re-election. There is the example of Helms, Grand Rapids, Michigan, who, with the encouragement of William Gibbons, who has participated in some anti-war demonstrations and recently took part in the meeting of the "Labor-University Alliance" in St. Louis at which Hoffa spoke.

Students Get Harsh Sentences In Canada

SPECIAL TO THE BULLETIN

MONTREAL—In February 1969, students at Montreal's Sir George Williams University were arrested during a demonstration.

The protests centered on Black and West Indian students' demands that the University carry out an investigation into the conduct of Dean of Social Science, Perry Anderson, who, the students charged, was a racist. After the University carried out an investigation designed to hide more than it revealed and which let Anderson off scott free, the students staged a sit-in on the 9th of April. Hall building to protest the University's conduct and to demand a new, impartial investigation. After several days, the University officials called a Montreal police riot squad to completely smash the protest. Many of the students were arrested.

Now, two years later, the last trial of the arrested students has ended. Shona Rutherford, Douglas, Ann Cool and Brenda Dickenson-Dash, three students who played a leading role in the protests, were all found guilty of conspiracy. Douglas was sentenced to two years less one day in jail and fined $5000 or an additional six months. Cool was sentenced to six months in jail and fined $500 or an additional six months. Dickenson-Dash was fined $2000 or six months.

Across the West Indies, where many convicted criminals come from and where Canada has heavy investments, workers and students protested the convictions. In Georgetown, Guyana, the Canadian Consul's house was stoned while in Barbados Prime Minister Edward Sandiford was stoned along with the Canadian flag.

ATTACKS

It is now clear that the arrest of the SGOU students, as is in a far harsher form, the arrest of the Minnesota, Ohio State and Jackson State University students in the U.S. marked the beginning of a new phase in which capitalism would be fought. The step up against both the youth and workers to the point of bombing them and shooting them in the streets.

May 19—A united Democratic-Republican Senate has approved the emergency bill to break the railroad signallers' strike. The bill was an even more vicious attack on the railroad workers than the original version proposed by Nixon, but the President happily called the bill "acceptable" to him.

Under the terms, the signallers may be fired and arrested for striking by giving the Congress plenty of time to enact Nixon's so-called emergency transportation bill, which would replace the current stopgap type of action with permanent legislation establishing binding arbitration throughout the transportation industry.

On top of this, the emergency bill grants an "interim" raise of a piddling 13.5% retroactive to Jan. 1, 1970, thus running out in just 3 years. The signallers have indeed been given the business by Nixon together with all the doves and friends of labor in Congress.

As with the previous anti-Communist-Civil Rights-Jewish interventions against the railroad workers this year, the aim of the ruling class is not only to hold back the wage demands of the railroad workers and bludgeon them into accepting revised "work rules" (massive unemployment) but is a further preparation for eliminating the right to strike of the entire labor movement.

The Taft-Hartley law with its cowardly attacks on the trade union movement is no longer sufficient for the ruling class. There is no doubt that the proposed transportation bill is not only aimed at the signallers but the whole working class who face a strike next fall, but is also a stepping stone to extend the Taft-Hartley law to all sections of U.S. industry.

REHEARSAL

The current emergency bill and its plea for the transportation legislation are taken now as a dress rehearsal for a probable steel strike this summer. With the steel strike coming up in the midst of a severe economic crisis threatening to erupt, the steel bosses simply cannot afford to give one inch to the railroad signallers.

For the ruling class is to break the strength of the organized working class. That is why Nixon and Congress take such prompt action against the railroad workers and such labor support as the Justice Department's Javits rush to introduce Nixon's emergency bill into the Senate.

The signallers are the first workers to present a mass struggle against the bosses and the government are united against them, when all they simply are asking for is a decent wage. They said that they make less than workers on the MTA and work under worse conditions. "The cost of living has skyrocketed but signaller's pay hasn't. In order to be able to pay your bills, you have to have another job besides this one, and we get no sick pay."

The signallers are among the most highly skilled of US workers and in reality need an immediate 100% increase just to bring them up to the level of many other highly skilled workers. As it is, the signallers' leadership under C.J. Chamberlain is young and growing and under its previous demand for $2.40 an hour over 36 months to $1.99. But as Chamberlain also says, accurately reflecting the mood of the signallers, "Our resistance is completely exhausted."

The question is whether the railways will pay their students and signallers, and the bosses of their leadership or are they going to demand support from the rest of the working class against this strikebreaking the end of which is to enslave all workers.
Sireabella Begs For Support

BY A BULLETIN REPORTER NEW HAVEN—A general membership meeting of the Yale Workers League was held Monday evening at 5:30 on May 25th, with Union business agent and current president John J. Connolly, of the Haven Central Labor Council, Vincent Sireabella, pleading the case of the Local 35's rank and file.

With the strike well into its second week and negotiations still seemingly at a standstill, it is made clear that Yale is out to bust the Union. According to the Yale Journal an article by a Yale trustee of its future plans to replace its college workers with students and part-time help. It is also said that the Yale representatives told him "it was the survival of Yale as an institution vs. the union and vs. that the union is not 'viable' or "strong."

The students have already been arrested as the strike enters its 3rd week and more arrests are imminent. The local police pick them off on the picket lines singlating out the most militant of the picketers, including a member of the Yale Workers League.

ISOULATE

With the school year coming to an end Yale intends to isolate the workers from the rest of the world. The company hopes to defeat the workers with Sireabella's help, by starving and taxing them back into a state of desperation.

The Workers League and Yale Workers League demand that Sireabella develop a new strategy to win. A fight must be conducted to mobilize the New Haven labor movement (the twenty thousand strong YNFC, 1199 Hospital Workers, and YWCA) to help the workers.

COMMITMENT

Sireabella must and will be held to his commitments to win the strike and beat back Yale's attacks. This must not waver on the hook with such statements as Yale's "overwhelming power" and "strength," and that the union is not "viable" or "strong."

Mafia And Zionists Join Hands

BY A REPORTER

NEW YORK—The new alliance between Rabbi Kahane of the Jewish Defense League and Joseph Colombo of the American Civil Rights League is another indication of the extremely character of the JDL. Kahane's search for allies finds natural bedfellows in Colombo and Company. Colombo has been labeled one of the top Mafia leaders. His whole campaign, intensely devoted to stop the "smear" campaign against Italian-Americans, is of course aimed at taking some of the heat off himself and his friends.

The rise of the Jewish Defense League shows that the Jewish middle class, 25 years after the end of World War II, is by no means immune from fascist ideology. Scared by the economic crisis, caught up in the intensifying class struggle and the militancy of the youth and minorities, these elements begin to turn, in the absence of leadership, to right wing demagogues who promise support for the "little man" and a return to "law and order."

Mafia Kahane (left) of fascist JDL with mobster Joseph Colombo. When these political hooligans join the rightist hoodlums it is a wrap of the depth of the crisis and the deep danger to the working class from such elements. What is needed now is an all-out fight for the labor party to unite the working class and at the same time firm steps of self defense to protect working class organizations from hooligan attacks.

Repression Hits Maryland U

BY STEVE DAMON

COLLEGE PARK, MD.—Students at the University of Maryland are suffering vicious repression in the aftermath of last week's riot triggered by the jailing of twelve thousand youth in Washington, D.C. Approximately 100 students have been arrested thus far.

The riot broke out at an anti-ROTC protest. But thousands of students who came cleaving classes in protest against anti-viet anti-ROTC protests in the face of the vicious repression in Washington as twelve thousand student demonstrators swarmed on to route 1 to block traffic.

ROTC

Throughout the week, new building occupations against ROC'T took place at Rob. Many of the buildings were occupied by thousands of angry students watching outside, eager to defend the demonstrators. This created new building occupations against both the National Guard and police. The University administration is trying to blame the SDS betrayal of the mass movement against repression, seeking to divide and conquer for anti-repression tactics. Halt the ton'ing back on the fight against repression. PLS-SDS it's-}

Steel Mill Closure Threatens 2,500 Jobs

BY AN INDUSTRIAL REPORTER

MINNEAPOLIS—Steelworkers across the country prepare for strike action against the steel barons and Nixon on August 1st, over 2500 of them still face the threat of U.S. Steel closing its Duluth mill and cement works. Involved are members of locals 1028 and 1281.

U.S. Steel has been under state orders for some time to end the pollution coming from its 55-year-old Duluth complex. Corporation spokesmen report a "profit outlook of less than five years," and then a "disaster." This is just the sort of the situation which the steel workers are preparing to fight.

The latest move to bull U.S. Steel out of the situation is the fratic battle for the Minnesota state legislature to grant a moratorium on the pollution charge with a $2 million dollars per month reduction in production. This will mean an increased tax would be used for pollution control equipment.

DUMPING

The dumping is an extra tax burden onto the backs of the working class, estimated as being $2.5 million per year. American ironically the meaning of Governor Anderson's name, "freedom" in the mind of the workers is bestowed upon the union bureaucracy as a "friend of labor." Anderson is now doing all sorts of tax increases. The bureaucracy is trying to stop surprising the million dollar tax to those in the legislature are worse.

PAY

In Duluth, full support has been given by the Central Labor Union leadership to the steel mill's tax assessments. They are willing to fight the Chamber of Commerce in accepting the fact that the workers must fight the crisis of the employers. District 33 Director of the Steelworkers Union, for Duluth, has taken an even more reactionary position on this issue under the Central Labor Union. He would rather see no pollution equipment installed if necessary to keep the plant open.

Their accommodation to the employers on this issue is an indication of the willingness of the union administration to collab ourate in plant closings. What is essential now is to build a na tional rank and file movement in the Steelworkers that can fight for the nationalization of U.S. Steel and the entire industry, without any compensation to their present owners, and under control of the steel workers.

Ferre Wants Low Wages For Puerto Rican Workers

BY JUAN P. FURNAS

GUAYNABO—Joaquin Ferre of Puerto Rico has issued another warning to the workers and youth of the island. Speaking before the Puerto Rico Chamber of Commerce in the United States he predicted the raising of the federal minimum wage to $1.80 by next January and to $2.00 by January 1973. According to the Governor, "raising an industry to pay $2.00 an hour will not help our problem as a result of the higher requirement the industry disappears.

He further called for the expansion of committees provided by the wage laws to review the application in Puerto Rico. These committees in the past would determine whether minimum wages set by law were "harmful to the island industry," and required the maintenance of lower wages in certain industries.

Power

At a time when the whole capitalist system is in crisis, these words of Ferre take on a sinister character of preparing even bigger attacks on the standards and the gains fought for by the Puerto Rican workers. These attacks must be answered by the united action of the Puerto Rican and American workers around a program for power.

Editor: Lucy S. John. AIMUTOR: Marilyn JONES
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SADAT COUP IS THREAT TO PALESTINIAN FIGHT

By Fred Mueller

The new political campaign in Egypt reveals another sharp turn to the right by the capitalist regime. The timing of this crisis is anything but accidental.

Ali Sabry was ousted as Vice-President of the People's Republic of Egypt on May 2. Just a few days later U.S. Secretary of State Rogers went on his "peace-seeking" mission to the Middle East. Sabry was involved in extensive consultations with Sadat and other leaders.

Just days following the Rogers visit, on May 13, Sadat announced the resignations of six leading members of the government and three top leaders of the Arab Socialist Union. Sadat announced that he was prepared to "cut out pieces" anyone who opposed him. He accused those resigning of having planned a coup d'etat and suggested that trials might follow for the alleged conspirators, now under house arrest.

Sabry has been denounced as the principal conspirator, and on May 15, for the first time since Nasser's death last year, huge portuguese virulence against Sadat were carried through the streets of Cairo in mass demonstration.

OMINOUS

All of these developments fit into a pattern which can only be regarded as highly ominous for the future of the Palestinian and popular movements. The political ground for these moves is the growing and intense pressure for a military settlement between the bourgeois regimes and Israel at the expense of the Arab masses. Washington has been particularly active in the diplomatic effort to achieve such a deal, and it has been assisted decisively by the Moscow Stalinists at every point.

The Palestinian guerrillas have been put on the defensive.

FEDERATION

The latest development along this line was the formation of a new federation between Egypt, Syria and Libya. It was a disagreement over this move which was said to have led to the clash between Sadat and Sabry.

Following the latest clashes in Cairo the heads of state of Syria, the Sudan and Libya journeyed immediately to Cairo to demonstrate their support of Sadat.

What is involved in every single one of these moves is the systematic erosion of a bourgeois leadership which is prepared to do business with the imperialists and to go all the way in imposing a betrayal on the Arab masses struggling against imperialism and Zionism.

The New York Times reports from Beirut that "Conservative Arabs praised what they considered President Sadat's crack-down on Communists and their supporters." The correspondent from Cairo says that "the sympathy and support for Mr. Sadat, and his willingness to make difficult decisions in the political machinery for a settlement with the Israelis, is the preparation for a ‘political’ settlement which would by immensely strengthen Zionism and imperialism in this region."

SELL-OUT

These ‘difficult decisions’ are of course a not-so-veiled threat to the imperialists and the Israelis. The latest maneuvers on negotiations for the so-called ‘settlement’ are the preparation for a ‘political’ settlement which would immensely strengthen Zionism and imperialism in this region.

BY A LOCAL 3036 MEMBER

NEW YORK—Taxi drivers engaged in a boycott of cab drivers are demanding that the union leadership be brought to heel. The union leadership is employing a cloak of tactics: selective boycotts, garage meetings, firings, etc. in an effort to force a contract acceptance. The Taxi Drivers Coalition, the amalgam of militant groups opposing the Van Arsdale contract settlement, has taken some important steps—petition campaigns to build support in the garages, individual legal action against the union—bute finds itself still unable to force a rapid and direct confrontation with the union leadership, Lindsay, and Van Arsdale.

Drivers, while not actually municipal workers, are nevertheless part of the whole city labor movement which Van Arsdale heads, a movement under direct attack from the bosses and city administration. Only by basing their struggles within the city labor movement can the cab drivers hope to win any kind of wage gains. By supporting and calling for general strike action, by realizing that layoffs anywhere in the city affect the entire industry, in short by taking a broader perspective and not seeing themselves as isolated as in the last strike—taxi drivers will move forward.

LEGAL

Legal action is important, but drivers must remember that ultimately the legal system is not set up to protect the working man. The owners for example are illegally extracting the ‘dime’ when the contract has not even been signed. Drivers should consider “extracting it back” and letting the owners worry about the legal technicalities.

PROGRAM

What is needed is a massive demonstration at City Hall demanding that the contract be signed and in the event that it is not, if by May 30th, Van Arsdale refuses to call a ratification meeting, that the present agreement direct garage action should commence. Withholding the ‘dime’ by the drivers, new drivers keeping 49c rather than 42c of the meter, caravans in formulating designs and actions designed to force a ratification meeting, should all be employed by employers to force Van Arsdale to accept the will of the rank and file drivers.

At the same time, a new negotiating committee should be formed with two Taxi Driver Coalition members from each local. The current contract formulation and present new contract demands, demands centered around “parity with transit.”

SAFETY IS BIG ISSUE IN STEEL CONTRACT FIGHT

By Steve Cherkoss

Local 1845 USWA

On March 25-27 the United Steelworkers of America held a National Safety Conference in Chicago attended by 1500 delegates from local steel unions throughout the country. The conference got a good deal of coverage in the April and May issues of Steel Labor—monthly newspaper of the USWA.

The conference itself was led by I.W. Abel, president of the USWA. Abel, in part responding to the rise in pressure of labor, has been an aggressive pressure on the steel companies to provide an out of the bag offer a solution. This is very typical of the present leadership. In order to keep the book closed and the lid on the growing rank and file desire for real change they are beginning to militantly, but when it comes to action, he lets the cat out of the bag.

CONTRACT

While the leadership talks in general about fighting on the "legislative and bargaining front" to force the state, labor and hazardous conditions, they do not respond to the demand by workers to present to the steel, copper or aluminum bosses in the upcoming negotiations. The four concrete things workers are demanding are to have an unsafe or unhealthy condition are: 1. Promptly report a complaint in writing to the appropriate management representative, giving dates, time; 2. Include in your complaint description of the violation; 3. Make four copies—one to send to the regional office of the Department of Labor, one to the union district rep. one to the local USWA safety and health department at the Pittsburgh headquarters and one to the foremen report to the Federal Inspector be sure to include the plant location, etc.

These four steps are the logic of the move to lead out Talk tough but don’t rock the boat. This same leadership is presently bargaining with Wheeling Pittsburgh Steel to drop out of the bargaining. They have already approved of Colorado Fuel and Iron dropping out along with fifty-five other steel companies, including such giants as Kaiser and Crucible. This means the union will pay directly into the companies’ hands. This is not exactly a strategy for victory. THE UNION MUST BUST DOWN THE WHOLE INDUSTRY AND PUT AN END TO STOCK PILING NOW!!

CAPITALISM

This increasingly high death and casualty rate is not due to carelessness on the part of the workers—the line the bosses always push—but to the result of the conscious penny pinching on not providing safe equipment, and working conditions free from steel and other kinds of poisonous dust; increased speed up and crew cutting; and the added factor of the workers...
Reformists Derail Move To Labor Party

The wage offensive of the American working class is now undermining every attempt by Nixon and the employers to hold together its fast falling economy. This ability of the Democratic and Republican parties acted swiftly to try to break the railway signalmen’s strike.

Nixon went to Congress to demand not only emergency legislation to stop the signalmen’s strike but legislation which would deny the right to strike to unions in the transportation industry and force compulsory arbitration. The same day Nixon’s Secretary of the Treasury Connally made clear that the dollar could only be preserved by stopping the wage demands of American workers.

Capitalism’s greatest problem is that it now faces a new alliance of workers and an alliance of workers which has been strengthened by thirty years of full employment and a high living standard.

The problem is how to turn to these two most vicious methods against the labor movement to take away every right, every gain the working class has won and to destroy trade unions.

The government must now intervene with all its force in this situation. The action against the rail workers to stop the labor movement is the premium for the upcoming battle in steel. This is understood by each and every Democratic and Republican politician who fills a seat of Congress, the state legislatures and the city governments.

The struggles of the American workers now come into direct conflict with their political ties to the capitalist parties and in particular to the Democratic Party. As the Democrats join wholeheartedly with Nixon to stop the labor movement they also join in the loud outcry for a wage freeze in every industry. This raises immediately the necessity of a break from the capitalist parties and the building of a labor party.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the Democratic Party cannot be sold to the ranks of the labor movement, to the unemployed, to the minorities and the youth. Precisely at this time sections of the trade union bureaucracy and the liberals together with the Stalinists and revisionists are moving to prevent the development of a labor party.

The forces will then create a third alternative which unites the working class on the basis of reformism with a section of the capitalist class.

This whole situation was made explicit in the testimony of Senator Louis B. Sullivan during the hearings on the United Steelworkers of America’s request to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to revoke thecxx exemption granted by the court.

To the class-collaborationist policy of Stalinism in Latin America and other colonial countries. New currents, developing under the liquidation of Stalinism and in the victory of Castro, are groping their way to revolutionary socialism and seeking to apply the main lessons of the colonial revolution to their part of the world. Since the Algerian Revolution has had a similar effect on the guevarismo of the African revolutionary national movement. To meet these leftward-moving currents, to work with them, even to combine with them without giving up any principles, has become an imperative necessity."

What is the record of the evolution of Cuba since 1965? Cuba, far from breaking from class collaborationism, supports the very Peruvian junta which maintained Hua Benco in jail and today still holds other revolutions in jail. Cuba is a warm supporter of the borkos coalition government in Chile and refused to support the Mexican students in 1968. Cuba turned its back on the May-June events of the same year and supported openly the Soviet tanks in Czechoslovakia. Now it calls out against Padrilla for being critical of the regime. A section of the United Secretariat led by Moscoso in Bolivia and supported by Mandel and Mannoni are actually seeking to carry out this “principled” document’s urgings to “combine the class struggle with genuine revolutionary movements" by effecting Cuba. Their efforts to liquidate the remnants of the United Secretariat in all America into Castro’s OLAS around a perspective of guerrilla war is being denounced now by Hansen. No doubt when this section of the SWP, controlled section Hansen will consider the question of adaptation to petty bourgeois Castroite guerrilla-ism ended there just as the que- varismo ended in 1965, and the question of the LSP ended with its expulsion in 1964.

The truth is that Pahlism represents the fundamental revision of Trotskyism. It is at its heart a method, the pragmatic method of the ruling class as it is expressed within the workers movement. This method leads to an adaptation to surface movements of the petty bourgeoisie, the abandonment of the perspective of the Transitional Program for “new transitional programs” and “structural reforms” and finally for the complete capitulation to imperialist pressures.

Since there are constant shifts in surface movement and in different parts of the world, Pahlism shifts in political position while still retaining a common method. And so the United Secretariat breaks into pieces and the SWP itself shifts from Castro, to Malcolm X, to the peace movement, to gay liberation.

Let Hansen explain why it is that his “principled” statement of reunification was agreed to by Pahl, and Mandel-Muhammed Moscoso, and Colin deSija N.M. Perera. No discussion took place on the question of Pahl- ism and on the already marked rightward reformist movement of the LSP. As for guerrillism is concerned they all openly endorsed it.

We end once more with another prediction of more standers to come. The SWP cannot avoid a discussion with us and therefore it is essential for the SWP party to throw bricks, bata, Turner, Tale and the kitchen sink at us. In the meantime, Hansen will nevertheless have to answer to us and his own ranks in the 1962 Congress and its political and methodology. He will be taken to count for this betray of Trotskyism!

"Herr Möller’s resignation had nothing to do with this."
The following articles are reprinted from the Workers Press.

IN AN 'open letter' published in Workers Press, April 16 and 21, 1970, we addressed the following questions to Joseph Hansen of the Socialist Workers Party (US).

What is Castroism? Who will build the revolutionary link-up to defeat imperialism and Stalinism? What is the future of Trotskyism?

Hansen — a leading Trotskyist for Castroism since 1950 — rejection of these questions, or an evasion of the points raised in our letter? This attention to his record on Cuba, and Hansen's smear attacks made on Castro by Hugo Blanco, then a member of the Peruvian military junta.

Castro has on several occasions praised this military regime, attacking the actions of students, workers and peasants.

This open letter deals with Hansen's evasions and answers his recently repeated slanders that the Socialist Labour League has been the main opponent of a principled unification on a world scale of genuinely Trotskyist forces.

Since 1963 the SWP has supported the revolutionary United Secretariat of the Fourth International. Before that it had maintained fraternal relations with the SLL. The Socialist Workers' Committee of the Fourth International Act against any party in the United States including all those at any level.

The record of the SWP and of you in particular, on the Cuban revolution was the subject of our past 'open letter' to you.

That letter showed how the emergence of the Castro leadership and the discussion, on the class nature of the Cuban state served as a trigger for an unprincipled repudiation of the SWP majority and the Socialist League.

Considerable documentary material relating to your activities over the last decade was submitted to show that you had renounced vital questions of Marxist theory and principle in your anxiety to break from the United Secretariat and link up with the Poblete International Secretariat.

But in your Journal of the International Communist, May 11, 1970, you once more evade the issues raised by the crisis in the ranks, and the further drift to the right of the Socialist League (which, as you know, faithfully endorsed the Kremlin policy of supporting the reactionary military junta in Cuba).

In this article, 'A note on the present situation in Cuba,' you refer to 'a large body of material relating to the congress of the United Secretariat' last summer. These are too be found in 'Fourth International' No. 2, Winter 1969-1970.

Our publication of these documents obviously causes you some political discomfort, yet you make the cynical remark: 'Shocking as it may seem to a good many members of the SLL that such a free discussion could hold, others may begin to wonder about the monolithic character of its organization.'

By attempting to turn the discussion away from perspectives and history to the narrow 'regime' of the SLL you emulate the wordly spokesmen of the petty-bourgeois opposition to Trotsky and in particular to your own party in the Trotskyist movement.

Following in the tradition established by Trotsky and his supporters to the left of the Alliance, Burnham and Shachtman, we refuse to be diverted by such petty-bourgeois tactics.

Your past unprincipled views on the reproduction of the SWP majority resolution on the World Trotskyist Movement and this is indeed a difficult style, a style that betrays a whole political method.

In his list of further documents to be 'exposed,' you should like to suggest that Hansen gives top priority to the ones presented below (i.e. Four Early Reunifications). It should be of interest to members of the SLL since it can be safely asserted that this book has never been heard of it and the remaining pages 0.01 per cent probably turn their numbered copies back to the SWP, Hansen personally.

What did Healy object to in the documents? He has stated his objections but they are by no means secret. An unanswerable opinion. Healy was motivated primarily by dead-end factionalism. What does this explain? Are political tendencies and factionalism to be explained on the basis of gearing at psychological motives? What has this to do with Marxism?

Abandon

You continue: 'In the years immediately after the Reunification Congress Healey has covered up his differences with the Council.' On these points of such immense amount of verbiage about the importance of the facts.

Here indeed is the heart of the question. The SWP did not simply talk about the importance of their own organization in minute detail that your and the co-opted leadership of Marxist theory, a capitulation to the inner facts, a substitution of the central Marxist theory. As you once proudly announced: 'We start with a whole factual polemical of the Cuban revolution, And, on another occasion, 'Diabolical materialism is equivalent to abandoning the political facts.'

To order to cover up your thoroughly opportunistic record on Cuba you have to resort to a total distortion of our positions. For example, you write: '... Healy still holds that Cuba's economy is state capitalist and that Castro is another “Battista.”'

We hope your readers will carefully note the use you make of quotation marks in this sentence. Putting the name of the former Cuban dictator in quotation marks suggests we said that he was a “Battista.” You know this is a downright lie. Even you develop this lie further, saying: '... it is sad that a person who shows so much about the importance of theory should have found so little time to attempt to make at least a small contribution to the economic theory of state capitalism and the political theory of Castroism as a synonymous for “Battista.”'

Again, the unexplained quotation marks.

In our first 'open letter' to you, we were scrupulously careful in quoting from your writings on Cuba. The bulk of our case rested on what you have said in the past about the 'unconscionable Trotskyist', (i.e. Castro) who endorses the most reactionary aspects of Stalinism and defends the military junta in Peru which held Hugo Blanco and his comrades captive.

But before checking over our position on Cuba, we will deal with the issues raised by your reproduction of the SWP majority resolution on reunification.

You say, 'It was accepted by an overwhelming majority on each side and this became the statement of principles on which the two sides carried out a fusion at the subsequent Reunification Congress in 1963.'

'While substantial differences still remain, especially over the causes of the 1953 split, the area of disagreement appears of secondary importance in view of the common program basis and common objectives of major current efforts in world development (i.e. Cuba) which unites the two sides.'

The SLL and our French comrades on the International Committee, see the differences as growing greater as between ourselves and the revisionists. But this line of yours was not new. As early as February 6, 1961, your Political Committee wrote to us an arguing for a radical unification with Poblete.

We did not oppose a principled unification that, and we do not do so now. But the type of faction you were advocating was one that would have caused the most radical questions would be obscured, hence the emphasis that the SWP leadership placed on the organizational nature of Poblete, and the neglect of its ideological, middle-class roots.

REVISES

We took up this point in our reply to you: 'We believe that the reason for the split in 1953 was not of a tactical nature... on effect Poblete revisionists the whole concept of the Marxist party...' We concluded our reply by calling for a careful proceeding of an international discussion, then within the ranks of the International Committee and then, if it is possible, within the Pobletes along the lines they have already suggested. (Emphasis
added.

They will find it most difficult to resist such an approach, even if they do, the most important question of this document is the same lack of respect for the policies of its members in the majority of the IC and the SWP.

The next stage in the discussion was the SWP National Committee draft resolution, Problems of the Fourth International and the "Next Steps", dated May 1, 1962.

Section five, "Proposals for Reunifying World Trotskyism" developed your thesis of January 61 that the gap had narrowed between the IS and the IC.

"This narrowing of the political differences between the two factors of the Fourth International movement made it possible to seek unification with the proper conditions and organizational safeguards..."

This was the question of the Cuban Revolution. Stalinism was dropped. It showed that unity was not only desirable but possible.

"Today the unfolding crisis of world Stalinism, the progressive development of the Cuban Revolution, and the renewed interest in Trotskyism, make unification all the more urgent, and we intend to fight for it against any opposition from any source."

Along these lines, you stated that an organizational unity between the IS and the IC could precede a thorough-going unification of the majority of the IS and the IC.

In a letter dated March 12, 1962, you criticized: "We have wasted almost eighteen months and the record of correspondence between us for itself. What does international collaboration mean if it does not imply discussion between sections of the IC. It is the purpose of drafting an international resolution as you have done and talking about the need for discussion upon it so that any national executive to your membership our contribution должен be appreciated.

But despite your flagrant violations of these comrades, we still held out hopes that the discussion could begin in good faith....

In conclusion we would like to express our appreciation of the efforts we have made during the most difficult circumstances of discussion between our two sections on the future of the International.

"It is clear that the close association between our two sections continues to be the most difficult circumstances of discussion between us."

As internationalists, we feel that the close association between our two sections continues to be the most difficult circumstances of discussion between us.
The political issues of the Party Committee was established to clarify.

Let us underline this very important fact: it was the SLL, and not the SWP, that took the initiative on the IC and proposed the establishment of the Party Committee with the Pabloites. We imposed, strongly asked the Committee, to carry the fight against revisionism into the camp of the enemy.

The SWP leadership, by making its own approach to the US withdraws in no way calling upon them to account for their reckless and clearly betrayal of basic Trotskyist principles in bivalent that.

This is the real background of your adhesion to Castroism, which, by the summer of 1962, had gone to incredible lengths, as in our previous ‘open letter’ to the US.

A principal fight for theory and a principal political fight involves evoking a discussion with the SLL, and the Pabloites. "Man of science" of the Castroist camp must address those who dwell on questions of theory and history.

Favourable

On March 19, 1962, you wrote to the SLL informing us that the Pabloites had repudiated the Nationalisation of the World Trotskyist Movement and the Second Declaration of the World Trotskyist Movement, and you pointed out that they have now reproduced the split of 1933.

On the side of the IC, the situation is quite different; it is more serious, and it is more urgent.

We hope that the proposals made to you by the US leadership are a beginning of an effort to reach a compromise in the IC, but we are not yet in a position to say that the situation is going to be resolved in the near future.

We believe that the SLL leadership and the Pabloites should be willing to participate in a discussion with the IC on the following subjects:

1. The question of the political and organizational principles of the IC.
2. The question of the relationship between the SLL and the Pabloites.
3. The question of the relationship between the Pabloites and the US.

On these three points, we believe that the US leadership has already made some progress.

The United Nations is not ready to make a move to resolve the situation.

Hugo Blanco

THE ATTACK ON the SLL’s "British insularity" was a slander of the worst kind. The fight to understand and carry into action the implications of the 1953 split was an undertaking of a thoroughly internationalist nature.

It demanded a principled fight against the traditions of anti-theory and narrow practicalism that have dominated the British workers’ movement and the radical middle-class circles, which have always infested it.

This fight was in fact the making of the SLL, and helped to make the Internationals and prepare the way for building our press board and announcing the main revolutionary party in Britain.

With this letter, we will be extending to you a call for a principal stand meeting Pabloites and a thorough discussion of our mutual differences.

As soon as, on April 6, 1963, we wrote to you again pointing out our differences in a refusal:

"It is not enough for you to stress the "sentimental" for unification. The great danger today arises from the considerable political confusion within our movement as a result of the Pabloites' refusal to work with us on new recruits from among those eager for action and impatient with theory and history. So unification pilot be forced on them at the various sections at all cost. The discussions if they have to take place at all can come after.

These are the philosophical limits of your attitude towards Castroism. It rejected the value of the tradition of the Revolutionary International. It is a distortion of Trotskyist dialectical materialism.

This was made even more clear in your nature letter (dated April 13, 1963), when you announced:

"For all Trotskyists who have reached a complete understanding of the basically socialist character of the Cuban Revolution, the discussion on imperialism has been completed."

It makes it abundantly clear that between the SLL and the SWP, and between the IC and the Pabloites, there is no longer any possibility of making a common fight against imperialism and colonialism.

We had already warned against the consequences of your letter to your newspaper (of March 29, 1961).

It would be wrong hastily to involve sections in Latin America, in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism, in a discussion about the nature of the Cuban Revolution. We do not believe that this is the way to strengthen our movement and to build a common front against imperialism.

We hope that you will not interpret your letter as a sign of a new split.

Gerry Healy

Gerard Healy, the split of 1953 and the capitulation of the SWP to the Stalinist line.

Any unification carried out on the basis of such confusion will only accelerate the splitting and disintegration of our forces.

What the Trotskyist movement needs is a thorough-going discussion which will lay the foundations for the reorganisation of the Fourth International.

We are not impressed by "sentimental" which is directed towards a unification at the expense of principle. We ask you to halt this move towards a split and agree to our proposals for holding the international conference of the IC in August or early in September.

We ask you not to call a conference of your own faction of the IC. If such a conference takes place, it is followed by a reunification with the Pabloites, we shall consider it as a hostile political act. It will most certainly tend to dissolve the international split, something which we want to avoid.

So we made it clear that the SLL for a split lay on the SWP. Once such a betrayal of Trotskyism was carried through, a new situation would obviously prevail within the international movement.

If you go ahead and split the International Committee, this would automatically cancel the proposals contained in our letter of March 29, 1961.

New assessment

"We would then be required to make a new assessment of the situation to see if it was possible to make a more substantial and realistic discussion between our respective organisations."

So even after an SWP merger with the IS, we did not rule out a continuation of the discussion with either the SWP or the European Pabloites.

In fact, we had always favoured discussion with the Pabloites (particularly in order to step up the fight against their revisionist influence in the International). We had even proposed it when we were writing this letter.

We made this very clear in a
In 1966, the Party Committee of the Cuban Communist Party, led by Fidel Castro, declared the end of the jugarismo, or political rivalry, among the factions within the Party. This move was seen as a step towards unification and strengthening the Party's leadership. The new leadership, led by Fidel Castro, focused on economic development and the fight against counter-revolutionary activities.

The political differences within the Party were formally resolved and the Party's focus shifted towards economic development and the fight against counter-revolutionary activities. The new leadership, led by Fidel Castro, focused on economic development and the fight against counter-revolutionary activities.

Parity

On September 2, 1962, the Party Committee of the Cuban Communist Party, led by Fidel Castro, declared the end of the jugarismo, or political rivalry, among the factions within the Party. This move was seen as a step towards unification and strengthening the Party's leadership. The new leadership, led by Fidel Castro, focused on economic development and the fight against counter-revolutionary activities.

The political differences within the Party were formally resolved and the Party's focus shifted towards economic development and the fight against counter-revolutionary activities. The new leadership, led by Fidel Castro, focused on economic development and the fight against counter-revolutionary activities.

Favourable

On March 19, 1967, Fidel Castro wrote to the SLL information service to affirm the Party's position and the Party's support for the SLL. He also encouraged the SLL to continue its work in support of the revolution. The SLL was an organization that supported the Cuban revolution and worked to promote its ideals.

The SLL was an organization that supported the Cuban revolution and worked to promote its ideals. The SLL was formed in 1961 and had a wide network of supporters in Cuba and around the world. The SLL's work was seen as crucial in supporting the Cuban revolution and promoting its ideals.

The SLL's work was seen as crucial in supporting the Cuban revolution and promoting its ideals. The SLL was seen as an important part of the Cuban revolution and its efforts were crucial in achieving its goals.

Hugo\n
Below: Peru military jets.
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Letter to the SWP Secretary F. Dubois, dated May 22, 1965:

"From 1954 onwards, it became clear to those of us who studied your press and publications that the SWP was very rapidly developing methods of work and thinking similar to those of Pablo. We hesitated to raise these matters with you at first since we hoped that they would be corrected in the course of time. However, this did not take place and the political differences between us became more serious.

"Early in January 1961 we opened a written discussion with the SWP. This discussion was entirely a one-sided affair. An examination of the records shows that not only did you not submit our documents over this period for the consideration of your membership, but you failed to reply to us on the important questions we raised."

These facts have never been denied by the SWP leadership. They prove that it was not the SLL that was 'insular', turned in upon itself and indifferent to the developments within the international and the world class struggle.

In this same letter-written only a few weeks before the SWP majority adopted the SLL program-we made it clear that we would still press for discussion:

"We propose to continue the discussion through the Pablo Committee even though we feel that your split is completely unjustified. [Emphasis added.]

"We feel that you should have waited until the International Committee holds its congress and then debated the political issues before the comrades with whom you have been associated for the past 10 years. Although the ultimate goal of our movement will suffer a reverse as a result of this action, we shall still press for a genuine and thorough discussion within the international movement for the purpose that we have already outlined. [Emphasis added.]

The second letter (May 22) we wrote to E. Germain of the European Pabloites, with whom the SWP leadership had been arranging their unification with the IS:

"A conference of this committee—which is to take place during the first two weeks of September 1963—we urged the SWP and those who support it to discuss their differences at that conference. [Emphasis added.]

"We further proposed that this international conference should get together with yourselves through the medium of the Pablo Committee and organize an international conference of all of our forces for the second week of October 1964.

"In 1953 there was a deep-going split in the Pablo leadership. Our main concern was the outcome of a revisionist rejection of Marxism by Pablo and his group on the International Committee of the Pabloites. You, at the time, organized a split based upon your own positions. You told the Trotskyists inside in November 1953.

"This split took place in an atmosphere of confusion because the rank-and-file of the international movement were not sufficiently clear on the issues involved.

"Early in 1954 we proposed a Pablo Committee to re-examine the discussion and endorse, if possible, to work out direct methods of collaboration. You at first agreed to this, but you requested us to break off our relations with the Pablo Committee and continue the discussion with the International Secretariat.

"In 1956 you proposed a unification of Pablo with a party in the world leadership because you considered we should not trust the organizational methods of Pablo and his group. We suggested to you that this approach had serious drawbacks, and it did not allow for adequate political discussion. The International Secretariat then accepted your proposals and your comrades stood for the time being.

"Yet they prefer to split rather than accept this procedure.

"It is also clear that you have been working to isolate the Pablo organization of this split. Both the SWP did not only regard the problem of political clarification as an entirely secondary one, but you go out of your way to place emphasis once more on the organization of a unification which cannot but encourage a repetition of the disastrous events of the past.

"We shall under no circumstances ever enter such a unification. We consider that it is merely the substitution of organizational measures in order to retain a foothold up to the real political task.

But our political hostility to the European Pabloites did prevent us from urging the principles we had fought for in all our dealings with the SWP since we rejected the differences over method. Political opportunism was, as always, paramount."

"The National Committee of the Pabloites assures us that we will be submitting proposals to its future congresses in order to relate to our attitude towards you in the plenum of the June conference.

"We hope that discussion can continue to be carried out on the lines of a Pablo Committee, although the immediate activity of the Pabloites has been greatly weakened by the splitting action of the SWP. [Emphasis added.]

And even after the unification of 1963, we continued to press for such a discussion, only to be refused on every occasion.

"Just one example will suffice. 'World Outlook', the International Secretariat's organ, in its June issue for the year, 1967, under the heading 'Pabloists for Workers International', made the following proposal: 'Letters' [founded by Workers International] is now an organ for the discussion on the problems of the international movement.

"The proposal was made in the form of a resolution adopted at the second plenum of the International Committee of the Fourth International:

"1. That a world congress of the forces of the IC and the IS should be convened during the autumn of 1964;

"Positive discussion

"2. That a joint committee of representatives of the two organizations should regularly meet to prepare this conference and to work out practical ways and means to cooperate with each other in the different countries;

"This resolution would outline the points of agreement as well as disagreement. During the preparation of the resolution, all the sections would be constantly informed of the work of the committee. In this way a genuine and positive discussion involving the differences would be organized;

"4. Congress insisted that this discussion must take place in all the sections, not only in the leadership, but in the ranks.

"Unless this discussion was carried out, it would be impossible for them to develop new cadres which would be able to provide adequate political leadership in the near future. A proper circulation of all documents must take place.

"5. Joint discussion between the members of the sections, especially in western Europe should be organized. While these discussions may have various local differences, Congress believed that they should be included in the discussion on the practical role of the local sections in a way that would bring members of the sections closer together. Such a discussion would also have an effect on the education of the cadres.

"We oppose the idea that the discussion must be immediately transmitted to the International Secretariat in the hope that the joint work can begin immediately."

"As on all previous occasions, our proposals were rejected by the International Secretariat.

Swep under mat

Once again, in the anti-Marxist tradition of Schachtman, 'practical questions' were to take priority over theoretical differences. Whatever the known, were to be 'put to the side'. The saying goes, swept under the carpet.

The anxiety to suppress serious

Farel Dobbs, Secretary of the Bookshop Party in 1938.

Ceylon's Prime Minister Mrs Sitivena Bandaranaike. She headed the 1964 coalition govern ment which contained members of the Pabloite LSP. They were subsequently expelled from the 'Unified Secretariat'.

Discussion within the ranks of the IS, one of the points we insisted on in the resolution, was understandable, if indefensible.

It would have been the whole wisdom of the newly-proclaimed revolution uniting all the forces.

For even at that early date, Pablo's understanding of the tendency that now bears his name, was developing it in important differences with the SWP leadership and their European allies over the trends within Stalinism (Pablo argued that Khrushchev represented the left wing of the bureaucracy as opposed to the "Unified Secretariat").

The number of countries with new splits have taken place. A whole group of leading spokesman of this tendency have written publicly in agreement with the left-socialist democrats in the European press.

"And above all has come the disaster of the entry of the "Trotskyist" massacre into the coalition government in Ceylon."
COLLECTED WORKS, VOLUME 45. LETTERS—NOVEMBER, 1920—MARCH, 1923. By V. I. Lenin. Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1970. This, the last volume of Lenin's "Collected Works", was certainly worth waiting for. Volume 44 dispelled a number of hoary old Stalinist myths about Trotsky revealed in the Civil War period. This volume does the same for the last two years of Lenin's political life and with even more devastating effect.

MYSTERY
Before we turn to the documents in question, let us disentangle the myths they demolish.

Ever since Stalin's faction expelled the Trotskiy "Left Opposition" from the Soviet Communist Party in 1927, the legend has been this:

Throughout Lenin's lifetime, from the foundation of Lenin's party in 1903, to the pre-post-Romanov Revolution in 1917, to the winning of the Civil War and the first steps towards the construction of socialism, Stalin's real threat was from his former comrade and friend.

This myth has certainly taken some resounding knocks over the years, not the least of them Khrushchev's devastating revelations in his "Secret Speech" in the March 1956 20th Congress of the CPSU. But stimulating, with the publication of the Finno-Ugric and Tatar Social Party history exposed by Khrushchev, both then and five years later at the 22nd Congress Stalinism had been over all the world, "Marxist", "liberal" and pro-Moscow and pro-Soviet was the line to follow in the absence of the essence of the fictions first propounded under Stalin's rule.

This is how it now looks. Lenin fought three major political battles: against the "new economic policy" of 1921 (referred to in the Sorokin text) and against the attempt to "liberalize" his political life. They can be listed as follows:

• Against Formalism
• Against the weakening of state control over the economy.
• Against Russian nationalism.

In Trotsky's "Left Opposition" was compelled, despite his declining health, to take issue most sharply with leading Party members on questions of basic principles. And each time his main opponent was...Stalin! The sum total of this fight to the hilt, it also establishes that, contrary to all the claims of the Stalinist mythmakers, Lenin's main (and in fact only) ally was...Leon Trotsky!

The essence of the fight was early in 1922 that a group of Central Committee members favored a relaxation of the state monopoly over foreign trade.

Any weakening of this monopoly would both stimulate the petit-bourgeois appetites of far cheaper goods from capitalist countries to flood the market, and permit Soviet enterprises to by-pass the state and establish direct relations with world capitalism.

Bucharin—later to become leader of the "Right Opposition"—emerged as the main bastion for this group. But no less

numbered among them was Stalin. The former document is my reference to Document 807 (pp. 602-3), which is a letter from Lenin to Stalin, which speaks of Stalin's fear of Trotsky and the fight for the leadership of the Opposition.

That in itself is damning enough for our Stalin-worshippers. But the worst is yet to come.

In Document 804 (p. 601) dated December 12, 1922, Lenin wrote to Trotsky:

"You are too violent and unwise...I am sending you Krestinsky's letter. Write me as soon as possible whether you think this document is true. I am going to fight for the monopoly."

What about you?

Trotsky has given Lenin his reply at once, for on December 13, Lenin again wrote (Document 805, p. 601):

"I have received your comments on Kronstadt and Avravin's plans (which called the full maintenance of the state foreign trade monopoly). I think you and I are in a complete agreement..." (Emphasis added)

Neither was it just a question of a formal agreement between Lenin and Trotsky. The sick Lenin asks Trotsky to fight not only against the leaders of the Party to which he is partly opposed to give it a more liberal form but to win over the trade monopoly.

"...it is my request that at the forthcoming plenum of the Central Committee (the first plenum) I shall ask a number of questions on the question of the need to maintain and consolidate the foreign trade monopoly." (p. 601)

This was no small question for Lenin. He was prepared, with Trotsky, to take the matter to the forthcoming March Party Congress, and even risk an open split with the Stalin-Bukharin group.

"I believe...that in the event of our (i.e., Lenin and Trotsky's) defeat on this question we must refer the question to a Party Congress." (Document 807, pp. 602-3): "I am now through with putting my business in order and am in a position to leave without worry (Lenin here refers to his departure—for health reasons—to the small town of Gorki outside Moscow). I have also come to an arrangement with Trotsky to stand up to my views for the foreign trade monopoly." Lenin added a postscript to this letter which requires little comment:

"I am reasonably opposed to any delay on this question of the foreign trade monopoly. If the idea should arise, for whatever reason, to postpone it until the next plenum, I should most resolutely object to it. I am sure that Trotsky will be able to stand up for my views just as well as I myself." (Emphasis added)

The next letter (Document 808, p. 604) is another to Trotsky, also on December 15:

"I consider that we have quite reached agreement. I ask you to declare our solidarity at the plenum..." Lenin's answer to all the outcomes of this struggle are expressed not only in his letters to Trotsky, but in their very language.

This volume contains four notes dictated by Lenin and staled against Trotsky between December 12 and 15. The last of these (Document 809, pp. 604-605) again returns to the question of the leadership over the question:

"If there are any fears that I am being worried by this question and that it could even have an effect on my health, I look upon "this as absolutely wrong, because I am infinitely more worried by the delay which makes our policy on one point dependent on the other point."

The massive pressure brought to bear by Lenin has been a leadership with the support given him by Trotsky, was sufficient to rout the campaign of the monopoly. For Lenin writes to Trotsky on December 21 (Document 811, p. 606):

"It looks as though it has been possible to take the position without a single shot, by a simple maneuver."

A temporary victory had indeed been gained. The Bukharin-Stalin group had backed down from a frontal clash with Trotsky and Lenin on such a fundamental issue. But Lenin did not relax for an instant. His letter to Trotsky continues: "I suggest that we should not stop here, should continue the offensive, and for that purpose put through a motion at the Party Congress the question of consolidating our foreign trade..."

"I hope that you (Trotsky) will object to this and will not refuse to give a report in the group."

"The attempt to be the end of the attack on the trade monopoly."

But another, and even more explosive crisis, was brewing at this very moment. This too can be traced through a document in Volume 45.

It is, of course, the so-called "Georgian affair". An ardent enemy of Russian nationalism, Lenin insisted that the Petritsky leadership be taken over the unification of Soviet Georgia with the other Soviet Republics.

Stalin ruthlessly trampled on the national sentiments of the Georgian Communists, and towards the end of 1922 became involved in a series of incidents that ended with one of his delegation striking the face of a Georgian Bolshevik leader.

When Lenin learned of this, he was furious, and at once drafted a postscript to his "Testament", calling on the Party to remove Stalin from his post of General Secretary. He was, said Lenin, "defensores et disloca" to hold such a Party post.

(And, other documents pertaining to the Bonnais and the rest of the Georgian question, to be found in Volume 36 of the Collected Works.)

Volume 45 has only one letter on the Georgian question. But it is quite enough:

"Dear Comrade Trotsky:

"In my earnest request that you undertake the defense of the Georgian case in the Party CC. This case is now under persecution by Stalin and Dzerzhinskis, and I cannot rely on their impartiality. Quite to the contrary, I feel at ease if you agree to undertake its defense.

"I shall therefore refuse to do so for any reason, return the whole case to me. I shall consider it a sign that you do not agree.

"With best comradely greetings, Lenin"

(Document 812, p. 607)

This is followed by the most sensational letter of all, that one that is quoted by Khrushchev in his secret speech, but never before so much as acknowledged, letter which is in an Emancipating Edition of Lenin's works:

"Dear Comrade Stalin:

"You have been so rude as to summon my wife to the telephone and use bad language. Although I have told you that she was prepared to forget this, the fact remains that it has been done against me, and it goes without saying that what has been done against my wife I consider has been done against me as well."

"I ask you, therefore, to think it over and not to be too hasty in what you have said and make your apologies, or whether you prefer that relations between us should be broken off." (Document 813, pp. 607-608)

This was almost Lenin's last letter (on this topic). The end of the document, by Stalinists and anti-communists alike, that of a leader who was a lion, the tragic cause, or, as the gravedigger of the Bolshevism put it himself a "weary battle.""

Lenin's final political document follows this damnation of Stalin. It too, burrs with hatred for the future leader of the counterrevolutionary bureaucracy:

"To Comrades and others (to the leaders of the Georgian Bolshevik Party).

"Dear Comrades Trotsky and Kamenev:

"Dear Comrades:"

"In my earnest request that you carry out this with all my heart. I am indignant over Orjnozsid's letter (and that the Georgian Bolsheviks) and the cominieal of Stalin and Dzerzhinskis. I am praying for you and for the others."

"(Document 814, p. 608)

"The last letter, and the last of the volume of Lenin's works...with Lenin preparing, alongside Trotsky, a fight to the end against Stalin and his faction.

REFUTE

How fitting that this volume, establishing beyond any doubt the real political relations existing between Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin in the last weeks of the Bolshevism leader's political career, should be published at this moment when Stalinism plunges into its deepest ever crisis.

We challenge the leaders of the British Communist Party to defend Stalin in the pages of your daily.

Just stop by to find that it was Trotsky, and not Stalin, to whom Lenin turned for support in his fight for the Socialist Soviet Union, and the end of the Bolsheviks.

But will all these words erase these truths, truths that were defended by Trotsky and his opponents against Stalinism in the teeth of world reaction and the most terrible purges, slanders and calumnies?

But has his collected works, a life-time devoted to the building of a party, based on the highest of all ideals, the idea of class to power over all the world, a struggle which we find reflected in his stupendous literary output, lives on.
Edgar: George Morris, labor editor of the CP Daily World, does more than write about CP unity problems. For the last 25 years, he has also written for The Daily Worker and determined what the CP “line” should be. He is the main one who insisted at the beginning that the whole cp-fascism was coming to an end, therefore the CP leadership in the US would dissolve the unions and amalgamate them with other unions as a “cover.” This would also mean some of the CP labor fighters would have to go on the offensive and pay the ground of “unity.” The Furies in the CP are more like Butchers./Butch the leading factions in Bridges’ longshore union and U.E. refused to go along with the policy, sparked by George Morris, and broke organizational ties with the ILWU.

Daily World of May 13; George Morris intimates that the CP has made some sort of deal with the ILWU Bridgess, as a brief period of criticism, focused on the contemptuous treatment of some CP longshoremen for Bridge.

He mentions the ILWU branch in Hawaii without saying it is the same as the ILWU branch that is opposed about “ethnic composition” of the UP strike. “The CP’s line is in the leadership of the ILWU representative of that ethnic diversity? Or that its large membership? I agree with him when he writes: “1948 Bridges was the major player in the ILWU’s history and in making it what it is.” What is it? Reading Morris to be compared with the “reporter”/dominated ILWU although Harry Bridges does not mind working with the syndicate in both the Longshore and Teamsters unions. Why couldn’t the ILWU convention go on record for a joint deal for the explicit and actual union contract on both coasts by extending the ILWU’s jurisdiction? “The ILWU by September 30th? Better have the same shipper bosses to negotiate with.

Morriss says nothing about the failure of Bridges’ “mechanization” program which cost the ILWU many jobs and helped put it in the weak position it is today. Morris has never criticized this plan in this very day. But it was first proposed, a few young CP members on the East Coast objected and quit the party in disgust.

The Milwauke wrote a goodarticle at the time. Why is he silent about longshore, East and West, today? Morris claims that “the big change in Brooklyn ILWU is a more advanced section of the ILWU.” It is headed by Anthony Scuito. Here is what the Village Voice (May 13) said about him: “If the Mayor doesn’t believe the FBI which has scuito listed as a capodecapeni in the Carlo Gambino Mafia family, maybe he should take a look at a more recent Dogs list by the State Legislature Committee on Crime.”

Weiss: Several years back another Political Committee member, Harry Weiss, came to the conclusion that the CP needed a new call to action. Starting out in 1935 in a fight with the liquidationism of Cochran, extending this fight to Pablo in Europe, only to drop the fight against Pablo ending up back with the Pabloites. But it didn’t stop there. Not the CP center. Liquidationism moves to the United States and the Political Committee of the Socialists Worker Party endorses positions essentially the same as those of Cochran.

In 1955, a crisis, arising to the surface movement of the petty bourgeois, the CP now decries the party itself ending the liquidationist position of Mandel that the party is more than “mecca” which can lead nothing but can be buried in a “mass worker’s party” how will become a mass revolutionary party at a later date. This moves to the private section which differs from both Cochran and Shachtman said in the 1930’s.

The presently active worker is coordinately a union and daily paper in England and now a page weekly in the United States.

Shappard’s reply to was to “map out the strategy” for the CP. This strategy is a program after the late affair, giving a distorted inaccurate picture of the incident and the party’s mistakes. /Shappard’s major position on it to the youthful audiences. /When pressed, he openly refused to point the body to take up the motion.

Cochran: The socialists and his associates on the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party have now come out and are singing a new song. Starting out in 1935 in a fight with the liquidationism of Cochran, extending this fight to Pablo in Europe, only to drop the fight against Pablo ending up back with the Pabloites. But it doesn’t stop there. Not the CP center. Liquidationism moves to the United States and the Political Committee of the Socialists Worker Party endorses positions essentially the same as those of Cochran.

In 1955, a crisis, arising to the surface movement of the petty bourgeois, the SWP now decries the party itself ending the liquidationist position of Mandel that the party is more than “mecca” which can lead nothing but can be buried in a “mass worker’s party” how will become a mass revolutionary party at a later date. This moves to the private section which differs from both Cochran and Shachtman said in the 1930’s.

Slender: This is it. New openly liquidationist course which forces the SWP to slander the Workers League and the International Committee which today emerges as the major party inter-nationally with a daily paper in England and now a page weekly in the United States.

SLANDER: The CP has a new policy of liquidationism which forces the SWP to slander the Workers League and the International Committee which today emerges as the major party internationally with a daily paper in England and now a page weekly in the United States.

CAUCUS: What must now be organized in the mills is a caucus committed to an all-out fight against the steel bosses—to fight Abel all the way when he tries to sell out the workers. Such a caucus must be built around a program to break the pattern of the car settlement with an immediate $2.00 across the board and full escalator clause and no security for thirty hours for forty. Within this framework we must demand real safety conditions run by the rank and file union, and stop the union that will sell standards and have the power to enforce them.

The Workers League is committed to building such a caucus and will work with all steel workers in this struggle.
Ceylon Pabolismo & The History Of The LSSP

The purpose of the unification was to throw up a more formidable parliamentary force in Ceylon. As a consequence, no serious united discussion took place before or after the unification.

The main results of the unification was the separation of the Fourth International in forces in India and Ceylon. This increased the problems of the national and nationalist tendencies of the LSSP by removing the necessity to build a party in the vast Indian subcontinent. At the same very time as Pablo was bringing up the need for a unified international unity in Ceylon, back in Paris he was spinning liquidationist schemes based on the theory that Stalinism could play a revolutionary role under the pressure of the masses.

SPLIT

In 1953 the Fourth International split into the International Secretariat headed by Michel Pablo and the International Communist Tendency of what is today the British SLL, the French OCI and supported by the SWP. At first the LSSP leadership expressed their support for the split. But then the period clearly opposed Pablo's adaptation to Stalinism. But it closer to remain only a minority in the international unity that Pablo could be counted on not to manipulate this oppositionism without the LSSP lent its considerable prestige to Panama's formation and this prestige acted as a cover for the liquidation of Trotskyism. At the same time this action of the LSSP expressed its refusal to confront the theoretical questions of the development of the International. Without a deep concern about the International party's problems a revolutionary party cannot be built in a colonial or any other country. It was the rise of the SWP party in the late 1950s with its nationalist and leftist demagoguery which was to expose the internal decay of the LSSP and drag it further to the right. In this period Madonna Bandaranaike's husband formed a coalition government which included the MEP party headed by Philip Gooswardene who himself was a renegade from the LSSP. Gooswardene wrapped himself in the most extreme communist of the Sinhala population against the more recent Tamil speaking immigrants from India. The LSSP opposed this government as a bourgeois government but at the same time Philip's movement into the government was to foreshadow their own.

ELECTIONS

It all came to a head around the two general elections of 1960. The last of the LSSP for the 1960 election was to fight for an LSSP government. It was convicted, together with Pablo, that the country would polarize between the tradi tional right wing LNP and the LSSP. Pablo democ erating the LSSP to a minor factor. While on the surface the demand for an "International Government" seemed radical in practice it was clearly a parliamentary approach.

The party will demonstrate that this (as a Southern African phenomenon) means to preserving and fostering national unity in Ceylon and therefore no serious struggle against the urgent reorganization of the country's political, administrative, economic and social structures. It means releasing and activating the nation's energies for these tasks.

Instead of fighting, as did Lenin, for the destruction of the bourgeois state, the LSSP with Pablo's blessing wanted an "urgent reorganization" of it.

The election turned into a serious disaster for the LSSP. Instead of a polarization between the LSSP and UNP there was a polarization between the LNP and UNP with the LSSP to its smallest parliamentary fraction in Ceylon. How could it be otherwise when the LSSP was unable to confront and fight the LNP in a principled manner as they capacity to party was, counterposing not electoral maneuvers but the actual struggle for power for the working class cause.

A new election had to be called im mediately as nothing of what Pablo's parties had the support to form a government. In the second election of 1960 the LSSP made no change against the SLFP whereby it would not run against the SLFP in certain districts and return for the same from the SLFP in other districts. This was in effect a breach with the SWP for the LSSP voted for the Crown speech of the SLFP which means an actual end of the split with Pablo. So much for Evans' lie that 1964 was the first time the LSSP "allied itself" with Bandaranaike's party.

Pablo criticized the LSSP for this "ex trasocialist" attitude but in reality in those circumstances it was clear his difference was not of a principle character. The Third International does not exclude support for the adoption of progressive measures, even by a national bourgeois or petty-bourgeois government in a colonial or semi-colonial country. But the social nature, composition, and general program of the Bandaranaike government does not justify the support which was accorded it."

UNITY

One year after this the SWP began its unity manoeuvres with the International Secretariat which led in 1963 to its split from the International Committee and re uni fication with the Pabolistas. The LSSP was to support this reunification as whole heartedly as it had earlier refused to withdraw from Pablo's International.

In 1962 Colvin deSilva, the very man today is in charge of the budget in Ceylon, appeared before the Public Committee of the SWP making clear his support for the reunification. At the same time the SWP leadership made it clear that while it agreed politically with the left wing of the LSSP around Edmund Samarakoddy it agreed with and supported deSilva's efforts, as Colvin was the center of the party, to hold Edmund together with the left wing around Perera. And so the reunification took place without any discussion at all of the LSSP question.

In the period immediately following this reunification there developed a movement in Ceylon around the 21 demands of the "Southern African Revolution". This movement threatened the existence of Stalinism in Ceylon if it was taken forward around a fight for a socialist government committed to nationalization of basic industry. And through this movement an understanding of the need to destroy the Pabloite faction, carrying through new organs of power out of the working class could have developed. But the LSSP, this time with full blessing from the United Secretariat, mounted by the SWP, took a different course. It formed a parliamentary bloc known as the United Left Front—a coalition of the LSSP, the CP, and the communist MEP. This bloc was able to hold the congress even if in the end it was divided over the neoliberalization of the plantations. While it was a bloc of workers parties it was based on a national program and thus a stepping stone to an open coalition with the bourgeoisie.

ENTER

Shortly thereafter in 1964 the LSSP held a special convention and in its overwhelming majority decided to enter the Bandaranaike bourgeois government. While the United Secretariat opposed this entry, it did so with the method of Pablo. It opposed:

"Any form of coalition with such a party as long as it remains the dominant majority within such a coalition..."

This opens the doors to a coalition in which the SLFP was a minority!

It even refused to enter the center group of Leslie Gooswardene and Colvin deSilva after they rejected the LSSP.

TAMPOCO

A rump group called the LSSP(R) maintained affiliation with the United Secretariat but refused to confront the roots of the degeneration of the LSSP in the history of Pabolismo and its anti-Marxist methods. The task of mediation between Edmund and Bala Tamapco, Tamapco, who now acts as spokesman of the United Secretariat. This organization begins from an international perspective, has conducted a serious struggle to understand Pabolismo, and fights to take forward the Marxist method.

The Socialist Workers Party today throws up a similar coalition to that carrying out murder in Ceylon in the past 30 years. The political logic of its refusal to take up the fight for a revolutionary perspective will force it in the near future over into open coalitionism with the bourgeois parties just as in the Trotskyite case.

Revisionism and Stalinism in the United States is now taken forward by the Revolutionary Communist League, affiliated with the United Secretariat. This organization begins from an international perspective, has conducted a struggle to understand Stalinism, and fights to take forward the Marxist method.

The Socialist Workers Party today throws up an anti-communist coalition to maintain quid pro quo in Ceylon in the past 30 years. The political logic of its refusal to take up the fight for a revolutionary perspective will force it in the future over into open coalitionism with the bourgeois parties just as in the Trotskyite case.
Inside Cuba

Castro Embraces Them All

BY ED SMITH

Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro chose the 10th anniversary of the defeat of imperialism’s Bay of Pigs invasion to unveil his absolutely rotten strategy for “anti-imperialist struggle,” a strategy that if followed up by the Latin American workers and peasants will lead to the success of the masses throughout the continent.

The 10th anniversary commemoration meeting at which Castro made his speech was significantly enough opened by Votadio Teitelboim, representing Salvador Allende and the front government in Chile. Teitelboim in turn quoted Castro’s brother Raul who said on April 17: “The face of today’s Latin America is not the same as it was ten years ago. The peoples are struggling against imperialist exploitation and domination, following different paths and methods, in finding the road that will lead us to the solution of the Continent’s problems. Two examples of this are Chile and Peru (our emphasis).”

NATIONALISM

In his response to Teitelboim’s speech, Castro elaborated his brother’s remarks into a whole strategy for the confiscation on the struggle of the Latin American masses behind nationalism, assisted by Stalinism and its Popular Front.

After extolling the nationalist struggles against U.S. domination, Castro goes on to make it clear that he regards the present day Latin America to be one of nationalism against the “yankies,” not of the workers and peasants against the bourgeoisie, both foreign and local. Castro does not, cannot distinguish himself from the position of a petty bourgeois nationalist, because in fact he is one.

Says Castro: “We consider ourselves to be a part of the Latin American family, a part of this continent, citizens of this continent, revolutionaries of this continent…”

“Those who were the first to fight for the independence of our people did not conceive of what we have today. Nothing could be further from our aspirations and objectives today. Such a conception is in fact one of the root causes of the failure of our revolutions in the past… In short, the bourgeoisie fought for another kind of America—for a united and strong America, not a balkanized, impotent and weak America.”

BOURGEOIS

Castro fails to note that Bolivar, San Martin and Suarez fought for a united, strong, and bourgeois America. Latin America, like Europe, is indeed kept “balkanized” by imperialism, but this can only be rectified through the destruction of capitalism and the assumption of power by the working class. Nothing else.

Says Castro: “We have fought for another kind of America—for a new kind of America, not a bourgeois utopia.” But this “bourgeois utopia” is precisely what Castro has in mind. Let us go on and see how he views the development of the military junta in Peru.

“We know and look with great sympathy with the development of Peru’s revolutionary process. We in this country have observed that process with interest over by the oil monopolies were taken over and recovered; the ferocious campaign against Peru launched in the United States; the Agrarian Reform Law; the exchange control; in sum, when we saw a series of measures that were taken, we understood that a true change of structures and revolutionary process were under way in that country…”

Castro (below) openly embraces not only Allende (center) and in his response to Teitelboim (right) to Cuba, but praises the Peruvian regime which jailed Trotskyist leader Hugo Blanco (left).

As the Peruvian Trotskyist leader Hugo Blanco has exposed, the “change in structures” Castro speaks of was nothing more than an attempt by the national bourgeoisie to somehow keep Peruvian economy away from imperialist domination. In the epoch of imperialist superpower attempts cannot lead to any long term changes in imperialist exploitation of the colonial countries. This can only be accomplished by socialist revolution.

In a letter of no concern to Castro, he continues: “We had no doubts, when it was still early in the process, that the process was revolutionary. This is because what determines whether or not a process is revolutionary aren’t the schemata, the fictions, and the abstractions but the facts. And the facts were telling us, in an objective manner, that there was a revolutionary process in Peru.”

“Of course, every process has its own characteristics…”

“In the Peruvian process the motives of the struggle against underdevelopment, against the foreign domination of the economy, the strongly national and national sentiments prevail. One cannot think of a Marxist-Leninist revolution in Peru. However, from the point of view of revolutionary theory, one may objectively consider that a revolutionary process is taking pace in Peru.”

The reasoning, the political method in this statement of Castro’s should be familiar to all who have studied the controversies inside the Trotskyist movement on the nature of Cuba. One must think of a Marxist-Leninist revolution in Peru. However, from the point of view of revolutionary theory, one may objectively consider that a revolutionary process is taking place in Peru.”

This is the alternative Castro holds out before the Latin American masses! This is where the empiricist methodology of the Novack and Hansen ends up—a justification of what is a clear case of outright capitalism to imperialist domination in Latin America.

A dying process—followed by his attacks on left critics in Stalinist fashion as “CIA agents” proves obviously that the struggle in Latin America can be carried forward not by a liquidation into Castroism, as the Pabloite United Secretariat proposes, but by an irreconcilable struggle against Castroism and its political line. This is the reason why the left is wrong. This is the reason why the left must fight. This is the reason why the left must fight Castroism.”
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BY JAMES DUNN

SANDiego—The depths of the "new international" appeared to be greater than ever when the annual meeting of the Paris Commune and hosted by the Young Socialist Alliance in San Diego.

Pursuing their version of the "united front" a step further, they mounted the platform, and then united with a front for Stalinism in the person of Herbert Marcuse, a proponent of the so-called Trotskyism, and Marxism, and now concedes revolutionary theories around several countries, and the present-day existence of the Comminists, and the current universal trend.

The Paris Commune was commemorated by invoking its memory as a cause and justifi-
cation for every middle class movement that the revisionists see as a threat to the Stalinist order.

After a liberal history pro-

fessor presented the "facts" on the Commune's history, and the other speaker, a member, and leader of the local women's movement, showed that nearly all of the women of the Commune were busy doing what women today do under capitalism: building their men's liberation. After discussing the roles for women found in the wom-

en's movement, he noted that the only thing that cut short the elaboration of the maximum program for women, including, we presume, day-care centers, free abortion for all, and control of one's own body was the victorious counter-revo-
lution that recaptured Paris and slaughtered the new Communards.

SLANDER

What a slander! The work-
ers of Paris locked in a great class battle to death, this young lady has the effrontery to say that the Communist Women's Union is "like our own women's center downtown." Today, the YSAs, Theo-
dore Edwards, a National Com-
mittee member of the Socialist Workers Party, present of more "lessons" of the Commune, and discoursed on what Marx, Lenin, Trotsky had to say about it.

The primary lesson he drew out of the Commune was the necessity to construct a re-

volutionary party and intensive national movement, but he did not mention that conclusion without mention-
ing even once Trotsky's struggle against Stalinism and the building of the Fourth International.

In Mr. Edwards' hands the struggle against Stalinism was transformed into a discussion of Moscow and Peking's "nationalist deviations," and the construction of the revolutionary party became support for a party that maintained a formal structure, one very significant conclusion emerged.

SUBMERSION

posed the necessity of submerging all ideological differences in order to win the struggle against the enemy. With his history of anti-Bolshevism, that was a dangerous policy, but the few of the working class is not to be prepared politically for revolution under the leadership of a revolu-
tionary party. Rather, it is drawn into the morass of middle class radicalism that is the only alter-

native to Bolshevism.

This point was further clarified in the discussion period, when Marcuse said that since there is nothing but a revolutionary or pre-revolutionary situation in the United States, ideological differ-
ences are meaningless any-

way.

In distorting the meaning of the Paris Commune in order to strengthen the petty bourgeois radical move-

ments, the SWP struck a bargain that stood side-by-side with the building of the working class, who is well-trained in pro-
bring a philosophical cover for Stalinism, and edifies the petty bourgeoisie with an occasional "theory." ADAPT

Armed with a view of the present which holds that the work-
ing class is not "in motion," the SWP-YSA easily adapted to Marcuse, who stands presumably on the same ground, but in the at-

tempt to maintain a pretense to Trotskyism, they let him draw that conclusion explicitly in this meeting while they came out with some formal statements about "building the revolutionary party.

Methodologically, Marcuse and the SWP stand together, and that is why they met together. Begin-

ning, not with the strength of the working class movement and taking up the fight for Marxism, but rather with a series of im-

pressions about "where the action is" that ends them up in opposition to the working class, this "non-

partisan" meeting came as no surprise, and it wasn't really non-

partisan at all. The partisans of the petty bourgeoisie were out in force.

BY RICHARD RIVERA

SAN Diego—The leadership of the San Diego County Employees Association is attempting to split and pit a-a-
egainst each other the ranks of the county workers in order to insure that they cannot mount a successful strike against the County of San Diego.

By ramming a "good" contract, they are attempting to split the Interdepartmental section, consisting of clerical, technical, and professional workers, to vote on the so-called "final offer" from the county Board of Supervisors. The meet-
ing was called in the Supervisors' Chambers, which won't hold even 200 of the 3000 members of this section, and which are as inviting for most workers as a concentration camp. The cham-

bers were filled immediately, and the rest of the room was caved in.

The offer read by the bureaucrats, lauded as the best they could do, praised as being twice what the county workers had been offered, apologized be-

cause the workers had to work on holidays, and increased wages in line with private indu-

try, and the ranks were threatened with losing even that if it was not approved.

The leadership, then tried to prevent any discussion by calling for an immediate vote. When this failed, they attempted to manipu-

late the discussion, and cut it short for fear of being unmasked as agents of the county. When the vote was taken, only those who were packed into the chambers had any voice. All those who were listening from the hallways were never heard from or counted.

The workers of the Interdepart-

mental section must see that the contract they got, which doesn't make up even for last year's inflation, and will force them back even further in the coming year, is the handiwork of the leadership of the Association, who are work-

ing hand in hand with the county supervisors.

If a decent contract is to be obtained now or in the future, this one must be rejected with the strike a strike of all county la-
cuse, this enemy of the working class who is well-trained in pro-

Leaders Split San Diego Workers

by Herbert Marcuse

Stanford Maoists Cover For Khan

STANFORD—At a teach-in at Stanford on Bangla Desh the Maoists of the Pacific Studies Center and Venceremos refused to take a stand against Mao's open support for Yahya Khan's butchery of East Bengals.

The Pacific Studies Center, which co-sponsored the event along with the Stanford chapter of the National Federation of Bangla Desh, played the utterly cynical and cowardly role of fomenting support for Yahya Khan while at the same time attempting to justify Peking's bloody part in crushing the East Bengal revolution.

In the document prepared for the teach-in by the PSC entitled "Rebellion (not revolution) in Bangla Desh," one of the editors, an author engaged in the most transparent sophistry to suggest (shame must have pre-
vailed) the author from making a clear counterrevolutionary state-

... ...
Stanford Head Arrests Youth in Witchhunt

BY BARRY ZVERKOV
STANFORD—The administration of Stanford University and the local authorities have intensified their campaign to eliminate all militants from the campus.

On May 4th six more warrants were issued against participants in the April 9th sit-in at the Medical Center, bringing the total number of people charged to thirty. All are charged with nine counts of misdemeanors. Seven, including BUU Chairman, Willie Newberry, are also charged with felonious assault on a police officer. A fourth warrant is presently charged as Sam Bridges, a Black hospital worker whose firing touched off the struggle at the Medical Center.

The following week, Leo Bazele, former chairman of the BSU, and Chris Laury, a member of the Black Liberation Front and a leader of the Medical Center fight, were arrested and charged with the beating of a white hospital worker who confronted a picket line outside in support of Black and Chicago hospital workers’ demands. Bazele and Laury were charged with criminal assault and burglary, both felonies.

ISOLATE

The severity of the charges against Bazele, Laury, and Newberry is indicative of the administration's willingness to use the full force of the law to silence all opposition to its policies, and to crush any independent voice among the students, faculty, or staff.

The situation at Stanford, despite the political differences, must now stand firmly in defense of the rights of Bazele, Laury, Newberry, and all political victims.

Reagan Blames Budget Cuts On Welfare
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BY A BULLETIN REPORTER

SANTA ANA—In April of last year, the United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) waged a bitter strike—defying court orders to return to work—and won a contract from the L.A. Board of Education.

In the face of that decision, that contract was ruled invalid by the state courts on the grounds that the school board had not bargained in good faith with the contract, and that a new contract was needed.

In the face of the court's attack upon the trade union movement of all California teachers, the UTLA leadership did nothing. Indeed, the UTLA bureaucrats appeared not to even understand the role of the capitalist courts; for, following the strike, one report was complaining that the judge had "disregarded" the fact that 75% of all teachers are covered by such contracts.

On the other side of the issue, the teachers very well the precedent set by his decision. In the face of the contract, the teachers proposed a new contract with the teachers association to cover all of the state's teachers. The new contract was rejected by the state courts on the grounds that the state has no power to act in such matters.

The teachers were not happy with the decision, and the new contract was rejected by the teachers association to cover all of the state's teachers. The new contract was rejected by the state courts on the grounds that the state has no power to act in such matters.
Stanford Head Arrests Youth in Witchhunt

BY BARRY ZVERKOV
STANFORD—The administration of Stanford University and the local authorities have intensified their campaign to eliminate all militants from the campus.

On May 4th six more warrants were issued against participants in the April 9th sit-in at the Medical Center, bringing the number of people charged to thirty. All are charged with nine counts of misdemeanors. Seven, including BSL Chairman, Willie Newberry, are also charged with felonious assault on a police officer: a week later a number recently charged is Sam Bridges, a Black hospital worker whose firing touched off the struggle at the Medical Center.

The following week, Leo Bazile, former chairman of the BSL, and Chris Laury, a member of the Black Liberation Front and a leader of the Medical Center fight, were arrested and charged with beating of a white hospital worker who covered a picket line set up in support of Black and Chicoan hospital workers' demands. Bazile and Laury were charged with criminal assault and burglary, both felonies.

ISOLATE

The seriousness of the charges against Bazile, Laury, and Newberry are indicative of the administration's effort to isolate Lyman's plan to isolate and smash all opposition to his policies—education cutsbacks, layoffs, and political repression. In a recent speech in Colorado, Lyman railed against the "new barbarians," only days after he gave the go-ahead for the notorious Santa Clara Sheriff's Department to increase its patrols at Stanford and take over from the campus police the job of hunting down militants. The Sheriff's tactical squad is in fact responsible for numerous racist attacks on peacefull demonstrators at Stanford, including the protesters who sat in at Stanford during the March for Education.

The wave of repression at Stanford is just a sample of what the ruling class has in store for the working class as it prepares to smash the union. The first priority of Lyman and his class brothers is to isolate and eliminate revolutionary students and minority youth, the potential leadership of the working class.

The leadership of the Medical Center shrugs off the BSL, Black Liberation Front, Mocha, and other militant workers in their own ranks, accusing themselves on Marxist and nationalization theories and the bankrupt confrontation tactics of Venceremos played into the hands of Lyman and his thugs. The result is a dangerous isolation of Blacks, Chicanos, and militant whites on the part of the administration and students. This isolation enables Lyman to make a sweep of all militants and to minimize the radicalize the campus.

The way forward was foreshadowed by the Stanford Workers League Club when it called for the immediate formation of a strike committee to shut down the campus in defense of the victims of Lyman's political witchhunt and in support of the unionization of the campus, and hospital workers.

The militants at Stanford, despite their political differences, must now stand firmly in defense of Bazile, Laury, Newberry, and all political victims.

Reagan Blames Budget Cuts on Welfare

ANAHEIM—The recent speech Governor Reagan gave here before 3000 delegates to the 72nd annual California Congress of Parents and Teachers made clear that the financial burdens placed upon the county governments by his new state budget and welfare "reforms" were consciously designed to produce a reactionary frenzy among the middle classes.

In Orange County, approval of Reagan's welfare "reforms" will shift an additional $2 million in costs onto the county. In addition to that, Reagan's budget reduces the county's share of Medi-Cal funds from $2.9 million to $1.927 million, and also reduces the amount of state funds given to the county for its mental health programs. Since Reagan's budget fails to compensate the counties for the loss of tax revenues, County revenues are principally derived from local property taxes, and the result of the state cuts in funding in Orange County is a projected 20% increase in the property tax rate. On May 4th, County Budget Director Tom Corbin announced that "welfare costs are the basic cause of the budget increase." This, in fact, is an escalation, since the shift in welfare costs from the state to the counties only accounts for 14% of the increase in the county's budget. But it is an escalation for a purpose that Reagan's speech makes clear. Reagan told the delegates that their children are "being robbed by the welfare monster which is destroying the moral values that have made America great. Unless welfare spending is cut, said Reagan, "there will be no way for the taxpayers to adequately finance our schools." And in a truly bold and big lie, Reagan proclaimed that "every dollar of the cost of welfare and Medi-Cal in California that might have been spent for education if the welfare drain did not swallow up so much public revenue!"

Teachers Protest Cutbacks

BY EARL OWENS
SACRAMENTO—"It's all a lot of rhetoric," one teacher commented as he listened to the speeches in front of the Capitol. Less than 1,000 teachers and municipal workers showed up here last Saturday for the so-called "March for the Money" to protest the $200,000 education cuts made by the state legislature. But a much larger turnout was due in part to a complete lack of publicity. "This will enable the union bureaucrats to blame the rank and file for apathy" as well as an understanding by many that the marchers would do nothing other than stand and shout slogans, speeches, and applause, and be led back to their boxes.

The crisis in education in California has left 15,000 teachers unemployed, but the organizers of the rally had no action to propose. On speaker had little more to say than "Decent education is good for everyone." George Mascone, Democratic State Senator, proposed that a "withholding system of state taxes" would improve public education.

Maxwell Wolsky of ASFMCE then took the platform. Although

New Blow Against Union Rights

BY A BULLETIN REPORTER
SANTA ANA—In April of last year, the United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) waged a bitter strike—deying court orders to return to work—on a conflict with the L.A. Board of Edu-
cation.

A year ago, that conflict was ruled invalid by the state courts on the grounds that the school board had not bargained in good faith with contract unions and employee organizations.

In the face of the court's attack upon the trade union movement of all California teachers, the UTLA leadership did nothing. Indeed, the UTLA bureaucrats capitulated not to even understand the role of the capitalist courts; for, following the rationale, one picnic was reported as complaining that the judge had "ignored the fact that 75% of all teachers are covered by such contracts."

The "court" decision was understood very well the precedent he set with his decision. And not only did the court's decision go over the heads of the Picnic, but the judge William Lee demonstrated by a recent decision against the Placentia Unified Education Association (PUEA) that he also understands.

The PUEA—supported by the southern section of the CTA—had filed a suit against the trustees of the Placentia Unified School District over an alteration in the wording of their contract.

The disputed provision, as originally worded, required that grievances be submitted to a "final and binding" decision on the trustees. On advice from the Orange County Counsel's Office, the trustees unilaterally changed "final and binding" to "advisory."