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Break with Bosses’ Politics Labor Needs its own Party

With the presidential elections only a few weeks away, the fundamental bankruptcy of capitalist politics is once again coming out in the wash. The vast majority of Americans will have no candidates representing their interests in the 1972 elections.

This majority includes unionized and non-unionized workers, as well as the black and brown communities, unemployed, farmers, housewives, and millions of citizens - most of whom are workers too - squeezed by rising prices, taxes, and the collapse of vital services. In 1972 both major parties, as well as the Wallaceites, stand in reality for an attack on all sections of the working class.

This attack includes smashing isolated strikes, and victimizing weaker unions and the unorganized, in order to discipline the more powerful and better organized workers. It also includes worsening conditions for black, Puerto Rican and Chicano communities, where unemployment among youth often exceeds 50 percent.

The Nixon-McGovern Presidential race is winding down to its Election Day anti-climax, with a
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Munich & the Mid-East Crisis

It did not take the Israeli government and its allies long to demonstrate the depth of their “humanitarian” outrage over the recent deaths of 11 Israeli Olympic athletes and coaches. The corpses of Munich were not yet cold when Israeli planes, to enthusiastic international applause, launched waves of bombing assaults in retaliation against so-called “commando concentration points.”

Extensive damage and casualties were allegedly inflicted on the guerrillas in these raids. The truth, however, is that the Israeli raids were primarily brutal acts of revenge directed against Arab civilians who bore no responsibility for guerrilla actions anywhere.

Typical was the bombing of one Lebanese village, reported in the New York Times of September 10, which destroyed most of the homes in the village and left probably scores of civilians dead — many times the number of Israelis killed at Munich.

This Lebanese village (whose inhabitants were not even Palestinians) had no guerrilla forces either inside or nearby. The message of Israeli revenge, corresponding to its entire history of retaliation against Arab guerrillas, is precisely that innocent civilians are a prime target — that no one in the Arab countries is to be safe from revenge for the actions of any other Arabs.

In the Israeli-occupied territories of Gaza and the West
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I.S. Launches $15,000 Fund Drive

Karen Kaye

The International Socialists are launching our second fund drive on September 27 with the goal of raising $15,000 by November 22. A year ago IS members and sympathizers succeeded in raising $11,963, or $1,963 more than the $10,000 goal of that first drive.

That money was used for improvements in Workers' Power equipment for the national office, educational conferences, and a travelling organizer. This year funds are needed for expansion of our activities.

These include increased travelling and education, a larger, more efficient office and office equipment, and staff for the publication of a theoretical journal.

The need for expansion represents, to IS members, one indication of success in the early stages of our primary political task: the re-establishment of the link between the struggles of the working class and the movement and tradition of revolutionary democratic socialism.

This link, which has existed in the form of revolutionary working class organizations in the advanced countries of the world since the days of Karl Marx, was severed in the United States during the reactionary and repressive era of the 1960s.

During that time the attention of the world was focussed on the struggle between the two great ruling classes that now exist—the capitalist class of the Western countries and the newer Stalinist bureaucracy of the "Communist" states.

The possibility of a socialist revolution from below, created by the working class in its own name, was nearly abandoned. Socialist and radical colleagues felt the horror of the degeneration of the Russian Revolution into alliance with the West or, on the other hand, defended Stalinism as a progressive alternative to capitalism.

During this period, the organization holding the revolutionary socialist views which the International Socialists represent, dwindled to the point where it existed only as a federation of scattered groups called the Independent Socialist Clubs (ISC).

But with the development of the Black Power Movement, the radical student movement and the anti-war movement in the mid-1960's, interest in radical ideas on how to achieve social change spread.

Through these movements flourished, and conducted many courageous and militant struggles, they were endangered by their isolation from the working class. The crisis engulfing American capitalism had engendered social protest movements, but the working class was still trapped in the reactionary ideology of the '50's and faced with increasingly bureaucratic and conservative union leadership.

An increase in the number of wildcat strikes and contract rejections, as well as the development of a few scattered militant and radical rank and file caucuses especially among black workers, indicated positive working class response to the crisis confronting the whole society.

But in the absence of a political working class movement to unify and take leadership of social protest, many radicals took a look at hostile "hard hats" and the Wallace movement and decided to look elsewhere for the agency of social change.

The ISC participated in all progressive and radical movements, offering leadership and criticism from a socialist viewpoint, and won respect within them for its unconditional and active support, and for its principled stand.

At the same time, we realized that it was necessary for socialists to take part in the growing revolt of the rank and file of the working class.

In the summer of 1969, members of ISC's across the country sent delegations to conventions where the various clubs united to form the International Socialists. The convention voted to begin a program of direct participation in working class struggles.

This program is being continued and expanded today, and along with the development of socialist theory is the major priority of this organization. IS members play active roles in militant rank and file caucuses in important industries across the country, including Teamsters, auto, telephone and teachers.

By now the isolation of the movements of the 1960's has indeed led to their collapse, mostly into the Democratic Party. But the crisis persists, and the solution American capitalism is attempting is increasingly being directed against the working class. The imposition of wages control is the drive for "productivity" and new attempts at anti-strike legislation are harsh evidence of this.

As the crisis deepens, the absence of that link between revolutionary socialism and the working class will become increasingly dangerous. The deep divisions which exist in the working class along lines of race, ethnic background, skill and sex afford opportunities for capitalism to use working class frustration to pit workers against each other.

The hesitancy and conservatism of the trade union bureaucracies and their desire to maintain peaceful relations with the employers means that they cannot be relied upon to lead the fight against these threats.

This can be accomplished only by a push from below, through the militant self-organization of the working class to regain democratic control over their unions and to defend themselves against the employers; to fight for the formation of a Labor Party that will represent their interests; to wage and join struggles in behalf of all oppressed people: blacks, ethnic minorities, women, gays — and unite these struggles into the fight for a socialist America and a socialist world. The International Socialists are engaged in this struggle.

We urge all readers of Workers' Power to join us in this effort and at this time to make a donation to the fund drive, which will enable us to continue and expand these activities.

Checks should be made payable to either Joel Geier or to International Socialists, and sent to 14131 Woodward Avenue, Highland Park, Michigan 48203.
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REPRESSION GROWS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Barbara Alden
ERIC LANGDON

Four years after the 1968 "Prague Spring" presided over by Alexander Dubcek, his successors who rode to power on Russian tank turrets are still trying vainly to "normalize" the Czechoslovak people.

The Czechoslovak people's high hopes that Dubcek's promises of reforms would bring them "socialism with a human face" have made the return to a hard-line police state all the more bitter.

An apocryphal story is now going the rounds in Prague: "It's true that the Czech people called on the vaillant Red Army to come to its assistance?" "Yes, goes the reply, "the call dates from 1938 (when Hitler occupied Czechoslovakia), but could be given a positive response only in August, 1968."

Unable in any way to solve the fundamental problems of Czech society, the Russian-backed regime of Gustav Husak is predictably jittery. It reacts most violently any effort to keep alive the hopes of 1968.

That is the real "criza" with which 46 citizens, of more than 500 arrested since last November, have been charged in the nine trials that occurred during July and August.

Husak's Secret Trials

Last November long-delayed elections took place - the first in seven years. The Czech government was eager to show that it, like the other governments in the Russian bloc, could produce a large turnout and a vote nearly 100 percent in favor of its candidates.

At election time a total of 71,000 opposition leaflets were distributed "in the country." The leaflets reminded citizens of their constitutional rights to strike names off the printed ballot, insert other names, or abstain from voting.

They also accused the Husak regime of using the elections to condemn the Russian occupation and the resultant loss of liberties.

Shortly thereafter began a wave of arrests, which, continuing into April, 1972, engulfed more than 500 individuals. The 46 recently tried have proudly admitted responsibility for the leaflets, but deny the charge that they aimed at "subversion of the socialist system."

For this attempt to exercise elementary democratic rights, sentences as high as 6 years were meted out. The two highest sentences went to Pavol Hrubá and Jozef Kacianka, both former members of the Student Communist Party's central committee and of the Czechoslovak Students' Union. They were sentenced to 10 and 8 years respectively.

The trials are just the tip of the iceberg. The Czech security police can simultaneously monitor 30,000 telephones in Prague alone. Even ringing bureaucrats are in danger. The chief of the international section of the Central Committee of the CP was suspended from his post for six weeks on charges of being in communication with Italian intelligence. His regular reports to the party leadership had been intercepted.

A week before the recent trials began, a Czech official stated: "It really is quiet here now in politics. The press no longer talks about political controversies, they are concerned much more now with their standard of living. That is the big achievement of Husak. Why should there be trials to upset this?"

Those few to politics may not remember that Czechoslovakia, unlike the other countries of eastern Europe, had a highly sophisticated industry before World War II. Since then, under Russian domination, industry has steadily deteriorated.

Until January, 1972, there was a short-lived aura of benign optimism. In that month Russian leaders Brezhnev and Kosygin paid a visit to Prague. They loudly announced the special shipments of Russian wheat, meat, crude oil, and other raw materials would be increased.

They also revealed that Russian orders for Czech commodities, such as locomotives and trolleybuses, delivered behind schedule or below specifications, were being cancelled. The Czech leaders were pulled up short.

As in Poland, where official complaints about the "indiscipline" of the workers force are published in the CP press, economists in Czechoslovakia are returning to the old recipes of the pre-Dubcek period to "overcome" work stoppages, slow-downs, and widespread absenteeism. To no avail.

Successive purges have had the result of instilling in the economic hierarchy such fear of being charged with "right opportunist deviations" that no one dares suggest logical solutions to his superiors.

In the absence of economic solutions, a search for scapegoats is on. The official journal of the eastern Czech还不是科P, Czechoslovak CP, last June 10, devoted an article to "the way the right-wing revisionists doped the people."

"The purchase in the west of computer programs that the capital canared with programs incompatible with the forms of socialist economic management facilitated the penetration of foreign ideologies and illusions into Czech economic theory and practice," the CP said. It then went on to make maximum use of the imported computers and even applied programs inappropriate to our economy; such enterprises demanded that Czech conditions be modified in a way they considered "modern and foolproof."

Thus was created conditions favorable to the penetration of foreign ideologies and illusions into Czech economic theory and practice."

"The enormous charge of "revisionist computer programs" only illustrates the poisonous effects of bureaucratisms that have recoiled in disgust."

It is the duty of all who oppose imperialism, whether of the US variety in Vietnam or the Russian variety in Czechoslovakia, of all who fight for human freedom to stand in solidarity with the Czech prisoners. The louder the international protest, the better the chance that further trials may not be held.

[Continued on page 14]
Nixon victory appearing increasingly likely. But regardless of the outcome, it is once again clear that the differences between the parties and the candidates are only differences of opinion among various factions of a single political establishment, responsible to the capitalist ruling class.

Wage-cutting, simultaneous speedup and layoffs, union-busting, elimination of unemployment benefits and new programs to victimize millions who are forced to subsist on welfare, are on the rise. These measures have the open approval of President Richard Nixon, who is running for re-election on the basis of a promise to provide "four more years" of higher corporate profits at the expense of working people, with government intervention to back it up.

But the Democrats too are committed to attacking the working class -- although in a slicker fashion. Their current campaign talk of fighting for the "little people" and ending the tax breaks of the rich are so many empty words.

Unlike his major rivals within the Democratic Party, Humphrey, Muskie, and Jackson, George McGovern believes it is necessary for the Democrats to adopt a pose of supporting some of the demands raised by various social protest movements in the last few years.

McGovern struck this pose largely because of the need to win the protestor vote back into the Democratic fold -- and to draw on the only possible base of support for his own candidacy. Since gaining the nomination, McGovern has dropped most of his radical pose.

While McGovern still promises to end the war in Vietnam -- a war much of the capitalist class would like to abandon as unwinnable -- he also promises to maintain America's commitments to US business interests abroad, commitments leading to new wars in Latin America and the Middle East. No matter who wins, an imperialist foreign policy continues.

Where once he embraced the demand for repeal of anti-abortion laws, he now favors "leaving the matter up to the states." His vice-presidential candidate Shriver actively supports the viciously reactionary so-called "Right to Life" movement against women's right to abortion.

McGovern's program contains not one proposal for ending race oppression in America, nor for the defense of militant black and brown organizations.

These movers give a clue to the "seriousness" of McGovern's present claims to lead a "tax revolt" on behalf of "little Americans." Already he has scaled down his original tax proposals (which were inaccurately billed as a proposal for "income redistribution").

Now he makes appearances before stockbrokers' organizations in a desperate attempt to convince the capitalist class that he is fiscally "responsible."

It is no wonder that workers approach the elections with so much cynicism. No matter who wins the election, taxes will rise -- campaign promises notwithstanding.

No matter who wins, the inevitable squeeze between corporate profits and the fight of workers to keep up with inflation will mean new curbs on the right to strike, new legal limitations on the right of the rank and file to vote on contracts, rewards to companies for "productivity" measures to speed up work.

Is it any wonder that a third of the electorate does not vote at all?

It is the historic responsibility of the American labor movement to produce its own political alternative to these parties. By organizing their own political party to fight for their own interests, could spearhead a gigantic upsurge of all oppressed and exploited people in this country.

(Continued from page 1)
Legislative attack on farmworkers extended to California

The United Farm Workers Union, under attack from regressive anti-union legislation in several states, now faces a similar challenge in California, the union’s base of operations.

The basis of the attack is Proposition 22, the “Agricultural Labor Relations” initiative, which California voters will vote on in November.

This initiative, similar to laws enacted in several other states, would if passed outlaw specified types of strikes, picketing and boycotts in the farm industry. It would also create a board having the power to certify unions as bargaining agents for workers.

At a recent AFL-CIO State Convention in Los Angeles, UFW Director Cesar Chavez called for a coalition of organized labor to defeat the initiative at the polls.

“This is a hard act, if adopted, will spread like a disease throughout the labor movement,” Chavez said.

“If this passes, you will be next.”

“We are the weakest link; if they break that link all of you will suffer. Either we win—we defeat Proposition 22—or we don’t have a union.”

James Simmons for the GPA presidency.

Simmons had been president since the association was founded several years ago.

Walters said the dispute in the association had come to a head this summer when Simmons demanded a change in the by-laws which would have made him chairman for life.

He (Simmons) has repeatedly stated that blacks could not play a leadership role, that they were not smart enough, and they would scare off whites—even though the GPA was 60 percent black,” said Walters.

The newly installed, inter-racial leadership pledged to continue programs to establish cooperatives for woodcutters’ tools and supplies, and to press organizing efforts for new local chapters in Mississippi and Alabama.

Union organizer murdered by hospital rent-a-cop in Philadelphia

A union organizer working on a drive to unionize hospital employees in Philadelphia was murdered on August 29 by a private security guard outside a hospital.

The slain organizer, Norman Raymon, worked for Local 1199-C of the National Union of Hospital and Nursing Home Employees. Local 1199-C had been conducting an organizing drive among hospital workers in Philadelphia for the past year.

Raymond was killed outside Metropolitan Hospital, where he was serving truck deliveries to determine if scab shipments of laundry work were being delivered to the hospital.

The guard who killed Raymond approached him with a knife, although no weapon was found on Raymond’s body.

The District Attorney has refused to bring any charges against the guard who killed Raymond.

In response to the killing, 500 people marched on City Hall in Philadelphia to protest the murder on Aug. 30.
New York
William Jackson

The news in New York City is that there will be no teachers' strikes this year, nor for the next three years. The United Federation of Teachers (UFT) — the main force behind the leadership of the national teachers' union — has "won" a contract in last-minute negotiations with the Board of Education. This, at least, is the claim of the UFT President, Albert Shanker, who has yet to produce a copy of the contract or present it for ratification.

New York, like many other cities, is going through a "productivity drive" (see the article by Diana Oliviari in Workers' Power, No. 61). This assault on public employees is also an attack on all who "benefit" from public services: school children, subway riders, welfare recipients, and everybody else. This especially affects black and Spanish-speaking workers, parents, and children.

The central Board of Education was clearly on the attack during these negotiations. Its proposals would have increased class size; taken away teachers' freedom during "preparation periods"; lengthened job security in several ways; increased non-teaching time for teachers; lengthened the school day for school workers.

The Board also offered a tiny increase in salary, amounting to a decrease due to inflation. The Board hoped to get away with this attack on school workers and students by the dirty game of playing the teachers off against the black and Puerto Rican communities. Both the leaders of the communities and the leaders of the UFT played right into the hands of the Board.

Last year a huge school budget cut was restored by the mere threat of a mass school closing and demonstration by both the union and all the thirty-one local school boards. This time it was divide-and-conquer all the way.

The local school boards — black, brown, and white — all sat on the central Board's side of the bargaining table. They accepted their role as part of "management."

They accepted the idea that the teachers are their "enemies" and the central bureaucracy is the "friend." The more "militant" community groups attacked the Board for not being "hard enough" on the teachers' union.

The local boards were preparing to break any possible strike. The goal of these community groups is not to replace the Board of Education so that they will become the new bosses over the teachers and other school workers.

The idea of "community control" of the schools once represented in New York City a real movement of black people fighting to control an aspect of their lives. That movement was broken in the racist 1968 teachers' strike.

Now, "community control" is a slogan mostly used by those who make a living from the "education" bureaucracy or the "poverty" agencies.

The equally bankrupt UFT leadership of Albert Shanker also made no attempt at united action — even though it recently gained the added strength of a merged statewide federation of teachers. Instead it raised false demands for cops in the schools. The UFT called for keeping the rigid licensing requirements which stand in the way of hiring many more black or Spanish-speaking ("bilingual") teachers (although all teachers know how meaningless these stupid license requirements are).

The union continued its opposition to all attempts to give the community or students any real control of the schools. It dropped all demands for improving the quality of education.

Although the issues in these negotiations were quite different from those of 1968, the union bureaucracy has continued the same general policies which led to the reactionary 1968 strike. These policies have greatly weak-

Chicano Furniture Workers Strike Against Wage Controls

On Monday, August 21, a small but historic action took place outside the Los Angeles convention center, where 3,000 delegates to the California AFL-CIO convention were meeting. As the delegates returned from lunch they were met by a demonstration of 500 Chicano furniture workers asking that the convention "take a strong stand against Wage Controls, a stand which is to be carried out in determined and unwavering political action."

The leaflet distributed by the workers described their action and its purpose. It read in part:

"This is a one-day political strike. Today we closed down six manufacturing companies in protest of the government's economic policies which benefit the rich and powerful corporations at the expense of the entire Working Class.

"The Democratic Party passed this anti-labor legislation and the Republican Party has put it into effect. If the politicians prefer to cater to the interests of the rich, we, the Working Class, must take up the fight on our own and take it directly to where it hurts the bosses — to the point of production.

"The government's wage policies that limit our incomes hit us particularly hard since our wages are low to begin with and we do not have the organizational strength of the big unions in basic industries. If our wages are allowed to be kept low, the wages of all workers will remain low also. In order to struggle successfully for decent wages we need the support of all workers in all industries and in all the Unions.

These 500 workers from small shops in a half-organized industry showed that the inaction of the AFL-CIO "labormanifestation is not a "responsible" or "prudent" course, but results from the stagnation of a labor officialdom grown fat and bankrupt on their privileges and their golf games with the employers.

During the week before the action rank and file committees met to discuss and plan the demonstration. Leaflets were written and detailed plans made since 500 workers from six widely scattered plants were to walk out together just before lunch and gather at the convention. On Monday morning leaflets from the rank and file committee were distributed to the workers announcing final plans.

Simultaneously the employed were notified by hand delivered letter that Chapter 5 of the California State Labor Code prohibits any attempt to "coerce or influence or attempt to influence his employees by means of threat of discharge to adopt or follow or refrain from adopting or following any partail course or line of political action."

The letter was signed by the Labor Committee of La Raza Unida Party, with which several of the leading rank and file are associated. This use of the Labor Code, backed up by clearly demonstrated rank and file organization and unity, has prevented any subsequent reprisals by the employers.

The action of the furniture workers has demonstrated the power of rank and file organization, from the bottom up, to build a struggle which can solve the problems of the workers of this country.
ended the union. Remembering the bitterness of the 1968 strike, teachers were in no mood for a repeat. We knew that the Puerto Rican and black parents were unsympathetic to any strike.

The union leadership also knew that the mood of preparing the ranks for a battle against the Board’s attack, Shanker kept on declaring that a strike would be a “disaster.”

Although a strike was unlikely, it was necessary to be prepared in the event that one happened. For this reason, a committee was formed by the Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP, formerly MPR), teacher members of the International Socialists, members of the Progressive Labor Party, and members of a few radical teacher groups.

United Front Program

This united front endorsed a position on the possibility of a strike. After criticizing the UFT leadership’s policies, the position paper stated: “Nevertheless, we give support to this strike in spite of our severe criticisms of its leadership and its policies. This strike is different from the 1968 strike.”

That was to maintain the power of the central Board over teachers as against the black and Puerto Rican local authorities. This strike is basically to defend the interests of teachers and paraprofessionals.

The paper also criticized the community leadership and then declared: “We believe that a coalition should be formed between the teachers and paraprofessionals, black and brown community organizations, all local boards, older students, and public employees unions and other unions.

It should be prepared to demonstrate, strike, occupy the schools (locking out supervisors), and generally raise hell (citywide and statewide; well beyond even nationwide), until it is: ‘

- Forces the state and the Board to bring all the issues to greatly increase funds for the schools (by taxing the rich and ending the war).

- Forces hiring of thousands of new New York City teachers, including bilingual teachers.

- Forbids the building of several hundred new buildings;

- Wins democratic control over the schools by parents, older students, and school workers together.

- Smashes the anti-strike Taylor Law (if one union is penalized, every one else should strike).

- Provides physical protection for school employees and students (partly by hiring more community aides, but even more by creating a new, non-authoritarian atmosphere in the schools and neighborhoods).

- We do not expect the union leadership and community leadership to change their approaches quickly or easily. Therefore we are starting right now to build an on-going coalition of militant teachers, paraprofessionals, parents, students, and black and Puerto Rican organizations.

- We will call demonstrations and mass rallies to support our program.

We will go to union meetings and to school board meetings and to parent meetings to urge that our programs be adopted.

We will support breaking this strike; but while we will support the strike, we will support it on another way.”

The contract Shanker finally receives will have to be accepted. This means that we must work with the Board’s attempts to widen the terms demanded by the Board of Education (outlined below) to be tantamount to signing away collective bargaining rights and the obliteration of almost every progressive item won in previous teachers’ contracts.

A work stoppage, on the other hand, was something for which the union membership was almost totally unprepared. Over the summer the leadership had done nothing to ready the rank and file of the union for the battle they would face. A strike would also most assuredly have faced a hostile community, to which the press had constantly been feeding many accusations about the teachers’ greed.

The teachers’ dilemma can best be understood by viewing what the union leadership had reported as the Board of Education’s first offer.

The teachers would have to agree to return to the 1970’s pay schedule, thereby obliterating the minor pay advance made in the school year 1971-72. In addition, the cuts would be forthcoming on sick days and holidays.

Days when teachers are required to be in attendance to do the bureaucracy’s work necessary to run a school – record days – would also be worked without pay.

Preparation periods, for which teachers had fought hard in the past, would be no more.

The school day for elementary students would be cut in half with corresponding cuts in the salaries of their teachers. To top the entire “agreement” off, the school board asked that the union waive collective bargaining for these and other budgetary cuts that would prove necessary, and allow individual principals the power to fully implement these measures.

The whole package would have spelled catastrophe for the teachers and the virtual collapse of public education in Detroit.

Instead of proposing an alliance with elements of the community for quality education, the union did nothing, partly in an apparent effort to withhold legitimacy from local community-school boards.

But when the first day of school arrived, there was a big sigh of relief by the teachers. The Executive Board of the union reported that the Board of Education had “crumbled,” and offered an acceptance of the agreement.

The contract was essentially that of last year with some sizable chunks cut out. It gives teachers last year’s salary, but took away a formula which gave them parity with other districts in the area.

Class size remains in the same muddled state as last year. A week’s “de-freeze of teachers’ pay” is a stated possibility within the contract.

There is no assurance that the contract will last the full year. On April 1, the agreement may be shredded “by either party” – except that the union may not violate it for a higher salary demand.

This package would ordinarily seal the doom for the union leadership. It is not only made no advances; it made significant cuts.

But because of the crisis posed to the members, it looked like a contract from God and was enthusiastically ratified.

One is left with the suspicion that the Board’s “first offer” was designed to bring about this reaction.

Detroit
James Arthur

Teachers in Detroit’s 341 public schools, all members of the Detroit Federation of Teachers, awaited the first week in September with a great deal of trepidation. To even the most conservative teachers, the Board of Education’s offer reported by their union leadership was totally unacceptable. To work under the terms demanded by the Board of Education (outlined below) would have been tantamount to signing away collective bargaining rights and the obliteration of almost every progressive item won in previous teachers’ contracts.
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The famous “two-party system” in America is really one party—the property party, of which the Republicans and Democrats are merely two competing factions. So declared the muckraker Kendrick Lundberg over 30 years ago, looking at the American parties with their subservience to business and their domination by the super-rich. This is still true today.

However, muckrakers like Lundberg have never fully understood the relation between the super-rich and their parties and the government. The more scientific dictionary of modern government is not Lundberg’s, but that of Marx in The Communist Manifesto. The executive of the modern state is but a commanding masonry of the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

The government often does favors for one particular business interest, as the Nixon Administration, for instance, did for ITT & [see Worker’s Power No. 64]. But more generally, the capitalist government acts as manager for the entire capitalist class, representing the interests of the capitalist system as a whole even more than those of any one section of business. The truth of Marx’s definition can be seen from the actions of the President in office—any president, of either party. Nixon’s “New Economic Policy” and “Phase II,” for example, represent the interests of the capitalist class—limits on wage increases, for measures to increase productivity increasing the speed and intensity of work, etc.

At the same time, Nixon’s measures reveal the weakness of government regulation in a capitalist economy. Since the very purpose of his controls is to increase profits, his Price Board has made only half-hearted efforts to control the big corporations.

In foreign policy too, the President represents the interests of American capitalism, and in moments of crisis the interests of the world capitalist system as a whole. This can be seen in any negotiation of tariffs or trade terms, or in more violent cases as the President intervenes abroad to protect American business interests.

Recent examples of intervention, even before Vietnam, included President Eisenhower sending marines to Lebanon in 1958; Kennedy’s invasion of the Bay of Pigs in 1961; Johnson’s use of troops to crush a popular insurrection in the Dominican Republic in 1965.

The grander and more solemn farces are reserved for bigger crises. In the Marshall Plan following World War II and in the long armed confrontation with the Soviet Union known as the Cold War, American capitalism rebuilds the European capitalist economies which were in danger of collapse.

At the same time, the US extended an armed shield against the possibility of capitalist exploitation being replaced in Europe by Stalinist exploitation. Whether Republicans or Democrats held office, the same policy was followed—American capitalism defending the capitalist system as a whole.

In representing capitalist interests in the world arena, the US president does not necessarily speak for a united capitalist class. The conflict among political and business leaders over the Vietnam war since 1968 represents the feeling of a large section of business that a losing war is no benefit to American imperialist interests.

Other sections of the capitalist class, and those responsible for carrying out the war policy, feel that to allow a defeat would be a worse loss for American interests than to fight uselessly without winning.

Similarly on the domestic scene the President has been known to intervene against the interests of some business concern for the good of the capitalist class as a whole. For example, in 1962 President Kennedy used threats to force US Steel and other steel firms to withdraw a scheduled price increase. Similar incidents have occurred before and since. Kennedy’s concern, however, was not to champion the interests of consumers against the corporations in general—it was to implement his economic policy, a policy which attempted to use tax incentives and other means to stimulate business activity without too much inflation.

Kennedy favored a policy, in other words, which benefited business as a whole and which took precedence over the immediate interests of US Steel.

A bigger and more instructive example of government intervention in the New Deal of President Roosevelt. The Roosevelt years are usually thought of as years of reform. In reality, two quite different kinds of reform were involved.

These were years in which labor unions first won the right to organize. While Roosevelt sponsored legislation to legalize unions, the occurred following the explosive upsurge of strikes in 1934, and in an effort to keep it from becoming even more explosive (see Workers’ Power No. 62). When police shot down strikers at Republic Steel in 1937, Roosevelt’s comment was, “A plague on both your houses.” His hope was to keep unionism within limits.

At the same time, Roosevelt was the first president to intervene in the economy on a large scale. This too earned him the reputation of a reformer, was bitterly resented by many conservative businessmen, and fooled quite a few radicals.

But the cooler heads knew that this intervention was necessary to save a sick capitalist economy; the historian Arthur Schlesinger, a fanatical admirer of Roosevelt, later wrote that Roosevelt “saved capitalism from the capitalists.”

Another historian, Barton Bernstein, has recently showed that an important section of business leaders backed Roosevelt against Hoover in 1932 because the old fashioned Hoover refused to use government intervention on a large scale.

Thus Roosevelt, like Truman and Eisenhower in the Cold War, like Kennedy in Cuba and against US Steel, like Johnson and Nixon in Vietnam and like Nixon with his NIP, used the Presidency to promote the interests of the capitalist system as a whole.

Not all Presidents see these interests correctly, of course. As already mentioned, an important section of capitalist opinion has long felt that Johnson and Nixon have not seen American imperialist interests correctly in Vietnam.

But, despite the reformers’ hopes, the basic fact remains that not one President, in all US history, has carried out or attempted to carry out a program which opposed the interests of the capitalist class in any important way.

**Bourgeois Democracy**

The “democracy” which is found today in the United States and other capitalist states is referred to by Marxists as “bourgeois democracy.” The bourgeoisie are the modern class of capitalists, owners of the industries and banks and large-scale employers of wage labor.

By “bourgeois democracy,” Marxists mean that despite the apparent democracy of frequent elections, etc., this system is a mechanism for maintaining the social power of the bourgeoisie and managing its affairs.

This is so, first, because the government, dominated at every level by the rich and their hirelings, acts as a political representative of the capitalist class, while its so-called “regulatory” agencies and planning bureaus actually function as aids to capitalist economic planning.

Second, bourgeois democracy respects and protects private property. This means that when a worker one steps through the plant gate or office door, he or she is under the almost absolute authority of management. Government intervenes only rarely.

(Continued on page 11)
On the morning of September 4, 1972, Warren K. Billings died quietly in a hospital in Redwood City, California. It was strangely fitting that he should die on Labor Day, for he had spent sixty of his 79 years fighting for the working class, nearly 25 of them in prison.

Victims of one of the most notorious frame-ups in modern history, Billings and his associate Tom Mooney had been for 23 years international symbols of class injustice. On July 22, 1916, the “Law and Order” Committee of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce staged a massive “Preparedness Day” parade as a demonstration for militarism and against labor union “lawlessness” (employer code for picketing). Thousands of non-union employees were forced to march on pain of dismissal.

At 2:00 p.m., a bomb exploded in the crowd of spectators, killing 10 people and wounding 40 others. The makers of the bomb, even its type and composition, will never be known. The police destroyed and altered all evidence, and didn't follow up any eyewitness testimony which conflicted with the case they manufactured against their pre-selected victins.

Within 5 days, 6 people were arrested and charged with a “red conspiracy” to terrorize the people of California. They were Tom Mooney, a leading radical in the Iron Molders Union and secretary of the International Labor Defense Committee; his wife Rena, a music teacher; Warren Billings, president of the local Boot & Shoe Makers Union; Ed Nolan, a radical leader of the Machinists; Israel Weinberg, president of the Jinney Drivers' Union; and Belle Lavin, proprietor of a boarding house in which a number of radicals lived.

All six were illegally arrested without warrants and their homes illegally searched; all were held incommunicado and denied attorneys until after they were indicted.

There was no evidence whatsoever to connect any of them with the bombing. Charges against Belle Lavin were dropped when it became apparent that even the frameworps experts of the D.A.'s office would be unable to manufacture a case against her, but the other five were indicted for first degree murder.

The main target of the prosecution was Tom Mooney, who had been a thorn in the side of San Francisco employers since 1910. Mooney had been the intended victim of several unsuccessful frameups earlier.

Warren Billings was a close associate of Mooney. After graduating from grammar school in Brooklyn, he had worked as a shoemaker and street car conductor. When he landed in California at the age of 19, he was on his way to Mexico to join the revolution there, but stopped to look for work for awhile.

Billings took the dangerous job of entering a struck shoe factory as an union spy among the scabs. He reported to Tom Mooney, who had volunteered to aid the shoe workers in organizing picketing and persuading scabs to change their ways.

Billings' first arrest was for “assault” on three company guards during the strike. When the judge compared the three six foot guards with the 5-foot, 4-inch Billings, he threw the case out of court. Billings had done three months awaiting trial.

In September, 1913, Billings got his first taste of the frameup technique. Engaged by an agent provocateur to carry a suitcase full of dynamite to striking Pacific Gas & Electric workers in Sacramento, he was arrested on his arrival by Martin Swanson, head of the Pinkerton Detective Agency in San Francisco. Billings got two years in Folsom Prison.

On the evening after the Preparedness Day bombing District Attorney Fickert (who had been elected by campaign contributions from PG&E and United Railroad, where Mooney had led an unsuccessful unionizing drive) secretly appointed the same Martin Swanson, by this time the head of PG&E’s “Utilities Investigation Bureau,” as special investigator of the bombing.

While Swanson was busy digging up “evidence” (every one of whom was subsequently proved to be a perverter), District Attorney Fickert himself had the embarrassment of being photographed while altering physical evidence. A prominent banker and official of the Chamber of Commerce was assisting him.

The trials were conducted in an atmosphere of hysteria created by the District Attorney and the San Francisco press. Billings, who had a previous record, was tried first and got life imprisonment. Mooney, up next, was sentenced to death.

Rena Mooney and Israel Weinberg were acquitted, but immediately re-arrested on additional murder charges. But with each successive trial the defense was discrediting more of the state's witnesses and evidence, and producing an increasing parade of suppressed evidence and eye-witnesses who had been told to "go home" by the police.

Finally, the additional indictments against Weinberg and Rena Mooney were dropped, and Ed Nolan was never tried at all.

Mooney might have been execut-ed and Billings forgotten in prison if not for intervention from the international labor movement. In a mass display of solidarity, tens of thousands of Russian workers demonstrated for Mooney and Billings outside the American embassy in Petrograd. The British Labor Party and the Netherlands Federation of Labor demanded a new trial.

The Seattle Central Labor Council called a 10-minute general strike and there was mounting sentiment for a national general strike and boycott of California products. In an effort to take some of the heat off, the governor of California commuted Mooney's sentence to life imprisonment.

Mooney and Billings spent the next 23 years in prison. A series of campaigns for their freedom were mounted. Despite the destruction of every shred of the prosecution's case, together with public statements by both the judge who sentenced Mooney and the Assistant District Attorney who charged Billings that they should have been acquitted, five successive governors of California refused to pardon them or further commute their sentences.

Even after Mooney was pardoned in 1939, Billings remained in jail for nearly 17 years. As a second offender, he couldn't be pardoned by the governor without the consent of the State Supreme Court.

That consent was being blocked by Attorney General Earl Warren, a reactionary Republican who had been promoted to state office as a reward for his good work in strike-breaking as District Attorney of Alameda County. (Warren, an expert witness with the ride, didn't become a "liberal" until some years later.)

Billings was finally released in 1947, with a commutation of sentence rather than a full pardon.

Billings had not been dead in prison. He had taught himself several languages, became an expert correspondence chess player, and secretly made the tools with which he taught himself to repair watches.

When Billings left prison, he became a fulltime watchmaker, but continued his work in defense of political prisoners and also joined in political rehabilitation work in aid of ordinary convicts.

Despite his dislike of the Commu-nists, he served as national chair-man of a committee to defend Earl Browder from a phony passport violation charge.

In his seventies, Billings continued to fight. He was one of the most active members of the Committee to Free Morton Sobell, from whose trial the Rosenbergs on espionage charges. As an officer of the Watchmakers Union and one of its delegates to the San Mateo County Central Labor Council, he played a leading role in the campaigns which led to that body's becoming the first Central Labor Council in the country to come out against the Vietnam War.

To his dying day, Billings was reached and he made his name the symbol of any fight for peace, justice or the rights of the working class. Although he was never a member of any political organization, he consistently reaffirmed his faith in the ability of the working class to create a classless and stateless society.
Review: George Jackson Blood in My Eye

David Finkel


George Jackson was a black revolutionary who was murdered by guards at San Quentin Prison in August, 1971. One year earlier his younger brother Jonathan had been gunned down leading the Marin County jailbreak attempt.

George Jackson had spent 11 years in California prisons since his conviction for a $70 gas station robbery at age 18. During his years in prison he evolved into a dedicated political revolutionary whom the prison system was determined to exterminate.

At the time of his murder he was a defendant in the trial of the "Sole- dad Brothers," charged with the kidnapping of a San Quentin prison guard (charges on which Fletta Drumgo and John Cluchette were acquitted earlier this year).

The written legacy of George Jackson consists of two small books of letters and essays: Solitary Brother and the newly published Blood in My Eye. While armies of academic social scientists every year publish dozens and hundreds of works of mediocre and trivial "scholarship," the black revolutionary had to attempt to compress his entire world-view, the entire record of his political development, into a few hundred pages of manuscript written in solitary confinement.

Jackson's work would be of interest only for the circumstances under which it was written: "Stating in a special locked isolation cell, sometimes even with the lock welded shut, and... no one to talk to... just the sound of screaming voices, I was strictly myself. The only friend I had was a book. Sometimes I'd find myself talking out loud to the author..."

In fact, however, Blood in My Eye has a significance far beyond the struggle of an individual revolutionary against the prison system's attempts at physical and psychological mutilation. Jackson gives a concise and cogent presentation of the strategy put forward by the Black Panther Party during its "urban guerrilla warfare" phase of 1969-70.

In outlining this strategy, the author enables us to get a close look at the Panthers' attempts to work out a theory of revolution in American society, and the political weaknesses which led to their collapse.

Black Colony

The Panthers' conception of black people in the United States as a "Black Colony" whose liberation would be accomplished by a separately organized elite military vanguard, adapting Maoist and Guerrierean tactics of guerrilla warfare to an urban industrial setting, provided a framework for the development of Jackson's ideas.

Jackson was a committed supporter of the Panthers and their leader, Huey P. Newton. It is evident from his writing, however, that he derived his own conclusions and style from a careful, independent study of an enormous amount of material covering widely varied areas of history, philosophy and social theory.

He appears to have read everything he could lay hands on in prison, from William Shiner and Wilhelm Reich to Hegel and Nietzsche, and committed himself to the task of organizing it into a systematic theory and strategy of revolution.

In no way can Blood in My Eye be taken as a finished theoretical statement. Jackson's ideas were clearly going through an extremely rapid process of development. Much of his discussion of fascism, for example, comes across almost as disjointed sets of fragmentary ideas, set down hastily in first-draft form as the author sensed the immediate threat to his own life.

Nonetheless, this book is a remarkable document of a phase in the evolution of a black revolutionary, an evolution which might have led to revolution had it not been cut short.

In working out his ideology, Jackson addresses himself to a great many of the crucial questions facing the black movement and all revolutionaries in this country: the problem of white racism in America, the problem of resisting repression, the origins and development of fascism, the nature of the American working class, the location of the center of power in American society and how to attack them.

Unfortunately, Jackson's answers to these questions are generally incomplete, distorted or totally unsatisfactory. Since he was trying to adapt a guerrillaist theory to an industrial society, he spends most of the book discussing military tactics—shooting down police helicopters, destroying the system's productive capacity through urban civil war, developing guerrilla super-fighters, and so forth.

In this discussion, carrying the Panthers' ideology to a logical conclusion, he brings out the elitist character of guerrillaism and unusual clarity of thought. He sees one of the main strengths of urban guerrillas as their ability to revolutionize the masses by provoking massive state repression against innocent citizens.

Jackson's search for a social force on which to base this utopian strategy leads directly away from the working class, although he makes some attempt to integrate class struggle into his strategy and even at times implies that he sees a revolutionary historical potential in the working class.

He regards most of the organized working class as a "pig class" organized by the "fascists" in support of the system through concessions and racist ideology. For the most part he sees the unions as agencies of the state to be destroyed.

Jackson's treatment of the black working class consists only of discussing its organization into "black communes." He had not yet developed the concept that black workers, not because of a "colonial" position but because of their crucial position in industry, can play a leading role in the struggle of the entire working class.

Fascism

Jackson also attempts to show that the United States has been a "fascist" state for twenty or more years, that the prosperity, economic centralization and political repression following World War II reduced the working class and its "vanguard organizations" to complete powerlessness and co-operation into the system.

In developing this theory, the Panthers made the mistake of generalizing too broadly from their own repression (the murder of black militants, after all, is part and parcel of bourgeois democracy in America). It was precisely the post-war prosperity, based on spreading and other waste, that enabled American capitalism to "solve" for a period the economic crisis that had given rise to fascist movements.

What followed for the Panthers from their analysis of the "Black Colony" and "Fascism" was that the class struggle was frozen. Their strategy would be to organize an underground military structure (combined with programs to save the people), trying to "create the consciousness that comes from the introduction of people's government" through providing community services.

Jackson did not foresee that the Panthers' tragic (but understandable) outcome would be the almost inevitable result of this "dual induct" program. One half of the military organization was crushed by police murder and discredited in the black community, the Panthers' community service programs became a reformist disaster. Today, the Panthers' revolutionary rhetoric is almost muted, while their real activity consists of organizing voter registration drives for the Democratic Party in California.

It is impossible for us to know how Jackson would have reacted to this development in the Panthers, which had barely begun to emerge at the time of his death. We can, however, note the way in which he attempted to exactly and closely work out the conclusions of the Panthers' theory, which he supported. Also striking is the depth of many of his insights into the psychology of the oppressors and the oppressed. These insights were intensified by the fact that Jackson observed the workings of this psychology under the most brutal circumstances.

Felt in this critical light, Blood in My Eye takes its place in the extremely rich tradition of literature produced by political prisoners throughout the history of the international movement.
Uganda: Fighting Poverty With Racism

James Coleman

On September 13 the military government of Uganda, headed by General Amin, threatened to put up to 50,000 ethnic Asians in concentration camps as of November 8. The order would apply to Ugandan Asians holding British passports, whom Amin in 1966 had ordered to leave Uganda, but who will not all be able to leave by that date.

Most Asians never hear of countries like Uganda except at such moments - moments of threats to non-Africans, usually Americans but sometimes others. Then, the American press uses such incidents to convince the public that African political leaders are incompetent.

Naturally, the press focuses on Amin's racist attack on Asians, but says little about Britain's racist refusal to grant them entry.

In Britain, right-wing politicians have long attempted to convince workers that non-white immigrants are responsible for Britain's sagging economy.

Moreover, the press never investigates the incredible poverty of 2 million Ugandans. They remain invisible, because they are Africans and the victims of imperialism rather than its perpetrators or agents.

Yet, the expulsion of the Asians is directly connected with the failure of Uganda to break free from poverty, which results from a world market controlled by the industrialized capitalist countries of the West.

For 10 years, since the achievement of independence from Britain in 1962, Uganda has remained locked in economic backwardness. Its income depends on exports of coffee and cotton. Both products are sold on the London market, where prices vary according to supply - so that no matter how big a crop Uganda produces, the price drops accordingly.

In 1971, Uganda's income from exports remained at the level of $125 million a year, despite bigger crops. The result is continued poverty not only for the farmers who make up most of Uganda's population, but for the 200,000 wage earners, most of whom work in agricultural processing industries.

In the meantime, 4 percent of the Ugandan population owns 8 percent of the plantations, mines and factories. The largest industries, import firms, and banks are British-owned.

Independence in 1962 did not mean independence from the double grip of agricultural poverty and British ownership. The first president, Milton Obote, collaborated with the British. When Uganda continued in poverty, Obote began in 1969 to nationalize some firms, as well as banning opposition parties to head off the growing discontent.

Obote still did not dare to attack British interests too strongly. After the nationalization announcement, Obote announced an agreement with the largest British bank for increased investment - but his measures antagonized Uganda's British-trained army officers. With help from British and Israeli advisers, they overthrew Obote in early 1971.

At the time, Workers' Power wrote: "The Army cannot solve Uganda's problems, or those of other African states." (No. 30)

The last 18 months have fulfilled this unhappy prediction. General Amin, the new ruler, has failed to raise Uganda's income or the living standards of its people. His order to expel those Asians who have retained British citizenship, like an earlier expulsion of Israeli technicians, is an attempt to focus popular resentment on a scapegoat.

Uganda's Asians came to Africa in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as middle-men for British imperialist imperialism. Today they form a Ugandan middle class. Some are shopkeepers, others professionals and businessmen.

They are not the real owners of Uganda's backward economy. But as the visible well-to-do, and as a racial minority, they are easy targets. Amin's cruel order will solve no problems for Uganda. At most, it will let a few well-placed friends of the generals get their hands on the Asians' assets. It cannot end Uganda's poverty. To do so would require a takeover of all the British firms and the larger African capitalist enterprises.

In addition, any serious solution would require economic and political cooperation first on an East African level, then on a continental level. It would require an end to the white-dominated, foreign-owned economies of Southern Africa - and even this would only buy breathing space as long as the world markets remained dominated by the United States and other capitalist states.

These measures could hardly be carried out through the present African governments, most of which have long since sold themselves to one or another imperialist power. Such policies would require as a pre-condition revolutionary governments committed to carrying them out.

Naturally, the United States, Britain, and the rest, want no part of such policies. Any African regime which even begins to move in such a direction can expect to face subservision from Western states. Amin is not about to try.

Amin himself cannot last. In a few months or a year or two, a new coup will remove him, the hapless servant of British imperialism. But a new coup, or elections such as have occurred in Ghana in West Africa since the 1966 coup there, will not solve things either.

"Independent" Africa, caught in neo-colonial exploitation, is in for a period of political instability which will last until the African working class is able to spearhead a movement against neo-colonialism and capitalism.

Elections

(Continued from page 8) and, in big disputes such as national strikes, intervenes on the side of management.

The idea that commerce and industry cannot be under the control of a tiny class of owners is rejected by the bourgeois parties, and by all bourgeois reformers.

Third, while the voters can choose their government, the bourgeois influence over this process is enormous. We have seen in earlier articles that, by the time a candidate is selected by one of the two capitalist parties, he is as tame as a kitten.

If not, he will find himself without friends in the press and without checks in his bank account.

Fourth, while the bourgeoisie regards bourgeois democracy as a good system for its purposes, its actual support for this system melts away when real threats to capitalist interests appear.

The bourgeoisie will often live with the results of a reform election as long as the "reforms" do not really threaten capitalist interests. But if the government does not furnish protection to capitalist interests at every level, the capitalists soon begin to look elsewhere.

For all these reasons, bourgeois democracy is often referred to by a less polite name - the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Bourgeois democracy is no more nor less than a tool to safeguard and carry out the control of social life at all levels by the capitalist class.

For this reason, it is when this control is in danger, when social crisis begins to grow, that the bourgeoisie reveals how shallow is its commitment even to the limited freedoms of bourgeois democracy.

[The final article in this series will discuss elections and the crisis of capitalism.]
Socialist Workers Movement Meets in Ireland

This past summer, the Socialist Workers Movement of Ireland held its national conference in Dublin. Delegates from the organization's various branches as well as fraternal delegates from the International Socialists of Great Britain and the United States attended.

The two-day conference dealt with a broad range of questions facing the Irish and international socialist movement. The pivot of the discussion, of course, centered on the tasks of revolutionaries in Ireland today.

At this conference the SWM reaffirmed and amplified on its view of the nature of the coming Irish revolution. This view stresses the necessity of combining the struggle against national oppression and imperialism with a workers' struggle for socialism.

For both wings of the Irish Republican Army (IRA) -- and the groupings clustered around them -- the Irish revolution will consist of two distinct and interrelated stages. Stage one is to be the "national struggle of all classes" for national independence and unity.

Only once the "national" goals are achieved -- by some unspecified means -- will the IRA's "war of national resistance" against the Irish capitalists.

On the Irish left today, the Socialist Workers Movement is the only group which understands the impossibility of separating the "national" and the working class goals and which actively fights to unite them.

For a Socialist Ireland

In Northern Ireland, Great Britain rules directly. In the South, where nominal independence has been achieved, British imperialism still rules indirectly, through the Lynch government.

This is inevitable given the continued domination of British capital over the Irish economy. Real independence from British and world imperialism, therefore, cannot be won until the economic bondage is ended.

This can only be accomplished by the Irish workers' movement, or North and South, expropriating the holdings of foreign investors and turning them into the common property of the entire Irish working class.

The various layers of the Irish capitalist class and their hangers-on, however -- far from being natural allies, much less dependable leaders, for such a movement -- are tied hand and foot to British and world imperialism.

The Irish bourgeoisie depends upon foreign investors for the capital which keeps them going. Ireland's petty or would-be capitalists cannot afford to drive their big brothers out of Ireland.

Even a purely "national" Irish capitalist system exists only as a myth -- would still be at the mercy of the international market in trade and finance -- a market which, of course, is once again controlled by the major imperialist powers.

Only by building a movement firmly based on the working class and waging an uncompromising campaign against all capitalists, both "native" and foreign, can the battle against imperialism and for national liberation be advanced.

As the SWM declares, "In the present period the struggle against national oppression can only be successfully concluded with the coming to power of the working class, with the achievement of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

While resolutely defending the Catholic community in the North from attack, the SWM understands that the present polarization of the Ulster working class can only be overcome by a movement of the entire class against the Irish and British capitalists.

In the absence of such a movement and of revolutionary socialist leadership, the only alternative which Protestant workers can see to their current alieance with Protestant and British capitalists is absorption into Jack Lynch's state. This is a state dominated by "Green" capitalists and the Catholic Church, in which the Protestant workers would find themselves both poorer and a persecuted minority.

All the sessions of the SWM national conference reflected this understanding. A number of social issues were discussed which face the Irish working class and which a socialist movement will therefore have to confront.

One paper presented, entitled "Women and Society," initiated a discussion on the SWM's role in the struggle for women's liberation. It pointed out that because of the Catholic Church's tremendous power in the Irish Republic, the struggle to obtain elementary rights like abortion reform, divorce, and birth control will be especially bitter and will require an especially powerful movement to succeed.

Thus far, however, the organized women's liberation movement in Ireland (as in the US) has failed to reach beyond the middle class to working class women. The SWM sees as critically the need to bring working class women into the movement, and to bring the movement to working class women to extend the scope of the movement's concerns to the needs of working class women.

In its paper, The Worker, as well as in daily activity, the SWM addresses such concerns as the fights for equal pay, for child care, and tenants' strikes, while explaining the connections between women's exploitation on the job and their oppression at home and throughout the society.

Since women compose a significant part of the work force in the low-pay, labor-intensive, foreign-owned firms, their struggle often embodies the fusion of the national, working class, and women's liberation struggles.

Anti-Labor Offensive

Another session of the conference dealt with industrial perspectives. As in the United States and the rest of the capitalist world, the Lynch government is seeking a new offensive against labor.

This offensive includes wage controls, productivity deals and the rest. And as in the United States, the official union leadership is doing little or nothing to organize and fight back.

Like the International Socialists, the SWM sees as crucial the initiation and development of rank and file groups at the workplace to fight the state-employer offensive and to turn the unions into democratic and militant fighting organizations.

Closely bound up with other discussions was a consideration of the state of the Irish economy, especially the impact which the recent entry of Great Britain and the Republic into the Common Market is likely to have on Ireland's workers and small farmers.

The entry reflects and will accelerate the integration of the Irish economy into the larger European economy and the competitive pressures exerted upon Irish-based firms by those of the Continent.

The final session of the conference was devoted to international perspectives. Just as socialist revolution in Ireland is necessary for the development of national liberty, socialist revolution on a world scale will be crucial to the successful building of socialism in Ireland.

To that end, the SWM declared itself "engaged in the struggle for the creation of a mass working class organization in Ireland as part of the fight for a new and genuine International" and "welcomes and encourages the development of fraternal links with other socialist organizations with this perspective."

The SWM sees, as preliminary steps towards the formation of a real international, ongoing contacts at both the international level among socialist groups, both in joint discussions as well as practical cooperation in struggle.\n
\n
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French CP ends efforts to suppress revolutionary newspaper

The attempt by the CGT (France's largest trade union federation, dominated by the Communist Party) to interfere with the distribution of the revolutionary socialist newspaper Lutte Ouvrièrse seems to have been abandoned.

Lutte Ouvrièrse made it clear that its supporters in the newspaper distributors' organization controlled by the CGT would not be intimidated into giving up their bi-weekly revolutionary bulletin. This bulletin is one of many published throughout France by supporters of Lutte Ouvrièrse, which attacks the bureaucratization and class collaborationist policies of the CGT.

After widespread protests from left groups, and a CGT denial of interference with Lutte Ouvrièrse, the Communist Party paper L'Humanite' opened editorially that on two occasions the newspaper had not been sent out to the provinces. Since then, the CGT has changed its line and now denies any interference with the distribution of Lutte Ouvrièrse. This is the CP's way of retreating without admitting anything.

Popular opposition grows in Bangla Desh over food crisis

Reports from Bangla Desh indicate the growth of a popular opposition movement demanding measures against the growing threat of famine.

In the past few weeks prominent coverage of the food shortage and economic crisis of the country has begun to appear in section of the press, especially in the papers sympathetic to political currents to the left of the ruling Awami League.

The weekly Holiday of Dacca makes the assessment that "the ill-starred Bengali nation is once again in the grip of a crisis, one whose magnitude and dimension surpass anything of this nature in the history of this land. In plain words, there is simply not enough food for this nation of 75 million."

The social factors behind the food crisis include the fact that 40 percent of the peasantry is unemployed and without support. Rising prices have made simple items like cloth a luxury beyond the reach of the masses. At the same time, accounts of corruption and fraud inside the government bureaucracy are widespread.

While every political group, from the ruling Awami League to the far left, is trying to mobilize support around the food shortage problem, the lead has been taken by the veteran pro-Maoist leader Maulana Shuabani, whose calls for mass hunger marches have attracted "wide support," according to Holiday.

Although no organized revolutionary vanguard exists in Bangla Desh, the possibility of a revolutionary crisis developing from the food shortage cannot be discounted.

There is also the possibility of new intervention from India, which cannot be expected to stand by as opposition forces begin to threaten the stability of the regime of Mujibur Rahman (who is currently out of the country for medical treatment).

Frame-up of Puerto Rican militant to be appealed in New York

The case of Eduardo Pancho Cruz, a young Puerto Rican militant, will be appealed in late September. Charged with possession of explosives, Cruz was sentenced to seven years in a New York prison early this year.

During his trial, a chemist testified that none of the substances Pancho had in his car at the time of arrest were explosives or used in making explosives.

This case is part of the increasing crackdown by New York police against Puerto Rican militants. The judge, Harold Birns, and the prosecuting attorney, John Fine, are notorious for their racist appeals and anti-left hysteria. They have previously tried such cases as the Tombs Brothers.

Cruz, confined to solitary, has become blind in one eye. He has also suffered stomach disorders without receiving adequate medical care.

Cruz's family, which lives in a public housing project, has been harassed and threatened with eviction.

To support the defense, write to: Committee to Defend Eduardo Cruz, Post Office Box 71, Puck Slip Station Post Office, New York, NY 10038.

Andres Figueroa Cordero dying after 18 years in US jail

Andres Figueroa Cordero was one of the Puerto Rican nationalist militants who fired on the US Congress in March, 1954. Faced by the brutality of US colonialism, he and several other nationalists carried out their act as a protest against colonialism and the repression of the Nationalist Party.

After 18 years in US prisons, Andres Figueroa Cordero is dying of intestinal cancer. The United Front to Defend Puerto Rican Political Prisoners is carrying out a campaign to free Andres, so that he may spend his last days with his family and friends.

[For information, write to: United Front to Defend Puerto Rican Political Prisoners, Box 3, Planetarium Station, New York, NY 10024.]

Housing shortage triggers Turkish-Dutch race riots in Rotterdam

After two nights of race riots in Rotterdam, in mid-August, authorities in the Netherlands were reported as "ferociously hoping for heavy rain" to prevent further clashes between Turkish immigrant workers and Dutch inhabitants of a crowded residential district.

The tension leading to the riots resulted from housing shortages. Dutch and Turkish tenants and landladies began forcing each other out of houses, culminating in an incident in which a group of Dutch people forced their way into a Turkish boarding house and threw the furniture into the street.

The number of immigrant workers from Turkey, Spain, Morocco, Yugoslavia, and other economically depressed countries in Holland number about 40,000. Isolated from the native population by racism and language barriers, they are usually concentrated in poorer parts of the major cities and towns.

While the government prays for rain as its solution to the racial conflict, a "socialist" Dutch trade union federation (the NVV) has adopted a violently chauvinist and racist stance. Calling for barriers on immigration, the union demanded that "in admitting foreign workers the effects on a district or city, and also its effect on the country as a whole, should be taken into account.

It is not only in the US that racial and national minorities are "not wanted" on the same street with the whites.

Capitalist coalition may be ousted by Australian Labor Party

After 23 years of conservative government, Australia seems likely to elect a Labor government in the coming elections. The election date will be in late October or November.

During a campaign under the slogan "It's Time, the Australian Labor Party (ALP) has a lot of appeal to the majority of Australians, who feel that it is indeed time for social change.

Labor's leaders, however, mostly mean that it's time the ALP got a chance to show how skillfully it can run capitalism, and defuse working class militancy and social unrest. A significant section of the business community is willing to give it the chance.

The government, a coalition of the Liberal and Country parties, is split over protective tariff policies which anger powerful wool and mining interests, and over the unemployment by American and other foreign companies in the Australian economy. It is also saddled with a ludicrously incompetent prime minister, William "Big Ears" McMahon.

Labor on its side must deal with its Socialist Left faction, which represents leaders of the committee to the trade unions and to social movements, and with the campaign of leftist leader Barry Johnstone, ALP candidate for federal parliament.

Labor will be hard to defeat, especially since many Australians have never known a Labor government. The opposition is by no means the post-war Chifley government is long forgotten, and illusions are very wide-spread about what the ALP would do in power.

Socialists in Australia are supporting Labor as the mass party of the working class, but warning that only a determined struggle can force it to carry through more than token reforms.

[Thanks to Ron Fleshy for this item.]
by the “Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine” in May. These are the depths to which Israel has descended, though not for the first time.

The deeper and more important distinction, however, lies in the character of the forces involved. Israel’s actions are those of an established state, complete with a full military and police apparatus. The Israeli government stands before the world wrapped in the legitimacy accorded to any official state. This Zionist state, whose existence rests on the expulsion and expropriation of another nation—the Palestinian Arabs—carries out a calculated, premeditated strategy of terror against an oppressed and disfranchised population.

The guerrillas represent neither a state nor an apparatus. Their actions are a reflection of the oppression of the Palestinians and the crushing of their national liberation movement during the Jordan Civil War in 1970 (from which the Black September group takes its name).

Their desperate attempts to employ terrorist methods—not as an adjunct, but rather as a substitute for, a glaring sign of a defeated and victimized people.

To say this is not, however, to give political support to the Black September commandos and their actions. The context of revolutionary opposition to Zionism, it remains necessary to make a sober assessment of the motivation and the effects of these actions.

The military objective of freeing imprisoned guerrillas, though legitimate, was fundamentally a hopeless one. To accomplish this objective would require an alliance between a massive new Palestinian liberation movement and an internationalist force. 

Labor Party

(Continued from page 1)

The building of an independent labor party in the United States, in collaboration with movements of the oppressed, would be the greatest step forward for the American working class since the struggles of the 1930’s which built the CIO.

As a political weapon of the labor movement, such a party would provide an alternative to the Democrats’ and Republicans’ electoral shell game. But its significance would far beyond the electoral arena. It would be a political force to defend workers in all their struggles.

And all movements of the oppressed, as well as every section of the population suffering from the decay of the capitalist system, would look to a working class party as their ally, as they looked to the CIO in the 1930’s.

The formation of a labor party is not only a historic need, but the urgent need of today. Another four years under the government of either the Democrats or the Republicans will only worsen the position of the US working class.

The real tragedy of the 1972 election is that no such independent party of the working class exists today. The top AFL-CIO officials’ refusal to endorse McGovern is unfortunately not a step in this direction. It represents only their anger at the Democrats’ refusal to choose a more conciliatory candidate and their own loss of power inside the Democratic Party. Malignants in the trade unions as well as in the minority communities can begin now to help break the illusions of most workers and oppressed, with the realization that the Democrats are a “lesser evil” or a positive alternative to Nixon. The call for independent political action by labor, for an independent party of labor and the oppressed, should be raised in every union. A rank and file movement must be built today to carry forward the fight for such a party.
Repression

[Continued from page 3]

eutrophic intervention into every aspect of scientific and economic work. It is not just economists who are being purged. In every office, factory, school, university, and research facility, everyone must fill out a "family registration form," the first in history to extend to three generations.

If anyone member of the family has had a "dangerous thought" in the past four years, it becomes impossible to find work in the same field or to continue one's education. Of 4,500 writers active in August, 1968, 2,200 have been fired. Under this act, April 7, 1972, the work of a writer known ever to have held unorthodox opinions cannot be published in newspapers, magazines, books, or on radio or TV. The Journalists' Union was dissolved in September, 1969; its puppet subordinate has been the object of ongoing "purification."

At least 30,000 intellectuals have lost their jobs. Only two-thirds have been "lucky" enough to find permanent blue collar employment.

Resistance

Czechs have not taken what they call the "humiliating consequences" of the Russian occupation lying down. A Czech student, an American student, and a himself to death in protest in January, 1969, 50,000 Czechs attended his funeral. On the first anniversary of the invasion that August, demonstrations of as many as 50,000 continued for three days in Prague and other major cities.

In March, 1969, the Trade Union Congress backed student demands for "immediate freedoms on all internal political questions," defended the independence of the workers' movement from government control, called insistently for the formation of workers' councils, and, for the first time in a so-called "Communist" state, established the right to strike.

Peace, the major trade union newspaper, became a byword for resistance. The 100,000 strong metalworkers union attempted to strike if Dubcek or another popular leader, Smrkovsky, were removed.

Mass Opposition

Jiri Pelikan, still in close contact with the opposition at home, stated in a recent interview that the majority of the Czech population has still accepted neither the Russian invasion nor the Husak regime it installed. "That doesn't mean that the mass of the population is engaged in active opposition."

Nor can it be said, he continued, "that the Czech opposition is a well organized movement with a defined political conception... What is very important is that for the first time a mass socialist Marxist opposition exists in a Stalinist country... with a base openly existing among the masses."

One of the most conscious of the early groups, the Revolutionary Youth Movement, was formed by young workers, students, and technicians. Nineteen of its members were placed on trial in the spring of 1970. Their "crimes" included having read and studied the works of the great Russian revolutionary Leon Trotsky and the Polish revolutionary Kurov and Modzelewski. Husak hoped that by branding this group "Trotskyites" he could isolate them, while terrorizing more moderate oppositionists.

He had a point. The liberal oppositionists, like Dubcek, often bureaucrats or ex-bureaucrats, including the trade union leaders, sought to ward off Russian demands by making one "small" concession after another.

Frightened that the workers might get out of their control, these bureaucratic reformers cautioned against mass action. Not only did they thus seal their own fall, but they opened the door to the expulsion of 50,000 active workers from the unions and revocation of the right to strike.

The Stalinist regimes show their weakness by their inability to rule except through repression. But the waves of terror following popular movements in Hungary 1956, Czechoslovakia 1968, Poland in December 1970 have consistently shown that in order to overthrow a bureaucratic ruling class armed to the teeth, a revolutionary working class must shed all illusions that the "Communist" Parties can be reformed, or that victory can be won without "a well-defined political conception" and thorough advance preparation.

Workers' Power

WE STAND FOR SOCIALISM: the collective ownership and democratic control of the economy and the state by the working class. We stand in opposition to all forms of class society, both capitalist and bureaucratic "Communism," and in solidarity with the struggles of all exploited and oppressed people.

America is faced with a growing crisis: war, racial strife, pollution, urban decay, and the deterioration of our standard of living and working conditions. This crisis is built into capitalism, an outlier system of private profit, exploitation, and oppression. The capitalist ruling class, a tiny minority that controls the economy and politics alike, perpetuates its rule by dividing the working people against each other — white against black, male against female, young against old, rich against poor, etc. The result is greater economic chaos.

Workers' power is the only alternative to this crisis. Neither the liberal nor the conservative wings of the ruling class have any answers but greater exploitation. The struggle for workers' power is broadly based on the economic and level, and the International Socialists stand in solidarity with these struggles over wages and working conditions. To further this struggle, we call for independent rank and file workers' committees to fight when and where the unions refuse to fight. But the struggles of the workers will remain defensive and open to defeat so long as they are restricted to economic or industrial action.

The struggle must become political. Because of its economic power, the ruling class also has a monopoly on political power. It controls the government and the political parties that administer the state. More and more, the problems we face, such as inflation and unemployment, are the result of political decisions made by that class. The struggle of the working people will be deadlocked until the ranks of labor build a workers' party and carry the struggle into the political arena.

The struggle for workers' power cannot be won until the working class, as a whole, controls the government and the economy democratically. This requires a revolutionary socialist, working class party, at the head of a unified working class. No elite can accomplish this for the workers.

Nor can any part of the working class free itself at the expense of another. We stand for the liberation of all oppressed peoples: those organizations, armed self-defense, and the struggle for self-determination for Blacks, Chicano and all national minorities; the liberation of women from subordination in society and the home; the organization of homosexuals to fight their oppression. These struggles are in the interest of the working class as a whole: the bars of racism and male chauvinism can only prevent the establishment of workers' power. Oppressed groups cannot subordinate their struggle today to the present level of consciousness of white male workers: their independent organization is necessary to their fight for liberation. But we strive to unite these struggles in a common fight to end human exploitation and oppression.

The struggle for workers' power is world-wide. Class oppression and exploitation is the common condition of humanity. US corporations plunder the world's riches and drive the world's people nearer to starvation, while military intervention by the US government, serving these corporations, awaits those who dare to rebel. The "Communist" revolutions in China, Cuba and North Vietnam, while driving out US imperialism, have not brought workers' power, but a new form of class society, ruled by a bureaucratic elite.

Wherever we find a bureaucratic-collectivist ("Communist") in nature, the ruling classes of the world fight desperately to maintain their power, often against each other, always against the working class and the people. Through both domestic repression and imperialist intervention (the US in Vietnam, the USSR in Czechoslovakia), they perpetuate misery and poverty in a world of potential peace and plenty.

Socialism — the direct rule of the working class itself — exists nowhere in the world today.

We fight for the withdrawal of US troops from all foreign countries, and support all struggles for national self-determination. In Vietnam, we support the victory of the NLF over the US and its puppet; at the same time, we stand for revolutionary opposition by the working class to the incipient bureaucratic ruling class. Our socialism, established through world-wide revolution, can free humanity from exploitation and oppression; and the only force capable of building socialism is WORKERS' POWER.
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