

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER

Published monthly by independent revolutionary socialists

Editors: Harry Turner, Hugh Fredricks, Robert Davis

P. O. Box 67, Peck Slip Station, New York, N. Y. 10038

Vol. 2, No. 3 Price 10¢ (\$1.00 per year) Labor donated March 1970

Contents: De Leonists Discuss A Revolutionary
Direction p. 17

Nationalism and Internationalism
The Arab-Israeli Question
--Productive Forces and
Production Relations 21

DE LEONISTS DISCUSS A REVOLUTIONARY DIRECTION

Vulgar Marxists have tended to link revolution to economic crisis in mechanistic fashion.

But as Trotsky demonstrated at the Third World Congress of the Communist International in 1921, a crisis arriving on the heels of a defeat such as that which occurred in Russia after the 1905 revolution, can exhaust and disperse a revolutionary movement. Its regeneration may then take place only after a period of economic upturn. It is necessary to relate subjective and objective factors, not a priori but, dialectically.

As Trotsky also pointed out, a serious revolutionary perspective cannot be based on individual fluctuations in the curve of capitalist economic development. While carefully weighing the impact on the psychology of the masses of the separate cyclic shifts, Marxists must take into account the basic nature of the economic curve.

If the over-all curve is ascendant, as it was from 1946 through 1966, revolutionary possibilities decrease. If, as from 1967 through 1969, world capitalism demonstrates growing instability--as the major world currencies and the economies which they represent are threatened with collapse, as the under-developed countries utilize US-Soviet rivalry to demand a larger share of imperialism's super-profits, as

capitalism is left precariously balanced on a high plateau, with growing indications of a disastrous collapse in the making--the economic disequilibrium is transmitted to the social sphere, is transmuted into social instability.

The earliest social response is found--not among the workers, who tend to react with greater deliberation, after the worsening economic conditions have begun to seriously affect their standard of living--but among the intellectuals.

This strata, and its student component in particular, is the most sensitive to variations in class barometric pressures, and tends to react to the molecular changes which herald sharpening class struggles in advance of others. In addition, the escalation of US imperialism's war on the Vietnamese, which has not brought it closer to a military victory, by exposing the contradictions of capitalism at home and abroad, has had an increasing radicalizing effect on US youth who are required to function as gendarmes for imperialism.

The most oppressed social layers, the Black and Spanish-speaking workers and "Lazarus-layers" of unemployed, have also reacted to sharp economic shifts in advance of the

working class as a whole. Once again, crisis and militancy or "prosperity" and passivity are not automatically coupled. An economic crisis did not bring Black militancy to the fore, but rather the "prosperity" of the '60's.

As the absolute number of Black unemployed decreased in the shrinking "industrial reserve army"--the over-all rate of more than double the white unemployed remaining unchanged--all the social aspects of double-oppression, in the workplace, in housing, in education, etc., came under greater fire from Black organizations. The increased radical posture of Black and Puerto Rican organizations, and especially such organizations as the "Black Panthers" and "Young Lords", however, directly reflects the crisis of world capitalism. Even the most abject reformists have had to don the mantle of militancy as awareness grows among the most oppressed sectors that their misery is rooted in the capitalist system.

Most socialist organizations have recognized that the radicalization of these social layers has a vital significance for the socialist movement.

Youth can play a valuable role as a disciplined cadre for a revolutionary socialist movement, can, as propagandists and agitators and later as workers, help bring the concepts of scientific socialism to the working class, can help build a working class movement.

Black and Spanish-speaking workers, who can be won to a revolutionary socialist perspective, represent, not only the especially oppressed, the strata which has historically been capable of the most heroic and self-sacrificing struggles, but also, a potential leadership for the working class movement as a whole.

The majority of socialist organizations, however, have reacted and continue to react superficially and empirically to the student and Black radical milieu, adapting to them in an opportunist manner.

The "New Left"-ist intellectual and student milieu, viewing the immediate situation without a Marxist historical perspective, despite present and considerable radical verbiage about the working class and "Marxism-Leninism", see themselves and the oppressed minorities as the only revolutionary forces. It is not surprising, therefore, that "new" answers have been taken from the dust-bin of history, that old anarchistic garbage has been offered to student militants as succulent viands, served, often enough, with the assistance of agents provocateurs.

But the working classes in all countries are becoming aroused, are becoming more militant in defense of their living standards. In Europe, this militancy has achieved a high level of awareness, in a class-conscious, socialist-conscious working class, which is kept from taking power at a revolutionary moment, only by the Stalinist neo-Social-Democrats in league with their prototypes. In the US, as well, the downturn in the economy forces the still politically unawakened working class, with the Black workers in the van, to fight, on the economic front today, on the political front tomorrow, against the attempts of the ruling class to place the burden of the decline on their backs.

De Leonists In Motion

All radical formations, in the US as elsewhere, have had to react to the growing economic and social instability, have been shaken up internally and thrust into political motion.

A significant and positive development for the socialist movement in the US in this respect, has been the emergence of oppositional De Leonist organizations, such as the Socialist Committees of Correspondence and Socialist Leagues for Industrial Democracy out of the Socialist Labor Party.

The factor which precipitated the

latest splits in the SLP, was the resignation of Eric Haas, a member for more than 40 years, an editor of its paper, the "Weekly People" for almost 30 years, and that party's four time candidate for President, in addition to candidacy for other offices on numerous occasions.

Haas, concerned with the deterioration of the SLP, its routinism, its "aloofness and hostility toward rebellious youth and militant Blacks", left the organization when he became convinced that the undemocratic atmosphere and campaign of vituperative abuse directed against him for daring to raise these issues, made an internal discussion and re-orientation of the organization impossible.

In preparation for a national convention of De Leonist organizations, planned for this summer, a Northeast Regional Conference of Progressive De Leonists was held over the Washington Birthday weekend in NYC.

Central to the deliberations of the delegates was the problem of the correct relationship between principle and practice, of the correct tactics by which students, Black militants and workers can be won to De Leonist principles, of the principled basis on which De Leonists could go beyond the abstract propagandist approaches of the SLP toward involvement in the ongoing struggles in factories, campuses, ghettos, and in the anti-war movement.

Every struggle begins with felt grievances, with partial demands. As the reporter on trade union work put it, the question by a member of the window cleaners' union, of how "window cleanerism" can be combined with the fight for socialism, had to be answered. It was in the framework of this central question that discussion on the Transitional Program which Trotsky had formulated took place.

In essence, the delegates were faced with choosing between Scylla and Charybdis, between "minimum" or "maximum" demands, between an opportunist adaptation on immediate issues divorced from a revolution-

ary socialist perspective or sterile preachments, and a sectarian isolation from struggle--or of a new point of departure, a program of transitional demands which attempts to raise the consciousness of the working class to the socialist level in the process of struggle, which connects "window cleanerism" to revolutionary socialism.

A complicating factor in this discussion was the assumption by some delegates that the Socialist Workers Party's opportunistic adaptations in the name of Trotsky's Transitional Program were in fact transitional. Other delegates, evidently, in an attempt at avoiding a confrontation on the issue of "Trotskyism" to which the whole conception of a transitional program is bound, stressed the concrete fact and eliminated the name, gave examples of work in the mass movement which applied the transitional approach, and linked immediate issues to the need for a socialist transformation, to De Leonist socialist industrial unionism, without using the "transitional" label.

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER Presentation

A highlight of the conference was the presentation made by Robert Davis, VANGUARD NEWSLETTER editor.

The De Leonists, as part of their political re-evaluation, had been conducting discussions with a number of socialist organizations, and had invited representatives from the Spartacist League and International Socialists, in addition to VANGUARD NEWSLETTER, to attend as observers. (We submitted fraternal greetings to the conference. See attachment to our February issue.)

Comrade Davis, following James Robertson of the SL and Sy Landy of IS to the platform, presented VANGUARD NEWSLETTER's perspective for the socialist revolution in a manner which electrified many of the delegates and observers.

Rescuing Trotsky's Transitional Program from the timelessness in which it had been debated, Cde.

Davis made clear that it had been proposed in a period of capitalist stagnation and decline, that the post-war economic upturn, which no socialist tendency had foreseen, had limited its significance, and that the maturing economic crisis was reinvesting the program with all its revolutionary meaning.

In this context, Trotsky's statements--that the transitional demands could never be realized under capitalism, that the program was intended to overcome the psychological lag of the working class behind the objective situation, that the ruling class would be unable to grant reforms, and that, therefore, even the old "minimum" demands could be given revolutionary meaning, when tied to a revolutionary perspective--now became quite clear.

De Leon and Industrial Unionism

Cde. Davis reminded the delegates and observers that Lenin had considered De Leon to be one of the few socialists to have made a contribution to Marxist theory, and had valued him as an outstanding revolutionary socialist. He then pointed to the close resemblance between VANGUARD NEWSLETTER's perspective for a transitional organization within the trade unions and the De Leonist Socialist Industrial Union; of revolutionary rank and file caucuses in the trade unions which would be linked industrially, regionally and nationally, and, which could become in a revolutionary situation, the factory committees, and workers' councils, the "Soviets", the form of working class rule which De Leon had been the first to project.

The danger was posed that the racial divisions within the working class, engendered and perpetuated by capitalism, would be utilized by the ruling class to attempt to destroy the working class movement through a fascist counter-offensive.

Cde. Davis then presented the perspective of VANGUARD NEWSLETTER for

a transitional program within the trade unions to unite Black and other doubly-oppressed workers with white workers, through a struggle against this special oppression, and in the context of a struggle for the interests of all workers.

In passing, Cde. Davis restated the VANGUARD NEWSLETTER position of support for the right of Black people to a separate state, if the majority should so decide in future, while re-emphasizing the need to unite all workers against capitalism.

Cde. Davis ended his remarks on a fraternal note, in a call for continuing discussion, and for cooperation in political activities on a principled basis, as a necessary part of the process of building a mass revolutionary socialist organization.

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER was questioned after the meeting as to whether it supports the right of the Black people to self-determination at this time. We would answer that the question of self-determination is not yet on the agenda; that not having a common territory, the Black people are not a nation but rather an ethnic or racial minority. We, however, have had to consider the possibility that the Black majority might demand a territory of its own. We do not consider this to be the most likely variant, and, in fact, propose its opposite, but should it happen, we would, at that time, support the Black people's right to separate.

The metaphysically inclined, who prefer a static formula will not be satisfied with our answer, but we believe that our position takes into account the possible changes in subjective and objective factors on this question.

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER DIRECTORY
New York VN Committee
P.O. Box 67, Peck Slip Station
New York, N. Y. 10038
Toronto VN Committee
31 Malley Road, Unit #2
Scarborough, Ontario, Canada

NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

The Arab-Israeli Question

--Productive Forces and Production Relations

For historical materialists, a given mode of production derives its historic justification, as against earlier modes, by its ability to increase the production and distribution of the necessities of life, differently defined at differing levels of man's development.

The productive forces, e.g., means and techniques of production, are seen by Marxists as the revolutionary elements within the old order which, in the final analysis, place the social revolution on the agenda. By the revolution, new production relations which correspond to the nature and level of the productive forces become dominant, and replace the old relations which have become barriers to further development.

The central question facing mankind today, is whether and how these forces can be liberated from the capitalist mode of production and the national state, which act, not only to constrict but, which are, in accelerating measure, transforming them into their opposite, into forces which threaten the destruction of man and all life.

Almost a century and a quarter ago, the bearers of scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, posed a revolutionary answer to this question, later concretely implemented by the Russian workers led by Lenin and Trotsky, by the Bolshevik Party in October 1917. The Russian revolution established, through Soviets, the first workers' state, the "dictatorship of the proletariat".

Marxists understand by this term, a state in contrast to all previous states which maintained "eternal" exploitative class relations, a transitional form of state, a state in the process of "withering away". The instrument of compulsion, any state, e.g., courts, jails, "bodies of armed men", etc., is, in this case, the instrument of the laboring majority against the former ruling classes. It no longer has a function to perform as the well-springs of social production pour

forth an increasing abundance, and as classes, and with them, the anti-social habits learned in class society, disappear. It too tends to disappear in the same measure.

The first revolutionary breakthrough in Russia, was, however, not followed by revolutions in the advanced countries, but rather, by a long series of defeats. The revolutionary wave in Europe after the first World War was beaten back with the help of Social Democracy. A bureaucratic caste emerged in the isolated proletarian state which had arisen on inadequate economic foundations. Revolutionary opportunities were turned into their opposite by the Social Democrats and Stalinists, paving the way for fascist counter-revolutions and for the devastation of the second World War.

The European working class, handcuffed by their Stalinist misleaders, were unable to overthrow capitalist rule, in the process and aftermath of World War II, as expected by Trotsky. In western Europe, the French and Italian working classes were disarmed and prevented from seizing state power, theirs for the taking. In eastern Europe, the Stalinists, with the Red Army in reserve, suppressed the revolutionary impulse of the workers and peasants, only later to collectivize the decisive means of production by bureaucratic means. In Asia (Yugoslavia, also) the Stalinists came to power over a passive working class, from a peasant base.

In all cases, states not qualitatively differing from the degenerated workers' state, the Soviet Union, emerged, but, in countries in which no proletarian revolution had taken place.

The seductive siren song of Michel Pablo, proposing the revision of Marxism to fit an empirically viewed reality, followed inexorably.

Stalinism, according to Pablo, would no longer be capable of betrayal, but would be compelled by "objective circumstances" to function in a "revolutionary" way, regardless of its counter-revolutionary past. "Centuries of degenerated workers' states" would result thereby, and would logically require that Trotskyists prepare for the future by making a "deep entry" into the Stalinist parties, in effect, to liquidate their revolutionary party.

The walls of Trotskyist orthodoxy, the memorized formulae, were not capable of withstanding the attacks of revisionism for long, in a period of rapidly changing reality.

Perceived empirically, the "epi-center" of the world revolution, beginning with the early 1950's, would seem to have shifted to the under-developed countries, as now, not only Stalinists but, nationalist petty-bourgeois layers with peasant support, expropriated imperialist and domestic capitalist property, in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

When, as in Cuba, the "objective historical process" even produced a state qualitatively indistinguishable from the deformed workers' states headed by Stalinists, orthodox "Trotskyism" succumbed.

The Socialist Workers Party, the leading party of the world Trotskyist movement, which had earlier discarded a working class perspective in practice, of revolutionary work in trade unions, joined the revisionists in a headlong chase after the "third world". Still mouthing ritualistic incantations about the "working class", it, in reality, accepted the concept peddled by the petty-bourgeois radical "third world"-ers, that the working class in both the advanced and under-developed countries had become a privileged formation, bribed, conservatized and no longer capable of revolutionary struggle, of revolu-

tionary leadership. The self-liberating working class which Marx and the revolutionary Marxists knew, it would seem, no longer existed, and a locum tenens, a substitute, was now needed to make the revolution over the heads of and for the passive working class.

The May-June 1968 revolutionary upsurge in France caused the SWP to undertake a reappraisal, and a verbal shift back toward more frequent and fervent statements of faith in the revolutionary potential of the workers. However, no visible alteration took place in its opportunist practice, e.g., its servility toward the Cuban bureaucracy, its adaptation to Black nationalism and "third world"-ism, its abandonment of its revolutionary military policy for Vietnam "popular front" single issue peace postures, which ignore the workers, but certainly not the liberal bourgeoisie, its clamor about the "Arab Revolution", its adaptation to Stalinism in all these areas.

That the proletariat is the fundamental lever of social revolution, that it is its function to overthrow capitalism, and to liberate all mankind by this act, has always been acknowledged by the social opportunists, but only in words, as a philosophical construct, as a question for the far distant future.

Trotsky's concept of the "Permanent Revolution", that the numerically weak working class of a backward country can lead behind it, the mass of the peasantry in a proletarian revolution, that it will thereby complete those democratic and national tasks which its prematurely superannuated bourgeoisie cannot, is similarly acknowledged by the "Trotskyists". But this concept is either ignored for the more "practical" policy of tailing behind radical petty bourgeois layers of one or another vintage or variety, or is distorted into a parody to signify the inevitable transformation of these layers resting on the peasantry into the leadership of a proletarian revolution, e.g., the "Arab Revolution", the "col-

onial revolution".

All scientific categories have an arbitrary aspect, in that form and content rarely coincide completely. New forms arise and new content continually emerges within the old forms. However, within the limits of "tolerance", the nodal point at which quantity changes into quality, categories are indispensable for science, and, in fact, for dealing with any reality.

Opportunists, however, find precise scientific language irksome. Vague terminology which does not stand close examination is more suitable to the Marxist-turned-opportunist, to cloak his confusion, inconsistency and lack of perspective, and to permit him to adjust his theory and practice to the empirical fact.

The "Arab Revolution" is a case in point. The struggle by even the most reactionary Middle Eastern regimes for independence from imperialism, to the extent that it can wage such a struggle, must be supported by revolutionists, and is not in question. However, the class content of a "revolution" is a fundamental question for Marxists.

We would describe, for example, a violent shift of power within the same layer of a ruling class as a coup, a transfer of power from a Stalinist parasitic caste to the working class as a political revolution, and from a feudal and/or colonialist to a bourgeois-democratic regime, as a social revolution. But the term "Arab Revolution", is deliberately used by the opportunists to hide its real class content, to insinuate that a socialist revolution is already in process--if not under the leadership of Nasser, then under Yasir Arafat of Al Fatah, if not under the latter, then by some mystical, as yet imperceptible emanation from the Palestinian peasant-guerrilla commandos--a socialist revolution without the proletariat or its vanguard party!

Those "Marxists" and "Trotskyists" who are involved in marginal "Popular Front" and "Democratic Front"

Arab peasant-guerrilla organizations, who think that chatter about "Soviets" can effectively substitute the peasants for the proletariat, who hope to repeat the Cuban and Chinese experience, will not see the deformed workers' states which is their model, but more likely, the concentration camps and execution chambers of a Suharto.

The Workers League and the Socialist Labour League, the British section of the International Committee of the Fourth International with which it is in political solidarity, insist that they represent the continuity of Trotskyism. They pose themselves as the revolutionary alternative to the Pabloist revisionism of the SWP and the United Secretariat with which it solidarizes. Yet, they characterize developments in the Middle East in the same opportunist manner--as the "Arab Revolution"! Tim Wohlforth, for example, indicts Nasser for:

"his complete sell-out of the Arab guerrilla movement, and his plans to collaborate with the US and USSR in a broader sell-out of the whole Arab Revolution". Arafat is also attacked for being "ready to help him in this". ("Bulletin", Nov. 17, 1969)

Marty Jonas amplifies the WL/SLL line. It would seem that the heart of the "Arab Revolution" is "the Arab workers and peasants organized primarily in Al Fatah." The "workers" of Al Fatah, which Jonas refers to, have as much basis in reality as the "peasants" of a once-famous leaflet issued by a branch of the US Communist Party in its ultra-left period, which was addressed to the "workers and peasants of Brownsville" in Brooklyn. However, it is, evidently, this primarily peasant formation, to which the WL has attached a proletarian label, which will carry on "the fight for the socialist revolution in the Middle East". ("Bulletin", March 9, 1970)

Nor is this their first opportunist accommodation.

For years, they hailed the "Vietnamese Revolution" without breathing a word of criticism of the Vietnamese Stalinists, whose NLF program is tailored to the "peaceful coexistence" plans of the Soviet Union, for a deal with the US to preserve the present world status quo, a program which, therefore, betrays the Vietnamese Revolution.

Robert Black, a writer for the SLL's paper, "Workers Press", eulogizes Ho while deploring his "contradictions" and the "factor... which always dragged him back from total victory... Stalinism's counter-revolutionary politics". Ho, it seems, "contained within himself... all the anti-imperialist hatred and fighting spirit of the colonial peoples."

While criticizing his "crimes", e.g., the killing of Trotskyists, Black also had the following to say about Ho Chi Minh:

"We pay an unstinting tribute to this anti-imperialist tenacity in Ho and recognize that his qualities as a leader have undoubtedly done much to inspire resistance to imperialism, not only in Vietnam and southeast Asia, but throughout the entire colonial and semi-colonial world."
("Bulletin", Sept. 22, 1969)

Black conveniently forgets that his "anti-imperialist" paragon, Ho formed the Viet Minh as a "people's front" coalition in 1941, that he prevented the seizure of land by the peasants in this period, that he welcomed his British "allies" in 1945 and "killed" Trotskyists for opposing this betrayal, that he supported the admission of Vietnam into the French Union on a promise of eventual independence. Nor does Black have a word to say about the program of the NLF! (See our Oct. 1969 issue)

Only after Chris Harmon, a spokesman for "International Socialism" was vilified by the Pabloist "International Marxist Group", for reminding the audience at a London

memorial meeting for Ho Chi Minh of the murder of hundreds of Trotskyists by the Vietnamese Stalinists at the end of World War II, was Cliff Slaughter, a leader of the SLL prodded into a more critical attitude toward Ho, but, again, without a word of criticism for the NLF program ("Bulletin", Dec. 8, 1969)

It would seem that the WL and SLL's approaches to nationalism and internationalism are a peculiar and eclectic mixture of opportunism and sectarianism, actually different variants of the same phenomena.

They demonstrate a rigid insensitivity toward the struggles of national minorities, and refuse to adopt a Leninist position of support to the right of self-determination of Scots, Welsh, French Canadians, Flemings and Bretons. They opposed the right of the Biafrans to separate from Nigeria, in the name of opposition to "tribalism". They have developed a pronounced myopia toward Black struggles in the US. But they have also shown a pliancy, an opportunistic adaptability to some bureaucratic and petty-bourgeois formations from the underdeveloped countries. Their vaunted mastery of the Marxist "METHOD" does not, however, enable them to achieve any consistency even in this respect.

Although the WL and SLL can readily discern the "Arab Revolution", and in a manner exactly like the SWP and United Secretariat, bolster the fiction that its essence is socialist, they are unable to see that the state in Cuba is not appreciably different from deformed workers' states elsewhere, and insist on classifying it as capitalist.

Only a Marxist analysis, i.e., a rigorously scientific investigation which takes into account all the factors operating in the Middle East, the dynamic interaction of all internal and external forces, and which can then assign them specific weights which accord with reality and not fantasy, can dispel the dense fog of opportunism which has blanketed the Arab-Israeli question.
(to be continued)

THE BAYONET IS AIMED AT ALL LABOR

You, the postal workers, are now facing scabs in uniform. Pres. Nixon is trying to deliver mail with bayonets, to break your strike.

Your national leaders continue to plead with you to return to work without an increase, and to trust the "good faith" of Congress. The bosses, their representatives in Congress, and their labor-lieutenants know that this means defeat. Like every boss, Nixon and Congress tell you, "Go back first, then we will talk." Of course! Once you go back, once the strike is ended, it will be possible to sell you out.

Now they use scabs, plan to jail your leaders, and hit them and your unions with heavy penalties! Can you stop them? Yes! First, by maintaining your own solidarity, and then, through the solidarity of all labor. You must keep your own ranks solid and convince other postal workers to join you. In addition, the whole of organized labor must spring to your defense, right now! All workers must understand that you stand in the forefront of the battle for all workers.

The organized workers have tremendous power in their hands. You postal workers have discovered this power to bring the whole economy to a halt. You have discovered that the workers, whose labor has created the vast productive machinery, can also stop it. You are also discovering that "government" is not an impartial body but the executive committee of and for the big corporations.

You must speak to the members of every union local in the country. Convince them that the bayonets are aimed not only at you, but at them. Press their leaders in Central Trades and Labor Councils, and in the mass production industries to call city-wide and industry-wide strikes, leading to a nation-wide general strike. You must begin to organize broad support through "citizen's committees", which are not liable to injunction, to apply pressure on Congress to grant your demands. You need to collect a strike relief fund from labor and the general public to keep from being starved out. Only in this way, can you prevent your strike from being broken, can you win your demands.

Nixon and company are trying to stop inflation by unloading it on the backs of the workers. It is not "inflationary" for Congress to vote itself a 41% increase! It is not "inflationary" for the corporations to make fatter profits than ever before! But for the postal workers to get even a measly 5.4% increase--far less than the amount of real wages eaten up by inflation last year alone--that is "inflationary"!

When they blame "excessive wage demands" for inflation, they lie! They know that the real reason for inflation is the bosses' war in Vietnam--that, and monopoly profits. \$28 billion a year is spent to crush the Vietnamese workers and peasants, who want to rid themselves of landlords and bosses. The \$80-odd billion a year for armaments, enables US big business to maintain its power to milk super-profits from the rest of the world. Where does the money come from? Out of your hides, at the cost of the living standards of your families!

The starting wage of \$8,500 a year which you have demanded, is still more than \$2,500 below a "moderate" standard of living for a family of four--as of a year ago! And a year from now, with inflation devouring

more than 7%--not to speak of increased taxes--where will you be? Without a cost-of-living escalator, adjusted for increased taxes, as well, you and all workers, will find that you can win increased wages, but can buy less. The American worker, on the average, had a higher real wage in 1965 than he has today!

The Nixon administration has brought on a "recession" to try to control inflation, to try to prevent a "depression". But a world crisis is in the making. The big corporations find the world market not big enough for their growing productive capacity. To out-sell their competitors, they cut "costs", e.g., attack wages and conditions. "Our" bosses are also getting ready to put the screws to the workers, to drive down their standards, to take away their right to strike, so that they can do to all workers, what has been done to the postal workers for years.

Nixon and Johnson, Republicans and Democrats, have tried to use Black and white workers against each other, to keep the workers divided, to use the higher unemployment rate of the Black and Spanish-speaking workers to force them to work for the least wages at the hardest jobs. The Post Office has thus been filling job openings at miserable wages as an "equal opportunity employer"! But the postal workers are now showing what the unity of Black and white workers can achieve, are an example to the whole working class of the need to fight to end super-exploitation and all forms of special oppression, in the interests of all workers.

As you have learned in this struggle, and as workers in all unions are learning, many of your leaders are "pie-cards" and sell-out artists. Others are conservative, see only their "own" union, and only the immediate "bread and butter" issues, and not too much "butter" at that. But as you postal workers well-know, and as other workers are finding out, "bread and butter" questions cannot be divorced from politics. Not the politics of the bosses, of the Democrats and Republicans! The workers need a political party of their own, a labor party based on the unions. Not sell-out "friends of labor", but workers' representatives who will fight for the immediate and fundamental interests of the workers.

As in the case of the Post Office, the modern productive forces can only be set in motion through the cooperative labor of tens of thousands of workers. They can provide all mankind with vast abundance. But as long as they remain the property of a small group of capitalists, man will find all his achievements turned against him. Unemployment and misery, side by side with great wealth! Nuclear wars and pollution for the greater profit of business! The only way forward for humanity is through a workers' government to socialism, through production planned and controlled by the workers in the interest of mankind, and not for the profits of a few.

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER, P.O. Box 67, Peck Slip Station, New York, N.Y. 10038

Please send me a free three-month subscription to your newsletter.

NAME

STREET

CITY STATE ZIP CODE

labor donated