Cubans mobilize against Carter's threats
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RATIFY ERA!
Fighting alliance with labor, Black mov’ts holds promise of victory

The following is a statement released by Andrew Pulley and Matilde Zimmermann, Socialist Workers Party candidates for president and vice-president.

We welcome the May 10 March for the Equal Rights Amendment in Chicago called by the National Organization for Women. Auto Workers, coal miners, and steelworkers marching, together with residents of Chicago’s Black community and women’s rights supporters from around the country, will make it clear to President Carter and the other Democratic and Republican politicians who have been sabotaging the ERA that it’s time to sit up and take notice.

This alliance of the labor movement and women’s and civil rights groups makes the prospect for an ERA victory brighter than ever before.

And it is an inspiring example for working people, especially youth, who are fighting for the right to a job and decent standard of living and against the “right” to be drafted to fight for the interests of Texaco and Exxon.

The power that actions like the May 10 march can bring to bear was shown on July 9, 1978, when 100,000 joined the NOW-sponsored demonstration in Chicago.

Continued on page 5
Attacks on RCP: threat to rights of all

On May Day, police in a number of cities attacked and arrested members of the Revolutionary Communist Party exercising their constitutional right to demonstrate. In some cases, the RCP was assaulted by right-wingers while police stood by.

Prior to May Day, there were numerous arrests of RCP members building their demonstrations. In Los Angeles, one was murdered April 22, and a second seriously wounded. Circumstances surrounding this sinister attack point to police complicity.

The attacks on the Revolutionary Communist Party constitute a serious attack on civil liberties for all. These attacks should be protested and the democratic rights of the RCP should be defended.

The paid right-wing assaults on the RCP do not occur in isolation. The escalating employer-government assault on working people in this country has been accompanied by a steady chipping away at democratic rights.

• Harassment and deportations of Iranian students have sought to intimidate anyone who opposes Washington's foreign policy.
• Carter has banned travel to Iran and curtailed U.S. news teams there.
• The White House threatens to lift the passports of or even prosecute U.S. athletes if they attend the Summer Olympics in Moscow.
• Through court rulings and congressional action, the government is trying to legitimize CIA and FBI secret-police operations.

The attacks on the RCP are part of this pattern. The aim is to establish precedents for stopping protesters from demonstrating or selling newspapers.

In moving to establish new curbs on democratic rights, the ruling class invariably employs a time-tested tactic: direct the initial attack against the most vulnerable.

And, certainly the RCP does present a vulnerable target. A Maoist sect whose politics have little chance of winning a hearing among workers, the group has engaged in a series of confrontations with workers and others that only adds to its isolation.

But that in no way justifies the police and right-wing violence against the RCP.

In Los Angeles, they were arbitrarily denied a parade permit, forced to walk on the sidewalk, and then savagely attacked by the cops.

In a two-month period prior to May Day, some seventy-eight RCPers were arrested in the Los Angeles area. According to their attorney, half the arrests were for selling their paper.

In downtown Chicago, the cops broke up their march and arrested thirteen. Earlier a number were arrested for selling their paper and distributing leaflets. The American Civil Liberties Union is defending them.

In Morgantown, West Virginia, right-wingers staged a counterdemonstration to the RCP— which wasn't even there. So, egged on by a state official, some of the right-wingers beat up a small group of pacifists from the War Resisters League.

A serious reminder that "an injury to one is an injury to all."

Why soldiers died

The bodies of the American soldiers killed in the raid against Iran were returned to the United States May 6, and President Carter, true to form, used the occasion to press ahead with his anti-Iran campaign. Proclaiming three days of national mourning, he said that the soldiers died "because they wished to right a terrible wrong."

The truth is that the soldiers were ordered into action because Carter has refused to right a terrible wrong done wrong to the people of Iran by the U.S. government's imposition and support of the shah.

For twenty-five years the people of Iran were murdered, tortured, and maimed, deprived of all rights; burdened with one of the world's most oppressive tyrannies. The hated shah, the Hitler of Iran, was put into power by a CIA-sponsored coup. He was propped up through the years with U.S. arms. His secret police murderers and torturers were trained by the U.S. government. Up to the last, Carter hoped to keep him in power.

All that the Iranian people are asking now is that the despot be returned to be judged for his crimes.

Washington's refusal to allow this is the root of the hostage crisis.

Carter's refusal to right the terrible wrong shows that he wants a free hand to continue hacking brutal dictators the world over.

American working people have nothing to gain from Carter's stand. Our interests lie in common with the people of Iran, not brutal dictators.

No more U.S. military intervention in Iran! Send back the shah!

Gain for Olympics

The Olympic committees of eighteen countries, including the nine countries belonging to the European Common Market, have dealt a rebuff to Carter's call for a boycott of the Moscow Olympics.

"We appeal to the Olympic committees of all the countries in the world to take part," they declared in a May 3 statement. "Any forgiving of the 1980 Olympic Games, besides failing to provide a solution to the present conflicts, would have disastrous consequences on international sport. . . ."

Their statement highlights the fact that, as of now, the great majority of Olympic committees are planning to send athletes to Moscow in July.

Carter's attempt to torpedo the Olympics is part of the drive to arouse public opinion against the alleged "Soviet menace" and reverse popular opposition, here and around the world, to new U.S. military moves against Iran, Afghanistan, or other countries that defy Washington.

Like accepting draft registration, giving up the games was one of the sacrifices demanded of us to further this policy.

The vote of the Olympic committees came a week after the collapse of Carter's raid on Iran. He had quite a nerve to demand that the world ostracize Moscow for sending troops to fight U.S.-backed reactionaries in Afghanistan, while he was plotting an invasion of revolutionary Iran.

The decision of the U.S. Olympic Committee on April 12 to bow to Carter's boycott demand was made under pressure of threats of travel bans, financial penalties, and other antidemocratic moves. The boycott is overwhelmingly unpopular among U.S. athletes, who want to participate in the Olympics.

Carter should drop his threats, and the committee's decision should be reversed.

Let our athletes go to the Olympics!

Militant Highlights This Week

Challenge to Mich. election law

Socialist Workers workers explain why the party's suit to overturn state's ballot requirements, which effectively bar small parties, is a defense of rights of all working people. Page 19.

Sartre: Existentialist Odyssey

George Novack discusses Jean-Paul Sartre's political and philosophical career and what it reveals about the relationship between existentialism and Marxism. Page 10.
Carter continues Cuba threats; backs off on Guantanamo landing

By Harry Ring

The Carter administration has been forced to retreat in its military pressure against Cuba, canceling a slated marine landing exercise at the Guantanamo Naval Base. But plans for scaled down naval maneuvers in the Caribbean between May 8 and 10 are going ahead, and Cuba is guarding for new U.S. threats.

Washington backed off in face of the repercussions of its " rescue " fiasco in Iran and it is increasingly tangled in the contradiction between declarations of support for those leaving Cuba and efforts to choke off their exodus.

In this situation, the slated landing at Guantanamo could only be seen by Washington as the provocation it was.

So Washington had to retreat. Carter tried to pass this off as a humanitarian act by suggesting that naval maneuvers slated for the Guantanamo operation were being diverted to help " secure " Cuba to stay in Miami.

But despite Carter's tactical retreat, the Cuban people know that their solidarity with Nicaragua, Grenada, and the rising struggle in El Salvador makes Cuba a prime target of Washington's military operations.

That's why the Cubans intend to go ahead with the student rally to protest Carter's threats in Havana on May 17.

Meanwhile, in a further shift, Carter declared May 7 that the United States " would provide an open heart and open door to those coming from Cuba in the boat lift."

That's trying to put a good face on an embarrassing situation.

After Cuba announced that boats could come to the port of Mariel and bring people back here, the Carter administration did its best to choke off the emigration. Boat operators were told they faced fines of $1,000 per passenger for bringing in " illegal aliens."

Several big boats were impounded.

State Department spokesperson Hodding Carter explained that the switch indicated by the new declaration had been " required by events."

But, added presidential press secre­ tary Andy Powell, the switch is not one of fundamental policy. " Turning those ships around at sea and sending them back to Cuba " he said, " is not an action, this government chooses to undertake."

More precisely, can afford to adopt.

But even that doesn't mean that those who make it to Florida are as­ sured of permanent entry.

A May 1 Washington Post report also added that " the administration intends to deport criminals who have infiltrated the flood of exiles and to find places abroad for people who don't have family ties in the United States."

(Emphasis added.)

Before Cuba canceled the sightseeing to Costa Rica, people arriving from Havana were shunted off to Peru, even though it was acknowledged that the great majority wanted to come here. It remains to be seen how many of those now arriving here will also find themselves being shipped off to some other destination not of their choice.

Those who do settle here will quickly learn some of the realities of American life.

May 8 New York Times described the scene at one of the Florida emigration centers:

" The town of Fort Walton Beach, a stronghold of conservatism, has not warmly welcomed the Cubans. The superintendent of the county's school system says he does not want the Cubans in his school system; he says he has already too many Vietnamese refugees. There have been some threats from the Ku Klux Klan and some motorists passing the entrance to the refugee center have shouted obscenities at the Air Force towers."

And it's not just this " conservative " town. The May 2 Miami Herald re­ ported that a slated reception center at the Ida Fisher Community School in Miami Beach was " abruptly closed Thursday morning after neighbors complained."

A Miami Beach assistant city man­ager said: " We don't know the condi­tion of these people in terms of com­ municable diseases."

A May 7 Miami Herald in an " open heart " — filled with racism.

Socialists launch Florida campaign

By Bob Schwarz

MIAMI—The Socialist Workers Party has entered the race for U.S. sen­ator from Florida.

The party's nominee, Rose Ogden, will campaign for a half to the military threats against Cuba and an end to the twenty-one-year blockade of Cuba.

She will press the demand for politi­ cal refugee status for Haitians and for an open door for those who wish to come here from Cuba.

Ogden, a laid-off rail worker, will challenge Richard Stone, the Demo­ cratic incumbent. A member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Stone has been a leading hate-monger against Cuba.

At an April 27 open house marking the beginning of her campaign, Ogden pointed to the significant gains that Cuba has made since its revolution, despite difficulties imposed by the U.S. economic blockade.

The escalation of Washington's threats against Cuba and other Carib­bean and Central American countries, she said, is a response to the power of the Cuban example.

Ogden said that responsibility for the difficulties of those coming here from Cuba by boat rests with Wash­ington. It is necessary, she declared, to end the blockade. In addition to impos­ sing hardships on Cuba, she said, the blockade " restricts free travel to and from Cuba."

Ogden also scored government compli­city with right-wing terrorists oper­ating in the Cuban community here and in other cities.

" These counterrevolutionary thugs, " she declared, " parades in the name of ' freedom ' while committing murders, bombings, and extortion."

" Socialists, " she declared, " join with the many people in the Cuban com­munity who demand a halt to the activity of these terrorists. There must be an end to government-sponsored violence directed against those in the Cuban community who favor a dialogue with the Cuban government."

Ogden also scored Stone for joining in the moves to block financial aid to Nicaragua. The revolution there, she continued, is coping with the deepening economic situation inherited from the U.S.-imposed Somoza dictatorship.

She pledged to campaign in support of the efforts to build a new Nicaragua and declared, " I think more Florida Socialists will stand with me on this than with Stone and the Carter admin­istr­ation."

Rose Ogden

Socialists launch Florida campaign

Pulley: 'Cancel maneuvers!'

By Roland Stone

Miami—Socialist Workers presidential nominee Andrew Pulley de­clared that he will cancel the slated military maneuvers in the Caribbean.

He also sent a message to Cuban government officials in Havana, " solid­ shield 80, " that " Cuba's people's possibility of an American naval block­ade."

In addition to Fidel Castro, principal speakers included Workers leader Da­niel Ortega of Nicaragua and Prime Minis­ter Maurice Bishop of Grenada.

Castro denounced U.S. aggression and the possibility of an American naval blockade. He announced expansion of Cuba's people's mil­itary. He predicted that some few million Cu­bans, half the popula­tion, would mobilize May 17 to protest illegal U.S. occupation of the Guantanamo Military Base, as well as its economic blockade of Cuba.

A Miami Beach assistant city man­ager said: " We don't know the condi­tion of these people in terms of com­ municable diseases."

" An open heart " — filled with racism.

A May 7 Miami Herald reported that a slated reception center at the Ida Fisher Community School in Miami Beach was " abruptly closed Thursday morning after neighbors complained."

A Miami Beach assistant city man­ager said: " We don't know the condi­tion of these people in terms of com­ municable diseases."

A May 7 Miami Herald in an " open heart " — filled with racism.

Socialists launch Florida campaign

BY ROSE OGDEN

MIAMI—The Socialist Workers Party has entered the race for U.S. sen­ator from Florida.

The party's nominee, Rose Ogden, will campaign for a halt to the military threats against Cuba and an end to the twenty-one-year blockade of Cuba.

She will press the demand for politi­cal refugee status for Haitians and for an open door for those who wish to come here from Cuba.

Ogden, a laid-off rail worker, will challenge Richard Stone, the Demo­cratic incumbent. A member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Stone has been a leading hate-monger against Cuba.

At an April 27 open house marking the beginning of her campaign, Ogden pointed to the significant gains that Cuba has made since its revolution, despite difficulties imposed by the U.S. economic blockade.

The escalation of Washington's threats against Cuba and other Carib­bean and Central American countries, she said, is a response to the power of the Cuban example.

Ogden said that responsibility for the difficulties of those coming here from Cuba by boat rests with Wash­ington. It is necessary, she declared, to end the blockade. In addition to impos­sing hardships on Cuba, she said, the blockade " restricts free travel to and from Cuba."

Ogden also scored government compli­city with right-wing terrorists oper­ating in the Cuban community here and in other cities.

" These counterrevolutionary thugs, " she declared, " parades in the name of ' freedom ' while committing murders, bombings, and extortion."

" Socialists, " she declared, " join with the many people in the Cuban com­munity who demand a halt to the activity of these terrorists. There must be an end to government-sponsored violence directed against those in the Cuban community who favor a dialogue with the Cuban government."

Ogden also scored Stone for joining in the moves to block financial aid to Nicaragua. The revolution there, she continued, is coping with the deepening economic situation inherited from the U.S.-imposed Somoza dictatorship.

Ogden also scored Stone for joining in the moves to block financial aid to Nicaragua. The revolution there, she continued, is coping with the deepening economic situation inherited from the U.S.-imposed Somoza dictatorship.

She pledged to campaign in support of the efforts to build a new Nicaragua and declared, " I think more Florida Socialists will stand with me on this than with Stone and the Carter admin­istr­ation."

Rosa Ogden

Socialists launch Florida campaign

Pulley: 'Cancel maneuvers!'

MIAMI—Socialist Workers presidential nominee Andrew Pulley de­clared that he will cancel the slated military maneuvers in the Caribbean.

He also sent a message to Cuban government officials in Havana, " solid­shield 80, " that " Cuba's people's possibility of an American naval block­ade."

In addition to Fidel Castro, principal speakers included Workers leader Da­niel Ortega of Nicaragua and Prime Minis­ter Maurice Bishop of Grenada.

Castro denounced U.S. aggression and the possibility of an American naval blockade. He announced expansion of Cuba's people's mil­itary. He predicted that some few million Cu­bans, half the popula­tion, would mobilize May 17 to protest illegal U.S. occupation of the Guantanamo Military Base, as well as its economic blockade of Cuba.

A Miami Beach assistant city man­ager said: " We don't know the condi­tion of these people in terms of com­ municable diseases."

" An open heart " — filled with racism.
Women workers speak out: Why we are fighting

By Suzanne Haig

For the growing number of women who are working in factories, mines, and mills to support families and keep up with inflation, the difference in pay and treatment is a cruel contradiction. This situation is propelling many women to fight for their rights and dignity. It is transforming the way they think about their jobs, their lives, and society.

In the weeks before the May 10 marches for the Equal Rights Amendment in Chicago, I had the opportunity to talk with several women workers who are involved in the ratification drive.

Fighting discrimination

Why are they for the ERA?

For the women members of United Auto Workers Local 692 from Sun- strand Airplane Corporation in Rock­ ford, Illinois, it is a matter of fighting the discrimination they face on the job. I talked to them at the April 26 Labor Conference for the ERA.

"If you are working next to a man on a machine," one woman said, "he may make it one of the top of the job class in six months to a year. For a woman, it will take about two years.

She has to be the team foreman and supervisor for a better job and kiss their feet. They decide whether you go to the next rate of pay, and that depends on what they think about you.

The auto workers were at the confer­ ence so they could go back to their co­ workers armed with facts and figures on the ERA.

Daisy Neithaus, a widow with five children and nine grandchildren, is for ERA because of the problems she faced when she tried to become a coal miner.

For the first day on the job, she was laid off at a sewing factory, she decided she had to get a better job.

"Well, don't do the same job, because they don't charge you less because you are a woman," she said.

She first went to Consolidation Coal and then to Sunstrand.

"Then I and fifty men took a test," she said. "They said they would call me. They never did.

Then she said that men were being hired, she filed a suit with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. She won. But by that time she was working at Bethle­ ham, fleeing to Bentleyville, about forty miles from Pittsburgh.

Women's committees

The need to ratify ERA has grown many women involved in their union's women's committees. This is the case with Elvena Miller, nicknamed Holly­ wood by her co-workers. Miller, a Black steelworker at Great Lakes Steel in River Rouge, a city adjacent to Detroit, is very active in the United Steel­ workers' District 29 Women's Commit­ tee, which has organized a bus for the May 10 march in Chicago.

"I married when I was nineteen. When we moved to the north, I had a with-one-year-old girl. I had to get out and make my own living.

"On the first day at Great Lakes the foreman told me to do some work on the railroad tracks. Then he took the machine away from me and I had to do the work of three people.

"He wanted to get rid of me. But I wouldn't go. I stood my ground. So I did the entire job. Then I went up to the foreman and asked, 'Do you have anything more for me to do? I've finished.' He couldn't believe that I had done so much work. He even gave me a chair for me to rest.

"After Miller saw how women were told to work with a 100-pound drill and jackhammer, which many men had trouble handling, she decided to form the safety committee and help the new women coming in. "I tell the girls to ignore anyone who is a non-entity. It's worth it.

"And I'm telling my daughter, 'You can be anything you want to be.'"

Building May 10

Miller thinks demonstrations such as May 10 are very effective. "I notice that any time there has been any change by the government there has been a demonstration before it—whether in Selma, Birmingham, or Washington.

Fran Ballad is also in USWA Dis­ trict 29. She has worked four years at Whitehoud and Kales and recently helped organize the Local 2141 ERA committee.

I talked with her right after their first meeting at which they discussed filling a bus to go to the May 10 march. Ballad was quite pleased with the turnout. Twelve people had attended, including four Black men and one Chi­ cano.

Ballad, who is white, believes that Black men and Chicanoes are interested in joining the fight for ERA because they see that they are getting along the same way we are. If you're not the right nationality, you don't make it.

Ballad has noticed that many women are getting more active in the union since it became involved in the fight for the ERA. First by supporting the January 10 ERA march in Richmond, Virginia, and now by backing May 10.

"They are coming to union meetings because they see the union doing things that pertain to them. It's really making a difference,

Carol Stocka, recording secretary for the United Mine Workers Local 1190, and Karen Tyler, a Black woman, were two of the first three women to go to work in the western Pennsylvania mines some five years ago. They exclaimed their experiences when they first went into the mines.

Mine owners attack women

"The men were literally the owners in the worst jobs. The company was surprised we had shown up," said Stocka.

"The superintendent said we could do any more work at home rather than work on the mine. The foreman gave us the women instructions but only a light helmet and a light.

"The company was hoping we would drop out and spread the word around so more other women would apply," said Stocka.

From what the women said, I ga­ thered that the companies felt that men were also the source of the resent­ ment against the women expressed by some male co-workers who bought the line that women can't do the same jobs as men.

The company is constantly talking about closing down the mines, and more recently, Tyler explained. "Some­ men thought we take jobs away from their friends. But I would tell them, 'I need a job to support my family just like your friends.'"

When the men worked with the women for a while, a lot of minds were changed. Now the men help the women out and give them pointers about the hard jobs.

When asked if they were going to the May 10 ERA march, Carol Stocka and Karen Tyler said they would love to, but they had just come back from the April 26 demonstration in Washington against nuclear power—for which they helped to organize a contingent of min­ ers—and needed to spend time with their families. But like thousands of other women, they will be marching in spirit. They are strongly opposed to nuclear power.

"It is time to do something," said Stocka. "We have precious cool under the earth. If we don't use coal for steel and power, what are we going to use it for?"

Hit by layoffs

These women recognize that a vic­ tory for ERA will give women more muscle to defend their rights in every area, including the fight against dis­ criminatory layoffs and downgrading.

Layoffs are dealing especially hard blows to women and oppressed national­ ities such as Blacks. Women steel­ workers in the Chicago-Gary area are acutely aware of this. That's why many of them came to a news confer­ ence on the May 10 march that was held in Gary April 22.

I talked with some of the women who are organizing a train to the May 10 march.

Vedna Lott, president of the north­ west Indiana chapter of the Coalition of Labor Union Women, has worked at U.S. Steel's Gary Works for eleven years.

"I worked eleven years and did not advance, and now I've been bumped down." She was referring to her recent transfer to the labor gang. The com­ pany has closed down her department in the run of layoffs, shutdowns, and cutbacks in steel.

Joan Hae is also from the Gary Works. She sees ERA as "a lever for us to fight back."

"A lot of people's jobs are gone permanently, and Blacks and women are being hit the hardest," she said. Hae has been on layoff for seven months.

She continued: "The consent decree is a court ruling that requires the steel companies to hire and upgrade women and minorities has been out of opera­ tion for a year. The new contract has no affirmative action clause that I can see which could be used to bring back the women who have permanently lost their jobs."

"It's almost as if we have to start all over again," she said.

War and the draft

Carter's call earlier this year for women and men to be registered for the draft has led to a lot of thinking about the draft and U.S. foreign policy.

Fran Ballard has strong feelings about Vietnam that were shaped when a friend who had been sent to Vietnam got cancer from Agent Orange. "At first the Veterans Administration didn't even notice it or give it a name for it," she said.

"He has had children since he got cancer and has the Agent Orange in his genes. So he has to take his kids for periodic tests.

She opposes the draft: "A person should have the right to choose whether to go fight for your country."

The March 22 antidraft march in Washington was the first demonstra­ tion she ever went to.

"I felt real good about going, and I'm ready to do it again," she told me.

This is Daisy Neithaus's attitude: "Send the sons of Rockefeller and Kinsinger to the wars. Then after their sons, they can take mine."

Elvena Miller opposes the draft, but has mixed feelings. "This is my coun­ try. If I am asked to go into the army, I'll go because I'm not afraid to fight."
The charges against Iran by the government and media have had an impact on her, but so has the government and media. They're taking bodies and displaying them, trying to force the Shah to come back. Let his people deal with him. Don't talk to me about the Shah of Iran, she said on a radio program in April.

The shah's butt back. Let his people deal with him. Don't talk to me about the Shah of Iran, she said on a radio program in April.

They're taking bodies and displaying them, trying to force the Shah to come back. Let his people deal with him. Don't talk to me about the Shah of Iran, she said on a radio program in April.

They're taking bodies and displaying them, trying to force the Shah to come back.
Texas socialists campaign for place on ballot

By Peggy Brundy and Jo Carol Stallworth
HOUSTON—Supporters of the Socialist Workers Party's campaign from around the state rallied here May 3 to hear SWP presidential candidate Andrew Pulley and to launch a drive to collect more than 24,000 signatures to get on the ballot in Texas.

Ballot drive

"My supporters are gathering more than 500,000 signatures across the country," Pulley told the enthusiastic crowd. The party plans to get on the ballot in thirty-one states.

"We're getting a very good response to the petition drive," Pulley explained.

"Working people are disillusioned with Carter. In his campaign four years ago Carter promised that human rights would be a watchword of his administration. He said he would deliver the Equal Rights Amendment for women, that he would never fire a black person, that he would never reinstitute the draft, and that he would never deregulate the price of oil."

"Every promise that meant anything to American working people has been broken."

Also speaking at the rally was John Sorge, a steelworker and SWP candidate for railroad commissioner. "Working people in Texas are faced with a two-front war," he said.

"On the one hand, Carter is trying to convince us of his plans for military intervention in the Middle East, while at home our standard of living is being driven down at an ever increasing rate. "In Texas, we are particularly aware of the oil companies' role in this big-business offensive. Texas is the largest producer and refiner of oil and a key producer of natural gas. Yet our gasoline prices went up 45 percent last year. The bills we pay for natural gas increased 1,000 percent over the last eight years."

"We were told that the Iranian revolution was to blame for an oil shortage last spring. But working people here didn't bite, because Exxon, Mobil, Texaco, and the other oil giants were reaping enormous profits."

"My message to working people in Texas is that we have the power to stop this ripoff. Oil companies should be nationalized and run by an elected board with all facts and decisions out in the open."

Sorge explained that the recent oil workers strike was particularly hard-fought here in Texas because this is a "right to work for less" state. The oil barons used an arsenal of weapons, including letters threatening disciplinary action, threats of firing, scabs, private detectives, and court injunctions.

"What working people and their allies need," he said, "is a labor party based on the unions to fight back on the political as well as economic levels."

ripoff blasted

Len Sherman, SWP candidate for Congress from the Fifth District in Dallas, and Laura Garza, candidate from the Twenty-third Congressional District in San Antonio, also spoke. Garza explained that well over half the people in her district, the second poorest in the state, are Chicanos or mexicansos. Most people are not educated past the tenth grade.

"Many of her constituents, she said, have come here from Mexico seeking jobs and a better standard of living. They are harassed by la migra, called illegal aliens, and treated like non-persons. Their children are denied education."

One of the high points of the rally was a speech given by Abdil Escohar Cunningham, a Sandinista from Nicaragua who is currently a student here.

He described how his experiences in fighting to get rid of the dictator Somoza led him to conclude that socialism is necessary not only in Nicaragua but in all other countries. "I became a revolutionary internationalist," he said.

"One day in Managua I found a copy of Perspectiva Mundiando by accident. I read it all, and I was surprised to see that it was published in the United States. In the back, there was a list of SWP and VSA offices, including in Houston where I had lived for five years. I was so inspired that when I came to the states to finish my studies I looked for the revolutionary socialist movement."

The next day, campaign supporters spent "No Draft" buttons and carrying packets of socialist literature gathered at the campaign headquarters to begin petitioning. Among them were Andrew Pulley and Arturo Ramirez, SWP candidate for Congress from the 18th District in Houston. They campaigned at the Cinco de Mayo festivities.

"Often people who were approached to sign would respond, 'Oh, I'm sick of candidates.' But after hearing about the plans in the socialist platform many changed their minds. "Those candidates are different. I'll sign,"" Pulley reported.

"After finding out that the SWP candidates stood for nationalizing the oil companies, an oil worker said: 'That's a damn good idea. I'll sign. We should start with the place I work.'"

Others were particularly attracted by demands such as: cops out of the Black community, stop deportations, or jobs for all. The demand to repeal "right to work" laws got us into some good discussions.

Blacks were interested in the idea of a Black steelworker running for president of the United States. Others signed to support the candidates' right to be on the ballot.

Andrew Pulley, Socialist Workers Party candidate for president, campaigns in Houston May 4. Socialists aim to collect 24,000 signatures to obtain ballot status in Texas.

"It's a damn good idea. I'll sign. We should start with the place I work."

Set May 17 march in D.C. against navy presence in Vieques, Puerto Rico

By Gus Horowitz

Supporters of Puerto Rican rights are organizing a march on Washington May 17 to protest the U.S. Navy's use of the island of Vieques to practice artillery bombardments and amphibious landings.

Vieques, a tiny island of more than 8,000 inhabitants, is located off the south-eastern coast of Puerto Rico. It is part of Puerto Rican territory, but the U.S. government has expropriated four-fifths of the land for military use by the navy.

Many residents of Vieques have been killed or maimed by the bombing practice. During bombardments the island's fishermen are prevented from plying their trade. The lives of all the inhabitants of the island have been disrupted, and the land is being destroyed.

Protests organized by the people of Vieques have been subjected to systematic police repression.

In the most well-known incident, twenty-two people were arrested in May 1979 while holding a protest ecumenical service on land claimed by the Navy's. Most served prison terms as a result.

One of the protestors, Angel Rodriguez Cruzabal, was found hanged in May 1979 while holding a protest rally on land claimed by the Navy.

"I was so inspired that when I came to the states to finish my studies I looked for the revolutionary socialist movement."
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"I was so inspired that when I came to the states to finish my studies I looked for the revolutionary socialist movement."

They were sentenced to six-month prison terms, but won a victory on April 30 when the court of appeals ordered their release on their own recognizance.

In related activity, three heroes of the Puerto Rican nationalist movement, Oscar Collazo, Irving Pierres, and Rafael Cancel Miranda, are now on a speaking tour of U.S. cities. They are talking here in Texas because this is a "right to work for less" state. The oil barons used an arsenal of weapons, including letters threatening disciplinary action, threats of firing, scabs, private detectives, and court injunctions.

"What working people and their allies need," he said, "is a labor party based on the unions to fight back on the political as well as economic levels."

"One day in Managua I found a copy of Perspectiva Mundiando by accident. I read it all, and I was surprised to see that it was published in the United States. In the back, there was a list of SWP and VSA offices, including in Houston where I had lived for five years. I was so inspired that when I came to the states to finish my studies I looked for the revolutionary socialist movement."

The next day, campaign supporters spent four hours carrying cards of socialist literature. Among them were Andrew Pulley and Arturo Ramirez, SWP candidate for Congress from the 18th District in Houston. They campaigned at the Cinco de Mayo festivals.

"Often people who were approached to sign would respond, 'Oh, I'm sick of candidates.' But after hearing about the plans in the socialist platform many changed their minds. "Those candidates are different. I'll sign,"" Pulley reported.

"After finding out that the SWP candidates stood for nationalizing the oil companies, an oil worker said: 'That's a damn good idea. I'll sign. We should start with the place I work.'"

Others were particularly attracted by demands such as: cops out of the Black community, stop deportations, or jobs for all. The demand to repeal "right to work" laws got us into some good discussions.

Blacks were interested in the idea of a Black steelworker running for president of the United States. Others signed to support the candidates' right to be on the ballot.

Andrew Pulley, Socialist Workers Party candidate for president, campaigns in Houston May 4. Socialists aim to collect 24,000 signatures to obtain ballot status in Texas.
ERA and the Draft: Lessons of the Suffrage Movement
By Suzanne Haig

Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980)
By George Novack

Month In Review: What Makes Anderson Run?
**THE MONTH IN REVIEW**

*Why is Anderson Running?*

This month's column was written by Nan Bailey.

Republican John Anderson has launched his "independent" campaign for president. But "independent" in this case means simply that he won't be the nominee of either the Republican or Democratic party this year.

"This is not an assault on the two-party system," he assured his listeners April 24. Anderson will remain a Republican.

He called for "national unity government" made up of "both Democrats and Republicans."

Anderson says he is the man to unite the country. "We are a nation at war with ourselves," he asserted. He warned against the "new battle of competing interests." And promises to "stop before it goes deeper." He promises to jack up the profits of big business.

The two-party system is under growing attack. The two-party system is under growing attack.

He favors nuclear power. That means profits for the utilities and energy monopolies—but higher cancer rates and the danger of devastating accidents for the rest of us.

He stands for keeping up the U.S. military, imposing sanctions on Iran, backing the ultraraghtists gangs in Afghanistan, banning grain sales to the Soviet Union, and boycottting the Olympics. These positions show that his opposition to the draft is an election-year gimmick. Anderson says he's for the Equal Rights Amendment. But he hasn't endorsed the May 10 march for ERA in Chicago, which is demanding ratification by the Illinois legislature. Illinois is Anderson's home state.

Anderson's pitch echoes the theme of Carter's campaign. Then Carter proposed himself as someone who was independent of the Washington establishment, and who could bind the country's wounds after Vietnam and Watergate.

In office, Carter has acted as front man for the employers' assault on the living standards and rights of American workers. Anderson is offering, as president, to continue that assault.

There is no substance, then, to the claims that Anderson represents a real alternative to Carter and Reagan. But why is he running? More is involved than yet another capitalist politician who has caught presidential fever.

Polls indicate that from 40 to 58 percent of those interviewed are not happy with a choice between Carter and Reagan in November. Many feel that is not enough at all.

This is not due to failings in the personalities of the candidates. They are about the same as always. It is related to the growing distrust of the government, the politicians of both parties, and the big corporations.

This growing frustration stems from seeing Democratic and Republican administrations alike pursuing antilabor policies. Both push down wages; both help big oil boost prices; both are dedicated to slash public services and social programs; both are out to prepare new wars for working people to die in; and both show the tenderest concern for big-business profits.

The two-party system is based on the illusion that the people who are elected represent "all the people" equally—on "national unity." This myth was enshrined during the decades of prosperity when the employers acceded to modest advances in the standard of living of working people.

But now the system is in growing economic trouble. The employers and their political agents in both parties are making working people pay the price.

This antiblack offensive is convincing more and more working people through bitter experience that "national unity" is a fraud, that the government and the Democratic and Republican parties do not represent "all the people" but only the oil monopolies, the steel magnates, the auto barons, and the owners of the other big business.

Growing numbers of workers are open to an alternative outside the two capitalist parties.

The two-party system is under growing strain. And Anderson is coming forward to prop it up, attempting to channel the new thinking back into capitalist politics and head off any motion toward political action by working people that would be independent of big business.

By stepping outside the organizational framework of the Republican and Democratic parties, Anderson hopes to gain added credibility.

What the Anderson campaign is trying to prevent is indicated by the growing discussion of the idea that the unions should form their own party to contend with the Democrats and Republicans.

This is the alternative proposed by Anthony Mazzocchi, health and safety director for the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers union. At a gathering at the United Auto Workers Region 9 hall in New Jersey on April 13, he declared, "I am not interested in electing an individual from either party because it doesn't make a damn bit of difference. . . ."

"The Democratic Party is the party of oil," he went on. "We absolutely need a new political mechanism, that's a labor party."

As for the claim of the Democratic and Republican parties to represent all the people, said, "I don't want an individual who represents the entire community. I want someone who represents us, period.

John Henning, head of the California AFL-CIO, made a similar point in a Labor Day statement last year: "There are signs American labor may be entering a decade of historic political change. . . Labor's dilemma is clear enough. The two-party system is no longer serving the economic and social interests of American working people. Indeed, the two parties appear simply one institution, with Democratic and Republican departments alike financed by the corporate community."

He called for study and discussion of the idea of forming a labor party.

In California, the Alameda County, Marin County, and San Mateo County Central Labor Councils passed resolutions indicating support for moves toward a labor party, as did the California State Central Labor Council.

The March 31 Union Advocate, a labor paper published in St. Paul, Minnesota, asked, "Has organized labor's place within the Democratic Farmer Labor Party [Minnesota's Democratic-Republican Party] deteriorated to the point that union members should withdraw from the DFL and form their own party?"

It noted that delegates from the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly "apparently felt that way when [on March 26] they unanimously adopted a report of the Assembly Executive Board calling on the Minnesota AFL-CIO to consider the matter." It noted that delegates from the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly "apparently felt that way when [on March 26] they unanimously adopted a report of the Assembly Executive Board calling on the Minnesota AFL-CIO to consider the matter." Such statements from the union officialdom are only pale reflections of the growing belief of working people that they are not represented in the political arena, and that they must be represented if they are to maintain the gains of the past decades.

Unlike the Anderson campaign, a labor party will mark a genuine break from the parties of big business.

Instead of forging "national unity" with the enemies of working people, it could forge unity among union members, the Black community, the women's movement, the unemployed, and working people, the Black community, the women's movement, the unemployed, and working people, the unorganized and unemployed—that is, the vast majority of society—to fight for jobs, equal rights, decent wages, and against war.

A labor party will provide working people with the political weapon they need to match the political weapons—the Republican and Democratic parties—owned by the corporations.

The discussions of a labor party are just beginning. This is a development that big business—and John Anderson—would very much like to stop before it goes deeper.

But the labor party idea is bound to grow in appeal as the hostility of the Republican and Democratic politicians to the basic interests of working people becomes more and more apparent.

---
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The Draft and the Women's Movement: Lessons of History

Throughout the war, the Women's Party maintained picket lines at the White House and Capitol Hill to protest the hypocrisy of making 'war for democracy' while depriving women of the vote.

and the U.S. emerged as the number one world power.

Class Divisions on War

Every movement for social progress came under heavy pressure as the war propaganda became more shrill and the U.S. rulers moved toward formalizing their entry into the bloodletting.

The suffrage movement was no exception. The pressure to support U.S. war preparations and entry into the war split the movement. By its very nature as a struggle of the oppressed sex, the women's movement included women from all classes.

The approaching war impelled these divergent classes to redefine their attitudes toward the war effort.

On the one hand were the wealthy and middle-class women who supported capitalism and thought that women could win full equality within it. They looked to the 'friends' of women's rights in government to push suffrage through. They consciously identified the interests of women with the war effort. Consequently they put suffrage on the back burner for the duration.

This position was held by part of the leadership of the largest suffrage organization, the National American Woman Suffrage Association, which had 2 million members in 1917. Two figures who played an important role in bringing this association into support for the war were Carrie Chapman Catt, the president of NAWSA during that period, and Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, a past president.

Opposing them was the more radical wing, which had more ties to working-class women and the workers' movement. The Workers' Party led by Eugene Victor Debs, saw the establishment of a workers government and the replacement of capitalism by socialism as the key to completing the liberation of women and abolishing the root cause of war.

At the outset of World War I most working people strongly supported suffrage.

Working People and Suffrage

The suffrage movement had swept forward under the impact of a broad radicalization of workers and farmers after the turn of the century who wanted equality, more democratic rights, and a better living standard.

This development, which led to the growth of unions and the burgeoning of organizations such as the Socialist Party and the Industrial Workers of the World, infused new energy into the women's movement.

By the turn of the century, radicalizing working people had overcome many obstacles put in the way of their active support to suffrage. Figures such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Catt, and Shaw had obstructed unity between the women's movement, workers, and the Black population. They had argued that the movement should favor restrictions on the vote to immigrants and illiterates—that is, for most workers of that time. They opposed any challenge to racist voting practices in the South. They even suggested that the vote of white women would help maintain white supremacy in the South.

They thought the support of immigrants, Blacks, and other working people for suffrage would frighten away "respectable" people like themselves—especially the government officials and legislators they hoped to persuade to grant the vote to women.

But the support they sought was not forthcoming. Big business and its political agents feared that the vote for women would increase the political weight of working people; that it would be used by women as the springboard to other rights—such as equal employment opportunity and equal pay.

But important sections of the women's movement responded to the new mood—and even the top leaders of NAWSA soon dropped calls for a restricted suffrage.

The Women's Trade Union League, founded in 1903, focused on winning union rights for women.
Jean-Paul Sartre: Existential Odyssey

By George Novack

The most widely held philosophies of our time have been existentialism and Marxism. Jean-Paul Sartre, who died in Paris April 15 at the age of seventy-four, exemplified the dilemma of one of the most qualified intellectuals and writers of our time tossed between these two incompatible views of the world.

Along with Simone de Beauvoir and Albert Camus, Sartre popularized the ideas and attitudes of existentialism among the post-World War II generation. Any observant visitor to the U.S. campuses during this period could testify to the extent of his influence. He exercised this not only through his novels, plays, and essays, which were translated into many languages, but also through the conduct of his life as a radical French intellectual. Although in a characteristic institutional," he spurned the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1964, because he did not want to be seen as a "faction." His politics from his philosophy. Their interaction is clearly discernible in the evolution of his theoretical positions. These fall into two distinctively different phases.

Being and Nothingness

As a young professor and aspiring writer in the 1930s, he embarked on the quest for an absolute freedom in a universe where everything is relative and materially conditioned. He yearned to be exempt from all determination by objective reality, natural or social. This hopeless enterprise was embodied in a big book of 724 pages entitled Being and Nothingness. This metaphysical disquisition brought him world fame but it is as obscure and labyrinthine as his novels, plays, and essays can be straightforward. It was a technical treatise, primarily addressed to fellow professional philosophers, that utilized the categories of Hegel's system filtered through the phenomenological school of the later German thinkers, Husserl and Heidegger, and modeled on the traditions of Continental rationalism and idealism.

In this work Sartre set out to show that man is a wholly free subject who, by his very nature, resists every attempt to transform him into anything else. To provide an underpinning for this conception of unlimited human liberty he begins by splitting reality into two opposing and irreconcilable parts.

One he calls being-for-itself; the other being-in-itself. The first is exclusively human; it is the pure consciousness of the individual, total negation, absolute freedom. Being-in-itself comprises everything else, it is "dumb-packed togetherness," rigid non-consciousness, materiality, and objectivity.

Sartre does not explain how these two starkly contradictory realms of being, the in-itself and the for-itself, originated. The non-human and the free subject are simply there, given facts. He thus makes a metaphysical mystery out of the natural and historical processes through which the human emerged from the animal, consciousness from the preconscious, the subject out of objective preconditions.

Sartre at no time accepted the theory of evolution. We are certain, he held, only of the existence of human life but have no plausible proof of the emergence of the organic from the inorganic. This retrograde position not only defied the conclusion of modern science that evolution is a primordial and proven fact of nature but runs counter to the Marxist view that the development of nature and society constitute sequential stages and integral parts of a unified historical process. Sartre's philosophy was literary and academic in inspiration and the spectacular achievements of the physical sciences and mathematics had no influence upon this thought. "Existentialism" was a rule recoil from the effects of science, industry, and technology as in themselves threats to the authenticity of the inner self.

The mystification of human origins and the unbridgeable dualism of the subject and the object were required to establish the absolute freedom of the individual. In the subsequent pages Sartre expounds the rationale for his one-sided conception of individualism in contemporary philosophy.

According to this view, I may be hedged on all sides by what Sartre calls "facticity." My place, my past, my surroundings, my fellows, and my death make up the situation into which I have been flung. But all these facts are accidental and incidental, not necessary and intrinsic elements of my existence. I do not have to accept them; I can reject and refuse to adapt to them. I assert and forge my authentic self in dissociating myself from these objective conditions and circumstances. Other things and beings have their essence made for them or imposed upon them. I alone have the power of fashioning the character and career I prefer. I can be a fully self-made person in a world I never made.

Such unlimited freedom in which every individual is a law unto himself or herself entails unlimited responsibility, not only for oneself but the fate of mankind. Sartre even maintains that every person then alive is co-responsible for the Second World War they could not prevent. (This left the imperialist warmakers off the hook.) Tormented anguish inescapably arises from the awareness that our choice may be wrong and have dreadful, unforeseen, unpro- mised consequences. But since we cannot avoid choosing at our peril in the dark, we must valiantly take our stand and face the music.

Critics have pointed out the logical inconsis- tencies in Sartre's idea of absolute freedom and the ethics derived from its premises. Its unreal- ity is obvious. He starts by excluding all concrete necessity from human action; he ends with the categorical imperative to be free. All that is "condemned to be free," even though his dearest projects are foredoomed to fail and his venture aspirations cannot find secure anchorage because the "for-itself" can never coincide with the "in-itself." But if I must be free, then I have no real moral choice in the matter. Total freedom thereby turns out to be its oppo- site: total determination.

Sartre and the Communist Party

Nonetheless, the contradictions in which he was enmeshed endeared this philosophy with an implicit dynamism that impelled this ultra-individualist along the road which held out an escape of freedom for mankind, even if no lasting satisfaction was attainable.

That was only to be found in the revolutionary objectives of socialism. Marxism is the scientific theory and method of this proletarian movement. And so the thrust of his existentialist ethics, confronted with his situation as a radical petty bourgeoisie in crisis, led him to support the cause of the working class, the oppressed of the world.

Unlike friends such as the Communist Paul Nizan, Sartre at first was unconcerned with the class struggle. He despised the bourgeoisie in a bohemian manner, not in the Marxist way. As ex-ploiters of the workers and oppressors of the masses, but as philosophy who did not appreciate the life of the intellect or the bourgeoisie.

His prewar political opinions were vaguely anarcho- libertarian.

In the third volume of her autobiography, Simone de Beauvoir relates: "In our youth we felt close to the Communist party to the extent that..."
its negativism harmonized with our anarchoism. We looked forward to the defeat of capitalism but not to a socialist society where the old thought would have deprived us of our liberty. The publication of the 1830 novel "The Nihilists" by the "Hitler Pilgrims" Sartre wrote in a notebook: "Here I am cured of socialism if ever I needed to be cured of it.

His wartime experience and participation in the Resistance changed his mind. After release from the camp, he helped organize a small Resistance group of intellectuals baptized "Socialism and Liberty," terms that no longer seemed applicable to him. He sought to express his support for the Communist fighters without joining the party. In consonance with his philosophy he remained a free-lance sympathizer of the left.

He had checked relations with the CP in which attraction alternated with repulsion. After the victory of the CP under Yalta, he cooperated with Communist friends without joining the party. In consonance with his philosophy he remained a free-lance sympathizer of the left. He had checked relations with the CP in which attraction alternated with repulsion. After the victory of the CP under Yalta, he cooperated with Communist friends without joining the party.

His wartime experience and participation in the Resistance changed his mind. After release from the camp, he helped organize a small Resistance group of intellectuals baptized "Socialism and Liberty," terms that no longer seemed applicable to him. He sought to express his support for the Communist fighters without joining the party. In consonance with his philosophy he remained a free-lance sympathizer of the left.

Marxism versus Existentialism

The Sartre of the unalloyed existentialist, remained a professed adversary of Marxism. In his 1947 essay on "Materialism and Spirit" he espoused a single thesis: it is Marxism that offers the fundamental principles. His indictment rejecting his claim to scientific truthfulness, its materialism, its scientific determinism, its intransigent view of nature, its conception of subject-object relations, and its derivation of social consciousness from social-historical conditions.
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and on organizing rallies for suffrage. It was especially strong in the garment trades in New York.

Harriet Stanton Blatch founded the Equality League for Self Supporting Women, renamed the Women's Political Union in 1910.

The Congressional Union, founded in 1913 as a section of NAWSA by Alice Paul and Lucy Burns, began to look toward working people as a potential base of mass support. The Congressional Union and the Women's Political Union later merged to form the Women's Party.

Another important component of the suffrage movement was the Socialist Party. In the first years of the century, its Women's Committee threw itself into the suffrage struggle. The struggle for suffrage became a campaign of the whole party after its 1908 convention.

The Socialist Party played an important—possibly decisive—role in winning suffrage amendments in California and Kansas in 1912 and Nevada in 1914.

These forces helped build the big suffrage marches in Washington, D.C., New York, and elsewhere, which became a prominent feature of the movement after 1910.

The War and Working People

Strong sentiment existed among working people against entry into the war.

Initially many Americans failed to register. In Donora, Pennsylvania, 40 percent of the men who registered gave their draft boards fictitious addresses such as vacant lots. In New York City, 70 percent of those who appeared at draft boards filed exemption claims. Draft lists were stolen to slow down the induction process. Merchants and bankers who openly supported the war were boycotted. Protest meetings and rallies spread across the country.

NAWSA Bows to War Drive

In 1914 NAWSA's paper, the Women's Journal, had issued a call for peace by suffragists from twenty-six nations.

But by 1916, Catt and Shaw had moved NAWSA closer to Wilson and support of his war policy. In that year, facing a difficult fight for re-election, Wilson was invited to address the NAWSA convention, even though he had refused to endorse suffrage.

Catt and Shaw enthusiastically supported the open declaration of war in April 1917. Under their guidance NAWSA became virtually an extension of the war effort.

NAWSA leaders were arguing to women that by supporting the war they would win suffrage as a reward. To the government they pleaded that granting suffrage would make women more enthusiastic about the war. Wilson didn't need to listen to their pleas, however, for he had already gotten what he wanted from NAWSA.

The call for the December 1917 NAWSA convention stated: "...the nation is realizing its dependence upon women as never before. It must be made to realize also that, willingly as women are now serving, they can serve still more efficiently when they shall have received the full measure of citizenship."

At that convention Anna Shaw declared, "We talk of the army in the field as one and the army at home as another. We are not two armies, we are one—absolutely one army—and we must work together. Unless the army at home does its duty faithfully, the army in the field will be unable to carry to a victorious end this war which you and I believe is the great war that shall bring to the world the thing that is nearest our hearts—democracy."

Shaw announced the formation of the Women's Committee of Wilson's Council of National Defense. Shaw was appointed chair of the body with Catt as a leading member. The Women's Committee was charged with duty and sacrifice and channeled women's groups into war work. Suffrage took second place at best while women were asked to conserve food, grow vegetables in their back yards and can them, hold fund raisers to buy tobacco for the men in the trenches, save work for the Red Cross, and peddle "liberty" bonds.

Shaw even called on NAWSA members to act like sires, during their own sons, husbands, and loved ones to their deaths: "The first thing we are asked to do is to provide the enthusiasm, inspira-

tion, and patriotism to make men want to fight and we are to send them away with a smile! That is not much to ask of a mother . . . . Keep the home fires burning, keep the home sweet and peaceful and happy, keep society on a level, look after business, buy enough but not too much and wear some of our old clothes but not all of them, or what would happen to the merchants?"

But Wilson wasn't able to line up the whole suffrage movement for the war.

The Women's Party kept up a militant struggle for the vote in the face of demands that they drop everything for the war effort.

In Jailed for Freedom, Doris Stevens describes the pressure put on the Women's Party at its March 1917 convention, one month before war was declared.

"Most of the delegates assembled had been approached . . . . and urged to use their influence to persuade the organization to abandon its work for the freedom of women and turn its activities into war channels," Stevens explained.

"Lay aside your own fight and help us crush Germany, and you will find yourselves rewarded with a vote out of the nation's gratitude,"
Suffrage marches through New York’s Washington·picketing: ions In men’s rights and the fight against militarization have no support for the war, the organization would take no official position on the war nor organize any while its individual members might either oppose the war and for suffrage despite its aims. It stated that no official position on the war nor organize any Meanwhile, Congress had voted only to deal with "war measures" as a way to avoid taking up suffrage and other concerns of working people. The strategy of the Women’s Party was to expose the hypocrisy of the government’s "war of democracy," when the vote was denied to half the population.

‘Kaiser Wilson’ Their carriers handed on a daily picket line at the White House. When foreign missions visited, they would see such slogans as: "We shall fight for the things we have always carried nearest our hearts." "Democracy should begin at home," and "We demand justice and self government in our land."

The February 1917 revolution in Russia had granted women the vote, so when a delegation came from the new Kerensky government, the government officials pleaded. But the 1,000 delegates refused to be tricked. The convention reaffirmed the organization’s commitment solely to suffrage. It stated that while its individual members might either oppose or support the war, the organization would take no official position on the war nor organize any support for the war. Women’s Party pickets are attacked by U.S. soldiers.

Wilson’s Response That is why Women’s Party supporters were viciously attacked by the Wilson administration. Gange of men were organized to beat up the women. Again and again the marchers were thrown into jail and brutally treated, food fed when they went on hunger strikes, thrown into solitary confinement, denied medical treatment, and manacled to their cells. Wilson hoped this would silence them. But they grew bolder and more determined as they toured the country in a special train to denounce the treatment of political prisoners and to demand the vote. Opposition mounted to the violation of their rights and cries for suffrage by the American government grew louder.

Socialist Party and Suffrage While the Women’s Party was fighting for the vote by exposing the “war for democracy,” the Socialist Party was seeking to galvanize the strong sentiment of workers and farmers against the war and for voting rights.

Although the most openly pro-war section of the Socialist Party split away as the war approached, the great majority of Socialist Party members—above all, its working-class base—fiercely opposed the war. They followed Eugene V. Debs. His antiwar speeches called on working-class audiences to maintain the tradition of solidarity with workers in other countries against the capitalists on both sides of the war. Like the Women’s Party, the Socialist Party continued to campaign for women’s suffrage. Socialists campaigned for the adoption of suffrage in every state they ran campaign. Where they had elected legislators, the party introduced suffrage resolutions. Throughout the war, Socialist Party members organized against the war and for suffrage despite repression, censorship, and vigilante attacks. Their 1917 mayoral campaign in New York City vividly demonstrated this commitment.

The victory in a 1917 referendum of a New York State suffrage amendment was largely due to the work of the Socialist Party. The socialist candidate for mayor of New York City, Morris Hillquit, campaigned for suffrage, calling upon his opponents to join him in a plea for the amendment’s passage. They declined.

The socialists held nightly suffrage meetings throughout the city, supported by two major socialist unions, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the International Ladies’ Garment Workers. Late in the campaign, some 20,000 people jammed into Madison Square Garden to hear Hillquit denounce the war and attacks on civil liberties. Suffrage carried New York City (where Hillquit got 145,000 votes) by a wide margin and did well in upset areas where the socialist vote was heavy. The Herald, a Rochester newspaper, commented, “Wherever the Socialists and the Amalgamada made headway . . . the suffrage vote automatically increased.”

The activities of the Women’s Party and Socialist Party put heat on Wilson. He began to give lip service to the suffrage cause—much as Carter occasionally gives lip service to the ERA today. He set up committees to investigate and discuss suffrage into oblivion. But the women kept fighting and the issue would not die.

In February 1919 when Wilson went to the peace conference in Versailles, France, where the victorious imperialist powers carved up the spoils, the suffragists burned his speeches about “liberty” in front of the White House and met his return to Boston with a suffrage demonstration. During the period of public picketing by and arrests of members of the Women’s Party, NAWSA played a part. Catt frequently visited the picketers.

The steadfast campaign for suffrage, which from 1915 on focused on passage of a federal suffrage amendment, finally forced Congress to pass it on May 20, 1919. After another series of battles it was ratified by a sufficient number of states and became the Nineteenth Amendment in August 1920.

Did Supporting War Win the Vote? It was not those who bowed to the war policies of the capitalist rulers who spurred on the victory of women’s suffrage, but those who stood up to them. The growing role of women in the work force—up to 20.4 percent by 1920—gave impetus to the women’s movement and the fight for suffrage, as it does to the fight for the ERA today.

The women’s rights movement at that time—which included the fight for the vote and the struggle of thousands of women workers for dignity on the job—was an attempt to bring the law into harmony with the new social position of women.

The movement for women’s suffrage began to regain momentum during the months of direct U.S. participation in World War I. A major factor was the inspiring effect on working people of the revolutionary events that occurred in Russia in 1917. An insurrection by war-weary masses of workers and farmers against the tsar of Russia, an ally of the United States in the “war for democracy,” began the Russian revolution in February 1917.

One of the first acts of the Provisional Government brought to power by the revolution was to grant universal adult suffrage to men and women. When the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Trotsky led councils of workers and peasants to power in October 1917, the new government inscribed the full liberation of women on its banner. What a contrast to Wilson’s jailing of the suffragists.

And the new government pulled Russia out of World War I, fueling opposition among working people. But the question of suffrage would continue to swirl. Under these circumstances, denying the vote to Continued on page 158/11
From Trotsky's Archives: Founding the International Left Opposition

By Duncan Williams

April marked the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the International Left Opposition, predecessor of the Fourth International. Up until now there have been gaps in our knowledge of what the founding conference did, and what problems it faced. Many documents about the conference and the early days of the ILO have been available for some time, mainly in the Writings of Leon Trotsky series published by Pathfinder Press, and in back issues of the Militant and the French Trotskyist paper Le Vertu. But the opening of the closed section of the Trotsky Archives at Harvard University has made it possible to examine conference minutes as well as letters about it.

Internationalism

Before taking up the conference itself, it is necessary to step back a little and take up some basic issues. Why is it necessary for revolutionaries to have an international organization? Why was the conference called, what was it supposed to accomplish?

Internationalism is a hallmark of the revolutionary workers movement. That is because it confronts an international economic system, capitalism. While workers in individual countries can overthrow capitalism, their struggles are interrelated and interdependent. And the building of socialism requires international planning based on the collaboration of working people in many countries.

The task of a revolutionary international organization is to foster the building of revolutionary workers parties throughout the world. Material outlooks of the working class, has always been an internationalist doctrine. The Communist Manifesto was written in 1848 for an international revolutionary organization, the Communist League. Marx and Engels helped found and participated in the First International. Later revolutionaries—such as Lenin, Liebknecht, Luxemburg, Debs, and Trotsky—were in the Second International. When it collapsed in 1914, with most of its parties supporting their own imperialist governments in World War I, Lenin began working to the perspective of Third International. Its founding congress was held in Russia in 1919, after the workers came to power there.

But after the victory of the Russian revolution and the founding of the Comintern, the world working class was hit by a wave of defeats that led to the degeneration of the new international.

 Rise of Stalinism

The setbacks to the German revolution between 1918 and 1923 were the most important of these.

The world capitalist system gained a breathing space, a period of relative stability. The survival of world capitalism through the 1920s led the world into devastating crises, like the depression of the 1930s; fascist victories in Germany and Spain; and a new world war, even bloodier than the first.

The defeats of the 1920s could not fail to affect the state that issued from the first successful socialist revolution, the Soviet Union.

Defeat abroad and terrible poverty and backwardness at home wore down the morale of the Soviet workers, who had made the revolution. Under these circumstances, a layer of bureaucratic state and party functionaries usurped political power after Lenin died in 1924. These people had to continue the封建 regime, and so they had to ensure their material comforts and privileges by collaborating with the imperialists.

Duncan Williams was the head of a team of researchers sent by Monad Press to examine the materials in the previously closed sections of the Trotsky Archives at Harvard University.

The theoretical justification that the bureaucrats, led by Stalin, came up with for this policy was “socialism in one country.” They said the Soviet Union could, on its own, construct a complete socialist society. No further victories for the world revolution were needed for this. The only thing that could prevent the achievement of socialism within Soviet borders, they claimed, was an imperialist invasion.

The Soviet bureaucracy sought trade and pledges not to go to war against the Soviet Union from imperialist governments. In return, the bureaucracy agreed to support these governments, and to help channel and contain anti-imperialist struggles.

No democratic discussion of this policy was allowed in the Soviet Union or the Comintern. The revolutionaries who raised their voices against them were expelled. Trotsky himself, as the central leader of the Left Opposition in Russia, was deported in 1929. (By 1940, the only surviving member of the Central Committee of Lenin’s time was Stalin.)

The Comintern became an instrument of Stalin’s policy.

This policy helped produce new blows to the working class, leading to further weakening of the revolutionary movement.

The Left Opposition

Trotsky had led the Left Opposition against the bureaucracy in the Soviet Communist Party. He saw the need to preserve and unify the forces on a world scale that were resisting the degeneration of the Soviet state and Communist Party. Most of them were in scattered groups, victims of successive waves of purges in the Comintern and continually in danger of demoralization and disorientation.

Confusion deepened when Stalin—frightened by real threats from Britain and the growing strength of procapitalist elements in the Soviet Union—began a sharp ultraleft turn in 1926-9. At home he launched five-year plans aimed at rapid industrialization and forced collectivization of agriculture. Internationally political support to types like Chiang Kai-shek in China and the British trade-union bureaucrats was replaced by calls for immediate armed struggle in China and other colonial countries, and by denunciations of mass trade union and social democratic parties as fascist.

Many Left Oppositionists, particularly in the Soviet Union, used the Lenin turn as a pretext for giving up what they saw as a hopeless struggle. They capitulated to Stalin.

And throughout the world, the ultra-revolutionary rhetoric of the Comintern seemed to belie the Left Opposition’s warnings that the Comintern under Stalin was moving farther from a revolutionary course. The result was deep isolation for the scattered revolutionists.

A description of the problems this caused for the American supporters who had more experienced leaders and stronger roots in the working class than most Left Opposition groups—can be found in the chapter in James P. Cannon’s History of American Trotskyism entitled “Dog Days of the Left Opposition.”

When he was deported from the Soviet Union in 1929, Trotsky began immediately to get in touch with opposition groupings all over the world, with the aim of working for the formation of a international Left Opposition current. This was to work as an expelled faction of the Comintern, fighting to change its disastrous policies.

The first stage in this work was to demarcate the Left Opposition not only from the dominant Stalinist current in the Comintern, but from all other expelled groupings that did not share basic revolutionary internationalist views.

The first of these were the Right Opposition groups. They were followers of Nikolai Bukharin. After the revolution, the Soviet government had taken state and Communist Party officials and employees of the railroad (the CERR had been built by the tsarist Eastern Railroad) revealed how deep the differences were going.

In July 1928 Chiang Kai-shek, in an attempt to aliterate the 1924 treaty concerning the Chinese Eastern Railroad (CERR) in Manchuria, arrested 174 Soviet officials and employees of the railroad. The CERR had been built by the tsarist regime as part of the Trans-Siberian railway. After the revolution, the Soviet government negotiated agreements with the Chinese government, allowing the Soviet Union to keep the railroad—until it could be turned over to an independent government representative of the Chinese people. Chiang backed down from his
The question of the international relations of the Left Opposition groups has developed independently of each other, without contact, often arriving at different positions on important questions.

In some countries, we have parallel groups claiming the same principles, but in practice fighting against each other.

In the USSR, the Opposition works under conditions of illegality. An international conference is needed to create a basis for unity; we believe it is possible and necessary to reunite as soon as possible.

The conference must be well prepared—it must elaborate a platform, a resolution on strategic and tactical questions, circulate drafts to all groups, organize a broad discussion before the conference.

The practical preparations of the conference require great attention—a list of all possible organizations to be invited, the elaboration of statute, voting procedures, etc.

We need to take the initiative.

... it is time for action. An international bureau should be established to promote contact among the different groups, to assure the exchange of materials and publish an information bulletin.

Trotsky proposed that the bureau have representatives in the French, Belgian, and Chinese opposition groups, with other groups in India, Japan, and other countries.

To Trotsky, an international conference was a life and death question; energy and resources had to be devoted to it right away. To the authors of the call in La Vérité, a conference was a good thing, but it was a difficult task which they apparently didn’t feel equal to.

The Conference is Held

The conference itself, held in Paris on April 6, was attended by eleven delegates, representing the French, Belgian, American, Czech, Spanish, German, and Hungarian Left Opposition groups.

Trotsky was surprised at the reaction to the Sino-Soviet conflict: it “is so elementary for every revolutionary.”

The necessity of a minimum of organization and the conference issued no declaration or resolution of illegality.

The conference itself, held in Paris on April 6, was attended by eleven delegates, representing the French, Belgian, American, Czech, Spanish, German, and Hungarian Left Opposition groups.

Trotsky argued that the conflict had to be viewed in terms of the struggle of working people against imperialism.

He explained that Chiang Kai-shek’s action could only benefit the British and Japanese imperialism. Having crushed the Chinese revolution, Chiang could not defend Chinese sovereignty over the railroad against Japan. Great Britain, or other imperialist powers.

Chiang’s challenge to the Soviet Union was a product of the blows that he had been able to deal to the Chinese national intelligentsia, the leadership of the political support given him by Stalin.

To turn over the railroad would thus mean turning it over to imperialism and weakening the Chinese people’s struggle for independence.

Trotsky also explained why defense of the railroad was absolutely necessary for every revolutionary.

This was a further sign that a wing of the revolutionary movement was wearing down under the pressure of fascism.

Shift by Ultralefts

Some who opposed Trotsky on this point also insisted that the Soviet Union was not a workers state, and that the Left Opposition should be opposing trying to reform the Comintern and declare for new parties.

Trotsky noted that many of these forces, such as Urbahns, had supported an earlier, ultraleft shift by Stalin (then in alliance with Grigori Zinoviev).

The experience of defeat has not failed to leave its imprint. But the lessons of these years have been far from assimilated by all the ultralefts.

Some freed themselves of prejudices while preserving the revolutionary spirit. But others dissipated the revolutionary spirit. But others dissipated the revolutionary spirit. At all events, most ultralefts in the Russian Opposition have been infected with ultraleftism.

Trotsky placed great value on the political differentiation that resulted from the discussion. He later wrote:

The break with . . . Paz in France, Urbahns in Germany, and others, was the most important element in the ideological preparation for the conference of genuine revolutionary communists.

But the discussion strengthened his awareness of the necessity of liquidating the so-called beligerent groups of revolutionary Marxists. He redoubled efforts to unify the Left Opposition organizationally.

Role of a Manifesto

When he discovered that this had not been done, Trotsky wrote to Shachtman:

Why wasn’t a short declaration of principle or manifesto issued? Why? Such a document would be of the greatest political importance. It should be shown to every thinking worker and every party organist that there is a genuine basis for the propaganda work of the International Opposition. It must always be possible for any member of the Opposition, in any country, to act as an international oppositionist.

We read the draft together—Shachtman, Naville (another leader of the French group), and I—and decided that a serious reediting job was necessary, a job that it was too late to take on, since it was already done, Trotsky wrote to Shachtman:

Our movement was attended by eleven delegates, representing the French, Belgian, American, Czech, Spanish, German, and Hungarian Left Opposition groups.

Trotsky explained why defense of the railroad was absolutely necessary for every revolutionary.

To turn over the railroad would thus mean turning it over to imperialism and weakening the Chinese people’s struggle for independence.

Trotsky also explained why defense of the railroad was absolutely necessary for every revolutionary.

This was a further sign that a wing of the revolutionary movement was wearing down under the pressure of fascism.

Shift by Ultralefts

Some who opposed Trotsky on this point also insisted that the Soviet Union was not a workers state, and that the Left Opposition should be opposing trying to reform the Comintern and declare for new parties.

Trotsky noted that many of these forces, such as Urbahns, had supported an earlier, ultraleft shift by Stalin (then in alliance with Grigori Zinoviev).

The experience of defeat has not failed to leave its imprint. But the lessons of these years have been far from assimilated by all the ultralefts. Some freed themselves of prejudices while preserving the revolutionary spirit. But others dissipated the revolutionary spirit. But others dissipated the revolutionary spirit.

At all events, most ultralefts in the Russian Opposition have been infected with ultraleftism.

Trotsky placed great value on the political differentiation that resulted from the discussion. He later wrote:

The break with . . . Paz in France, Urbahns in Germany, and others, was the most important element in the ideological preparation for the conference of genuine revolutionary communists.

But the discussion strengthened his awareness of the necessity of liquidating the so-called beligerent groups of revolutionary Marxists. He redoubled efforts to unify the Left Opposition organizationally.

Need for Conference

In his letter to Trotsky, Shachtman sent a draft of a circular letter calling for an international conference of all Left Opposition groups to Alfred Rosmer, a leader of the French Opposition. Rosmer was the most prominent Oppositionist outside of the leaders of the Russian Opposition.

He had been a leader of the First World War revolutionary party, and later served as French representative to the early congresses of the Comintern, serving on that body’s executive committee.

The conference, which Trotsky proposed be sent to all Left Opposition groups, stated:

The question of the international relations of the Left Opposition is a matter of life and death. The conference is Held

The Conference is Held

The conference itself, held in Paris on April 6, was attended by eleven delegates, representing the French, Belgian, American, Czech, Spanish, German, and Hungarian Left Opposition groups.

Trotsky was surprised at the reaction to the Sino-Soviet conflict: it “is so elementary for every revolutionary.”

The necessity of a minimum of organization

Roemer did not respond to Trotsky’s letter for several months. Then, in February 1930, La Vérité published a call of its own for steps to prepare an international conference. The authors wrote:

The necessity of a minimum of organization regrouping our greater forces is acknowledged everywhere.

As our readers have been able to confirm from the correspondence we have published, the same idea has been formulated time and again. . . . In individual letters, they add: “You should take it on yourselves to create this unification. . . . Up until now, despite repeated insinuations, we have hesitated to take on this work. Not that we were less convinced than you that it is very important to the work of the Opposition, but it’s too easy to speak of an ‘international conference’; it’s another thing to do it.

We think it is necessary to start with the publication of an information bulletin. . . . A secretariat should be assigned to put together the documentation and publish it.

If we compare this call with Trotsky’s, the conclusions appear the same—setting up an international coordinating body, publishing a bulletin, and preparing for a conference—but the tone and emphasis were worlds apart.
and plagued with factionalism. The first International never equal to the tasks before it. The lack of an authoritative international center was a serious point of support in the [French Communist] youth. Several comrades with important posts are already completely won over. 11

It's hard to believe that, with such opportunities opening up, a clear statement of program and perspectives would not have brought the ILO even more recruits from the Communist parties and would have made it easier for those who did join to do so faster.

Weakness of Leadership
Because the aims of the conference and the new secretariat were so vague, the International Secretariat was not able to function with the necessary coherence, coordination, and efficiency. Although no votes were taken at the conference, it was generally agreed that the secretariat would have representatives of the Russian, German, and French Opposition delegates. The members of the secretariat were not designated or elected at the conference.

As late as October 2, Trotsky was to write to Kurt Landau, a leader of the German section and member of the secretariat:

Since no one knows the real decisions of the April conference, which were never published, and since your information [on the composition of the secretariat] is at odds with the information in the international bulletin and the French paper (which are in turn at odds with each other), please tell us if you have the decisions, what you base your understanding on. 12

The secretariat underwent many changes in its membership over the next few years. For example, Alfred Roemer and Kurt Landau, who were two of the three members finally designated for the first International Secretariat, had both left the International Opposition within a year after the conference. Consequently, the secretariat's authority was never equal to the tasks before it. The lack of an authoritative international center was particularly damaging in the early years of the ILO, when most of the small groups were disoriented and plagued with factionalism.

The first issue of the international bulletin, which was to come out twice a month, did not appear until August, at which time a declaration

The Writings of Leon Trotsky
1929-1940

The Writings of Leon Trotsky (1929-40), a twelve-volume series with a two-part supplement, are from his last exile. With their completion, what Trotsky called "literary-bureaucratic" methods in the functioning of the ILO are given up. It is hard to believe that, with such opportunities opening up, a clear statement of program and perspectives would not have brought the ILO even more recruits from the Communist parties and would have made it easier for those who did join to do so faster.

Weakness of Leadership
Because the aims of the conference and the new secretariat were so vague, the International Secretariat was not able to function with the necessary coherence, coordination, and efficiency. Although no votes were taken at the conference, it was generally agreed that the secretariat would have representatives of the Russian, German, and French Opposition delegates. The members of the secretariat were not designated or elected at the conference.

As late as October 2, Trotsky was to write to Kurt Landau, a leader of the German section and member of the secretariat:

Since no one knows the real decisions of the April conference, which were never published, and since your information [on the composition of the secretariat] is at odds with the information in the international bulletin and the French paper (which are in turn at odds with each other), please tell us if you have the decisions, what you base your understanding on. 12

The secretariat underwent many changes in its membership over the next few years. For example, Alfred Roemer and Kurt Landau, who were two of the three members finally designated for the first International Secretariat, had both left the International Opposition within a year after the conference. Consequently, the secretariat's authority was never equal to the tasks before it. The lack of an authoritative international center was particularly damaging in the early years of the ILO, when most of the small groups were disoriented and plagued with factionalism.

The first issue of the international bulletin, which was to come out twice a month, did not appear until August, at which time a declaration

attributed to the April conference was published, probably based to some extent on the preliminary draft Trotsky and Shachtman had drawn up. Although a future authoritative conference of the ILO was discussed in general terms at the April meeting, no discussion took place as to the time, place, or agenda. In fact, the next international gathering of the ILO (a preconference) did not take place until February 1933.

Importance of Conference
The major reason for the resistance to moving forward aggressively were indicated at the beginning of this essay: 1) defeat of the world revolution; 2) degeneration of the Comintern; and 3) defeat and capitulation of many leaders of the Russian Opposition.

Moreover, most of the early leaders of the Left Opposition were from petty-bourgeoisie backgrounds. This was no crime in itself, but, cut off from the working movement, it was very easy for these people to inject an element of skepticism and what Trotsky called "literary-bureaucratic" methods in the functioning of the ILO.

Of course, the conference had accomplishments to its credit. Most groups, although they were weak, had more than a few hundred members—reported progress establishing weekly papers and making new contacts and recruits from the CPs and their milieu.

Certainly, in comparison with other tendencies, the ILO emerged as the only truly revolutionary current in the world working class. The Comintern and the Social Democracy continued to pave the way for terrible defeats in Germany and in Spain. The Right Opposition disintegrated throughout the 1930s, with many of its supporters finding their way back to the Stalinist parties or to the Social Democracy. Unhappiness, Part, and others, wanting to build independent groups, built essentially nothing.

The Conference had the effect of controlling and limiting centrifugal forces that were pulling the revolutionary movement apart in a period of defeats. It enabled an organized body of revolutionists to hang together until fresh openings occurred. These developed after the Comintern's policy in Germany allowed Hitler to take power without a shot, exposing for the Workers' Opposition the complete hollowness of the Comintern's revolutionary rhetoric.

It was in the wake of this tragedy that the ILO decided that the Comintern could not be reformed, and set out to build the Fourth International. The ferment provoked by the German events, and the emergence of new left currents within the Social Democracy all allowed the revolutionary movement to move forward, although not without great difficulties.

Despite all its failings, the conference was a rudimentary organizational commitment to internationalism. It made possible the publication, however rare, of the international bulletin, and

but whose activity remained confined to their milieus, and we were completely ignorant of them. Like many others, they wanted to see us at work, to evaluate us, before making an approach to us. Now the liaison is firmly established, we are going to work together closely; these recruits of ours are far above the ordinary level. That can be seen from what they write. . . . Moreover, they have shown themselves to be model distributors of the press, having sold 160 copies of the issue with their first article.

Also, Roemer reported having established contact with three leaders of the central committee of the Italian Communist Party, who were later to split and form the New Italian Opposition, the Italian section of the International Left Opposition.

Most important, on May 9 Roemer reported:

We now have a serious point of support in the [French Communist] youth. Several comrades with important posts are already completely won over. 11

It's hard to believe that, with such opportunities opening up, a clear statement of program and perspectives would not have brought the ILO even more recruits from the Communist parties and would have made it easier for those who did join to do so faster.

Weakness of Leadership
Because the aims of the conference and the new secretariat were so vague, the International Secretariat was not able to function with the necessary coherence, coordination, and efficiency. Although no votes were taken at the conference, it was generally agreed that the secretariat would have representatives of the Russian, German, and French Opposition delegates. The members of the secretariat were not designated or elected at the conference.

As late as October 2, Trotsky was to write to Kurt Landau, a leader of the German section and member of the secretariat:

Since no one knows the real decisions of the April conference, which were never published, and since your information [on the composition of the secretariat] is at odds with the information in the international bulletin and the French paper (which are in turn at odds with each other), please tell us if you have the decisions, what you base your understanding on: 12

The secretariat underwent many changes in its membership over the next few years. For example, Alfred Roemer and Kurt Landau, who were two of the three members finally designated for the first International Secretariat, had both left the International Opposition within a year after the conference. Consequently, the secretariat's authority was never equal to the tasks before it. The lack of an authoritative international center was particularly damaging in the early years of the ILO, when most of the small groups were disoriented and plagued with factionalism.

The first issue of the international bulletin, which was to come out twice a month, did not appear until August, at which time a declaration

attributed to the April conference was published, probably based to some extent on the preliminary draft Trotsky and Shachtman had drawn up. Although a future authoritative conference of the ILO was discussed in general terms at the April meeting, no discussion took place as to the time, place, or agenda. In fact, the next international gathering of the ILO (a preconference) did not take place until February 1933.

Importance of Conference
The major reason for the resistance to moving forward aggressively were indicated at the beginning of this essay: 1) defeat of the world revolution; 2) degeneration of the Comintern; and 3) defeat and capitulation of many leaders of the Russian Opposition.

Moreover, most of the early leaders of the Left Opposition were from petty-bourgeoisie backgrounds. This was no crime in itself, but, cut off from the working movement, it was very easy for these people to inject an element of skepticism and what Trotsky called "literary-bureaucratic" methods in the functioning of the ILO.

Of course, the conference had accomplishments to its credit. Most groups, although they were weak—none had more than a few hundred members—reported progress establishing weekly papers and making new contacts and recruits from the CPs and their milieu.

Certainly, in comparison with other tendencies, the ILO emerged as the only truly revolutionary current in the world working class. The Comintern and the Social Democracy continued to pave the way for terrible defeats in Germany and in Spain. The Right Opposition disintegrated throughout the 1930s, with many of its supporters finding their way back to the Stalinist parties or to the Social Democracy. Unhappiness, Part, and others, wanting to build independent groups, built essentially nothing.

The Conference had the effect of controlling and limiting centrifugal forces that were pulling the revolutionary movement apart in a period of defeats. It enabled an organized body of revolutionists to hang together until fresh openings occurred. These developed after the Comintern's policy in Germany allowed Hitler to take power without a shot, exposing for the Workers' Opposition the complete hollowness of the Comintern's revolutionary rhetoric.

It was in the wake of this tragedy that the ILO decided that the Comintern could not be reformed, and set out to build the Fourth International. The ferment provoked by the German events, and the emergence of new left currents within the Social Democracy all allowed the revolutionary movement to move forward, although not without great difficulties.

Despite all its failings, the conference was a rudimentary organizational commitment to internationalism. It made possible the publication, however rare, of the international bulletin, and
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women in the face of demonstrated protests created problems for Washington's attempt to parade as world liberator during and after the war.

The U. S. government hoped that granting women the vote would underpin support for the Russian revolution. They had hopes of crushing it at the same time. The aura of democracy as the cover for this counterrevolutionary act. But working women and men didn't fall for the trick, and the U. S. government in Russia failed.

The ERA Battle

Today, the fight for ERA is playing a role similar to the suffrage battle in the fight for women's rights. And working people are moving forward to support it, just as they supported suffrage.

The solidarity forged between working women and men, Black and white, in the fight for women's equality makes it more difficult for the rulers to haul working class men and women into the hallowed halls of Congress.

Along with the mass opposition to involvement in another unjust war, the demand for ERA represents the refusal of working people to sacrifice their rights and interests.

It is in this context that Carter came up with his proposal to register women as well as men for the draft.

Carter's aim was not only to put over his war preparations, but to sink the ERA--to frighten working men and women out of supporting the ERA by identifying it with the draft and war. And he wanted to undermine opposition to stepped-up war preparations among women by presenting the draft as in the interests of equality and the military as some sort of equal opportunity employer.

But as the groundswell of labor support for ERA shows, the movement of women and men and the labor movement for ERA continues to grow.

The National May 10 march for ERA in Chicago, called by the National Organization for Women, is the most recent example of the power of this movement.

It is the first time in decades that a demonstration for basic civil rights has had such broad sponsorship from the organized labor movement. It is taking place in the midst of an election year, when working people are expected to put their faith in capitalist politicians rather than demonstrating in the streets against their policies.

But we have not yet won the battle. Time is running out. We can expect that Carter will attempt all kinds of subterfuges to undermine this unprecedented and insistent movement for women's equality--especially as the current economic crisis deepens and the war drums beat louder, which they will.

It is vital that the women's movement know who are our friends and who are our enemies. And it is crucial for the movement to be clear on the issues of war, the draft, and the military.

Our allies and our enemies have not changed since World War I. We don't need to repeat the mistakes that many of the suffrage leaders made.

Putting an M-16 rifle in a woman's hands to gun down our brothers and sisters in Vietnam, Afghanistan, or Nicaragua is no improvement over handling us a needle to sew a bandage during World War I.

The first may sound like liberation to a few, but it is an intensified form of our slavery.

The power to liberate women lies in unity with the millions of working women and men here and around the world who are compelled to challenge Washington's power in their fight for a decent life.

The position paper published by the NOW leadership on the draft is dangerous because it poses the same disastrous course that the NAWSA leaders adopted after 1914.

But times have changed, and women in this country have learned a lot from the experience of Vietnam.

I think the NOW membership will reject the course proposed by the position paper and take their stand unconditionally with the opponents of the draft for men or women under any circumstances and support the new Vietnams Washington is trying to prepare.

Unions have not done so well. Membership continues to decline in relation to the total work force. The number of organized workers fluctuates around the 20 million mark. The AFL-CIO has fewer members than the 15 million it started with in 1955. The largest and most combative unions are outside the federation. They are the Teamsters, Auto Workers, United Mine Workers, and National Education Association. Together they represent about 6 million members, nearly half the number represented by all the more than 100 AFL-CIO affiliates.

The class-collaborationist policies of these independent unions are not essentially different from the AFL-CIO under Meany's direction. But the federal government, because it offers nothing better, is not an attractive force for organized workers outside its range.

The unions have a potential of organizing millions of unorganized workers in this country, but the present leadership makes little effort to do so.

The union movement has less political influence today than any time since the early years of the CIO movement.

The record on any count, from the standpoint of working people, does not speak well for the Meany leadership of the union movement.

There are three lessons workers can learn from their too-long and too-tolerant experience with CIO leaders.

1. Don't make deals with the bosses, don't trust capitalist politicians, and don't undermine workers' struggles here or in other countries.

George Meany
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Two pressures from either side. Viewed by themselves and portrayed to others as great movers and shakers of history, the bureaucrats in fact play no fundamentally independent role. Much as they abhor and try to dampen the class struggle, their actions are ultimately determined by its logic.

The bureaucracy was slow to respond to the economic, social, and political changes of the 1960s and '70s. But it did respond. It had to. The class collaborationist strategy did not and has not worked.

The union official who stood all sorts of public relations stunts to improve their image, to create the general impression that they are antibodies of game, trying to take back what workers already have, is Meany's and his social democratic coterie served as the symbol of this, as in other matters.

In early 1975 the right-wing social democrats first chose a prominent AFL-CIO vice-president as the honored recipient of their Eugene V. Debs award. I. W. Abel, then president of the United Steelworkers, hardly knew who Debs was and certainly had nothing in common with the revolutionary socialist tradition that Debs represented.

In other words, most unions have been forced to negotiate pay cuts in real-dollar terms, and unionization efforts have not done so well. Membership pressures from either side. Viewed by themselves and portrayed to others as great movers and shakers of history, the bureaucrats in fact play no fundamentally independent role. Much as they abhor and try to dampen the class struggle, their actions are ultimately determined by its logic.

The bureaucracy was slow to respond to the economic, social, and political changes of the 1960s and '70s. But it did respond. It had to. The class collaborationist strategy did not and has not worked. The class collaborationist strategy did not and has not worked. The class collaborationist strategy did not and has not worked. The class collaborationist strategy did not and has not worked.

The bureaucratic leadership equation.

Fortune magazine reported in 1967 dollars for the average worker with three dependents declined from $90.86 in 1967 to $87.55 in December 1979, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Union contract negotiations in 1979 provided first-year wage increases of 8.4 percent. Inflation ran ahead at 11.5 percent in 1979. Today it is 18 percent, while real wages are lowered under pressure of the Carter administration.

In other words, most unions have been forced to negotiate pay cuts in real-dollar terms, and unionization efforts have not done so well.

Profile show the other side of the labor-management equation. Picket lines reported in May 1979 that previous-year profits for the top 500 U. S. industrial corporations "were absolutely sensational." The average return on shareholders' equity was 14.3 percent, a record since Fortune began collecting data in 1958. It is certain that 1979 was another banner year ... for most of them.

Union leaders come to honor Debs, they will indict the war criminals—Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Carter. That will be a fitting tribute to the Debs tradition.

It is true that Debs did not fully understand the double exploitation of Blacks in this racist society, but he solidarized with the struggles of Blacks and always defended their rights. That contradicts with Meany's shameful record.

The union movement did not prosper under Meany's leadership. The working class is less protected by the unions now than it was in 1955 when the AFL-CIO was formed. It is under heavy attack from the employers and is poorly armed defense. On all fronts the employing class is advancing, the workers retreating.

The weekly paycheck (in 1967 dollars) for the average worker with three dependents declined from $90.86 in 1967 to $87.55 in December 1979, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Union contract negotiations in 1979 provided first-year wage increases of 8.4 percent. Inflation ran ahead at 11.5 percent in 1979. Today it is 18 percent, while real wages are lowered under pressure of the Carter administration.

In other words, most unions have been forced to negotiate pay cuts in real-dollar terms, and unionization efforts have not done so well.

Profile show the other side of the labor-management equation. Picket lines reported in May 1979 that previous-year profits for the top 500 U. S. industrial corporations "were absolutely sensational." The average return on shareholders' equity was 14.3 percent, a record since Fortune began collecting data in 1958. It is certain that 1979 was another banner year ... for most of them.

Unions have not done so well. Membership continues to decline in relation to the total work force. The number of organized workers fluctuates around the 20 million mark. The AFL-CIO has fewer members than the 15 million it started with in 1955. The largest and most combative unions are outside the federation. They are the Teamsters, Auto Workers, United Mine Workers, and National Education Association. Together they represent about 6 million members, nearly half the number represented by all the more than 100 AFL-CIO affiliates.

The class-collaborationist policies of these independent unions are not essentially different from the AFL-CIO under Meany's direction. But the federal government, because it offers nothing better, is not an attractive force for organized workers outside its range.

The unions have a potential of organizing millions of unorganized workers in this country, but the present leadership makes little effort to do so.

The union movement has less political influence today than any time since the early years of the CIO movement.

The record on any count, from the standpoint of working people, does not speak well for the Meany leadership of the union movement.

There are three lessons workers can learn from their too-long and too-tolerant experience with CIO leaders.

1. Don't make deals with the bosses, don't trust capitalist politicians, and don't undermine workers' struggles here or in other countries.
George Meany and Social Democracy

By Frank Lovell

"American workers can feasibly accept the guns or bitter argument, and opt for bitter over guns, under only two conditions: either they no longer see an external threat, or they have gone into revolutionary opposition."

—Lane Kirkland, AFL-CIO president, at the 1969 Eugene V. Debs Award ceremony sponsored annually by Social Democrats USA.

One of the myths bequeathed to the union bureaucracy by George Meany—among the other mental encumbrances he bestowed—is the ever-present threat of communist invasion. Fear is an innate characteristic of social democracy, one of the main political currents indigenous to the workers' movement, and it derives historically from the economic insecurity of workers under capitalism.

Social democracy turns this insecurity into an identity of compromise, a theory that the conflicting interests of the working class and the employing class can and must be reconciled. It comes, then, to mean (as the masters have (or think they have) found a modicum of stability and prosperity for themselves within the profit system) the threat that faces work-the class struggle is to be avoided, defused, or suppressed at all cost.

In a recent series of articles in the Militant (February 22, February 26, and March 21) I detailed George Meany's history of collaboration with the bosses on the economic field, his intimate ties to U.S. imperialist foreign policy and especially the CIA, and his unrelenting opposition to a union break with the capitalist two-party political system. Throughout this career Meany was the embodiment of right-wing social democracy in this country. He promoted fear of communist infiltration and espionage. This same philosophy is the counterpart of the social democratichabit of the unions in this country is the minority in the modern labor movement the bureaucratic ethos of the officials in this country is the counterpart of the social democratic working class parties in Europe. Their main class collaboration with the ruling class in their respective countries are similar. The difference is the absence in this country of an independent working class party.

But for social democracy this is a tactical difference. Social democrats here believe—ever since that it is wiser and safer to work within the capitalist two-party system. Right-wing social democracy found its most articulate early exponent in World War I. George Meany is remembered as the originator of the union policies and practices initiated by Gompers.

"More—For Some"

Social democracy is the minority in the modern labor movement the bureaucratic ethos of the officials in the unions in this country is the counterpart of the social democratic working class parties in Europe. Their main class collaboration with the ruling class in their respective countries are similar. The difference is the absence in this country of an independent working class party. Right-wing social democracy found its most articulate early exponent in World War I. George Meany is remembered as the originator of the union policies and practices initiated by Gompers. Was Gompers who once asked what the unions want, be answered "more." But there is an unspoken corollary to this. Both Gompers and Meany always tried to get more for a stratum of privileged workers at the expense of other working people. They hoped to convince the ruling class that in this way the employers would also gain.

How this worked out in practice is illustrated by the struggle for the rights of Black workers in the AFL-CIO. At the 1955 merger of the old AFL with the Congress of Industrial Unions, the new constitution outlawed race discrimination by any affiliated union. By the time of the 1959 AFL-CIO convention nothing had been done to eliminate discrimination by most of the old craft unions. A. Philip Randolph, president of the all-Black Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, demanded an accounting. He had fought in the AFL against discrimination within his union, but he thought the new constitution after merger with the CIO ought to be enforced.

Randolph spoke with greater authority in 1959 than previously even though his union was in decline. He had the growing power of the civil rights movement behind him, and this gave him an alternative course of action when his pleadings were largely ignored by the union bureaucracy (which included him as part of a small minority).

Negro American Labor Council

In 1960 Randolph, then president of the charting convention in Detroit of the Negro American Labor Council (NALC). It was attended by a thousand Black delegates from AFL-CIO and independent unions, including the Teamsters and United Mine Workers. At first Meany derided this as "dual unionism," but he soon changed his tune and after some face-saving negotiations made peace with Randolph, who also understood the needs of the bureaucracy. "More—For Some"

After passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Meany sponsored the A. Philip Randolph Institute under AFL-CIO auspices. The single most important position as mediators in the continuous struggle between the working class and the employers. Top union officials were becoming nervous. Meany's job, as he perceived it, was to calm their fears and work out consensus among them on how to respond to government pressure, employer attacks, union dissidence, and social unrest.

United Auto Workers President Walter Reuther's departure from the AFL-CIO Executive Council in 1965 signaled the general uncertainty and insecurity in that body. A year later, in retrospect, Reuther said, "I wouldn't want to hold the hands of reluctant labor politicians." In 1970 Jerry Wurf, president of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees and a vice-president of the AFL-CIO, pointed to the ebbing political power of the labor movement at that time. He found it hard to believe that a president of the United States—even Nixon—would dare veto an increase in the minimum wage in times of serious inflation, risking the wrath of a united labor movement. "That Mr. Nixon did so, and that labor could not persuade Congress to override the veto, is one of the most telling facts about what's wrong with labor today," Wurf said.

A newcomer to the AFL-CIO Executive Council, William Winpisinger, president of the Machinists unions, told them the cold truth in 1977. "We're perceived as a middle-class lobby protecting our own ass," he said.

Social Change

The threat was more ominous than Meany knew. It came from unseen social forces beyond the control even of the ruling class. Economic and social changes in the world since the AFL-CIO merger have overshadowed all institutions in this country, not only the established unions. Union bureaucrats dislike being reminded of all that has happened, but the facts will not go away.

The image of U.S. invincibility was erased by its military defeat in Vietnam. The myth of dollar stability was destroyed by the decline in competitive advantage of U.S. goods, and the weakening of the dollar.

The illusion that class harmony, industrial peace, and social well-being can be nurtured in the United States at the expense of a world at war has been shattered. Early in the 1970s a vocal minority within the AFL-CIO hierarchy began to sense their precarious position as mediators in the continuous struggle between the working class and the employers. Top union officials were becoming nervous. Meany's job, as he perceived it, was to calm their fears and work out consensus among them on how to respond to government pressure, employer attacks, union dissidence, and social unrest.

United Auto Workers President Walter Reuther's departure from the AFL-CIO Executive Council in 1965 signaled the general uncertainty and insecurity in that body. A year later, in retrospect, Reuther said, "I wouldn't want to hold the hands of reluctant labor politicians." In 1970 Jerry Wurf, president of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees and a vice-president of the AFL-CIO, pointed to the ebbing political power of the labor movement at that time. He found it hard to believe that a president of the United States—even Nixon—would dare veto an increase in the minimum wage in times of serious inflation, risking the wrath of a united labor movement. "That Mr. Nixon did so, and that labor could not persuade Congress to override the veto, is one of the most telling facts about what's wrong with labor today," Wurf said.

A newcomer to the AFL-CIO Executive Council, William Winpisinger, president of the Machinists unions, told them the cold truth in 1977. "We're perceived as a middle-class lobby protecting our own ass," he said.

Image Makers

The union bureaucracy is not merely the representative of the capitalists inside the workers movement, although it is that. It balances between the two contending classes, bending to
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Petitioning takes SWP campaign to thousands

By Sheila Oftrov

DETROIT—After three weeks of petitioning, the Socialist Workers Party has collected well over the 18,385 signatures required to put the party on the ballot; 38,165 signatures were collected.

Petitioning was part of the overall fight to challenge the restrictive Michigan ballot requirements. The Michigan law is one of the most undemocratic in the country.

The petitioning drive was organized and carried out on a monthly, in record time, in order to comply with the May 5 filing deadline. Jim Burfield, one of the petition drive organizers, explained, "We in the SWP made a firm decision that all other work would be put aside in order to accomplish the petition drive in three weeks.

"We were able to turn unemployment against the ruling class by organizing laid-off steel and auto workers to petition six days a week.

"Supporters responded to an appeal to use paid personal holidays and vacant time to organize to help put the SWP on the ballot."

Bill Arb, SWP candidate for Congress, said: "One of the most important aspects of this is the positive influence in the petitioning with socialist campaigning. We were able to talk to thousands of people, which was a very class alternatives. Thousands of leaflets outlining key aspects of the SWP's platform were passed out. Petitioners carried Young Socialists for Public Control cards with them to add names of interested people to the mailing list.

"Young Socialists teams were organized around the state. Teams were sent to East Lansing, Grand Rapids, Traverse City, Lansing, Flint. Campaign supporters got a particularly good response in Flint, a major auto center that has been hard hit by auto layoffs and has the highest percentage of workers in the state."

They traveled to Michigan State University and Central Michigan University, where more than 1,600 signatures were collected.

Petitioners learned a lot about the mood of working people in Michigan. They heard about jobs being lost with the lack of alternatives. A common response was, "Anything is better than what we have now."

A campaign supporter who works at Ford's River Rouge complex said one evening, "I collected more than 100 signatures today. All I had to say was, 'These candidates think we should reduce the workweek with no loss in pay to spread the available work around. I also tell people that we want to create jobs to build housing, schools, hospitals, mass transit, and other needs. Working people are immediately interested in these kinds of proposals and would like to see them discussed in this election.'"

Campaign supporters petitioned at an unemployment office that almost immediately served laid-off workers. A black woman laid off from Chrysler Lynch Road plant asked if the petitioners were for SWP presidential candidate Andrew Pulley. "Let me see that, I've been looking for it," said the Fair Practices Committee in my local has been discussing this campaign and we're interested in having Pulley speak to our committee."

"An older white woman asked if the petition was against Carter. When she heard that these candidates were working people, she said, 'Yes, that's what we needed that for a long time. It's clear the Democrats and Republicans aren't going to do anything for working people. And we especially need a woman.'"

Martha Dowling, SWP candidate for U.S. Congress and member of United Steelworkers of America Local 241, was able to petition among her co-workers. Many already knew she was a candidate and were glad to sign her petitions. Several had met Pulley on a previous campaign tour and had talked with him at the plant. They were anxious to sign to make sure Pulley and Dowling would be on the ballot so they could vote for them.

"Much of the discussion revolved around the undemocratic ballot laws. Most didn't realize that there was a possibility Pulley would be barred from the general election ballot."

Supporters of the campaign who participated in the petitioning included a steelworker from McClouth Steel, a high school student, and a teacher. These supporters collected more than 500 signatures in one day alone. They also helped with the mountains of paper work that was required.

The support and participation of the Young Socialist Alliance was decisive in the success of the campaign.

By Nan Bailey

Fundamental issues are being raised by the ballot case of the United Steelworkers Court challenge to Public Act 94. This is the Michigan election law which has barred smaller parties from the general election ballot by requiring them to get 4,000 to 6,000 votes in the primary election.

"We recently discussed the suit with Manitoba Winter and Ron Resoli, SWP attorneys in the case. Resoli told me, 'There have been two primaries since this undemocratic law was passed. Because the primaries were overwhelmingly oriented to voting on presidential candidates, no smaller party has met the requirement."

"When the Democratic and Republican parties are given a monopoly on the election ballot," said Winter, "it isn't just the rights of the SWP which are at stake. The fundamental rights of all working people to hear and discuss the socialist platform were passed out.

"We're saying that the Michigan election law violates the First Amendment rights of the people of Michigan to consider the views of a workers party like ours, in this election where most of the candidates have raised this popular thing."

"We have an important precedent for our argument and that's a ballot case we won in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit—a seat now held by Rep. Patricia Schroeder.

"In Missouri, about seventy-five volunteers have collected nearly 25,000 signatures—15,000 from the St. Louis region and 10,000 from the Kansas City area. This is well over the 18,000 required under state law to contest the position of her Democratic precinct caucus. We have asked the woman whether she would sign to put the socialist slate on the ballot, she said "Yes, we need more alternates."

"In fact, she said, she was resigning from the Democratic Party because "I don't want war and I don't want my five children to die in a war."

"The Colorado SWP is also running Silvia Zapata for the U.S. Senate seat now held by Gary Hart, and Harold Sudmeyer for the U.S. House of Representatives from the First District—a seat now held by Rep. Patricia Schroeder.

"In Missouri, about seventy-five volunteers have collected nearly 25,000 signatures—15,000 from the St. Louis region and 10,000 from the Kansas City area. This is well over the 18,000 required under state law to contest the position of her Democratic precinct caucus. We have asked the woman whether she would sign to put the socialist slate on the ballot, she said "Yes, we need more alternates."

"In fact, she said, she was resigning from the Democratic Party because "I don't want war and I don't want my five children to die in a war."

"The Colorado SWP is also running Silvia Zapata for the U.S. Senate seat now held by Gary Hart, and Harold Sudmeyer for the U.S. House of Representatives from the First District—a seat now held by Rep. Patricia Schroeder.

"In Missouri, about seventy-five volunteers have collected nearly 25,000 signatures—15,000 from the St. Louis region and 10,000 from the Kansas City area. This is well over the 18,000 required under state law to contest the position of her Democratic precinct caucus. We have asked the woman whether she would sign to put the socialist slate on the ballot, she said "Yes, we need more alternates."

"In fact, she said, she was resigning from the Democratic Party because "I don't want war and I don't want my five children to die in a war."

"The Colorado SWP is also running Silvia Zapata for the U.S. Senate seat now held by Gary Hart, and Harold Sudmeyer for the U.S. House of Representatives from the First District—a seat now held by Rep. Patricia Schroeder.

"In Missouri, about seventy-five volunteers have collected nearly 25,000 signatures—15,000 from the St. Louis region and 10,000 from the Kansas City area. This is well over the 18,000 required under state law to contest the position of her Democratic precinct caucus. We have asked the woman whether she would sign to put the socialist slate on the ballot, she said "Yes, we need more alternates."

"In fact, she said, she was resigning from the Democratic Party because "I don't want war and I don't want my five children to die in a war."

"The Colorado SWP is also running Silvia Zapata for the U.S. Senate seat now held by Gary Hart, and Harold Sudmeyer for the U.S. House of Representatives from the First District—a seat now held by Rep. Patricia Schroeder."
The same analysis can be extended to the amount of labor time required to produce commodities used up or worn out in the production process. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, that's a 123 percent increase. Sounds like a lot.

But prices, measured by the Consumer Price Index, rose 130 percent in the same period. So corrected for inflation, the workers took home only $87.50 in December 1979—less than thirteen years ago. (It's also worth noting that the amount produced by each worker—productivity—rose 17 percent during the past ten years in the (over-)productive business sector and 31 percent in manufacturing. The worker is producing more and more but getting paid less and less."

This year, as the economy slides into recession, the government has been reporting each month that real wages fell another 1 percent or so. But prices keep climbing at an 18 percent annual rate.

Profit is fixed. In other words, the corporations can simply pass along any increases in wage costs through higher prices, while reaping the same profit. If this was true, the capitalists would be quite indifferent to union activity. They would simply grant wage increases as requested and proceed to raise prices. There would hardly ever be strikes, since why would a corporation risk the loss of business through a strike if at no cost to itself it could grant higher wages. The long history of the bosses' attempts to smash unions indicates there is some error in this explanation.

Do wage increases, what does that? And what effect do wage increases have? The answer to those questions was discovered long ago by the early nineteenth century British economist David Ricardo. The fact that Ricardo was a strong supporter of capitalism and no friend of the working class makes his argument all the more convincing.

Ricardo explained that when supply and demand cancel each other out (as they tend to do in the long run) the price of a commodity is determined by the amount of labor time necessary to produce it. That's not only the time for final assembly of the product, of course. It includes the labor time necessary to produce the raw materials and that portion of machinery used up or worn out in the production process.

Wages vs. profits

Now, if wages rise, what is the effect on the amount of labor time required to produce commodities? None at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OIL PROFITS SCOREBOARD</th>
<th>January-December 1979</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company</strong></td>
<td><strong>Profit</strong> (in millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exxon</td>
<td>$1,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobil</td>
<td>$1,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texaco</td>
<td>$1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoco (Standard)</td>
<td>$767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil of Indiana</td>
<td>$386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What does happen is a shift in the division of national income from capital to labor. Wages rise and profits fall. It is exactly this principle that is involved in every strike over wages. The employers, on the other side, fight to keep wages down because that means higher profits for them—certainly not in order to give lower prices to consumers.

It might be argued that a rise in wages would at least cause an increase in the prices of those commodities consumed by the workers, because demand for these commodities would now exceed the supply. This might happen, but it would be a temporary effect. If higher demand for basic consumer goods led to higher prices, then the firms producing those commodities would make higher profits than those producing luxury goods for the bosses. The companies making goods for consumption by workers would therefore step up production; more companies would probably enter this field to take advantage of the higher profits. As that happened, the supply of these goods would increase until it equalled demand or even (since production under capitalism is not socially planned) exceeded demand. Prices would stabilize and then fall.

The opposite would happen with the companies producing goods for the rich. In response to lower demand and lower profits on these goods, production would decrease; until supply no longer exceeded demand.

In the end, the prices would be the same as before. But the composition of production would now be different—more would be produced for the workers and less for the bosses. In reality, these temporary price movements would be very slight or would not occur at all, because of the great amount of unused productive capacity that usually exists under capitalism.

**Tax-cut hoax**

The same analysis can be extended to taxes and social spending. If taxes on the rich are increased across the board and the extra money used to finance social programs, the well-being of the working people is increased at the expense of the bosses.

For example, if social security taxes paid by the employers were increased and the funds used to increase payments to the elderly and disabled, these people could purchase more commodities and the employers less. The market would shift productive resources toward meeting the needs of the elderly and disabled, away from producing commodities for the rich. Prices would not go up.

The reverse is also true. And this is not just a theoretical question. Many Democratic and Republican politicians are pushing to cut taxes paid by corporations and the rich as a way of "fighting inflation."

If such tax cuts occur and social benefits are cut (and this is already happening), the result will be a shift in production of commodities away from the beneficiaries of social services and toward consumption by the employers. Prices will not come down!

**What about OPEC?**

What about the claim that today's soaring prices are caused by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC)?

It is true that a monopoly pushes up the prices on particular commodities and thus is able to realize superprofits. The classic example of monopoly, however, is not OPEC but the giant U.S. and European oil companies, especially the so-called Seven Sisters. Without opening the books and records of these companies, we have no way of knowing the real production cost or availability of oil. We don't know how much oil is being deliberately withheld from production in this country in anticipation of future price increases. We don't know how much of the current increase in energy prices is going to OPEC and how much is going into higher superprofits for the U.S. oil companies. The first-quarter 1979 profit figures (see box) suggest the U.S. monopolists are among the biggest beneficiaries of soaring energy prices. It is certainly true that for all his "anti-inflation" rhetoric, Carter's energy policy—like that of Nixon and Ford before him—is based on higher energy prices. Carter's lifting of controls on domestic crude oil prices will cost U.S. consumers an estimated $1,000 billion over the next decade. That is all money going to U.S. companies—not OPEC.

To make matters worse, the centerpiece of Carter's "anti-inflation" program is a ten-cent-a-gallon tax increase on gasoline. These price and tax increases are a big hardship for working people. However, the rise in the relative price of oil by no means explains the general rise in the prices of commodities. At the end of last year, the federal government estimated that oil price rises added 2.4 percentage points to consumer prices in 1979 and would add 3.1 percentage points in 1980. Inflation is now running at 18 percent. What accounts for the other 15 percentage points?

* * *

So far we've seen none of the prevailing explanations for double-digit inflation will hold up under scrutiny. It's not caused by demand exceeding supply. It's not caused by low productivity. Nor by high wages, oil shortages, or OPEC. Then why are the prices of commodities rising?

In fact, why aren't prices falling in the face of record productivity and supply that so far exceeds demand that massive unemployment is developing as business liquidates "excess" inventories? That's what our next article will begin to take up.
Add a grain of salt—New York Times correspondent Jo Thomas reported from Costa Rica, with a straight face, that Cuban emigres told her they survived at the Peruvian Embassy in Havana by eating dogs, cats, and a papaya tree. This despite Thomas's prior report from Havana that four major hotels were trucking food into the embassy. Back in Havana, Thomas explained how they ate the tree. They "boiled it." In the embassy's hot springs.

We're all in this together—Ford workers on layoff are comforted to know that Henry II's daughter Charlotte is living simply in a four-bedroom New York City apartment at Southhampton, and a condo in Sun Valley. And she has no maid. She vacuumed herself, explaining, "It's very therapeutic."

Yes, yes!—To relieve the stench of government wiretapping, a special court was appointed to pass on requests for bugging operations. Attorney General Civiletti reported to Congress that in the first year, the government made 199 applications to bug people in other countries. Of these, the court approved 207. "There was," the New York Times reported, "no immediate explanation for the disparity in the numbers."

The golden years—Old-age pensioners will be particularly gratified to know that the FBI office for Nixon is already ready. A place that includes a kitchenette and private toilet. (You want him to use the one in the hall?) Alternatives cost $53,000. Annual rent, $66,000.

Be prepared—Nixon said he favors a pecetive time draft, "so that we do not have to have a wartime draft."

Fire sale—we reported that, to dampen opposition, the French government is offering a 15 percent rent discount to people living near nuclear sites. Could be a bargain, unless you consider things like the recent fire at a nuclear reprocessing plant near Cherbourg which caused "some" contamination.

Safety first—A veteran Pan Am pilot voiced complaints about lax maintenance procedures. He cited finding his own generator failure, clogged fuel strainers, and failure of navigating receiver. Pan Am responded with prompt action. It grounded the pilot.

By Any Means Necessary

August Nimtz

FBI raids Harlem

This week's column is by Osborne Hart.

Anyone with illusions that last month's Supreme Court ruling warranted search and seizure (the "no-knock" law) would halt such cop activity didn't have to wait long to have them dispelled.

Just four days after the ruling, on April 19, fifty FBI agents armed with shotguns and machine guns stormed a Harlem apartment building.

Roosting tenants from their beds, the FBI shook the place—and the people—down. Doors were bashed in, and apartments ransacked. Guns were pointed into faces and pecked into stomachs.

What or who were they looking for without a warrant at midnight?

They say they were looking for Joanne Chesimard.

Chesimard, also known as Assata Shakur, is a Black nationalist convicted for allegedly murdering a New Jersey state trooper in 1973. She escaped from prison last November.

It would seem, however, that the FBI doesn't know what she looks like. During the raid, agents demanded that women expose their thighs because Chesimard has a scar on her thigh!

With a straight face, that Black, women on the streets of New York are being terrorized and harassed under the guise of the hunt for Chesimard.

In the wake of the real raids of Morning­side Avenue, Harlem and around the country, it's time to renew the demand for an end to government spying, harassment, and terror.

What's Going On

CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES

Panel: Discussion on Labor and the Equal Rights Amendment. Report from the Chicago Labor ERA Rally. Sat., May 17, 7:30 p.m. at the American Labor Museum, 318 W. 55th St. (213) 276-7254.

NEW JERSEY

NEWARK

Socialist Workers Campaign Rally. John McElroy, SWP candidate for Congress, for the New Jersey Socialist Workers Campaign. For more information call (201) 687-1729.

MINNESOTA

TWIN CITIES

Campaign Banquet and Rally with Anne Drew Pulley, Socialist Workers Party candidate for Congress. Fri., May 16, 6 p.m. refreshments, 7 p.m. dinner, 8:30 p.m. rally. 200 N. Snelling Ave., St. Paul. Donation: $5 dinner, $1 rally only. Ausp: SWP Campaign Committee and Great Lakes Socialist Alliance. For more information call (612) 884-6903.

NEW YORK

BROOKLYN


GEORGIA

ATLANTA

Cuba today—Panel and slide show. Speaker: James Preston, Socialist Workers Party candidate for U.S. Senate, former probation officer from Cuba, with slide show. Sat., May 17, 7:30 p.m. at the Atlanta Labor Temple. Donation: $4-50 in advance. Ausp: Georgia Socialist Workers Party. For more information call (404) 872-7292.

OREGON

PORTLAND

A Campaign Reception. Meet Fred Auger, Socialist Workers Party candidate for mayor. Sun., May 18, 7:30 p.m. reception, 8 p.m. rally. 155 Ladd St., Portland. Donation: $3 in advance. Ausp: Socialist Workers Campaign. For more information call (503) 633-8502.

NEW YORK CITY

SOCIALIST WORKERS CAMPAIGN RALLY. John McElroy, SWP candidate for Congress, for the New York Socialist Workers Campaign. For more information call (212) 842-3889.

NEW YORK

GRENADA:


THE FUND FOR OPEN INFORMATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY, INC. and clients of Mike Perlis and Dave Scribner celebrate the victory in lawsuit preventing FBI's destruction of files. Thu., May 15, 7:30 p.m. rally. Eddie Condon's. Donation: $15. All Militant Forum. For more information call (212) 733-8595.

Olive McKee, an Irish American who refused to submit handwriting sample to federal grand jury investigating arms smuggling to Ireland. Sat., May 16, 1, p.m. Daily News Building 220 East 42nd Street. Ausp: The Ad Hoc Committee to Free Olive McKee. For more information call (212) 857-1611.

Drew Pulley, Socialist Workers Party candidate for vice-president; Chris McEldowney, SWP candidate for vice-president; Harry Rangel has called on government wiretapping, a special court is appointed to pass on requests for bugging operations. Attorney General Civiletti reported to Congress that in the first year, the government made 199 applications to bug people in other countries. Of these, the court approved 207. "There was," the New York Times reported, "no immediate explanation for the disparity in the numbers."

The golden years—Old-age pensioners will be particularly gratified to know that the FBI office for Nixon is already ready. A place that includes a kitchenette and private toilet. (You want him to use the one in the hall?) Alternatives cost $53,000. Annual rent, $66,000.

The residents of Morning­side Avenue, their Harlem neighbors, and other working people should investigate the FBI's crimes. Open the files and let the victims get to the truth.

Congress, Carter, and their police agencies apparently believe it is all off, freeing them to openly step up their intimidation operations against the Black community.

With fatal attacks on democratic rights in Harlem and around the country, it's time to renew the demand for an end to government spying, harassment, and terror.

The Great Society

Ring Harry

The golden years—Old-age pensioners will be particularly gratified to know that the FBI office for Nixon is already ready. A place that includes a kitchenette and private toilet. (You want him to use the one in the hall?) Alternatives cost $53,000. Annual rent, $66,000.

The residents of Morning­side Avenue, their Harlem neighbors, and other working people should investigate the FBI's crimes. Open the files and let the victims get to the truth.

Congress, Carter, and their police agencies apparently believe it is all off, freeing them to openly step up their intimidation operations against the Black community.

With fatal attacks on democratic rights in Harlem and around the country, it's time to renew the demand for an end to government spying, harassment, and terror.

FBI agents vandalized Violet Hyman's apartment at 92 Morningside Avenue. She was away at the time.
May Day, an international holiday, celebrates the solidarity of workers in all countries in the fight for a better world. This year saw celebrations on all continents. A particularly inspiring event was the gathering of a million workers and a half in Havana vowing resistance to Washington's schemes.

In the United States there was no major celebration. There haven't been in a number of decades. Most American workers don't know much about May Day, which is generally portrayed in the capitalist media as some kind of "foreign," "communist" affair.

But May Day is as American as the proverbial apple pie.

May Day was established by the organized American labor movement then fighting for an eight-hour day. Later it was made a worldwide holiday by the Second International, the Labor and Socialist International.

May Day in the United States also marks the martyrdom of a group of working-class fighters, the anarchist victims of the Haymarket Riot. There was a major industrial center with a high growth and there was a sharp strike at McCormick Harvester. There was a confrontation with scabs and a bloody battle was joined. There was a sharp attack in recent times. Today many workers had put in more than forty hours either because they were being paid an average of three dollars a day or because the wage-price gap makes overtime necessary.

In early America, workers labored fourteen to sixteen hours a day. In the early 1890s, the fight began for a ten-hour day and, with the end of the Civil War, that fight was pretty well won. Labor then set its sights on the eight-hour day.

That convention set May 1, 1886, as the date for action in winning the eight-hour day. During that period the unions enjoyed a big growth and there was a sharp increase in the number of strikes, including strikes for the eight-hour day.

On May Day, 1886, thousands of workers in many cities struck out. The most powerful action was in Chicago, already a major industrial center with a militant working class.

Two days later, Chicago workers joined in a solidarity rally with striking workers at Menasha, Wisconsin. There was a confrontation with a mob and a bloody police attack. At least one striker was killed and eleven were down wounded.

A protest rally was called for Haymarket Square the night of May 4.

As that rally was ending, police suddenly ordered it to disperse. At that moment a bomb exploded among the cops. A number of them were killed.

1912: Immigrant workers strike for eight-hour day.

The incident was used to open an attack on labor. Thirty-one people were indicted, including a number of anarchists who were leading figures in the unions. Eight were convicted in a rigged trial where no evidence against them was presented.

On November 11, 1887, four of them were hanged—Albert Parsons, August Spies, George Engel, and Adolph Fischer. A fifth committed suicide and three went to prison.

The trial brought protests, here and abroad. After the executions, the fight continued for those imprisoned.

That fight was won in 1893 when Gov. John Altgeld pardoned them, declaring his belief that all the defendants were innocent.

Their stories are told in The Autobiographies of the Haymarket Martyrs (Pathfinder Press, $4.45).

The 1886 convention of the AFL voted to renew the fight for the eight-hour day and set May Day, 1886, as the next target date for action.

And, at the founding congress of the Second International in Paris in July 1869, it was voted to establish an international workers' holiday. May 1 was chosen in solidarity with the action of the AFL.

That's how May Day spread from here around the world.

In succeeding decades, a conservative labor bureaucracy joined with government and bosses to stifle the May Day tradition. But just as it spread abroad, it will come back again, marking a new level of battle against capitalist exploitation and misery.

—Harry Ring

Klan thugs serve two

Two members of the Ku Klux Klan who attacked and brutally beat an anti-Klan demonstrator in Encinio, California, March 15 were let off the hook by the District Attorney.

The District Attorney's office rejected a request from the Oceanide police to file felony assault charges against the Klansmen for the beating of Bruce Kala, a member of the Revolutionary Socialist League in Los Angeles.

Kala was a participant in a demonstration against the Klan when he was attacked by several Klansmen wielding clubs, chains, and carrying knives and guns. More than 200 stitches were required to close the wounds in Kala's head.

As Socialist Workers Party candidates for U.S. Congress in the 42nd District, I have called on the authorities to prosecute the KKK attackers to the fullest extent of the law.

The record of the Ku Klux Klan is clear: a history of murder and violence against Black people, Mexicans, and organized labor. The most recent example was in Greensboro, North Carolina, where local Klansmen gunned down five anti-KKK demonstrators with the complicity of the police. In Oceanide as well, the police did nothing to protect demonstrators from the Klansmen.

We need to build a broad, powerful movement of labor, Black and Chicano groups, and women's organizations to stop Klan violence.

We need a mobilization of thousands—like the Greensboro march of 7,000 on February 2—to demand the indictment of the Klans thugs and let the KKK know that we will not be intimidated.

Kachyn: Crucader San Diego, California

Our party is your party
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Learning About Socialism

The Truth About Afghanistan

Five months ago, thousands of Soviet soldiers moved across Afghanistan's southern border into Soviet-occupied Afghanistan. Afghanistan was thrust to the center of world politics.

Carter claimed that the Soviet intervention threatened world peace. The capitalist media poured out stories about mass uprisings by Soviet troops and denigrated assertions of the ultrarightist guerrillas. Afghanistan was labeled "Russia's Vietnam".

The Afghan event and the responses of the U.S. government pose many questions for working people. What is happening in Afghanistan? Why are Soviet troops there? What is Soviet foreign policy? Is the Soviet Union or U.S. big business the cause of the war danger?

Jenness points out the fallacy of the portrayal of Afghanistan as Russia's Vietnam: "The fact is that the Soviet troops intervened in Afghanistan on the side of the forces fighting for the interests of the workers and peasants, who are the big majority, and against the reactionary ruling classes, who represent the interests of a minority. In Vietnam, on the other hand, Washington intervened on the side of the landlords, capitalists, and other privileged rich, while the bulk of the population supported the fighters of the National Liberation Front."

The real threat of war stems from big business and its government in Washington: "Today, the big clashes are... struggles by the boiling masses to take control of their lands and resources away from the masters..."

"In response to these struggles," Jenness explains, "the U.S. government has intervened time and again in colonial and semicolonial countries to protect the investments of the American ruling rich. The U.S. ruling class uses every means at its disposal--including military force--to suppress economic pressure to blockades, CIA plots, and arms sales."

"A victory for the counterrevolution in Afghanistan," he concludes, "will only embolden the imperialists to try to defeat the struggles of the masses in Nicaragua, Grenada, Kampuchea, Iran, and other countries in the midst of revolutions.

"The Soviet Union, on the other hand," writes Jenness, "has played a different role in relation to the colonial countries. It does not have an economic system which demands foreign investments. It has no big corporations--like Exxon--with profit to protect. The colonial revolution doesn't fit into its system of international relations because in some cases, the Soviet Union has even extended aid to liberation struggles. Soviet foreign policy has had a defensive character--its principal concerns have been to protect the development of war, including nuclear war, has largely come from the United States.

"To counter the spread of revolutions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the U.S. rulers are increasing their military spending, trying to reinstitute the draft, and imposing austerity on American working people. The lies and distortions about Afghanistan are suckers bait aimed at persuading us to go along;" Jenness relates, "the Afghanistan answer the lies with the facts. It is well worth reading."

—Osborne Hart
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March on D.C. May 17 for jobs, peace, justice
Unions, NOW, Black groups back action

By Jerry Hunnicutt
WASHINGTON—Support is growing for the May 17 national march for jobs called by Black leader Jesse Jackson, head of Operation PUSH.

At a May 7 news conference here, national leaders of the United Steelworkers, United Auto Workers, National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees, and National Organization for Women put their groups behind the May 17 effort.

Speaking along with Jesse Jackson, they tied the May 17 effort to the May 10 march for the Equal Rights Amendment in Chicago.

Both John T. Smith, special assistant to USWA President Lloyd McBride, and UAW Vice-president Marc Steep pointed to the layoffs and plant closings afflicting hundreds of thousands of their union members as requiring support for the May 17 action.

Jackson explained the “emergency” confronting the American people, with the economic crisis at home and U.S. war threats abroad.

“The American people are caught in the middle. We must not panic, but neither can we remain merely observers. We must act. We must engage in direct action, legislative action, and political action simultaneously.

“Weaken the Leftists, women, labor, youth, and the poor must not suffer in isolation or silently. May 17 represents the beginning at the return to mass-street action.”

All out May 17!

Time is short until the May 17 march for jobs. Local unionists and Black and women’s movement activists are working to translate the immediate struggles of the workers into broader publicity and buses and car caravans for the action.

The rally will assemble on May 17 at 9 a.m. at the Ellipse and march past the White House to the Capitol. For more information and to volunteer to help, contact Operation PUSH, 75 Rhode Island Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. (202) 462-5420.

The need for such action was reinforced May 2 when the Labor Department released unemployment figures for April. The rise to 7 percent from 6.2 percent in March was the biggest one-month jump in the unemployment rate since January 1976, in the middle of the last recession.

Those officially unemployed now number 7.2 million. The percentage for Black and Latino workers rose to 12.6 percent unemployed. More than 14 percent of teen-aged workers can’t find jobs—and for Black youth the rate is 30 percent.

More than 100 Black civil rights, church, and community leaders attended a May 1 planning meeting in Washington for the May 17 jobs march. Participants heard Jackson dispel the myth that marches no longer have a political impact.

“If you think marches don’t count, just ask Bull Connor,” Jackson said, referring to the Birmingham official who became a symbol of hard-line racism in the 1960s until the civil rights movement put him in his place.

“Just ask the shah of Iran.”

Jackson blasted the military budget and Carter’s efforts to reinitiate the draft. “We are opposed to the military budget because there is nothing to defend. Minorytly and working people can’t find jobs, housing, adequate health care. They’re closing the Black colleges.”

“Responding to Carter’s actions of war against the Iranian revolution, he explained, ‘The media is trying to get us to hate the Ayatollah and the Iranian people, but they’re not our enemy. Our enemy is right here at home. That’s why we have to march on the White House and on Congress.”

The May 17 demonstration has also been endorsed by International Association of Machinists President William T. Graham and William Gates, president of the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists.

Endorsers include Revs. Ralph Abernathy and Joseph Lowery of the SCLC, Dick Gregory, Rev. Benjamin Chavis of the National Student Association, and many League President Vernon Jordan, and nearly every member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Black church and civil rights leaders from Philadelphia, New Jersey, Delaware, North Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia report they have committed more than 100 buses for the action.

The executive board of UAW Local 1250 at the Ford Brock Park plant in Cleveland has voted to fund at least one bus for the Washington march. Seven thousand of the 15,000-member work force at Brock Park are held off.

In Baltimore, David Wilson and Joseph Kooltuck, presidents of the two United Steelworkers locals at Bethlehem Steel’s Sparrows Point mill, have endorsed the May 17 protest.

The march has the backing of William Simons, head of the Washington Teachers Union, as well as the Washington School Board.

The Chicago Fire Fighters Association has endorsed the march and plans to send people to Washington. Jesse Jackson plans a central role in defending the fire fighters after the recent attempt by Chicago Mayor Jane Byrne to break the union.

Socialist Workers Party presidential candidate Andrew Pulley told the Militant that he is urging his campaign supporters to join the march for jobs.

‘This could be a powerful first step in a united fight against unemployment and plant shutdowns,” Pulley said.

Kent State rally: Continue antihwar fight!

By Joanna Misnik

and Andy Pollack

KENT—Ohio—Nearly 1,000 people from around the Midwest rallied at Kent State University May 4 to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the murder of antiwar students here.

Four were killed and others wounded when the Ohio National Guard opened fire, without warning, on students protesting the American invasion of Cambodia ordered by Nixon in an escalation of the war in Vietnam.

The response to the invasion and the Kent murders, followed less than two weeks later by the police killing of two students at Jackson State College in Mississippi, was the biggest student strike in U.S. history.

Speakers at the rally here May 4 included Dave Dellinger, attorney William Kunstler, War Resisters League Chair Norma Becker, Nobel Prize winning biologist George Wald, Rwandan Toure (Stokely Carmichael), Bella Abzug, and Frank Jackson, president of the East Indians Student Association.

Shouts of “Hell no, we won’t go!” interrupted speakers as they decried the Carter administration’s moves to reinstate draft registration and the ominous acts of war against the Iranian people.

The speakers, all seasoned fighters against the war in Vietnam, urged the crowd to build a movement that can stop the drive toward another Vietnam as the best way to remember the students killed ten years ago.

Other recent anti-draft activities included:

April 17 debate at Ohio State University in Columbus organized by the Undergraduate Student Government. Speakers included representatives of Army ROTC and the Moon Church speaking for the draft and the American Civil Liberties Union, Young Socialist Alliance, and Columbus Anti-Draft Campaign speaking against it.

April 19 anti-draft teach-in at the University of Miami.

April 25 protest in San Diego. One occurred at the University of California campus, the other at the Federal Building.

April 23 rally at Oberlin College in Ohio. Three hundred and fifty people heard speakers against the draft from the Women’s Community, Campus Ministry, Young Socialist Alliance, and the campus anti-draft group. The action was called on less than one day’s notice in response to the April 22 House vote in favor of the draft.

May 5 Baltimore picket of a speech by Carter’s National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski. Seventy-five people joined the action called around the demand: no draft, no war, no registration, U.S. hands off Iran.