

Auto Contract Stinks— Vote It Down!

DETROIT, October 5—United Auto Workers (UAW) president Leonard Woodcock and Ford Motor Company's chief negotiator, Sidney McKenna, walked into the press room at Ford World headquarters in Dearborn at 10:30 this evening to announce that a settlement of the three-week-old auto strike had been reached. However, no details were furnished by either side.

After reading a brief statement, Woodcock refused to answer even whether he considered it a good pact or not. In response to a question from a *WV* reporter, McKenna said that the agreement did not affect Canada. (Woodcock's statement referred only to U.S. workers.)

From the beginning of the bargaining a news blackout has remained in effect. Only those with "highly placed sources"

continued on page 10

**How the
Reuthers
Tamed the
UAW 6**



Auto strikers at River Rouge as Ford strike began, September 14.

WV Photo

Police Are Strikebreakers, Not Workers!

Down with NYC Cop Rampage!



WV Photo

New York cops demonstrating outside City Hall last week.

OCTOBER 2—New York City cops are rampaging through the streets, openly defying civilian authority, menacing the rights and safety of working people, and in general behaving like the armed thugs of the bourgeoisie that they are. Although ostensibly the result of a "labor dispute" over wages and schedules, the police outburst is, in fact, a reactionary political mobilization in defense of their special privileges.

Sections of the population normally inclined to rally round the "boys in blue" were taken aback when the tranquility of petty-bourgeois white neighborhoods was shattered by a week of late-night police demonstrations. Off-duty cops blew whistles, chanted, hurled "fire crackers and banged garbage can lids, while blocking traffic and directing confused motorists down dead-end streets. Their uniformed cohorts merely grinned and set off squad car sirens in sympathy.

An outraged governor Hugh Carey

denounced the cops as "rowdies" after his limousine was dented in the melee caused by several thousand police demonstrating outside Yankee Stadium Tuesday night. "New York's finest," in and out of uniform, encouraged hundreds of youths to try to crash the gates at the heavyweight championship boxing match. Numerous ticket-holders were robbed and mauled in clear sight of the picketing cops, some of whom actually cheered the lumpen hoodlums.

Indeed, the lawless marauding of police protestors in the last week demonstrated how thin the line is between anti-social criminal elements and the swaggering, macho cops who supposedly protect society. That line is maintained mainly by their badges and social "respectability."

From the stadium, several hundred cops drove to the home of police commissioner Michael Codd in Queens where they rampaged drunkenly

continued on page 11

UE Faces Union-Busting Attack in Boston

Support the Cambion Strike!

CAMBRIDGE, Mass., October 4 — The Spartacus Youth League (SYL), youth section of the Spartacist League, last Thursday sponsored a benefit at Boston University for the workers of Cambion-Cambridge Thermionic Corporation, a locally based electronics firm with international manufacturing operations. The workers have been on strike for nearly half a year. Ever since Cambion's 270 employees—50 percent women, and 50 percent immigrants (mostly Portuguese)—voted to recognize United Electrical Workers (UE) Local 262 as their union in June 1974, Cambion president Frank Lyman has made clear his intention to bust the union by any means necessary.

After provoking the current strike, the Cambion management rented a round-the-clock special detail of Cambridge police to harass the striking workers. The rent-a-cops have so far been responsible for the arrest of 14 picketers and the injury of at least seven others. (One woman striker injured in May required a back operation, and another picketer hospitalized on September 20 required several stitches for a deep head injury.) The UE estimates that the cost of this private mercenary force—\$300,000—exceeds the total cost of the union's rather modest demands!

However, even after numerous arrests and incidents of police brutality against the pickets, the union leadership still kowtows to the myth of the "neutrality" of the bourgeois state. At a City Council meeting on September 27, shop chairman Sandi Polaski (who faces frame-up charges of assault and battery with a deadly weapon) "asked whether the Council would hack a request that the police 'retain their neutrality' at the picket line" (*Cambridge Chronicle*, September 27).

The current UE contract establishes conditions considerably below those prevalent elsewhere in unionized industry. Cambion workers have no pension

plan whatever and next to no medical coverage. Piece-rate workers, the great majority of whom are women, start at a base rate of \$2.50 an hour. When a wage reopener on the union's two-year contract came up this April, management threatened to lock the workers out at midnight unless the union accepted the company's offer: zero wage increases, zero benefit increases. On the afternoon of the deadline, April 13, the company offered an insulting wage increase of 20 cents an hour to hourly workers and 13.8 cents to pieceworkers. The workers responded with an overwhelming vote to strike.

By moving production from the Cambridge facility to four smaller plants scattered across the globe, all of which are non-union, Cambion has maintained partial production from the start. And although Teamsters have refused to handle scab products in both Massachusetts and New Hampshire, Cambion has successfully used scab trucks to handle its goods. In July, foremen were brought back to the struck plant and some production recommenced. On September 13 Cambion started bringing some non-union workers back to the plant. According to the union leadership, Cambion has now achieved a company-wide production level of 70 percent.

The hard core of picketers has demonstrated perseverance and militancy, repeatedly attempting to halt scabbing despite vicious police assaults. But since mid-September, the number of scabs has been slowly creeping upward. Meanwhile, support for the Cambion strikers from the rest of Local 262, the International and the rest of the Boston-area labor movement has thus far been pitifully inadequate. The UE International is currently sending Cambion strikers benefits totaling a measly \$1,000 a week—which works out to slightly over \$3 per striker! The disgraceful lack of financial support from the Interna-



WV Photo

Boston cops attacked UE pickets at Cambion plant September 24.

tional is matched by the capitulation of the Cambion Local leadership, which has urged the majority of the strikers to get full-time jobs rather than build massive picket lines.

The Cambion workers have been successful in obtaining financial support from rank-and-file workers in other plants and unions and from other supporters of the strike, but only the most token reinforcements for the picket line have been obtained from the rest of the 1,000-member Local 262, not to speak of other Boston unions. Although considerable numbers of Cambridge students and radicals have been mobilized on occasion to man the lines, they are no substitute for a massive labor mobilization.

At the SYL benefit for the UE strikers on September 30, SYL speaker Bonnie Breen called for students to support the strike through financial contributions and picket duty, but pointed out that in the last analysis, "it will be the workers who really win this battle at Cambion." She pointed out that it was not accidental that the Cambridge police had viciously assaulted the strikers, because "that's exactly what cops are for." The hypocritical behavior of Cambridge mayor Alfred Vellucci, who claims to be a "good union man," was typical of Democratic Party "friends of labor." She called for students to join the SYL in order to help build the Spartacist League, the nucleus of the revolutionary party in the United States.

Other speakers included Cambion shop chairman Sandi Polaski, Boston University professor James Higgins and maritime militant Jon Brooks. Polaski presented a history of the UE at Cambion and of the current strike. Higgins (a co-author with founding UE leader James Matles of the well-known history, *Them and Us, Struggles of a Rank-and-File Union*) stated that although he and the Spartacist League "may have political disagreements, we certainly have no disagreements on the need for solidarity among the working people of the U.S." He then proceeded to underscore his disagreements with the SYL by calling for a "reduction" (not elimination) of the military budget and by uncritically praising the Stalinist governments of Cuba and the USSR.

Jon Brooks of the Militant-Solidarity Caucus of the National Maritime Union (NMU) spoke on the tasks of class-struggle unionists and the strategy needed to win battles like the Cambion strike. He said that workers at Cambion, which has foreign plants and is part of a highly international industry, would do well to look at the American maritime industry, which heavily utilizes non-U.S.-flag ships. In both cases it is not even possible to wage serious strikes with simple economist reform demands; these struggles are directly political and international in scope.

However, the politics which the UE and NMU bureaucrats put forward are those of patriotic class collaboration. While the reactionary NMU tops beg Congress to enact quotas for U.S.-flag ships on Soviet grain deals, the "progressive" Communist Party-supported UE leadership hatches another protectionist panacea: a Congressional bill to tax firms with runaway shops. In contrast, the Militant-Solidarity Caucus calls for international organizing campaigns and joint strike actions. The local union leaders' legalistic refusal to fight against scabbing by clerical and management personnel has been opposed by militants within the strike committee.

One opposition group at Cambion, supported by the Maoist Revolutionary Communist Party, limits itself to calls for slightly more militant strike tactics. Members of a second group, the Committee for a Democratic Union (CDU), participated in the discussion at the strike-support meeting. The CDU's program for the strike includes demanding increased support (financial and otherwise) from the UE International. It denounces the strategy of the union leadership as being aimed at "persuad[ing] Congressman] Tip O'Neill and the Cambridge City Council to intervene with the NLRB or the police."

Although it earlier campaigned on a two-point program—union democracy and working-class independence—the CDU had occasionally called for a break from Republican and Democratic politicians and for a "political party and political leaders who will fight for working people." But the CDU's program is essentially to call for a more militant local leadership to pressure the

Mississippi Court Tries to Bankrupt NAACP

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) is the target of a vicious legal broadside of the racist Mississippi courts aimed at bankrupting the 67-year-old civil rights organization. In August, a Piggly Wiggly supermarket and a group of white merchants in Port Gibson, Mississippi, won their \$1.2 million damage suit against the NAACP, Mississippi Action for Progress and 132 individuals. The state court said that the successful NAACP-initiated boycott of 1966 had "wrongfully combined and colluded a civil conspiracy."

To begin a legal appeal of the verdict, the NAACP is required by Mississippi law to post 125 percent of the judgment—nearly \$1.5 million! NAACP spokesman Glover Current reported that the organization isn't doing so well in its fund drive to raise the money by the first week in October. "Far from half" of the sum has been raised, he said.

It is ironic that the liberal NAACP

should be having such trouble with the courts. The court system, after all, was its great hope to redress the oppression of black people. Now it is this same court system that threatens to destroy the legalist NAACP.

When the NAACP complains that it is being "sued to death," the time is long overdue to recognize the failure of the liberal civil rights movement. In its heyday of pacifist liberal court actions, the NAACP legal fund would have had no trouble collecting the money from the liberals whose main concern was to keep the movement within respectable bounds. Now, in a period marked by the erosion of even the token gains of the civil rights movement, such support is less popular on all sides.

All those who fight against the oppression of blacks must protest this racist attack by the Mississippi court system. A victory by the NAACP-busters would add another reactionary weapon to the government's arsenal in its battle to undo even the limited gains achieved by the old civil rights movement. ■

International a hit further to the left. Moreover, at a union meeting last Monday the CDU put forward a parochial and defeatist motion that "if the membership does not replace the present leadership ... the only way to save our union is to return to work!"

As to the group's weak call for a party that will "fight for working people," the recent UE convention came out for "independent political action" and long-time International president Al Fitzgerald has occasionally said some nice words about a labor party. In a heavily Stalinist-influenced union such as the UE, the need for a full transitional program for working-class struggle should be even clearer than elsewhere. Without it would-be militants will capitulate to the bureaucracy and/or sink into irrelevancy as a reformist local opposition.

On the morning after the SYL forum, two CDU members, who sat on the strike committee by right as elected shop stewards, were expelled from the strike committee by a two-to-one margin. Their "crime" was calling for the removal of the current union leadership and dissenting from the positions of the strike committee in the union and in public. The SYL resolutely condemned this expulsion, which is a serious blow to workers democracy, and has sent a letter to the UE Local 262 Strike Committee, noting in part:

"We wish to point out that when we initially approached Sandi Polaski to request that Local 262 send a representative to the forum, the SYL explicitly stated that all supporters of the strike were invited to participate in open and democratic discussion, including criticism, as is always the case at SYL forums.

"Another reason given for the expulsions... is that the SYL was disturbed at their intervention at the Thursday night forum and that therefore we did not come to the picket line Friday morning. This is not the case. In fact, several SYL supporters went to the line on Friday afternoon to deliver the \$68.12 we collected for the strike fund at the forum. We will continue to mobilize support for the strike and be present on the picket lines to the extent that our forces allow.

"To expel... elected stewards... from the strike committee for their political views and criticisms of the strike leadership is a violation of workers democracy. As such, expelling them can only undermine the unity of the strike and is counter to the interests of Cambion workers.

"Victory to the Cambion strike!" ■

SPARTACIST LEAGUE LOCAL DIRECTORY

ANN ARBOR.....(313) 769-6376
c/o SYL, Room 4316
Michigan Union, U. of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

BERKELEY/
OAKLAND.....(415) 835-1535
Box 23372
Oakland, CA 94623

BOSTON.....(617) 492-3928
Box 188
M.I.T. Station
Cambridge, MA 02139

CHICAGO.....(312) 427-0003
Box 6441, Main P.O.
Chicago, IL 60680

CLEVELAND.....(216) 281-4781
Box 6765
Cleveland, OH 44101

DETROIT.....(313) 869-1551
Box 663A, General P.O.
Detroit, MI 48232

HOUSTON
Box 26474
Houston, TX 77207

LOS ANGELES.....(213) 663-9674
Box 26282, Edendale Station
Los Angeles, CA 90026

MADISON
c/o SYL, Box 3334
Madison, WI 53704

NEW YORK.....(212) 925-2426
Box 1377, G.P.O.
New York, NY 10001

PHILADELPHIA
P.O. Box 13138
Philadelphia, PA 19101

SAN DIEGO
P.O. Box 2034
Chula Vista, CA 92012

SAN FRANCISCO.....(415) 564-2845
Box 5712
San Francisco, CA 94101

TROTSKYIST LEAGUE OF CANADA

TORONTO.....(416) 366-4107
Box 222, Station B
Toronto, Ontario

VANCOUVER.....(604) 291-8993
Box 26, Station A
Vancouver, B.C.

Letters

20 September 1976

Dear Editor,

There are a few salient points that can be added to your article "Who Mourns Mao?" (*Workers Vanguard*, 17 September 1976). Those self-described (and wrongfully so) "Trotskyists" who hold that Mao was a proletarian revolutionary with essentially Bolshevik politics run up against two insurmountable problems. First of all, if Mao was a Bolshevik up until 1972 what caused Mao to degenerate and why at that particular point. I have yet to read any explanation of this in the ostensibly Trotskyist publications. Secondly if Mao was a revolutionary up until then and became a political counter-revolutionary how did it occur so "peacefully"? In the Soviet Union under Stalin it took the physical liquidation of virtually the entire Bolshevik Party and most of what was left of the working class after the Civil War. In China this did not happen in 1972 or after. What these "Trotskyists" believe is that there wasn't a political counter-revolution but a political counter-revolution in 1972. This is simply the reverse side of the endemic Pablist belief in "revolution from above" (bureaucratic self-reform) as the road to Soviet democracy in the degenerated/deformed workers' states.

Of course Maoist politics never really have changed. In 1935, I believe, Mao wrote "China is not ready for socialism. Only Trotskyites and metaphysical phrase-mongers hold that it is." A brief list of Mao's Stalinist politics would include the following points: (A) When Mao was trying to form his bloc with Chiang in the 1930's he suspended land reform in those areas already under his military control in order to placate the Kuomintang war-lords and capitalists. (B) In 1965 when Sukarno was ousted from power in Indonesia by a bloody counter-revolution that wiped out one of the largest Communist Parties outside the workers' states (a CP which by the way was in political agreement with Mao!), Mao uttered not a single word of protest. (C) Both Yahya Khan, formerly dictator of Pakistan, and the Shah of Iran—leaders of "Third World" countries who have wiped out students, leftists, and worker-militants—received enthusiastic welcomes in Peking before 1972. (D) When the Guevarist JVP led a rebellion in Sri Lanka (Ceylon) in 1971 China rushed military aid to Mrs. Bandaranaike in order to crush it. This list could be expanded *ad nauseum*, but that wouldn't bother the Pablists. Their minds are made up and they do not wish to be confused by the facts.

Comradely,
Al Greengold

WV replies: The writer is quite correct in pointing to the dilemma of the Pablist revisionist current embodied by the United Secretariat (USec), which wants to uncritically embrace Mao as the architect of the third Chinese revolution, and therefore equivocates over the fundamental characterization of Maoism as a national variant of Stalinism. A recent example of how the USec, when it wants to appear "orthodox," modifies its position without admitting it was provided by Ernest Mandel's obituary for Mao. Now that Mao is dead, the USec's chief theoretician suddenly discovered that "the Chinese revolution was a bureaucratized revolution from the beginning" (*Rouge*, 10 September).

In the 1950's and 1960's the Pablists politically supported Mao, including harking the Mao faction against its bureaucratic rivals in the "Great Prole-

tarian Cultural Revolution." Only in 1969 did the USec first, cautiously and sporadically, call for political revolution in China. Just as it failed to explain then what was the decisive dividing line which made a political revolution necessary, likewise, today Mandel casually remarks that the revolution was deformed "from the beginning," but says nothing about why and how this fact escaped the attention of the USec and its predecessors for more than a quarter of a century!

A naive observer might conclude that if the USec is willing to admit that the Mao regime is bureaucratically deformed it must now be willing to characterize the Chinese Communist Party as a Stalinist party. Not so. A typical recent article in *Rouge* lauds the "authentic Maoism" of Mao and "his immediate followers," as exhibited in the Cultural Revolution. *Rouge* argues that Mao was a Marxist because he always "wanted to establish close contacts with the masses," and concludes that therefore "Maoism cannot be confused with Stalinism" (*Rouge*, 20 September).

The U.S. Socialist Workers Party (SWP), which is in the process of breaking to the right from its fraternal associates of the USec (whose centrism the SWP has long since transcended by its own degeneration into consistent reformism), has attempted to use the USec's capitulation to Stalinism (in particular to popular "Third World" varieties) to gild its own fake-orthodox cover. Thus over the Cultural Revolution, the SWP took a formally correct line of no support to either wing of the Chinese bureaucracy, and its recent obituary for Mao took pains to appear "orthodox."

Following the original 1950-53 split between the Pablist wing (now the USec) and the International Committee (IC), the IC led by the then-revolutionary SWP sought despite serious theoretical weaknesses to maintain the Trotskyist program of political opposition to Stalinism combined with unconditional defense of the gains of the Chinese revolution. At the "Fourth World Congress" in 1954, the Pablists had made explicit their refusal to call for political revolution in China (see "Mao's Jails for Revolutionaries," *WV* No. 63, 28 February 1975). The SWP and the IC, on the other hand, correctly insisted on "the iron necessity of political revolution against the bureaucratic caste" ("The Third Chinese Revolution and its Aftermath," [SWP] *Internal Bulletin*, October 1955).

The SWP's present posture of orthodoxy over China is cheap and empty. Its opposition to Stalinism in China has nothing in common with the Trotskyist opposition to Stalinism, but proceeds rather from a desire to disavow anything labeled "communist" by the bourgeoisie whose reformist tail it seeks to become. Thus its obituary for Mao makes no mention of the need to unconditionally defend China against imperialist aggression and against any domestic counterrevolution seeking to reverse the gains of the Chinese revolution: the expropriation of the bourgeois-

sie and the establishment of a deformed workers state.

The real content of the SWP's hollow "orthodoxy" over China was already shown in the extremely acerbic disputes which occurred within the USec over Vietnam. Capitulating to petty-bourgeois idealization of "Third World" struggles, the USec majority presented the Vietnamese Stalinists—who repeatedly sold out the struggle of the Vietnamese workers and peasants during and after World War II—as revolutionary, even as unconscious Trotskyists who had "assimilated the fundamental lessons of the Permanent Revolution." This political capitulation to non-proletarian strata was a display of the consistent Pablistism of the USec majority.

The SWP (whose bloc with the Europe-centered Pablists in 1963 had created the USec) criticized the uncritically pro-Stalinist line of the USec majority. For internal USec consumption it frequently sought to camouflage its opposition with orthodox arguments, but its motivation was fundamentally *opposite* to that of authentic Trotskyists. The SWP refused to call for the military victory of the Stalinist-led forces in Vietnam, in order not to antagonize the liberals with whom it was attempting to form a "single-issue" alliance within the antiwar movement. While the centrists enthusiastically tailed after Stalinism in its Maoist or Guevarist variants, the suit-and-tie "radicals" of the reformist SWP hastily washed their hands of anything labeled "communist" and refused to come out for the military defeat of their own bourgeoisie in Vietnam. In the service of maintaining its rotten-bloc organizational alliance with the SWP, the USec majority deliberately avoided any attack on the popular-frontist role of the SWP in the antiwar movement.

As the factional warfare within the USec intensifies (see "USec on the Brink," *WV* No. 126, 24 September) oppositionists within both pro-majority and pro-SWP groupings must come to grips with these questions. Those who empirically rebel against the opportunism of the USec majority but are unable to locate its source in the essential revisionism of the Pablist current as expressed in the 1950-53 split, will find themselves disoriented and duped by the pseudo-orthodoxy of the SWP. Those who flinch from the recognition that the SWP's opposition to the majority proceeds from a rightist, reformist program will be derailed from any possibility of a principled opposition to the USec majority. It is around these fundamental questions that the battle to reforge the Fourth International must be waged.

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Weekly
of the Spartacist League of the U.S.

EDITOR: Jan Norden

PRODUCTION MANAGER: Karen Allen

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Anne Kelley

EDITORIAL BOARD: Charles Burroughs,
George Foster, Liz Gordon, Chris Knox, James
Robertson, Joseph Seymour

Published weekly, except bi-weekly in August
and December, by the Spartacist Publishing
Co., 260 West Broadway, New York, N.Y.
10013 Telephone 966-6841 (Editorial),
925-5665 (Business) Address all correspondence
to Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y.
10001 Domestic subscriptions \$5.00 per year.
Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y.

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

Spartacus Youth League Pamphlet

THE FIGHT TO IMPLEMENT BUSING

For Labor/Black Defense to Stop
Racist Attacks and to Smash
Fascist Threats

Price: 75¢

Make checks payable to: Spartacus
Youth Publishing Co., Box 825 Canal St
Station, New York, N.Y. 10013

Muñoz Family Reunited in Paris

Olga Meneses Ihassetta arrived in Paris from Buenos Aires September 30 to rejoin her companion, Mario Muñoz. In early August Muñoz, the exiled Chilean miners' leader who had been the target of a vicious police manhunt, won safe conduct out of Argentina and received asylum in Europe. Accompanying Olga Meneses were the couple's five children and four nephews. On hand as well to welcome the family were representatives of the Partisan Defense Committee (PDC), the Trotskyist League of France, the international Spartacist tendency and the Committee to Defend the Worker and Sailor Prisoners in Chile.

The family's long-awaited reunion marked the successful conclusion of the work of the Committee to Save Mario Muñoz which, in its effort to rescue Muñoz, served to widely publicize the plight of the tens of thousands of Latin American left-wing refugees who were trapped in Argentina by the Videla coup. A spokesman for the Committee to Defend Worker and Sailor Prisoners in Chile which had co-sponsored the defense campaign told *WV* that "the campaign had a great importance, not only because it saved Mario Muñoz and his family, but also because at one point it succeeded in breaking through the criminal silence of the European gov-

ernments on the tragic events in Argentina." "This campaign has been the most important one carried out since the Pinochet and Videla coups," he went on. "Above all because of the class line which we maintained from the very beginning; we carried out a campaign without capitulating, but at the same time were able to achieve the support of many organizations which made our success possible."

In an interview with *WV* in Paris, Olga Meneses recounted the roadblocks she had encountered in her final weeks in Buenos Aires and described the conditions faced by the refugee community there. She reported that she had to wait 25 days for the French visas to be reconfirmed. Moreover, the Argentine officials at first would only let her and

eight of the nine children leave the country, refusing to let the youngest child (who was born in Argentina) go until they obtained a birth certificate. Olga Meneses denounced the fact that "many Uruguayan businessmen are obtaining visas to leave Argentina, but there are many compañeros who have appealed for visas months ago but have not been accepted by any country. These workers leaders are in very hard conditions and there is no security for them. They are picked up at any time and never are seen again as happened to Moroni." (Ricardo Moroni, a former Socialist Party leader of the miners federation in Chile, was last seen when he went to the Chilean embassy in Argentina to obtain papers required on a Canadian visa application. He is now believed to be dead.)

She reported that under an ominous new decree giving foreigners illegally in Argentina until October 30 to register with the immigration department or else face deportation, Argentine refugee authorities were requiring the completion of a 21-question sworn statement. "But many are afraid to give information," she said, "because the list can be obtained by anyone and at any moment."

"After you fill out the forms," she said, "they send a copy to Chile so the

Chilean police can verify that you said the truth. They don't let you leave the refugee hotel until they have received back information."

She reported that shortly before she left, four men who arrived in a black car such as those used by the intelligence service were seen on the terrace on top of the hotel but the police who were supposed to be guarding the hotel said they had no idea who the men were.

In an announcement hailing the successful conclusion of the Muñoz campaign, the Partisan Defense Committee pointed to the continued danger facing all Latin American left-wing refugees in Argentina, as well as Argentine leftists and trade unionists. The PDC has highlighted the cases of six compañeros of Mario Muñoz in Argentina, as well as nine remaining prisoners of a group of 13 (mainly Chilean) who have been imprisoned in Buenos Aires without charges since last November.

Particularly alarming, said the PDC statement, is the decree issued on August 31 requiring registration with the government of all "illegal aliens" in Argentina within 60 days. If refugees who have arrived clandestinely (a total estimated at close to 100,000, compared to 16,000 officially registered with the

continued on page 10



WV Photo

PDC Demo Demands Freedom for Muñoz' Compañeros

Approximately 80 people picketed the Argentine consulate in New York October 1 demanding safe conduct out of Argentina and political asylum elsewhere for six Chilean leftists—Jorge Henrique Pereira, Manuel Garrido Vargas, Juan Manuel Asmaj Crus, Eduardo Crus Farias, Daniel Flores Matamala and Luis Tapia López—facing Videla's repression. The six are compañeros of exiled Chilean miners' leader Mario Muñoz, who recently escaped the hands of the Videla junta and secured asylum in Europe as a result of a campaign of international protest on his behalf. Their plight was driven home by the news last week of the arrest of Muñoz' brother, Carlos Damián Muñoz, in San Juan province of Argentina.

Today's demonstration was called by the Partisan Defense Committee (PDC), whose spokesman told the protesters that the situation of the tens of thousands of left-wing Latin American political prisoners trapped in Argentina grows ever more desperate. He pointed to the announcement on August 31 by the Videla junta that all foreigners have 60 days to show documentation of their status or be deported from Argentina. For the thousands of Chileans—many of whom, like Muñoz, clandestinely crossed the Andes to escape Pinochet's police—as well as for the exiled trade-union militants and leftists from countries such as Uruguay, Paraguay and Brazil, deportation will mean imprisonment, almost certain torture and in many cases death!

The PDC spokesman called for continued international protest to stop the rightist terror, noting that the announcement by six countries of willingness to grant 2,000 visas for Latin American refugees in Argentina was in part a result of the campaign to save Muñoz. The situation of Muñoz' compañeros underlines the perilous gap between promises and results. The PDC spokesman also announced the good news that Muñoz' family had finally arrived this week in Europe to join him.

Pickers at the consulate today included a large contingent from the Spartacist League/Spartacus Youth League (SL/SYL), representatives from the Revolutionary Socialist League, Communist Cadre and International Workers Party as well as a spokesman from the Solidarity Committee with the Argentine People (NY-SCAP). Rank-and-file seamen from the National Maritime Union and a member of the Militant Solidarity Caucus of striking UAW Local 906 were also on hand.

Immediately prior to the demonstration, members of the consulate staff were seen lounging around the front door chatting with police and passers-by. But the gates were locked tight upon the demonstrators' arrival and efforts to gain admittance to the building to deliver a letter in behalf of the threatened militants went unheeded. Outside a Latin American photographer, no doubt from some secret police agency, snapped pictures of the demonstrators, fleeing when he was himself photographed by *WV*.

For over an hour the protesters marched outside chanting "Stop the witchhunt, Hands off the leftists," and "Chile, Argentina, Smash the AAA and DINA." In addition to signs demanding safe conduct for Henrique, Garrido, Asmaj, Crus, Flores and Tapia, other SL/SYL signs read "No popular-front illusions. For workers revolution," and "Avengé Orlando Letelier—Smash the Bloody Junta, Workers to Power!"



WV Photo

Photographer outside Argentine consulate refused to be identified.

Signs of the seamen called for "Boycott all military goods to Argentina and Chile."

Speakers for each contingent were invited to address a short rally concluding the demonstration. Natalio Guerra of SCAP asked for support to the Koch/Fraser Bill providing visas to the U.S. for Latin American political refugees. Joel Myers, spokesman for the guerrilla enthusiast Communist Cadre made the absurd and incredible claim that the guerrillaist actions of the Argentine Peoples' Revolutionary Army (ERP), led by the "real Trotskyists of the PRT," were "the struggles which freed Muñoz"! Not only has the PRT renounced its former professed allegiance to Trotskyism, but the "victorious" ERP is now reeling under the blows of vicious junta repression, with PRT/ERP leader Mario Roberto Santucho assassinated in late August.

continued on page 9

WORKERS VANGUARD

SPARTACIST

Canada

Subscription: \$2/year
(11 issues)

Make payable/mail to:
Spartacist Canada Publishing
Association
Box 6867, Station A
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Break with the Liberals! Oust Schmidt/Brandt!

Social Democrat/FDP Coalition Squeaks By in German Elections

OCTOBER 4—Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's Social Democratic Party (SPD), in coalition with the bourgeois-liberal Free Democrats (FDP), squeaked through to electoral victory in West Germany yesterday. The SPD will retain its trusteeship of the German capitalist state with 212 seats in parliament which, combined with the FDP's 40, give the Social Democratic government a razor-thin majority of eight seats over its electoral rivals, the Christian Democrats (CDU) of Helmut Kohl.

The SPD narrowly withstood an aggressive electoral challenge from the CDU and its Bavarian sister party, the CSU of arch-reactionary Franz-Joseph Strauss. Early in the campaign it appeared that widespread working-class apathy and disillusionment with the SPD's abandonment of its "reform" promises would allow the CDU to win by default. But the strident anti-socialist, anti-union campaign waged by the CDU backed by goading the labor movement to rally behind the Social Democrats in self-defense.

Under the slogan "Freedom or Socialism," the CDU sharply attacked the "excessive power" of the trade unions. Commercial aimed at Germany's prosperous and conservative middle class showed left-wing demonstrators attacking police, goose-stepping soldiers of the East German army and refugees attempting to scale the Berlin Wall. Meanwhile the CDU launched an "invasion" of the industrial Ruhr area, a bastion of SPD support, where secretary-general Kurt H. Biedenkopf proclaimed, "It is intolerable that union leaders can openly throw their unions' support behind the Social Democrats," and "We want unions in which Christian Democrats can hold up their heads as high as Social Democrats" (UPI, October 2).

The CDU may have had some success in playing on petty-bourgeois fears of the powerful trade unions and on the deeply-rooted anti-Communism focused on East Germany, but the hard rightist campaign forced the Social Democratic bureaucracy to timidly counterattack. Chancellor Schmidt claimed his party had no fear of the word "socialist," invoking rhetoric not heard since the SPD, at Bad-Godesberg in 1959, formally abandoned its self-designation as a party of the working class in favor of the classless "people's party." Heinz Oskar Vetter, head of the trade-union federation, had earlier assured the electorate that a CDU victory would not "automatically mean an end to social peace," but the labor bureaucracy was forced to launch a last-minute attempt to mobilize the rank and file behind the SPD.

"The German Model"

The florid overkill of the CDU campaign goaded the German working people into turning out behind their historic party, the SPD, despite its unbroken record of class betrayal. In 1972, a similarly aggressive CDU assault against SPD chancellor Brandt's *Ostpolitik* (diplomatic rapprochement with East Germany) had touched off massive working-class demonstrations in support of the SPD. But this time around the SPD, although its social

composition is based on the trade unions, was programmatically virtually indistinguishable from the CDU in the campaign.

The Social Democrats have campaigned under the slogan of a "German model" of prosperity and reform. But if West Germany under the SPD has been a "model" of anything it is of authoritarian regimentation of the working-class movement on behalf of the capitalist state. The only "reforms" the SPD has actually carried through have been reforms designed to strengthen the repressive state apparatus against internal dissent and working-class struggle, and to maintain high profits through wage controls and expulsion of several hundred thousand foreign workers during the economic downturn since 1976.

Most of the SPD's 1972 campaign-promised "reforms" have been subverted or abandoned. The reform of Paragraph 218 prohibiting abortion was overturned by the supreme court and a diluted version—providing for legal abortion only where there is a prospective deformed child or danger to the mother's health—was substituted. Even this measure is not being carried out in south Germany, where predominantly Catholic health institutions have consistently refused to perform any abortions. The SPD/FDP coalition has also instituted massive cutbacks in public education, closed whole faculties of study to new high school graduates at the universities and decreased the size of the teaching force.

In the SPD's actual practice of internal repression, even the CDU finds little to criticize. Perhaps the most striking political event during the SPD's decade in office has been the show trial of members of the so-called "Baader-Meinhof gang" of anarchists, in a specially constructed prison-"court," during which one defendant died in a hunger strike while another was found hanged in her cell. In the course of this persecution, in which some defendants have already been in jail for five years, elementary bourgeois-democratic



Der Spiegel

CDU candidate Helmut Kohl, left, with SPD candidate chancellor Schmidt.

norms such as the right to confer with counsel have been explicitly abrogated.

New repressive measures attacking the civil rights of so-called extremists (characterized legally as "enemies of the constitution") have been instituted while a campaign of harassment of "radicals" in government employ, instigated under Brandt, has resulted in an orgy of witchhunting. Only a few hundred have been fired, but over a half million Germans have been "investigated" under this *Berufsverbot* law. The SPD guardians of capitalist "law and order" have also beefed up the federal border police into an internal security force of heavily armed shock brigades.

For the labor movement, the most trumpeted aspect of the Social Democratic "German model" were schemes that go by the general name of "social partnership": "concerted action" (tripartite contract bargaining with man-

agement, labor and government) and above all *Mitbestimmung* (workers' supposed co-management of industry). Although originally begun in 1952 as a scheme by the Western Allied occupying powers in order to curb the powerful coal and steel magnates, it also served as a myth of a grand "workers capitalism" by and by. This encouraged the unions to keep their wage demands down until the explosion of labor unrest in the late 1960's.

The aim of this class-collaborationist utopia is to further institutionalize the role of the labor bureaucracy in economically policing the workers in the interests of higher capitalist profits. So in 1972 *Mitbestimmung* was extended to 400 additional enterprises and a total of over 6,000,000 workers. However, due to pressure from the Liberals, last year all pretense was dropped of achieving parity on boards of directors (irrelevant in any case, since the real decisions are made by management outside the board). Provisions such as guaranteeing tie-breaking votes to the board chairman (management) and the requirement of "confidentiality of information" openly affronted the illusions which the bureaucrats had zealously instilled.

Among the concrete results of "workers' representatives" sitting on management boards can be listed union acquiescence in the firing of some 25,000 "superfluous" Volkswagen workers during last year's recession. A similar "victory" for the working class under SPD "leadership" was the fact that no one was fired from the massive Thyssen-hütte steel plant at Duisburg during recent economic contractions—instead everyone was cut back to a 24- or 32-hour week with a corresponding pay cut (New York Times, 27 June 1976).

Critical Support?

The Social Democrats' campaign was based on maintaining their seven-year coalition with the bourgeois FDP. Alarmed that this parasitic little liberal

continued on page 8



Arbeiterkampf

Frankfurt cops protecting neo-Nazi rally attack leftist demonstrators in August.

How the Reuthers Tamed the UAW

ITEM This year's negotiations between the auto manufacturers and the United Auto Workers (UAW) take place in the context of near-record industry profits. Earlier this year, wage settlements exceeding 30 percent were negotiated by both the Teamsters and the Rubber Workers. Yet despite conditions favorable to a successful strike struggle, the UAW, generally in the forefront of the unions, is asking for next to nothing. The wage demand is a mere 9 percent increase over three years.

ITEM: In earlier years the UAW pioneered such "innovations" as union pensions, the cost-of-living allowance (COLA), supplementary employment benefits (SUB). This year, however, UAW president Leonard Woodcock's only piece of "social engineering" is a pathetic "time bank" proposal—a glorified scheme for solving company absentee problems and giving workers a few extra holidays as a reward.

ITEM: Nor is the sellout at the hargaining table by the UAW International being challenged by local union officials. With a very few exceptions, mostly centered among skilled tradesmen in Detroit, the local bureaucrats have mobilized actively behind Woodcock & Co. And in the period preceding the contract expiration, they and Woodcock gave the companies a free hand to harass and victimize those militants who did raise serious opposition to their policies.

Who Built the UAW?

How did this sad state of affairs come about? How did the roar of what was once America's most vociferous union turn into a pathetic mew? How was the UAW "tamed"? In answering these questions class-conscious unionists can understand what it will take to unchain the UAW, breaking the bonds which the bureaucracy has forged to tie labor to the class enemy.

The architect of the consolidated UAW bureaucracy was Walter Reuther, a trade-union militant in his youth for whom socialism was a hobby, to be given up when it proved expensive to his career. Reuther outmaneuvered such rivals in the UAW as Martin, R.I. Thomas, George Addes and Richard Frankensteen. Most of these and other opponents had credentials equal to Reuther's as active participants in the early organizing of the UAW. They were equally ambitious and at one time they had at least as much authority in the union as Reuther.

However, they failed where Walter Reuther succeeded. Reuther was an extremely dexterous opportunist who could combine appeals to trade-union militancy and a skillful manipulation of social-democratic rhetoric in order to achieve a trade-off with the bourgeoisie. It was the biggest such deal—the introduction of the Cold War to labor domestically and internationally—that secured Reuther's position and consolidated the union bureaucracy which continues to dominate American labor today.

But to the apologists for this bureaucracy, Reutherism is the epitome of militant, democratic unionism. It is to the task of perpetuating and embellishing this myth that Walter's brother Victor dedicated himself in his book *The Brothers Reuther and the Story of the UAW* (1976). While Victor relates a number of interesting particulars, his "history" of the UAW is both partial and deceptive. There are many incidents and facts which he does not relate. This is not accidental; the true story of the UAW would reveal how the Reuthers consciously betrayed the early radical traditions of the union.

The union was shaped during the great class battles of the 1930's when the

mass industrial unions were launched and labor radicalism was widespread. The first successful mass strikes of auto workers took place in Toledo in 1934 and 1935 and were led by militants sympathetic to Trotskyism. Long-time Communist Party fellow traveler and UAW vice president Wyndham Mortimer describes in his book *Organize!* the early breakthroughs in auto organizing led by Communist Party (CP) cadre. Bob Travis, the main strike strategist in Flint in 1937, and Bud Simons, strike leader at Fisher Body Number One, were CP supporters, as was Lee Pressman, CIO general counsel and one of the signers of the original GM contract for the CIO. Socialist Party (SP) members active in the Flint drive included B.J. Widick of the Rubber Workers, Genora and Kermit Johnson, and Victor, Walter and Roy Reuther. (Widick and the Johnsons were recruited to Trotskyism and later became activists in the Socialist Workers Party, founded in 1938.) The early leadership of the UAW was very much dominated by supporters of both the SP and the CP.

The Socialist Party

The early chapters of the book are sprinkled liberally with references to the three Reuther brothers' eager participation in Socialist Party activities such as campaigning for Norman Thomas. After years of decline, the Socialist Party experienced a resurgence of growth in the middle 1930's. With the Stalinized Communist Party on an



Walter Reuther

ultra-left hinge, building fake "red" unions and hurling "social-fascist" epithets at all its enemies, and then moving far to the right in prostration to Roosevelt, the SP appeared attractive to many union militants, unemployed activists and students and intellectuals drawn to socialist ideas. A number of hardened reformists quit the SP and a new left wing was formed, many of whose adherents would ultimately be recruited to revolutionary Trotskyism. However, the party leadership remained in the hands of opportunists who, in classic social-democratic style, did nothing to curb the increasingly bureaucratic appetites of a layer of emerging SP trade-union leaders.

In Detroit, where the Reuther brothers were increasingly involved in the UAW, the SP was divided into two branches. Branch One for UAW members and Branch Two for lawyers, teachers, students and others. Veteran SP member and UAW staffer Frank Marquart describes the continual conflict between the branches in his recently published book *An Auto Worker's Journal*. Branch Two stood for the traditional SP policy of opposing the Democrats and running SP candidates.



Detroit News

Reuther, third from right, and union brothers watch as Ford Company goons approach on the River Rouge overpass in May 1937. Reuther and Richard Frankensteen, second from right, were soon beaten to the ground and kicked down a nearby stairway.

Branch One—the UAW members, including the Reuthers, Emil Mazey, Leonard Woodcock and George B. Edwards (later a Detroit police commissioner and now a federal judge)—increasingly bent to the pressures of trade-union parochialism as the union grew and sought a rapprochement with bourgeois society through the Democratic Party. "Walter Reuther is a power-hungry hysteric who wants to become president of the UAW," Marquart remembers SP leader Manny Seidler shouting at him. "And those guys around him like Woodcock and Mazey are opportunists who are using the Socialist Party as a training ground to promote their union careers!"

This process was already evident at the 1936 UAW convention, where Walter Reuther was first elected to the International Executive Board. The convention passed a resolution at the initiative of SP members calling for the formation of a labor party and defeated an endorsement of Roosevelt for reelection. Roosevelt got wind of this and stormed to John L. Lewis, Adolf Germer, Lewis' CIO lieutenant and former National Secretary of the SP, threatened to withhold \$100,000 in organizing funds unless the convention reversed itself. SP and CP tops capitulated disgracefully and Roosevelt's reelection was endorsed in the last five minutes of the convention without discussion. Reuther still opposed support for Roosevelt but now he had a union office to protect. He kept his mouth shut.

With the "hitch goddess of success" glinting in their eyes, the Reuthers moved rapidly to the right. In 1938 Walter gave support to Democrat Frank Murphy for reelection as Michigan governor. This earned him the support of Lewis and Hillman, who were trying to cleanse the CIO of its radical potential. Walter cooked up a deal with SP head Norman Thomas to avoid a public resignation from the party, which would have been politically embarrassing. However, within a short period the Reuthers and most of their followers slid quietly out of the SP to pursue their union careers. This fundamental betrayal of principle in order to seek personal advancement sealed the Reuthers' incorporation into the bureaucracy.

World War II And After

The biggest obstacle standing between Walter Reuther and his sought-after pinnacle was the CP bloc that ran the union throughout the World War II period. Although Reuther and the CP were united in their support for Roose-

velt, the war and the no-strike pledge, bureaucratic infighting raged for the better part of a decade. During the brief interval of the 1939-41 Hitler-Stalin pact, when the CP made a partial left turn toward opposition to the war, Reuther moved quickly to adapt to the rising tide of social patriotism. In 1941 he led the fight for a constitutional amendment barring "communists" from UAW office. Reuther also pushed through a resolution condemning the strike of the North American Aviation workers, which Roosevelt broke with the use of federal troops.

However as the war dragged on and auto workers grew restless under wartime controls, Reuther—with characteristic flexibility—modified his earlier position. In 1943 he led the fight against the introduction of the highly unpopular "incentive pay" system and scored points against the Stalinists, who, after the German invasion of the Soviet Union, had become the most rabid



Ed Weaver

Victor Reuther

defenders of the war and the government's labor policies. However, his attempts to maneuver around the no-strike pledge nearly brought him to disaster. At the 1944 convention he sponsored a resolution to do away with this pledge, but only after V-E Day and then only in *non-war-production* plants. This thinly disguised maneuver to avoid taking a position either in favor of or in opposition to the pledge brought him only well-deserved ridicule.

It was not until after the war that Reuther managed to recoup his flagging popularity. With the CP largely discredited because of its consistent anti-strike policies, he saw his chance. During the 113-day 1946 GM strike Reuther's militant posturing in favor of "wage increases without price increases" and "open hargaining" won him considerable support. Meanwhile the CP argued for extending the no-strike pledge into

peacetime and tried to sabotage the strike. In the 1946 UAW elections Reuther finally won the presidency. Significantly, his campaign enlisted the support of the most backward layers of the union, including reactionaries like the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists (ACTU).

Victor insists that the Reuthers were strong advocates of "democratic unionism" and would not hear of "purging" their opponents. He quotes Walter as saying: "Exposure, not repression, must be our goal." This is pure bunk. Victor conveniently neglects to mention Walter's key role in ramming through the "red" clause in 1941. He also "forgets" Walter's proposal to the 1948 CIO convention to expel "those who do not uphold the CIO's political policies," i.e., support Truman instead of the CP-backed Progressive Party candidate Henry Wallace, a proposal even reactionary CIO president Philip Murray balked at. Similarly unmentioned was his endorsement of local union trials held to expel UAW members "found guilty" of not supporting the Korean War.

Victor Reuther, as International Affairs Director of the UAW, and for a time of the CIO, offered his services to imperialism just as directly—if less publicly—than his better-known brother. In his book, Victor lashes the AFL for its splitting tactics in CP unions and for its covert acceptance of CIA money to finance these endeavors, but he is forced to admit his own "dirty tricks" as an agent of the Marshall Plan "re-stabilization" of Europe. While stationed in Paris for the CIO in 1947, he accepted \$50,000 via Walter from Thomas H. Braden, International Division chief of the CIA and a right-hand man of John Foster Dulles.

This money was used to prop up anti-communist split-off unions in France and Italy. Until Braden blew the whistle in a 1967 magazine article, this information was carefully concealed. Victor disingenuously explains, "When I first met Braden in the early 50's, I had hardly even heard of the CIA, and was under the impression that he was an employee either of the State Department or the European Recovery Program." As if that made a difference! The point is not which governmental agency the money came from, but the ignominious task the Reuther brothers were neck-deep in: anti-communist splitting and wrecking in the European labor movement as the direct agents of U.S. imperialism. The record of the AFL was worse only in quantity, not quality, and Reutherite anti-communism paved the way for the CIO's acceptance by the AFL in the trade-union merger of 1955.

Social-Engineering

Victor's other main claim is that the Reuthers were "social engineers" not merely concerned with securing higher wages for workers. Victor takes pride in noting Walter's role in securing pensions, COLA, SUB, etc.

While these are all gains that class-struggle militants would support, Victor pointedly neglects to tell us at what cost they were achieved. The cost-of-living escalator, for example, was gained at the expense of the one-year contract and restricting yearly wage increases to a level of 2 percent. The \$100/month pension (including Social Security) at age 65 won in 1949 was a trade-off for an agreement providing no wage increase. The SUB plan, while useful during periods of temporary business slackness, has failed dismally during protracted downturns. Introduced as a reformist substitute for the UAW's historic demand of a shorter workweek at no cut in pay, this plan has proved itself a far cry from the "guaranteed annual wage" Walter Reuther promised it would be. And as for Reuther's periodic grandiose schemes for improving capitalism such as converting aircraft plants idled after World War II into factories for the mass production of prefabricated housing they have uni-

versally fallen through.

Reuther's key role was as consolidator of a bureaucracy sufficiently homogeneous to become an effective guarantor of labor discipline for the capitalists. This took many years. It was not easy to wipe out overnight the relatively democratic and militant traditions of the UAW.

In Reuther's extended battle to outmaneuver his bureaucratic opponents, he more than once had recourse to militant trade-union demagoguery, as in the 1946 strike. However, such posturing was episodic at best. Trade-union militancy in itself is not a program. The trade-union militants and the picket line leaders of the 1930's have become the ossified strikebreaking AFL-CIO bureaucrats of today.

The policies of trade-union leaders are determined by their attitude to fundamental political questions. Reu-

ther's union battles of the 30's as well as their hand-picked successors are today comfortably enshrined in the labor bureaucracy. This bureaucracy has in recent years kept a tight lid on the class struggle. Even defensive economic strikes to preserve real wages and working conditions have been few and generally not very militant.

There are, of course, some instances where rank-and-file elements have mounted rebellions against their bureaucratic straitjackets. Notable examples include the miners' wildcats and the brief flare-up by Detroit Teamsters against the contract sellout this year. Unfortunately, the leaderships of these rebellions have already demonstrated their parochialism. Teamsters for a Decent Contract (TDC), which led the Detroit wildcat, has systematically bred illusions in the capitalist state with its policy of taking the union to court. The



Reuther (second from right) and George Meany hail the merger of the AFL-CIO in December 1955. UAW later pulled out of AFL-CIO in mid-1960's.

ther broke strikes during World War II because he supported Franklin Roosevelt and his imperialist war aims. The participation of bureaucrats like Reuther in the massive post-war strike wave did not fundamentally alter their class-collaborationist course: they sought to tame the unrest while using it to supplant the badly discredited Stalinists.

What proved far more decisive was Reuther's avid lining up with the American bourgeoisie in support of cold war policies and the witchhunting of reds in the labor movement. This meant pervasive adaptation to the most backward elements of the working class and opened the way for the capitalists to make major inroads on the UAW's once powerful position on the shop floor. A key reason for the labor movement's inability to wage a determined fight against the implementation of a host of vicious anti-labor laws like Taft-Hartley was the fact that such legislation contained anti-red clauses and was effectively promoted as a weapon against "communist subversion of the unions." The bureaucracy quickly extended its willingness to allow the companies to victimize radicals into acceptance of "company security clauses," which gave the company the right to discipline any participant in "unauthorized" work stoppages. The elimination of the one-year contract, replacement of shop-floor methods of resolving grievances by arbitration and the virtually unchallenged control by management of crucial shop floor conditions like line speed eventually followed suit.

The Bureaucracy and Trade-Union Militancy

Reuther is dead, but his peers and compatriots instrumental in the trade-

union battles of the recent miners' wildcat against federal court injunctions pervasively reflect the virulent anti-communism and social backwardness of the region.

Reuther, who was a product of the deep social and political ferment of the 30's, was in fact considerably less parochial than the TDC's Camarata and Flezlar or Doug Wriston of the UMW. Should Camarata, Wriston & Co. manage to punch their way into the trade-union leadership, it is not difficult to predict that they will follow the same trajectory of that other erstwhile "trade-union militant" Walter Reuther and wind up as hardened bureaucrats and strikebreakers.

The attitude taken toward such economist trade-union militancy is an important criterion by which to judge ostensibly revolutionary organizations. The International Socialists (I.S.) and the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP), who uncritically cheered on and helped build the authority of the wildcat leaderships (in the Teamsters and UMW, respectively) must be condemned for their capitulation to these aspiring bureaucrats. Such fundamentally bankrupt policies will not lead to politically smashing the labor bureaucracy, but only to refurbishing it with newer and slicker elements.

The correct policy for building genuine class-struggle leadership does not arise spontaneously out of trade-union struggles for better wages and working conditions. It must be consciously implanted in the working class through the intervention of a vanguard Leninist party.

In the period of the formation of the CIO this role was played by the revolutionary Trotskyists who in 1938 founded the Socialist Workers Party (SWP). It was the Trotskyists, then a

faction in the SP, who combatted the trade-union reformism of emerging opportunists like Reuther. It was the SWP that combatted the pro-Rooseveltian and pro-imperialist war policies of both the Stalinists and the Reutherites. And it was only the SWP that consistently opposed the post-war red purge while mercilessly criticizing the reformist policies of the Stalinists, who capitulated miserably to the red-baiting.

While the SWP carried with it into the trade unions a class-struggle program, it was generally reluctant to form independent caucuses based on this program. Its militants tended to seek out larger blocs of union militants to which to attach themselves and propagate their viewpoint. While it managed to pull back from committing major betrayals of principle, this flaw led the SWP on occasion to become too closely identified with whichever bureaucratic faction was currently putting on a more militant face.

Nonetheless, if the SWP did not play a major role in the history of the UAW, it was not because it lacked a revolutionary perspective. The Trotskyist fraction in the UAW was significantly smaller than and did not have the resources of either the Stalinist or the Reutherite "progressive" bloc. Yet at times, such as in the fight against the no-strike pledge at the 1944 convention, it was able to rally significant forces around it.

This earlier SWP is a far cry from the reformist and degenerate SWP of today, which supports without criticism anti-communist strikebreakers like Arnold Miller and Ed Sadlowski and fears to counterpose its paper position in favor of a labor party to the bureaucracy's endorsement of Democratic Party politicians. For today's SWP, struggling politically against the popular-front alliances of the Stalinists, carrying class-struggle opposition to imperialist war into the unions or defending bureaucratically deformed workers states against imperialist attack is "sectarian." The SWP's policies in the unions are now indistinguishable from the Stalinists', currying the favor of liberal bureaucrats, offering to police the ranks and keeping its mouth shut on working-class politics.

Today it is the Spartacist League that continues the revolutionary struggle of Trotskyism. The SL fights to oust the present misleaders of the mass organizations of the workers and replace them with a class-struggle leadership based on the Trotskyist Transitional Program. In doing so we continue the historic fight earlier waged by the SWP. ■

SL/SYL PUBLIC OFFICES

Revolutionary Literature

BAY AREA

Friday and
Saturday..... 3:00-6:00 p.m.
1634 Telegraph (3rd floor)
(near 17th Street)
Oakland, California
Phone 835-1535

CHICAGO

Tuesday..... 4:30-8:00 p.m.
Saturday..... 2:00-5:30 p.m.
650 South Clark
(2nd floor)
Chicago, Illinois
Phone 427-0003

NEW YORK

Monday
through Friday..... 6:30-9:00 p.m.
Saturday..... 1:00-4:00 p.m.
260 West Broadway
Room 522
New York, New York
Phone 925-5665



Transil workers demonstrate in front of RTD office earlier this month. WV Photo

After Five-Week Strike—

L.A. Transit Strikers Get No More than Original Offer

LOS ANGELES, September 26—After a frustrating and sometimes militant month-long strike, the more than 6,000 drivers and mechanics of the Southern California Rapid Transit District (RTD) have been forced back to work with a contract whose terms amount to nothing but a reshuffling of the pre-strike management offer. While union tops crowd that they had achieved a 21-percent increase in hourly wages and fringe benefits, the hard-line anti-labor RTD chairman Byron Cook could claim that due to work-rules changes, overall labor costs would rise less than the original 19.5-percent offer.

The first to be sold out were the drivers, members of the United Transportation Union (UTU), at a September 21 ratification meeting attended by over 4,000 drivers. UTU Local chairman Earl Clark announced the terms of the settlement, with a 93 cents per hour wage increase over three years, instead of the \$2.00 per hour which the union had initially demanded. Also included is a partial cost-of-living allowance (COLA), but overtime will be cut back, and time allotted for rush hour runs is being reduced (a very dangerous form of speed-up). In addition, for the first time employee payroll deductions will be instituted, the health plan will not include any COLA, and it will now take drivers three years to reach full pay (instead of the previous one year).

Frustrated by the realization that after nearly five weeks on strike they would be forced to return to work with no more money than the original RTD offer, drivers at the ratification meeting frequently interrupted speakers from the negotiating committee with boos and shouts. Like all other union activities over the course of the strike, the meeting was run in a bureaucratic manner. No microphones were provided for discussion from the floor, and after presentation by the leadership, Clark proposed that anyone with questions could come up and discuss them personally, while the rest of the membership would simply go ahead and vote! Less than three-fifths of the 4,000 members present voted, and the contract was approved by 1,785 to 571.

In a separate ratification meeting held today, the mechanics and helpers, members of the independent Amalgamated Transit Union, voted by a close margin (387 to 257) to accept the RTD contract proposal. In a hoodwinking maneuver similar to the one used against the drivers, management and union negotiators tied a 19-percent

wage increase (over three years) to the creation of a new job classification of "yard helper," with a pay rate substantially below that of present employees doing the same work. This will quickly lead to speed-up and victimizations as the company attempts to replace current workers with lower-paid "yard helpers."

The strike did not have to end in defeat. The RTD board's transparent attempt to hamstring the unions, going so far as to turn down a 21-percent wage hike agreed to by its own negotiators, turned public opinion against it. A militant union leadership would have called for solidarity actions on the part of the entire Los Angeles labor movement in support of the striking drivers and mechanics. Instead, the bureaucrats channeled such militant actions as the spontaneous semi-sit-in by over 500 drivers at city hall September 8 into pressuring liberal Democratic mayor (and ex-cop) Thomas Bradley to in turn pressure his appointees on the RTD board.

The current sellout will almost certainly induce oppositionists within the UTU to challenge the present leadership in elections to be held later in the year. The only active oppositionists in the union are presently grouped around the "Drivers Newsletter," whose implicit program is based on (1) defeatism (their leaflet was headlined, "You Have Suffered Through a Useless Strike"), (2) government intervention in the unions (to guarantee "honest union elections") and (3) a liberal-utopian scheme to reform the RTD Board of Supervisors (legally requiring them to "bargain in good faith").

What L.A. bus drivers—along with the rest of labor—need is not a warmed-over dish of the same old class-collaborationist stew, but a militant leadership fighting on a class-struggle program. Rather than wallowing in pessimism or acting as a pressure group on the bureaucrats, such an opposition would challenge the union tops' phony "friend of labor" capitalist politicians and struggle for a workers party, based on the unions, to fight for a workers government. ■

CORRECTION

In WV Nos. 126 and 127 (24 September and 1 October) we incorrectly reported the number of 34,000 auto workers in Canada. The actual figure is 14,000.

Germany...

(continued from page 5)

party might not get enough seats to give the SPD-FDP bloc a parliamentary majority, the SPD took special mealy-mouthed care to avoid offending possible FDP swing-voters.

For communists, a minimum condition for critical support to a mass reformist workers party like the SPD is the commitment to rule in its own name. With the SPD proudly committed to its coalition with a bourgeois party, the tactic of critical support loses its purpose of assisting the communists to exploit the contradiction between the SPD's working-class base and its pro-capitalist leadership. This internal contradiction is suppressed in the sense that the SPD leadership can point to the exigencies of coalition politics and the demands posed by its bourgeois partners to deflect the disgruntlement of the ranks and obscure responsibility for its betrayals.

Thus the Trotskistische Liga Deutschlands (TLD), German section of the international Spartacist tendency, announced it could not give critical support to the SPD. The TLD's propaganda around the elections was directed toward exposing not only the SPD's "direct organizational bloc with the bourgeoisie" but also the programmatic capitulation to the class enemy represented by most of the campaigns of the German left, headed up by the Moscow-loyalist DKP.

The DKP pursued an exclusively parliamentarist campaign based on its theory of "anti-monopolist democracy." Its aim is to serve as a reformist party of the second mobilization should the SPD discredit itself sufficiently among the broad masses of workers to leave a reformist void. The DKP, with 30,000 supporters, envisions a piecemeal radicalization which it hopes will bypass the SPD in its favor. However, any upsurge in proletarian militancy tends initially to reinforce the SPD, as did the 1972 confrontations over "Ostpolitik." A massive radicalization will tend to polarize even this highly bureaucratized party along class lines.

As for the Maoists of the KPD and the slightly more "critical" KBW, both are participating in Peking's orgy of pro-NATO agitation against the "social-imperialist" USSR. The German Maoists have shamelessly catered to the most reactionary strains of nationalism and anti-Communist fears (at one point the KPD-ML sued the federal defense minister for not sufficiently defending West German soil against the "Soviet menace"). No votes to the fatherland defenders, allies of Kissinger, Vorster and Franz-Josef Strauss! As for the "critical" Maoist KB, it vacillated over its electoral program and refused to address the question of the class character of East Germany and the USSR, finally coming out for a vote for "one of the organizations to the left of the SPD."

Among ostensible Trotskyists, the pseudo-orthodox Spartacusbund this year rejected any electoral bloc (last year they expelled the Trotskyist Faction for objecting to its unprincipled "Communist electoral alliance"). However, instead of calling for a united front of working-class organizations to defeat the anti-proletarian measures of the SPD government, the Spartacusbund proposed yet another of its rotten propaganda blocs of "all left organizations." Only the candidacy of the GIM, German Usec section, met the minimum programmatic criteria for critical support to a small propaganda group. In particular, the GIM maintained (although not very prominently) a defensist position on the deformed workers states, a key question in central Europe and particularly given the large Maoist movement in West Germany.

In defining its "negatively characterized support" the TLD noted that the

GIM electoral platform did not transcend reformism. The GIM waters down and breaks up the transitional program of interlocking demands to turn them into reforms which could be realized within the capitalist framework instead of leading to the destruction of the capitalist system. Thus the sliding scale of wages and hours becomes "legal introduction of the 35-hour week at full wages." Similarly, the GIM calls for "democratization" of the trade-union federation rather than working to build



Franz Josef Strauss, CDU leader



Vice-chancellor and FDP leader Hans-Dietrich Genscher

communist fractions within the unions as a programmatically-based alternative leadership.

The TLD noted that the GIM has not descended to the vulgar anti-communism of its Austrian counterpart, the GRM, which campaigned on the slogan "We do not want socialism à la Czechoslovakia." This social-democratic "anti-Stalinism" abandons the Trotskyist position of unconditional defense of the deformed workers states combined with the call for political revolution to overthrow the treacherous Stalinist bureaucracies that undermine a real defense against imperialism and domestic counterrevolution.

For German Trotskyists, a central slogan must be the revolutionary reunification of the divided nation by a resurgent working class led by a Trotskyist vanguard party, with the preservation of the social conquests of the East German state freed of their bureaucratic shackles, and the extension of these gains to West Germany. As the TLD noted in concluding its article on the elections:

"The Bundestag elections of 1976 demonstrate with complete clarity that the proletariat requires a revolutionary leadership irreconcilable in the class struggle. The proletariat needs a revolutionary party, which must be a section of a recreated Fourth International." ■

Australasian SPARTACIST

a monthly organ of revolutionary Marxism for the rebirth of the Fourth International published by Spartacist Publications for the Central Committee of the Spartacist League of Australia and New Zealand, section of the international Spartacist tendency

U.S. \$5—12 issues (airmail)
U.S. \$2—12 issues (surface mail)

Order from/pay to: Spartacist Publications, GPO Box 3473, Sydney, NSW 20001, Australia

California Farm Labor Bill...

(continued from page 12)

"(b) The Board shall decide in each case whether...the unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit or subdivision thereof."

The reactionary bureaucracy of the American Federation of Labor hailed the Wagner Act as "Labor's Magna Carta" because it took labor disputes out of the hands of the generally more conservative state courts, and because of its section 7, which upheld the right of employees to form unions in order to engage in collective bargaining. This formal statement was taken from

section 7(a) of the National Recovery Act (NRA), which was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court shortly before the Wagner Act was rushed through Congress by Rooseveltian Democrats.

There were many reasons why revolutionaries and militant unionists opposed the Wagner Act. In the first place, the right to form unions, to engage in collective bargaining and to strike had already been recognized in the 1932 Norris-La Guardia Act. This outlawed various kinds of anti-strike injunctions, thereby eliminating the hitherto frequent practice of courts enjoining strikes because they were "in restraint of trade" and therefore unconstitutional. In any case, this right had already been won in practice by the workers' struggles (as is usual for rights "granted" by the bourgeois state).

Secondly, handing to the government

the power to decide what is the jurisdictional unit to vote in a representation election is to give the class enemy a potentially significant weapon for use against the most militant unionists. Craft unions can be favored over industrial unions, and jurisdictions gerrymandered so that reactionary-led unions can swallow up or split left-led unions.

Exactly that happened to the CP-led West Coast marine cooks and stewards (NUMCS) during the McCarthyite witchhunting years. First the government indicted the union leaders under anti-communist laws; then the NLRB refused to let the CP-influenced ILWU on the ballot. Finally the Labor Board redefined the jurisdiction to include all West Coast-based unlicensed seamen, a category in which the notoriously racist, anti-communist SIU was already dominant.

Even more fundamentally, however, it is only by jealously maintaining their independence from the capitalist government that the unions can serve the interests of the workers. Other things being equal, Marxists favor a single union bargaining agent per plant, but we oppose any law by the government which imposes this (such as the NLRB designation of an "exclusive" representative of "all" the employees). Such a law can be both a weapon in the hands of a dominant bureaucracy against minorities—expel them from the union and then the employer is legally prohibited from bargaining with them—and a union-busting tool in the hands of an anti-labor government.

In short, we oppose all government laws regulating union representation. Only essentially negative laws eliminating legal penalties and obstacles to unionization—for instance, the Norris-La Guardia Act—can be supported. Even then, communists must warn the workers not to place any trust in the bosses' government. However, when certain provisions of unsupportable laws can be used to labor's benefit, naturally then we must take advantage of them nonetheless and show how in practice the laws' promises are empty and their threats real.

The Left and the Wagner Act

The fact that the bulk of the California union leadership has jumped aboard the Prop 14 bandwagon is indicative of the dangerous intermeshing of the labor bureaucracy with the capitalist state apparatus. And the reasons given by Governor Brown for endorsing the measure—that it would provide two years of "peace" in the fields—are indicative of the intentions of the so-called "progressive" Democrats. But it is not just piecemeal seeking to work out a deal with the class enemy and big business politicians seeking to defuse an explosive issue who are backing Proposition 14.

The fact that much of the ostensibly Marxist left has been swept along in the campaign is due to their long-standing policies of tailing after every twist and turn in Chavez' tactics, applauding his "Movement" rhetoric and covering up for his betrayals of strikers and "illegal aliens." It is also an indication of their own degeneration from revolutionary Marxism and even centrism into craven reformism. The Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and the Communist Party (CP) can uncritically support Proposition 14 only by erasing their own history.

While today the SWP and CP support Proposition 14, in 1935 both Stalinists and Trotskyists opposed the Wagner Act as a threat to labor's ability to strike. The Trotskyists of the Workers Party (WP, precursor of the SWP) made it clear that the act was a trap for the working class, despite the fact that there was reactionary bourgeois opposition to the "progressive" FDR program (a split in the bourgeoisie analogous to the current cleavage between Governor Brown and the growers). They wrote in the 6 July 1935 *New Militant*:

"Under this bill a National Labor Relations Board is to be set up to

enforce' collective 'bargaining,' etc. Thus the way is paved for eventual greater control of government over the unions. Apart from that, bitter experience has taught the workers how slowly the machinery of these Boards operates even when 'friends of unionism' sit on them, and that the employers have numerous devices for evading their decisions or crippling their operations. Besides, under a capitalist government, which necessarily is concerned about keeping the wheels of industry (i.e. capitalist industry) running smoothly, the basic concern of these government agencies is never that of enforcing the rights of the workers, but that of maintaining 'industrial peace,' in other words, preventing strikes or if they break out somehow, 'settling' them, getting the workers back to work as quickly as possible.

"Thus these government boards become in effect strike-breaking agencies even under the best conditions.

"The workers will not get salvation from the Wagner bill. They must now as ever fight the entire system for which it stands. They will get nothing except that which they can take by their organized strength and militancy."

However, they also added:

"It is possible that the initial psychological effect of the passage of the Wagner bill on some sections of the workers will be similar to that which occurred when the NRA was first proclaimed to create the impression, namely, that unionization will get government support and so to stimulate organizing campaigns and strikes.... Militants will take advantage of the situation precisely in order that in the struggle to get what the government purports to give them [the workers], they may learn the true nature and function of all capitalist governments."

It is interesting that even the Communist Party came out against the Wagner Act. While they soon became the most vociferous supporters of Roosevelt's "New Deal" hoax, in mid-1935 the CP had not yet completed its turn toward the Democratic Party and still made ultra-left denunciations of FDR as a "fascist" and of the NRA as the "slave labor law." The CP correctly warned in the 6 July 1935 *Daily Worker*:

"The Wagner Bill does NOT guarantee (except in words) the right to organize. Long before the N.R.A., labor won this right wherever it fought for it.

"On the contrary, the bill sets up compulsory arbitration machinery that can be used to prevent and break strikes and to tie labor hand and foot."

It should be extremely embarrassing for supporters of the SWP and CP to read what their predecessors said about a law that was far more liberal than Prop 14 (which is roughly equivalent to the Wagner Act after it was drastically amended by the Taft-Hartley anti-union law). At that time the Trotskyist WP defended Marxist policies and even the CP felt obliged to make a genuflection in the direction of revolution. Today their successors lie prostrate before the class enemy. The Spartacist League is virtually unique among left groups in California in warning that Proposition 14 is a threat to labor and must be rejected. *Vote No on Prop 14!* ■

PDC Demo...

(continued from page 4)

The final speaker, the SL's Ed Clarkson, declared that the Castroites of the MIR and PRT/ERP must bear part of the onus for the defeats of the Chilean and Argentine workers. The former "critically" supported the Allende popular front and the latter first sought an accommodation with the bourgeois populist Perón, then all but called for a military coup to overthrow his widow. "Picking up the gun is useless in isolation from the independent mobilization of the proletariat," said Clarkson, "and this is precisely where the MIR and the PRT failed." Clarkson ended by demanding "Free All Victims of Right-Wing Repression!" "Build Trotskyist Parties in Argentina and Chile!" and "Smash the Bloody Juntas Through Workers Revolution!" ■

Hands Off the OL!

KKK Terrorist Shot Outside Houston Maoist Office

HOUSTON—On Saturday night, September 18, members of a front group of the fascist Ku Klux Klan calling themselves the "Veterans for Victory Over Communism" attempted to break up a memorial meeting here for Mao Tse-tung which was co-sponsored by the October League (OL) at the Prairie Fire bookstore. During the assault, one of the racist thugs was shot in the chest and seriously wounded. The remainder of the attackers thereupon quickly scurried away.

According to an account in the OL's *Call* (27 September), two of the KKKers tried to enter as the meeting began, but were quickly expelled when recognized by those present as Klan members. Later, two carloads of Klansmen arrived armed with shotguns and began leafletting outside against the "communist menace." A group of the thugs then charged the storefront, led by Thomas West, who hurled a rock through a window and was then shot.

As the racists fled the Houston cops arrived almost immediately. Two of those defending the bookstore were immediately arrested and another shortly afterwards. The three have subsequently been released, but the district attorney's office is reportedly considering putting the incident before a grand jury. Of course, no charges have been brought against any of the fascist attackers.

Houston has a long history of such racist attacks. One long-time leftist who has lived in the area for three decades kept his house sandbagged until 1974 due to numerous threats and a machine gun attack on his home in the 1960's. A few years ago a pipe bomb exploded in the local headquarters of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), and in February 1975 the Klan demonstrated outside Houston SWP offices. In April of the same year, members of the Spartacist League/Spartacus Youth League received threatening phone calls from a group itself the "Volunteers and Veterans to Vietnam." And also in 1975 a band of Scott Nelson's "United Whites of America" set upon a May Day march led by the Revolutionary Communist Party, unsuccessfully trying to break it up.

Not surprisingly, no one was ever charged in any of these attacks. Moreover, during the 1975 events, Houston police chief Carrol Lynn freely admitted the existence of cops in Houston "whose views are very close to those of the Klan"

(quoted in the *Militant*, 21 March 1975). Later Lynn admitted he had known of two of the incidents in advance.

Houston authorities will most likely have a difficult time pinning frame-up charges against those attending the Maoist meeting. The defenders of the Prairie Fire bookstore have wisely refused to cooperate in any way with the witchhunting investigation, in which the cops are trying to blame the shooting on the OL rather than arrest the fascist assailants. It has also been reported that



The Call

Wounded attacker West fleeing from Prairie Fire bookstore in Houston after participating in racist assault.

when offered broadcast time to debate the Klan, the OL correctly refused to debate with the fascist terrorists.

However the defense is severely weakened by the OL's sectarianism. Although a leaflet for an October 1 rally against the Klan assault was signed by a "Houston Committee to End Fascist Attacks," the OL has refused offers of assistance from other left groups and no attempts have been made to organize a united-front defense. Nor has there been any serious attempt by the Maoists to publicize the incident on Houston campuses.

It is the obligation of all socialist and labor militants and supporters of democratic liberties to defend any of the participants in the Mao memorial meeting should charges be brought against them. Not empty bluster like the OL's boast that "We won't take attacks from the fascists sitting down" (*Call*, 27 September), but united working-class defense is key to smushing the Klan thugs. ■

Auto Contract...

(continued from page 1)

had the slightest idea of what was going on, and the 170,000 UAW members at Ford didn't even know what they were striking for. For the union ranks, the silence from Woodcock & Co. was part of preparation by the UAW tops to spring a sellout.

Woodcock has been consistently trying to minimize the effect of this strike, which he never wanted. Even the most elementary steps have not been taken by the UAW bureaucracy to win the strike. Over half a million workers at General Motors, Chrysler and American Motors have been left on the job and Ford operations in Canada were also allowed to continue. As if this weren't enough, local officials have allowed streams of scabbing salaried personnel and hourly workers with union passes to pour through the picket lines.

What the "well-informed spokesmen" have been saying about the tentative settlement is the following: on wages, a 3 percent increase in the second and third year and slightly more in the first year; on "shorter work time," 13 additional holidays (rotated on an individual basis) over the life of the contract (or roughly four days off per year); for retirees, up to \$600 cash settlement, to be paid for from COLA payments of working auto workers; Supplemental Unemployment Benefits (SUB), slightly improved from 9-14 cents company contribution per manhour up to 13-22 cents; a restructuring of SUB to increase protection for high seniority workers, and an extra pay boost for skilled workers.

The wage increase is exactly the pittance the UAW leaders asked for, while the holidays plan is at best an insult and more likely nothing but a form of absence control. Suffering from layoffs, speed-up and inflation, auto workers needs far exceed this stinking offer.

UAW members need a shorter work-week at no loss in pay—at least "30 for

40"—to combat unemployment. They need a big increase in wages, as well as protection against speed-up, through rolling back and locking line speed in the contract and fixing job description at the beginning of the model run. Despite the predictable ballyhoo that, "we got all the company will give," none of these are part of Woodcock's deal.

Militants must reject this sellout "tentative agreement"! The UAW membership must demand adequate time to study all the details of the offer, with full discussion in the locals and voting on a plant-by-plant basis. Every plant should remain closed until all local grievances are settled.

Strike Against John Deere

While auto workers were being kept in the dark on the proposed deal during last minute hargaining, workers in the agricultural implements section of the UAW were even more the victims of a bureaucratic blackout. As contracts for major manufacturers expired at the end of September, Woodcock extended his defeatist one-at-a-time strategy to "Ag-Imp." While 80,000 workers at International Harvester and Caterpillar remained on the job, 27,000 workers at John Deere were called out literally not knowing what they were striking for.

Despite the blackout, workers at John Deere launched the strike with enthusiasm. Members of Local 865 in East Moline, Illinois, wildcatted 12 hours before the strike officially began a tradition with the local. A local official told *WV* that a supervisor had been injured in the scuffle at the plant gate as he tried to enter the struck plant the first day of the strike, and a number of scab supervisors had their tires slashed.

Workers at Deere have endured some of the worst speed-up and working conditions in the industry, since UAW International policy has emphasized wage and fringe benefit improvements in exchange for all kinds of work rule changes. This historically militant section of the union has one of the highest

pay scales and benefit packages in the entire union (averaging close to \$8 per hour in wages), but according to union sources, wages are not even an issue this year.

The bureaucrats are instead trying to "tighten up" language on subcontracting as a measure against layoffs. (Present "Ag-Imp" contracts include a provision giving companies wide latitude to subcontract work if use of plant employees involves "extra cost," thus enabling management to pass work to low-wage, seah shops.) But the bureaucrats' approach weakens the union position on overtime, which is voluntary in the agricultural implements section (unlike auto). The reasoning is that if the union can prevent subcontracting, then workers must make themselves available for the extra work the companies will need! The fight against layoffs and unemployment, by creating *more jobs*, is conveniently forgotten in such a revolting trade-off.

Another demand of the union, as at Ford, is a vague attempt to shorten the workweek, still another trick to convince the workers that a fight against layoffs is actually being waged. What it boils down to is a form of discipline to improve attendance: one half hour credit for every week of perfect attendance, or 39-1/2 for 40!

In contrast to the Big Three auto companies, whose contracts specified that pensions would not be discussed in this round of negotiations, there is no such agreement in agricultural implements and therefore no excuse for not waging a struggle for COLA on pensions. But this is not what Woodcock & Co. have in mind. In spite of the general inability of workers with 30 years' seniority to afford retirement, the UAW hargainers are asking for only a small monetary adjustment on pensions.

Spokesmen at Deere—a particularly profitable company which could easily afford a hefty wage increase—have publicly stated that they will wait for the Ford settlement so as to avoid setting any precedents in the negotiations. This underlines the cooperation that exists not just between auto companies, but also between them and the farm machinery companies organized by the UAW. The Reutherite "one-at-a-time" strategy is supposed to hurt the "target" company through threatening its market share. In fact what happens is that each company knows it will be struck only once in nine years or so, and that its settlement will probably be accepted by the others.

This encourages them to "hang tough" rather than the opposite. Striking one company at a time weakens the overall impact of the strike on the industry and the economy, and damages the solidarity of the workers. "Pattern" bargaining is a pattern for defeat! All auto and agricultural implements companies should be called out together in order to maximize the union's power, and the strike run by a democratically elected strike committee.

The UAW leadership's leaky picket lines, like its policy of keeping the membership in the dark, are testimony to its contempt for the ranks. After two-and-a-half weeks of letting scabbing supervisory personnel and others through the lines, Local 600 (River Rouge) officials finally issued a leaflet explaining "Why a Skeleton Crew in the Plant." The leaflet assures strikers that no production is being run or tools or dies being made. This conflicts with earlier reports gathered by *WV* on the picket lines that coke ovens and BOF blast furnaces were indeed being kept in operation during the strike. And in any case, facilities which legitimately require "banking" or constant maintenance could and should have been shut down prior to the strike.

The leaflet also attacks "those who would divide"—that is, militants who have been critical of the leadership. In a not very subtle red-hat the leaflet states, "they have been distributing leaflets—

attacking our union and trying to divide the membership, but they do not say one DAMN WORD against the company." This is an outright slander against several groups and individuals who have criticized Woodcock & Co. for defeatist misleadership.

It is the *UAW bureaucracy* which is responsible for weakening the strike by demoralizing the ranks who are told nothing of the negotiations and ordered to stand idly by while hundreds of salaried and hourly workers stream into the plants through their picket lines. When militants have resisted this strategy and attempted to stop scabbing on their own, cops and "UAW Flying Squads" have been quickly on the scene to keep the lines open. So far, at least two committeemen at Local 600 have been suspended by the union tops for "conduct unbecoming a union member"—i.e., trying to stop scabs!

The lack of any significant organized opposition to Woodcock's treachery is testimony to the weakness of the U.S. left and the break in continuity from the historic battles that built the industrial unions in the 1930's and 1940's. With the exception of the Spartacist League and small groups of class-struggle militants in the union, no significant tendency in the auto union even raises the call for an industry-wide strike!

The Independent Skilled Trades Council (ISTC), at a meeting last week, accurately described the one-at-a-time strategy as strikebreaking. But instead of demanding that all North American auto and farm equipment companies be shut down at once, the ISTC passed a motion for a one-day industry-wide strike on October 14, the day of the one-day protest against Trudeau's wage controls called by the Canadian Labour Congress! Charles Dewey of the ISTC said that autoworkers would "have to start talking about" shutting down all of auto "sooner or later!"

Last week a *WV* reporter asked a supporter of Auto Workers United to Fight in '76—a reformist opposition politically supported by the Revolutionary Communist Party—how they can ignore the industry-wide strike demand. Coining an aphorism in the Maoist tradition, this brother said that it would be like "turning the sky upside down." For Woodcock and his reformist fellow-travelers, a militant industry-wide strike would indeed turn their world topsy-turvy, raising the "danger" that the mobilized ranks might get out of hand and sweep aside the sellout misleaders. But for class-struggle militants, this is the beginning of a struggle that will be victorious only when the auto capitalists and the rest of their class are expropriated and the working class for the first time takes control of its destiny. ■

Muñoz Family...

(continued from page 4)

UN) fail to report, they are liable to being picked up in raids and immediately deported.

If they *do* register, however, this is official admission that they are illegally in the country, and therefore may also be deported. Moreover, information on these refugees is then sent to their country of origin, and if another rightist dictatorship wants to extradite anyone, the list makes it easier to locate radicals and other targets of junta repression. This registration decree could be the beginning of an escalating witchhunt and murderous bloodbath. The PDC strongly denounced this draconian law and called for international protest against the continuing perilous situation, in Argentina. ■

Le Bolchéviek

publication de la
Ligue Trotskyste de France

No. 1, 1er trimestre 1976, 0,50 f.

pour toute correspondance, Pascal
Alessandri, B.P. 336, 75011 Paris, France

NMU Scabs on Auto Strike



News Photo/Howard Shirkey

DETROIT, October 5—*WV* learned yesterday that the UAW leadership at Local 600 (River Rouge) is cooperating with National Maritime Union (NMU) officials from the Port of Detroit in ushering NMU workers across auto strike picket lines. At least one ship, the 8,708-ton *Henry Ford II*—one of five ships in Ford's fleet—has been delivering ore to the Rouge dock throughout the strike.

Local 600 staff director Bob Moran admitted authorizing the passes. He justified the shipments as necessary for the maintenance of coke oven operations. According to Moran, the *Henry Ford II* is still unloading. An International spokesman claimed ignorance of this scabbing and NMU officials were unavailable for comment.

Early in the strike, five UAW members boarded a private 28-ft. yacht in the Rouge River in an attempt to block the 611-ft. freighter. Though the pickets believed their resourcefulness had turned the freighter away from Ford docks, a spokesman from Ford Marine Operations denied it. *WV* asked Moran what happened to those pickets. Moran said, "We ran them the hell out."

This incident has angered workers at the Rouge picket lines. It is one more example of how the UAW bureaucracy's failure to shut the entire auto industry down tight has hurt the strike. NMU militants must demand that no seamen scab on the auto strike and UAW auto workers must see to it that the mass crossing of picket lines is stopped!

NYC Cops...

(continued from page 1)

through the streets. They wrecked a passing tow truck when the driver refused to honk his horn in sympathy. Several high-ranking officers were knocked down, one was kicked and a deputy chief inspector had his stars ripped off his shoulder.

On Wednesday an irate commissioner summoned 300 top police brass to headquarters. Calling the protests, which violated a court injunction, "intolerable," Codd complained: "Over the last five days there have been a number of situations in which commanding officers did not command, in which commanding officers and supervisors did not supervise, in which sworn members of this department did not fulfill the duties they were sworn to fulfill" (*New York Times*, 30 September).

Although intra-departmental disciplinary proceedings have begun against the cops who assaulted superior officers, an aide to mayor Abraham Beame admitted that City Hall was generally handling the law-breaking cops with kid gloves: "So far the consensus is that mass arrests of cops would only escalate the problem by meeting provocations with provocation. It could produce a wildcat strike" (*New York Times*, 30 September).

Fearful that police patrolmen would disobey orders to arrest fellow cops, disproportionately high numbers of superior officers have been assigned to the main demonstrations—at Gracie Mansion Monday, at Yankee Stadium Tuesday and at City Hall yesterday where 4,000 police picketed to demonstrate their rejection of the city's latest offer. But even this unusual measure has not resulted in a single arrest.

Such benign toleration when police run riot contrasts sharply with the Gestapo-style treatment and mass arrests of hospital workers in recent strikes. Although the police wail and moan about being treated as "second-class citizens," their brazen disregard for

the "law and order" they prate about underscores their sinister bonapartist appetites for autonomy from civilian control and their total contempt for the people of New York.

Even the demands for which they are fighting illuminate a lesson which the labor movement forgets only at its peril—cops are not "fellow workers" but hired guns for the bourgeoisie who expect and normally receive special treatment from their masters.

Early last year the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association (PBA) demanded wage increases high enough to break the traditional pay parity between cops and firemen and to further increase the existing 10 percent differential above sanitationmen. Instead a three-man arbitration panel recommended the same two-year 14 percent increase for cops, firemen and sanitationmen alike. In the midst of its austerity program, the Beame administration refused to comply with the award at all.

Indicative of the bourgeoisie's recognition of the special status of the police, a State Supreme Court then exempted the PBA from the wage freeze imposed on city unions last year with the connivance of the weak-kneed labor bureaucrats. As the bankers and Congress tighten the economic screws, the city officials are, for once, reluctant to throw the customary bone to their professional enforcers and are appealing the court decision. The cops' revolt aims at winning their pay increases retroactive over the past year and overturning heavier work schedules, thus reclaiming the special status to which they believe their guns and badges entitle them.

Although the bourgeoisie and the labor skates treat the PBA as a legitimate labor union, it is nothing of the kind. Its typical functions are to propagandize for greater police autonomy and to intercede for racist, trigger-happy cops brought up on charges. It labels exposures of rampant police brutality as concoctions of "bleeding-heart liberals and sob-sisters." It objects to investigations of departmental graft and corruption as devious schemes to

undermine "police morale." The PBA, rather than a union, is an ultra-reactionary, paramilitary political organization.

Feeding this week's protests is a power struggle among various PBA factions, each contending that it can better defend the prerogatives, organizational power and "morale" of the 18,000 police patrolmen. Behind the power struggle is more than a decade of right-wing organizing and the tradition-



al elitist caste mentality among cops in New York and other cities. Following major upsurges in the civil rights movement in 1963-64, liberal Democratic mayor Robert Wagner gave the cops an "open season" on black and Spanish-speaking people. The police acquired a new consciousness of their special social role as the city's armed enforcers of racism—and they liked it.

In 1966, as part of a general consolidation of the new administration, Republican "Fusion" mayor John Lindsay broke up the old police hierarchy—the "Irish mafia"—and then set up a powerless Civilian Review Board to deflect the growing outrage of racial minorities. In response, the PBA, in alliance with the Conservative Party, John Birch Society and an assortment of racist, right-wing groups, launched a heavily bankrolled referendum campaign to eliminate even this token rein on their ability to brutalize non-whites, student radicals and striking workers.

This right-wing campaign to abolish

the review board became a political referendum on police autonomy. Recognizing the bonapartist threat behind the referendum, the Spartacist League issued a leaflet: "Vote No to Cop Brutality and Racism." While placing no confidence in the review board, we warned then: "If the cops actually get the vote of confidence they're after, it will strengthen the hand of the ruling class and the cops against all working people and their organizations."

In January 1971 New York police carried out a six-day work stoppage over a retroactive pay claim. The reformist Communist Party prated about "racist currents" and "beating up of strikers" by the police but then grotesquely called for "fighting unity of the working class" to defend the cops' right to strike for "justified wage demands"! With equal obscenity, the political bandits of the Workers League hailed this bonapartist revolt by labor's mortal enemies. An article in the *Bulletin* (25 January 1971) entitled "New York Labor Begins Showdown" maintained that the police work stoppage had "triggered a whole fight on the part of the city labor movement." The article concluded by denouncing the municipal labor bureaucrats for not calling a general strike to support the cops.

Workers Action (April-May 1971), predecessor to *Workers Vanguard*, denounced this blatant capitulation to backward social attitudes among relatively privileged sectors of white workers, some of whom regard police as their "friends" and protectors against insurgent minorities and radicals. It also pointed out:

"The police work stoppage was fundamentally an *anti-labor* action. It was a *political* strike by a police force that has become dangerously conscious of its social role as the armed defenders of the social system of big business and the 'law and order' that protects and maintains the power and privilege of this ruling class. It reflects the general motion of the working class only in a *negative* sense, for the motion of the police is the symmetrical, polar opposite of that in the working class and in fact more resembles the recent re-emergence of fascist organizations attacking striking workers in France and Italy, or vigilante bands of police terrorists in Guatemala and other Latin American countries that have been assassinating labor leaders and members of revolutionary workers groups."

Much of the blame for workers' confusion about the real nature of the police rests with the sellout policies of the trade-union leadership. Having shoved lay-offs, speed-up and wage freezes down the throats of the rank and file, the bureaucrats set the stage for the police to appear as "militant" antagonists of cutbacks in city workers' jobs and wages. (In fact, Victor Gotbaum's only complaint about the cop rampage was that the PBA doesn't have strong leaders who can tell their members that they can't get any more money...i.e., tell them to shut up and lump it, like Gotbaum's members have to!) The cops' marauding (an extension of their social role and usual activities), however, have sharply undercut the support they expected to receive.

The police revolt points to the necessity of working-class self-defense. The trade unions require their own workers militia to protect themselves from the bosses' uniformed goons. Hospital workers have already had a taste of nightsticks wielded by their so-called "fellow workers" in blue, and if the Gotbaums, Shankers, Mayes and DeLurys had carried out the necessary co-ordinated strike struggles to defend the interests of city workers, it would be even clearer to the members of municipal unions which side the police are on. However, it will not be the class-collaborationist labor fakery who bring this truth to the working masses but only a revolutionary party which (unlike the CP, WL and others) can recognize the sharp class line that separates cops and workers! ■

Subscription-Drive Report WEEK 3

	Total	Quota	%
Berkeley/Oakland	130½	225	58.0
Boston	194	160	121.3
Chicago	250	325	76.9
Cleveland	146	160	91.3
Detroit	211	200	105.5

	Total	Quota	%
Los Angeles	183	260	70.4
Madison	41	60	68.3
New York City	359	450	79.8
San Francisco	153½	225	68.2
At-Large	55	55	100.0
	1723	2120	81.3

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

September 10 to October 15

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____
Zip _____ Phone _____

Workers Vanguard (includes *Spartacist*)

☐ \$5/48 issues ☐ \$2/16 issues

Young Spartacus *Women and Revolution*

☐ \$2/11 issues ☐ \$2/4 issues

SPECIAL DURING SUBSCRIPTION DRIVE:

☐ \$6 for 48 issues of
WORKERS VANGUARD,
and 4 issues of
WOMEN & REVOLUTION

Make payable/mail to: Spartacist Publishing Co., Box 1377 GPO, NY, NY 10001

WORKERS VANGUARD

WORKERS VANGUARD

No Compulsory Arbitration! Vote No on Proposition 14!

California Farm Labor Bill Threatens Right to Strike

SAN FRANCISCO While the rest of the country yawns in boredom over a lackluster presidential race, California has been sharply divided by a ballot initiative, Proposition 14, aimed at making the state Agricultural Labor Relations Board (ALRB) independent of legislative tampering. Put on the ballot by more than 700,000 signatures collected by United Farm Workers (UFW) organizers, the bill is supported by most of organized labor officialdom (not the Teamsters) and opposed by the growers and conservative Republicans. Last month, following the lead of California governor Edmund Brown and U.S. senator John Tunney, Democratic presidential candidate Jimmy Carter also signed on for "Prop 14," and in return received the union's endorsement.

UFW leader Cesar Chavez of course hails the bill as a saviour for California

agricultural workers strike in the summer of 1973 in favor of impotent consumer boycotts, he has virtually abandoned any thought of union industrial action. Instead Chavez appeals to the "progressive" bourgeois politicians in the Democratic Party, who enacted the law setting up the ALRB last year. Supposedly the Labor Board was designed to "guarantee" farm workers the right to choose their own union through state-run representation elections in the fields.

However, when the elections began in September 1975, UFW organizers found themselves confronted by armed vigilantes brought in by many growers to intimidate the workers and keep out "the Chavez union." In addition, sheriff's deputies patrolled many of the fields in order to protect the growers' property rights. At ranches under sweetheart Teamster contracts, Teamster goons

literature admits that as of June 23 the union had only 46 contracts, representing little more than half the workers for which it is certified bargaining agent. And given the timidity of the Chavez leadership, even those contracts "nailed down" are nothing to boast about. For example, at Interharvest lettuce company, a major UFW showpiece, base pay for field workers is only \$3.10 per hour.

Alarmed by the UFW's modest success in the representation elections, the reactionary growers put pressure on the Democratic Party-controlled state legislature, which responded by cutting off funds to the ALRB in February 1976. This effectively put the Labor Board out of the elections business and left the UFW with a list of paper successes. Giving in to grower complaints that the Board was pro-Chavez, Governor Brown appointed three new members and a general counsel. Following this concession, the legislature then restored some funding to the ALRB in an effort to head off Proposition 14.

An Anti-Strike Bill

Having learned nothing from this disastrous experience, Chavez now proposes to repeat it with Proposition 14. This bill essentially repeals the 1975 law and re-enacts it word-for-word with a few amendments and alterations designed to make the ALRB more independent of the legislature. The main changes would require the legislature to appropriate whatever money is "necessary" to enforce the act, ensure three hours a day access for union organizers, require employers to supply lists of employees for election purposes and strengthen the ALRB's power to punish "unfair labor practices" by allowing it to assess treble damages.

The new ALRB could not be tampered with by the legislature but only by another ballot initiative in 1978. Since the Board is appointed by the governor, what this means is that Chavez has given up on his Democratic Party "friends of labor" in the legislature by banking everything on Democrat "friend of labor" Governor Brown! Entrusting the farm workers' fate to such a hoard is a dangerous step which must be opposed by militant unionists. Strengthening the ALRB's powers to punish "unfair labor practices" can obviously cut both ways—against militant unionism as well as the most blatant grower violence.

A recent ALRB action is indicative of the potential dangers involved; at the V.B. Zimnoch ranch near Richgrove, the state Agricultural Labor Board revoked certification won by the Teamsters in representation elections because of alleged "escalating violence" against scabs in a strike which started there in August (*San Francisco Chronicle*, 2 September). Such arguments could be

used against the UFW as well, to smash any strike.

Historically, government labor boards to "certify" union representation elections have been intended and used to defuse militant class struggles by channeling them into a maze of bureaucratic regulations, with the bourgeois state standing as supreme arbitrator. The anti-strike intentions of the 1975 Agricultural Labor Relations Act, as well as of Proposition 14, are quite explicit in several sections. For example, section 1154 defines a series of "unfair labor practices" by unions, including any attempt to "restrain or coerce" for the purpose of promoting secondary strikes and boycotts. Also outlawed are strikes for union recognition "if another labor organization has been certified as the representative." In other words, if the Teamsters steal an election through intimidation, conniving with the growers, buying off ALRB officials or any other means, the UFW's only recourse is through the courts!

The Wagner Act

The California Agricultural Labor Relations Act is not, after all, a new issue. The most immediate parallel to the ALRB is, of course, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), created by the Wagner Act in 1935. Indeed, UFW literature promotes the California Board as a logical extension of the Wagner Act, from which farm workers were excluded (as they have been from all other major federal labor legislation, including minimum wage laws). Actually, on paper the Wagner Act sounded much better than the California law, since the former did not include a list of "unfair labor practices" by unions and at least contained a clause stating: "Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike...."

In its detailed provisions, the Wagner Act did in fact curtail the right to strike, and more generally it attacked the independence of the unions. Its purpose was to impose state adjudication of labor disputes in order to get the workers to rely on the "neutral" government instead of engaging in "disruptive" actions like strikes. Thus the act created a Labor Board, appointed by the president, which would decide on "unfair labor practices" and whose decisions could be overturned only by federal courts. The law also stated:

"Sec. 9 (a) Representatives designated or selected for the purposes of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes, shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment or other conditions of employment"

continued on page 9



Cesar Chavez, right, joined UFW picket protesting administration of ALRB in Sacramento last September.

farm workers. It is, in fact, the crowning piece of his 15-year drive to organize agricultural workers through reliance on capitalist politicians and the bosses' government. But to the struggling UFW membership, Proposition 14 is a threat. Under it they are prohibited from conducting secondary strikes and boycotts, key forms of union action in this industry. Moreover, the ALRB can arbitrarily decertify a union on trumped-up charges of "unfair labor practices," such as "violence" against scabs during a strike.

History of Class-Collaborationist Defeatism

A mere description of the history of Proposition 14 demonstrates the failure of Chavez' class-collaborationist strategy. Since the UFW leader disbanded the

were often in evidence to intimidate the farm workers from voting UFW. Thus even the meek ruling of the ALRB allowing the UFW access to ranch property for three hours a day to talk with the workers was frequently violated, and many Chavez supporters were thrown out of their jobs or suffered serious physical injury. So much for the capitalist "law and order" Chavez depends on!

It is a testament to the deep hatred of the farm workers for the agribusiness employers and their Teamster flunkies that even under these adverse conditions the UFW scored significant electoral successes. According to the union, 382 elections were held under the 1975 law, and the UFW won 205 of them. This represented 30,804 workers, or 68.8 percent of the total vote. But UFW