

Tri-Partite-- Labor Peace Through Union Busting

Bulletin

OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

Vol. 2, No. 31

June 6, 1966

10 Cents

**End Student
Deferments!**

End the Draft!

End the War!

Independent Political Action



**THE UNIONS
THE PEACE MOVEMENT
THE NEGRO MOVEMENT**

Tri-Partite--Labor Peace Through Union Busting

Bulletin

OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

Vol. 2, No. 31

June 6, 1966

10 Cents

**End Student
Deferments!**

End the Draft!

End the War!

Independent Political Action



**THE UNIONS
THE PEACE MOVEMENT
THE NEGRO MOVEMENT**

END STUDENT DEFERMENT. END THE DRAFT! END THE WAR!

The recent draft deferment tests given to hundreds of thousands of college students across the country have produced renewed antiwar protests, this time centering on the campuses themselves instead of in Washington and the major cities. At the same time as the right wing of the movement mobilized about 8-10,000 people in Washington for the so-called Voters Pledge march, many thousands of college students were demonstrating against the war on their campuses. Whatever their confusion and limitations, these student demonstrators were at least interested in the causes of the Vietnam war and in wanting to really fight the war. The moderates were devoting their energies to presenting a "reasonable" line to the imperialists and to supporting the various liberals who have voiced some questions or criticism of Johnson's foreign policy. Militants were right to refuse to support this action, which simply leads the protests right back into support for the very same system which breeds crisis and war and will inevitably breed new Vietnams and even worse unless it is fought and defeated. The relative smallness of the moderates' march is simply a reflection of the continuing student ferment and militancy, which cannot be contained so easily within "respectable" forms as previously.

To break with the right wing of the movement is not narrowing the movement, because if the right wing is removed as an obstacle, a broader and at the same time more militant class opposition to the war can be built. This is the big question facing the antiwar movement. It is not simply a matter of breaking from the right wing and its conceptions of compromise, neutralization of Vietnam, UN intervention, and other attempts at a "solution" through containment of the Vietnamese revolution. Sympathy and support for the revolution is very important, but will mean very little unless the fight is brought into the broadest layers of the population, and particularly into the existing mass movement of both the working class as a whole and the Negro people.

Opposition to Deferment -- The Beginning of a Program

A class program is needed and the recent campus demonstrations were very important with respect to this program, as the article from C.C.N.Y. in this issue indicates. For the first time clear demands in the interests of the working class youth as well as the students themselves have been raised. At least a section and perhaps a majority, of the sit-in demonstrators at the University of Chicago, for instance, were for the abolition of all college draft deferments on the grounds, as reported by the NY Times, "that it is unfair specifically to poor, uneducated Negroes" and "those who cannot go to college". The students coupled this demand for an end to all student deferments to demands for the abolition of the draft itself and for university non-cooperation with the selective service system. Similar demands were raised on many campuses elsewhere.

This represents at least a beginning, a groping in the direction of a class approach. A serious struggle can unite the student protests with the growing but still embryonic dissatisfaction of the Negro and white workers. In their attempts in this direction, however, tentative at this point, the students are confirming the Marxist analysis of the need for a class approach to the antiwar struggle.

Adam Clayton Powell's statement attacking the draft and the war is also important, not because he is serious about his opposition but because he is, in his own interests, at least partly sensitive to the pressures and moods of the Negro masses. Thus in a distorted way he reflects growing dissatisfaction with the war.

There is nothing the ruling class would rather see, once it is faced with student and workingclass uneasiness in the growing war crisis, and must contend with this unrest, than division between these forces, the Negroes, white workers, and students. That is why the students, who are the first stratum to come into serious opposition, must go to the working class movement wherever it exists, in the trade unions, the Negro movement, and the neighborhoods, and seek to forge a common program.

The students must answer the charge of the ultra-right that they are cowards, as absurd as it may seem, many of them having already spent time in jail in the civil rights struggle. They must answer this charge, nevertheless, because workers listen to such charges and are disoriented by them. But what will these workers think if the students make it absolutely clear that they are not interested in a personal solution or in special class privileges, and that they are ready to stand the same risks as the young workers in relation to the war? Together the workingclass and student youth can fight against the draft and the war. End student deferments! End the draft! End the war! These must be the slogans of the antiwar movement, taken into the streets, shops, factories, and trade unions.

On to the Economic Issues

This is just the beginning of a program. We must go on to denounce Johnson's wage guidelines. The students must solidarize completely with the workers in their fight against the growing inflation, higher taxes and the 3.2% guidelines, all of which together are resulting or threatening to result in a decline in the standard of living and real wages of the workers. End the wage guidelines! No war, no guidelines, no new taxes! These must be major slogans of the antiwar movement. Militants should fight for the adoption of these slogans, against anti-workingclass and right wing elements who will attack them. Similarly the antiwar movement must seek to connect up more and more with the Negro movement, North and South. The movement must concretely aid, on the picket lines and wherever else necessary, any important labor and civil rights struggles which arise, and must relate these struggles to the war which is affecting all of them in ways that must be explained and exposed. It must reject the arguments, put forward even by some "radicals", who say that these issues are not or should not be interrelated.

The job of developing a full transitional program for the antiwar struggle is still before us. Meanwhile there is inevitably a great deal of confusion both inside the movement and out. Paul Booth, National Secretary of SDS, has said that the current campus campaign includes opposition to class ranking for deferment purposes, to the draft deferment test and to any student deferment as well as to the war itself. This remains an amalgamation which is not solidified on a clear political stand. Those who simply want a personal 'out' and don't care about the war or who dies in it as long as it isn't them, may join along with those who want to fight the war and are beginning to see that a class program is necessary for the fight. Broadest common action against the war is necessary and to be welcomed, but it must be on a principled political basis. The personal solutions must flow from collective action by all whose interests are fundamentally the same as those of the workers and peasants of Vietnam.

DRAFT DEFERMENT STRUGGLE SHAKES UP CCNY

For more than a decade, issue after issue, from civil rights to free tuition, has failed to arouse more than a handful of already convinced radicals at CCNY. The war in Vietnam and the draft, which threaten the very lives of the students, have forced even the normally apathetic student to make up his mind on these questions, one way or the other.

On May 13, some 250 students occupied for 24 hours the college's Administration Building. They demanded that a student-faculty referendum be held, after a 30 day discussion period, to determine whether the College should comply with the draft procedures. An Administration representative offered a "compromise" to the students: a referendum, drawn up by a student-faculty committee, which would not be binding, and which the Administration could blithely ignore. The participants in the sit-in rejected this proposal, saying that as the ones who were being asked to give up their lives, the students should have the say.

At a subsequent meeting called by the Sit-in Committee, the decisive issue emerged, despite considerable organizational and procedural wrangling. The question posed is: Who runs the University--the students and the faculty, or the Administration? The President of CCNY, Buell Gallagher, addressed the students with the condescending, patronizing attitude of a Patient Martyr, Superior in Understanding. One might think that a college president who had for years posed as a liberal, after having carefully scrutinized the Berkeley events last year, and being confronted with similar events on his own campus, would offer a few clever concessions to soften up and divide the students. Quite the contrary: he offered nothing, and was insulting as well. Quite understandably, his cliché-ridden gems were received with derision. Anyone who had any lingering doubts that Gallagher is anything but a fink should have had them dispelled by this speech, to say nothing of the fact that he sat on the platform of a pro-war rally the previous week.

Students Force Faculty to Act

An important outcome of the sit-in was that a number of faculty members were convinced by this action of the correctness of the student's demand for a referendum, and prevailed upon President Gallagher to call a meeting of the entire faculty to discuss the question. Such a meeting is a rare event indeed; several faculty members themselves stated that they had been spurred into action by the sit-in.

The faculty meeting was a disappointment to many of the students. For one thing, only about 350 teachers out of 800 were present. For another, of the five resolutions before the meeting to oppose the draft procedures, the only one that was passed by a large majority was the one which stated opposition to the use of academic standing to determine draft status, and called for a separation of the college from the administration of draft procedures. While a large majority was quite willing to voice their opposition to the draft procedures in this abstract manner, far fewer faculty members were willing to do anything concretely to implement their views. The resolution urging that the College refuse to allow its facilities to be used to administer the draft test was easily defeated. The most crucial resolution, which stated that the academic standing of students would not be released to the Selective Service until a binding student-faculty referendum should be held, was referred to a mail vote because the hall in which the meeting was held had to be vacated at a certain time.

Encouraging for the Future

Actually, however, recent events at CCNY have been quite encouraging. Of course, the large majority of students are inactive. Of course, a significant minority of students and faculty are actually in favor of the war. But for each one of the 250 students who took part in the sit-in, there are dozens more who support their cause. Most important, two issues (in addition to the war itself) are becoming the center of controversy: 1) Who is to make decisions at the university? and 2) How can the inequities of the draft be ended?

Among both students and faculty, a surprising number of people have raised the issue of the discriminatory nature of student deferments, and have called for their end. This is surprising because it is against their immediate self-interest. There is growing recognition that it is the working class -- particularly the black, the Puerto Ricans, the unemployed -- those who can't afford the privilege of going to college who are the ones to bear the brunt of the fighting and the dying in Vietnam. This is encouraging, for as little as a year ago it was only revolutionists who called for an end to student deferments.

While it is true that some of those who oppose the College's involvement in the Government's draft policy do so because they wish to maintain the ivory-tower purity of the college (which in any case has always been and still is a myth) or because they favor a "more equitable" means of meeting the country's military needs, it is obvious from listening to the discussions at student and faculty meetings that the majority are totally opposed to the war, and to

drafting anyone for it at all. Why don't those who are for the war offer to do the fighting? We haven't seen any stampede to leave school and sign up with Uncle Sam.

This student protest is still, at CCNY, in an incipient stage: unclear as to aims and tactics, without an effective leadership. However it is unlike previous protests, and it will grow.

INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION

The Unions * The Peace Movement * The Negro Movement

The concept of independent political action is gaining acceptance among militants in the Negro movement, the peace movement and the trade union movement. Last month militants around Stokely Carmichael took over the leadership of SNCC. These militants are pledged to the development of a political party completely outside the Democratic or Republican Parties in the South. Robert Scheer is running as "peace candidate" within the Democratic primary in Berkeley, California. While this campaign lacks the clear break from the Democratic Party that SNCC is making, it is significant as an expression of the desire of militants in the peace movement to seek a political solution to the problems created by the Vietnam War. At the recent UAW Convention Walter Reuther made a special point of denouncing a delegate, Art Fox of Local 600, for raising the concept of a labor party. Reuther obviously felt that the labor movement's failures to get any pro-labor legislation from Johnson might give credence to Fox's position.

Viewed in isolation each of these efforts appears weak, confused, distinct and different from each other effort. But when viewed together we can see the beginning of something new, of something with the potential of transforming this country from top to bottom.

In fact one of the central tasks we will face before we can build a serious political alternative to the two parties of big business is precisely to break down this isolation, the separation of the Negro movement, the labor movement, the peace movement, each from each other. For that we will need a program and it is to this question that we will now address ourselves.

The Scheer Campaign

The beginning of developing a program for independent political action--and it is only a beginning--is to make a clear break with the Democratic Party. The Scheer campaign is a case in point. Scheer insists on running within the Democratic primary. But he maintains that this is just a "tactical" matter and in the course of his primary campaign he will "attack" the Democratic Party. Needless to say once his campaigning began in earnest he more and more softened his criticisms of the Democratic Party.

This is no mere matter of a good tactic carried out badly.

It is rather inherent in the tactic itself. If we begin with the understanding that the Democratic Party is the main instrument of oppression of the people here at home as well as of the masses in Vietnam, then how is it possible for us to explain to anyone that they should continue to participate in the political life of this party? Clearly our central task must be to expose the Democratic Party, to oppose the Democratic Party, to seek to destroy the Democratic Party. We seek at every moment its defeat--we celebrate when it loses an election and we mourn when it wins.

This is not Scheer's position. For all his talk of criticisms of the Democratic Party, his central orientation is still towards this party. This is but a reflection politically of his strategic orientation towards the class this party represents (oh, how these new lefters dislike this clear, sharp, precise, and yes, scientific term). To Scheer the whole anti-Vietnam movement is but a method of pressurizing the capitalist leaders. We are to petition these people, beg these people to be "democratic" and "peaceful". But under no circumstance are we to declare our intentions to oust these people, to replace them with the leadership of another class.

Not having really broken from the American ruling class Scheer seeks to contain his struggle within the leading party of this class. His orientation is to castrate the movement by taming it, containing it within capitalist party politics.

Black Panther Party

The development of the independent Black Panther Party in Lowndes County, Alabama and the recent endorsement of this kind of political action by the new leadership of SNCC represents an important step in the right direction. SNCC by breaking with the conciliatory politics of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party--that is seeking to function within the Democratic Party--has gone considerably beyond Scheer and his supporters. SNCC has learned through its own struggles that the Democratic Party both locally and nationally acts so support the oppression of the Negro people in the South. It realizes that this oppression cannot be overcome by the King school of publicity stunts and hat in hand begging at the steps of the White House. Only through the independent struggle of the Negro mass can progress be made. The Black Panther Party is a reflection of the political scene of this understanding.

Stokely Carmichael, in an interview in the May 23rd Militant, expresses clearly the goals of the Black Panther Party when he states: "We're going to take power in Lowndes county and rule. We don't even want to integrate. We want power, pure undaunted political power." Later on he amplifies on this point: "We're not a protest movement. We're out to take power legally, but if we're stopped by the government from doing it legally, we're going to take it the way everyone else took it, including the way the Americans took it in the American Revolution."

The problem is that once power is taken what is to be done with it? Without a clear idea of the use to which this power is to be put it will be difficult to get the power to begin with and

impossible to hold it. Carmichael has a general idea of what he would like to do with this power. His idea is to tax the wealthy, specifically the biggest company in the county, Dan River Mills, and use the money to better the conditions of the Negro poor in the county.

This is certainly the beginning of a program which has at least in embryo a class approach--the rich, specifically the largest corporations who amass great profits at the expense of the workers must be made to pay for the eradication of economic inequality in the United States. This issue can be directly related to the question of the Vietnam war. Who should be made to foot the bill for this war--the rich who run the government or the working class who are being forced not only to pay for the war but to fight it for the capitalists? At present the cost of the war is being shifted to the back of the working class--black and white--by means of inflation while the capitalists get richer and richer off of war profits.

But Carmichael has only the beginnings of a program and the beginnings of a movement. This he clearly recognizes. He is well aware inequality cannot be eradicated in one county. His objective: "a national alternative, when Negroes will be organized independently, neither Republican nor Democrat."

It is precisely when Carmichael's program is projected on to a national scale--as it must be--that its weaknesses show up. Carmichael starts at the right place when he struggles for "power, pure unadulterated political power". He has learned the hard way what the working class as a whole must learn--that without real political power, without running the state ourselves, without this there will be no real freedom, no real equality, no real peace.

It may seem possible in an isolated Southern rural county, which is 80 per cent Negro, for the Negro to strive for such power on their own. But how can 11 per cent of the population--even if it could possibly function cohesively, remain impervious to class differentiation--think seriously in terms of power, yes, of domination of the state itself? But if this is not the objective then all one really has is a political "protest movement", black Bob Scheers seeking to pressurize the oppressor into utilizing more enlightened methods of oppression.

Carmichael recognizes this when he states "at the state and federal level things get confused and you have to make too many compromises." But this is where the real power in this country is--not in an isolated rural southern county.

We have got to build a national political movement in the United States capable of taking power away from the Dan River Mills of the nation, eradicating both racial and economic inequality, ending bloody wars of imperialist domination. Such a movement cannot be constructed on racial lines. It can only be constructed on class lines. There can be no ducking this issue. Each independent political struggle must be viewed within this framework--as the beginnings of a movement which must lead to the formation of a party of the American working class. Developments like the Black Panther Party can play a

great role in this process for at least some of the militants involved have confronted the question of power and are seriously striving for power. But this will be the case only if the militants recognize the relationship between the racial struggle and the class struggle, racial oppression and class oppression.

The whole experience within the Negro movement over the last decade makes it clear that there is no such thing as a homogeneous Negro people. There exists a small but important Negro bourgeoisie and a rather sizable Negro petty bourgeoisie. These social classes have been at the roots of both the opportunist tendencies towards compromise with the oppressor--the Kings-- and also of separatism. Perhaps some black militants sincerely believe it is better to be exploited by a black man or beaten up by a black cop or sold out by a black leader. But is this really what the Negro masses are fighting for--black oppression, black brutality, black dishonesty? We don't think so.

The Trade Union Movement

The trade union movement is a great force in the United States. Contrary to the rationalizing of many who call themselves socialists, it is a force the rulers of this country must seriously reckon with. Certainly the Lindsay Administration in New York City knows of what we speak. Lindsay took office in the middle of the subway strike. Soon followed the printers strike which still continues. Then came a taxi strike, an airport bus strike, a threatened hospital nurses strike, an actual public health nurse strike. Contracts with 100,000 city employees come due shortly and the teachers are talking of striking in the Fall.

While the situation in New York City is more severe than elsewhere, strikes have been occurring more frequently and have lasted longer once held. The central factor behind most of these strikes is precisely this question of who is to pay the bills for the Vietnam war, and who will foot the costs of maintaining the general wealth and strength of the capitalists as part of a crisis ridden world system. Taxes and high prices are eating away at the workers pay checks. Automation is forcing workers out of work. Those sections of the working class left out of the general prosperity of the country as the Negro and minority peoples in general, specifically the agricultural workers, the teachers, the hospital workers, etc.-- are demanding their fair share.

This is the general background within which the UAW held its recent convention. The situation of the working class as a whole has deteriorated when compared to that of the opulent capitalists. Some sections of the workers have felt this with greater intensity than others. The Johnson Administration has been developing warmer and warmer relations with business and cooler and cooler relations with the trade union movement. Johnson has been unwilling to utilize his considerable influence to pass a single piece of labor legislation.

So when Art Fox, who has been known in the UAW for many years as an advocate of a labor party, presented this idea on the convention floor it could not be ignored. Reuther had to utilize his

prestige to attack someone who in a different context would have been ignored. The New York Times felt this attack was worthy of front page coverage -- a sign it did not share the view of many socialists that a labor party in America is some wild outlandish idea.

The real need today is for socialists to take up the idea of a mass party of the working class and to fight for it. We should explain this idea to our brothers who are fighting for freedom in the South. We should counterpose the struggle for a class party with the capitalist politics of the Scheers in the peace movement. Above all we must understand that Stokely Carmichael is right when he talks in terms of going beyond "protest movements" to the struggle for "power, unadulterated political power."

Without power the Vietnam war will be followed by another, bloodier war. Without power the Negro will remain in chains, allowed only to dissipate his revolutionary energy in leaderless and aimless rioting. Without power the capitalists will go on getting richer and richer while the paychecks of the workers -- and their security to get a paycheck next week -- will get smaller and smaller. Without power the tenements will rot as will the people in them, the schools will deteriorate, the country will decay.

The only real power is class power. We suffer under the power of the capitalist class. This must be destroyed and replaced with the power of the workingclass tomorrow -- the power of the vast majority of the people. This is the only really serious struggle there is -- and it is about time we applied our full energies to it.

LABOR PEACE THROUGH UNION BUSTING

Tri-partite and the S.S.E.U.

The Lindsay goon squad has announced its intention of presenting the city council with its newest weapon against labor: Tri-Partite. In a disgusting show of company unionism and scab politics, the leaders of District Council 37 have collaborated with Lindsay to produce a vicious anti-labor package designed to trample tens of thousands of New York city employees into the ground. Tri-Partite says, "Underlying the parties' agreement on this Memorandum is their commitment to the philosophy and practice of peaceful settlements of disputes in order to prevent strikes or other interruptions of service. The procedures set forth herein are designed to accomplish this result." Now what does this mean? It means that such a philosophy of labor flourishes best in the graveyards of militant unions tended by cooperative company unions. Every sentence, every word, every punctuation mark of the Tri-Partite report is an insult thrown in the face of labor. This report is the first step in a plot to place all city employees at the mercy of the labor smashing machine headed by Lindsay.

Although Tri-Partite applies to 180,000 city workers, the 90,000 covered by the Career and Salary Plan are most vulnerable.

The Career and Salary Plan sets uniform rules for wages, increments, vacations, sick leave and overtime. The inequities of this plan were a major cause of the January 1965 Welfare Dept. strike. All city workers are opposed to this plan. The firemen, policemen and sanitation workers are not now covered by Career and Salary as they were powerful enough to break free of it.

A Labor Bureaucrat's Feast

Under Tri-Partite, Career and Salary Plan is not negotiable, all workers must conform no matter what agency they are in. Bargaining rights belong to the union which represents 50% of the workers, in this case, D.C. 37. Thus the scab leadership which originally agreed to Career and Salary Plan, which agreed to reduction in sick leave and vacation time, and which did not even consult its own membership on Tri-Partite, will gobble up the smaller unions such as the SSEU. Of course this tempting morsel is not for free. D.C. 37 agrees that, "It is the right of the city, acting through its agencies, to determine standards of services to be offered by its agencies...standards for selection for employment...release its employees from duty because of lack of work or for other legitimate reasons, determine the methods, means and personnel by which government operations are to be conducted, determine the content of job classification, and exercise complete control and discretion over its organization and technology of performing its work. The city's decisions on these matters are not within the scope of collective bargaining..." If this list of horrors is not enough, Tri-Partite sets up an Office of Collective Bargaining which will give little or no voice to smaller unions and a host of provisions to enforce compulsory arbitration. It is no accident that Rockefeller in Albany simultaneously presents proposals to smash any union of state or municipal employees which dares to strike.

New York City - The Lindsay Sweatshop

The implications are clear, very clear. Faced with a deepening financial crisis and more and more labor unrest, Lindsay is going to try to force the working people of New York City to bail him out. A cut in Lindsay's budget or tax proposals will give him just the excuse he needs. "My hands are tied", he will say, "I have no choice." Tri-Partite can be used to dictate sweatshop policies of job freezes, wage freezes, speed-up and layoffs. No city worker will be safe! Department of Welfare employees may be offered the chance to sign Commissioner Ginsberg's new affidavits themselves. Tri-Partite is only the beginning, The teachers and the transit workers are next.

Tri-Partite must also be seen as a reflection of the crisis of the national economy. It is directly linked to the Johnson effort to freeze wages, and preserve growing war profits. 3.2% for labor, no limits on the Consolidated Bomb Co! New York City workers can only depend on their own strength and unity. They cannot depend on the labor fakers who negotiated sweetheart contracts for the TWU for so many years and then desperately held down and isolated a strike they could no longer prevent. They cannot depend on fakers who throw the solution of the taxi dispute into

Lindsay's lap and they cannot depend on the criminals that support the Tri-Partite. They want the same sweetheart deal with Lindsay that they got from Wagner.

The SSEU has led the struggle against Tri-Partite. The SSEU knows what Tri-Partite means-- it means death to the union. But the leadership of SSEU wants to both broaden the fight and escape isolation and at the same time to keep the situation from getting out of their control. When Tri-Partite was first announced, the SSEU leadership mobilized its membership to picket DC 37 headquarters. Meetings were held at all Welfare centers to explain the sellout to the membership and to plan action. A start was made at reaching local 371 clerks- and mobilizing them to fight their sellout leadership. But in the middle of beginning to fight, the leadership seemed to run out of ideas and allowed the issue to cool down. No more leaflets were distributed and the rank and file was allowed to think that the crisis had passed. This was such a great let down that when a membership meeting was called less than 100 members appeared This is a union of almost 5,000.

United Front Against Tri-Partite

This is not to say that the leadership ceased its opposition to Tri-Partite. They simply have begun to operate in isolation from their rank and file. This process must stop. Preparations are being made for a mass rally at City Hall to protest Tri-Partite when it comes before the City Council on June 1st. The SSEU is calling for trade union, community and political support. A loose coalition of city unions representing about 30,000 employees has been formed to fight Tri-Partite. There is support from the communications workers and the teamsters. The sanitation workers have offered some vocal support. This coalition is vital but it is tied together with a shoestring of immediate struggle, not on a basis of agreement for a long term fight. This agreement comes from the leadership, the rank and file still remains isolated in the fight for its own survival

What this call for political support has meant is speakers to the Reform Democratic Club, letters to city councilmen, requests to work for reform candidates and the endorsement of the SSEU Vice President Tededino's reform democratic candidacy for state assembly.

Community groups have been contacted through letters and a few representatives, but the union has insisted that it is opposed to organizing clients. No attempts have been made to mobilize the rank and file to gain support.

In short, then, the whole struggle has been conducted on a leadership to leadership basis. In the middle of a crisis when everything demands reaching out for mass support, everything has stopped just short of this. In a situation in which the militancy, awareness and participation of the membership is essential, the leadership has chosen to ignore its rank and file.

Nevertheless, the Mage leadership has moved in the correct path in calling for a united front against Tri-Partite. This must be supported. Committees must be set up in every welfare center to discuss the issues, plan action, coordinate information and to help

bring 371 clerks into the struggle. The membership must be mobilized and provided with leaflets to take to the community. For this struggle the support of labor unions, community groups and clients is necessary. Everyone is in danger, everyone is threatened.

A Program to Unite Labor

The events of the past few years have proven the militancy of the NY city employees. The teachers, the TWU, and now the nurses have demonstrated their potential. It is this independence and militancy which Lindsay and the labor bureaucrats fear. The SSEU can play a significant role in deepening the struggle by developing and fighting for a program to unite the labor movement.

It is not enough to simply call for support against Tri-Partite. When other unions are threatened the SSEU must be in the forefront of those calling for support. There should have been union-wide efforts to mobilize support for the TWU when it was on strike, and similar efforts behind the nurses in their fight with the city. Let the SSEU be known for its constant efforts to build a united front against the bosses. The SSEU support for the Chicago strike is a beginning.

In a period when the living standards of all workers are being threatened by inflation and rising taxes and subway fares, the SSEU must stand for the defense of living standards against the bosses. Demand a cost of living increase not only for the unions but also for the unemployed and those on welfare. Let the rent gangsters, the stock market barons, the real estate interests and the bosses pay, not the workers.

The Democrats and Republicans have offered nothing but taxes, inflation, slums, draft calls, bigger jails and rising relief rolls. They are responsible. It is an illusion to think that simple reforms of paper work and calls for professionalism will solve the problem of the welfare worker. The welfare bureaucracy is insane and irrational only in so far as it reflects the insanity and irrationality of the system of which it is an essential part. The welfare worker can either solidarize with his clients or he can act as a policeman for the city.

Democrat Wagner threw the SSEU leadership in jail and Republican Lindsay did the same to the TWU. By actions such as these the true nature of these parties is revealed. The Tri-Partite crisis once again demonstrates that labor has no friends in government now, because it has no independent political organization to serve itself.

The need for a party owing allegiance only to labor becomes more and more obvious. The SSEU has the resources and organization to play a significant role in the struggle for such a party. Only a labor party can defeat the bigger Tri-Partites to come.

ALL OUT FOR THE MASS RALLY AT CITY HALL JUNE 1ST

A UNITED FRONT TO SMASH TRI-PARTITE

LABOR SCOPE

Flurry of Strikes Hits New York City

In the lingering shadow of New York's momentous transit strike of last January, the city has again been hit by a series of walkouts. Indeed, at one point during the last month it seemed almost as if a new picket line was springing up everywhere one might turn. The newly formed New York World Journal Tribune (a merger of three New York papers) was strikebound before it could even get off the ground and has yet to appear. It should come as no surprise that the basic issue underlying this strike is the question of which and how many workers are going to lose their jobs in the most recent episode of the "progress" of the New York newspaper industry.

For the second time in less than a year, New York's 23,000 fleet taxicab drivers were on strike, this time for 6 days. The Carey Transportation Company which has the franchise for operating the buses servicing New York's airports is still shut down by a mechanics' strike. The Long Island Railroad was hit by a one day strike as a protest against the disciplining of trainmen who were allegedly drinking beer during lunch hour in violation of "company regulations." With appropriate irony, but in all seriousness, an official of the railroad brotherhood personally delivered notification of the strike to the president of the Company who was wining and dining along with his fellow executives at a banquet in a plush New York hotel, quite clearly and openly in violation of said Company Regulation.

Finally, as we go to press it has just been announced that there has been a contract settlement with the City's public health nurses who, like their sister municipal hospital nurses one week earlier, had "tendered their resignations" en masse. The Public Health nurses apparently won their demand for parity with the municipal hospital nurses whose minimum wage increases from \$5150 annually to \$6050 retroactive to last Jan. 1 with another \$350 increase on Jan. 1, 1967.

Both the nurses action and the taxi strike continue the pattern of recent years of militancy of workers in New York who are not industrial workers. We can also include in this pattern the strikes by the Hospital Workers (if we want to go back that far), the Teachers, District 65, welfare workers, transit workers as the major actions of this pattern along with the taxi and nurses strikes. What is common to all these actions is that they have involved workers who are either weakly organized or completely unorganized in a union before and in some cases after striking. With the notable exception of the transit strike, the strikes mentioned are to some degree concerned with union recognition, strengthening the status of the union as bargaining agent, or organizing the unorganized as in the case of District 65.

On the surface, the pattern is one of militant action by workers who are either trying to break out of the status of "unorganized", who work for the city, or both. But behind the recent strikes beginning with the transit strike, if not earlier, is the emergence of a mood of militancy and struggle in response to rising prices, increased taxation and a definitely tougher attitude by employers and espec-

ially by public "employers" like New York City. (See article in this issue on the SSEU.)

Capitalist Strategy

The strikes of city workers as in the case of transit and the nurses are most directly political, but strikes such as the taxi strike soon reveal that the city government is quite concerned with strikes against private employers which concern the "vital public interest" just as Johnson and the US government is concerned with steel strikes, longshore strikes, etc. At this stage, the tactic of the bourgeois state as represented either by Johnson or by Lindsay is to subordinate the unions to the State by collaboration with the bureaucratic leaderships of the unions. It is therefore necessary for Lindsay to make a deal with Harry Van Arsdale in the settlement of the taxi strike. This "relationship" which Lindsay developed with Van Arsdale, who is unofficial leader of the taxi union as President of the New York Central Labor Council, is not simply to settle the cab strike, but even more important, to try to get Van Arsdale in his hip pocket in order to obtain his service in controlling the possible thousands of city employee who may go on strike after June 30.

A "Fair" Strikebreaking Bill?

There is no doubt that Lindsay and the big capitalist interests for whom he speaks are very uneasy about the increase in strike activity, especially of public employees. The New York Times in fact devotes almost half of its entire editorial page of May 25 to its concern over this question. Says the Times editorial writer, aptly expressing the muted hysteria of the publishers and their Wall Street colleagues: "The current shutdown of child health stations... is merely the curtain-raiser to what could become an epidemic of conflicts when contracts covering more than 100,000 civil service employees expire June 30." As an answer the Times puts in its plea to enact the Rockefeller bill which revamps the "unenforceable" Condon-Wadlin Act. Let us have no illusions as to any possible progressive content of this proposed bill. Its purpose is exactly what its millionaire architects and supporters say, i.e., to create penalties against strikes of government workers that are enforceable: to most effectively harness and strait-jacket unions representing these workers. Accordingly, the proposed bill will provide for the stripping of unions of their representation rights after any "illegal walkout".

The significance of the recent strikes, especially the transit strike--- and of the reaction of the capitalists to these strikes, is that the contradictions of American capitalism are now being most sharply expressed in the relations of the New York City Government to its employees. The proposed legislation and attempts by Lindsay to house break the unions representing these workers are only the first attempts by the capitalist class to move against the entire labor movement. Today it is claimed that it is necessary to protect "the public" against public employees" strikes--tomorrow it will become "necessary" to protect the public against "unauthorized strikes".

The Workers Need a Strategy

The labor bureaucracy is being forced to struggle even

against its wishes and instincts. The shift in administration from Wagner(a capitalist politician with whom the bureaucracy had a long period of close collaboration) to Lindsay has spotlighted all the serious problems, financial and otherwise, which have been building up for years. At the same time the municipal and other workers who have been sold out for so many years now look around and see the tremendous disparity between their wages and conditions and those in private industry or in other cities. The tremendous pressure of these awakening workers is behind Quill's and Van Arsdale's "militancy", as well as the resignation threats of the nurses, unprecedented for such a professional-oriented union.

Union militants, while reminding the officialdom of its past and present behavior, should welcome militant action now, but insist that it be carried through. In this way the workers who are just coming into the struggle will learn in the course of the struggle that the present bureaucratic leadership must be replaced. Militants must also insist that a major element of a program of struggle must be that the bosses should pay the costs of the city's financial crisis while not throwing any workers out of jobs because of automation. There must be a political struggle against the attempts to unload the burdens of the ruling class on the workers.

All the unions must therefore fight not just on the picket line, not just on the "economic" level, but on the level of politics as well. Every strike will have to confront more and more directly the state power--local state, or Federal--and the political agencies and organizations and parties of this power. It becomes an ever more urgent need of the working class to reply in kind by forming a labor party to challenge the political organizations of the capitalists.

* * *

(The following letter has been sent to the SWP and the YSA)

To the National Secretaries of the SWP and the YSA

Dear Comrades:

Leo Bernard was killed and Jan Garrett and Walter Graham were wounded as martyrs in the continuing class struggle. The assassin was a demoralized worker, tragically misled and deluded by anti-working class propaganda to the point where he committed this crazed act.

We, the membership of the American Committee for the Fourth International, extend our condolences to the memberships of the SWP and the YSA and to the families of the victims.

This incident is the latest in a series including the bombings of the DuBois Club and VDC headquarters. We call for united defense against anti-working class hooliganism and terrorism.

Fraternally,
American Comm. for the Fourth
International

SUBSCRIBE NOW*SUBSCRIBE NOW*SUBSCRIBE NOW*SUBSCRIBE NOW*SUBSCRIBE NOW

____ 1 year sub to the Bulletin @ \$2.00.

____ 10 issue sub @ 50¢

Name(please print)

Street and Number

City State Zip

Send check or money order to:

Bulletin of International Socialism, 339 Lafayette St., New York, N.Y. 10012.