

Welfare Workers: The Real Cost of Mage's Victory

Bulletin

OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

Vol. 2, No 27

March 14, 1966

10 Cents

Vietnam Policy Debate Rocks Establishment

British Workers
Face
New Election



Welfare Workers: The Real Cost of Mage's Victory

Bulletin

OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

Vol. 2, No 27

March 14, 1966

10 Cents

Vietnam Policy Debate Rocks Establishment

British Workers
Face
New Election



THE MEANING OF FULBRIGHT HEARINGS AND KENNEDY'S STAND

Ruling Circles in U.S. are Rocked by Policy Conflict

A full-scale Vietnam policy debate is now rocking the American capitalists, not to mention their various allies around the world. This is the central meaning of the Fulbright Senate Hearings and Senator Kennedy's recent controversial remarks.

These hearings were held not so much in response to popular dissent about the Vietnam War but rather because of the frustration of an important sector of the American ruling class which feels it is not getting a hearing from Johnson at a time when Johnson's policies, in their opinion, could hurt the world position of the imperialists.

**THAT
THIRD
OLD
LINE**

Fulbright, the Senator from Arkansas, a state controlled for a long time by Rockefeller interests, is no wild maverick. He has been one of the key architects of American foreign policy in the post war world. His outlook has always reflected the (internationalist, Eastern section) of the American bourgeoisie. Robert Kennedy, the current Kennedy family pretender for the American throne, is likewise motivated by more than liberal malaise over the war. Like his late brother, Kennedy is seeking national leadership by formulating a (bit more far-sighted policy for the preservation and extension of American imperialist world interests.) Thus his remarks on Vietnam today seem but a repetition of the role Senator John Kennedy played in the prelude to the Geneva Conference in the early 1950's.

As we have noted before, American foreign policy is marked by fundamental contradictions. On the one hand the imperialists see an entente with the Soviet Bloc as a central prop for their world dominance. Their goal is both to get the collaboration of the Soviets in preserving some form of international stability and to slowly undermine the workers states through economic penetration by encouraging Liebermanist trends (See BULLETIN, Feb. 14). Certain circles foresee agreement on these lines even with China. On the other hand the Sino-Soviet camp represents a great threat to them, especially during a period of international instability. This requires of them a hostile military policy particularly in Southeast Asia where any collapse of capitalist forces raises the immediate threat of the spread of Chinese dominance. Faced with this dilemma the U.S. has sought both to penetrate Eastern Europe and the USSR economically, and at the same time deepen its military struggle in South Vietnam, surrounding China with a military build-up. But every day that the war goes on in Vietnam the possibilities of a detente elsewhere become less and less.

Johnson's Line Exposed

It is within this context that the American imperialist circles are presently torn by the dissension which has now come to the surface. The Foreign Relations Committee Hearings have

exposed the real line of the Johnson Administration. Johnson and his circle oppose any negotiations directly with the NLF precisely because they exclude the NLF from any role in a postwar South Vietnamese government. They exclude the NLF because of their own rather accurate assessment of the weaknesses of the Saigon Government and its inability to offer any serious resistance to the NLF in a future government. Johnson is stuck with another Chiang Kai-Chek style regime but he is unwilling to retreat as did Truman under similar circumstances in China. **NO LIE?**

This position of Johnson's has a deadly logic to it-- a logic which Johnson himself seems unlikely to face up to. If the NLF is to be excluded from any future South Vietnamese government then it must simply be annihilated during the current war. But

even to attempt such an annihilation will require a build-up in Vietnam far greater than anything presently considered. In addition this would mean a humiliating defeat for North Vietnam and to a certain extent for the USSR, and would endanger the security of China. Under such circumstances Johnson must realize that the North Vietnamese and Chinese will be forced to act as did China in the Korean War when U.S. troops reached the Yalu River-- that is, with direct military intervention.

"Regardless of all the talk about international supervision of elections in South Vietnam, the men in control of the instruments of government power in that society are likely to get the result they want."
"This is well known to everybody concerned in the dispute. As one official here put it, 'In that part of the world the question is not whether you have elections but who rigs them.'
-James Reston, N.Y. Times, 2/23

Certainly, this side of nuclear war, in such a ground war the U.S. would lose whatever military advantage it might gain as long as it could send an immense number of well-armed troops into South Vietnam to fight the NLF only.

What Fulbright and Kennedy are After

NOT QUITE

It is this logic of the Johnson policy which has thrown up the Fulbright Kennedy opposition. Kennedy, basing himself on his own experience in bargaining with the USSR during the missile crisis in Cuba, recognizes that imperialism's only alternative to Johnson's policy is precisely the establishment of a government in South Vietnam which grants the NLF some role and in which an imperialist military build-up is excluded. Only such a solution could possibly be acceptable to North Vietnam and China, and to force an unacceptable solution to these powers could mean a war reaching to the nuclear stage.

**No!
ALL
OF
THEM**

The difficulty with Kennedy's position, as far as the imperialists are concerned, lies precisely in the weakness of the Saigon government discussed earlier-- a weakness which increases every day the war passes. The position of U Thant, as reported in the New York Times, is a logical extension of the Kennedy line to realistically face up to this aspect of the situation. U Thant

foresees a future South Vietnam state as a "neutralist", "Titoist" Stalinist state. He obviously feels whatever losses imperialism suffers through such an arrangement can be made up by opening up a period of imperialist penetration of China as well as North and South Vietnam.

At this time, the leading imperialists reject such a solution because they legitimately fear the "dominoes effect". They are faced not only with instability in South Vietnam but almost as great instability in Thailand, Malaya, India and similar countries. While they could no doubt depend on the support of North Vietnam and China in their efforts to prop up capitalism in Southeast Asia, they must also face the reality that the Soviet countries are no longer capable of delivering revolutionary movements to the imperialists as they once did. It must be remembered that the NLF struggle itself started independently in the South and received support from the North only at a later date when the North feared the imperialist military build-up under the Diem regime.

SOUTH AMERICA

What Our Policy Should Be

It is not our task to decide which of these various policies would be the most effective for the imperialists. It is rather our task to recognize that each of these policies aims at maintaining world imperialist domination and preventing the spread of revolution. U Thant, Kennedy-Fulbright and Johnson represent three anti-revolutionary reactionary policies aimed at maintaining a dying economic system.

IGNORANCE IS BLISS

We must struggle for an alternative policy which is concerned neither with maintaining the stability of the capitalists nor the stability of the Soviet bureaucrats. Rather we seek the victory of the working class against the bureaucracies of the Soviet lands and against the capitalists. In South Vietnam we are for the victory of the National Liberation Front. We oppose its defeat either through military means or through diplomatic maneuvers such as the establishment of a coalition government. At the same time we are for the workers and peasants of South Vietnam creating their own state and running it democratically as in the early days of the October Revolution. We oppose the foisting of a bureaucratic regime on South Vietnam of the same character as dominates the North. Of course, should such a bureaucracy develop we would continue to defend the country from the imperialists as we struggled to overthrow the bureaucracy from within.

MEANING WHAT EXACTLY

Wow China?

... AND THE MILITANT SAYS ...

The Militant's flight from Trotskyism has now brought it to the point that has been outflanked on the left by N.Y. World-Telegram columnist Murray Kempton.

In the leader for the Militant's Feb. 28 issue, one reads: "The division in the capitalist power structure offers a tremendous opportunity for the antiwar movement."

"One year ago," Militant staff writer Roberts continues, "there was almost unanimous agreement in the American ruling class about how to prosecute the Vietnam war. Two Senators alone, Morse and Gruening, could be considered outspoken critics of that policy. Today it is estimated that from 30 to 50 senators oppose Johnson's Vietnam policy and as many as 100 congressmen are uneasy about it."

On March 1, exactly five of Roberts' "30 to 50 senators" voted against tabling Morse's motion to repeal the "Tonkin Bay" resolution. Of Militant writer Roberts' epoch-making "oppositon" to Johnson's policy in the Senate, Murray Kempton wrote in the March 2 World-Telegram: "He (Johnson) had gained the whole Senate and he had lost the chairman (Fulbright) of its foreign relations committee. But otherwise he had reduced his opponents to the designation the tabloids used for the girls in the Mickey Jelke case: They were soiled doves." In direct opposition to the Militant's shameless expectations of Wayne Morse & Company, Kempton is refreshingly hard-headed: "...it is hard to believe that the resitants will be ready to stand and fight at any point in the predictable future."

Behind the rightward tendencies of the Militant is the bankrupt antiwar perspective of staff writer Roberts' masters. That perspective may be summed up: (Ultimately, millions upon millions of students, middle class people generally, and some individual Negroes and workers, will be united in one vast movement; at that point (the pressure will be sufficient to compel the growing congressional opposition to rear up on its hind legs and stop this war.) In this respect the ex-Trotskyists of the SWP and the Stalinists are Tweedledum and Tweedledec; both support the old "Popular Front" swill of the Communist Political Association and the Progressive Party hey-days. The Militant's disgraceful adulation of Morse is an inevitable reflection of its perspective; it, like the CP, is looking for a new "Henry A. Wallance" to lead it.

This is not to suggest that the SWP would come out in support of a "peace" candidate today or even tomorrow. True, its antiwar perspective leads in that direction; a number of rank-and-filers have already shifted mental political gears to that purpose. Yet, a section of the leadership and ranks with roots in the labor movements of the past are not completely happy with the present turn. In a situation within the SWP in which there is considerable jockeying for posts, with incipient struggles brewing internally, there is and will continue to be a constant mixture of spurts of wild opportunism followed by "corrective" sectarian counter-marches.

In evidence of that, the SWP last winter abandoned its "Black Nationalist" activities perspective at the time it decided to take a ride on the antiwar movement; yet, Malcolm X's speeches continue to replace Lenin and Trotsky in the Militant's pages. The current political perspective of the SWP involves a complete abandonment of working-class activities; yet, from time to time, particularly when the antiwar movement is momentarily in a lull, considerable Militant lineage is given to trotting out empty truisms about future struggles of the working class.

SWP
LINE

LARRY PANTS
FIVE/2/68

This surface confusion about the "real" politics of the SWP is resolved by considering two very important facts not explicitly represented in the pages of the Militant. First is the SWP's abandonment of even the pretense of a working class orientation. Nowhere, for example, does one find in current SWP publications even the hint of a program for linking workers and Negro militants to the struggle against the war. Second, each of the past and impending expulsions from the SWP represents an internal opposition which stands for such a class orientation.

Just last summer these minorities stipulated that an antiwar perspective must, as a starting point, programmatically and actively link student anti-war radicals with the most militant section of the Civil Rights movement in the South; the Miller-Phillips tendency was expelled for advancing such a perspective, just weeks before the Julian Bond "case" broke.

The SWP today is a party with a middle class orientation and political character. That is the key to the emptiness of its use of a formally correct slogan, "Withdrawal Now!" To seriously advance such a policy, "Withdrawal Now!" means to demand, in practice, the immediate victory of the Viet Cong. It means, above all, to deny the imperialist state the right to mobilize the prime resource of the state, the army, in the service of imperialism's vital self-interests. To make such demands on the imperialist state one must simultaneously organize the forces to replace the bourgeois state, to become the state.

Even the SWP leadership would still grant, on paper, that that only can be done through a United Front based on the working class. Thus, if one is serious about "Withdrawal Now!" one's practice centers on the objective of finding practical, programmatic means for uniting radical students with vanguard elements of the working class, even with so small a vanguard element of that class as the most politically advanced section of the Negro minority. If one does not have that concern as one's central occupation, then all "Withdrawal Now!" polemics are only beating on an empty drum. **YEAH**

Exemplary of the Militant's bankruptcy on just this point is Roberts' journalistic cretinism, expressed in such terms as "Wayne Morse made a slashing indictment..." (emphasis added). Morse and Fulbright have spelled it out time after time that they are not, as Kempton cites Fulbright, going to raise a "white flag over the Capitol." Morse has stated that his program is to have the United Nations do in Vietnam what it did in the Congo! If Roberts were a revolutionary, he would tell the truth; he would not say "slashing," he would write "hypocritical."

Roberts' journalistic cretinism is merely a reflection of his party's middle class orientation. The history of so-called "independent action" by middle class elements is written in the records of the Nazi Sturm Abteilung, the "Reform Democrats," the miserable "center socialists" and that beggarly lot of Stalinists and ex-Trotskyists who now attach themselves to the "soiled doves" of the imperialist political machine.

NEW YORK LABOR SCENE I - WELFARE WORKERS

Mage Slate Wins Election But Loses Principles

In elections held January 28 by the Social Service Employees Union (SSEU), which just one year ago led thousands of New York welfare workers in a historic 28 day illegal strike against the City, the slate headed by Judith Mage swept to victory, defeating two slates to the right of it. The Mage slate won six out of seven positions contested, losing only the position of first vice-president to the Lahab-Tepedino Slate by a three vote margin. Tepedino, founder of the union and its president till now, managed to defeat Bernie Caccione, only after a whispering campaign against him as the son of former Communist Party City Councilman Peter V. Caccione. Immediately preceding and following the election there has been a pick-up in union morale which had declined sharply since last summer.

The Mage slate's base of support came from the Manhattan and Bronx centers--mainly from the younger, "idealistic" section of workers who believed that in supporting Mage they were supporting a genuinely militant and progressive program. On the other hand, both the Lahab-Tepedino slate and the very small Noe slate, which won only a few hundred votes, openly geared their campaigns around appeals to the more conservative and backward sections of the workers, claiming that Mage stood for control of the union by an "activist minority" rather than by "the silent majority who don't attend union meetings." The private campaigning by supporters of the right wing groups was conducted almost entirely at the red-baiting level, while publicly they charged Mage with wanting to center union activity around "foreign policy" and issues they claimed were unrelated to the job, such as organization of welfare clients. These slates both called for the union to confine itself to "bread-and-butter" issues.

Unfortunately, the confidence of the young union militants in the Mage slate is misplaced--though in the context of the election it was necessary to critically support this slate against the two others. (The knowledgeable and astute Mage has been shifting her positions over the last several months in an attempt to undercut right-wing criticisms and gain the union presidency.) On Vietnam--one of the two issues most debated prior to the election--Mage repeatedly stated that though she thought it likely a majority of the active membership would vote to adopt a position opposing the war, nevertheless she was against the union's taking such a stand as it would be "divisive." She successfully prevailed upon the Welfare Workers' Vietnam Committee to cease public activity for several weeks prior to the election so as not to hurt her chances of winning.

The other heavily-debated issue, and one of fundamental importance to the welfare workers, was the relationship between the union and the welfare clients. Immediately following last year's strike, which had been much longer and much harder than anticipated by most workers, Mage correctly contended that the major lesson of the strike experience was the necessity for client organization and support. Such organization would of course not only help welfare

workers in winning their demands from the City, but would give the presently atomized and powerless clients a weapon with which to fight for their own rights and interests, which in many areas dovetail with those of the workers. The initial impetus for such organization would almost necessarily have to come from the caseworkers, for they alone know who the clients are. A small but successful experiment in client organization was made by the union last summer when it rallied several hundred clients in support of Iris Asher, a worker being victimized for expressing too openly her sympathy with her clients and her contempt for Welfare bureaucratism. This initial attempt horrified the Welfare Administration and they made it plain that the one thing they would not tolerate was organized worker-client solidarity. The experiment was not repeated.

-8- Recently, Mr. Dan Clark, a case-worker at the East End Welfare Center was suspended for insubordination when he refused to remove a peace button at the request of the administrator. Over 90 of his co-workers signed a petition supporting his right to wear this button. The day after his suspension, many of the workers wore peace buttons as a further indication of support. The issue was resolved by Mrs. Mage and the new Welfare Commissioner. Clark was reinstated without any penalties. He will be allowed to wear his button in the welfare center but not in front of the clients.

Mage Deserts Poor for 'War on Poverty'

Coming into the election, Mage continued to be linked with her previous position on this question. She therefore found it necessary during the course of the campaign to make herself crystal clear: "Read our program. Is there any suggestion, any hint, that we go out and organize clients? I am not in favor of our organizing clients." Retreating from her earlier position that the clients are the main ally of welfare workers, she now stated, "Our allies are those groups in the community most involved with clients, such as the poverty program groups, HARYOU, MEND, and East Harlem Protestant Parish." Yet she is well aware that none of these groups represent the interests of the clients any more than does the Welfare Department. Mrs. Mage is well aware that these groups are maintained by various arms of the ruling class that profit from the conditions that have forced hundreds of thousands of poor black and Puerto Rican workers onto the welfare roles and into a life of misery and despair. She knows that the purpose of such groups is to prevent the formation of independent organizations that could genuinely fight for the interests of poor people, such as a Clients' Union affiliated with the welfare workers union.

The key to union strength lies in the adoption of a program containing not only immediate demands to lighten the load of the caseworkers and to "humanize" the welfare system (an impossibility), but also long-range, transitional demands that have as their goal the elimination of the welfare system through the elimination of its causes. Such demands must include the fight for a 25 or 30 hour work week which if won by the labor movement would

immediately create millions of jobs and lead to the reintegration into the economy of hundreds of thousands of husbands, boyfriends and fathers of those presently on relief. (It is noted that this demand, which was raised by the SSEU in contract negotiations last year, has now been dropped from the contract proposals of the Mage program!) It must include the call for the labor unions and civil rights movement to form their own political party to fight for the interests of the workers, the poor, and the minorities. It must begin immediately to initiate and aid in the building of a union of welfare clients. A grouping is presently crystallizing within the SSEU around such a program.

The failure of the union to implement such a program is already being felt. In the ghettos the welfare workers are more and more coming to be regarded as the enemy. Attacks on welfare workers are increasing. The union has responded with only short range proposals--including a call for additional police to be sent into the ghetto! This is an insane demand which will only widen the gap between the "community" and worker and which will in the long-run tend actually to increase attacks upon workers. Instead the union must begin immediately to demonstrate the community of interests between workers and clients and make it clear that it is the City, and not the workers, that is responsible for the welfare system. The union must prove that it is willing--in deeds--to make common cause with this most oppressed layer of capitalist society. A first step would be the immediate organization of a number of joint street meetings of union representatives and clients at key spots in the ghetto.

Welfare is a vicious and degrading system which condemns nearly a tenth of the City's population to lives of misery, deprivation, humiliation, and hopelessness in order to subsidize the low wages paid by New York employers. (New York, America's richest city, has the highest welfare rolls and the lowest average wages of any major city in the country.) The welfare system helps prepare the ground for fascism by allowing Negro and Puerto Rican workers to be increasingly squeezed out of any role in the economy--to become at a later date a visible surplus population to be wiped out without any harm to the economy in a period of social crisis. Welfare workers must have no vested interest in the preservation of such a system. And they must begin to demonstrate this now!

###

NEW YORK LABOR SCENE II - TRANSIT WORKERS

Whose Victory Was It?

Mike Quill's finest hours came in the weeks just before his death--and in the view of many militants in the Transport Workers Union that isn't saying much. Mike's long-time friend Bob Wagner eulogized: "I think he was unique. He could have lead his men up the mountain and down again." Mostly Mike Quill led them down!

The Transport Workers Union Rank and File Committee charges Quill with fraud even to the end. The much touted 70-million dollar settlement turns out upon careful analysis to amount to at most a

gain of \$30 million. The union would have won \$65 million only if the increase had been granted at once rather than spread over two years. Transit workers will not do much more than keep up with the rising inflation.

Yet the recent thirteen-day bus and subway strike in New York City was by no means a defeat. This strike was a direct attack on the Johnson-administration's 3.2% wage guidelines policy. Lindsay was forced to agree to a settlement of 4% in the first year, 4% in the next six-month period and 7% in the last six-month period. A schism appeared between the long term interests of US capitalism represented by Labor Secretary Willard Witz and the immediate desperation of New York City businessmen defended by "liberal" Lindsay.

The power of the striking workers has been further testified by the action of the New York State Legislature, exempting the striking transit workers from penalties under the Condon-Wadlin Law. (Provisions under the law call for the suspension of pay raises for a three year period for any striking civil-service worker.)

One of the most important victories of the strike is the strengthening of the Rank and File Committee in the union, headed by Joe Carnegie. It was because of pressure by this group, which won 4000 out of 16000 votes in a pre-strike Local 100 election, and by rank and file militants throughout the union, that Quill was not able to make another one of his infamous eleventh-hour New Year's Eve contract deals. As a result of striking, the workers won at least 4 million dollars above the city's deadline offer; more important they won the experience of their own power and solidarity.

"Red Mike"

Mike Quill, the self-proclaimed radical labor leader, was a familiar face on New York television screens every two years, threatening that this time the TWU would strike, threatening that he would withdraw his support from friend Bob and organize a labor party, advocating free subways. But when the time finally came, when the TWU did come out on strike, Quill did little to counter the de-visive propaganda, isolating his union from the rest of the population.

The TWU leadership, led by Quill did not prepare the grounds for struggle. Without serious support from AFL-CIO brethren and with active hostility not only from businessmen but from large sections of the population who could not get to work and suffered a loss in pay, they lacked the social imagination to gird themselves in terms of real conflict. For that it was necessary to advance a program that would win the support of a decisive section of the cities working population. The Rank and File Committee proposed such a program, demanding that pay raises be financed not by the working people but out of real estate taxes and by a moratorium on subway bonds.

It is essential in the next period that real solidarity between the different civil-service unions and the teachers union be established. That these unions demand that any which they win not be paid out of the pockets of the poor. That they win the

support of all organized and unorganized workers throughout the city by struggling against unemployment and racial discrimination.

Fundamentally any strike by city employees is a political strike, a strike against the government. Striking against the City administration today means striking against "law and order", against Presidential "guidelines", against Democratic and Republican political machines. It means striking against the political, economic and educational mobilization for the Vietnam war--a war that demands domestic "sacrifice" and restraint.

The working people in New York City need a Labor Party -- not in the tradition of the old American Labor Party--but independent of Democrats as well as Republicans and based upon direct union affiliation. The Rank and File Committee has demonstrated its militancy during the recent strike. It has shown by its program that it is aware of the need to build a united front with the working community of New York City. The Committee can realize its program only through the struggle to organize such a Labor Party.

#

WILSON CALLS NEW GENERAL ELECTION IN BRITAIN

Aim is to Push Through Anti-Union Legislation in the Face of Mounting Working Class Opposition

By calling an election for March 31, Prime Minister Harold Wilson hopes to increase the Labor majority in Parliament by some 60 to 100 seats. Wilson's aim is clearly not to help the cause of the working man and woman in Britain but on the contrary to gain the margin of strength he and his colleagues feel is necessary to enact a reactionary program. This program is a Tory program which presently the Tories feel too weak to put through themselves. Hence, they are depending on their lackey 'labor lieutenants of capital' to discipline the working class in order to try to solve the balance of payments problem and modernize industry for the capitalists. The cornerstone of this reactionary program is the legislation against the trade unions and the right to strike as well as racist immigration laws and all out support to LBJ's Vietnam butchery.

Wilson hopes to take advantage of the confusion being spread in the working class by various 'left' forces in deceiving the workers as to the nature of this legislation. By calling an early election he hopes to increase his majority and enact a capitalist program before the rising working class opposition to this program becomes too strong.

In the forefront of this opposition are the Young Socialists and the Socialist Labor League. The February 26 issue of the NEWS-LETTER, weekly organ of the Socialist Labor League, reports the proposal of the SLL's Central Committee for a "national one-day strike which will bring tens of thousands of workers to Parliament after the Easter recess. (Make the voice of Labour heard and felt among Labour MPs).")

The proposal of the SLL Central Committee follows on the heels of one of the most important political demonstrations in the recent history of the British working class which took place on Jan. 26, 1966. Over 1500 trade unionists, students and young people, including members of the Socialist Labour League, the Young Socialists, and the Communist Party, lobbied against proposed anti-trade union legislation to be enacted by the Labor government.

The Lobby was called by the Lambeth Trades Council which, soon after the call, lost its recognition by the "official" Trades Union Congress. The only organizations to fully support the lobby were the Young Socialists and the Socialist Labour League. Despite efforts at sabotage by the Communist Party and assorted centrist groupings, thousands of workers indicated their support of the demonstration by electing representatives as lobbyists, so that the 1500 represented many thousands more. The demonstration became an embryonic united front embracing rank and file trade unionists and CP militants as well as the Trotskyist forces.

The participants in the lobby were able to see several Labor Members of Parliament. The response from these people was predictable. Most of them were either noncommittal or said they would vote for the proposed anti-trade union legislation. Many refused to see the lobbyists. MP Crashaw said, "It is necessary to have machinery to deal with wild-cat strikes." MP Ogden said, "There must be penalties for breaches of agreements."

At a meeting of the lobbyists, Vivienne Mendelson, chairman of the Lambeth Trades Council, said, "This campaign and demonstration today is the beginning of building a new leadership in the labor movement to lead the fight to defeat the legislation." The significance of the lobby lies in the fact that it was a mobilization of workers in opposition to a labor government which is doing the dirty work for the capitalists. This sets the lobby apart from earlier militant demonstrations several years ago which were called as a result of rank and file pressure but which the Labour Party bureaucrats felt obliged to "support." In this case the bureaucrats who have since become the government must openly oppose and attack militant demands of the workers.

The role that Wilson and Company is playing is similar to that played by trade union bureaucrats in this country when they sell out the workers' struggle for the sake of the system, instead of putting up a fight against the capitalists. The crisis of world capitalism is being reflected in a more acute way today in Britain than in other advanced capitalist countries. A situation is developing where the British capitalists can no longer afford the tactic of concessions and reforms which has in the past confined the class struggle (which continues even in the "best of times") to the trade union field. The ruling class must strengthen its position by reducing the real wages of the workers. Hence, the proposed "wage pause," and the threat to legislate against "wildcat" strikes. The capitalists can no longer simply count on a little help from the trade union bureaucrats in pushing over a wage pause. They have to have some means of enforcing the wage pause if the workers refuse to accept it, reject their "leaders" advice, and go out on unofficial

strike action. This is the meaning of the proposed legislation against the trade unions.

Whose Government Is It?

The Labor government is being used by the capitalists to carry out their offensive against the workers. The Labor government is being used as a direct tool of the imperialists, not only with regard to Vietnam but right at home, and this role is becoming more and more blatant every day. The capitalists would prefer "convincing" the workers by using the services of the reformist leadership. Their hope is that the workers will accept, even if with a little grumbling, unpopular measures which are enacted by their government and not the Tories. The Labor leaders thus play a very specific function of attempting to distract the attention of the working class from the very real measures to reduce their wages and standard of living.

It is clear that the situation in the very center of world imperialism is not so very different from the situation of more vulnerable Britain. Here too the pressure on the capitalists is shown in Johnson's "wage-price guidelines" (while corporate profits rose some 20% in 1965!), in the furor over the determined strike action of the New York City transit workers, and in Johnson's State of the Union hint of federal legislation to bar "disastrous" strikes.

The nature of the Labour Party as an instrument of the capitalist class in times of crisis must be clearly understood. While the capitalist class can continue to give reforms, the workers will fight on the trade-union-reformist plane. When the bourgeoisie is not in a position to be so generous the workers in their continuing struggle for reforms are impelled onto the path of political struggle. The reformist workers party will be used by the capitalists in times such as these and the working class will have to politically confront their own bureaucratic leadership.

What is significant here is that the revolutionists of the Socialist Labour League and the Young Socialists have been building an alternative revolutionary leadership. While the Pabloites and other assorted centrists have sneered and tried to sabotage their work at every opportunity, they have been participating in all of the struggles of the working class and now they are beginning to provide leadership to the more conscious workers who are being pushed into the political road by the capitalist crisis itself.

Several possible outcomes are possible for the developing crisis. The ruling class could solve its problems by overcoming workingclass resistance and defeating the working class. The working class can with revolutionary leadership, wage a successful struggle against the capitalists and their agents culminating in workers' power. Or neither side could impose a solution and the economy could collapse, inconjunction with developments on a world scale, of course. This also would be a crushing blow to the working class from which it would take a certain amount of time to recover. None of these outcomes are inevitable. The task of the revolutionaries is to build a party and lead the working class in struggle so that the capitalists will be unable to impose their solution and the workers

will prevent a complete economic collapse by replacing the capitalist economy by a planned economy with workers control. It is towards this that the British Trotskyist movement is taking such great strides; the successful London lobby represents one preparatory step in the struggle.

#

"INDEPENDENT" POLITICS IN CHICAGO

A New Pop Front Party

Forces genuinely desiring to build an independent workingclass party were stymied at the Jan. 15 conference held by the Chicago Committee for Independent Political Action (CIPA). The overwhelming number of "independent" Democrats, liberal do-gooders and old line "progressive" who showed up dominated the conference. A person who had been around the Chicago civil-rights movement for the past few years couldn't help but notice how few of the long-time activists, persons who had seen the Democratic Party in action, were present at the conference. Last summer's fruitless civil-rights struggle culminating in a quickly smashed riot in Chicago's West Side Ghetto accounts for some demoralization in the movement, but this by no means explains away the poor attendance at the CIPA conference by militants. The feeling of identification so necessary for the participation of the hundreds of Negro and white civil-rights workers in the CIPA conference was lacking. The call for the CIPA conference proposed running candidates in the Democratic Party primaries. Affixed to the call were the names of such sinister figures as Dick Gregory, who after calling upon Negro workers to go home and in effect peacefully submit to Gestapo terror during the Watts riot was shot in the leg by a resident of that Ghetto.

The few militants who got up early on a Saturday morning to attend the CIPA conference, heard, one after another, boring speeches by "progressive" community leaders (persons who were rarely if ever seen on the picket lines of the past summer. These militants expressed the mood of their absent brothers in discussion on the floor and in Congressional District meetings. Even though the politics presented by the civil-rights militants were confused, the great majority opposed coalition politics. In the morning session one local civil-rights worker after another took the floor to explain the necessity of "going into the streets", "opposing the power structure", and "massive civil disobedience". When the militants spoke two things became obvious: a turn towards blind activism, reflecting a feeling of demoralization and frustration with liberal politics, a desire to break from consensus politics, without seeing a clear "political" alternative.

UW
In an attempt to give voice and direction to this mood among the militants a paper was presented at the conference, "Towards a Freedom-Labor Party." The fight by this small cross section of the advanced workingclass for workingclass politics (in an organization whose leadership is bent upon making a sellout to the Democratic Party) is of crucial importance to the civil-rights movement.

In the wake of the riots on Chicago's West Side it has become clear that the crisis in the movement is in leadership and program. For the first time a leadership with the main elements of the necessary program has arisen. The prospect of tying up the combativity of Chicago's Ghetto masses with meaningful class struggle becomes, now, that much less remote.

#

MILITANT STAFF WRITER JOINS PEACE MOVEMENT AND FINDS GOD

The following are excerpts from a leaflet distributed in February at a Times Square (New York City) demonstration. While the leaflet is filled with the commonplace cliches to be expected in this sort of mush-headed, pacifist leaflet, it distinguishes itself in two ways: it is more religious than most, and secondly, the list of signers includes the name of Fred Halstead, staff writer of the "Trotskyist" paper The Militant.

"MR. PRESIDENT:
In the Name of God, STOP IT!

Pope Paul and U Thant had urged Johnson not to resume bombing. Both have openly condemned the resumption of bombing. Over 100 members of Congress urged the bombing "pause" to be continued. Mayor John Lindsay called for diplomacy instead of bombing. The President and his advisors - Dean Rusk and Robert McNamara - scorned these appeals from religious and political leaders. The bombing of North Vietnam has been resumed ..."

"WHO WON'T NEGOTIATE?"

Johnson blames Hanoi because it won't negotiate. But we are fighting the National Liberation Front (vietcong) in South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese support the National Liberation Front but they do not control them and they cannot negotiate for them. If Johnson wants to end the war by negotiation, he must negotiate with those we are fighting - the National Liberation Front. ...

"The newspapers report that half a million Americans will be in Vietnam before the end of this year. ... U.S. troops will be killing thousands of Vietnamese, including women and children, who want all foreign troops to leave Vietnam.

Stop this killing and bloodshed now. Stop the bombing of North Vietnam. Recognize the National Liberation Front in peace negotiations. Withdraw American military forces now."

* * *

JUST ARRIVED FROM ENGLAND

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL -A Journal of International Marxism
Vol. 3 number 1

Contents Include

Trade Unions at the Crossroads- EDITORIAL

Imperialism and the Liquidity Crisis by Peter Jeffries

Marxist Political Economy and the 'Socialist World'
by Michel Varga

The Fight for Marxism-- Two speeches and an article
by Leon Trotsky

DOCUMENTS

Trotskyism in the United States
Statement on Vietnam

BOOKS

'The New Economics'
by Eugene Preobrazhensky

48 pages, illus., price 50¢

Still Available:-- FOURTH INTERNATIONAL Vol 2 #1 Summer 1965
featuring articles and documents on Algeria and Vietnam;
the Fourth International in the Socialist Workers Party

52 pages, illus., price 50¢

ORDER FROM

Bulletin of International Socialism, 339 Lafayette St.
New York, N.Y. 10012 make checks payable to Bulletin

_____ copies FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, Vol. 3 #1 (current issue)

_____ copies FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, Vol. 2 #1

_____ BLACK NATIONAL ISM and MARXIST THEORY @ 20¢

_____ 1 year sub to the BULLETIN @ \$2.00 _____ 10 issue sub @ 50¢

Name (please print)

Street and Number

City State Zip