

World Power Balance in Vietnam: Nixon on Offensive; USSR-China Temporize

The Nixon administration reacted to the initial successes registered by the April DRV/NLF offensive with brutal and provocative retaliation. Like a losing poker player who pushes all his chips into the pot, Nixon turned to the mining of the Haiphong harbor complex and the North Vietnamese coast as well as massive bombing of North Vietnam and its rail links up to China's borders. Nixon gambled with possible escalation into World War III in order to cover up and reverse the defeat of his Vietnam policies.

The North Vietnamese offensive had exploded the fraud of Vietnamization. Massive bombing of the DRV and its forces failed to halt the offensive or even prevent the flow of DRV tank columns into South Vietnam. Wherever they confronted DRV/NLF troops the ARVN forces fled in terror or capitulated outright. With the fall of Quang Tri in the northernmost province of South Vietnam the important centers of Hue and the provincial capital of Kontum in the Central Highlands were turned overnight into ghost towns manned by troops far more concerned with their escape routes than their lines of resistance. Commerce ceased and the frightened wealthier strata became refugees. Despite the notable absence of DRV shelling of Saigon, the tank victories immediately to the north around the town of An Loc added to the panic and sense of impending doom in the Thieu government and army.

Militarily, Hue was to be had for the asking, and the momentum of such a victory on the heels of triumph at Quang Tri might have placed the DRV/NLF in a nearly irresistible position of strength. Yet the offensive came to a mysterious halt. The 29 May Newsweek reported, "But the most prevalent feeling was simply bewilderment. 'I really don't understand it,' said one U.S. officer in Saigon. 'The longer the Commies wait, the better it is for the ARVN. Surely the enemy must realize this.'"

Time Out for the Summit?

At this critical point Nixon announced his military measures in the North, directed primarily at the Soviet Union. Nixon's direct statement to the Soviets in his 8 May address read in part: "We do not ask you to sacrifice your principles [!] or your friends [!]. But neither should you permit Hanoi's intransigence to blot out the prospects we together have so patiently prepared. . . . We are prepared to continue to build this relationship. The responsibility is yours if we fail to do so."

The world anticipated a repetition of the Cuban missile crisis. And this time the Soviets held most of the trump cards: In contrast to 1963, the U. S. is thousands of miles instead of 90 miles away from the scene of the conflict. The U. S. ruling class is deeply divided while the mass of the U.S. population resents the war, and the decades of Vietnamese valor and suffering have created enormous sympathy and support for their cause. In addition the clear violation of Soviet international maritime rights coupled with the improved Soviet military position compared with a decade ago made Nixon's operation a dangerous adventure.

Nevertheless Nixon's coldblooded gamble worked. The Soviets waited three days to deliver a vague ultimatum which did not even clearly assert Soviet rights in the matter. The real message was appropriately conveyed by none other than the Soviet trade ambassador who when asked if the summit was still on declared (as reported in the San Francisco Chronicle): "We never had any doubts about it, I don't know why you asked this question. Have you any doubts?"

Nixon succeeded in forcing the Soviets to acquiesce to his massive escalation of the war

continued on page 2

TELEGRAM:

Defend the DRV-NLF!

Embassy of the U.S.S.R.,
Washington, D.C.

U.N. Mission of the
People's Republic
of China
New York, N.Y.

On behalf of the urgent revolutionary needs of the international working class and in accord with the inevitable aims of our future workers government in the United States, we demand that you immediately expand shipment of military supplies of the highest technical quality to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and that you offer the DRV the fullest all-sided assistance including necessary Russian-Chinese joint military collaboration.

No other course will serve at this moment of savage imperialist escalation against the DRV and the Indochinese working people whose military victories have totally shattered the myths of the Vietnamization and pacification programs of Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon.

signed: Political Bureau,
Spartacist League of the U.S.
8 May 1972

copies to: DRV and NLF delegations,
Paris



Podgorny and Nixon at Moscow Airport.

THE UAW AND THE CRISIS IN AUTO

The crisis of the U. S. automobile industry is an important, integral part of the crisis of U. S. capitalism as a whole. Faced with a declining rate of profit curtailing new investment and threatened with mounting foreign competition, notably Japanese, the future for U. S. auto companies is bleak unless they can expand investments abroad and heighten the exploitation of labor at home—at the expense of their foreign rivals and U. S. workers.

Nixon's aggressive economic policies of August 1971 were largely a response to the particular needs of U. S. auto makers, whose situation exemplified the needs of U. S. capitalism as a whole. Nixon sought to subsidize auto profits by curbing imports, paving the way for continued U.S. capital expansion overseas and ending the auto excise tax. Domestically, he ordered a wage freeze and an intensified "productivity" (read speedup) campaign. Despite this attack on American workers for the sake of corporate profit, the United Auto Workers bureaucracy under Leonard Woodcock continues the Reutherite tradition of subordinating the interests of the auto workers to those of capitalist production.

What's Good for GM Is Good for the Country?

Unlike the postwar U. S. economy as a whole, the auto industry had relatively high rates of

growth, profit and increase in labor productivity. While subject to the same chronic slumps as the rest of the economy, the "Big 3" regularly returned a higher dividend rate to stockholders than other manufacturing companies. Yet in the last 20 years, this rate of growth has been steadily declining. Capitalist unwillingness to accept a declining rate of profit on invested capital prevented new investments and caused stagnation in labor productivity, which is dependent on the relative amount of capital investment per worker.

By the end of the Sixties, the auto industry was in a virtual state of disaster by capitalist standards. 1970 was especially bad: production was lower than at any time since 1961, 955 domestic new car dealers went broke for lack of profits. GM's margin of profit on sales was lower before the auto strike of fall 1970 than in any year since 1946; and, most significantly, its 1970-71 profits on invested capital were down to 9.8% from 15.5% in 1969-70, 17.7% in 1968 and 25.2% in 1965 (Rothschild, "GM In More Trouble," New York Review of Books, 23 March 1972).

As U.S. auto headed into contraction and slump, foreign auto production was expanding. In 1955, the U. S. produced 72% of the world automobile output; in 1959, 52% and by 1969, 36%. Despite a massive effort to stem the flow of imports through

continued on page 8

Continued from page 1

Nixon Offensive

and belittle its significance. The Soviet bureaucracy first described the action as brinkmanship but quickly came to pretend that nothing special had happened. The Stalinist press has in the three months since the China visit caught itself in a grotesque contradiction. The Daily World of the Communist Party U.S.A. (CPUSA) on 23 February reacted to the Nixon-Mao talks with the headline "Nixons Applaud Ballet As Bombings Escalate." The same could be said (but of course wasn't) of Nixon's stay in Moscow.

The military value of the blockade in interdicting the supplies of an increasingly well-armed DRV striking force was disputed by many of Nixon's own advisors, including the CIA. The Soviets have also alluded to the blockade's questionable military significance as a justification for not seriously opposing it. The Soviet and Chinese claims that supplies can and will be sent along other avenues are at best a partial truth. It is no accident that the sea lanes have carried the bulk of supplies until now. Nixon's moves, in addition to tying Soviet hands at sea, will increase the costs of aid and affect its amount of aid as well, especially since the Chinese have denied the Soviets use of ports for delivery to the railheads and have not sent back the thousands of railroad workers withdrawn several years ago, who could greatly speed repair of bombing damage. But Nixon's purpose was as much political as military. He is playing his Russian card.

Stalinists as Prop of Bourgeoisie

In 1968 Nixon stated: "We need a new policy that will awaken the Soviet Union to the perils of the course it has taken in Vietnam." Today Nixon turns to the Soviet bureaucracy to extricate himself from the most serious defeat ever suffered by U.S. imperialism. Nixon justifies his policy on the premise that Soviet aid is responsible for the war's continuation, i.e., for the ability of the DRV/NLF to survive. Certainly the lack of aid is the primary reason the DRV/NLF have not won the conflict—combined Soviet and Chinese aid equals less than one fiftieth of U.S. expenditures on the war. The Soviets have been far more willing to provide aid to the bourgeois United Arab Republic—in the form of SAM III missiles (which could reach the high-flying B52s which are wreaking such devastation on Vietnam) and the latest MIG fighters (which even sophisticated anti-aircraft can't touch). The less the total Soviet aid, of course, the more vital will be every scrap obtained! Nixon therefore shrewdly chose the eve of a summit on which the Russians were counting heavily in order to once again bring pressure to bear.

There is a widespread sense that Soviet-American deals are being hatched behind the backs of the North Vietnamese or with their partial connivance. No less an imperialist spokesman than Hubert Humphrey hinted in a Los Angeles television interview that "secret arrangements" had been made in advance between the USSR and the U.S. on the blockade of North Vietnam. (A current joke has it that if Haiphong were completely sealed off the Soviets would retaliate with the devastating blow of cutting off the fall tour of the Moiseyev Dancers.) The CPUSA felt compelled to denounce Humphrey, the former "progressive," as an "unscrupulous scavenger," reflecting the contradiction between the CP's role as apologist for the Moscow bureaucracy's foreign policy and its desire to keep in step with its subjectively anti-imperialist youth supporters (as well as the fact that Humphrey is out as a major contender for the Democratic nomination). Arrangement or no arrangement, Kissinger's presence in the Soviet Union at the time of Nixon's speech was hardly coincidence, and certainly no military mobilization like that during the Cuban crisis occurred.

The Soviets' gross conciliation in the face of Nixon's provocations demonstrates that they are setting great store by the summit talks, and the struggle of the Vietnamese will not be permitted to get in the way. The Vietnamese Stalinists are duly worried and Soviet-Viet conflict is mirrored indirectly in the Hanoi press. The Hanoi leadership has reported attacks on Soviet ships while Moscow is silent, and Hanoi has denounced the

Nixon summit in language reminiscent of Peking's attacks a few years back on the Paris talks.

Despite Hanoi's concern over the summit meeting, the overall strategy of the Vietnamese Stalinists is for a negotiated settlement short of a workers' and peasants' victory. Madame Binh recently declared:

"I believe that the most firm guarantee of this question is the aspirations and will of the people. Since 1960 we have stood for a peaceful, independent, democratic regime and neutral Vietnam. That is to say that we have a desire to build in South Vietnam a broad, democratic regime that is not a socialist regime." [emphasis ours]

—Daily World, 12 May 1972

By counterposing a "broad, democratic" regime to a "socialist regime" the Stalinists reveal their intentions to prevent the construction of a workers and peasants government, in favor of a bourgeois coalition government which would mean at best a renewal of the civil war at some later date, with probable imperialist intervention, or at worst a new massacre of militants by the forces of the bourgeois regime. Until now the Thieu government and its U.S. masters have turned a deaf ear to the Stalinists' coalition proposals. The dynamic of the struggle thus forced upon them may impel the Vietnamese Stalinists (as it did the Chinese CP before them) to preside over the creation of what they define as socialism, i.e., a bureaucratically deformed workers state, in order to protect their own existence and future as a bureaucratic stratum. Such a real, though limited and ultimately reversible, social transformation would occur under the worst possible conditions, following years of Stalinist attempts to stifle social revolution and refusal to mobilize vital elements, particularly the urban working class. The Stalinists fear the Vietnamese proletariat since they know that its objectives will be socialist and not merely bourgeois-democratic.

The Russian Card and the Nixon-Mao Summit

The Nixon-Mao summit set the stage for the present talks with Brezhnev. Freed from the worry over a denunciation the Chinese can now ill afford to make, the Soviet bureaucrats can now more openly seek further accommodations with U.S. imperialism. The Chinese bureaucrats' silence on the escalated bombings during their dealing with Nixon, coupled with fears of Moscow's belligerence, have diminished their role as "left" critics of Soviet Vietnam policy.

The Nixon-Mao accords which pose a potential anti-Soviet bloc increased Soviet apprehensions, manifested physically in the deployment of approximately 44 divisions (around 400,000 men) along the lengthy Sino-Soviet border. The burden of this massive concentration of troops and matériel is a powerful impetus to the Soviets to stabilize U.S.-Soviet relations thereby contributing to China's isolation. The fanfare over the present summit, as one of "substance" in contrast to other meetings as "froth," is designed to upstage and partially cancel the significance of the earlier Mao meeting. In diplomatic jargon this tactic is an example of the principle of encirclement and counter-encirclement.

The principal Soviet strategic aim is the final ratification of a European treaty ending World War II. The Soviets desire this partly to avoid a possible battle on two fronts, but also because their long-term strategy of "peaceful coexistence" turns upon a neutralized European bourgeoisie particularly in West Germany.

The overall Soviet goal at the summit is to reframe and solidarize the division of the world based upon a growing Soviet relative strength—particularly a rough military parity. The decline of U.S. hegemony vis-a-vis the other imperialists, the capitalist international monetary crisis, the U.S. recession and the running sore of the Vietnam war indicate that the U.S. needs the summit as well—not to speak of Nixon's desire for reelection.

Despite these shifts in position and advantage, the determining factor remains U.S. economic superiority. The commodity, as Marx once remarked, still has the ability to batter Chinese

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Monthly
Published by the Spartacist League

Editorial Board: Liz Gordon, Marv Treiger,
Nick Benjamin (managing editor).

Production manager: Karen Allen.
Circulation manager: Janet Rogers.

West Coast editor: Mark Small.
New England editor: George Foster.

Subscription: \$1 yearly (11 issues). Bundle rates for 10 or more copies. Address: Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001. Telephone: WA 5-8234. Opinions expressed in signed articles or letters do not necessarily express the editorial viewpoint.

Walls, and the prospect of significant trade on favorable terms with the U.S. is the principal carrot that Nixon dangles before a Soviet bureaucracy whose existence is a brake on the whole development of the Soviet economy. Despite Khrushchev's boastful predictions, the strength of the Soviet economy relative to the American remains qualitatively what it was in the Fifties.

Political Strikes in Germany

The European question retains primary significance not only because of Europe's industrial power but because of its division into capitalist and deformed workers states. These two blocs are themselves Balkanized—yet Europe as a whole is economically interdependent. The unsettled boundaries and disputes arising out of former imperialist wars plus its overall strategic significance make a settlement in Europe the main question in preventing World War III.

The Soviets correctly place their main policy emphasis on Europe, but in a completely reformist fashion. The slogan of a socialist United States of Europe adopted by the Third Congress of the old Communist International under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky was directed against capitalism, reformism and the outmoded character of the national economic boundaries. The Stalinists have long since abandoned such a perspective and instead rely upon the liberal bourgeoisie and their political allies the labor bureaucrats to "reduce tension" and "peacefully coexist." The Soviets have turned to Willy Brandt and his Social Democrats to create a treaty to settle the outstanding issues of World War II. Unless such a settlement is accomplished through the intervention of the revolutionary proletariat it will constitute only new terms of truce between imperialist wars. It is therefore of the highest importance that German workers from the Ruhr and other areas took to the streets in the first political strikes to occur in Germany since the movement against the co-determination laws in 1952.

continued next page....

SPARTACIST LOCAL DIRECTORY

ATLANTA Box 7686 Atlanta, GA 30309	NEW ORLEANS Box 51634, Main P. O. New Orleans, LA 70151 (504) 866-8384
BERKELEY-OAKLAND Box 852, Main P. O. Berkeley, CA 94701 (415) 848-3029	NEW YORK Box 1377, G. P. O. New York, NY 10001 (212) 925-2426
BOSTON Box 188, M. I. T. Sta. Cambridge, MA 02139 (617) 876-1787	SAN DIEGO Box 22052, Univ. City Sta. San Diego, CA 92122 (714) 453-1436
CHICAGO Box 6471, Main P. O. Chicago, IL 60680 (312) 643-4394	SAN FRANCISCO Box 40574 San Francisco, CA 94140 (415) 826-8259
DENVER (contact New York)	WASHINGTON, D. C. - BALTIMORE (202) 223-1455
EUREKA Box 3061 Eureka, CA 95501	(FRANCE) Paris—887. 67. 13
HOUSTON (contact New York)	
LOS ANGELES Box 38053, Wilcox Sta. Los Angeles, CA 90038 (213) 467-6855	

Threat to NY Abortion Right Stalled

**Attica Butcher Rockefeller
Rescues WONAAC**

**FOR FREE ABORTION
ON DEMAND!**

The near enactment of the Donovan-Crawford bill to repeal New York State's liberalized abortion law threatened to return women to the purview of the 19th century statute which decreed that abortions could be performed only when the life of the mother was in danger. Since the passage of the liberalized law in 1970, bills to repeal or modify it have been introduced into every session of the New York State legislature as the result of pressure from the Catholic Church and so-called "Right-to-Life" groups maintaining that abortion in any form (even when the mother's life is endangered) is murder. At the same time a suit to strike down the liberalized law has been filed in the courts by Robert Byrn, a reactionary Fordham University law professor who was proclaimed by a Catholic judge to be "a guardian of all fetuses between the 4th and 24th week of gestation." Of course all the crusaders for repeal refuse to admit that reinstatement of the old law will not qualitatively reduce the number of abortions performed on New York State residents. Those who can afford it will go elsewhere for their abortions or pay outlandish prices for "safe" illegal abortions. Working-class women who had been able to take advantage of the new law despite the high cost of legal abortions will be consigned to back-room butchers with the usual resultant high mortality and sterility rates. Maternal and infant mortality rates dropped substantially in New York State following the passage of the 1970 law.

Legislators Run for Cover

The Donovan-Crawford bill received much

more attention than similar bills in the past and managed to pass both houses of the state legislature. 1972 is an election year and all the legislators are highly concerned with their images in their home districts. Many had been challenged on the abortion issue and others hoped that they could divert their constituencies' attention from other issues by playing up the abortion repeal drama. The complete hypocrisy of the legislative shell game is evident in the fact that some legislators who favored the liberalized law and voted for its passage in 1970 voted for the Donovan-Crawford bill this time around simply because they knew that Rockefeller planned to veto it anyway!

Rockefeller's Motives

Governor Rockefeller had pledged all along to veto any attempt to repeal the liberalized law and did indeed veto the Donovan-Crawford bill even after the infamous letter written by President Nixon to Cardinal Cooke, Archbishop of New York—in which Nixon told the Cardinal that he was opposed to abortions and "would personally like to associate myself with the convictions you deeply feel and eloquently express"—had been made public. Rockefeller could go ahead with his veto since Nixon's position on abortion is not a serious potential rift between the two Republican leaders, as indicated by the White House's rush to claim that the letter had been intended to be private, that Nixon (for whom Rockefeller will act as campaign manager in New York State) did not intend to embarrass Rockefeller, etc. Rockefeller's veto is hardly an expression of his concern for the rights of women; rather, he is also up for re-election this year and needs to woo the liberal voters. He intends to get a portion of the conservative vote too, by his support for a "compromise" measure which would reduce the time limit within which legal abortions could be performed from 24 to 18 weeks of pregnancy. Rockefeller's real motives

become clearer when viewed in the context of recent events in the State of Connecticut. The U. S. District Court recently struck down as unconstitutional Connecticut's ancient anti-abortion statute, leaving no law in force in Connecticut. Governor Thomas J. Meskill (a Roman Catholic who considers abortion to be murder) called the General Assembly into special session to write a new abortion law. The Assembly quickly delivered the goods—a measure as restrictive as the old law, permitting abortions only if the mother's life is in danger—which Meskill promptly signed into law. Rockefeller has pointed out that if the U. S. District Court's ruling is upheld, the old New York law, if reinstated, would be invalidated as well since it is practically identical to the Connecticut law. That would leave New York with no law at all which would mean—no restrictions on abortion!

Separation of Church and State?

The reactionary nature of the Catholic Church and the ties between church and state have been clearly evident throughout the New York State abortion fight. The Catholic Church has sought to push its medieval moral doctrines into law by using its wealth and influence to pressure the New York State government to repeal abortion reform. According to the Church, women must be punished for their "original sin" by bearing the pain of childbirth and caring for unwanted children—they should not even be allowed to practice birth control, let alone have any rights at all to abortion. Furthermore these doctrines must apply not only to practicing Catholic women, but to all women, since the Catholic Church appoints itself the moral guardian of society as a whole. The Catholic Church stands on a history of the slaughter of thousands of "heretics" during the Holy Inquisition. The American bourgeoisie stands on a history of the slaughter of millions in its imperialist

continued next page . . .

Continued . . .

The German workers correctly sensed the revanchist maneuvers of the right wing of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) to sabotage the treaties. Rainer Barzel, who heads the CDU, insisted upon a "clarifying clause" restating the German right of "self-determination" and disclaiming any binding character to the agreement with regard to defining future European borders. The workers' political strikes meant that they were not relying automatically on Brandt to carry through the treaty. Brandt in fact compromised and accepted Barzel's "clause" in order to ensure a Social-Democratic majority in the vote in the Bundestag. The Brandt coalition fell short of a majority vote until the CDU abstained.

The passage in the Bundestag on May 17 and 19 of the Russian and Polish treaties affirmed the Oder-Neisse frontier as the boundary between the German Democratic Republic and Poland: the treaty renounced the use of force and gave de facto recognition to the GDR. The Soviets considered the passage of these treaties even in watered-down form as essential for a successful summit. They expect a better treaty to come out of a proposed European Security Conference which would also lead to a reduction in troop strength on the part of NATO and the Warsaw Pact powers.

The chain of events unfolding in West Germany on the eve of the summit played a central role in shaping a "soft" Soviet response over Vietnam. Anticipating this, Nixon was emboldened toward reescalation.

Pro-Imperialist "Peace" Movement

The U. S. bourgeoisie was almost unanimously united in favor of the Vietnam war in its early days, as directed ultimately against China. The drastic effects of the Cultural Revolution internally on the Chinese military-economic readiness, however, combined with the isolation of the Chin-

ese Stalinists internationally, especially after the 1965 massacre of hundreds of thousands of pro-Peking Indonesian Communists, gradually convinced most influential sections of the American bourgeoisie that the Chinese threat to U. S. hegemony in Asia had for the time abated, and with it the advisability of continuing in Vietnam the war they had come to regard as a sheer adventure. But the failure of the U. S. to disengage from Vietnam is not simply the result of governmental inertia—such a withdrawal, while advisable for U. S. imperialism, would nonetheless constitute a defeat, unless complete betrayal on the part of the Vietnamese Stalinists and their allies, especially the Soviet Union, can be assured. Hence the inability of the U. S. to pull out despite the widespread and by now long-standing bourgeois opposition to this particular war. The U. S. bourgeoisie may even ultimately have recourse to the method of the French, which had to resort to coup d'etat, installing General de Gaulle, to extricate itself even on favorable terms from Algeria.

Tailing the large section of the bourgeoisie now seeking an escape from Vietnam (to put the forces of U. S. imperialism to work elsewhere) is the U. S. anti-war movement held together by the Socialist Workers Party-Young Socialist Alliance. The SWP/YSA recalls its Trotskyist past well enough to offer a few clumsy, almost Pavlovian dissimulations in response to criticism of its bloc with the anti-war bourgeoisie and its pop-front formations' refusal to call for DRV/NLF military victory, labor strikes against the war, etc.

The SWP/YSA asserts its "independent" "socialist" campaigns as evidence of innocence of the pop front charge—after all, if the SWP has bourgeois, pop-front politics, why does it continue to run its own campaigns, criticize the Democrats, etc.? What the SWP's "independence" in fact illustrates is its impotence in the eyes of the U. S. bourgeoisie. The U. S. ruling class has at present

absolutely no need for the SWP as a political partner beyond joint participation in the liberal vote-gathering jamborees organized by the SWP-led National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) and the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC). That the bourgeoisie has no need for electoral pop-front collaboration with the ostensibly socialist SWP should not be confused with the question of SWP program and appetites, through which the SWP has completely prepared such collaboration, sponsoring bourgeois politicians in its own "single-issue" front groups.

In 1953 an SWP leader, Farrell Dobbs, wrote:

"... the most vital place to carry on anti-war agitation and participate in anti-war actions is in the unions where the masses are. We have always envisaged the struggle against war as an extension of the class struggle onto a higher plane. The fight against the war can really be effective only to the extent that the workers adopt class-struggle policies in defending their interests. If we are to help this process along we must be in the unions, . . ."

This Marxist line on imperialist war has vanished without a trace from the SWP's politics.

Student Strikes, Labor Unrest

A series of student strikes responded to Nixon's brazen challenge to North Vietnam and the Soviet Union. The student response was generally less political than the response to the Kent-Cambodia events of two years ago, reflecting a general but very uneven de-politicalization of campus life. Meanwhile the U. S. working class, seething with discontent over the war and economic conditions but lacking an independent political vehicle and ignored by the anti-war pop-front bandwagon which touts its bourgeois and bureaucratic betrayers, can only express its rage by wildcat strikes (e. g. Norwood and Lordstown in auto) and "protest" votes for Wallace and McGo-

continued on page 4

Continued from Page 3

Nixon Offensive

vern, both promising quick and "radical" solutions to the war and the economic crisis.

The SL has fought ceaselessly to expose the student-based pro-imperialist "peace" movement and orient militants toward working-class strike actions in solidarity with the Vietnamese revolution. We sought to use the recent student strikes as an opportunity to supplement our propaganda within the labor movement for labor strikes against the war, through the vehicle of Work Stoppage Committees. Students from the WSCs addressed union meetings urging anti-war strikes, stressing class solidarity with the Vietnamese working people's struggle and the need to programmatically break the U.S. labor movement from the bureaucracy's collaboration with the class enemy. The SL also demonstrated against the Soviet and Chinese Stalinists' military and diplomatic betrayals of the Vietnamese revolution.

The Soviet refusal to seriously oppose Nixon's attempt to strangle North Vietnam is a heavy blow against the working masses everywhere. The recent European treaties are objectively advantageous to the proletariat, but only in the sense of buying time for revolutionary working-class intervention which alone can prevent the next world war. The motives of the Soviet bureaucracy, of course, are the same in the Vietnam betrayal, the European boundary treaties and the summit agreements. Unable and unwilling to rely on the strength of the world proletariat, the bureaucracy attempts to preserve its strategic position through stabilizing relations with imperialism, now by outright betrayal, now by detentes which may incidentally benefit the workers but are designed simultaneously to circumscribe their struggle. Only the political revolution, based on the program of a reconstructed Leninist-Trotskyist Fourth International, can lead the workers to destroy the usurping Stalinist bureaucracy and seize the political control of their destinies in the deformed workers states, maintaining international defense against imperialism and providing inspiring example and aid to workers under imperialism. ■

Continued from page 3

..... Abortion Threat Stalled

ploys throughout the world. Even as Nixon again escalates the war in Vietnam, he finds time to babble with obscene hypocrisy to his friend Cardinal Cooke about their mutual commitment to "the sanctity of life." Both Cardinal Cooke and Bishop Edwin B. Broderick, chairman of the New York State Catholic Committee, sent statements to Rockefeller urging him not to veto the Donovan-Crawford bill. Meanwhile the New York State legislature has just passed a bill granting state aid to parochial schools.

WONAAC: Minimum Demands

The New York State government nearly managed to take away the minimum gains that have been won in the struggle to abolish all abortion restrictions because of the weakness of the movement behind it. The Women's National Abortion Action Coalition (WONAAC) and its Socialist Workers Party/Young Socialist Alliance (SWP/YSA) leadership have made the abortion issue the single-issue focus of the women's liberation movement. Of course we must defend any gains in the struggle for abortion reform (such as the liberalized New York State law). Abortion is a basic right and must be won as part of a fight to free women from the restrictions of the nuclear family which places total responsibility for children (whether wanted or not) upon the mother. But the abortion demand is nonetheless basically a reformist one, which the bourgeoisie could grant with relative ease. Abortion restrictions are not necessary to the maintenance of the nuclear family, but rather serve as a subsidiary prop. Many

bourgeois countries have already abandoned abortion restrictions as the liberal wing of the U.S. bourgeoisie wants to abandon them.

WONAAC: Bought Off

WONAAC and the SWP/YSA have consciously sought and cemented an alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie in order to maintain the illusion that they are leading a "mass movement" for abortion reform. They boast as supporters such bourgeois politicians as Bella Abzug, the Democratic Party's token women's liberationist. The recent May 6 WONAAC demonstration in New York City featured a whole panoply of bourgeois speakers—Abzug, Shirley Chisholm and Mary Lindsay (wife of the mayor of New York City who has been responsible for a prolonged and vicious attack on the working class: squashing strikes, laying off city employees, reactionary welfare legislation, etc.) after which the SWP spokesman got up to say "we have no faith in either of the capitalist parties—Republican or Democrat"! Were he a woman, one would not be surprised to see Rockefeller himself, the butcher of Attica, on the platform of the next WONAAC demonstration. Except for their ceaseless prating about "the movement" being "independent" (certainly not from the ruling class) and "in the streets," the WONAAC spokesmen have never gone even quantitatively beyond the stand taken by Rockefeller. His repeal statement sounded like the typical speech of a WONAAC member:

"The truth is that this repeal of the 1970 reform would not end abortions. It would only end abortions under safe and supervised medical conditions.

"The truth is that a safe abortion would remain the optional choice of the well-to-do woman, while the

continued next page....

Letters

Princeton, N. J.

I am using this opportunity to give you my opinions, in a comradely fashion, about your organization and your paper. So as not to keep you guessing, I am a member of the I.S. and a high school student.

The only time I have ever come into direct contact with your group was at a forum of yours about a year ago, and I must say I was not too impressed. The sum total of anyone there's discussion with me was when one of your people, in fact the person who had apparently organized the thing, asked "Do you want to buy a subscription to the Spartacist, kid?" I doubt this is [your] usual line toward high school students - we don't in general enjoy having our intelligence insulted - I don't think you would have much luck in getting your program across to us with attitudes like that. In all probability, I was addressed in that manner on account of politics, as I was wearing an I.S. button. However, had I been black I don't think you would have said, "How about a subscription to the Spartacist, n----r?" At any rate, it left a rather lousy taste in my mouth.

The main reason I am subscribing to your paper is that it is interesting to read your criticisms of the I.S., because we are sure to [be] mentioned at least twice every issue. Just out of curiosity, how many workers do you think could really care less about our position on this or that or Wohlforth's latest flip-flops? Your paper, I feel, would [be] much more interesting if you avoided all the sectarian trivia that now takes up so much space. In fact, I pledge \$5.00 to you if I see an issue that does not engage in long polemics against one or another left group. It would be well worth it.

One last note. If you have anything about high school situations I would very much appreciate it if I could see them, or get in contact with any h.s. members that you have. I will definitely reciprocate.

Yours for the Revolution,
Carl M.

Mosheim, Tenn.

Please stop sending me mail (i.e. take my name off your mailing lists).

I've joined Zero Population Growth and Friends of the Earth and am no longer interested in revolutionary ideas.

Thank you,

Michael C.

East Orange, N.J.

You can take your "Revolutionary Communist Youth Movement" and stick it right up your a-s. If you think Communism works, try the other side of the Iron Curtain.

Your organization is a downright insult to the Anti-War Organization of America. We want to stop war, you claim to also. But you want to cause another Civil War in the U.S. Forget about it. Ending capitalism in America, and setting up Communism, is going from bad to worse.

The SMC couldn't give two s---s about the SDS, as far as we're concerned, you can blow each other away. And take your f-----g RCY with you!

Peace Now, Communism No!
Tom C., SMC

Tempe, Arizona

There are some YSA comrades here in the Phoenix local and some in the newly-formed Flagstaff at-large-area who have become increasingly disillusioned with the "politics" of the YSA/SWP. As the Educational Director of this local, I have had to spout nonsense about "recruitment on the basis of nationalism and feminism" which you rightly

call, the lowest common denominators. I have been told by the National Office that recruiting workers in my factory is unimportant if they cannot find time to do "mass work" on the campuses here. The possibility of a struggle for a union at my plant and myself playing a key role in that fight is of no interest to the Regional Center in L.A. Running a little petty-bourgeois creep, who I must call comrade, for a student government office at Arizona State University is of paramount importance to the RC, however. My discontent with the lack of a proletarian orientation has caused the Regional Organizer to say that, I "don't understand YSA politics" and that I will, eventually, "join the Sparts." We also have a comrade at a . . . plant here who has been told that his primary concern with his fellow workers should be getting them to "help build the anti-war movement." These guys on his crew are being investigated for "possible subversive activities" by the FBI. . . . And, to top it all off, these same workers put out a very militant, underground labor paper. The YSA's concern, however, is not with labor militants. Our concern is in putting across our "transitional program for students." We had a comrade at a steel plant here until he transferred to L.A. He was told to "play it cool on the job." "Don't antagonize the bosses. You need the job to pay your sustainer." . . .

One of the Flagstaff comrades said he was completely dismayed by the number of pacifists he was discovering in the YSA. Pacifists! This same comrade, even though he is a student, is thoroughly disgusted by what he characterized as the "petty-bourgeois reformist politics" of the YSA. Two close friends of his and mine (one a former member of the YWLL and the other a woman in the . . . union) are completely unimpressed by YSA's "working class politics," but are, however, interested in the Spartacist League. . . . Before any of us consider joining the RCY or League, however, it is neces-

continued next page....

Continued....

Abortion

poor would again be seeking abortions at a grave risk to life in back-room abortion mills.

"The truth is that, under the present law, no woman is compelled to undergo an abortion. Those whose personal and religious principles forbid abortion are in no way compelled against their convictions under the present law. Every woman has the right to make her own choice."

—New York Times, 14 May 1972

WONAAC refuses to demand even the minimal reform, Free Abortion on Demand, and confines its slogans to "Repeal All Abortion Laws," "Repeal Restrictive Contraception Laws," and "End Forced Sterilization," in fear of alienating its capitalist friends who will not tolerate even the struggle for free abortion with its limited attack on capitalist privilege and profit. WONAAC thus abandons the needs of the majority of women—poor and working-class women—who would not be able to afford the high cost of legal abortions.

Women's Liberation Is Class Issue

Even winning the important free abortion reform will not liberate women from their social and economic oppression in class society. Working-class women are oppressed not only by the atomization and degrading roles they are forced into through one of the main social institutions of class society, the nuclear family, but face sexual discrimination in hiring, promotion, and wages in addition to the general oppression and exploitation faced by all workers. As part of a huge pool of reserve labor, marginally employed, women in particular suffer from the necessary "safety valves" of the capitalist system, such as the wage freeze and the chronic unemployment of a large segment of the work force. Women will win "control over their own bodies" only when the capitalist system has been destroyed and replaced by socialism. The struggle for women's liberation requires for its fulfillment a class struggle, based on the recognition that there are irreconcilable conflicts between the needs and interests of working-class women and men and the needs and interests of the bourgeoisie—male, female, liberal or otherwise. WONAAC/SWP confines the women's liberation movement to the single reform issue of abortion law repeal, carefully divided from other social struggles, in order to maintain within its ranks the enemies of the working class. Under its present leadership, divorced from the

working class—the section of society which has the social power and the objective interests to liberate all of society—this "women's liberation movement" will be as unsuccessful as the SWP-led, class-collaborationist anti-war movement, after six years of marches and a bourgeois "pacifist"-imperialist ideology.

Fake Lefts Cover Betrayal

Tagging along in the wake of the SWP/YSA are the International Socialists (IS) and the Progressive Labor Party (PL). IS plays the same loyal opposition role in WONAAC that it does in the SWP/YSA's other alliance with the liberal wing of the bourgeoisie, the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC). At the February WONAAC conference the IS voted against a Women and Revolution proposal demanding exclusion of bourgeois politicians and repudiation of the expulsion of communists from the conference. (Members and supporters of Women and Revolution, the Spartacist League, and Revolutionary Communist Youth were excluded from the opening session of the conference after attempting to present a resolution to bar the class enemy from the platform—see Workers Vanguard #6). IS' own resolution would have permitted bourgeois representatives to participate in WONAAC if they or their parties favored free abortion. (No doubt the IS will tolerate only those representatives of the bourgeoisie in NPAC who are for immediate and total withdrawal from Vietnam—like Vance Hartke.) IS' refusal to base itself on a clear break from class collaboration in the fight for women's liberation can only mean that it entertains and sows illusions about WONAAC.

Joining IS in spreading the criminal illusion that popular fronts like WONAAC can be pressured into fighting in the interests of the oppressed and exploited is the Progressive Labor Party's "left-center coalition," the University Action Group (UAG). Previously characterized by sectarian refusal to participate in principled united fronts with other tendencies, the hopelessly muddled politics of PL/UAG now push them eagerly into the arms of WONAAC. This action follows PL's decision to "relate constructively" to NPAC at the Cleveland conference last December, where PL pledged support to the next peace crawl. Since its right turn, PL is finally caught in the tentacles of fatal, class-collaborationist politics.

WONAAC Brags

WONAAC and the SWP/YSA have falsely inflated the size and success of the abortion reform movement, claiming that "the fact that opponents of women's liberation have made abortion the central focus of their counter-attack on the women's movement emphasizes the importance of this issue." The gains in this struggle have been mini-

mal at best. The liberalized New York law has been retained but is being eroded—abortions can no longer be performed outside of clinics or hospitals and will no longer be paid for by Medicaid. WONAAC has learned nothing from the legislature's near-successful attempt to reinstate the old law. WONAAC and the SWP even claim that Rockefeller was forced to move to immediate veto of the Donovan-Crawford bill because he was scared by WONAAC's planned demonstration for May 15! And they plan to continue their fight with the same old tactics—a recent New York WONAAC meeting entertained suggestions for more letter-writing campaigns, more phone calls to legislators and more meaningless "mass" marches, with of course no mention of the class nature of the women's liberation struggle. These tactics will never lead to real advances because they are undertaken with the perspective of pressuring the bourgeoisie for minimal democratic reforms. To claim otherwise only invites cynicism and demoralization on the part of women participating in the movement. The movement as it presently exists is doomed to powerlessness and defeat unless it can break out of its middle-class isolation and ally in struggle with other oppressed sectors of society in a unified working-class movement. To do this the women's liberation movement must have a working-class orientation both as women and as workers!

Only clearly defined revolutionary perspectives embodied in a program of transitional demands can build a mass, class-conscious women's liberation movement capable of giving women the right "to control their own lives and their own bodies." Free abortion on demand, free birth control for men and women, and no forced sterilization must be fought for in the context of and along with these and other demands:

- Free quality health care for all.
- Free 24-hour quality child-care centers controlled by parents and staff.
- Equal pay for equal work—equal access to all job categories. No job discrimination based on sex.
- No laws against any form of sexual activity between consenting individuals. End the legal persecution of prostitutes.
- Employment for all; "30 for 40"—thirty hours' work for forty hours' pay. Control prices, not wages.
- For labor political strikes against the Indochina war.
- No confidence in bourgeois politicians, male or female: Break with the capitalist parties. Build a labor party based on the trade unions.
- Women's liberation through socialist revolution
 - Build a socialist women's liberation organization! ■

Continued....

sary for us to clarify several points in our minds. As a member of the executive committee here, it was decided by interested comrades that I should take steps to get the desired information and present it to them. I will list below the points which we would like clarified for us. Please cover these as fully as possible in order to facilitate a better understanding.

- (1) An analysis of the '53 split in the Fourth and the subsequent reunification. Explain the nature of Pabloism, its roots, etc.
- (2) Your position on a Labor Party in the US.
- (3) Your policy on trade union work. What is your reply to the SWP assertion that to build communist fractions in the unions is to "bury ourselves until such time as the trade union layer of the working class begins to radicalize." What is your assessment of the present state of the Labor Movement and its roots.
- (4) Your analysis of the "national liberation struggles" in the US. Your stance on these movements. The standard defense of the SWP/YSA against an attack on their position is that our opponents on the Left do not distinguish between the nationalism of the oppressed and that of the oppressor. It is also pointed out to skeptical comrades that Trotsky was in favor of our supporting the right of blacks to self-determination. How do you counter this. We would also like your analysis of the ghetto rebellions by black workers over the past decade and your position on these rebellions.
- (5) Your analysis of the recent prison revolts such as Attica.
- (6) An analysis of the anti-war movement and the concept of "non-exclusionary mass movements" in general. Drawing a class line? Why is NPAC a popular front, i. e., we are aware of the presence of capitalist politicians and labor skates as "hon-

ored guests" at NPAC sponsored rallies, but what is your analysis which leads you to characterize the NPAC program as bourgeois?

- (7) An analysis of the student movement and its class nature. SDS—bourgeois formation, social-democratic? Your analysis of PL's intervention in and subsequent takeover of the remnants of SDS.
- (8) Analysis of the "women's movement" and its class nature.
- (9) Position on the current SWP election campaign.
- (10) Your general defense policy—not only political defense but also your attitude toward armed self-defense.
- (11) General analysis of the current radicalization and its roots.
- (12) Your reply to Ernest Mandel's theory of neo-capitalism.
- (13) Your analysis of the colonial revolutions and the concept (first advanced by Pablo?) of epicenters of revolution. An analysis of the Cuban Revolution and your position on Cuba.
- (14) Analysis of the Middle East and your stance on it.
- (15) Your analysis of the revolutionary upsurge of May-June '68 in France and the events in Italy in the fall of '69.
- (16) Analysis of and position on current struggle in Ireland. What is your attitude toward the regular IRA?

With communist greetings,
Steven P.

(Editors' note: For interested readers of WV, virtually all the above points are extensively covered in earlier [and still available] issues of Workers Vanguard, Spartacist and/or the RCY Newsletter.)

Chicago, Ill.

I have been buying Workers Vanguard whenever I've had the occasion to be at meetings where your members were present. Though I have some political disagreements with you, nonetheless I find your paper to have a consistently high level of political and theoretical analysis of issues and questions of vital concern to revolutionaries everywhere. I particularly enjoy your coverage of the insane courses of the I.C. and the United Secretariat. Consequently, I enclose \$1.00 for one year's subscription to your paper. Thank you.

For a Socialist World

This pattern of recent correspondence indicates that our press serves its proper Marxist function—repelling reformists and philistines and attracting those with a potential role in the struggle to build a revolutionary workers party.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Our refusal to spell out some of our correspondents' words is based on different considerations. Our objection to "dirty words" is not primarily a matter of taste, but of legal liability especially in the uncertain future. We object to racist epithets in principle—language reflects thought and conditions deeds.

"Therefore, the sections of the Fourth International should always strive not only to renew the top leadership of the trade unions, boldly and resolutely in critical moments advancing new militant leaders in place of routine functionaries and careerists, but also to create in all possible instances independent militant organizations corresponding more closely to the tasks of mass struggle against bourgeois society; and if necessary, not flinching even in the face of a direct break with the conser-

vative apparatus of the trade unions. If it be criminal to turn one's back on mass organizations for the sake of fostering sectarian fictions, it is no less so to passively tolerate subordination of the revolutionary mass movement to the control of openly reactionary or disguised conservative ("progressive") bureaucratic cliques. Trade unions are not ends in themselves; they are but means along the road to proletarian revolution."

—Leon Trotsky, "Transitional Program," 1938

In the recent hotly-contested leadership election in the Social Service Employees Union (SSEU)-Local 371 in New York, concluded on April 28, the "Committee for New Leadership" (CNL), a caucus supported by Tim Wohlforth's Workers League (WL), consummated a betrayal of basic Trotskyist principles in a straight Stalinist-model left-center coalition. Foregoing an independent slate entirely, the CNL joined with the Communist Party-supported Unity Caucus and the SSEU Black Caucus to support the incumbent union president, Stanley Hill, against an opportunist breakaway slate headed by Bart Cohen. Cohen and two others on his slate had been officers under Hill, a leadership which the CNL had denounced for two years as sellouts, betrayers, and even red-baiters, since the Hill slate was elected with WL/CNL support in 1970.

Since December 1967, when the Workers League launched its short-lived "Trade Unionists for a Labor Party" on an opportunist, five-point program deliberately omitting reference to racism or the Vietnam war, the WL has amply demonstrated that its fundamental orientation to the organizations of the working class is that of left pressure group on the existing trade union bureaucracy, accommodating to and ultimately reinforcing working-class political backwardness. Its most criminal demonstration of its attitude was the support to the reactionary anti-labor "strike" of New York City police last year, a capitulation to the widespread illusions among workers that the police are their friends and fellow-workers (see "Police Militancy vs. Labor," *Workers Action*, April-May 1971). Under the pressures of the current economic crisis, the WL's appetite for a gimmick has developed under the umbrella of increasing warnings of the rapid development of "fascism," reflected most recently in the WL's May Day call "Stop Wallace! Build a Labor Party Now!" The Communist Party's cry of imminent fascism from Nixon (or Goldwater, Eisenhower, Dewey, etc.) is intended to build up the Democrats. The WL with its cry of imminent fascism from Wallace intends to build up the credit of various labor bureaucrats, who in turn support the Democrats however loudly the WL demands from them the formation of a labor party. The WL call for a labor party, instead of being used as a battering ram against all the labor fakers, is subordinated in practice to embellishing the role of the "progressive" union bureaucrats as opposed to the "reactionary" bureaucrats, in the long-established pattern of Stalinist betrayal in the labor movement.

WL Finds Greater Evil

To establish SSEU incumbent president Stanley Hill's "progressive" credentials with a view toward supporting him in the April election, the WL/CNL had to first create a "greater evil" in the Cohen opposition slate by characterizing it as—you guessed it—"a reflection of the completely reactionary and racist Wallaceite movement in our union" (CNL leaflet). Earl Browder himself would be proud of that formulation. Cohen is in fact a much more systematic and determined career bureaucrat than the weak and vacillating Hill. But his principal claim to notoriety was not as a "Wallaceite," but as the part of the Hill-Cohen leadership heavily responsible for establishing and conducting SSEU negotiating policy (although Victor Gotbaum personally is automatically chief negotiator for all DC37 locals). In 1970 Cohen became Vice President, Legal Services, because the Hill slate did not oppose his candidacy even though he was running as an incumbent on the Morgenstern slate, and together with Hill had run successfully for office on the Morgenstern slate in 1968. Cohen has been an officer in the union bureaucracy since 1965, and a working associate of Hill for four years! The actual composition of the Cohen slate itself illustrated further the fictitious and self-serving nature of the WL characterizations. Of the Cohen slate of eight officers, four were black and five were incumbents under Hill since 1970! Apparently they became "racist Wallaceites" only

after their break with Hill. One of them, Joe Sperling, was (and possibly still is) a member of the Unity Caucus which formed part of Hill's coalition and which the WL described as supported by the Communist Party. Impressed by Sperling's occasional opposition to Hill from the "left," the CNL attempted to court him and for a brief period even invited him to its caucus meetings. But what the WL/CNL had once called simply the "Hill-Cohen leadership" began to be qualitatively differentiated at least by the editors of the *WL Bulletin* in an 18 October 1971 article titled "Right Wing Goes on Offensive in SSEU" in which a grouping around Cohen was described as the emerging "right-wing pro-Gotbaum section" of the Hill leadership. (Victor Gotbaum heads District Council 37, AFSCME, of which SSEU is a member local as a result of a disastrous re-merger in 1969 which wrecked the internal democracy of the SSEU and set up the political preconditions for the series of defeats suffered by the membership since then. The CNL claims major credit for that merger "even though it was on unfavorable terms." The CNL forces were then known as the "Affiliation Now Committee"—see "Death of a Union," *Spartacist* #14.) Although they hadn't yet discovered Cohen to be a "Wallaceite" the WL/CNL had begun to lay the foundation for their rotten bloc with Hill and his Stalinist supporters.

WL Denounces Hill

The bloc with Hill developed gradually. In a *WL Bulletin* article of 29 November 1971 responding to an attack by Communist Party hack George Morris in his pamphlet *Rebellion in the Unions, a Handbook for Rank and File Action* (described by the *Bulletin* as "an apology throughout for the so-called liberal wing of the trade union bureaucracy") Dennis O'Casey cited CP support of the "progressive" wing of the labor bureaucracy and stated:

"Stan Hill is no exception. Hill has openly refused to break with Gotbaum while Gotbaum stands as a firm supporter of Meany's role on the pay board."

But only one month before we were told that it was Cohen who was the "right-wing pro-Gotbaum section" of the SSEU leadership. Obviously then we would conclude, and did, that both Cohen and Hill support Gotbaum—that there was no fundamental difference between them then or now. Apparently O'Casey at that time agreed for he stated:

"What this shows is that it is precisely those who support one wing of the bureaucracy claiming that this is the way to fight the other wing that end up in support of the policies of the bureaucracy as a whole. It is Morris and his [Communist] party who back up Meany through the so-called lefts in the labor bureaucracy."

Prophetic words indeed! O'Casey observed that "The Hill leadership in spite of its CP backing is falling apart at the seams." He concluded with the resounding declaration:

"The CNL's perspective is to now take full advantage of the new situation by launching the most ambitious drive ever to win the SSEU officers' election in April 1972."

Win the election for whom?

Preparing for the Bloc

By 20 December 1971 the *Bulletin* "lesser evil" strategy began to blossom:

"The right wing, pro-Gotbaum opposition to Hill can play a very dangerous role by utilizing the legitimate anger of the membership with Hill, to get those who would be even worse into office."

This was the turning point. In the *Bulletin* of 6 March 1972, the left-center betrayal fully flowered: "CNL Demands That Hill Defeat Right Wing in SSEU Election." This article proceeded to list the programmatic points determining the support to Hill. The first two were workload ratio and negotiating demands. The third condition would have been crucial were we dealing with Trotskyists instead of centrist opportunists:

"that the SSEU must repudiate Gotbaum and Wurf's [national president of AFSCME] call for support to Muskie in the '72 electoral campaigns and come out for a labor party."

"Left-C Betray Welf Uni

The article concluded with a statement that if Hill did not accept these conditions for support, "the CNL is prepared to wage an independent campaign against the Cohen forces" and stated the CNL was publishing a newspaper, the *Campaigner*, presumably fighting for these positions. However, the *Campaigner*, already issued in February, did not list the labor party demand as a precondition for support to the Hill slate! Instead it substituted a demand that Hill call for "city-wide union action." This cynical deception—one "line" for *Bulletin* readers and another for SSEU members—showed that the WL/CNL had never intended that the labor party demand be a basis for support to Hill! As a matter of fact, in Hill's main election brochure, issued before these WL/CNL articles were written, he boasted that he had obtained support against various regressive welfare programs "from the majority of elected officials in the New York area and from such national leaders as Senator George McGovern." For what small change did Judas-Wohlforth sell the crucial demand for a labor party? Part of the answer is contained in the very same issue of the *Bulletin* in another headline, "SSEU Head [Hill] Endorses YS March for Jobs." (The Young Socialists are the latest WL youth group.) In bourgeois political parlance this is called mutual back-scratching. Workers League-Hill-McGovern in the SSEU; Workers League-NPAC-Hartke in the anti-war movement! So much for the WL "labor party" call: endlessly repeated, dropped immediately to support a Democratic bureaucrat.

"Vote Hill"

By the end of March the WL/CNL had abandoned any pretense of "critical" support in their all-out campaign for Hill's reelection. Hill and his supporters spoke at public meetings of the CNL. One photo in the 27 March *Bulletin* depicted Hill at one such meeting "denouncing Cohen for spreading racism in the union." Following Hill's prearranged endorsement of a CNL motion at an SSEU general membership meeting calling for a work action (described by the *Bulletin* of 3 April as "a sharp departure from [Hill's] previous policy of inaction" that "also provides the basis for a sharp counteroffensive against the right wing insurgency of Bart Cohen") the CNL issued a leaflet titled simply "Vote Hill," criticizing only the "pack of right wing reactionaries" of the Cohen slate. Tacked on at the end—this time—was the demand "For a labor party in '72," ending with the statement:

"We call upon all those who support this program

Center" oyal in fare ion

1970 elections, the very same "Committee for a New Leadership" (which should be retitled the "Committee for the Same Old Leadership") again urged "Vote Hill," but under slightly different circumstances. Marty Morgenstern was then SSEU President, with Hill as Vice President of Organization. In 1969 Morgenstern and Hill had pushed through a contract constructed around a reorganization scheme announced by the Welfare Department that promised to freeze out 75 per cent of the existing caseworker staff. It resulted in a catastrophic deterioration of working conditions.

Whence Morgenstern?

It is worth noting that in 1968 Morgenstern was elected on a major plank of re-merger with Gotbaum's DC37. Instead of fielding a full slate, the CNL (then called the "Affiliation Now Committee") ran Dennis Cribben alone as token opposition for the bottom position of Treasurer, campaigning fully for merger, and giving Morgenstern's campaign a left cover by tacking on the equally token "labor party" demand. Only the SSEU Militant Caucus—supported by the Spartacist League—ran an opposing slate on a full program of transitional demands and opposed to merger as a defeatist trap, receiving 22 percent of the vote! The ANC/CNL, in a de facto bloc with Morgenstern and a Progressive Labor-supported caucus, helped push through the final vote for merger on January 10, 1969 under the call that "only through the unity of strength provided by merger with DC37 can we fight the City's re-organization scheme." Of course, as predicted by the Militant Caucus, precisely the reverse was the outcome.

And by the 1970 elections, the mood prevailed that "anything would be better than Morgenstern." Hill, a key part of Morgenstern's justly despised leadership, split and formed a Black Caucus-Unity Caucus coalition (the same one as this year) with nothing more than an anti-Morgenstern program. Both the CNL and the Militant Caucus ran opposing slates. Before both were eliminated in a runoff election, the 6 April 1970 Bulletin described the Hill slate thus:

"The openly racist anti-union black nationalist poison spewed out by Hill & Co. is deliberately calculated to channel the legitimate hostility of thousands of black SSEU members... into the blind alley of the black caucus slate."

The elimination of both independent slates left only the opportunist Hill coalition to battle the incumbent opportunist Morgenstern. Then the WL/CNL developed a "new" strategy revealed in the 27 April 1970 Bulletin which boasted "CNL Holds Balance of Power in SSEU Elections." The WL/CNL instantly threw its approximately 6 per cent vote (about equal to the Militant Caucus vote) into a game of two-bit power broker! The article stated very clearly:

"The CNL maintains today just as it has throughout the campaign that the Hill candidacy differs in no respect from that of Morgenstern, that in fact these two bureaucrats are absolutely identical."

To Kill an Illusion . . .

Unable and unwilling to withstand the overwhelming anti-Morgenstern mood and seeing its first opportunity to bargain for patronage, the WL developed a slimy rationale that was a perversion of the Leninist tactic of critical support to reformist labor leaders to hold them to their promises and expose them before the masses they have fooled—when the reformists claimed to contend for power against the bourgeois class enemy. But the WL maintained that the way to demolish the

illusion that one bourgeois-supporting bureaucrat (Hill) was superior to another bourgeois-supporting bureaucrat (Morgenstern) was to help put the currently popular faker into office!

Of course the ranks would soon learn how wrong they were to support more-of-same Hill out of revulsion against Morgenstern's sellouts. But the WL/CNL did not merely warn the members of this—it told the ranks to vote for Hill. To prove to the members that Hill was no better, it supported Hill, that is, lied to the members that Hill was better, reinforcing the very illusions it claimed to be destroying. An enlightened SSEU member would say, "We were fools to support Hill. We should dump him and reject those who supported him like the WL/CNL 'Trotskyists' who led the pack."

... Support It

The Bulletin of 27 April 1970 made a general statement of the WL strategy for dealing with fake insurgent bureaucrats lifted straight out of Stalinist practice:

"With the deepening crisis of the bureaucracy in the American labor movement all sorts of fake militants will advance themselves out of the bureaucratic woodwork on the back of rank and file revolt against the traditional union leaders. The construction of revolutionary leadership in the labor movement will require the testing and exposing of each phony alternative in the actual course of struggle before it is rejected by the ranks." [Emphasis ours]

The WL statement is nothing less than a general license for the grossest opportunism in the labor movement, plunging head first into the "lesser evil" swamp of the Morrisseys, Yablonskis, Foxes, and on ad nauseam. The CNL leaflet on the final runoff two years ago was even more blatantly contradictory. While urging their supporters to "Vote Hill" (with not even a pretense of a "labor party" escape clause) it stated that:

"The CNL has absolutely no confidence whatsoever in the ability of Hill to take this fight forward one inch."

Then came the punch line:

"At the same time, the only way that Hill, who now comes forward in the mantle of partial opposition to reorganization, can be exposed for the fraud he is; the only way the rank and file of the union can be broken from him, and the struggle against the city taken beyond him as it has already been taken beyond Morgenstern, is by placing him in the position of SSEU-371 president." [Emphasis ours]

Militant Caucus: No Difference Between Slates

The Militant Caucus, also eliminated in the first vote, issued a leaflet prior to the second vote which told the truth. It stated:

"In our opinion, there is no qualitative programmatic difference between these slates and a vote for either one would be a wasted vote. . . . In this vicious run-off fight, where each side is revealing the inside dirt about the other (and we have no reason to doubt either side's accusations), no matter who wins, the membership loses."

The CNL leaflet tried to cover its exposed flanks, claiming that because:

"[The] Militant Caucus are against taking forward the fight against reorganization or the fight to break the rank and file from both the Morgenstern and Hill leaderships, that they fight for abstention in Friday's runoff election, thereby fighting to guarantee the reelection of the Morgenstern leadership."

continued on page 12

to vote Hill Friday and to join the CNL to take forward this fight."

The point cynically obscured here is that the program upon which the WL/CNL based their support to Hill was not the program that Hill was running on! A particularly gross example of the fraudulent nature of the WL/CNL's newly discovered differences between Hill and Cohen was revealed in the Bulletin of 17 April where they ominously warn:

"If these Cohen forces are elected there will be a vicious red-baiting witch-hunt of all militants in the union."

Yet an "Open Letter to Stan Hill and the Hill Leadership" signed by Dennis Cribben for the SSEU-371 Committee for New Leadership, appearing about two years ago in the 16 October 1970 issue of the SSEU newspaper The Unionist, charged:

"The vicious red-baiting attack on the CNL launched by Les Phillips in the last issue of the 'Unionist' is in our opinion an open announcement by your administration that it will now attempt to witchhunt the CNL out of the union."

The very same Les Phillips ran this year in the number two spot of Executive Vice President on the CNL-supported Hill slate! Apparently the WL/CNL decided that a "progressive" red-baiter was preferable to a "Wallaceite" red-baiter.

"Committee for the Same Old Leadership"

The 1972 SSEU election was not the first time with brother Hill for the WL/CNL. In the previous

As Seen by Workers League—

The Many Faces of Stanley Hill



Stanley Hill: "Absolutely identical" with Morgenstern—1970.



Stanley Hill: "Vote Hill"—1970.



Stanley Hill: "Betrays ranks in first week of office!"—1970.



Stanley Hill: "Vote Hill"—1972.

Continued from page 1

THE UAW AND THE CRISIS IN AUTO

the "productivity" drive and special product development to improve competitiveness, such as GM's costliest project ever to create the new "Vega," imports mounted. Despite GM's predictions that 1971 sales of foreign cars would only amount to 10% or 11% of the domestic market, they were double that figure by August. In the first year after the launching of the Chevrolet Vega and Ford Pinto "sub-compacts," Toyota sales increased 74% and Datsun's 108%.

Profits Are the Problem

At this juncture, the auto companies, along with American capitalism generally, demanded special measures to cope with the situation, including greater "productivity" sacrifices from American workers to make U. S. industry more competitive with its "cheap labor" rivals. But it is not the workers' lack of sacrifice that makes U. S. industry uncompetitive and unproductive; it is the capitalist demand for profits. Capitalists produce not when it is socially desirable or useful to do so, but only when it is profitable to do so.

Emma Rothschild, writing for the *New York Review of Books*, 25 February 1971 and 23 March 1972, provides useful information on this process as it applies to the U. S. auto industry, yet falls into the trap, in at least some of her conclusions, of seeing the basic cause of the crisis as saturation of the market—the automobile glut which has provided the U. S. with at least one car for every 2 1/2 people. This over-production, Rothschild concludes, caused the drop in sales, which in turn led to lower profits, less investment incentive and stagnating productivity. Her statistics, however, show that U. S. auto companies still have a strong though shrinking edge over their foreign rivals in capital assets per employee. This means that the productivity of the American auto worker is greater than that of his foreign counterpart. It also means, however, that the rate of profit on new investment has been driven down, since profit is derived from labor, and the more productive the labor, the more initial capital investment is required to begin the labor process. While the immediate cause of falling profits in U. S. auto is the competition of foreign manufacturers, this takes place within the framework of the longer term phenomenon Marx described as the "tendency of the rate of profit to fall," affecting all capitalisms in all countries. It is this process, not the "glut" of the market, which halts productive new investment and brings on economic crises.

The "glut" of too many automobiles is apparent to any big-city dweller, especially one caught in a traffic jam. It is not the reason for lagging

sales of automobiles, however. If cars were made cheaper through reduction in auto company profits, more people would buy them, since the need for adequate transportation is by no means "glutted." The opposite is true: massive new production is needed to entirely change the nature of the transportation system from one based on inefficient, polluting private vehicles to an efficient system of widespread mass transit, using clean power sources and private vehicles only in uncrowded areas. This task would require unified central planning and expropriation of auto and other transport industries by the workers. It is blocked only by the power of private capital—the handful of private owners of industry who must produce only what is immediately profitable to them.

The auto capitalists have two basic courses open to them as the squeeze of a falling rate of profit clamps down on them: I) seek to export capital overseas to take advantage of their competitors' "cheap" (but less productive) labor, or II) try to drive up their rate of surplus value (rate of exploitation).

I—The Drive to Export Capital

The drive to export capital in addition to cars is greater in the older U. S. companies than in their newer rivals, but all are headed in the same direction—toward the inevitable clash over limited investment fields. GM, which advertises the Vega as "a car built in America to American tastes," has subsidiaries producing for the U. S. in Germany, England, Australia, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil and South Africa. 20% of GM output (including manual transmissions for the Vega) is produced outside North America and the percentage is rising. The other two of the "Big 3" import more components for their "anti-import" compacts, and Chrysler has contracted with a Japanese firm to produce the engines for Chrysler's entry into the diesel truck market. GM may have the biggest foreign ambition of all: beating Japan to the China market. It is already well down the road toward this central U. S. strategy, with sales of heavy duty equipment to China through an Italian associate and setting up of operations in South Korea, Philippines, Malaysia, Thailand and Japan itself.

European and Japanese companies, too, are fighting for new markets for sales and investments, but even as they gain headway in the U. S. market—especially vital for Japan—they face Nixon's retaliation on behalf of the U. S. bourgeoisie. Worldwide expansion will not lead to the "rushing toward alliances" envisioned by *Automotive News*, except in the short-run sense of overseas mergers now being actively pursued even in Japan by U. S. companies. Rather, it tends toward a life-or-death struggle for control of the world between the major capitalist powers. Like Nixon's August 1971 challenge to U. S. trading partners, the clash of the world's auto giants, which are a vital center of the capitalist industrial system, forewarns the approach of yet another, perhaps final, inter-imperialist war for redivision of the world.

II—Productivity and the Rate of Exploitation

The rate of exploitation is determined by the ratio expressing the part of the working day the worker receives back in wages and the part acquired by the boss. This concept is also known as the rate of surplus value. One means of increasing this rate is to increase the productivity of labor without the worker expending any more energy or time. Raising productivity means investing in new labor-saving machinery (usually accompanied by layoffs to reduce the overall work force).

It is possible, however, to increase the capitalist's profits (his part of the day) without increasing productivity through (1) increasing the amount of work performed in the day (speedup); (2) cutting wages; (3) prolonging the working day. The demand for "productivity" through speedup and other worker sacrifices is a major capitalist hoax. Even when the capitalists do stop their phony howling for more "productivity" from the workers to actually engage in productive investments, layoffs and intensification of work are again the usual results for the workers.

Therefore, to concentrate only on wage gains linked to productivity increases, while allowing layoffs, speedups and compulsory lengthening of the working day to proceed unchecked, as the UAW bureaucracy has done virtually since its inception, is to follow exactly the capitalists' demands. Their essential interests are advanced, while those of the workers suffer. Nevertheless, the

tendency of the rate of profit to fall is only temporarily slowed by these measures. The inevitable crisis will come, whether in the form of a new world war or an intensified depression or both; and when it does, the workers will be disarmed and unprepared by a policy of capitulation.

Bureaucratic Treachery in UAW

The UAW bureaucratic elite, which was cast into an impervious leaden mass and draped in pious social-patriotism and liberal hypocrisy by Walter Reuther, has indeed been most effective in lashing the workers to the fortunes of their capitalist opponents. GM responded to the present crisis in the U. S. with two fists: Lordstown and GMAD. The \$100-million new factory complex at Lordstown, Ohio to produce Vegas was designed to raise actual labor productivity, while the special General Motors Assembly Division (GMAD) management team was created to drive up the rate of exploitation through layoffs and speedup at Lordstown and throughout the GM system. The UAW leadership considered itself a slightly critical partner in both these forms of capitalist aggression against the auto workers, rather than an opponent.

Because the Lordstown experiment was the most expensive project of its kind ever undertaken by a U. S. corporation and a key test in the capitalist "productivity" drive against foreign competitors, the events at the specially designed, super-fast and (supposedly) super-efficient plant since the arrival of the GMAD management team, leading to a strike last February, were well publicized in the capitalist press. Intensification of work through the elimination of "unproductive" motion, etc., was made intolerably worse by GMAD's further intensification through layoffs, increased work loads, and victimization of those who couldn't keep up. Less well known is the fact that these policies are commonplace at other GMAD plants and throughout the industry, and that many other locals, such as Norwood, Ohio and Buick Local 599 in Flint, Michigan were considering strike action over similar grievances at about the same time as the Lordstown workers. The UAW bureaucracy managed to stall the others so that Lordstown, and then the Norwood local after it, struck separately. This UAW policy is precisely what GMAD wants—isolated strikes to break morale and force the workers to accept layoffs and speedups. GMAD itself sparked six such strikes in 1969 alone.

The Absurdity of Isolation

The workers at Lordstown, Norwood and other plants throughout the Midwest, know the absurdity of one local union trying to defeat management policies by striking alone, especially against a giant like GM. The Lordstown strike, besides forcing GM to close Fisher Body plants in Syracuse, Buffalo and Detroit, began to affect steel production in Youngstown and Warren (where 5,000 tons of steel per week is produced for Lordstown) and tire production in Akron (Vegas take 10,000 per day). The Lordstown strikers received the support of the 10,000-member IUE Local 717 in Warren, representing GM workers who make electrical wiring harnesses and other assemblies for Vegas, as well as that of many other workers in industries throughout the country. The youthful and militant Lordstown strikers themselves showed imagination and recognition of the need for international solidarity of workers: they wanted to send delegations to get the support of striking West Coast dockers and Japanese auto workers. Not only was this request refused by the UAW bureaucracy, which sends its bureaucrats on international pleasure trips in the name of fighting multi-national corporations, but "Solidarity" House finally succeeded in railroading the Lordstown strikers back to work with the speedup unchanged, compulsory overtime to 9 hours a day, the disciplinary layoffs (DLO's) unresolved and the other 800 laid-off workers somehow "lost" in a supposed "miscount" of the actual number laid off! (Union bureaucrats never miscount their dues-paying members!)

Recognizing the central importance to the auto companies of the kind of cost-cutting campaigns conducted by GMAD, the UAW bureaucracy, in keeping with its general policy of partnership in

continued next page....

the main interests of capitalism, remains consistently soft on this monster. Exasperated by the UAW tops' inaction in the face of the GMAD assault, one lower-level bureaucrat (the secretary of UAW Local 34, GMAD, in Atlanta) complained:

"Since we were changed from Fisher Body and Chevrolet Division of General Motors Assembly Division we have experienced not only much difference in bargaining with the Company but also a marked difference in the attitude of our upper leadership. . . Leadership should not mean followship and that is the way it appears to the members of Local 34, especially since we have been GMAD. . . We. . . believe our leadership has reached a place of complacency. . ."

—The United National Caucus,
Special Convention Issue, April 1972

The UAW bureaucracy's position is not fundamentally different than right-wing AFL-CIO protectionism. Both put the national interests of U.S. corporations above international labor solidarity. This leaves the bureaucrats open to attack from the right, as evidenced by the many locally-endorsed protectionist resolutions submitted to the 1972 convention. The bureaucrats have no answer except to sweep the whole problem under the rug or capitulate to the right. The March 1972 issue of *UAW Solidarity* ran an article entitled, "We're Still Not Fonda Honda," which reported that because of some unspecified UAW influence, Honda had announced a reduction in the work week for its employees. There was no mention of the need to establish concrete links of solidarity with Japanese workers, or of the need for a shorter work week in the U. S.

As to layoffs, 100 UAW workers walked off an assembly line in Detroit to protect the jobs of 5 fired workers. But the UAW "leadership," faced with the closing of Fisher Body plant No. 23 in Detroit, threatening "most" of 1,100 jobs permanently, offered a two-fold response: 1) they "demanded" that the Mayor set up a "Jobs For Detroit Committee," which they then sat on, and 2) they called for a federal law to "force" runaway plants to apply for a federal permit before they run away! The latter point would obviously make runaway plants perfectly legal, providing the bureaucrats with an iron-clad excuse for not opposing them. Instead of relying on strike action to fight the layoffs which have put 300,000 auto workers out of work and caused a 15% drop in UAW membership—despite an actual increase in production so far in 1972—the bureaucracy looks to the capitalist class and its politicians to save it from its plight. Said Woodcock to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress in 1971, ". . . it is up to you and to your decisions that we look for

the leadership. . . which our country needs. . . " (*UAW Solidarity*, March 1971).

Woodcock Ignores Ranks

The auto worker ranks never endorsed this bureaucratic policy of cooperating with the capitalist enemy and its political stooges. Many have outspokenly opposed it at every step of the way, but the bureaucracy hears little and forgets the rest. When Nixon declared his wage freeze, 2,000 auto workers from Illinois and Iowa demonstrated, including Local 997 Maytag workers from Newton, Iowa who had just completed a 5-month strike. The latter demanded a nationwide strike against the freeze. Although showing his "left" face at the time, Woodcock chose to completely ignore this demand.

GM Contract Betrayal

The contract agreed to by the UAW tops to end the 1970-71 GM strike was typical of the pattern of cooperation with capitalism. It provided some wage gains and limited cost-of-living protection against inflation, but completely sold out on speedups, layoffs and working conditions. The grievance procedure was actually weakened, compulsory overtime was maintained despite promises to eliminate it, and 30 demands for improved safety and working conditions were simply dropped altogether. As stated in the introduction to the contract: "General Motors holds that the basic interests of employers and employees are the same." Brother Woodcock couldn't agree more.



Walter Reuther



Leonard Woodcock

Carnival in Atlantic City

If anyone still doubted the treacherous nature of the UAW bureaucracy after the betrayal of the GM national and Lordstown strikes, the April 1972 UAW convention in Atlantic City should have dispelled them. Despite the defeat at Lordstown, massive grievances, speedups, layoffs, etc. throughout the auto industry, and an ongoing strike at Norwood, Ohio, over these very questions, the convention paid virtually no attention to the vital interests of auto workers. The nearly 3,000 delegates, almost entirely local union officials and a few of their hangers-on, spent most of their time listening to capitalist politicians, passing meaningless resolutions for the politicians to act on, and going to booze parties. It was left to Kennedy to note in an address to the convention that conditions on the auto assembly lines are so bad that workers are sometimes forced to run to keep up with them.

"Don't Worry About Your Contracts, Leonard"

Woodcock's dull State of the Union address to an inattentive audience emphasized his pro-capitalist ideology. Referring to inflation, Woodcock asserted that "labor, fighting to recapture its eroded position, began to be part of the problem. . . ." He criticized the 1970 Teamster wildcat victory of a \$1.85 hourly increase as inflationary, and wondered aloud why the Pay Board had been critical of the Aerospace pact, since:

"UAW contracts, I repeat and insist, are socially responsible, are counter-inflationary; the leading industrial spokesman on the Pay Board, Mr. Virgil Day, said to me, 'Don't worry about your contracts, Leonard, they are on the side of the angels.'"

The first day of the convention was devoted mainly to post-mortem worship of Walter Reuther, and included the showing "for the first time anywhere" of a film about his life—some of it, The film reminded the delegates that the union wasn't built on wage demands alone, but on the struggle against speedups and intolerable working conditions—implying, of course, that all this had been taken care of the minute Reuther left the auto plants and became a union bureaucrat.

The Heritage of Walter Reuther

Reuther was a bureaucratic leader whose accomplishment was to forge an impervious bureaucracy to control a powerful, lively and sometimes "unruly" union. He didn't change conditions on the auto assembly lines; he did succeed in deadening the union. Woodcock is an equally bureaucratic follower whose accomplishment will be to preside over the disintegration of that bureaucracy (it is already beginning to crack) until he is

discarded, or thrown out of office by the auto workers. There is a tendency on the part of dolts like *Daily World* columnist George Morris to assume that Woodcock represents a shift to the right away from Reutherism who is unable to carry forward the "progressive tradition" of the UAW. Says Morris: ". . . the pace of decline in the UAW's relative progressiveness. . . has increased since Leonard Woodcock stepped into the union's presidency" (*Daily World*, 4 May 1972). What Morris is trying to cover up beneath an elaborate, phony theory of "good-guy" progressive trade union bureaucrats like Reuther vs. "bad-guy" reactionaries like Meany, is that Woodcock represents absolutely nothing new: Reuther did it all, in a much slimmer fashion, long ago.

It was Reuther who firmly established bureaucratic one-man rule in the UAW in 1949, after years of lively and relatively democratic factional struggle. His complacent slogan, "teamwork in the leadership and solidarity in the ranks," which is so highly touted by his squabbling heirs, was the drapery that concealed his steamrolling, in one way or another, of all those who dared oppose him. It was Reuther who laid the groundwork for Woodcock's betrayal on Nixon's Pay Board by thoroughly establishing the "principle" of class collaboration and participation on every available government board and agency—during World War II, the Korean War and in between. It was Reuther, too, who established once and for all the "tradition" of linking wages to increases in productivity and letting working conditions go to hell. Those who praise Reuther's "achievements" also boast of reversing many of his distinctive "achievements"—contracts as long as 5 years (over the original 1 or 2) with separate termination dates for the major companies, no-strike and "company security" clauses. . . .

subscribe NOW

Special Subscription Offer: \$1 11 ISSUES

INCLUDES SPARTACIST

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____

WORKERS VANGUARD
Mail to: Box 1377, G.P.O./New York/N.Y. 10001

WV Sub Drive Hits 40%—One Month to Go!

Resumption of massive U.S. bombing of North Vietnam precipitated very heavy RCY and SL intervention in student strikes, especially in the struggle to link them to anti-war labor action. We then responded to Nixon's decision to mine Haiphong harbor by agitation around defense of North Vietnam and demonstrations at Russian and Chinese missions and consulates demanding full military aid to the NLF and the DRV.

All this led to a slow start in our *Workers Vanguard* subscription drive. But as the figures show, all SL local and organizing committees and RCY chapters are making heavy, sustained and successful efforts to meet their quotas. While subs are generally easiest to get from students and undifferentiated youth, all local units, individual comrades and especially industrial fractions must stress securing subs from young workers and union militants in our areas of industrial concentration.

The two-month subdrive will formally conclude as of 30 June. The next *WV* will report semi-final results. *RCY Newsletter* and *Women and Revolution* subs are counted at a half point each toward individually winning the drive, but all figures listed here are for only the one-year paid *WV* subs.

Area	Now	Quota
Berkeley-Oakland	21	55
Boston	52	125
Chicago	9	40
Los Angeles	32	50
New Orleans	12	15
New York	63	160
San Francisco	9	25
San Diego	4	10
Stony Brook	5	20
Washington, D.C.	7	10
At-Large	36	90
Totals	250	600

Continued from Page 9

..... UAW

...rity" clauses imposed in defiance of explicit convention decisions, taking wage cuts under pressure and bargaining away cost-of-living protection. It was Reuther, moreover, who rode to power and stayed there as one of the worst red-baiters in the labor movement, combining with reactionaries and racists in and out of the labor movement to defeat his opponents, even setting them up for persecution by government witch-hunting agencies such as HUAC!

"Peoples Car"— "Peoples" Capitalism

It was Reuther who established the slick social-patriotism which characterizes the UAW bureaucracy today. His biographers emphasize how he was always coming up with "Reuther plans" to make things work better for the capitalists, such as getting fighter plane engine production on an assembly-line basis during World War II and drastically reducing the amount of labor time required in the boring of tank cannon and artillery. A more recent example, which would be ludicrous if it weren't serious, demonstrates clearly how Reuther's "leftism" was only designed to make U.S. capitalism more efficient. Concerned about the threat that imports posed to U.S. auto capitalists from the very beginning, Reuther proposed that the major auto makers be permitted to set up a joint-venture corporation to produce a "people's car" to compete with Volkswagen. This would turn back the import threat, help sales and profits, fight unemployment and strengthen the U.S. balance-of-payments position. "[Lyndon] Johnson was impressed. . ." (Cormier and Eaton, *Reuther*, 1970, p. 365).

Reuther was a "new-style" bureaucrat, unlike old-line AFL leaders (like Tobin, Hutcheson, Green, etc.), who could never have kept power in a union like the UAW. Without ruling out open suppression of opponents, he generally used more subtle means to stay in power. He pretended to agree with a position or program he actually opposed, to avoid an honest confrontation of views. He used "tactical" and organizational excuses to defeat principled demands such as the creation of a labor party, a shorter work week at no loss in pay, opposition to class collaboration, etc., so he could sabotage them later. This was the school in which Woodcock learned to whine out of both sides of his mouth.

Reutherite Slime: Food for Liberals

Reuther succeeded by combining militant phraseology and social demagoguery with maneuvering, trickery and cunning. Probably his most important single "achievement" was at the 1944 convention, where his trickery prevented the UAW from discarding the wartime no-strike pledge, thereby beheading the powerful class-struggle momentum which was strongest in the UAW ranks. His use of social demagoguery and his ability to conceal undemocratic acts under a cloak of pseudo-democracy made him popular with intellectuals and liberals. He was regarded as a man of "social vision" because of his fluency in blocking or confusing the discussion of class-struggle policies and cloaking his basically conservative, bureaucratic machine in an aura of social and political progressive rhetoric.

Reuther's fundamental opportunism was established as early as the 1936 convention when, as a newly elected executive board member, he covertly aided John L. Lewis' pressure to overturn the convention's pro-labor party and anti-Roosevelt position in order to appear "respectable." From that point on, his position on the labor party was always, "Now is not the time." With this excuse he supported the Democrats and finally, at the 1955 CIO convention, with the ranks disillusioned and demoralized—and the CIO bureaucrats eager to prove their respectability to their soon-to-be marriage partners in the AFL—Reuther's real position came out: "A labor party would commit the American political system to the same narrow class structure upon which the political parties of Europe are built. . . . Basically what we are trying to do is work within the two-party system of America. . ." he said. So it was

that a great industrial union was brought back to the reformist cretinism of Samuel Gompers.

The Old Opposition

There has been a long history of opposition to reformism and bureaucracy in the UAW, even extending through the Reuther-dominated cold-war years, when other unions were more easily cowed. Auto workers demonstrated their contempt for the cold-war witchhunt when, at the height of it, they came out in force to defend a small strike in Detroit being baited as "communist" and attacked by the police. UAW oppositionists spoke out against the Korean War at the time, and the leadership of the giant Ford Local 600 staged a long rebellion against Reuther, emphasizing among other things the demand for a labor party. Yet at no time during this period did the opposition manage to forge a permanent, cohesive organized force based on a principled program. Without a consistent anti-bureaucratic and anti-capitalist perspective, the groups tended to come and go, some selling out to Reuther's bureaucracy, others leaving the labor movement. A long-term political focus and basic cadre for overthrowing the bureaucracy and replacing it with revolutionary working-class leadership was lacking.

The New Opposition

The new opposition is destined to travel the same road as the old, unless it learns the lessons



Wives of sit-down strikers talk with their husbands at Fisher Body No. 1, 1937: Reuther's job was to tame militancy which built UAW.

of the past. Many caucuses exist ("Rank and File for Progress," "Action Caucus," etc.), but the only serious political opposition to the machine at the 1972 convention came from the United National Caucus (UNC). The UNC is loosely structured and based on previous caucuses, particularly Art Fox's caucus in the skilled trades unit of Local 600, but it represents the fusion of diverse forces and new ideas. Fox himself, no longer the sole leader, publicly spurns his own opportunist past without having changed one iota. The new caucus has a relatively advanced program on paper, with demands for 30 for 40, no labor participation on government boards, immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Southeast Asia, and for a labor party. It prides itself on efforts to become integrated and to develop programs to combat racism from a working-class standpoint. Yet the caucus incorporates the grossest opportunism within its ranks because of failure to appreciate the true nature of its tasks.

With no membership requirements beyond dues payment, the UNC stands open to many completely contradictory, even counterposed political tendencies and to careerists simply looking for an avenue to personal power. Many of the latter, like the frustrated candidate for president of Local 600 who received special speaking rights at the UNC caucus meeting at the '72 convention, are fully embroiled in suing the union in the capitalist courts, a basic class betrayal which can only increase the tendency toward government control over the unions. Illusory, immediate or personal gains may sometimes be won in this way, but the workers will never advance under this cop-out masquerading as a "tactic": in fact, rank-and-file control will be blocked and militants victimized,

as bureaucratic control is supplanted by direct government supervision from judges to "arbitrators" to HUAC-style inquisitors. Bureaucracy must be fought by rank-and-file caucuses based on a principled program of struggle within the labor movement to defend it against all interference from the capitalists and their state machinery.

Despite UNC labor party rhetoric, a leaflet issued by the League of Caucuses at the convention contained a statement which could easily be construed as backhanded endorsement, or at least softness toward, a "reforming" orientation toward the Democratic Party. In "An Open Letter to the Membership of the UAW," the League declared:

"All over the United States, the people are in motion, trying to make institutions which are important to them (such as the Church, School, Political Party) more democratic, more sensitive and responsive to their needs."

And in response to the convention's grant of honorary UAW membership to Senator Edward Kennedy, UNC leader Art Fox declared that the caucus was considering making New York Democratic Representative Bella Abzug an honorary UNC member!

Convention Maneuvers

Because of the UNC's loose attitude toward program, it largely succumbed to pressure to drop most of its program at the convention in favor of support to a referendum system for the

election of all UAW officers (instead of delegated elections at conventions), a position endorsed by 13 local unions prior to the convention. The referendum position has a history in the UAW (it got more support in '68 than in '72), and gave the UNC the opportunity of appearing to head a powerful movement beyond the limited scope of its own forces. To aid this opportunist impulse, the UNC set up a "League of Caucuses" before the convention, based on only two points: the referendum vote question and a court-suit campaign against the union on the retiree-vote question (the retiree vote is used by the bureaucracy to maintain conservatism and even



Supporters of sit-down strikers arrive from other auto and steel plants, 1937.

overturn the wishes of the working majority, as happened in a recent Local 600 election). Thus the UNC's more radical and class-conscious paper positions were revealed as empty rhetoric to be dropped at the first opportunity in favor of a power bloc around abstract "democracy"—the real program of the UNC.

Although some UNC members regretted it, and the "League" didn't function as an organization on the convention floor, the UNC itself concentrated on a push to get the referendum question on the floor. This effort was quashed by the bureaucracy in high-handed fashion, leaving the UNC with little to show for its effort. Some Caucus leaders, such as co-chairman Pete Kelly, who spoke from the floor for the labor party, seemed more concerned about the struggle for the full Caucus program; yet none were willing to fight inside the Caucus for a split with the careerists and re-

continued next page . . .

formists, politically hardening the better elements.

Real Meaning of Referendum Proposal

The referendum proposal appears to make the union more democratic by placing decision-making power directly in the hands of the ranks. A sheer illusion! A referendum system is in fact less democratic in that it reduces the decision-making body to dispersed and isolated individuals who never come together in a discussion in which counterposed proposals and programs are debated. Union policy is thus determined by polling the existing consciousness rather than a process of political struggle. One need only look at the ossified National Maritime Union (NMU) or the rigid Steelworkers Union, both of which use the system, to see its effects. The backers of the referendum answer by combining the referendum slogan with other democratic demands, such as unlimited free access to union periodicals for opposition groups, etc.—but who is to say that these demands will be any safer under a different structure as long as the same bureaucracy is running headquarters?

The UNC should study the history of the referendum issue in the UAW; it was precisely through a referendum promise that Reuther got the 1944 convention to reverse itself and endorse the no-strike pledge! Once the convention was over nothing mattered—its will had been subverted and it was dispersed. A bureaucracy in power can manipulate a referendum system ten times more easily than it can dominate a rebellious convention. If adopted, the referendum system would immediately disarm the rank-and-file opposition by separating the choosing of leaders from the making of decisions at national conventions, thereby enabling a bureaucracy to remain in power through stalling, mobilizing backward elements, etc. Oppositionists should shun such gimmicks like the plague, and concentrate on the serious political work among the ranks required to get committed, principled delegates to the conventions.

Two Methods

The UNC on the referendum question is one example of orientation toward immediate advantage as opposed to a long-term struggle based on firm principles. Failure to make the right choice will lead the UNC into making a much more serious and costly mistake: opportunist adaptation to a wing of the reformist bureaucracy as against a serious anti-bureaucratic perspective, again, based on principles, not "tactical" advantage. Already the method of jaded ex-radicals such as Fox and his fake-left supporters in the International Socialists (IS) is clearly toward following rifts in the bureaucracy and seeking a broad, unprincipled bloc with one wing of a deep split in the UAW bureaucracy. Fox openly expresses (and the IS pants for) the possibility of a unification of the UNC with ex-Western Regional Director Paul Schrade and his supporters, who, according to the Daily World include Emil Mazey and other prominent members of the International leadership.

When a bureaucracy splits, both wings, especially those who are "out" and want to get back "in," try to appear to be to the left of the other, in order to gain or retain power. Schrade, dumped with Woodcock's blessings at the '72 convention, was always indistinguishable from the other bureaucrats on "trade-union" questions but active in the anti-war movement and generally a liberal outside the union. Schrade had gone along with the rest of the bureaucracy in selling out the Aerospace workers, whose contract was scotched by the Pay Board upon which Woodcock continued to sit. Unfortunately for Schrade, most of the Aerospace workers happen to be in his region. Schrade furthermore made the mistake of not supporting Woodcock for president following Reuther's death. Therefore, ambitious bureaucrats from the apparatus in Schrade's region were allowed to take over unhindered, accusing Schrade of "not paying enough attention to union issues," which was hardly the problem.

"Left" Circus on Schrade's Ouster

Schrade is no better or worse than his accusers; his liberalism has simply served for many years to help shroud with a thicker fog of Reutherite social demagogy the bureaucratic betrayals which he and the rest have jointly perpetrated on the workers. Yet the various fake-left organ-

izations, in their grasping after straws for various self-serving and opportunist purposes, present a ludicrous example of the lengths to which one can go—and the depths to which one can sink—in tailing after either wing of such a meaningless, bureaucratic split. The Daily World (Communist Party) and the Militant (ex-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party) both tended to favor Schrade, since they are both primarily motivated by building popular-front coalitions of liberal capitalist politicians and "left" trade union bureaucrats like Schrade who, they like to think, represent workers in the anti-war movement. Said the Militant, "The issue was right-wing opposition to Schrade's positive role as an activist in social movements, not a militant opposition to his role as a bureaucrat" (12 May 1972).

The wretched "Workers" League, however, although it supports the pop front anti-war movement and blocs with the bourgeoisie to attack "Stalinism" in the movement, is more concerned than these others in going after the real source of bureaucratic power as rapidly as possible. The WL tended to support Whipple, who defeated Schrade, seeing a possible direct route to the core of the UAW leadership itself. Although it later declared that all parties concerned (Woodcock, Schrade, Whipple) were wings of the bureaucracy, the WL's initial reaction in the 1 May 1972 Bulletin was very emphatic: "UAW Rebels Dump Woodcock Man" screamed a front-page headline, over an article calling Whipple's victory a "... rebellion [which] reflects a deep dissatisfaction among rank and file members..." The Bulletin neglected to mention that Whipple, too, was a "Woodcock man" (perhaps even more so than Schrade), and was a top member of the "Schrade team" itself until shortly before the

The Sliding Scale of Social-Patriotism

Reuther: "... America is a society... in which we do not have this rigid class structure... Basically what we are trying to do is work within the two-party system of America..." (1955)

Woodcock (on inflation): "... labor, fighting to recapture its eroded position, began to be part of the problem..." (1972)

Sims (Co-chairman of United National Caucus): "... to make your America great, to make it productive... you're not going anyplace without me or someone like me." (1972)

Fox (United National Caucus): "We are fighting to save our union, and, in a broader sense, to save our country." (1972)

"rebellion." The WL tails the UNC bandwagon in order to imply that its positions have influence there. The 1 May 1972 Bulletin printed an interview with a UNC member headlined, "UAW Ranks Speak Out on Labor Party—National Caucus Member: Bosses Control Democrats." Unfortunately, in small type in the body of the article is revealed the ambivalence characteristic of the UNC:

"Bulletin: Who do you think controls the Democratic and Republican parties?

"Maddox: I think big business does, but I think there should be a national caucus of the working people and give our vote to whatever party is going to do our bidding whether Republican or Democratic."

The WL is also more than eager to drop its erstwhile—and incorrect—characterization of all black caucuses as simply "reactionary," when organizational advantage beckons. Its 24 April Bulletin features prominently, and without criticism, an interview with Nat Mosley, chairman of the Black Caucus in Local 25, St. Louis, under the headline "Auto Worker Demands Labor Party!"

Sliding Scale of Social-Patriotism

Some UNC members seem to have learned literally nothing from either the history of past oppositions in the UAW or the whole development of

"Reutherism." Reuther's chief method for holding power was to pass off his social-democratic and patriotic schemes for making capitalism work better ("serve the people") as a substitute for the working class struggling in its own name for its own interests. One finds a remarkably close resemblance between Reutherite demagogy and statements of supposedly "left" UNC leaders. Caucus Co-chairman Jordan Sims, a black Local 961 worker who was fired by Chrysler for his militancy, said, "... you recognize one thing: to make your America great, to make it productive, to make it serve you and benefit you—you're not going anyplace without me or someone like me" (UNC, April 1972, emphasis ours). This bit of social-patriotic demagogy was not only featured prominently on the front page of the special convention issue of the Caucus paper, but was also picked up and quoted without criticism by the UNC's chief outside supporters, the IS, in Workers Power #52. The IS has once more demonstrated the existence of a social-democratic and patriotic (and therefore anti-communist) continuum through which it, as the extreme left-wing representatives of this social-democracy, is linked with an indissoluble political umbilical cord to the right-wing anti-communist social-democrats such as the very heirs of Reuther. As it so easily sells out today to tail after the relative small fry like Fox and Sims, all the greater will be its betrayals tomorrow to the Schrades, Mazeys, Woodcocks and Reuthers.

As if this weren't enough, Fox added his bit to the social-patriotic, Reutherite bandwagon by pointing out quite seriously in the UNC caucus meeting at the '72 convention that, "We are fighting to save our union and, in a broader sense, to save our country." He has yet to find, in his search for any fake-left handle with which to smash every last shred of his radical background, the answer to the question: what is "ours" in the most powerful imperialism of the world?

The IS, which eagerly built public meetings for Fox in several cities, refrained as usual from attacking him for his wretched social-chauvinist remark or any other aspect of his opportunism, happy to present this cynical reformist in the role of working-class leader in exchange for a chance to brag about its informal ties to Fox—a "real" (and "influential") "militant" worker!

Program and Party

The UNC cannot achieve its objectives—even partially—with a partial perspective. To defeat a well-entrenched bureaucracy, which well understands its central role of containing the class struggle within bounds acceptable to capitalism, requires a full program of struggle against the system, not just for "saving" the union or reforming the country. No aspiring "democratic" bureaucrats can provide a definitive programmatic break from all forms of labor-capital "partnership." Without such a break the most honest, decent and democratic oppositionist will be driven into the Reutherite swamp, whining over the lot of the wage slaves while supporting their slaveholders. To ensure that the programmatic requirements for achieving working-class power and not "partnership" are maintained, such caucuses must be linked to the revolutionary vanguard party, which struggles in all arenas of society for a revolutionary program leading to the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of workers power. While the caucus cannot normally advance the full program of workers' revolution in its day-to-day work, it must uncompromisingly carry out a transitional program which is fully consistent with the revolutionary goal. It is such a party and such caucuses that the Spartacist League and its youth section, the Revolutionary Communist Youth, seek to build. ■

CORRECTION

The May 1972 issue of WV contained the following factually incorrect statement in the article "George Morris and the CP—Record of Betrayal": "... District 65 in New York... left the AFL-CIO and joined the ALA without a single membership discussion or vote!" The official vote on disaffiliation took place at a General Council meeting on April 15, 1969. Locals voted during the period from late March to late April. According to the District 65 Constitution, the votes in locals were meaningless since the General Council has the power to overrule any membership vote. 65's letter of application for ALA affiliation was accepted by the ALA on April 16, 1970, and the official announcement made within a day or so. In at least some locals the membership vote on affiliation did not take place until May 5, 1970.

Continued from page 7

"Left-Center" Betrayal in Welfare Union

Having already stated that Hill was a "fraud" and "absolutely identical" with Morgenstern, the CNL fought to put Hill in office (with Morgenstern's politics) and called opposition to both bureaucrats support for Morgenstern! Nowhere in the WL/CNL "lesser evil" schema was Trotsky's demand to fight for independent revolutionary leadership in the trade unions "boldly and resolutely in critical moments advancing new militant leaders in place of routine functionaries and careerists..." This—the perspective advanced by the Militant Caucus and the Spartacist League—was labelled "abstentionist" by the Workers League!

The WL Smells Influence

A component of the capitulation two years ago that should not be overlooked, especially since it loomed very large for the WL, was their exulting in the new-found role as "power brokers" in a close fight, strutting around and puffing in the *Bulletin* of 27 April 1970: "This places the CNL in the position of holding the decisive margin to swing the runoff elections toward the candidate it chooses." Following Hill's election on May 1, 1970, the WL bragged in the 11 May *Bulletin*:

"Hill's election in this very close race was due primarily to the fact that the Committee for New Leadership... fought to transfer its 6% vote gotten in the April 17th election to the Hill slate."

Here stand revealed the real appetites of the Workers League toward hopefully becoming "left" office boys for some grateful bureaucrat. Of course, it still had to maintain the facade of putting Hill into office in order to "expose" him. Sure enough, it didn't take very long, for the *Bulletin* of 25 May 1970 carried a big headline screaming, "Hill Betrays Ranks In First Week of Office!" Well, you can't say they didn't warn you.

Hill Exposed—Hill Loses

Two whole years have passed since and, as accurately predicted by the WL, the betrayals of its candidate have been thoroughly exposed and amply covered in the pages of the *Bulletin*. Regarding the 1971 SSEU contract it wrote on 9 August 1971:

"President Stanley Hill has brought to the membership of SSEU Local 371 a settlement that is not only a sellout on wages, but completely hands over the job security of every member to Welfare Commissioner Sugarman and to Nixon."

and again on 30 August 1971, "Hill Pushes Sellout Through!" and so on. But apparently Wohlforth's much-vaunted "scientific method" is not yet satisfied that Hill has been sufficiently exposed. However, the WL has accomplished its hypocritically stated intent of 1970 "to break the rank and file from Hill"—since Hill lost the election on April 28 to Cohen by a vote of 4022 to 2664! But the Workers League, especially since the "Wallaceite" opposition to Hill is now in office, is still trying to keep its rotten left-center coalition together, holding out dirty hands once more to Hill. The *Bulletin* of 8 May 1972 ends an article covering the "right wing victory in the SSEU" with an appeal to Hill & Co.:

"In the course of preparing to build the CNL as the real alternative to Cohen, the CNL appeals in particular to Hill and those active in his campaign that they now break with those who are advocating making peace with Cohen and particularly those like Winnie Davis who advocated on April 26 that SSEU members withdraw from the Union. What is necessary now is that they join with the CNL in the fight to reverse the dangerous situation created by this election." [Emphasis ours]

The meaning of the WL's anti-Leninist betrayal in the SSEU goes far beyond that particular New York white-collar union. Its SSEU intervention spans more than six years, its longest continuous organized activity in any trade union. The CNL, in intimate contact with the New York national

center of the WL, provides the most authentic expression of the WL's wildly oscillating politics. The CNL betrayals are not the blunders of inexperienced people, nor simply more of the many "mistakes" the WL seems proud of. For the WL its heavily publicized SSEU activity is the prototype for all its trade union work, and represents the acid test for this organization on the key question facing Trotskyists the world over: how to re-

Stan Hill (left) confers with Dennis Cribben (right) of CNL and Jack Talbutt (center) of Stalinist-supported Unity Caucus.



solve the crisis of leadership of the working class that stands as the principal obstacle to proletarian revolution. The Workers League has generalized on its SSEU experience, developing a consistent practice of taking the working class from one betrayal to yet another, a policy "theoretically" justified by the insistence that to dispel the illusions of the workers about "all sorts of fake militants" it is a "necessary and progressive step" to put each currently popular labor hustler into power! This is nothing less than a reformist theory of stages that completely obscures the critical difference between destroying illusions and creating them. We, as revolutionists, want the working class to leap over the road of reformist dead ends, not lead them into it. If we should nevertheless fail in this task, the defeat suffered by the working class at that particular intersection of class forces should be in spite of a relentless struggle beforehand to expose their traitorous misleaders, in the course of which the foundation has been laid for future victories.

But not so for the Workers League, since its "program" is determined by petty opportunist appetites and the Healy-Wohlforth method of cynicism, a desire to be big-time operators, tail-ending the fake leaders while offering lip-service opposition. Thus in the 16 December 1968 *Bulletin* the WL issued a call, "Vote Morrissey Ticket" in the National Maritime Union (NMU), claiming once again that "the election of these men can be an important step for the rank and file seamen," when in fact Morrissey was a co-bureaucrat of NMU President Joe Curran for years, sharing in all his betrayals until it seemed opportune to "break" from Curran, and then turning to the ruling class' courts to clean up the NMU mess. The *Bulletin* currently features uncritical reportage on the pro-Yablonski "Miners for Democracy" opposition in the United Mine Workers, and the "United National Caucus" in the United Auto Workers, an unprincipled coalition led by Pete Kelly and one Art Fox, a former political collaborator of Wohlforth's. So when the Workers League calls on "progressive" bureaucrats like Victor Gotbaum, David Livingston, Jack Speigal, et al. in a *Bulletin* editorial of 5 October 1970 "to take the lead" in forming a labor party as "the only way to beat back the right-wing attempts to build a reactionary movement to destroy labor in America," we know the programmatic meaning of its current sloganeering to "Stop Wallace! Build a Labor Party Now!" It is the Stalinist call for a left-center coalition, a call to build nothing but the prestige of "progressive" labor traitors, a call for the betrayal of the working class! ■

Demand New Trial for Martin Sostre!

In June, 1968 Martin Sostre, operator of the Afro-Asian Bookstore in Buffalo, New York, was convicted and sentenced to a 31 to 41-year term on drug charges. Sostre was convicted on the testimony of one Arto Williams, a repeated drug offender at the time, and Detective Sgt. Alvin Gristmacher, since dismissed from the Buffalo Police Department for suspected graft and drug dealing. Sostre can receive a new trial if Williams receives immunity from prosecution for perjury in order to return to testify at a new trial. Williams now admits that the narcotics squad pressured him into framing Sostre.

The Vanguard Defense Committee for Martin Sostre is circulating a petition asking New York Governor Rockefeller and Judge Bayger to grant Williams immunity from perjury prosecution so that he can testify, and to free Sostre on bail pending a new trial. Defense of Sostre's right to a new trial in which the nature of his frame-up conviction can be exposed is the more important now since according to the Vanguard Committee, Youth Against War and Fascism (YAWF) has abandoned its defense effort on his behalf.

The Vanguard Defense Committee for Martin Sostre may be contacted and petitions obtained at its mailing address, Box 839, Ellicott Station, Buffalo, N. Y. 14205.

SL Initiates DRV-NLF Defense Call

NEW ORLEANS—A united front organized by the Spartacist League demanded defense of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam against the current wave of imperialist attacks. The Womens Socialist Study Group, the Marxist Socialist Study Group, the Marxist Studies Committee and the Marxist-Leninist-Trotskyist Study Group joined with the SL in sending the following telegram to the Chinese mission to the UN and the Russian embassy in Washington:

"In the interests of the international working class movement, we urge you to expansion of military supplies of the highest technical quality to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and that you offer the fullest military assistance to the DRV including the necessary Russian-Chinese joint military collaboration. The interests of the international movement and the Vietnamese struggle demand that no strings be attached to this aid.

"We also urge that you engage in no political alliances with imperialist governments."

Maoists Capitulate to Chauvinism

All working-class tendencies in New Orleans were contacted by the SL. Many, including Youth Against War and Fascism and the Young Workers Liberation League, refused to participate in the action, claiming that the Vietnamese did not lack arms. The Red Collective, a Maoist grouplet with fraternal relations with Mike Klonsky's October League and the Georgia Communist League took the road to capitulation before patriotic sentiment as its reason for non-participation. While initially showing reserved interest in the project, the Red Collective's representative, Gi Schaefer, argued that workers in this country would not like the idea: "They would say to us, 'You guys want more bombs dropped on our heads.'" The Red Collective found it easy to send a telegram congratulating the DRV at the beginning of its offensive, but when bourgeois pressure intensified they quickly backed into the more comfortable position of saying nothing. Mao, after all, is now dealing with Nixon. Those whose purported loyalty to workers state means acceptance of the limits imposed by the counterrevolutionary bureaucracy are inevitably led to betray the working-class duty to fight against imperialist war. ■