

Full Citizenship Rights for Foreign Workers!

Protest Daily News Smear Campaign!

As joblessness continues to soar, big business interests and their apologists in the labor movement are desperately looking for a scapegoat to divert the rising anger of working people. As in the past the strategy of the defenders of the capitalist system of exploitation and unemployment is to intensify national and other divisions in the working class.

Currently there is a reactionary offensive to whip up chauvinist hysteria against undocumented immigrants and other foreign workers. The head of the passport division of the State Department has just proposed the introduction of national identity cards for U.S. citizens as a means of eliminating "illegal aliens." All militants must protest this South African-style police-state measure and unite to defeat it before it can be implemented.

Last year more than 800,000 were deported by U.S. authorities; this year they promise to expel 1,000,000 or more. The jingoist campaign extends from coast to coast. In Los Angeles "migra" authorities regularly sweep through the barrio of East L.A. in Gestapo-like dragnets that resulted in tens of thousands of deportations last year.

In New York a series of rabid articles recently published by the *Daily News* accused foreign workers of being responsible for every conceivable social ill (unemployment, bad schools, high taxes, etc.) with headlines such as "100,000 Illegal Aliens Rob City" and "An Alien Bust Would Boom Jobs, Official Says."

The Spartacist League has been in the forefront of the fight against deportations. In California the SL was the first left organization to publicly denounce Cesar Chavez' attacks on foreign workers, notably his support for the Rodino-Kennedy Bill, at a time when most opportunists were shamelessly apologizing for the United Farm Workers leader. (The SL also defended the UFW against grower, Teamster and government attack, calling for "hot-cargoing" of scab produce and a state-wide general strike in defense of the union.)

In New York the SL was repeatedly active in demonstrations against the deportations of Haitians last year.

Recently, on February 11, the Spartacist League-initiated Ad Hoc Committee to Smash the Attacks on Foreign Workers picketed the offices of the *Daily News* protesting the racist and chauvinist filth being spewed out in its campaign against aliens. At the demonstration SL spokesmen called for a fight to win jobs for all, to stop the deportations and to achieve full citizenship rights for all foreign-born residents of the country. The struggle to stop the deportations is an urgent task of all socialists and labor militants.

- No Deportations! Full Citizenship Rights for Foreign Workers!
- Jobs for All! 30 Hours' Work for 40 Hours' Pay! Organize the Unorganized!
- Expropriate Industry and Finance—No Compensation! Forward to a Planned Economy Under a Workers Government!
- Workers of the World, Unite!

Stop the Deportations!



Demonstrators protest N.Y. *Daily News* hysteria campaign against foreign workers, February 11.

Ethiopian Troops Out of Eritrea!



Eritrean Liberation Front fighters in January.

For the past three weeks, Ethiopian troops and planes have been massacring thousands of civilians in brutal "mopping-up" operations in the main towns of Eritrea (particularly Asmara, the capital) while napalming numerous villages. This, however, is only the latest stage in a 13-year campaign of repression against Eritrean nationalist rebels who wish to secede from the Ethiopian empire.

These attacks are being carried out by the military junta which took power in Addis Ababa last year, as part of its "Ethiopia First" policy of subjugating dissident minorities to the traditionally dominant Amharic nation. Although this policy is now masked with "socialist" rhetoric, it has not changed from when it was carried out by the arch-reactionary Emperor Haile Selassie with Israeli advisors and military support from U.S. imperialism. Moreover, Washington has just announced that it is resuming arms and ammunition deliveries to Ethiopian forces. China, also, is reportedly backing the junta.

Without placing any political confidence in the petty-bourgeois leaders of the present Eritrean independence movement, we call for their military victory over the troops of the junta. Socialists must defend the democratic right of self-determination for Eritrea, as well as other democratic demands including full civil and trade-union liberties, a democratic constituent assembly and agrarian revolution. We warn, however, that only a workers and peasants government which overthrows capitalism can carry out national democratic tasks in an epoch when the "national" bourgeoisies are but water-boys of imperialism. For the Right of Self-Determination for Eritrea! Ethiopian Troops Out of Eritrea! No Military Aid to the Junta! Military Victory for the ELF/EPLF! ■

Pabloists Betray Trotskyist Prisoners

Mao's Jails for Revolutionaries.....6



SOVPHOTO

PL Gangster Attacks in River Rouge

Militants Fight for Program in UAW Unemployment Committee

DETROIT—Unemployment lines here grow longer daily as the continuing collapse of production at auto's "Big Three" spreads to related and service industries. The city's largest single employer, Chrysler, recently reported its greatest net losses in history for both the fourth quarter and all of 1974 (*New York Times*, 18 February). According to industry sources, at its current depletion rate the Chrysler SUB (Supplemental Unemployment Benefits) fund will be exhausted by the end of March (*Detroit News*, 12 February). In spite of this and ignoring the crying need for union organization of the unemployed to fight for jobs and increased benefits, the United Auto Workers' Solidarity House has actively opposed the establishment of local and regional unemployment committees.

One of the few UAW committees to emerge with actual membership participation is the Unemployment Committee (UC) of the Dearborn Assembly plant at Ford's River Rouge complex (Local 600). Much of the left press credits this to "progressive" DAP unit chairman Hank Wilson. However, in recent interviews with Unemployment Committee members *WV* learned that, in fact, the creation of the UC represented Wilson's frightened response to independent initiative from the ranks. In the week before the first massive layoff on November 15, Wilson reportedly had to be pressured into even calling a union meeting, the first since August!

Ten militants in the unit had signed and distributed a leaflet urging DAP workers to turn out for the meeting and vote for union-wide action against layoffs. Their leaflet called for the creation of union unemployment committees and the election of a special body to mobilize throughout the UAW for reopening the contract to win jobs for all through a shorter workweek with no loss in pay, opening the company's books, full cost-of-living protection and other key demands.

At the meeting, the "progressive" unit chairman reportedly ruled this motion out of order, repeatedly interrupting and cutting off the speaker. This came after Wilson had spent 30 minutes of his president's report waving the leaflet about while decrying "outsiders" and "communism"! Wilson then announced he had appointed about ten unit officers and committeemen to an Unemployment Committee. Workers at the meeting said none of the appointees had ever heard of the committee before that!

(Such bureaucratic high-handedness and red-baiting are the stock-in-trade of labor fakers who support the present capitalist system, as Wilson does. In a telephone interview he told *WV*: "I think we can improve the system we have.... The system is failing now, there's no question about that, but there's so much room for improvement.")

Program for Victory or Reformist Antics?

The UC did not go quite the way Wilson had planned. Most of his appointees have reportedly boycotted the committee, orienting to an anti-Wilson electoral bloc for the upcoming spring unit elections. A number of workers sympathetic to the views of various

left groups have, however, participated. Most have been more than willing to go along with Wilson's desire to use the Unemployment Committee as a sounding board for his own re-election plans, at the expense of raising the necessary political answers to company layoffs and the strangulation of the union by the Woodcock machine.

Nevertheless, the DAP workers who had drawn Wilson's fire at the November meeting, principally Jerry Harris and Keith Dodds, joined the committee to fight for a strategy to meet the industry/government offensive. In an interview, Harris explained that a proposal submitted by him and several other militants not only answered the immediate problems facing auto workers but also pointed to their fundamental solutions.

Among the points included in this program were: jobs for all through a shorter workweek at no loss in pay and massive union-controlled public works; increased unemployment/SUB benefits for the duration of layoff; a fight against the special oppression of women and minorities; a fight for full citizenship rights for foreign workers (particularly important to Detroit's many Arab auto workers); international workers solidarity against economic protectionism and imperialist war plans; workers control of a nationalized auto industry (no compensation to the owners); and a break with the backstabbing Democrats to build a workers party.

These militants also took the lead in advocating a tactic that could reverse the union's complete passivity in the face of permanent layoffs which have hit more than a third of auto production workers: the sitdown strike. At the January 25 DAP unit meeting, the day after another 500 workers were sacked, Dodds put forward two motions, one calling for nationwide UAW sitdown strikes against layoffs and the other mandating a sitdown demonstration in the plant to protest the layoffs which have already cost over 2,000 Dearborn Assembly workers their jobs. Wilson's behavior was the same as in November, continually interrupting the speaker and finally ruling his motion out of order.

The clash in the UC and at union meetings between Wilson's reformism and class-struggle politics has seen the supporters of several left groups repeatedly side with Wilson or else "lie low," providing no leadership in the fight against unemployment. Those who sympathize with the Communist Party repeatedly declare their support for Wilson and Mayor Coleman Young. Others who support the views of the Communist Labor Party have had nothing more to propose than a Christmas party to raise money for the unemployed (!) and sending a letter to other UAW locals notifying them of the UC's existence.

PL Race-Baiting and Red-Baiting

By far the most grovelling performance, however, has been by supporters of the Progressive Labor Party. With originally only one committee member sympathetic to their politics, himself a member of the motley hodgepodge called United Trade Unionists (UTU), ever increasing numbers of PL supporters simply started attending



Ford's River Rouge complex in Detroit.

WV PHOTO

and voting at UC meetings, despite the fact that none of them were employed or laid off from the DAP! When this was objected to, PL's newspaper *Challenge* (30 January) stooped to a new low in gross red-baiting and race-baiting. Describing its opponents as "racist swine," PL whined:

"...there is an organized right wing of the Maoist Revolutionary Union, Trotskyite Sparticus [sic] League and sell-out "Communist" Party members. They have done everything in their power to side-track discussion."

Evidently sentiment against the PL supporters' obviously undemocratic maneuver was somewhat more widespread than *Challenge* implies, as a recent UC meeting voted overwhelmingly to restrict voting rights to employed and laid-off workers from DAP. Only two voted against, the UTUer and a PL supporter who has never worked at Dearborn Assembly.

PL is well aware that the UAW bureaucracy has used its red clause to purge militants from the union's ranks before. By attempting to finger workers as "members" of "outside" organizations, PL aids the companies and the anti-communist UAW tops. Aware that red-baiting can be used against them too, and having seen Hank Wilson's proficiency in this area, PL supporters have *not* once put forward or fought for positions Wilson disagreed with.

Nor have they objected when Wilson altered the minimal program of the UC, going so far as to add to it, in one of his "Ford Facts" columns, a call for wage controls! They have never mentioned Wilson's support of the entire Woodcock slate at the 1974 UAW convention, nor his support for the "entire Democratic ticket" in the fall elections. In UC meetings they have labelled DAP workers who dared to oppose Wilson as "snakes"!

Stalinist Gangsterism

It is PL's cowardly unwillingness (in fact, its inability) to distinguish itself from Wilson's craven reformism that has made it grow more and more shrill in denouncing those who do fight for class-struggle policies. The 15 February *Challenge* shrieks:

"Also if the racist Trotskyites think that they will go on sabotaging and disrupting our committee and local, and setting up our leaders for attack, they too are dead wrong. We in PLP have been very patient in struggling against their racist dribble. They have exposed themselves to all as representing no one but themselves. We will no longer tolerate these self-centered, boss-serving saboteurs. They have been politically isolated and must now be physically defeated."

PL supporters have already begun to act out these hooligan fantasies. They began by threatening to "kick ass" on various Unemployment Committee members during UC meetings. Then at the January 25 union meeting the UTUer was not content with chanting along with right-wing bureaucrats "no support, no support" in response to Dodds' sitdown proposals; nor with

applauding wildly when one committeeman suggested removing Dodds and Harris from the UC for leafletting the plant advocating sitdowns (only six weeks earlier this same UTUer had done the same). Almost immediately after the meeting concluded this two-bit would-be thug lunged across a table to assault Dodds and had to be dragged off by other workers, who immediately leaped to the militants' defense.

An even more serious provocation occurred recently in the plant itself. During a break, three PL supporters, none of whom work in the building, cornered a worker who had frequently supported the militant perspectives of Dodds and Harris in UC meetings. They tried to provoke a fight with full knowledge that the worker could be instantly fired for fighting on company property. This militant told *WV* that the thugs started to push him around in an aisle bordered on both sides by boxes of stock. Only because he managed to move into sight of the other workers on the line was a bloody incident averted. The Stalinists finally left muttering threats of further violence.

Reformists are driven to such frenzy by the class-struggle politics which expose their subservient alliance with sellout bureaucrats. While they may curry favor with a temporary ally (who will turn on them later with the same methods they are now using), the PLers' thuggery and opportunism cannot build a working-class movement that will put an end to unemployment and overthrow capitalism. Those union militants in the DAP Unemployment Committee who have been advancing a class-struggle program hold the key to unlocking the bureaucratic chains that bind the UAW to the class enemy. ■

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Bi-weekly of the Spartacist League

Editorial Board:

Jan Norden (editor)
Liz Gordon (chairman)
Chris Knox (labor)
Karen Allen (production)
George Foster (advisory)

Circulation Manager: Anne Kelley

Correspondents:

West Coast: Mark Small
Southern: Joe Vetter
Midwest: Len Meyers
New England: R. Carling
West Europe: Joseph Seymour

Published by the Spartacist Publishing Company, Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001 Telephone: (212) 966-6841

Opinions expressed in signed articles or letters do not necessarily express the editorial viewpoint.

Witnesses Admit Lies, Reveal Frame-up

Free Carter and Artis!

Late one evening in 1966 two friends, Rubin "Hurricane" Carter and John Artis, were driving in Paterson, New Jersey. They were picked up, questioned about a triple murder and held for 17 hours by local police before being released without charges. Four months later two witnesses stepped forward and accused Carter and Artis of being the two gunmen involved in the shooting of three whites in a local tavern the same evening Carter and Artis were first questioned. Because of recent riots in the black sections of Paterson, and because the victims were white and the killers allegedly black, the murders received nationwide publicity.

1964 Harlem Riots

In addition to being a well-known boxer (a leading contender for the middleweight championship in the early 1960's), Carter also had a reputation as a militant, stemming from comments made to a *Saturday Evening Post* reporter after the Harlem riots of 1964: "Self-defense is the absolute right of every living being on earth.... The Black public ought to protect its own against this type of tyrannical invasion by white cops into Black neighborhoods" (quoted in the *Guardian*, 12 February 1975).

The 1964 Harlem riots were preceded by a vitriolic press campaign against black people in New York. When the killing of 15-year-old James Powell by an off-duty cop sparked protests in Harlem, the cops used this as an excuse to move into the ghetto to quell burgeoning black militancy. Wave after wave of specially trained elite police—the Tactical Patrol Force—swarmed through the streets, beating and terrorizing all who happened to be in their path.

At the time, the Spartacist League initiated the Harlem Solidarity Committee (HSC) to rally working-class support for the besieged blacks. Calling for "Remove the Rioting Cops from Harlem" and "Support the Right of the Citizens of the Ghetto to Defend Themselves," the HSC's garment center rally was attended by nearly 1,000 workers. (For a full account of the 1964 Harlem riots, see *Spartacist* No. 3, January-February 1965.)

Sometime later, Carter moved to Paterson where the local enforcers of small-town "law and order" felt threatened by the presence of a prominent black man who refused to "stay in his place." Paterson police harassed Carter with traffic violation citations and repeatedly followed him. So when the cops had a triple-murder case on their hands, one which needed a fast "solution" because of the wide press coverage, what better way to neatly dispose of both problems than by blaming Carter?

This they did, with the now-exposed help of bought testimony. Detectives of the Passaic County Prosecutor's office promised favorable treatment to two criminals facing a series of robbery charges if they would identify Carter as the triggerman. Reportedly, a \$10,500 reward was also offered to one of the "witnesses" in return for useful lies. On the night of the triple murder the two "eyewitnesses" were admittedly in the process of robbing a factory within sight of the tavern where the shootings occurred. Because of this opportune coincidence, the phony proof cooked up by cops created a nearly air-tight case.

"Witnesses" Reverse Testimony

However, the prosecution's "witnesses" have now confessed that their story in court was pure invention. In a September 1974 interview with a *New York Times* reporter one of them revealed, while in jail for another burglary conviction, that the identifica-

tion of Carter and Artis was fabricated to lessen their sentences for robbery.

The perjured testimony during the 1967 trial brought Carter and Artis stiff sentences: two consecutive life terms for Carter (one for the murders, one for what the presiding judge termed "antisocial behavior") and a life term for Artis. The cops succeeded in eliminating the "nuisance" Carter; Artis was

The Partisan Defense Committee, legal defense arm of the Spartacist League, urges readers of *Workers Vanguard* to contribute to the fund initiated by Carter's family to cover legal expenses for Carter and Artis. Make payable/mail to: Rubin Carter Defense Fund, Box 2934, Paterson, New Jersey 07509. For more detailed information on Martin Sostre's case and to send donations, write: Martin Sostre Defense Committee, P.O. Box 839, Ellicott Station, Buffalo, New York 14205.

implicated only because he happened to have been with Carter on the night of the shootings.

Already eight irreplaceable years of these innocent men's lives have been spent behind bars on the basis of admittedly false "evidence." Even though the two finger-men were reportedly reluctant to admit their lying, they obviously took notice of the five-year statute of limitations on perjury prosecution before they recanted their testimony!

New Jersey Superior Court Judge Samuel A. Larner—the same judge who sentenced Carter and Artis in 1967—heard a motion in December for a re-

trial based on sworn statements by the state's two witnesses recanting their earlier testimony. He denied the request on the incredible and obviously self-serving pretext that the statements lacked the "ring of truth!"

Larner said that "the criminal minds" of the eyewitnesses "are so devious and amoral that it is impossible for a court to analyze their motivations and mental gyrations in order to arrive at a reason for their conduct" (*New York Times*, 12 December 1974). But if their testimony is not believable now, why was it sufficient for the judge to sentence Carter and Artis to life terms in 1967?

After this initial denial Carter and Artis dismissed their "public defender" counsels and obtained two criminal-trial lawyers from New York. The new defense counsels petitioned last month to reopen the hearings on the basis of new testimony supporting the story of the recanting witnesses and claims of recently uncovered evidence, reportedly circumstantial proof that the cops planted a bullet-casing in Carter's car.

However, at a mid-February hearing, Judge Larner, who refused to disqualify himself, again rejected the motion. An appeal to higher New Jersey courts will be made shortly; if the request for a new trial is again denied at the state level the case is expected to be appealed to a federal court on constitutional grounds.

"Blind" Justice

The conviction of Carter and Artis is a blatant frame-up! Unfortunately, this victimization is no exception to the rule. The lengthy case of Martin Sostre shows chilling parallels. Sostre, too, was viciously railroaded by cops who wanted to "get" him for militancy. A repeated drug offender was coerced by the narcotics squad of the Buffalo police into setting up a supposed drug purchase by Sostre. This single witness against Sostre has now recanted his testimony, but here, too, the capitalist courts have



Frame-up victim Rubin Carter

refused to grant a retrial and Sostre remains in jail.

Bourgeois justice is indeed "blind"—except to the "plight" of the ilk of Nixon and his craven Watergate Gang, the Spiro Agnews, corporate extortion, etc., *ad nauseam*. While admitted Watergate criminals go free, Sostre, Carter, Artis and thousands of other innocent victims of capitalist class "justice" languish behind bars. Socialists, labor militants and black organizations must build powerful protests against such savage injustice meted out by the bourgeois courts. Free Carter and Artis! Free Martin Sostre! For the proletarian justice of a workers state! ■

"Illegals" Under Attack

Union-Busting Roundups in L.A.

Profit-grubbing capitalists are not alone in their efforts to super-exploit hundreds of thousands of "illegal" immigrant workers under turn-of-the-century sweatshop conditions. The wretched U.S. trade-union bureaucracy cynically cooperates by refusing to organize foreign workers even in periods of economic boom, and then beating the drums of the "alien" plague when the crunch comes and mass unemployment mounts.

Following the tradition of Gompers/Meany-style "business unionism," the labor skates seek only to make a deal with "their" capitalists while openly condoning the maintenance of an "industrial reserve army" of specially oppressed workers which serves to keep all wages down. A case of this treacherous hand-in-glove collaboration with the bosses is now unfolding in Los Angeles.

Recently the U.S. immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) arrested 17 undocumented foreign workers, all members or known sympathizers of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU), in a raid on the High Tide Swimwear Company. This action followed a walkout, over the dismissal of a union organizer at that plant, by about 150 workers many of whom were "illegals," on January 20.

The ILGWU has only lately and with the greatest reluctance begun to even make a pretense of organizing undocumented workers. Its long-standing policy has been to call for tougher immigration laws, refusing to engage in any but the most token organizing efforts of scab shops, especially in the large reservoirs of low-wage non-union labor such as the South and the L.A. area.

The chauvinist, race-baiting union tops will sacrifice anything except their own venal comforts in order to line up the workers behind the "national interests" of the bosses. Cornelius Wall, regional director of the ILGWU, told the press after the arrests that "we want these jobs for American citizens." The INS, he said, "cannot and will not do the job of keeping illegal aliens out" and so the unions supposedly "have no choice but to organize illegal aliens and bring their standards up" (*New York Times*, 16 February).

But Wall was more than reluctant to organize "illegals." Although the workers are now out on bail, paid by the union which has agreed to defend them, it is now reported that none other than Cornelius Wall blew the whistle on them in the first place! After the walkout the ILGWU piecaker had contacted the INS and offered union money and resources to the agency if the INS would raid High Tide!!

Wall then ordered the workers back to work because of his "concern" about the possibility of permanent job losses. The plant was railed the day after their return. The local chief of the Immigration Service while conceding that it was "rather strange that the only aliens we picked up were union members" pleaded that "we only went into the plant because the garment workers union was so persistent."

Although Wall's underhanded efforts to unleash the government on these unfortunate workers are certainly grotesque, they are only less subtle examples of the daily practice of the ILGWU bureaucracy and the rest of union officialdom. Working-class militants must vigorously protest such

jingoiist attacks on foreign workers as part of the struggle to topple the labor tsars from their positions of power.

The ILGWU misleaders have an almost unrivaled record of betrayal. They repeatedly invoke arguments about runaway shops and foreign (or southern) scab labor to browbeat the membership into accepting miserly wage settlements, the grinding piecework system, rampant subcontracting at less than union scale and a starvation-level \$75-a-month pension (the lowest union pension in the country). In the meantime they have used every racist, chauvinist, sexist, anti-communist ploy imaginable to suppress opposition by trade-union militants and rationalize their sellouts.

The social-democratic ILGWU is not alone in its scab attacks on foreign workers. The United Farm Workers led by that "radical" darling of liberals and "leftists," Cesar Chavez, has repeatedly turned in "illegals" to the INS and even set up its own "border patrol" to keep out Mexican workers. Meanwhile the UFW has lost most of its contracts because of Chavez' refusal to defend the picket lines.

The labor movement must mobilize to demand an end to these union-busting roundups and deportations while calling for full citizenship rights to all foreign and immigrant workers. This is only a first step toward the international labor action and organization necessary to defend union gains, particularly during the current worldwide capitalist economic crisis. Only a militant new leadership based on a class-struggle program can oust the defeatist labor bureaucracy and wage such a fight to victory. ■

Military Tightens Grip in Portugal



Troops confront demonstrators in Lisbon last year.

FEBRUARY 20—After a period of relative calm following the September 29 "stabilization" in the face of a threatened right-wing coup, events in Portugal are once more rising to a crisis level. Deep dissension exists within the Movement of the Armed Forces (MFA) over questions of political and economic policy, and open strife has broken out within the government between the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP) and the Socialist Party (PSP). Meanwhile the reactionaries connected with the previous Salazar-Caetan dictatorship are mobilizing and have formed an ultra-rightist party, the Social Democratic Center (CDS), officially launched last month and already granted legal status.

On an international level, the imperialists have not been dormant. The CDS is obviously well-financed and such arch-conservative organs as the *Economist* (1 February 1975) have recently undertaken a campaign for aid to the PSP from European social-democratic parties (to be financed, no doubt, by the British and West German states and, of course, the U.S.). CIA agents (reportedly well over 100) have flooded the country although Washington officially denies any involvement.

Tensions soared late last month when a NATO fleet of warships and submarines began maneuvers off Portugal's coast January 29. In addition to the time-honored technique of "showing the flag" the State Department brazenly tried to create a diplomatic incident,

alleging that Moscow was about to destroy Western defenses in the Atlantic by requesting use of Portuguese port facilities for Soviet fishing boats!

The international and domestic political conflict is taking place against the background of a sharpening economic crisis. Unemployment now stands officially at 8 percent (over 200,000) as thousands of emigrant Portuguese workers return home, unable to find jobs elsewhere in Europe. Inflation, in turn, has reached 30 percent and many enterprises have closed or are avoiding immediate bankruptcy only through the aid of short-term loans.

The highly militant Portuguese working class has repeatedly demonstrated its will to fight. This was shown by the mobilization of at least 10,000 workers, many of them marching in hard hats and overalls, on February 7 to protest against a law permitting mass layoffs. The march, organized by the delegates commissions of 38 large enterprises in the Lisbon area, defied a ban by the government, MFA and military junta on demonstrations in the capital during the NATO maneuvers.

The main banner carried by the marchers read: "Unemployment is an inevitable consequence of capitalism. That is why the workers want to destroy it and build a new world." According to a report in the French newspaper *Libération* quoted in *Informations Ouvrières* (12-19 February), when the column reached the central avenue of Lisbon, parachutist and commando units

blocking the street in order to protect the American embassy opened their ranks to let the marchers pass through. As the workers reached the Ministry of Labor they raised their fists shouting, "NATO out, national independence," and were joined in the chant by the elite troops stationed around the building.

But if large sections of the workers have shown their desire to go beyond the narrow limits set by the MFA and its servile "Communist" and "Socialist" lackeys, they nevertheless stand disarmed before the ominous maneuvers of international reaction. Held back by the reformist PCP, the working class lacks above all an authentic revolutionary, Trotskyist party which can mobilize the proletariat behind a program for socialist revolution. The construction of this Leninist vanguard party is the primary task facing socialist militants in Portugal and throughout the world.

Military-Enforced Trade-Union "Unity"

The disputes within the government reached a crisis point earlier this month over a hotly contested trade-union law sponsored by the Stalinists. According to the law, if more than 50 percent of Portugal's trade-union federations vote in favor of a single national inter-industry confederation, no other could be formed. This in effect puts the strikebreaking PCP in a position to discipline the entire unionized labor force, since it presently controls the one existing confederation, the Intersindical.

The law was hypocritically fought by the PSP, which has supported every other measure for legal restriction of the labor movement. Now afraid of being frozen out of the unions, social-democratic leader Mario Soares, a minister without portfolio in the government, declared that the PSP would "defend liberty" and not allow itself to become a satellite of the PCP. Another Socialist, Minister of Justice Francisco Salgado Zenha, charged that the law was "unconstitutional," which led the Stalinists to reply with justice: "One could ask, which constitution is the Minister referring to, since the 'constitution' which governs the current provisional regime is the Program of the MFA..." (*Avante!*, 16 January).

To counter PSP charges that the bill was being rammed through undemocratically the Intersindical staged a demonstration on January 14 which brought out over 80,000 in support of "trade-union unity." The Stalinists point out that "governments of national union" in France and Italy following World War II fell after splits in the labor movement engineered by the U.S. Irving Brown, CIA-connected European representative of the AFL-CIO and the man

who set up the anti-communist labor federations, the FO in France and UIL in Italy, visited Portugal last fall.

Sentiment for trade-union unity among the ranks of labor can be a powerful force in organizing the class to overthrow the bourgeoisie. But the bureaucratic straightjacket imposed by the PCP is not proletarian unity against the capitalists. Rather it is the class-collaborationist "unity" with the class enemy which led to the tragic 1973 coup in Chile and the bloody defeat of the Spanish Republic in the 1930's.

The MFA sided with the Stalinists in this dispute, although reportedly by a narrow 11 to 9 margin in its top council. The reason, it is clear, was to ensure the tightest possible control over the unions. Since last year's coup d'état the PCP has been the main ally of the military in discouraging and literally breaking strikes. Where the reformists were too weak to hold back the workers—for instance in the strike by maintenance workers of TAP airlines in September—the MFA was forced to resort to direct military occupation. However, the troops are no longer reliable for such missions, so the Stalinists' bureaucratic stranglehold must be tightened.

Undemocratic Elections for a "Constituent Assembly"


Another key source of friction within the government stems from the approach of elections for a constituent assembly. With the long-promised vote now scheduled for April 12, pressures are mounting for postponement. (Elections have already been pushed back from the original March deadline.) The PCP favors delay on the grounds that the "democratic parties" have not had "time to prepare the broad electorate for voting on key issues" (*Daily World*, 17 January).

PCP General Secretary Alvaro Cunhal alleges that early elections would favor the ultra-rightists, as the "April 25 Revolution" is only now reaching the more backward regions of the country. The MFA is also evidently concerned with the strength of reactionaries in certain areas, particularly the north, and has lately been sending army propaganda teams to the villages in order to fight the influence of elements linked with the Salazarist dictatorship, especially the priests.

However, the PCP and MFA are even more concerned to prevent "far-left" groups from participating in the elections, just as the "trade-union unity" law was aimed at preventing militant forces from consolidating organizational strength in the labor movement. Thus, in addition to repeated efforts to postpone the election, the "democratic" colonels last fall issued election laws barring all but "legal" parties from



Socialist Party leader Mario Soares.



Communist Party leader Alvaro Cunhal.

participating. These must produce evidence of having at least 5,000 members, a requirement that so far only the PCP and the reactionary CDS have fulfilled.

The draconian laws on political parties and associations published in October (after Spínola was removed) provide the state with numerous means to ban small leftist parties. Article 21 of the parties law says that courts can dissolve a party for having less than 4,000 members, being financially insolvent, or when its "real aim is unlawful or against moral and public order." Another ground for dissolution is if a party's "aim is systematically to... disturb the discipline of the armed forces."

Those groups not large enough to qualify as parties are regulated by an "associations" law which says, in Article 3, that any groups that propose to "overthrow democratic institutions and are apologists for hate and violence are not allowed." And the preamble states that the freedom to associate with international political organizations "must necessarily suffer the limits imposed by the necessity of maintaining the parties' independence." Obviously such vaguely worded clauses are aimed at including any groups which incur the disfavor of the officer caste.

On the other side, the PCP has been at great pains to assure itself of support from the petty bourgeoisie and even sections of the bourgeoisie. At the party's congress held in Lisbon last October 20, the Stalinists formally dropped the phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat" while favorably mentioning the bourgeoisie as part of the "unity of popular forces in the political struggle."

The program also states that the PCP opposes nationalizing "small and medium-sized" businesses because "this would not be in the interests of the people" and indicates tolerance of NATO. Explaining away these changes, PCP central committee member Aurelio Santos stated: "We are following capitalism at present but revolution is not made in a day. Our case is democratic revolution" (*Manchester Guardian Weekly*, 9 November).

Growing Bonapartism

For the last nine months the slogan of the PCP has been the "unity of the armed forces with the people." More specifically the Stalinists hope to preserve the role of the Movement of the Armed Forces as strongman to prevent the masses from going too far. Thus Cunhal calls for the reservation of seats in the "constituent assembly" for the MFA and calls on the officers to "jointly determine the general lines of government policy and work out the outlines of a constitution before elections to the Assembly are held" (*Daily World*, 17 January).

In the editorial of the 16 January *Avante!* the PCP castigates those who "publicly call for the return of the MFA to the barracks" and declares, in bold type: "The people's movement without the Movement of the Armed Forces would not be in a position to advance democracy or even to assure its survival." In this defeatist view they are in agreement with the leading officers. A spokesman for the MFA stated last month to the *New York Times* (18 January) that:

"The revolutionary process does not and cannot end with the elections for a constituent assembly. Throughout 1975, the direction of this process belongs to the Armed Forces Movement."

Chief of Staff General Carlos Fabião leaves open "the possibility of military intervention whenever it was felt that the principles of the revolution were being betrayed" (*New York Times*, 19 January).

The young military officers who carried out the April coup do not have a clear political orientation. Every new issue provokes a major crisis in the MFA: in December it was over economic policy, in January over the trade-union law, in February over the elections. And while for the moment the majority of the officer caste appears to side, at least tacitly, with the left, this would quickly change in the face of a

mass upsurge as their fundamental ties to the bourgeois order and fear of proletarian revolution are revealed.

Thus, for example, the MFA continues to support and enforce the rigorous anti-strike law which outlaws the following kinds of labor action: strikes for political or religious reasons; strikes against a collective bargaining agreement; strikes which take place before 30 days' of negotiations or before seven days notice to the employers; solidarity strikes with workers not in the same profession; and occupation of factories. Evidently, the Stalinists' "democratic revolution" leaves much to be desired, even from the point of view of bourgeois democracy.

The MFA has also created an elite strike force, the Continental Operations Command (COPCON), enabling it to dispense with the no longer reliable army.

General Otelio de Carvalho, head of COPCON.



COPCON forces turned the tide on September 29 when they joined leftist militants in manning checkpoints around Lisbon to prevent a rightist mobilization. But they did so in perfect order and on the instructions of their chief, Brigadier General Otelio Saraiva da Carvalho. The tide could easily have gone the other way.

The Struggle for Democratic Rights

Last spring we wrote that Portugal is in a classic pre-revolutionary situation of a slow type. This continues to be true. Thus the demand for soviets—for unitary, democratically elected bodies representing the working class, which can serve as the organizing framework for revolution and the core of a future proletarian state—remains on the agenda. It is necessary to put forward this perspective in the course of strikes, demonstrations, defense actions and general propaganda. This is the main form of proletarian unity which it is necessary to achieve today.

At the same time the struggle for democratic demands remains of fundamental importance. As we wrote last May, "the demand for immediate elections to a constituent assembly... would also directly threaten the power of the military, the main guarantor (along with the Stalinists) of bourgeois rule in Portugal today" (*IV* No. 45, 24 May 1974). Today, also, the demand for fully democratic elections hits at the heart of Stalinist-backed military rule, as does the demand that the PCP and PSP break with the MFA and leave the provisional government. No to class collaborationism!

The fight for democratic rights must have a proletarian axis; in this period of imperialist decay the bourgeoisie is pushed ever more overtly into the arms of international reaction. Popular frontism is the blueprint for defeat! Communists must take the lead in mobilizing the workers to overthrow censorship and guarantee freedom of the press, to smash the law against strikes and the blatantly anti-democratic laws on political parties and associations.

Large numbers of working people in Portugal already see that the Stalinists' support to the MFA can easily lead to another Chile-style massacre. Marxists must point to the murderous consequences of class collaboration throughout the world, in order to emphasize the need for an international proletarian program and party. Only by focusing on the question of revolutionary leadership, drawing the lessons of past defeats and providing a program for consistent class struggle today, can small communist forces advance the proletarian cause. For a Portuguese Trotskyist party, built in the struggle to re-create the Fourth International. ■

Drop the Charges Against Edelin!

Abortion Witchhunt in Boston


On February 15 a Boston doctor, Dr. Kenneth Edelin, was convicted of manslaughter for an abortion operation he had performed in October 1973. Dr. Kenneth J. Ryan, chairman of a national commission studying guidelines for medical research on human fetuses, aptly commented: "The court trial on abortion has not established the funda-

the money of the wealthy will continue to provide them access to safe abortions, while the poor must resort to desperate expedients; an increase in the number of dangerous, illegal abortions can be expected.

The next target of Boston Assistant District Attorney Newman A. Flanagan is four physicians accused of performing experiments on aborted fetuses; they are being prosecuted under an 1814 grave-robbing statute! According to the state their crime consists of having performed unauthorized autopsies on the fetuses, on the grounds that an aborted fetus is a corpse, not a surgical tissue specimen.

A similar complaint was filed with the U.S. Attorney's office on February 14 by Brooklyn abortion foes, charging that the civil rights of a fetus were violated when it was allegedly allowed to die following an abortion at the Nassau County Medical Center.

The Boston trial was a blatant exercise in bigotry and obscurantism, a "witchhunt," as Edelin put it. The prosecutor's claim that manslaughter was the issue was garbage; it was women's right to abortion that was on trial.



5L contingent in Boston demonstration to defend Dr. Edelin last week.

mental facts on viability, has not established what an abortion is. And certainly it has not defined the moral issues any more than the Scopes trial was the last word on evolution." Edelin's conviction is a victory for reactionary "right-to-life" fanatics.

The decision was met in the medical community with astonishment and dismay. It will mean that abortions, especially in the second trimester, will be more difficult to obtain. And as always,

Edelin was a pawn in a political battle, and the jury fell, hook, line and sinker, for the bait. Sensationalism and emotionalism triumphed over legality. Photos allegedly of the fetus in dispute, the perverted obsession of anti-abortion crusaders, were displayed for their emotional impact on the jury and constituted the bulk of the prosecution's case.

Reactionary elements in Boston are a well-organized pressure group. They have successfully made the schools of South Boston a racial battleground in an attempt to set back the struggle of blacks for basic democratic rights. Anti-abortion billboards in Boston provide ample evidence of their full-scale campaign against women's rights.

Some weeks ago the "right-to-lifers" got Catholic schoolchildren released from school to participate in an anti-abortion demonstration at the State House. They have switched from agitating for repeal of state laws legalizing abortion to focus on a national campaign for a Constitutional amendment barring abortion.

The Spartacist League participated in a demonstration of 2,000 people in defense of Edelin, with banners calling for free abortion on demand and free quality health care for all, denouncing bourgeois "justice" and calling for a workers government and women's liberation through socialist revolution. Another demonstration was held following Edelin's sentencing to one year's probation pending appeal.

Despite their hypocritical, self-righteous pretenses, the anti-abortion reactionaries who "speak for God" are among the most "anti-life" elements in the world. They oppose social welfare programs, including "aid to dependent children," and cheer at the napalming of Vietnamese men and women—and babies too. They offer only the continuation of war, poverty and degradation. Communists defend women's right to abortion at any stage of pregnancy, the only criterion being medical safety. What the anti-abortion cabal's policy means is not the "right to life" but the killing of desperate women in coat-hanger abortions. It is the communists who, on behalf of all the oppressed, stand for life and fight to improve the quality of life, which in the last analysis can be safeguarded only through socialist revolution. ■

CORRECTIONS

In the last issue of *Workers Vanguard* (No. 62, 14 February) there were several errors. In the article "UAW Demonstrates in Washington" the demand is raised for the government to take over the auto industry's nearly bankrupt SUB (supplemental unemployment benefits) fund and merge it with unemployment and welfare programs. The stipulation "at the highest rate of pay" was omitted due to an editorial oversight.

In the same article, UAW vice-president Douglas Fraser is listed as a participant in the recent convention of the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee (DSOC). Actually Fraser only sent greetings to the DSOC delegates, as did a number of labor bureaucrats (including Murray Finley of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Moe Foner of the Hospital Workers, Patrick Gorman of the Meat Cutters, Victor Gotbaum of AFSCME, Jerry Wurf of AFSCME and Ed Sadlowski of the Steel Workers).

The article entitled "Chinese Old Guard Patched Up" correctly called for a political revolution to oust the parasitic bureaucratic caste which sits atop the Chinese deformed workers state. However, it also included the following ambiguous sentence: "Unchecked by democratic control by workers soviets, the bureaucracy is rent with powerful centrifugal tendencies." But true democratic rule by workers soviets is antithetical to the very existence of the parasitic bureaucracy. Soviet democracy cannot be achieved through reforming or "checking" the bureaucracy, but only by means of a political revolution under the leadership of a Trotskyist vanguard party. ■

Pabloists Betray Trotskyist Prisoners

Mao's Jails for Revolutionaries

At the end of 1952 the Stalinist bureaucracy which controls the Chinese deformed workers state began a nationwide wholesale roundup of Chinese Trotskyist militants. Seized in their homes one night, these revolutionaries, together with families and friends, were bound and dragged off to jail to serve indeterminate sentences for unspecified crimes. In the next several weeks many were secretly shot.

The victorious Chinese Communist Party (CCP), led by Mao Tse-tung, already had a history of such savage criminality toward working-class revolutionaries. Immediately after the overthrow of the bourgeois Kuomintang (KMT) regime in 1949, the agents of the new "People's Republic" raided several local organizations of the Chinese Trotskyist Party. The CCP mounted an anti-Trotskyist campaign in Chekiang and Kwangtung provinces, where the supporters of the Fourth International had a long tradition of struggle and influence.

Taken away to be shot, these militants demanded that they be permitted to wear signs imprinted with the single word, "Trotskyist." They were refused that last subversive gesture, and were instead falsely branded "Kuomintang agents" by the Stalinists. Their executioners shoved cotton in their mouths so that they could not shout out to those watching and wondering why veteran revolutionists were being reviled and butchered.

The same sinister *modus operandi* was employed by the secret police in the arrests of 1950 in Kwangsi province, and in the blanket dragnet in December 1952 and January 1953 in which every known Trotskyist and sympathizer was locked up. "From Peking to Canton and from Shanghai to Chungking" the mass arrests, obviously ordered on central authority, were kept secret. There was not a word in the newspapers; there were no public trials.

Chinese Trotskyists' Appeal Suppressed by Pablo

Hounded and persecuted, the Chinese Trotskyists had to find a way to get their story out of China. At considerable risk they put their appeal before the Fourth International, desperate for international assistance. "We hope to complete this document," they wrote, "and find means to send it abroad before agents of the Communist Party knock at the door. Our fate and that of countless comrades and friends rely now almost entirely upon the voice of justice and the actions of the international working class, revolutionaries, and all progressive individuals.... This document is written in Shanghai and will be taken to Hong Kong at the risk of death. We hope it will be published to the whole world by our friends."

But the enemies of the Chinese Trotskyists were not only those who held rifles to their backs and shoved cotton in their mouths. They found them also among those to whom they turned for help. *The International Secretariat of the Fourth International, headed by Michel Pablo, suppressed their desperate plea for aid.* Only nine months after the arrests, on 19 October 1953, was their statement printed in the *Militant*, newspaper of the Socialist Workers Party in the U.S.

How could this happen? The Fourth International was at the time embroiled in a dispute which led to a split in November 1953. At the heart of the fight was the attitude to take toward Stalinism, which had expanded its rule in Eastern Europe and consolidated hegemony over key sections of the workers movement in France, Italy and elsewhere after World War II. The fac-

tion around Pablo argued that the Stalinists could no longer betray and would be forced by "the objective process" into "roughly outlining a revolutionary orientation."

Although late, and even then only incompletely, the SWP decided to fight Pablo, upholding the necessity of building Trotskyist parties throughout the world. Writing to Ernest Mandel in a letter dated 19 January 1954, George Breitman stated that the SWP had not published the appeal sooner because they "never saw [it] until a few months ago because Pablo suppressed it." This was not an accident:

"The Chinese [Trotskyists] were condemned and ridiculed [by the Pabloists] as 'refugees from a revolution,' including, I presume, those who were murdered at their post inside China. Whenever anyone would say anything about the need for an independent party, the answer hurled at him was: 'Look at China. Wasn't the revolution made there without our party? Keep talking that nonsense about the independence of the party and you will end up the way the Chinese did... running away from the revolution.'"

"Fugitives from a Revolution"?

Just who were these so-called "fugitives from a revolution"? The appeal includes the name of Chen Chao-lin who was a leader of the 1927 revolution in the Wuhan area. He was a founding member of the CCP and of the Chinese Trotskyist movement. After the end of the Sino-Japanese war he continued his revolutionary work in Shanghai. He spent seven years in the prisons of Chiang Kai-shek and, if he is still alive, 22 years in the prisons of Mao Tse-tung. He would be 74 years old today.

Ying Kwan's name was also included in the appeal. He was associated with Chou En-lai in France in 1920 and became secretary of the Chinese Socialist Party organization in Europe. He participated in the 1927 revolution in the province of Anhwei. Ying Kwan broke with the CCP and became a Trotskyist in 1929. Arrested by the KMT police, he spent 1932 to 1934 in prison. Like Chen Chao-lin he continued to fight for Marxism-Leninism in Shanghai until his arrest in 1952.

Thanks to an article by Li Fu-jen other names have been added to the list of revolutionaries arrested by Mao. These include: Chiang Tseng-tung, a leading activist in the Shanghai labor movement who participated in that city's general strike in 1925 and a Trotskyist who, if alive, is now 65 years old; Ling Hwer-hua, who was a member of the executive of the Printers Union of Canton and a Fourth Internationalist who would be over 50 years old; Ho Chi-sen, a student leader in Peking in the early 1920's who worked in the underground for the CCP after 1927, became a Trotskyist in 1929 and represented the "Proletarians" in the fusion that formed the Communist League of China (section of the International Left Opposition) in 1931. These are only a few of the Trotskyists in Mao's prisons, and it should be understood that these jails are not for Trotskyists only. Today they hold many oppositional worker militants, radical intellectuals and left-wing youth arrested in the aftermath of the "Cultural Revolution."

Trotskyism vs. Liquidationism

What had these Chinese comrades done to deserve the deaf ears that Pablo, Mandel and the others turned toward them? Mandel ticks off some political errors made by the Chinese section in 1947, but it was not any political

error which set Mandel/Maitan/Frank against the Chinese Trotskyists. For the Pabloists the Chinese Revolution of 1949 was the most positive example of the "new world reality" which gave revolutionary capacities to non-proletarian forces. By extension, the Chinese Trotskyist Party, which continued to oppose Mao, was the singular example of what not to do.

The Chinese Trotskyists refused to liquidate the struggle for a Bolshevik party—this was their "crime," both in the eyes of Mao and of Pablo and his acolytes. The failure of Stalin's policies in China and the massacres of the Shanghai and Canton soviets in 1927 played a crucial role in deepening Trotsky's understanding of Stalinism and the crisis of revolutionary leadership. One can easily imagine that many of the CCP who managed to live through that period,

Fourth International had quite a different position. An International Executive Committee (IEC) resolution stated in May 1952 that "The Fourth International and Chinese Trotskyists will give critical support to Mao Tse-tung's government." The document makes certain criticisms of the CCP regime—lack of soviets, slow pace of agrarian reform, problems with "certain theoretical concepts"—but not a word is said about the 1949 and 1950 arrests of Chinese Trotskyists.

When these critical supporters of Mao's government did get around to criticizing the mass arrests of their own comrades, it was in the language of sycophantic apologists and not Trotskyists:

"The revolutionary Marxists would have no criticism whatever of these measures [eliminating counter-revolu-



Mao Tse-tung with American ambassador Patrick Hurley in Chungking, August 1945. Under pressure from U.S. imperialists Mao offered to form coalition government with butcher Chiang Kai-shek.

UPI

seeing the erstwhile "revolutionary ally" Chiang Kai-shek butcher thousands of their comrades, became some of the earliest and firmest supporters of Trotskyism outside the USSR.

In his "Open Letter to the Communist Party" printed in the *Militant* of 2 November 1953, Peng Shu-tse, one of the leaders of the Chinese section of the Fourth International, pointed out that the Trotskyists had an unblemished record of revolutionary opposition to the KMT, unlike Mao who "engaged in continuous and prolonged compromise peace negotiations with Chiang Kai-shek... in hope of establishing a 'coalition government'...."

Peng criticized the bureaucratic abuses of the CCP regime, pointing out that the worker and peasant masses were not allowed to strike, have independent trade unions or elect their own councils to control the state administration and all organizations of production—fundamental elements of proletarian democracy as realized in Lenin's Russia. But, he pointed out, the Trotskyists had participated in the overthrow of Chiang, in the land reform campaign, in the campaign against U.S. "aid" to Korea, and stood ready to defend China against imperialism.

Covering Up for Mao

Unfortunately for the Chinese Trotskyists, the Pablo leadership of the

tionaries] if they were directed exclusively against reaction and if they were carried out by the revolutionary activity of the democratically organized masses. But this is not exactly the case. [No, not 'exactly'!] The Chinese CP has included in its campaign of elimination of counter-revolutionaries all former revolutionary Marxist opponents...."

—Fourth International
March-April 1953

This pusillanimous "critical support" was given political justification in the resolution on "The Rise and Decline of Stalinism" of the Pabloists' "Fourth World Congress" in 1954, which declared:

"...the Yugoslav CP and the Chinese CP have been able to lead a revolution victoriously and independently of the Kremlin and have in these instances ceased to be Stalinist parties in the proper meaning of this term...."

"Since both the Chinese CP and to a certain extent also the Yugoslav CP are in reality bureaucratic centrist parties, which however still find themselves under the pressure of the revolution in their countries, we do not call upon the proletariat of these countries to constitute new revolutionary parties or to prepare a political revolution in these countries."

In contrast to Pablo's orientation of pressuring the bureaucracy and prettyfying the CCP (which had locked up and murdered his own comrades!) into a "bureaucratic-centrist" non-Stalinist force, the SWP and its allies in the



Mao's troops entering Nanjing in April 1949. Shortly afterward Stalinists raided local organizations of Chinese Trotskyist Party, arresting scores and secretly shooting many.

HENRI CARTIER-BRESSON/MAGNUM

International Committee correctly stated:

"The Third Chinese Revolution was deformed by the Stalinist leadership and control....

"The contradiction between the conquests of the revolution and the bureaucratic rulers is the central internal contradiction of Chinese society.... "...posing before the Chinese workers the iron necessity of political revolution against the bureaucratic caste."

—"The Third Chinese Revolution and Its Aftermath," [SWP] *Discussion Bulletin*, October 1955

Opportunist Reunification

There can be no doubt of the fundamental differences behind the 1953 split. With regard to China, Pablo suppressed the appeal of the Trotskyist prisoners, refused to call for political revolution and said that the CCP "can project a revolutionary orientation" ("The Rise and Decline of Stalinism"); the International Committee, in contrast, published the appeal, accurately labelled the CCP Stalinist and called for political revolution. Thus the fight against Pabloism was the fight for the preservation of the independent Trotskyist perspective and for the very lives of the Trotskyist cadres.

As the isolation of the SWP grew due to McCarthyism and the weakening of its modest proletarian base by the 1953 split of the American Pabloists, the central party leadership began more and more to adopt capitulatory stands approximating those of Pablo's International Secretariat (I.S.). By the early 1960's the SWP found itself in agree-

ment with the I.S. over Cuba, which both characterized as a healthy workers state (although "lacking the forms of workers democracy") and proposed reunification.

At the congress which set up the so-called "United Secretariat of the Fourth International" (USec) in 1963 it was agreed to ignore a number of past differences, such as over the 1953 split and China. However, as always occurs in such opportunist maneuvers, later events brought out the old differences once more. In the case of China, the so-called "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" found the SWP trying to assert a bogus orthodoxy by giving support to neither Mao nor Liu Shao-chi, while the European majority around Mandel/Maitan/Frank (i.e., the remnants of the old Pablo leadership of the I.S.) preferred its past policy of apologizing for the Maoists.

The SWP objected to statements in the "Draft Resolution on the Cultural Revolution" adopted by the USec majority in 1969, which declared that "Peking... objectively favored anti-imperialist struggles" and furthermore that:

"The more radical line pursued by the Chinese leadership towards world revolutionary developments since the beginning of the Sino-Soviet conflict which, on several important questions, brought it nearer the positions of revolutionary Marxism...."

What is happening here, of course, is that the centrist European majority wants to tail after the Maoist-influenced "youth vanguard" while the now-reformist SWP, orienting to left liberals and mainstream social democrats,

wishes to absolve itself of support for anything labelled "communist."

The Unity of Renegades

As in the dispute over guerrilla warfare currently raging in the United Secretariat, the SWP's pretense of always having had an orthodox Trotskyist position on China is given the lie by the very documents on which this rotten-bloc "International" was founded. The SWP castigates Mandel and Co. for not calling for political revolution in China until 1969. But what did resolutions of the 1963 reunification congress state? They not only fail to mention political revolution, but give the same kind of "critical support" to Mao in the Sino-Soviet dispute that the SWP objects to today:

"Within the framework of the world Communist movement, the Fourth International reaffirms its critical support to the Chinese Communists in their struggle against the neoreformism of the Khrushchev leadership... because it holds that the Chinese line on the fundamental problems of the anti-imperialist and anticapitalist struggles... is on the whole more progressive...."

—"The Sino-Soviet Conflict and the Situation in the USSR and the Other Workers' States"

Even today, when it now says a few nice words about political revolution, the United Secretariat continues to apologize for Mao in the most obscene way. Thus, while passing a resolution demanding freedom for the Chinese Trotskyists in April 1972, USec majorityites have given this statement little or no circulation. And when challenged about its assertions that Peking favored anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist struggles with the example of the Indonesian massacre (the result of the Indonesian CP's reformist line of "peaceful coexistence" with Sukarno, a line specifically endorsed by Peking), the majority replies:

"Even if one wished to attribute to Mao exclusive responsibility for the defeat of the Indonesian revolution—which, in any event, would be excessive: the Kremlin's responsibility is at least equal to if not greater than Mao's in this tragedy—this event weighs less heavily on the scale of twentieth-century history than the victory of the Chinese revolution."

—IEC Majority Tendency, "The Differences in Interpretation of the 'Cultural Revolution' at the Last World Congress and Their Theoretical Implications," [SWP] *International Information Bulletin*, November 1973

These were not the scales that Trotsky used to weigh the tragedy of the Spanish revolution! These are the lawyers' arguments of apologists for Stalinism, the worshippers of non-proletarian leaderships, the renegades from Marxism who have abandoned the struggle for an independent Trotskyist world party of proletarian revolution!

And if there is any lingering doubt about the fundamental Pabloism of both sides in the feuding United Secretariat it can be seen in the attitudes toward the Vietnamese and Cuban Stalinists and Trotskyists, attitudes which exactly mirror Pablo's attitude toward the Chinese Stalinists and Trotskyists in 1953.

Pabloism Means "Jail and Kill the Trotskyists!"

In the early 1960's when Joseph Hansen was defending the SWP leadership's characterization of Cuba as a healthy workers state against the attacks of the Revolutionary Tendency (the U.S. forerunner of the international Spartacist tendency) within the party he was forced to explain why the supposedly non-Stalinist Castro was locking up the Cuban Trotskyists. Hansen justified this bureaucratic suppression by pointing to some of the theories of J. Posadas' brand of ostensible Trotskyism in order to dismiss the specific anti-bureaucratic demands of Posadas' Cuban affiliate. Hansen attacked them as "ultra-leftists" who "added to the complications facing the central leadership" (i.e., Castro); Hansen was proud to claim for the SWP

the appellation "Fidelistas."

The proposals of the Cuban POR (Revolutionary Workers Party) for institutions of workers democracy were called "bizarre or utopian," and its criticisms of Castro were dismissed as refusing to entrust him with "the red charter" until he becomes a "simon-pure Marxist-Leninist" (*Militant*, 13 August 1962). After the Cuban Trotskyists were arrested beginning in November 1963, the SWP maintained a discreet silence and when questioned about them at a public meeting Barry Sheppard, now SWP national secretary, replied: "There are Trotskyists and there are Trotskyists. But, if I were in Cuba I wouldn't be arrested". (see "Freedom for Cuban Trotskyists!" *Spartacist* No. 3, January-February 1965). How true?

More recently, the European majority of the USec has taken to praising the "revolutionary" capacities of the Vietnamese "Communists" in a similar manner, denying they are Stalinists, asserting that they have absorbed the lessons of the permanent revolution, etc. There is, of course, the sticky point of the Vietnamese Trotskyists who were murdered by Ho Chi Minh and his associates in 1945-47. But for this, too, Mandel and Co. have an "explanation," just as Hansen and Co. explained the arrests of the Cuban Trotskyists.

Pierre Rousset, the USec's "Vietnam expert," has written that the "VCP [Vietnamese Communist Party,] i.e., the Stalinists" led the revolutionary process in a way that was uncontested—at least after 1939-40" (*International Socialist Review*, April 1974). In his book on the same subject (*Le parti communiste vietnamien*, 1973), he tries to cast doubt on the actual occurrence of the murders of Ta Thu Tau and the rest of the Vietnamese Trotskyist cadres, referring to "These assassinations, about which historians of the Indochinese CP don't speak, in their writings in French at least...."

However, if one grants that they occurred (which is not at all in doubt), Rousset explains that they demonstrate "the width of the political gulf which then separated the Trotskyist groups from the Indochinese CP" (!) and accuses the Trotskyists of "probably underestimating the importance of the national question...." The implication is that this alleged political weakness justified their extermination! (See "Stalinism and Trotskyism in Vietnam, Part IV: Those Who Revile Our History," in *WV* No. 21, 25 May 1973.)

This brazen covering up for counterrevolutionary Stalinist crimes is the inevitable consequence of Pabloism. It is the concrete demonstration that Pabloism and Trotskyism have nothing in common, that these renegades will side with the Stalinist butchers against their own former comrades in order to curry favor with the bureaucrats.

In fact, to take their statements literally one would have to conclude that the USec "Trotskyists" reason like this: China, you see, has a bureaucratic-centrist CP; it vacillates and can only "approximate" a revolutionary line. Thus they jailed our comrades there (those "fugitives from a revolution") and killed some of them. But the Vietnamese Communists, they are really revolutionary! They murdered every last one of our comrades they could get their hands on (which is why there are no Trotskyist prisoners in Hanoi's jails).

China, Cuba, Vietnam: In each case the newly victorious bureaucracies found it necessary to liquidate revolutionary Marxist opponents in the process of consolidating their bureaucratic rule. In each case the Pabloists apologized for these assassinations and mass arrests, or else passed them over in silence while suppressing appeals from the endangered comrades. This is the history of betrayal which, whatever their numerous differences, is common to all the renegades from Trotskyism who lead the United Secretariat. The struggle for the rebirth of the Fourth International is the struggle to expose these crimes and politically destroy these revisionists, stripping them of every last pretense of Marxism. ■



Red Guards demonstrate in front of Russian embassy, August 1966.

NDP in Power

"Socialist" Strikebreaking in British Columbia

VANCOUVER—In August 1972 twenty years of rule by W.A.C. Bennett's ultra-reactionary Social Credit Party ended in British Columbia with the election of a New Democratic Party majority in the Legislative Assembly. The trade-union movement and the working class generally looked upon the election as a tremendous victory, thinking that the new government under provincial Premier Dave Barrett would rule in their interests. Today, less than two and a half years later, B.C. workers are sadly disillusioned with the social-democratic NDP's brand of capitalist government—crushing strikes, ordering compulsory arbitration and passing anti-labour laws rivaling those of the Socreds.

As a result of this bitter experience, many rank-and-file militants are seeking an alternative to the reformist trap, but in the absence of a revolutionary pole to the left they have nowhere to turn. Most are slinking back into "grin and Barrett" apathy, while their less class-conscious fellow workers are in some cases despairingly turning to the refurbished bourgeois Socred and Liberal parties. The history of the British Columbia NDP government is a case history of social-democratic betrayal, holding vital lessons for those worker militants and avowed "socialists" who hold or foster illusions that such reformist workers parties will struggle for the workers' interests.

The B.C. Working Class

The Canadian economy, much of it based on extraction of primary resources, exhibits regionalist features to a much greater degree than virtually any other advanced capitalist country. This is reflected in a greater degree of decentralization of governmental power than in the U.S. or most of Europe. Economic regionalism and governmental federalism have given greater importance to provincial elections in Canada.

They have also led to sectional pre-dominance by particular parties. The New Democrats, for instance, currently hold only 16 out of 264 seats in Parliament yet they lead majority governments in three of the four western provinces (B.C., Manitoba and Saskatchewan). This, in turn, has given rise to illusions about the possibility of "socialism in one province." In British Columbia, workers' illusions in the NDP were heightened by the fact that the social democrats had been the principal opposition party almost uninterruptedly for the last 37 years.

The 1972 NDP victory was based not only on the expectations of B.C. workers, but also on the need of the capitalist class to control a volatile labour movement. Next to the industrial heartland of southern Ontario and Quebec, British Columbia is economically the most important region of Canada. It has the most class-conscious labour movement in English-speaking North America, centered on the 45,000-member International Woodworkers of America (IWA). In the early post-war years the Communist Party overwhelmingly dominated the B.C. Federation of Labour (BCFL), but through a combination of their own misfired bureaucratic maneuvers and the cold-war witchhunt the Stalinists lost many key positions by the 1950's. Nevertheless, the British Columbia CP remains the largest and strongest on the continent.

The rise of the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation—fore-

runner of the NDP) in the West Coast province went hand-in-hand with the red purges, as the Stalinists and social democrats fought for bureaucratic dominance of the labour movement. The CCF won out, and the alliance established between it and the BCFL tops gave the social democrats a solid electoral base they did not have in any other industrial province. At no time since 1935 did the CCF/NDP vote in British Columbia fall below 22 percent of the total. Yet not until the massive strike wave of 1972 did they approach a majority. That year's provincial elections gave the New Democrats a surprising landslide victory over Social Credit, with the NDP taking 38 of the 55 seats.

Policing the Labour Movement

The Social Credit government, which had as one of its main aims the luring of U.S. capital to B.C., based its dealings with the labour movement on a series of repressive laws which severely restricted collective bargaining rights. The most notorious of these was the Mediation Services Act, passed in 1968, which provided for a government-appointed commission to order strikers back to work, dictating their wages, working conditions and other contract terms.

The Socreds were notably unsuccessful in implementing this draconian anti-labour legislation, however. A rank-and-file rebellion during a 1970 strike wave forced union tops to defy government-ordered compulsory arbitration until the situation cooled. In 1972 there was another upsurge of industrial action by the IWA, longshore and other key unions which took out almost a third of the province's unionized workforce in strikes that averaged almost a month in length (106,000 workers involved, well over 2 million man-days lost).

As a result, during the election campaign of summer 1972 a major plank in the NDP program was an opportunistic call for repeal of all anti-labour legislation. Demonstrations of militant workers against the Socreds' strikebreaking laws were held throughout the province. The social democrats rode the crest of this labour militancy to a first-ever victory in B.C. But right from the outset the new Labour Minister Bill King spelled out his government's intentions: "Our mandate is to represent the total community, and labour can expect a fair deal and that's all."

Immediately upon taking office the

NDP began to implement its "fair deal" by carrying out its prime responsibility to the capitalists—maintaining "labour peace." For a full year the government made no move to repeal any of the reactionary Social Credit labour laws. In July 1973, worried by grumbling in the ranks, the BCFL tops were forced to present a brief to Prime Minister Barrett calling for implementation of the repeal program. But only after the provincial council of the NDP itself had twice demanded repeal did the cabinet announce that it would introduce new labour legislation.

The NDP's Anti-Labour Legislation

Even before the content of what was to be Bill 11 was made public, NDP Labour Minister King, asked for a preview of the impending legislation, stated that it would be "broadly acceptable to labour and management." Acceptable to management it clearly was. When informed of the provisions of the bill, the president of the Employers' Council of British Columbia stated: "These are very sweeping provisions and innovations. It is not something we can condemn out of hand. We've been seeking new and improved methods to deal



TORONTO STAR, DOUG GIFFIN FILE



CP

Top: B.C. Premier David Barrett. Right: Federal NDP leader David Lewis.

with labor-management problems, so we must adopt a constructive attitude" (quoted in *Globe and Mail* [Toronto], 3 October 1973).

Various political representatives of the capitalist class also welcomed the social democrats' bill. Liberal Leader David Anderson praised it, noting that many of its provisions were based on labour legislation passed by the Conservative government of Ontario. B.C. Conservative leader Scott Wallace was particularly pleased with its provisions for compulsory and binding arbitration.



B.C. workers demonstrate against Socred anti-labor laws in 1972.

And James Chabot, the previous Social Credit Labour Minister, predicted that Bill 11 would help speed settlements of industrial disputes (in the interest of management, naturally).

The major provision of the new code was for the creation of a Labour Relations Board (LRB) with "jurisdiction over all aspects of labour-management relations" (B.C. Department of Labour Annual Report, 1973). This "independent" body was to include, in addition to token "labour representation" (three union bureaucrats out of ten members), representatives of the bosses and their government, plus the inevitable "public" members (petty-bourgeois capitalist lackeys such as pimp lawyers, "labour relations experts," etc.). The purpose of such boards is to mask the role of the capitalist state in policing the unions by giving immediate jurisdiction to a special body in which the labour misleaders have "a voice."

The LRB was given unlimited power to certify and decertify unions, and to decide who is or is not to be considered a union member. It was empowered to impose a compulsory settlement in the first year of a contract. All its decisions were to be "final and conclusive," not open to question or review, and no proceedings could be restrained by injunction or other court action.

LRB decisions were to have the force of court orders—unions found in violation of one of its provisions would be subject to \$1,000-a-day fines, indiv-

idual members to fines of up to \$10,000. The Labour Code went so far as to backhandedly revoke the closed shop, through a disguised "right-to-work" clause stating that an employee may be exempted from having to join a trade union because of so-called "religious beliefs."

Bluff and Bluster from the Labour Brass

The class-collaborationist union brass responded to Bill 11 with a transparently hypocritical display of verbal opposition. While BCFL secretary-treasurer Ray Haynes was bemoaning the fact that "we've got more compulsory arbitration now than we had under the Socreds," the Federation was already preparing its own list of nominees to the LRB! The labour misleaders "fraternally" suggested to their fellow bureaucrats in the NDP cabinet that the bill might "require amendment... if it is to promote improved industrial relations in the province" (BCFL statement, 2 October 1973). They, however, refused to mobilize any of the widespread rank-and-file opposition to the bill, acquiescing to its passage in the legislature by a unanimous vote on October 28.

The following weekend the BCFL met in convention and voted to back its executive council's milk-toast demand for removal of certain "restrictive clauses" of the code. The Communist Party dominated the convention with left-posturing bombast and threw its full support behind the executive's resolution. In the absence of a class-struggle opposition at the convention there was no call for intransigent opposition to Bill 11, the only position consistent with union independence from control by the bosses' state.

In fact, the main complaint expressed by the assembled bureaucrats was that their own nominees were not accepted by the government! But Labour Minister King and national NDP leader David Lewis both put in convention appearances in an attempt to force the BCFL tops to drop even this phony "opposition." Their efforts bore fruit only two weeks later, when the BCFL "campaign to change the code" was publicly dropped.

Meanwhile, the NDP provincial convention of November 10-12 formally voted (by 322 to 290) to uphold established party labour policy over the reactionary Bill 11. The party's center, worried about losing popularity among its working-class constituency, attempted to uphold NDP's social-democratic "traditions" as expressed during many years of oppositional pro-labour rhetoric. In truth, the rightist cabinet leadership was only swifter to react to the changed circumstances (governmental office) in which the party found itself. Although the NDP convention passed a motion instructing the government to follow party policy, Barrett simply announced that the cabinet intended to ignore directives it disapproved of, including this one!

Social Democracy in Power

The backlash of the workers against "their" government became apparent in the 1974 federal election, when the NDP popular vote in British Columbia declined by 12 percent and its parliamentary representation in Ottawa fell from 11 seats to two. In the absence of a viable left-wing alternative, the anti-NDP protest vote passed over to the Liberals (who were campaigning against wage controls) or was reflected in unrecorded abstentions. The state of the provincial party in those months was succinctly put by Hans Brown in the post-election issue of the B.C. NDP monthly paper, the *Democrat*: "[since the election of the provincial government] our membership has stagnated, our organizers have been cut back, our coffers are dry, and our people are tired."

Throughout 1974 the government continued its campaign for "labour peace" by repressing one strike after another. In an IWA strike during the summer, King threatened to use the Labour Code to force a "settlement" on the union. (The Woodworkers bu-

reaucrats backed down following this threat and forced their membership back to work.) At an emergency session of the legislature (recalled specifically to deal with the issue) on August 10, the government passed Bill 164, the Essential Services Continuation Act, to break a fire fighters' strike in four Vancouver-area municipalities.

Barrett was also able to quash opposition within the NDP to his strike-breaking policy. At a Labour Day 1974 provincial party convention he succeeded in defeating the outgoing executive report critical of the cabinet's refusal to implement party policy, by a vote of 368 to 202. Today much of the "old," radical-populist NDP in B.C. is disoriented. An "oppositional" caucus surfaced at the convention centered on members of the outgoing provincial executive such as the hoary hatchetman Hans Brown, who spent much of the last year trying to get supporters of the League for Socialist Action (LSA) expelled from the B.C. NDP.

Several of these out-of-favour party bureaucrats signed a statement, "Turn Toward Socialism," which calls for the government to "work with the party in the process of building a new socialist B.C." Its goal is a vaguely defined "new democracy" where "people have real power over all aspects of their lives..." Among the specific measures advocated are introducing "social ownership" into food distribution, housing, communications and natural resources processing industries; electing worker representatives to boards of directors of government-owned corporations; creating an Environment Ministry; etc.

For a Trotskyist Party in Canada!

Everything in this utterly reformist program is consistent with the maintenance of capitalism and with the extreme right-wing social-democratic traditions of the NDP. Harold Wilson's Labour Party government in Britain is actually carrying out policies to the left of what is proposed by the B.C. "oppositionists."

As the current sharp economic crisis serves to underline, working people cannot defend their interests by adopting a perspective of reforming the present bankrupt system. What is needed is a revolutionary program and party capable of leading the class struggle forward to the overthrow of capitalism, the expropriation of the bourgeoisie as a class. Instead of pleas to Barrett to carry out NDP party policy, it is crucial to demonstrate to militant workers the need to go beyond dead-end social-democratic reformism.

Some groups, such as the fake-Trotskyist LSA, occasionally pretend to do this. In *Labor Challenge* (7 October) the latter has made some left-sounding criticisms of the "Turn Toward Socialism" document, complaining that it does not demand "nationalization of industry" and that it "pose[s] the capitalist state and government as a force that can be used in working peoples' interests." Moreover, "This party [the NDP]—a social-democratic labor party—is not an instrument which can carry out a socialist transformation."

The LSA's hypocrisy knows no bounds. Its own call for "nationalization" carefully avoids the important question of compensation to the capitalists. This is no accident, for these reformists actually oppose the demand "no compensation"; in 1971 the LSA actually disciplined its own supporters who had won the New Brunswick NDP to this demand! As for using the capitalist state in the workers' interests, *Labor Challenge* seems somewhat out of step with its U.S. counterpart, the *Militant*, which has been calling for troops to Boston where they would supposedly defend black people subjected to racist terror.

Moreover, for twenty years the LSA and its predecessors had as their main orientation the pipedream of creating a "socialist" NDP (or CCF). (Only because it is currently not running a major NDP operation does the LSA now adopt a more "left" posture.) The original architect of this policy, Ross

Dowson, left the LSA in 1974 to form the Socialist League, a social-chauvinist Canadian nationalist outfit which declares that "winning the NDP and its ranks to socialism remains for us the central challenge of the epoch..." (*Forward*, December 1974-January 1975)! For the working class, the central task of this epoch is quite different, namely the overthrow of the bloody system of capitalist exploitation.

Not surprisingly, given its overall tailist policy, the SocL considers that "a good beginning" was made by the B.C. opposition document (*ibid.*) and declares that "For all its drawbacks the NDP government in BC represents a great stride forward for working people" (*Forward*, October 1974).

Trotskyists can give electoral support to a reformist workers party under certain conditions, but we do so without building illusions in social-democratic misleaders of the Lewis/Barrett ilk. We seek to place these "gentlemen" in office not because of delusions that they represent a "step forward," but in order to expose their true policies, warning in advance that they will betray and that the workers must have no confidence in them. Such a policy in the 1972 elections could have enabled Marxists to subsequently crystallize a revolutionary faction in the B.C. NDP as Barrett's sellouts became ever clearer.

Revolutionaries are under no obligation, however, to give electoral support to reformist betrayers unconditionally. We do so only when a vote for their party can aid the working-class struggle by drawing a class line, if only at the organizational level, against the bourgeoisie. Thus we do not call on workers to vote for social democrats and Stalinists when the latter are running in coalition with capitalist parties. Such "popular fronts" are a direct negation of the Marxist principle of proletarian independence. Yet in the last federal election, both the LSA and the Revolutionary Marxist Group (RMG) called for votes to the NDP, even though Lewis & Co. had kept Trudeau's minority Liberal government in power for the past two years (the so-called "corridor coalition") and promised to do so again.

The international Spartacist tendency, in contrast, called for conditional opposition to the NDP in the July 1974 election, unless it repudiated its policy of tacit coalition with Trudeau. We urged votes for LSA and RMG candidates, however, while criticizing their opportunist programs (see "NDP Must Break with Liberals," *WV* No. 47, 21 June 1974).

Both nationally and in B.C. large numbers of workers have turned away from the NDP as its class-collaborationist, strikebreaking policies become clear to all. While many retreat into apathy, a principled Trotskyist party could turn disillusion into class-conscious militancy, not through seeking to fool the workers about "winning the NDP to socialism" but by consistently telling the truth. This struggle has already been begun by the Canadian Committee of the international Spartacist tendency. ■

Spartacist Local Directory

- BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON, D.C.
P.O. Box 4398,
Arlington, VA 22204
- BERKELEY/
OAKLAND (415) 653-4668
Box 852, Main P.O.,
Berkeley, CA 94701
- BOSTON
Box 188, M.I.T. Sta.,
Cambridge, MA 02139
- BUFFALO (716) 882-3863
c/o SYL, Box 6,
Norton Union, SUNYAB,
Buffalo, NY 14214
- CHICAGO (312) 427-0003
Box 6471, Main P.O.
Chicago, IL 60680
- CLEVELAND (216) 621-3379
Box 6765,
Cleveland, OH 44101
- DETROIT (313) 921-4626
Box 663A, General P.O.,
Detroit, MI 48232
- HOUSTON (713) 926-9944
Box 9054,
Houston, TX 77011
- ITHACA (706) 277-3211
c/o SYL, P.O. Box 578
Ithaca, NY 14850
- LOS ANGELES . . . (213) 485-1838
Box 26282, Edendale Sta.,
Los Angeles, CA 90026
- MADISON
c/o SYL, Box 3334,
Madison, WI 53704
- NEW HAVEN (203) 776-5953
c/o SYL, Box 1363,
New Haven, CT 06505
- NEW ORLEANS . . . (504) 866-8384
Box 51634, Main P.O.,
New Orleans, LA 70151
- NEW YORK (212) 925-2426
Box 1377, G.P.O.,
New York, NY 10001
- PHILADELPHIA . . (215) 667-5695
Box 25601,
Philadelphia, PA 19144
- SAN DIEGO
P.O. Box 2034,
Chula Vista, CA 92012
- SAN FRANCISCO
Box 5712
San Francisco, CA 94101
- TORONTO (416) 366-0871
Canadian Committee of the International Spartacist Tendency
Box 6867, Station A,
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
- VANCOUVER
Canadian Committee of the International Spartacist Tendency
Box 26, Station A
Vancouver, B.C., Canada

Fremont UAW Protests Deportations

The following resolution, introduced by the Committee for a Militant UAW, was passed at the February 23 meeting of Local 1364:

Whereas: organized labor in America can unite with foreign-born workers in common struggle against the American corporations only through the resolute struggle against deportations which is an attack on workers solidarity by the government, and;
Whereas: the UAW International reinforces this national chauvinism by blaming layoffs on foreign auto workers and calling for Import Quotas instead of organizing an international offensive against the multi-national corporations;
Be it resolved that local 1364 stand prepared to demonstrate its opposition to any deportation; specifically the so-called "census" in San Jose and the gestapo tactics of the Los Angeles Immigration Bureau. Instead we demand: Jobs for all! Full citizenship rights for all foreign-born workers, and, further the UAW must mobilize the entire labor movement in a major drive to organize the unorganized in the southwest and across the border into Mexico. ■

WORKERS VANGUARD

Nome _____
Address _____
City _____
State/Zip _____

includes SPARTACIST

- ☐ Enclosed is \$5 for 24 issues
- ☐ Enclosed is \$1 for 6 issues, introductory only

order from/poy to:
SPARTACIST PUBLISHING CO.
Box 1377 GPO, New York, NY 10001

Bridges Prepares Longshore Deregistrations

SAN FRANCISCO, February 21—"Longshoreman" may soon become an extinct category, and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union will be destroyed if Harry Bridges and the rest of the ILWU leadership get their way. With union jobs already slashed drastically and employers reaping huge profits under his previous "Modernization and Mechanization" contracts, Bridges has just signed up for more of the same.

Massive new employer attacks in the form of speed-up and job-cutting automation can be expected if the proposed new two-year longshore pact is approved in membership voting to be held next week. Central to the contract—which Bridges is trying to ram through a full four months early—is a provision designed to crush rank-and-file resistance to employer attacks by penalizing the membership of an entire port for any work stoppages, even by one individual, in that port.

"It's a Union Buster!"

"Reject the Contract! It's a Union Buster!" say oppositionists' leaflets circulating in Local 10, the San Francisco Bay Area longshore unit. "If we ratify this contract, there will be a hell of a lot fewer of us around to ratify the next contract." They might have added as an afterthought, "...if there is a next contract."

Bridges has been making incredible claims for his new deal. Operating on the principle that the bigger the lie the better, he asserts that "Nobody in the present work force of 12,000 can be laid off for any reason because of the economic recession. We now have protection against the depression" (*San Francisco Chronicle*, 11 November). Similar glowing statements filled a front-page story of the 11 February *Chronicle* describing the proposed new contract.

An equally laudatory article in the ILWU's *Dispatcher* (7 February) noticeably omitted crucial information ("...full details of the tentative agreement will not be announced until later..."). This was provided to the membership only after Bridges had secured approval from a February 13 meeting of the Coast Longshore, Ship Clerk and Walking Boss Caucus by a two-to-one margin. Despite heavily orchestrated advance publicity buildup, the vote showed unusually strong opposition.

A detailed examination of the proposal reveals that this supposedly "depression-proof" contract actually contains less job security than ever. The basic "anti-layoff" clause is unimproved over the 1973 pact:

"There shall be no reduction in registered longshoremen or clerks work force during the term of the agreement except for normal attrition due to quits, deaths and retirements, and deregistration for cause. This does not preclude the parties from agreeing upon a reduction in force should unusual circumstances develop."

This contains two gaping loopholes. The first is that "deregistration for cause" includes kangaroo-court trials before an arbitrator for men who, although meeting all availability requirements,

must demonstrate why they should not be deregistered.

Bridges Plans to Axe Longshoremen

The ILWU International leadership revealed plans two months ago to conduct such trials of B-men jointly with the employers. B-men are second-class longshoremen, kept out of full union membership and given last choice on jobs. The proposal, which is now being carried out, is to try all B-men on the lower half of the hours-worked list. This could mean deregistering hundreds!

The two Local 10 members who authored the "Reject the Contract!" leaflet, Stan Gow and Howard Keylor, are also circulating a petition calling on the union to fight against any deregistrations and for jobs for all. They have reportedly collected over 200 names so far. A-men recognize that if Bridges and the PMA (Pacific Maritime Association, the employers' association) succeed in getting rid of hundreds of B-men, downgrading and deregistration of A-men won't be far behind.

Largely because of this pressure Local President Larry Wing, who failed to oppose the deregistration plan when it was first announced, has recently been intervening in the separate hearings and opposing all deregistrations. The employers, however, can appeal each case to the Coast-Wide Labor Relations Committee, a joint union-management board.

The second loophole is the "unusual circumstances" clause, which could refer to a drastic reduction of available work as in a sharp economic crisis. Bridges had promised to change this, but after failing claims he has a "depression-proof" deal anyway!

That "unusual circumstances" simply means lack of work is made crystal clear by other provisions of the contract. Ports with few jobs available are designated "Low Work Opportunity" ports, and Bridges' "no-layoffs" solution is to require the men to move to another port! (This will mainly serve to drive them from the industry, since there is little work available even in the major ports. In the Bay Area full union members work only three to four days a week.) A special clause for hard-hit Port Hueneme offers a "separation allowance," consisting of six months' pay at the Guarantee rate, to get out of the industry.

The "M and M" Betrayals

Bridges' plan is to allow the companies to force "excess" workers off the



PORT OF PORTLAND PHOTO

Containerized dock facilities in Portland.

docks in ways other than openly admitted layoffs. The pattern is the same as in previous contracts, notably the disastrous "Modernization and Mechanization" agreements of 1961 and 1966. The principle of these deals was to allow the companies to introduce planned automation through containerization, LASH (Lighter Aboard Ship) and other systems, in exchange for "no layoffs" and a Pay Guarantee Plan (PGP).

However, numerous loopholes make it hard to collect the Guarantee and thousands have been driven from the industry for lack of work due to automation. From 26,000 in 1948, the union's longshore membership (including clerks) has declined to 12,000 officially (actually closer to 10,000 active members), with most of the drop occurring since 1959. Thus job loss due to automation in longshore under Bridges' "no-layoffs" agreements has drastically exceeded that in industries without such "protection."

Furthermore, the employers benefited greatly from speed-up and manning scale reductions which were allowed under the "M and M" agreements. Combined with the massive increases in productivity per man-hour due to automated techniques, this led to increased profits many times in excess of the meager benefits to longshoremen under the PGP. The government Pay Board estimated in 1972 that the companies profited by \$900 million while dock workers received only \$63 million (*San Francisco Bay Guardian*, 19 October-1 November 1974).

One delegate critical of the new contract terms pointed, at the February 13 Caucus, to figures indicating a more than four-fold increase in the yearly tonnage handled by an average longshoremen since 1958. Another delegate asked Bridges if he had challenged the employers for figures on the increase in productivity, to which the reply was a flat "no!"

Bridges has also made other important concessions that have eroded vital union gains and limited the membership's ability to resist further employer attacks. In 1959 the special "B" list was created, and in 1966 Bridges allowed the companies to create a "steady-men" category of members who work permanently for one employer. This has seriously undermined the hiring hall, the great achievement of the 1934 strike

which founded the union, as well as eroding the job categories of longshoremen.

Work-Stoppage Clause Strangles Resistance

The most notable new concession to the companies in the present contract terms is a clause to prevent work stoppages. Dock-by-dock walkoffs to prevent the deterioration of working conditions have been on the rise as members are increasingly fed up with sellout contracts and the lack of union protection in grievance procedures. One business agent in the S.F. port remarked last year that 1974 saw more such stoppages than any year in the previous ten.

Under the proposed terms any walkout, even by a single individual asserting his contractual right not to work under unsafe conditions, will result in the lifting of the Pay Guarantee for that week for the entire port if it is declared illegal by an arbitrator. This will have a tremendous chilling effect on struggles to prevent new employer encroachment on jobs and working conditions.

Other catches have also been introduced to make it harder to collect the Guarantee, such as required availability for Saturdays and Sundays (presently voluntary) and a clause requiring dockers to take any job for which they are qualified. As jobs decrease and conditions worsen such clauses will cut down the numbers eligible for the Guarantee and more will be driven out of the industry. In addition, these provisions establish a virtual dictatorship of employers and arbitrators over the dispatching of jobs from the ball, the key to the union's past strength.

The International leadership has repeatedly refused to fight such company attacks. A 134-day strike in 1971-72 was a fiasco because of Bridges' defeatist policies. The strike was isolated while cargo moved through Mexico and Canada, military cargo was shipped despite ILWU resolutions calling for immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, and no attempt was made to fight the Pay Board, which sharply cut the settlement.

These betrayals shackle the union today. Having failed to fight the Pay Board in 1972 (or the Taft-Hartley in-

SL/SYL PUBLIC OFFICES—*Revolutionary Literature*

BAY AREA

Friday and Saturday } 3:00—6:00 p.m.

330-40th Street
(near Broadway)
Oakland, California
Phone 653-4668

CHICAGO

Tuesday 4:00-8:00 p.m.
Saturday 2:00-6:00 p.m.

538 So. Wabash
Room 206
Chicago, Illinois
Phone 427-0003

NEW YORK

Monday through Friday } 3:00-7:30 p.m.
Saturday 1:00-4:00 p.m.

260 West Broadway
Room 522
New York, New York
Phone 925-5665

junction in 1948), Bridges now raises the possibility of new wage controls as a reason for settling far in advance of the June 30 expiration date. (The real reason was given more candidly by Ed Flynn of the employers' association, quoted in the 11 February *San Francisco Chronicle*: "...PMA suggested earlier negotiations, Flynn said, because it wanted a guarantee of stability at West Coast docks.") Also, while shoving an early settlement on U.S. longshoremen, the union tops have kept Canadian dockers working well past their contract expiration on December 31, despite an overwhelming vote to strike in Vancouver.

Build an Alternative Leadership!

As a result of these defeatist policies and conscious sabotage by the Bridges' machine, many longshoremen feel incapable of winning another strike. But dock workers still wield tremendous power; it is the bureaucracy's misleadership that threatens defeat. At a Local 10 meeting called to discuss the contract prior to voting on it, according to workers interviewed afterwards by WV, Bridges baldly accused oppositionists who struggle for "exorbitant" demands of being "employer agents."

It is the treacherous labor bureaucracy that is actually an agent of the capitalists in the unions. Bridges and Co. are wedded to an alliance with bourgeois politicians like San Francisco Mayor Alioto and the shipping interests he represents. They are committed to allowing the companies to automate away jobs rather than waging a fight to reduce the workweek at no loss in pay, which would spread the benefits of automation to the workers. The path to victory lies through the building of militant, class-struggle caucuses to replace the present pro-capitalist regime in the unions.

But the contract must be rejected now. Militants committed to class-struggle policies must organize support for a strike and for the kind of tactics necessary to achieve victory. The Gow-Keylor leaflet points to the critical importance of the recent KNC Glass strike in Union City (in the ILWU's warehouse section) as an example of how rank-and-file organizing beat back a union-busting attack by mobilizing the membership and "hot-cargoing" supplies for the plant, within the framework of official union action. In the course of waging such struggles an alternative leadership to the reformist bureaucracy can be built.

The "Reject the Contract" leaflet summarizes the inadequacies of the Bridges' proposal and raises six demands of particular importance in the contract struggle:

"1. JOBS FOR ALL--NO LAYOFFS! A shorter work week with no loss in shift pay to guarantee everyone work and a full paycheck. 6 hours work for 8 hours pay! No extended shifts. And keep on sliding the hours down and wages up to create jobs!"

"2. 100% automatic escalator clause in the contract, the rise in the cost of living calculated monthly. No limit on the escalator!"

"3. Abolish 9.43 [the "steady-men" clause] completely. Full daily job equalization. Full skilled job training for all, controlled by the union at PMA expense!"

"4. Full A status for B men now! No deregistration of A men or B men!"

"5. Full right to strike over work conditions and union issues!"

"6. Common expiration dates for all ILWU longshoremen (in U.S., Canada, Alaska and Hawaii)."

Hardly exorbitant, these demands represent the immediate felt needs of longshoremen threatened with job losses, massive inflation and attacks on their right to strike. They can only be won through building a solid coastwide longshore strike and replacing the bureaucracy with a militant class-struggle leadership. Such a leadership would reject Bridges' defeatist policies of class collaboration by calling for a break with Alioto and all capitalist parties and polticleans, and for the formation of a workers party based on the trade unions, to fight for a workers government. ■

Continued from page 12

Warehouse Ranks Back Militant

"What Happened at Boron" spelled out the importance of the issues involved for the union and for the entire labor movement. The Boron strike was a monument to the legalistic reformism of the ILWU bureaucracy and was trumpeted by *Fortune* (December 1974) as a model of how to break unions in a period of high unemployment, by recruiting scabs.

The strike was crushed because the ILWU leadership allowed *ILWU longshoremen* in Locals 20-A and 13 (Wilmington and Los Angeles) to load and ship scab borax coming from the mine-refinery in the desert town of Boron. A picket line was set up briefly at Borax' Wilmington facility, but when an arbitrator ruled the picket illegal it was taken down. AFL-CIO craft unions also scabbed because ILWU tops made no effort to stop them. The International's "support" to the strike was limited to collecting donations from other ILWU locals.

In the KNC strike in Union City, however, a similar threat was met by mass picketing, including support from longshoremen, teamsters and other unionists, as well as from Local 6 members from surrounding houses, because Mandel and two other members alerted the membership with their leaflets. The leaflets called for hot-cargoing of products going to and from the struck plant as well as mass picketing and warned of the possibility of government intervention.

An injunction against the picketing was issued later and defied by the pickets, until the leadership moved to end the strike with a few contract improvements. These were wholly inadequate, leaving KNC still below the Local 6 standard, and could certainly have been improved upon. However, militant strike methods did beat back the attempt to break the union, which would have been successful had the strike remained isolated under the defeatist misleadership of McLain et al. The censure motion was the bureaucracy's attempt to smash what it saw as a

threat to its very existence—militants with a program for *victory* instead of defeat.

The East Bay Division meeting was itself a demonstration that the sellout labor bureaucracy can be defeated within the unions by a militant rank and file. What is needed is a class-struggle program and the core of an alternative leadership, to organize the struggle and clarify the issues to the membership. The Militant Caucus has been carrying out this task.

When the meeting opened, McLain reportedly did not even make an effort to thwart discussion on the GEB minutes, which contained the censure motion. Instead, the officials supporting the motion tried to hold their remarks until after opponents had spoken, in order to sway the body just prior to the vote. They refused to speak at the beginning despite Rosenberg's repeated demand for an explanation of the charge of "provocation," which he said had no basis. But even this tactic proved to no avail. When the vote was taken, the opposition was so overwhelming that McLain stopped counting and announced that the censure motion had been rejected by the East Bay Division.

Front-Men for Class Collaboration

The discussion made it clear that elements in the union supported by the reformist Communist Party were actively fronting for and working with the leadership, denouncing all criticism as "divisive." This confirms our estimation that "The slanders leveled against Mandel... have all the earmarks of a Stalinist-style purge of the left..." (WV No. 62, 14 February). Supporters of CP politics on the GEB said that the criticisms of the leadership contained in Mandel's leaflets would show the employers that there were divisions in the membership.

What this phony "left" rhetoric tries to cover up is the fact that it is the labor bureaucracy that functions as the

agent of the employers within the unions, by urging respect for every letter of bourgeois legality, subordinating labor to the bourgeois political parties and to the maintenance of the employers' profits. The unions can only be made to serve the interests of the members if they place themselves on the path of class struggle, and for this a new leadership is needed. A militant leadership must relentlessly expose the failings, passivity and betrayals of the bureaucracy. Not to do so means subordination to the class collaborationism of the labor fakers, which is exactly the position of the Communist Party.

Unlike the CP, supporters of Warehouse Victory, a grouping backed politically by the Maoist Revolutionary Union, supported the opponents of the censure motion at the meeting. They were forced by the rank-and-file outrage to give temporary support to a militant policy, but this conflicts with the RU's frequent sectarianism to the point of physical attacks on its left critics.

Pat Ryle, an executive board member who actively supported a recent march for jobs in Sacramento initiated by the ex-Maoist Progressive Labor Party, had abstained in the original vote on the censure motion at the GEB. However, in the membership meeting he admitted he was changing his vote to opposition, saying that Mandel's leaflets had "mobilized the rank and file." This is in marked contrast to the current frenzy to be found in the pages of PL's *Challenge*, which is accusing class-struggle militants in the UAW in Detroit of being "racist swine" who must be "physically defeated" (see article elsewhere in this issue).

This victory for class-struggle militancy, both in defeating union-busting at KNC and in the vote of the East Bay Division of Local 6, is all the more important as the entire working class is threatened by a period of deepening economic crisis and unemployment. Such conditions make it easier to mobilize scabs, using the army of the unemployed to hold down wages and generally intimidate employed workers into accepting greater exploitation. As the union tops are competing with each other to decide how much of labor's gains to *give up*, KNC shows the way to defeat the employer offensive. ■

International Women's Day Forums



Garment workers during 1919 strike.

NEW YORK

"Forward to a Women's Section of the Vanguard Party"

Wednesday, March 5
7:30 p.m.
Columbia University
Hamilton Hall—Room 304
Speaker: Kay Blanchard

PHILADELPHIA

"From Feminism to Marxism"

Saturday, March 1
7:30 p.m.
Germantown Community
United Presbyterian Church
Green and Tulpehocken Sts.
Speaker: M. Salzburg

WASHINGTON D.C.

"From Feminism to Marxism"

Friday, February 28
7:30 p.m.
American University
Hurst Hall—Room No. 2
Speaker: N. Gerard

HOUSTON

"CLUW: Feminism and Reformism vs. Class Struggle in the Trade Unions"

Week of March 10—call 926-9944 for date and time
Sundry School
University of Houston
Speaker: Sue Shepherd

"Under the lead of the Third International, the day of the working women shall become a real fighting day; it shall take the form of practical measures which either solidify the conquests of Communism... or prepare the way for the dictatorship of the working class."

—Alexandra Kollontai

WORKERS VANGUARD

ILWU Bureaucracy Defeated in Censure Vote

Warehouse Ranks Back Militant

No More Borons!

OAKLAND, February 23—Warehouse workers last week scored a victory over bureaucratic attempts to divide and defeat the labor movement. In a well-attended meeting of the East Bay Division of Local 6, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, members voted decisively to reject a censure motion that had been passed by the Local's General Executive Board (GEB) against militant Bob Mandel.

This vote was a repudiation not just of the cowardly censure motion but also of the criminal passivity of the reformist trade-union leaders in allowing crushing defeats to take place such as the Boron strike last year. It was a statement that the militant methods of the KNC Glass strike—mass picketing and "hot-cargo" boycotts of struck products—represent the answer to Boron-type disasters and the way forward for labor to win strikes, even in a period of high unemployment.

The censure motion, passed several weeks ago by the GEB, was aimed at a group of militants in the ILWU who had sparked mass picketing by Local 6 members in support of KNC Glass strikers. KNC workers had received the same threat of permanent replacement by scabs which had come true just a few months earlier for hundreds of Local 30 members at the Borax works in southern California.

The efforts of these militants led to

a successful labor boycott action by ILWU longshoremen in Oakland, who refused to handle glass shipments to KNC. Following the strike, Bob Mandel, who was attending his first meeting of the GEB after being elected to the Board on a class-struggle program, was singled out by the motion and accused of "provocative actions" and "anti-union attacks" in literature handed out by him to support the KNC strike.

Since then, Mandel and other militants have formed a Militant Caucus and begun publishing a caucus news-

Button distributed by Militant Caucus of ILWU



letter, the *Warehouse Militant*, to build support for a class-struggle program and an alternative leadership in the unions. They also produced buttons saying, "For Militancy and Solidarity, NO MORE BORONS" which have been popular with the membership.

Opposition to Bureaucratic Censure Mounts

Immediately after the motion of censure was passed, KNC chief stew-

ard Rosenberg wrote a statement, which was reprinted in the first issue of *Warehouse Militant*, answering the GEB's charges against Mandel and defending the militant tactics of the strike. This statement was subsequently endorsed by every Local 6 worker at KNC.

Support was also received from militants in Local 10 (longshore) and 34 (clerks) in the Bay Area, as well as from LaFranya Mayes, a steward at a shop near KNC who was a key supporter of the militant defense actions and instrumental in building support for the strike in her shop. The second issue of *Warehouse Militant* reports that a petition—demanding the censure be dropped and calling for support to the tactics that stopped the union-busting drive at KNC—was circulated in Canada by members of Vancouver Local 500.

Meanwhile, the Local 6 leadership under President Curtis McLain secured approval for the censure motion in a few divisions of the Bay Area-wide warehouse local by lining up large numbers of officials to speak and vote, counting on small meetings due to the lack of information on the issues by the members in other units. In at least two other divisions, officials improperly refused to hold meetings for fear of losing the vote. But in the East Bay Division it was impossible for them to pull the wool over the membership's eyes.

According to members who spoke with WV reporters afterwards, Rosenberg denounced the censure motion and gave a detailed defense of the strike.



ILWU militant Bob Mandel

Other KNC workers also opposed the motion and heckled Local secretary-treasurer Keith Eickmann when he claimed that Local officials had kept in "close touch" with the strikers.

KNC vs. Boron

Many of the 150 members present turned out on the call of the second issue of *Warehouse Militant*. An article headed "Stop the Censure Motion! No More Borons" and another entitled

continued on page 11

Bridges Prepares Longshore Deregistrations...10

¡Alto a las deportaciones!

A medida que la tasa de desempleo continua elevándose, los voceros de los grandes negocios y sus apologistas en el movimiento sindical desesperadamente buscan una víctima propiciatoria para desviar la creciente ira de la población trabajadora. Así como en el pasado la estrategia de los defensores del sistema capitalista de explotación y desempleo es intensificar divisiones nacionales y otras divisiones dentro de la clase obrera a través de esquemas proteccionistas, trato de preferencia en los despidos y otros engaños similares.

Corrientemente existe una ofensiva reaccionaria para inducir histeria reaccionaria contra inmigrantes sin documentos y otros trabajadores extranjeros. El director de la división de pasaportes del Departamento de Estado acaba de proponer cédulas de ciudadanía como una medida para eliminar a los inmigrantes ilegales. ¡Todo militante debe protestar esta medida policíaca, de estilo sudafricano, para aplastarla en semilla!

El año pasado más de 800.000 fueron deportados por las autoridades norteamericanas; este año prometen expulsar a 1.000.000 o aún más. Esta campaña chovinista se extiende de costa a costa. En Los Angeles las autoridades de "la migra" regularmente saquean

el barrio del East L. A. en brançadas de tipo Gestapo, resultando en decenas de miles de deportaciones el año pasado.

En Nueva York una serie de artículos rabiosos recientemente publicados por el *Daily News* acusaba a los obreros extranjeros de ser los responsables por toda clase de enfermedad social (desempleo, malas escuelas, altos impuestos, etc.). Los títulos decían: "100.000 extranjeros ilegales roban a la ciudad" y "Arrestos de extranjeros fomentaría empleos, dicen oficiales".

La Spartacist League ha estado en la primera fila de lucha contra las deportaciones. En California la Spartacist League fue la primera organización de izquierda que públicamente denunció a los ataques que César Chavez hizo contra los trabajadores extranjeros, notablemente su apoyo al proyecto de ley Rodino-Kennedy, durante el tiempo en que la mayoría de los oportunistas disculpaban desvergonzosamente al líder de los United Farm Workers. (La SL también defendió al UFW contra los ataques de los cultivadores, los Teamsters y el gobierno, llamando por un boicot laboral de productos esquiroleros y por una huelga general en todo el estado de California en defensa del sindicato.)

En Nueva York la SL repetidamente ha estado activa en manifestaciones contra las deportaciones de haitianos el año pasado. Recientemente, el 11 de febrero, el Comité Ad Hoc para Aplastar a los Ataques Contra Trabajadores Extranjeros, iniciado por la Spartacist League, estableció un piquete en frente de las oficinas del *Daily News* protestando la porquería racista y chovinista que se estaba arrojando en su campaña contra extranjeros. En la manifestación, un vocero de la SL hizo una llamada para luchar por empleos para todos, para poner fin a las deportaciones, y para obtener plenos derechos de ciudadanía para todos los extranjeros que presentemente residen en el país. La lucha para poner fin a las deportaciones es una tarea urgente para todos los socialistas y militantes sindicalistas.

—¡No a las deportaciones! ¡Plenos derechos de ciudadanía para los trabajadores extranjeros!
—¡Empleos para todos! ¡30 horas de trabajo, 40 horas de pago! ¡Organizar a los no organizados!
—¡Expropiar a la industria y la finanza, sin compensación! ¡Adelante hacia una economía planificada bajo un gobierno obrero!
—¡Obreros del mundo, uníos!

