

POWER to the UNIONS with a LABOR PARTY!

By MARGARET GUTTSALL

Since the Trotskyist Organization initiated the struggle to build a Labor Party Coalition, we have actively involved working class youth and union members in this struggle and we have found hundreds more ready to support it by signing a petition to put a Labor Party Coalition on the ballot.

At least four working class organizations advocate a Labor Party: the Socialist Workers Party, the Internationalist Workers Party, Socialist Action, and the Fourth Internationalist Tendency (Lovell-Breitman). And one of these, the Fourth Internationalist Tendency, is even advocating building Labor Party organizations inside the unions.

This is only a small portion of the oppressed population that is increasingly disgusted with the anti-labor Democratic Party, with its failure to launch a struggle against the Reagan regime, its internecine wars and its crude attempts to force its hand-picked candidates on the oppressed population.

Now is the time to take the offensive against the Democratic Party and the AFL-CIO leadership that supports it: to build a Labor Party Coalition that unites all forces for a Labor Party; to put forward Labor Party candidates; to carry this struggle into the unions and build Labor Party caucuses in union locals. Building Labor Party caucuses is a way to mobilize the ranks against the union's Democratic Party policy and leadership and create a concrete alternative to it.

No single organization may yet have the authority and influence to win the masses of union members to this fight, but a united front will. And what the union members decide will be decisive. The AFL-CIO leadership cannot continue to pour resources into an anti-labor party without the members' support.

The Key

The fight for the Labor Party in the unions is *the key* to the fight to win all the workers' demands — from getting back concessions, getting back jobs, and stopping the US invasion of Central America, to ending the domination of the Democratic Party machine and ending the Reagan regime.

To achieve these goals, the unions must build their own power. To build their power, the unions must build their own party — a Labor Party, with its own program, leadership, organization and press.

Union support to the Democratic Party of concessions, strike-breaking, union-busting and racist attacks — Chrysler, PATCO, Greyhound, Phelps Dodge, Miami — not only wastes the unions' power, it *undermines* the unions' power. This support has always been a drain on union resources and an impediment to struggle, particularly since the beginning of World War II and the no-strike pledge to Democratic Party president Franklin D. Roosevelt. But now, in a situation of total class war, these contributions to the enemies' war chest and subordination of the unions to the enemies' demands, have become absolutely *destructive*.

Either the unions break with this policy or soon there will be no unions at all.

Necessity or Luxury

Thus the battle to stop union support to the Democratic Party and build a Labor Party is not just a luxury, a nice idea for some future date, it is an immediate and burning necessity.

Nevertheless, the very parties that advocate a Labor Party continue to see it that way.

"If the AFL-CIO leaders were to break from their don't upset the applecart relationship with the bosses and their futile reliance on the Democratic Party . . ." says the Socialist Workers Party (SWP, *The Militant*, April 6, 1984, *emphasis added*).

They should have as a strategy the patient explanation of the idea of forming a Labor Party," says the Internationalist Workers Party (IWP, *Working Class Opposition*, April 1984).

Not surprisingly, the tactics that they advocate to build a Labor Party reflect this conception of a Labor Party as a luxury to be acquired at some future date. Their candidates for office advocate a Labor Party as one slogan at the end of a long list of many others. The SWP endorses the National Black Independent Political Party as a model for a future Labor Party. The IWP endorses the California Peace and Freedom Party in a similar fashion.

But these parties aren't models for a Labor Party based on the unions. They are *petty bourgeois* parties and they haven't even broken with the Democrats. NBIPP supports Jackson and PFP supports Dellums, one of Jackson's managers (and a Democratic Congressman from California). They are really just safety valves for the Democratic Party, a place to blow off steam.

When it comes to actually *doing* something in the unions, the SWP and the IWP drop the Labor Party fight altogether and come up with something completely different.

"A fightback program," says the SWP. "Labor Solidarity — the Path to Victory," says the IWP. And the IWP is actually circulating a petition within the unions with at least ten different demands on it — including everything from defending Phelps Dodge workers, to withdrawing troops from foreign countries, to gay rights and a five minute national work stoppage — and not one of these demands is a demand to stop union support to the Democratic Party and build a Labor Party! And in an election year!

At the same time, CISPES is in a state of semi-paralysis, unable or unwilling to organize *mass actions*, to even try to set large numbers of Americans in motion against their government. Instead, handfuls of militants hang banners over freeways, take opinion polls, etc.

Socialist Action has recently published a criticism of the Socialist Workers Party's (SWP) anti-war work. While reserving this as a whole for future discussion, we want to take up one point SA raised.

It objects to the slogan of negotiations, saying correctly that Americans must not recognize the "right" of US imperialism to negotiate the fate of other peoples. But SA also, quite explicitly, does not go beyond the SWP's position during Vietnam — no right of US to negotiate, right of those fighting to seek negotiations. Now we have long written against the negotiations slogan, but we have also pointed out that the SWP's policy yielded politically to Stalinist leaderships.

When the Bolsheviks negotiated with the Germans at Brest-Litovsk, two facts existed: the Russian armies had evaporated, the party had a full discussion on the question. Neither of these conditions existed in Vietnam or exists today in Central America. The military relationship is completely to the revolution's advantage, no discussion is allowed.

Thus, in order to build an anti-war movement, the Trotskyists have to sharpen their intervention: all steps to achieve US withdrawal, aid to the revolutionary forces, no concessions to imperialist maneuvers, independence from Stalinist popular front politics in Central America.

So the problem obviously is not time, space or even tactics. It's policy. For the independence of the unions from the bosses' state, beginning with the parties that lead it or not? Is this the key question for the unions, or not? The first in each case is the working class, Trotskyist position.

Effective Struggle

Naturally, as Trotskyists, we favor militant union struggle and solidarity. But how can such a struggle or solidarity be *effective*, as long as the unions are pledged to support the pro-concessions, strike-breaking, union-busting Democratic Party?

The bosses know that the unions are pouring resources into an anti-labor party. They know that no matter how hard the workers struggle that the Democratic Party union leadership is going to undermine that struggle.

The biggest problem in the PATCO, Greyhound, Phelps Dodge and McDonnell-Douglas strikes, wasn't the bosses, the strike-breakers, or even the government, it was precisely the Democratic Party union leadership. This leadership has *sabotaged* every single strike against concessions since it signed the concessions agreement with Carter, Mondale, the Democratic Party Congress and Chrysler in 1979.

The AFL-CIO leadership did not lift a finger to help PATCO. When the Detroit Democratic Party mayor sent police to escort scabs into the Greyhound terminal, the AFL-CIO leaders cooperated, reorganized pickets, cleared a path, and called protesters "company plants." The AFL-CIO has left Phelps Dodge workers, under attack from a Democratic Party governor and his National Guard, high and dry. When McDonnell-Douglas started to run ads threatening to replace striking workers with scabs, the UAW leadership withdrew its share of the double strike benefits!

RAM

And the UAW tops are not the only ones in the union whose actions are dictated or influenced by the Democratic Party. Even the historic opposition leadership within the UAW, for example, Pete Kelly, UAW Local 160 president, and others, have now succumbed to the Democratic Party's influence.

Kelly and others claimed to be socialists, partisans of a Labor Party and fought the UAW tops for years, although never for a Labor Party — A Dollar An Hour Now, the United National Caucus, the Independent Skilled Trades Council, Locals Opposed to Concessions.

They even formed "Restore and More in '84," (RAM) called a press conference and demanded that the companies give back concessions and exposed GM's infamous strategy document and plans for more concessions.

Yet when Bieber bombarded the UAW Bargaining Convention with his pro-Democratic Party speech and said that the present situation makes any real union struggle for workers' demands impossible (see *Truth* No.181), Kelly didn't say a word. And now, after the Convention, he's completely abandoned the struggle. He reprints Bieber's speech in full with an approving headline and the comment, "I sincerely hope Brother Bieber will be a man of his word." "RAM" wasn't mentioned.

This shows that we have to get the Democratic Party out of the unions and do it now!

Fellow workers: comrades of the SWP, IWP Socialist Action and the Fourth Internationalist Tendency. We have the power to make this happen. Let's use it. Labor Party Coalition; Labor Party Candidates; Labor Party Caucuses Now!

Get the US Out of Central America Now!

By KEVIN FITZPATRICK

The Reagan administration is taking ever greater steps toward open war in Central America. Every worker, young person and militant has to take up the fight to defeat these moves, to *get the US out of Central America now!*

Senate Votes for War

The latest step in these actions against the Sandinista government in Nicaragua and against the revolutionary forces in El Salvador is the Senate vote (76-19) approving Reagan's request for 82.7 million dollars in military aid to the Salvadoran dictatorship (61.7 million) and to the Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries, the *contras* (21 million).

The size of the vote shows that the *Democratic Party* is going along fully with Reagan's war drive, just as its members did during Vietnam. Its claim to be the "peace" party is a hollow fraud. The vote shows that electing a Democrat to replace Reagan will in no way end attacks on the people of Central America.

The Salvadoran government has all the advantages, including massive US aid, but it cannot stand up to the rebel guerrillas in any open fight. The recent fake election in that country, again supported by the Democrats, shows not support but one more twisted stunt to try to fool the US population in particular. It may well end in an open seizure of power by the screaming right wing forces around the psychotic killer D'Aubuisson.

The Sandinista government in Nicaragua came to power at the head of a mass revolution against the US-backed Somoza dictatorship. Nobody gave the Sandinistas 21 million dollars to help in their fight — certainly not the imperialist US government, which was pouring money into Somoza's regime. Nobody ever gave the people of Nicaragua, who marched on Somoza's "bunker" armed with sticks, knives and rocks, any money at all. *But they won.*

But the Nicaraguan *contras*, financed, armed and trained by the US — complete with the brazen mining of Nicaraguan harbors, an action that the US government all but openly brags about while crying "peace" — are so isolated and hated that if the US didn't keep subsidizing them they would be easily crushed.

This is the big picture of US attacks on the poor people of that region. But the details show the war drive even more clearly.

As part of the virtually permanent US military maneuvers in Honduras, 2,500 US troops took up positions right on the border with El Salvador on the eve of the recent fake "elections." In this way, the general threat of US involvement becomes the *direct menace of open US intervention*.

Make no mistake, with the support of the peace-talking, war-making, lickspittle Democrats, Reagan is getting ready for exactly that course of action! The revolution is too strong to be defeated by imperialism's local lackeys, so Reagan must — soon after the Democrats hand him his re-election — try to repeat the Grenada invasion.

But the attack on the Nicaraguan and Salvadoran Revolutions will provoke a massive response throughout the region that will make Reaganites look back on Vietnam like a quiet Sunday at the Country Club. US imperialism will be heading into a meat-grinder.

The Anti-War Movement

What role will the American workers, young people — the poor of this country, against whom Reagan is also waging war — take in this coming fight?

The great majority oppose US involvement in that region. But they are not politically armed against the maneuvers Reagan and the equally imperialist Democrats stage to confuse them and make them at least passive by-standers to the war.

Among the forces now active in opposition to US involvement, there are active disputes over how to proceed, how best to win the American working class to the side of the revolution.

CISPES (Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador) is the chief anti-war organization today. It politically supports the Salvadoran FMLN-FDR; that is, its policy of an alliance with the bourgeoisie (even in armed struggle) and of a peaceful settlement with imperialism. In that sense, the recent CISPES conference (not democratically elected or representative) endorsed — vaguely, to be sure — Jesse Jackson's "Rainbow Coalition."

HELP BUILD A LABOR PARTY COALITION!

1. Subscribe to Truth.
 2. Help circulate petitions to put a Labor Party Coalition or Candidates on the ballot in Michigan and Illinois.
 3. Build Labor Party Caucuses in union locals.
- For more information call: 313-841-6154 or write *Truth*.

For a Common SWP-TO Slate in Michigan!

The Trotskyist Organization addressed several letters to the Socialist Workers Party in Detroit and Chicago appealing to it to join us in building a Labor Party Coalition, in putting forward a common slate of Labor Party candidates and, particularly, in petitioning to put a Labor Party Coalition on the ballot in Michigan and Labor Party candidates on the ballot in Illinois.

Yet the SWP never bothered to reply. It just put forward its own candidates and started petitioning for them alone. When our comrades in Chicago approached Mel Mason, SWP candidate for president, after he said the SWP was the only party making an independent fight against the Democrats and Republicans, Mason was completely taken aback.

Finally, when Mason came to Detroit and we spoke with a Detroit branch member at one of Mason's meetings, we got a response . . . sort of.

Dave Frankel, former managing editor of *Intercontinental Press*, told us that the SWP is not for building a Labor Party Coalition in the unions because there is no movement in the unions toward a Labor Party. He said that the Jackson movement is a movement toward the Democratic Party; that the SWP intends to build a *Marxist* tendency in the unions; that, in any event, the SWP and the Trotskyist Organization are "two very different organizations."

Frankly, we find this response somewhat puzzling. Perhaps we misunderstood.

Even the most recent issue of *The Militant* says: "The Washington campaign and similar campaigns in Philadelphia and Boston reflect — in a distorted fashion — the drive by Blacks and other workers for more political power. Jesse Jackson's bid for the Democratic Party's presidential nomination is aimed at tapping this sentiment."

Or, "Working people are searching for a way to win more political power. Unfortunately, this sentiment is trapped in the two-party system."

"The unions should form their own party — a labor party," says the SWP.

What is this movement but a movement toward a Labor Party, even if the workers themselves aren't fully aware of it? And why does the SWP call for a Labor Party if it doesn't see any basis for it in the unions?

Even more curious is Frankel's counterposition of building a Marxist tendency in the unions to building a Labor Party tendency. What is a Marxist tendency in the unions? What can this possibly mean to thousands of workers who want to get back concessions? Frankel is too mature to think he can unfurl the *Communist Manifesto* and expect workers to rally around it. So what is his policy for these workers?

Most curious of all is the statement that the SWP and the Trotskyist Organization are two very different organizations. Of course we are. If not, we'd be in the same party. But since when do political differences between working class parties mean that they can't join in a united front against the common enemy for what they do agree on: in this case, a Labor Party? The SWP's differences with the Democratic Party did not stop it from working with the bourgeois Democratic Party in the anti-war movement in the 60s. Why do its differences with the working class Trotskyist Organization prevent it from working with the TO today to fight for a Labor Party against the Democratic Party?

In any case, whether Frankel's statement contradicts the SWP's line or not, we think it's a false position that will only leave the unions in Michigan in the hands of the Democratic Party. And in a state where union opposition to the Democratic Party machine is at an all-time high. Letters from working class readers poured into the *Detroit Free Press* protesting Black Democratic Party leader Coleman Young's attempts to intimidate workers into voting for Mondale in the primaries. Workers were absolutely indignant about the treatment they got from the Democratic Party machine at the polls.

By now the SWP branch in Detroit has cer-

tainly learned that it is too late to acquire the more than 20,000 signatures necessary to get on the ballot as a party. And Michigan makes no provisions for independent candidates. What is the branch going to do? Give up?

We think this would be a mistake. Working class candidates on the ballot will help working class parties reach thousands of workers with the Labor Party fight. We can *still* put forward a common slate of independent candidates and sue the state of Michigan together to put these candidates on the ballot.

Michigan's law has been ruled unconstitutional and courts in the past have been forced to order the state to put independent candidates on the ballot, like Gus Hall and Angela Davis or Peggy Goldman-Frankie. If we put forward a *common* slate and a *common* suit for this slate, our position in the courts and in the working class will be immeasurably strengthened.

We will be able to reach many more workers with the Labor Party fight and the authority and influence of both your party and ours will grow in the working class.

We have supported SWP candidates in the past and we are happy to do so today, even to refrain from putting forward our own candidates for certain offices, if it would make it easier to arrive at such a common slate and common fight in the working class.

Such a fight for independent ballot status for working class of Labor Party candidates, could even be a point of departure for building Labor Party Caucuses in UAW locals where we both have supporters.

This is the kind of fight for a Labor Party that the Socialist Workers Party branch in Detroit made in the 1940s and '50s, in both the highs and lows of working class opposition to the Democratic Party. We think it is the kind of fight that has to be resumed today. Think it over comrades. It's your turn to speak.

M.G.

THE GLOBAL CONFLICT

Welcome Nora Astorga!

The Sandinista government has indicated its intention of nominating Nora Astorga as its new ambassador to the United States.

Now there are rumblings in Washington that Reagan may use his option (hardly ever taken) to reject the person named, refusing to accept her as diplomatic personnel.

On what grounds? Why because Nora Astorga, as a fighter in the Nicaraguan Revolution, was involved in the killing of a person whom government figures here regarded as "a friend and a colleague" and as a "US asset."

This "asset" was Gen. Reynaldo Perez Vega, second-in-command of the Somozaist National Guard. Known as "The Dog," Perez Vega was a torturer, a rapist and murderer. This is what the US calls an "asset," like the current head of the Salvadoran Treasury Police (source of a large portion of the death squads), Col. Nicolas Carranza, who has been on the CIA's payroll for the last half-dozen years.

When Astorga became single, Perez Vega tried to force himself on her. Working with the Sandinistas, she helped to arrange a plan to kidnap and use him for prisoner exchanges. In the course of the attempt, Perez Vega was killed.

Using this incident, the torturers and murderers in the American CIA, etc., want to honor their "colleague" in their bloody trade by having Astorga rejected.

Repudiate the imperialist killers! Welcome Nora Astorga as our colleague in the American Revolution!

Fidel Speaks, And Says the Same Thing

In the April 1 issue of *Parade*, a nationally distributed Sunday supplement with a very large circulation, the prominent liberal journalist Tad Szulc (with important contacts among liberal imperialists) reports on a meeting he had with Cuban leader Fidel Castro.

As we have pointed out consistently (most recently in *Truth* #179), Castro has been engaging in a series of contacts — some open, some private — aimed at arranging a sellout ("peaceful settlement") in Central America.

In this article, the same old changes are rung: "It is not we who declare ourselves the enemy of the US. It is the US that declares itself beforehand the enemy of revolutionary countries."

So, naturally, if the US stops this curious behavior, Cuba will drop its "reciprocal right of helping the revolutionaries." Thus, he told Szulc ("stressed," in Szulc's words) that, again, the war in El Salvador can be ended: "A formula for a negotiated political solution must be accepted in which *all sides* would make concessions" (emphasis added). And again, "We have no means to be able to decide the events militarily,"

Szulc got the message: "My own impression is that Fidel Castro may be beginning to search for additional alternatives for Cuba, a subtle effort to which US policymakers might pay attention." As the Kremlin gets ready to bargain away Castro, Castro gets ready to bargain away the revolution.

This interview is one more piece in the mosaic that, slowly but surely, is giving us a picture of an emperor with no clothes.

Argentine Debt

At the end of March, the US government intervened with a \$300 million dollar loan to Argentina, to avoid a formal default by that country on its debts to the imperialist banks, which the US feared would mean "a crisis of government." Such a default would have caused immense political repercussions throughout Latin America (as Chileans, for example, again went into the streets against their dictatorship) and economic repercussions in the US itself.

"Robbing Peter to pay Paul" is the old expression that fits here — another \$300 million was pledged by Brazil, Mexico, Colombia, and Venezuela; they owe huge amounts themselves to the banks. And this loan only covers the interest payments: Argentina owes a total of \$43.6 billion.

Stalling, playing fortune, shifting paper figures — all this cannot deal with the real situation. The countries of Latin America must be freed from imperialism. That can come about only through socialist revolution. That prospect is what drives imperialism to throw good money after bad in a futile attempt to avert destruction.

Chicago Local Committee Founded

On March 24, the Trotskyist Organization held a conference in Chicago, Illinois, to found a Local Committee. Delegates from the Trotskyist Organization and its leadership attended as well as several observers.

The focus of the conference was the '84 elections and the construction of a party that is an alternative that workers and young people can truly call their own — a Labor Party — with Labor Party candidates to run in the upcoming elections.

The TO is building a Labor Party Coalition as a massive tool for the unions, students and other organizations who are for building such a party. The results achieved prior to the conference — subscriptions at Chicago Vocational High School (CVS), work in the neighborhoods and also in other organizations, such as CISPEP — were based on this open struggle.

The conference and its resolution mark an important advance for the TO. Chicago is a key political center for the Midwest and, as we have seen through the mayoral elections in 1983, the political situation here is far from ordinary. We've dedicated ourselves to fight against the racist Democratic machine and its allies. To stop the closing of factories (South Works) and against concessions and unemployment. To make clear through our press and propaganda that healing the split in the Democratic Party is not in our interests as Jesse Jackson would like us to believe. The split here in Chicago — Washington and Vrdolyak — is just one clear example of the bankruptcy of this party that

claims to be for the workers yet slashes their throats with concessions, unemployment, union-busting and uses racism, especially here in Chicago, to keep the working class divided.

The conference of the Chicago Organizing Committee (COC) itself does not mark a beginning, but rather a continuation of the fight the COC has waged in Chicago since early September, to implant the Trotskyist Organization in the working class and to organize the fight of the Labor Party. One of the main discussions at the conference was the Fourth International's fight against centrism in the working

class. The resolution reads, "The fight against centrism is a struggle to develop our policy on a regular basis, especially in terms of other organizations." This means *against* the policy of regroupment outside of the working class. *Against* the SWP's policy of "Socialist Education," only. *For* an open struggle in the working class to put independent Labor Candidates on the ballot, we propose to these organizations that they join the fight to build the Labor Party Coalition.

The conclusion here is "the fight against centrism is above all the fight to lead, to differentiate, to struggle for the best policy to lead the working class in each and every battle." This is one of the conclusions that the conference has drawn out in its resolution.

A workplan was also developed that mapped out a clear plan that the Chicago Committee will be following in the elections as well as daily activity. The plan has already been set in motion. Within one week of the con-

ference results are visible in sales and subscriptions at Chicago Vocational High School and in South Side neighborhoods.

TO SUBSCRIBE TO TRUTH:

Fill out this form and send it with the correct amount to Truth, P.O. Box 32546, Detroit, MI 48232
 Introductory Subscription, 6 issues for \$1; Regular Subscription, 24 issues for \$6.
 Supporting Subscription: 24 issues for \$15.

Name _____

Address _____

School/Union/Organization _____

TROTSKYIST ORGANIZATION OF THE USA NATIONAL OFFICE

P.O. Box 32546, Detroit, MI 48232

CHICAGO

P.O. Box 388334, Chicago, IL 60638

DETROIT

P.O. Box 32546, Detroit, MI 48232

TRUTH

Published by the Trotskyist Organization/USA

ADDRESS

P.O. Box 32546, Detroit, MI 48232

EDITORIAL BOARD: Kevin FitzPatrick; Editor, Margaret Guttshall; David Mark; Barbara Putnam.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: North America: Introductory — 6 issues for \$1; Regular — 24 issues for \$6; Supporting — 24 issues for \$15. Inquire for other rates, including institutional rates.

An Open Trotskyist Congress to Rebuild the US Section of the 4th International

A significant number of young people have begun to turn to Trotskyism as the only tendency capable of guiding the working and oppressed masses.

Yet there are several organizations that claim to be Trotskyist. Each has its own policy that it calls Trotskyist. And the largest of these, the Socialist Workers Party, appears to be the far-

thest from basic Trotskyist principles.

The Trotskyist Organization of the USA, Section (Sympathizing) of the Fourth International, was founded in 1975 to overcome this problem, to lead a struggle to clearly differentiate Trotskyism from various centrist or intermediary tendencies that masquerade under its name; to train

a new generation of revolutionaries capable of guiding the American working class in the foundation of its own party and the fight for power, in other words, to rebuild the US Section of the Fourth International.

We call on youth turning toward Trotskyism, as well as youth and workers fighting for a Labor

Party, to join us in this struggle, in particular, in preparing and building an open Trotskyist Congress to bring the struggle to a successful conclusion. This page is especially dedicated to this struggle. It is open to any militant or tendency that wants to contribute to it.

A Letter from the IWP

We are publishing below a letter from the leadership of the Internationalist Workers Party (IWP), the US group in political agreement with the International Workers League (IWL) headed by Nahuel Moreno. We believe this letter and our response speak for themselves. All we want to indicate additionally is that while the letter is dated March 7, it was post-marked March 22. Thus, it appears in the first issue of *Truth* following its receipt.

Dear TRUTH Editors,

The Political Bureau of the Internationalist Workers Party would like to briefly respond to several inaccurate statements about our political work made in your newspaper. We will keep our remarks as brief as possible because we are asking you to publish this letter in your next issue.

Your article "IWP Perspective Fails" in the Jan. 20, 1984 issue of *Truth* attempts either through direct falsehood or through innuendo to create the impression that 1) the IWP advocated the dissolving of a Trotskyist organization into the Peace and Freedom Party; 2) the IWP abandoned the fight for the Labor Party; 3) the IWP would have abandoned its fight for independent socialist politics if the Search Committee for a United Left Presidential Ticket convention had voted to endorse Dennis Serrette of the Consumers Party last November. These are dishonest descriptions of our actual political positions, and will become, unless you publicly correct them, examples of unscrupulous journalism in *Truth*.

Your article asserts falsehood number 1 in the following way: "They [IWP] denounced us as 'sectarians' because we refused to . . . dissolve the Trotskyist Organization into Peace and Freedom Party . . ." Never at any time has the IWP made such a proposal, and we challenge *Truth* to provide any evidence that the IWP has advocated "dissolving" into the P&FP. The IWP has maintained its political distinctness from the P&FP with its own press, offices and other organizational forms which reflect in an unambiguous way socialist and revolutionary politics. The IWP would not make the mistake of accusing the TO of dissolving into a Labor Party simply because TO is advocating that Trotskyist organizations join in a political united front under the Labor Party slogan. But this is the logic of TO when it asserts that the IWP advocates "dissolving" into the Peace and Freedom Party. Such logic would stand in the way of all united front work. As a result of our fight for socialist politics in the Peace and Freedom Party the IWP has grown by considerably more numbers than there are members of TO, which has remained its same size as the result of its sectarian position. Such an organization which cannot grow year after year when such growth is required ends up by dissolving itself. Your article asserts falsehood number 2 by stating "the IWP . . . published an election platform calling for the formation of a labor party . . . but later reversed themselves and rushed headlong into the Peace and Freedom Party." Your article deliberately neglects to mention that the IWP successfully fought to have the call for a Labor Party adopted as a platform of the Peace and Freedom Party, thus enabling the Labor Party slogan to be raised in a large forum. The P&FP has over 40,000 registered voters in California, whereas *Truth*, which also agitates for a Labor Party, is read by probably no more than 100 militants. The IWP has repeatedly pointed out to TO that the P&FP could be used as a platform to advocate and build a Labor Party, and at no time was the P&FP counterposed to the Labor Party. The editors of *Truth* were certainly aware of this clarification, but apparently chose not to mention it in its article so that the readers of *Truth* would get the false impression that the IWP had counterposed the P&FP to the Labor Party. Falsehood number 3, that the IWP was willing to support the Consumers Party candidate at the SCULPT convention even if this involved abandoning socialist politics, is fantastical conjecture which goes directly against the history of the IWP in the SCULPT process up to the time of the SCULPT convention. Precisely to insure that the Peace and Freedom Party, a participant in SCULPT, break from becoming a satellite of the Democratic Party, the IWP took the lead in forming the Left Wing Tendency.

The Left Wing Tendency had won a number of battles in the P&FP against the social democrats and Stalinists on the question of independent socialist politics, however, mention of this would have made the innuendos made in your article more difficult to make. Despite its relatively smaller numerical size, the IWP was able to win certain battles over the question of socialist politics in the P&FP; Trotskyists will encounter many such battles with the social democrats within emerging independent political movements. Revolutionaries should not shrink from every political battle in which the representatives of the bourgeoisie begin with greater strength. The IWP continues to fight for independent socialist politics in the Peace and Freedom Party, including the Labor Party in the platform, and invites the TO to support the following candidates in California as an integral part of its campaign for a Labor Party: *Sonia Cruz* is a candidate for the Californian State Senate. *Sonia* is the first and only Salvadoran Socialist candidate in the US elections. *Julie Banzuela*, the first Guatemalan

candidate to run for a public office, is seeking a State Assembly post. *John O'Brien* is a socialist candidate for a California State Assembly seat. *James Green*, union militant and shop steward from Communication Workers of America Local 11502 has been recommended by his local to be endorsed in the elections. He is running for the 24th Congressional Seat. *Ted Zuur*, a shop steward of Local 2 of the Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union, is seeking the 5th Congressional seat in San Francisco. As you can see, these candidates are not only fighting for the Labor Party on the Peace and Freedom Party ticket, but they also reflect militant solidarity with Central America. Moreover, these candidates are running against candidates of the Socialist Party, the Communist Party and Workers World Party in the Peace and Freedom Party primaries.

We would also like to briefly comment on the *Truth* article (Feb. 24, 1984) titled "Volunteers and the ENTC". In it you chastise the IWP for not responding to your Nov. 17, 1983 letter to the participants in the Emergency National Trotskyist Conference. This letter proposed a petition campaign to organize defense of the Nicaraguan Revolution against US intervention, being in line with the resolution on unconditional defense of Nicaragua passed at the ENTC last summer. Since the IWP had put forward the original resolution, we would naturally be in agreement with such efforts to organize campaigns around defense of Nicaragua. Furthermore, the IWP(FI) not only proposed this resolution on international combat brigades to give active solidarity to the Central American Revolution, but has also put international solidarity into practice. In 1978-79 our international current organized the Simon Bolivar

Brigade of internationalist fighters who participated in the armed struggle against the Somoza National Guard. In fact, the first nucleus of our party in the United States was made up of veterans of this heroic action of internationalist solidarity. We raised this slogan concerning the Salvadoran Revolution for the first time in 1981 when the Trotskyist Organization wasn't even talking about militant solidarity with the workers and peasants of El Salvador, let alone the calling for the formation of Internationalist Brigades. In late 1981 we organized a movement within the Central American community of Los Angeles to collect more than 1,000 signatures as part of a letter sent to the leadership of the FMLN-FSLN demanding that they call for the formation of internationalist brigades. In fact, our party here in the United States is the *only* organization, not just among those organizations which work under the banner of the Fourth International but of the entire left, which can claim to have participated in the Central American Revolution. Currently, our party is the US carries out numerous solidarity actions (material and human aid) to support the Trotskyist combat organizations in Central America, that is, the Salvadoran PST, the Nicaraguan LMR, the Costa Rican PRT, the Panamanian PST and our comrades in Guatemala and Honduras. This aid includes the education and development of Central American cadre among the hundreds of Salvadorans, Guatemalans and Nicaraguans in the US from the Central American exile community who are active supporters of the IWP(FI).

We do not think that the Trotskyist Organization is very serious about actually carrying out in a concrete way the joint work of the ENTC. After the IWP

produced in Los Angeles the 1st issue of the ENTC discussion document *Trotskyist Bulletin*, TO wrote to us asking to have sent 20 copies, which sell at \$3 each. The IWP then mailed these copies, but TO did not send the \$60. We then sent you a letter asking for payment for the *Bulletins* you requested, but this has never been answered. Also, following the ENTC, Chicago Workers Video asked if you were willing to participate in a demonstration in Chicago against the Simpson-Mazzoli Bill, which was also a position agreed upon at the ENTC Conference. On the day of the demonstration, although the TO had informed the CWV that it would be at the demonstration, the TO comrades who had planned to come did not appear and made no effort to contact CWV to discuss the cancellation. Furthermore, on July 3 CWV sent TO a letter asking that it share expenses in the production of a jointly signed leaflet CWV had prepared for the demonstration, along with a copy of the bill for the printing costs. TO has not to this date paid the bill. CWV has subsequently joined the IWP. Frankly, the Political Bureau cannot think of a single organization in the US who would take seriously doing joint work with such an outfit with the habits described above. Can you?

With revolutionary greetings,

Leon Perez - Mark Elliot
for the Political Bureau of the Internationalist Workers Party (Fourth International)

. . . And Our Reply

We welcome the opportunity to publish the IWP's letter, because it does enter — in a negative way — into the discussion on the Trotskyist Congress.

Two months after the article (the last of several devoted to the IWP) appeared, the IWP leadership finally attempts to justify its policy. Unfortunately, it is unable to do so politically, and responds only on the level of charges, evasions and (of course, of course) money. Not only do we emphatically reassert the correctness of the characterizations made in the article, but we want to deepen those criticisms in this response.

1) *Dissolution*. The leaders of the IWP are hardly political neophytes. They are well aware that political dissolution does not necessarily mean organizational liquidation, especially at first. Pablo himself denied dissolving the FI because he of course maintained a "press, offices and other organizational forms."

The IWP really is *begging the question*. The Trotskyist Organization has characterized the Peace and Freedom Party (P&FP) as a *petty bourgeois radical party*, based on its origins, its social composition and its program (despite whatever rhetorical concessions it may have made to the IWP and others). "Building" such a formation is "counterposed" to a Labor Party. That is the way the IWP has treated it in California, New York and in Illinois (Comrade Perez was quoted in *Truth* #173 as saying the Labor Party was "abstract"; he does not deny that).

Now, such petty bourgeois "socialist" formations are an old story in the American working class. We point out that the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) in 1968, when in our view it was already a centrist formation, still maintained enough of its class independence tradition to rightly condemn the P&FP. ("The PFP was not conceived as a break with the Democrats. Its roots are rather in an attempt to elect peace candidates in Democratic Party primaries . . . an announcement by the P&FP at a kick-off rally: 'We ain't marching anymore . . . it isn't necessary.'" *YSA Discussion Bulletin*, February 1968.) But the IWP is completely unable to confront this question of class nature, and still less capable of explaining why the SWP of that time, which it says was a Trotskyist party, took a position so much at odds with the policy of the IWP.

It cannot do any of this, because to do so would be to reveal *political dissolution* of working class formations into those of the petty bourgeoisie. Instead we get the "40,000 registered voters in California" (and this is typical of IWP "figures" — *Working Class Opposition* #5: "over 57,000 registered voters";

WCO #6: "about 60,000 registered members"; *WCO* #8: "over 50,000 registered members"; behold, the incredible shrinking Peace and Freedom Party!) counterposed to the supposed "no more than 100 militants" who read *Truth*.

Two questions arise. First, doesn't the IWP know the difference between petty bourgeois voters and the supporters of a working class newspaper? Second, if we are so unimportant, why is the IWP so upset by our characterizations, and why — of all things — does it want a letter published in our paper?

The IWP's position on P&FP is part of a larger picture. Moreno's PST literally dissolved into MAS in Argentina, and when the poor results for this electoral bloc became known, the IWP lost all its interest in "figures" and mentioned in passing that MAS didn't score any "landslide victories." Irony itself stands disarmed.

Likewise the Spanish PST's Central Committee sent a formal letter to "solicit the entrance of the PST into" a pro-Kremlin split in the Spanish CP, in order to build a "revolutionary communist party."

Dissolution is thus hardly confined to the question of P&FP. Dissolution is the IWL's international line!

2) *Other points*. Anyone can read the IWP's electoral manifesto of 1982 (*WCO* #4) and see that it devotes pages to the Labor Party and *one line* to P&FP; that is, the opposite of its actual policy today. On Dennis Serrette, the article said (which the IWP finds inconvenient to quote): "In fact, it is altogether possible he could have been nominated with a few more votes. Would the IWP have supported him in that event?" Still a good question that the IWP still can't answer.

3) *ENTC*. It is on the question of the agreements made at the Emergency National Trotskyist Conference (ENTC) that the letter from the IWP reaches its real point.

It is apparent even to the authors of the letter that the long paragraph they devote to a "comment" on our article about the non-response by other ENTC participants (by no means the IWP alone) to a concrete proposal on volunteers in *no way* answers the article. The authors go on and on, they pound their chests, but *they don't say why the IWP didn't answer our proposal*.

(Naturally, it also includes very blatant misstatements of fact: ". . . in 1981 when the Trotskyist Organization wasn't even talking about militant solidarity with the workers and peasants of El Salvador." In reality, one of the key slogans appearing in *Truth* throughout that period was "trade union boycott of the Salvadoran junta." Likewise, today's Chicago representative of the IWP was present at the February

1981 CARD Conference in Detroit and fought along with us, unsuccessfully, for this policy's adoption — based on the ILWU example.)

Unable to answer factually, the writers try to shift the ground to those tried-and-true methods — complaints of organizational and financial abuses.

A) The TO did not make a demonstration in Chicago. Sadly, our comrades were delayed. But the IWP neglects to mention that its members also did not get to Chicago.

B) We neglected to pay a portion of a printing bill. The sum of \$12.30 did slip our mind. Curiously, it was never raised to us again until it seemed useful to the IWP.

On the question of payment for the *Trotskyist Bulletin* the smokescreen character of these petty charges, their objective of confusing everyone, becomes linked to real political questions.

First, as usual, the IWP's assertions are factually erroneous. Our letter of October 4, 1982, said: "In accordance with the resolution passed by the ENTC [in the first pages of the *TB* — Editors] . . . we will reimburse you for the production costs (on a per copy ordered basis) that were incurred, over and above our initial \$25.00 advance payment on these costs." The response of the IWP, much later, was a form letter with filled-in blanks — and the "figures" are wrong, too; the IWP's own numbers were \$3.50 apiece; with a remainder of \$45.00 — that studiously ignored all the agreed-upon procedures.

Comrades Perez and Elliot want everyone to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. They expect militants to worry about the cost of the *Trotskyist Bulletin*, while not noticing that it is the IWP leadership that has put it out of existence. The practical agreements, the *TB*, the Coordinating Committee and the whole ENTC have been *scuttled* by the IWP.

Continuing the ENTC would mean continuing the discussion and combat on the rebuilding of the US section of the Fourth International. But trying to forget the ENTC happened was not successful; the fight of rebuilding continues *right in these pages*. That is why this letter makes its sudden appearance, as feeble as it is.

Unintentionally, the IWP have opened up a chance for their own militants to see the real nature of political disputes. They must ask their leaders why they suppressed the ENTC, and why they cannot conduct a principled political discussion.

Bring Down Vrdolyak with a Labor Party!

By RICHARD TETRAULT

April 12 marked one year since Harold Washington narrowly beat Republican Bernard Epstein in the mayoral elections and became Chicago's first black mayor. The Trotskyist Organization said from the very start, beginning with the battle in the Democratic primary that pitted Washington against State's Attorney Richard Daley and then-Mayor Jane Byrne, that this election represented something different, profoundly different. It represented an attempt by Blacks, Latins, youth and workers to assert themselves as a political power and to break from the hated "Machine," the Democratic Party.

For his part Harold Washington set out to save this racist and capitalist party with talk of reform and defending the interests of Blacks in Chicago. We also said that, whatever intentions Washington might have, he would be forced to choose between defending the interests of the people who elected him or the interests of the capitalist class that the Democratic Party serves. This meant a fundamental struggle over the question of jobs, education, housing and ultimately — political power. A closer look at Washington's achievements, his continuing battle with the racist Ed Vrdolyak, chairman of the Cook County Democratic Party, and the worsening condition of Blacks in Chicago will reinforce the conclusion that any real advances will only be made by breaking from the Democratic Party, by building a Labor Party Coalition.

Last April's mayoral election witnessed a record voter turnout (82%). And there was a large turnout for Jesse Jackson in the primary. But it wasn't as large as the turnout for Washington last year. Huge sums of money and time were expended to "get out the vote." But there were fewer registered voters in each of the decisively Black wards in Chicago in the recent Illinois Democratic primary. In these seventeen wards there was an average decline of 4.3%, and in fact there were drops in all fifty wards for a city-wide decline of 4.4%. If not for the big voter push, it would have been even more obvious that the groundswell that put Washington in office is not as enthusiastic about supporting the Democrats, even Jackson. And in the wake of these results, we are now seeing yet another attempt to reconcile the differences between Washington and Vrdolyak. Both being loyal Democrats, their primary concern is the "unity" of the Democratic Party.

And there is good reason why workers' enthusiasm, for Washington and other Democrats is cooling this time around. Within months of taking office, Washington laid off 734 city workers, with the heaviest cuts taking place in the Department of Health, Streets and Sanitation and in Public Works, areas which affect every resident in Chicago. Since then, the

total has risen to over 3,000 jobs lost, with 1,350 due to layoffs and firings. This makes hollow any promise of jobs of financial stability for the unemployed and youth. And in fact it's the same method Reagan used when he came into office.

Shortly after the first wave of layoffs, and perhaps because of it, the Chicago Teachers Union and seventeen other unions representing Board of Education workers began what was to become the longest school strike in Chicago history. These workers were the backbone of the movement that put Washington in office just six months earlier, yet he turned his back on them at this critical moment and claimed to be "neutral" on the matter. But his accomplice in this affair, Reverend Jesse Jackson and his Operation PUSH, filed suit in court to break the teachers' strike. As the saying goes: "With friends like these, who needs enemies!" It is also apparent in Washington's recent remarks concerning the unionization drive affecting 10,000 white-collar city workers. He said that the workers really don't need to join unions to protect themselves. This is, once again, part of his "neutral" position.

But the real question lies at the heart of the dispute between Washington and Vrdolyak. Vrdolyak is, for all intents and purposes, the essence of the Democratic Party. His show-

manship, arrogance, racism and chauvinism are the methods of that party. And Washington wants to *reform* such a party. But as the recent elections indicate, he may be increasingly alone in his efforts to save the Democratic Party because more and more Blacks are skeptical of it.

In the budget battle of last December, Washington cut a deal with Vrdolyak and the city council majority in which he sacrificed the meager reform proposals he had put forward for some power-sharing in the county slate-making process, a deal that Vrdolyak quickly reneged on. The big losers were the workers of Chicago who received cuts in services and a list of new and improved taxes.

Following this shameful display of leadership, Washington's supporters began a movement to "Dump Vrdolyak" that was to utilize the Democratic committeemen races of March 20 to win enough new seats to replace Vrdolyak with a pro-Washington candidate. Once again, the workers, Blacks and youth of Chicago expressed their sentiments by refusing to participate in this spectacle. And it is quite clear from the elections results that neither Vrdolyak's nor Washington's factions made any clear gains. The disturbing conclusion to this situation is that these two seemingly uncompromising chieftains are now embracing each other in a

search for "party unity," and that can only mean that the working class is in for another deal like the budget battle.

Harold Washington, like Ed Vrdolyak, is a capitalist politician. Concerning the city budget, his interests are the same as New York City bankers. Concerning industry, his interests are the same as the owners of sweat-shops and US Steel. But in order to defeat Vrdolyak, it is becoming abundantly clear that the working class must build its own, independent struggle. It cannot rely on cheap-talking reformers like Washington or Jesse Jackson. We can only rely on our own strength and policies, on our own party.

As we said earlier, that fight is summed up in the struggle to build a Labor Party Coalition in Illinois that will place Labor Candidates on the ballot. The First and Second Congressional Districts are very important, especially in terms of a struggle against Vrdolyak in his own ward. The 34th and 35th Representative Districts are important for the same reasons. There are other seats we must consider seriously but this is a question of an open fight in the unions and with other organizations. And it is an open fight to build a new leadership for the working class.

Working Women and the Labor Party

By BARBARA PUTNAM

In 1973 the Coalition for Labor Union Women (CLUW) held its founding conference in Chicago. What was it then, where is it headed?

The founding conference had the character of a mass gathering of union militants, young women who wanted deep and lasting change to come about by forming a powerful union women's organization that could continue and really finish the struggles they had taken up in the 60s — against the Vietnam War, for the liberation of women and the working class.

Filled with high hopes and the possibility of tapping the giant energy and strength slumbering in the unions, hundreds of angry young women came from across the country: auto-workers from the Detroit factories, telephone workers of the CWA, restaurant slaves from the big cities, laborers, maids, clerks and secretaries of every political stripe from dozens of unions.

Militants addressed the packed crowd from microphones out on the floor — some of the more moving calls to action brought the militants out of their seats, and sent and electrifying thrill through the assembly. It was the promise of *what they could do, what could be* that galvanized them.

During the conference the bureaucrat types

were busily manipulating the outcome. Their machinations depended on the political naivete of the majority of the participants. Some, whole groups who called themselves "Trotskyist Feminists" could not really understand why their resolutions and desires were not being passed in the workshops and sessions. Their political confusion was expressed in their self-conception — we are "Trotskyists but we are also Feminists" — we are for the revolution but we will only fight for women is what they seemed to be saying. They were a part of a whole militant wing of the conference that was unable to determine its outcome.

Ultimately, the timidity and political cowardice of the bureaucrats prevailed. CLUW adopted four basic goals: 1) organize the unorganized; 2) affirmative action in the workplace; 3) political action and legislation, and 4) participation of women within their unions — hardly a fighting program and in deep contradiction to the intentions of the majority of the participants.

Now over ten years later, CLUW held its third biannual convention in Chicago, March 26. Instead of the fiery speeches of young women, they applauded Lane Kirkland (!) of the AFL-CIO who is an advisor on Reagan's Central America War Board. Practically no

other union opposition groups like Teamsters for a Democratic Union (TDU) or the now dying RAM ("Restore and More in '84" — UAW) would have dared bring in Lane Kirkland. But this testifies very clearly to what CLUW has become. (Like true confusionists, the CLUW bureaucrats passed a resolution against Reagan's Central America war moves later in the conference).

The greatest dream of the bureaucrats who completely dominate the CLUW is to rub elbows with the "higher-ups." The resolutions they passed reflect a losing strategy — to apply pressure to the powers that be to make small gains for women. They passed a resolution calling for support for a presidential candidate who will "work for vigorous enforcement of federal equal opportunity laws" and federal bills for childcare.

These proposals and the methods they are based on will never appeal to the broad masses of working class women. The reason CLUW failed to fill the promise of 1973, has failed to organize the unorganized is because working class women know or feel that under the prevailing condition of deep irrevocable unemployment, preparations for war and cataclysmic struggles breaking across the world that pressure tactics and partial economic struggles as proposed by the CLUW leadership would take too long, would require too many sacrifices and above all would not be justified by the results.

The only spark of life left in CLUW is its largely symbolic gesture of picketing General Dynamics (on strike since June) for "equal pay." It's not, though, just a question of too little too late, but of the overall dynamic of CLUW. If it is ever to be an important force for union women, it must take another road. It must learn to think creatively and not in the old "collective bargaining," "legislative" framework. The most creative task of any union organization at this point in history is the all-out *political* struggle to form a new leadership based on the strength of the unions and not their weaknesses, a Labor Party. It means an organized struggle to break from the Democrats and the Lane Kirklands. Rather than cheering them — it means running independent Labor Candidates who stand for the things the young militants of CLUW's founding conference stood for but could not formulate — uncompromising and relentless struggle for freedom for women and the working class.

Again on the Church in Poland

The new issue of the English-language edition of *The Fourth International* is now out. It sheds considerable light on the question of the role of the Catholic Church in Poland.

At this writing, the "war of the crosses" seems to have ended in a deal, just as we anticipated in our last issue. But while Cardinal Glemp, the head of the Polish hierarchy, tries to position himself vis-a-vis the working class, his real position is leaking out.

In an interview in a Brazilian paper (Glemp just returned from that country) he opened an attack on the Polish workers and Solidarnosc. We have not been able to obtain the complete interview, but extracts that we have found are highly revealing.

Glemp asserted that Lech Walesa "lost control" of the union, and that because half of Solidarnosc's members were formerly rank-and-file members of the Communist Party, this meant "that its ideals are not the same as the Church's."

Announces Glemp: "Marxist and Trotskyist elements undermined Solidarnosc . . . the Church supported Solidarnosc only while its line was with the social teaching of the Church."

The new issue of *The Fourth International* carries an article that develops this picture of the perspectives of the Catholic Church, but in a particular way. It confirms that the Church and the Stalinist bureaucracy work *together* to attack Trotskyism, the policy that the Polish workers need for their revolutionary victory.

In a quarterly magazine of the Vatican (in English: "The Shepherd of Polish Souls Abroad") a reactionary priest, Poradowski, wrote an article: "Centennial of the Death of Karl Marx." The same article was re-published as a pamphlet by the London publishing house Mysl Polska (Polish Thought), representing the pre-war Polish right wing. A new title was given to the piece: "The Actualization of Marxism by Trotskyism!"

We get such gems as: ". . . Leon Trotsky is the pseudonym of Leiva Bronstein, the son of a rich and cultivated German Jew . . . On the other hand, it is a legend that Stalin was anti-Semitic; he assassinated the Trotskyists, but given that the Trotskyists are nearly all Jews, he suspected every Jew in Russia of being a Trotskyist. But Stalin probably was himself a Jew, only not of the Ashkenazi, like Trotsky and the Trotskyists, but of the Sephardim, who among themselves, despise each other terribly."

Now these quotations are bad enough, but much more light is shed when we contrast such statements from the Vatican as, "But Stalin never took his eyes off Trotsky, probably foreseeing the possibility that Trotsky would make a deal with Hitler," to statements from the Polish junta like this: ". . . In reality, Trotskyists have uncovered their face as agents of world capital, presenting themselves under far

left and ultra-demagogic slogans."

The Church worries: ". . . These destroyers of Catholicism also want to become the destroyers of the current Polish communism of the Soviet-type, a thing that the communists of Warsaw and Moscow don't want to allow." On this basis, a "holy alliance" is in place between the Vatican and Kremlin against the revolution.

The Fourth International is available for seventy-five cents each (to *Truth*) or can be subscribed to: ten issues for six dollars.

K.F.

Fourth International!
New Issue!
Out now!
Write to Truth.

With Friends Like These . . .

AFL-CIO union leaders are fond of advising union locals and members to vote for Democratic Party "friends of labor." So we've decided to include a regular column that highlights some of the things that these "friends of labor" are doing. We think readers will quickly see what we're calling this column "With friends like these . . ."

Election Laws

A higher court has recently ruled that Michigan's election laws are unconstitutional. The only way anyone can get on the ballot outside the Republicans and Democratic Parties is to form a new political party and get at least 20,000 supporters in several different congressional districts. There is no provision for inde-

pendent candidates. In other words, if you want to run for Congress in your district, as an independent, *you can't*.

Now the court instructed the Michigan legislature to change this dictatorial law. But instead of doing so Democratic Party Representative Michael J. Bennane from Rosedale Park, introduced a law that more than *quadruples* the number of supporters needed to get on the ballot as a party, from approximately 20,000 to over 100,000. Fortunately, the measure failed.

Unemployment

Democratic Party candidates just took their campaigns to Pennsylvania where thousands of steel workers are laid off or have permanent-

ly lost their jobs. According to the *New York Times* the debates between the candidates were unusually subdued. No wonder. Not one had one single proposal to get steel workers jobs now. Every candidate said that they key is making the US economy more competitive. But it has been precisely the automation and workforce reductions necessary to do this that have led to massive layoffs, plant closings, etc. Jesse Jackson said: ". . . cut down on the waste, fraud, abuse concept toward our military budget . . . rebuild these 50,000 bridges, create a new demand for steel . . ." But what is the steel worker supposed to do while Jesse Jackson tries to convince the military of that? There is a simple solution — recall all laid off workers; divide work among all workers. M.G.