A powerful two-day strike action by thousands of New York City municipal employees that gave the local ruling class and its politicians a foretaste of workers' power, ended in a naked settlement on June 8, said Victor Gotbaum, Executive Director of District Council 37, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, and Harry Feinstein, President of Local 381, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, ordered their members back to work before the settlement, stated to the press that the strike had failed in purpose,

"A renewed period of militant struggle has begun in the U.S. labor movement and is making itself felt in the National Maritime Union. The deteriorating job situation in the industry, combined with the general economic and social crisis, has stimulated opposition to the NMU's Cunard leadership, one of the most corrupt, heavy-handed bureaucratic machines in American unionism. Betrayed from every quarter—an angry membership, a recent Seattle NLPC challenge to the union structure, a proliferation of organized oppositional caucuses—the NMU bureaucracy is compelled to rely ever more heavily on totalitarian methods and gross intimidation to stanch the rising tide of strikes and rank and file opposition."

The whole strike was a cynical maneuver by Gotbaum to save his own skin from his rank and file, while reminding the city that he does have something to sell out. By Sunday night, after an attempted compromise with Rockefeller and key legislators had failed to materialize, Gotbaum knew that the plan was dead for this year's session. Having promised strike action to save the pension plan, he was forced to make a grandstand move he knew would have no effect on the Legislature. The strike was organized entirely from the top down, including relatively few workers, and no membership votes of the affected locals were taken to rally the back-to-work settlement.

Most important, by this dramatic but meaningless action, Gotbaum intended to head off and deflect the growing mood for a general strike against the state and city budget cuts with their threat of layoffs and job freezes. "Our union has never threatened a strike over layoffs," Gotbaum said on June 13, when DC37 would support a general strike, if necessary, called for June 16 by the Civil Service Employees Association.

Both unions and city have long used pension benefits as a source of compromise settlements. For the city, increased pensions, with their deferred costs, are preferable to wage and benefit

**Which Road to Fight for Jobs and Rights?**

**Struggle in NMU**
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**New York Membership Rebels**

In the Port of New York, the situation is developing rapidly. Over the past several months rank-and-file opposition has been repeatedly evidenced in union meetings. The NMU is tightly controlled by Joe Currin, his first and only president. Meetings are a mockery of even the rudiments of union democracy. Points of order and procedure are often blandly ignored; the officials seem to develop a problem of multiple vision when counting their supporters' votes, combined with temporary blindness to votes against them. At the April meeting, the members cast overwhelming yes and standing votes opposing the officials' suppression of their rights—votes which were instantly overruled by the meeting chairman. At an earlier meeting, a member trying to defend a brother speaking at the microphone was attacked by Currin's goons. The May meeting ended in chaos, after the bureaucrats' ruled to silence a dissident against overwhelming opposition. The bureaucrats resorted to provocation, then adjourned the meeting because of "disruptions" when angry NMU members responded. The members remained inside for nearly an hour, but instead of discussing how to fight the leadership, the session finally resorted to picketing the union hall in New York-June meeting, to keep the irate membership from selling concessions. The rank-and-file revolt within the NMU has reached such proportions that it was necessary for the officers to organize a full scale mobilization of their supporters for the New York June meeting, to keep the rank and file from being sold out. Loyal pro-administration members were brought in.
**Editorial:**

**GOVERNMENT GOONS and "LEFT-WING" HYPOCRISY**

In recent cases of government repression and intra-movement hooliganism, widespread sections of the left have convicted a conclusion fatal to revolutionary practice. This is the inability to distinguish between one's opponents within the workers' movement and the ruling class. Groups already tarnished by physical attacks on political opponents reveal even greater revolutionary unfitness by their refusal to defend opponent tendencies against repression by the bourgeois state. Even worse, some of these groups have justified these activities on agencies of the bourgeoisie to silence opposition. The winners, of course, are the bourgeois and the most class-collaborationist sections of the left, who profit by any diminishment of many political revolutionaries at the spectacle of organizations substituting violence for political struggle and collaboration. For sections of the working-class, it is solidarity with their opponents in the face of ruling-class law.

Even these organizations so rotten as to seek an accommodation with the ruling class must be defended against the state when it attacks them at the same time as we expose their treachery. The Communist Party was a rotten class-collaborationist group throughout its history, indeed nearly three decades before that—the "syphilis of the working-class movement." Should revolutionaries and working-class militants then have refused to defend them during the witch hunt? Must we not just as strongly repudiate CP leaders being run out in the late 40's, their assessment of the CP's role in the union was, indeed, that they were right-wing bureaucrats in demanding no-strike pledges, suppressing the press and file, etc. what many workers failed to see was that although the CP leaders had to be removed for their betrayals, the government wanted them removed as the opening move in a campaign against all "Un-Americans" and "troublemakers." It was the job of the workers themselves to remove the CP holdouts and other business-as-usual right-wing class collaborators, not the job, of course, it became a new practice in the internal defense of these workers, but an attack on the entire labor movement—part of the Taft-Hartley pattern of government regulation and restrictions, in the "public" (i.e., the boss') interest.

The case of the government vs. James Hoffa in 1967 California is a case in point, a case of business-union careerist,obviously deserved to be thrown out by the Teamsters. But that is not why the government wanted to get Hoffa. Everyone should show well the government co-exists with real or alleged corruption everywhere. They wanted him out of the way more than bare minimum gains for sections of the working-class. Members of the pseudo-Trotskist Worker League (WL) selling their literature on April 9 outside the office of the Puerto Rican national movement Pro-Independence (MPI) in New York City were attacked without provocation. As soon as three WL members were injured, one seriously, The Worker League then issued an appeal for united action against this hooliganism (Bulletin, April 9, Does the Worker League "defend" against other government repression, as in the Juan Farcas case, or from gangsters with the radical movement? Certainly not, if a particular group's ethics and honesty were the criterion for defense support. The Worker League has defended beatings of its own opponents, and has defended violence against other radicals on the part of groups toward which it temporarily felt appetites. The Worker League's disgraceful conduct has done a great disservice to the development of anti-gangster consciousness on the left, and the failure to defend the WL's rights—and thus the principle of free speech and the workers' movement—would be to sink to the WL's own abysmal level.

In an "Open Letter to Workers, Minorities, and Youth" in the April 12 Bulletin, WL National Secretary Tim Wohlforth makes several proposals, concluding with an appeal for united front defense against hooligan attacks.

That Wohlforth's appeal in fact shows in that his understanding of workers' democracy is on a par with that of a man who answers who sees very clearly the need for unity to defend the movement's line is hide is threatened by attack, and hopes no workers will remember the two years of government opposition against the movement to which he appeals. The Worker League and its international bloc, the "Congress of the Left" (IC), has experienced anti-WL behavior in its efforts to facilitate a veritable textbook example of Stalinist-style violence and pseudo-Trotskist violence carried out in the name of Trotskyism.

**Wohlforth vs Violence**

The following underlined quotations are taken from Wohlforth's "Open Letter." He demands:

"That all members of the movement and particularly those engaged in physical attack on other tendencies in the working-class movement..." The Worker League has not only violated the "open letter" in its proclamation of "anti-fascist" violence, but its rapidly shifting political alibis have led to it making deadly overtures toward those very formations against which it had upheld the use of violence!

In 1967 California members of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) were attacked while distributing election literature by members of the then-Maoist Progressive Labor Party (PL). At that time the response of the Workers League was to solidarize with PL's attack, describing the SWP as "scum." A few weeks later (The W., briefly held a position of enthusiastic "counter-support" to the Red Guard and wing of the Chinese bureaucracy,) No defense against Healy was written by the SWP then! But 1967 was the year that the WL, following its British mentor, Gerry Healy's Socialist Labour League (SLL), characterized the SWP as "one of the camp of Trotskyism and of the working-class" and hence, presumably, fair game for its opponents, even Moslats. Three years later, the Bulletin was repeatedly calling for unity discussions with the SWP—"United Front". So, let us assume, the SWP was so rotten as to be outside the pale even of discussion against the SLL. But in 1970 the SWP had improved so drastically as to merit unity discussions with Healy, Wohlforth & Co. Needless to say, Healy-Wohlforth's prior behavior gave the SWP-SLL a perfect excuse. If they needed any, for rejecting the IC overtures.

The Queen's Justice

"That we specifically affirm the right of all tendencies to freely present their views and to sell their literature; that we oppose all government or hooligan attacks on these right; "

The grosser example of what Wohlforth must conceal now in his defense overtures is the behavior of Gerry Healy, James Hoffa, or any other widely publicized victim incident violating all of these principles. In 1967 Healy not only had Ernest Taylor (a supporter of the SWP-United Secretariat" wing of ostensible Trotskyism) beaten without provocation at a SWP meeting, but threatened him with libel proceedings forpublicizing the incident! (The "Tate Artists"

1967.) So much for the call to "oppose all government or hooligan attacks on these rights." Did Healy accept an "independent workers' commission of inquiry..."

The Worker League is prepared to come before an independent workers' commission of inquiry..."

But again the WL decided of its own accord on the left, and the failure to defend the WL's rights—and thus the principle of free speech and the workers' movement—would be to sink to the WL's own abysmal level. We call for its overthrow. But we call for its overthrow to clear the path for Trotskyism."
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Government, Union and "Left-Wing" Hypocrisy
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recent May Day March in New York, Spartacist salesmen were beaten; at a demonstration held June 19, a Spartacist salesman in New York was knocked to the ground by the police. 

Police agents admit: but since they are photographic or the bourgeois is not allowed to come to see the capitalists to give a little bit more. In a time of general capitalist attack on workers' organizations, a tactic can only prove futile, "Mechanization and Modernization"

The roots of the present situation go back to the formation of the Pacific Maritime Association (PMA) in which the Bridges leadership agreed to a program of "Mechanization and Modernization" in return for various monetary benefits. Assuming, as Bridges did, that it was "natural" for the PMA to own the means of production, how could one possibly object to "mechanization" and "modernization"? In return for this concession, the ILWU got a $21 million special retirement and wage guarantee fund. Wages were to be guaranteed on the basis of a 35-hour straight-time week. Retirees with 25 years in the industry at age 65 to 68 were to receive a $7500 special payment over and above pensions. With all these special catches, however, few could benefit, and the wage guarantee fund was practically untouched over the entire contract period. When the fund was liquidated and settled in 1966, it amounted to $800 after taxes per man!

The employers won additional concessions in 1966. By 1970 the union had the basis for the establishment of a second-class union member-the "BP-man"-who worked alongside the "A" men but had fewer rights and had to wait for "A" status. This obviously divided the union. The 1961 contract deepened the split by casting demands of unions from payments under the M&G agreement even though they were working alongside the "A" men! Further, the contract authorized speed-up through the phrase "unnecessary men": "The employer shall not be required to maintain unnecessary men" (Sec. 15, 2). This allowed the employer to use smaller gangs and larger loads. The basic hold gang was effectively broken through "unnecessary men" interpretation-reduced from six to four men.

The 1966 contract further undermined the union's strength and discouraged union action. The two "swing men" could be added for one type of operation (hand-pushed big loads) were eliminated. The new "robot-unit" operation, with its portable crane, allowed the YSA machine, eliminated the gang boss (union foreman) and required a minimum of two men to perform many different operations, with at least one worker in the hold. Most dangerous is notorious Section 7A, which allowed the ILWU to require a substantial portion of the regular union hiring hall for certain jobs and build up a pool of "steady men," rather than distributing the available work daily through the hiring hall. This greatly weakens the hiring hall itself, a major gain of the 1934 strike, and thus weakens the union's control over conditions.

In May 1968, the LIT leadership, finding itself unable to break up the new technology, instead of by them. Defense of such groups-cooperated with intransigent criticism like the defense of more radical sections of the ILWU-refused to give any support to Jail Fannin, now a member of the Workers League, who for many years has been a member of the "non-A" or "non-union" ports, of anti-war "crimes" alleged-committed while he was functioning as a member of PL! (Was this a warning to the leadership of the coming "anti-war" crime wave?) They also refused support from "Trotskyites" when PL member Bill Epton was thrown in jail. This attitude is growing out of the Harlem police riots of 1964.

For all labor, no matter how well-meaning the "workers councils" or "militant unions," which can be transferred by crane to different modes of transport. Once stoned, the containers require only a crane to operete the docks, where, by eliminating the longshoremen. Although by 1966 the Mau-Mau, and other sections of the radical movement can be tolerated only as long as they are confined to certain "swing men," which were, after all, and the ILWU-Longshore Division control. Many of the so-called "Container Fighters" who have been under attack over the "illegal car go in for life or death struggle; a decision was made and the regular contract agreed to "have all container work brought to CFS on the dock or in areas where it is the "legal work." This action, at the end of 1970, was "progress"?

By far the most important development in the last decade of the ILWU is the development of the new technology in longshore work which can be transferred by crane to different modes of transport. Once stoned, the containers require only a crane to operate the docks, where, by eliminating the longshoremen. Although by 1966 the Mau-Mau, and other sections of the radical movement can be tolerated only as long as they are confined to certain "swing men," which were, after all, and the ILWU-Longshore Division control. Many of the so-called "Container Fighters" who have been under attack over the "illegal car go in for life or death struggle; a decision was made and the regular contract agreed to "have all container work brought to CFS on the dock or in areas where it is the "legal work," in May 1968, the Matson Co. and other companies had set up a system, a major gain of the 1934 strike, and thus weakens the hiring hall itself, a major gain of the 1934 strike, and thus weakens the union's control over conditions. The membership is growing, and this is reflected in renewed attacks on the leadership and cracks in the old bureaucracy, initially, of course, the new movement is undirected and confused. In Local 10, this unrest has broken out in active opposition to the leadership. The new leadership membership recently turned down a much-needed increase in protest against the leadership, and in the summer of 1970, the ILWU National Secretary-Treasurer, Louis Goldblatt, in out to the Provost Marshal General with a view to bring some change at all. Responding to the gossip, the union has tried to put on a public show of solidarity.

Reacting to the new rank-and-file resistance, People's World (the CP newspaper which has always endorsed Harry Bridges) now appears to have second thoughts, in preparation for dumping Bridges
YSA has been the chief disputes within the bureaucracy over how to lead limited struggles in order to retain some with the two parties of capitalism are increasing—previous period to advance their personal careers in the way beyond the capitalists' immediate ability to selling out in favor of accommodation to the own position. as in Reuther's cold split with the two. Contract (in the Alameda County Central Labor Council, in which the jurisdictional struggle continues, decentral tactics by the leadership designed to sabotage en- dorsement. Labor Council delegates are invari- ably the rank and file of the local union bureaucrat, and their actions in several California labor councils besides this one (as well as anti-war actions by "left" bureaucrats as a whole) must be seen as a struggle of one wing of the trade union bureaucracy against another.

Bureaucrats Fun Exposure

The content of these developments is the rising tide of class struggle and attempts of rank-and-file workers to defend their gains against increas- ing efforts on the part of the system to dismantle measures designed to deal with the deepening economic crisis. One form of attack on the working class: wage-price controls, curbs on the right to strike, mass layoffs, attacks on welfare (last refuted by the SNCC), spending millions in tax money to prop up bankrupt corporations, cutting off essential services at the expense of the dollar. The clear need for defense against these attacks combined with a dramatic rise in rank-and-file militancy has put the bureaucrats on the spot. Militant teamsters are now demanding strike action to free big bobs, despite Hoffa's clear record of opposition to any such rank-and-file action over his case. Rank-and-file is now acting against bureaucratic squabbling over crumbs, as in the Teamster-ILIU dispute over container stuffing on the West Coast. Contract negotiations, wildcat strikes, demands which go beyond the capitalists' immediate ability to grant and which are often opposed to the war, hatred of Nixon and dismissal with which these demands are met are increas- ingly tormenting the professional compromisers and confessing bureaucratic unions.

These fakers, who based themselves on the anti-communism and apparent class peace of the previous period to advance their personal careers in the "business" of unionism, are now forced to lead the struggles in order to retain some credibility with the angry rank and some ability to continue compromising, compromising, and any semblance of relation to the system. This tense situation has led naturally to disorganization of the ranks, organization by how to suc-ceed. The dominant right wing, most strongly represented by the "left" bureaucracy, is led by George Meany, Joseph Curran, the building trades, etc., is being challenged by a left wing, led by Morris B. Schnapper, who seeks to appear more militant in order to strengthen their own position, as in Reuther's cold split with Meany to form the "militant" ALA. That these "progressives" are really no different is proven time and again. In the fillies and early sixties, they were all practically indistinguishable from Meany himself. Now, after the war and the ruling class that it led has driven the workers to desperation, these "leaders" protest. Something is wrong; we need new leaders, they say. But be- fore the last election, the "left" of the New York labor movement mobilized against the Meany supporters. At the AFL-CIO convention, the question they raised was which Demo- cratic Party candidate to support!

Progressive Cover for Sellouts

The "single-issue" anti-war movement, for which the SWP is the chief bureaucracy and organizer from the very beginning, has play- ed right into the hands of the leaders of this movement. It has handed the new careerists a "movement" which appears militant but which is actually politi- cally safe. Compatible with both the posture of the capitalists' electoral interests and, importantly for them, their continued existence as professional concil- iators and reformists within the labor movement, but the war question cannot possibly be sepa- rated from the class question or the class strug­ gle as a whole. That is why the much-lauded "uni- ty" between the various "nationalists" (as well as feminist, homophile, etc.) groupings at the marches is so tenuous, fragile, temporary — in fact, non-existent. The various "nationalists," so the theory goes, who normally pursue their con- tradictory, me-first politics separate from one another, find their "common ground" in the anti-war demonstration. But this is not, however, the correct approach. The Berntz Boretas from asserting their "national- ist" machismo against everyone else in the San Francisco speakers' rally."

"LABOR" is viewed as though it were just anoth­ er "nationalist" movement, really splashing around in the pool in a big way. The bureaucrats are assur­ ed of being treated like little kings, eagerly count­ ed and appreciated for the size of their "masses" followings. Their role as betrayers of their own members will not be challenged; after all, "self- determination for everybody" means that all, the little-pol-spoiled and aspiring bureaucrats get to run their own bailiwicks without "criticism" from "outside." And the SWP-YSA adheres to this in practice—making only harmless, occasional, general "criticisms" and pushing "community control" instead of class struggle and generally-ignoring work in the unions. The class struggle, the only real force uniting the interests of most workers, is being ignored. "The various "nationalists," who seek to lead a "mass" movement on an opportunistic basis.

No More Peace Picnics for Labor Fakers and Politicians!

POWER AGAINST THE WAR!

BRING WORKING-CLASS

Members of the Direct Mail Local of the SWP
in Washington, D. C. on April 24.

New York, which saw some of the "best" re- sponse by labor and bureaucrats, as depicted by District 65 and 1199 to get the members to Wash­ ington, D. C. on April 24. The context of these developments is the rising tide of class struggle and attempts of rank-and-file workers to defend their gains against increas- ing efforts on the part of the system to dismantle measures designed to deal with the deepening economic crisis take the form of attacks on the economic crisis. For example, the rise of the bosses. All the ruling-class measures de­ signed to deal with the deepening tide of class struggle and attempts of rank-and-file workers to defend their gains against increas- ing efforts on the part of the system to dismantle measures designed to deal with the deepening economic crisis take the form of attacks on the economic crisis. For example, the rise of the bosses. All the ruling-class measures de­ signed to deal with the deepening tide of class struggle and attempts of rank-and-
(Continued from Page 1)

simple union democracy approach, the MSC contracts to this self-limiting liberal perspective a full program dealing with the immediate and long-term interests of the seamen’s class. Ship registration, war, unemployment, racial oppression, anti-labor laws and the role of the government in the capitalist Democratic and Republican parties. It is essential that NMUers understand how their particular problems and conditions are related to the struggles of all workers and the reorganization of society as a whole, and how the capitalists own the means of production and control the government to further their own interests at the expense of the majority of workers. The struggle against Joe Curran and his thugs must be inseparable from the fight against the capitalist system which Curran and his ilk represent within the labor movement.

Morrissey’s approach is fundamentally inadequate to confront even the immediate problems of the seamen’s class. A simple economic trade unionism, Curran’s response to the demand for a national working class control over ships is to chide the刊登 on social welfare programs, economic growth, and the rapidly increasing costs of living. For Curran, wages are merely a cost of doing business, and the only way to cut them is to push the workers to make concessions for the benefit of the capitalist class. This is a direct affront to the majority of NMU workers, and a clear indication of how much the MSC is committed to working with the capitalists and not with the workers. The MSC is committed to a program of piecemeal reform, a program that is inconsistent with the struggle for jobs and improved working conditions.

Job Rotation

Another critical issue in the struggle for the MSC is job rotation. The MSC is job rotation proposal in itself, The MSC’s failure to stand up to the threat of layoffs and to make more jobs available to the workers. The MSC is consistent with its past support for NMUers to fight job rotation because he can expect that NMUers will be satisfied with any number of jobs, in a program that can be expected to create new jobs. In exchange for these jobs, the MSC has committed to abandoning the basic principle of class independence, and encouraging the development of a small stratum of union leaders who can control the unions and freeze the wages and working conditions of the workers.

Morrisey’s Liberalism

Vital issues divide the two major oppositions. Morrissey’s group holds a broad-and-doctoral view of the struggle. It is committed to a program of piecemeal reform, a program that is inconsistent with the struggle for jobs and improved working conditions. The MSC is committed to a program of piecemeal reform, a program that is inconsistent with the struggle for jobs and improved working conditions.
Workers' Action

Pension Strike Sellout

(continued from page 1)

cuts in services on Rockefeller and the State Legislature who had already reduced the amount of revenue sharing state aid to the city when fixing the State budget in April, and who had to authorize any new taxes requested by the city to balance its budget.

Two months of horse trading, charges and counter-charges of exaggerated or underestimated revenues and expenses followed the April announcement, which hit supposedly "secure" city employees' jobs. In fact it was a cynical manipulation of the fears of city residents and workers in general—especially the poor and working class—by the Lindsay administration in pressing for his administration's budget program.

On June 9, the Republican-dominated Legislature, with Democratic support, authorized a $255 million increased tax package. The overwhelming bulk of the new taxes will come out of the city wage-earner's pocket. The biggest increase is an 80 per cent rise in the city income tax. Other major taxes included an extension of the now thoroughly regressive sales tax, New Yorkers now pay a total 7 per cent sales tax (a 3 per cent city sales tax and a state sales tax recently increased to 4 per cent). Neither party wants to take full responsibility for the crushing burden of the new taxes on city residents, already the highest per capita taxpayers in the country. To reassure the Democrats, Lindsay is said to have pledged only "minimal" layoffs of city employees with job cuts coming through a freeze on hiring. The most optimistic estimate promulgated by Lindsay is a freeze on hiring with an anticipated 14,200 job cuts this coming year starting empty, and an additional 5,000 jobs being abolished, producing the inevitable increase in "productivity" that Lindsay and his fellow destroyers of jobs have pleaded with their members to be grateful for small things "in these hard times," expressing sympathy for poor John Lindsay and his fiscal problems. Gotbaum, instead of urging a general strike to protect city workers, has waged a virtual pro-Lindsay "Save Our City" campaign since April.

 Shortly after Lindsay's announcement of the cuts, Gotbaum organized a protest trip to Albany to "Restore the Budget Cuts" and "Save Our City." The whole operation was a box office

speakers' list as Democratic liberals," most of whom later voted for the giant package of new taxes to alleviate the city's fiscal crisis out of the pockets of city workers.

Epilogue

Since October 1970, over 3,300 full-time and 2,000 part-time city employees have been laid off, and thousands of other jobs have been eliminated. Few of these workers would have been fired but for Gotbaum's tacit cooperation and job freeze. In fact back as June 1970, Lindsay, backed up by the Democratic City Council, launched an offensive with leaks to the press concerning a "study" of the pay cuts, furloughs, layoffs and paychecks for the city employees were cut back by former Mayor LaGuardia during the Depression. "Anything we can cut is fair," the large municipal employee unions of sanitation men, firemen, welfare workers, etc., that were once coming to Gotbaum's office with complaints, were acknowledged by the union leaders in their negotiations later on.

In an editorial in the June 19, 1970, issue of the Daily Worker, Paul Robeson wrote, "John Lindsay has cleared righteously that times had changed and "today there is a union representing some 150,000 city workers in the city that has not yet acknowledged that workers' struggle for their sources and the political apparatus to assure that our members are not made the fall guys for a national crisis," The real test for Gotbaum came only a few months later in November when the large Sanitationmen's union conducted a strike that was broken on December 31, the city's strike leaders? 'We won't take the punishment, we'll take the punishment," he mobilized a protest trip to Albany in the capital's history. The big mass strike action is a prima facie case. The Sanitationmen, firemen, welfare workers, etc., that were so out of touch with the struggles of city workers, were cut back by former Mayor LaGuardia during the Depression. "Anything we can cut is fair," the large municipal employee unions of sanitation men, firemen, welfare workers, etc., that were once coming to Gotbaum's office with complaints, were acknowledged by the union leaders in their negotiations later on.

In an editorial in the June 19, 1970, issue of the Daily Worker, Paul Robeson wrote, "John Lindsay has cleared righteously that times had changed and "today there is a union representing some 150,000 city workers in the city that has not yet acknowledged that workers' struggle for their sources and the political apparatus to assure that our members are not made the fall guys for a national crisis," The real test for Gotbaum came only a few months later in November when the large Sanitationmen's union conducted a strike that was broken on December 31, the city's strike leaders? 'We won't take the punishment, we'll take the punishment," he mobilized a protest trip to Albany in the capital's history. The big mass strike action is a prima facie case. The Sanitationmen, firemen, welfare workers, etc., that were so out of touch with the struggles of city workers, were cut back by former Mayor LaGuardia during the Depression. "Anything we can cut is fair," the large municipal employee unions of sanitation men, firemen, welfare workers, etc., that were once coming to Gotbaum's office with complaints, were acknowledged by the union leaders in their negotiations later on.

In an editorial in the June 19, 1970, issue of the Daily Worker, Paul Robeson wrote, "John Lindsay has cleared righteously that times had changed and "today there is a union representing some 150,000 city workers in the city that has not yet acknowledged that workers' struggle for their sources and the political apparatus to assure that our members are not made the fall guys for a national crisis," The real test for Gotbaum came only a few months later in November when the large Sanitationmen's union conducted a strike that was broken on December 31, the city's strike leaders? 'We won't take the punishment, we'll take the punishment," he mobilized a protest trip to Albany in the capital's history. The big mass strike action is a prima facie case. The Sanitationmen, firemen, welfare workers, etc., that were so out of touch with the struggles of city workers, were cut back by former Mayor LaGuardia during the Depression. "Anything we can cut is fair," the large municipal employee unions of sanitation men, firemen, welfare workers, etc., that were once coming to Gotbaum's office with complaints, were acknowledged by the union leaders in their negotiations later on.

In an editorial in the June 19, 1970, issue of the Daily Worker, Paul Robeson wrote, "John Lindsay has cleared righteously that times had changed and "today there is a union representing some 150,000 city workers in the city that has not yet acknowledged that workers' struggle for their sources and the political apparatus to assure that our members are not made the fall guys for a national crisis," The real test for Gotbaum came only a few months later in November when the large Sanitationmen's union conducted a strike that was broken on December 31, the city's strike leaders? 'We won't take the punishment, we'll take the punishment," he mobilized a protest trip to Albany in the capital's history. The big mass strike action is a prima facie case. The Sanitationmen, firemen, welfare workers, etc., that were so out of touch with the struggles of city workers, were cut back by former Mayor LaGuardia during the Depression. "Anything we can cut is fair," the large municipal employee unions of sanitation men, firemen, welfare workers, etc., that were once coming to Gotbaum's office with complaints, were acknowledged by the union leaders in their negotiations later on.
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(Continued from Page 5)
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possibly even hoping to ride on the coattails of Lindsay's presidential aspirations. He has been roundly criticized for bloating the city payroll, for not getting the state to pay its share of city pension costs, etc. Lindsay and the unions have agreed to submit the agency shop issue to a vote on a city-wide ballot. (Continued from Page 6)

STRUGGLE IN NNU

front can NMU members escape the double trap of their declining industry and treacherous union leadership? A powerful program of Morrissey's "Committee for NMU Democracy" is funds-

ing the Situation to ride the welfare hobby horse, homeowners with big interests getting off light. Real estate taxes make up only 24% of the budget with most tax money going to next year! At the same time the major source also assumed a number of functions formerly taken on an increased load of social services-recent wages (such as various kinds of welfare) and dens.

Rents are expected to rise an incredible $100 a month per apartment, accompanied by landlord harassment to vacate apartments, As rent control will soon be a fond memory, two of the most heavily used services—or orthopedic treatment for artificial limbs, braces, etc. (see Workers' Action and Bridge Authority, Metropolitan Transit Authority, etc.-which may offset Conservative popular-

Nixon while Morrissey would prefer the "friends of labor" touted by more "progressive" union bosses. Only a labor movement truly working class, to be sure, a labor party will not be left in the dust by the new "law and order" reaction. One of the great achievements workers have made in the class struggle in such a party against the reformist sell-out note as they will show in the near future. But only a party of the workers themselves can be an instrument of the working class; the capitalist parties can only be their enemy. Only through struggle on the broadest possible front can NMU members escape the double trap of their declining industry and treacherous union leadership? A powerful program of Morrissey's "Committee for NMU Democracy" is funds-

ing the Situation to ride the welfare hobby horse, homeowners with big interests getting off light. Real estate taxes make up only 24% of the budget with most tax money going to next year! At the same time the major source of new Conservative voters were young, eth-
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CONTINUED FROM PAGE 6
LONGSHORE UNION IN LIFE-OR-DEATH STRUGGLE

should a new bureaucrat arise on the scene (perhaps Goldblatt). An editorial in the March 15 PW attacks Bridges for not caring about rank-and-file (a new discovery for PW). Specifically cited is Bridges' support of the British Trade Union Council when it opposed the recent movement workers' strike against anti-labor legislation. In this extended and obviously bitter dispute, Bridges and a minority of the union paper Dispachter, charging PW with making "smoke cracks, distortions," etc., claim that the political section of PW is the one that lies about our union, its leadership and activities. (March 15 PW, quoted from Dispachter.) But it appears the CP at least is not yet ready to make a final break-the March 15 article states later on, "The ILWU is a good union; one of the best, its leadership has a record of protecting, defending and extending the powers and well-being of the members unequalled by most unions we know of. So the union is clearly an example of "For a Six-Hour Day and No Extended Work Days," "Eliminate 9, 43 Steady Man Sections," "Defend Our Port ..."

Along with the fissures in the old bureaucracy, genuine rank-and-file opposition has surfaced. One example of this is Local 10, where a small group began publishing the "Rank-and-File T-Letter" in May 1971. The principal authors of this letter originally ran in the union elections in October 1970 for caucuses (contract committees) and caucuses to elect a delegate, around militant contract issues such as "For a Six-Hour Day and No Extended Work Days," "Eliminate 9, 43 Steady Man Sections," "Defend Our Port Workers," "Protect Our Composition," etc. and vital political issues including "Repeal All Anti-Labor Laws," "Keep the Employer-Con­ trolled Courts and Government Agencies Out of Internal Union Affairs," "End Racism and Other Forms of Exploitation," "CFS," "Keep the ILWU, ILWU, ILWU," etc. These, of course, would finally mean an end for membership in the ILWU, which is never separate from the political sphere, but in times of relative economic stability it was possible for the bureaucratically oriented union movement to "breathe" a bit and permit rank-and-file issues and to nudge the political questions.

As the July 1 deadline approaches, what does Bridges offer to counter the employers' offensive? Here are highlights of Bridges' program (from the union paper Dispachter, Section 9.6):

1. Raise of $1 per hour in basic longshoreman's wages for all workers.

2. Full compliance with CFB agreement by July 1, meaning that all container work ("except that delivered by lighter vessels") must be moved to the docks under union supervision.

3. For a two-to-three year period, the PCLC covering Section 9, 43 shall be changed so as to guarantee exclusion of the "rank and file" workers.

5. "Work opportunity guarantee-either furnishing work or pay for 40 hours per week, for all registered workers.

6. A reduction in shift length from 8 to 7 hours with no extended shifts in the second year of the contract.

Even assuming for a split-second that this program was acceptable, it is clear that the Bridges leadership has no intention of waging a hard fight. At the 16th Biennial convention of the ILWU in April, the union's officials reported that "Demands are substantial and some of the issues extremely sticky. Whether a contract can be negotiated without strike action remains to be seen..." The convention then went on to pass traditional paper resolutions of such issues as defending Angela Davis and opposing the Indochina war. As far as defending the union's existence, they could only offer such "collaborative" policies as "coordinated regional action" and "political activity." The wage guarantees included in the program were offered by Bridges to "neutralize" the ILWU into a sort of inventive to employers to bring work through the ports. The ILWU is now being pressured to accept such a document which will only further erode the union's political role.

"The wage guarantee idea is offered by Bridges as a sort of hedge to employers to bring work back to the docks. In April, the ILWU oppositionists printed a leaflet called "The Lead­ger" which we would not ask for their help unless we were really on the ropes. Thus, instead of pub­lication..."
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