

THE MILITANT

Published in the Interests of the Working People

Vol. 34—No. 27

Friday, July 10, 1970

Price 15c

Mass action: a weapon of the revolution

By Peter Camejo

—begins on page 9—

CAMBODIA INVASION IS FAR FROM OVER

On June 30 all U.S. ground troops were reportedly withdrawn from Cambodia. But it is clear that the May-June invasion was only the beginning of U.S. intervention in Cambodia.

Hedrick Smith, in the June 30 *New York Times*, summarized the situation in Cambodia as the troops withdrew: "American planes now fly tactical air support for the Cambodians under the guise of raids against enemy supply lines. American ships blockade Cambodia's coastline. And new military and economic aid is being prepared. Thus, the operation, now formally ended is, in fact, far from over."

In order to understand the prospects for continued U.S. intervention in Cambodia, one must lift the curtain of lies that surrounds Nixon's explanation for the invasion and look at the real reasons behind it.

The purpose of the invasion was to support the right-wing military dictatorship of Lon Nol against the rising Cambodian revolutionary forces; that is, to support one side in a developing civil war in Cambodia.

The *Times* article by Hedrick Smith began by saying, "President Nixon's venture into Cambodia is ending with proclamations of unprecedented military gain, but it was launched for the broader purpose of rescuing Cambodia from sudden Communist domination and that purpose is still unrealized."

Virtually all the commentators now admit that Nixon's original stated purpose for the invasion was a fraud. Nixon said that the North Vietnamese troops were massing in Cambodian sanctuaries, getting ready to attack South Vietnam. This fabrication was dropped when intelligence sources reported that the guerrillas were in fact moving in the opposite direction, trying to escape the already-anticipated American invasion.

Nixon also boasted that the invasion could knock out "the headquarters for the entire Communist military operation in South Vietnam." This invention too was quickly abandoned.

Finally, Nixon claimed that the invasion was only directed against North Vietnamese troops and South Vietnamese NLF guerrillas who were using Cambodia as a base for their operations in Vietnam as well as trying to effect a "Communist take-over" of Cambodia.



Saigon troops carry wounded soldier from Cambodian battlefield. With 34,000 Saigon troops left in Cambodia to face powerful Vietnamese-Cambodian guerrilla force—which enjoys support of Cambodian people—the Saigon regime will press hard for return of U.S. forces.

Actually, the Vietnamese NLF had been allowed by the Sihanouk government to build bases in Cambodia for several years. And the Vietnamese and Cambodian guerrillas were supported in their struggle by the mass of Cambodian peasants.

The American invasion, therefore, was directed against the civilian population of Cambodia, not at "outside invaders" of the country. Just as in Vietnam, whole Cambodian villages were leveled by wholesale bombing and strafing.

Washington's policy of attempting to crush all popular revolutionary movements has a logic which will lead the U.S. to greater and greater escalations of the Southeast Asian war. Already, the effect of the May 1st invasion of

Cambodia has been to deepen the resistance of the Cambodian people, strengthen their respect for the Cambodian guerrillas, and draw the revolutionary forces in Cambodia, Vietnam and Laos into closer solidarity.

Nixon withdrew the ground troops from Cambodia not because they had accomplished the real purpose of the invasion, but rather because the resistance to the invasion by the Cambodian people was combined with the most powerful wave of antiwar protest yet to develop inside the U.S. Literally millions of Americans poured into the streets to express their disgust with the escalation of the war. In addition, journalists reported a near-unanimous hostility to the invasion on the part of GIs.

The Cambodian invasion is yet

another proof that there is no middle ground between complete withdrawal of troops from Southeast Asia and continued escalation of the war. The invasion occurred despite all Nixon's talk about "phased" troop withdrawals. All "assurances" to the contrary, U.S. troops will be pushed into further escalations as long as they remain in Southeast Asia. A new invasion of Cambodia remains a real possibility.

In the light of the experience of the Cambodian invasion, the American antiwar movement can clearly see both its potential power to limit the actions of the war-makers, and also the responsibility on its shoulders to continue and redouble its efforts to organize masses of Americans in actions against the war.

How PL-SDS disruption was foiled

An example for the entire movement

New York, N. Y.

I think there was one significant motion made at the antiwar conference in Cleveland June 19-21 not included in *The Militant's* report of the gathering. That was the motion by the Progressive Labor-SDS faction to dispense with the marshaling system that functioned throughout the conference and during the anti-Agnew demonstration that weekend.

After a brief discussion, the motion to eliminate the marshals was defeated by an overwhelming vote—and rightly so.

It was apparent from the outset that the PL group came not to participate in a movement conference but to disrupt and, if possible, to break it up. Such a course is consistent with their previous attempts to deal with other sectors of the movement by means of physical violence.

I think it was a remarkable tribute to the Cleveland conference that the PLers were frustrated in their effort and that this was done without denying them their democratic rights. When you consider how much damage an organized group of about 200 can do in a gathering with something over a thousand present at any given session, it becomes apparent what was accomplished.

I think three things were responsible for this:

First, the conference had a definite political focus and the disrupters were not permitted to divert the conference from it. Second, the disrupters were accorded their full democratic rights—and more—thus making clear to the entire gathering where the responsibility for the disruption lay. And third, the effectively organized and dis-

Letters from our readers

This column is an open forum for all viewpoints on subjects of general interest to our readers. Please keep your letters brief. Where necessary they will be abridged. Writers' initials will be used, names being withheld unless authorization is given for use.

ciplined marshaling system made it perfectly plain that anyone who tried to stop the conference by physical force would have a serious force to reckon with.

This political-organizational combination was such an effective deterrent that even a group not particularly noted for its grasp of reality was compelled to recognize the relationship of forces and restrain themselves from an ultimate act of folly. I think the conference provided an excellent example for the entire movement in dealing with the problem of disruption.

H. C.

Wants more reports from and about Palestine

Flint, Mich.

The recent articles on the Palestine liberation movement in *The Militant* are most welcome. It is difficult to get reports that show the true nature of that struggle: that nature being the overthrow of a racist state (Israel),

and the establishment of a secular, democratic state in Palestine for all Palestinians.

The Palestinian revolution may well be the test of true revolutionary Marxism-Leninism among members of the American left in the 1970s. The fact that the Young Socialist Alliance has long supported the Palestine liberation movement speaks for itself.

I am glad to report that the YSA in Michigan has a good reputation with those Arabs involved with the Palestine liberation movement in the U. S. I hope to see more reports from and about Palestine.

Allen D. Adams

An appeal from MPI

Springfield, Mass.

Puerto Rico has been for years the victim of American imperialism. The island has been exploited economically and politically, it is serving as a major naval and military base, and is also the victim of cultural aggression.

Nevertheless Puerto Ricans are determined to obtain their independence and sovereignty by any means possible. We want the right to determine our own political destiny. MPI—Movement for Puerto-Rico's Independence—is at the forefront of the struggle for liberation. However, the organization needs funds and the solidarity of all U. S. progressives.

At the present moment we are conducting a fund-raising campaign that will help us increase the struggle. We will appreciate your contribution. Mail it to: Secretaria de Finanzas, MPI, Ponce de Leon 1122 altos, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico 00925.

Jose La Luz

Portland longshoremen fight back

Portland, Ore.

On May 16 a giant mass meeting of Columbia River longshoremen met in the fairground exhibit hall in Longview, Wash., to hear reports, discuss, and finally vote to tie up every port in the Portland area. There were more than 4,000 present, the largest meeting of longshoremen in many years. The issue that brought them out was union control over all work on the Portland docks.

In a union statement, the provocative situation was described as follows:

"During the months that Port Service Inc. operated off the docks at N.W. 21st near Front Avenue, this dispute did not exist between the ILWU and the Dock Commission. It was only when the Dock Commission leased a portion of waterfront property at Terminal 4, and persons other than longshoremen began to do work there, that a dispute arose. As a member of the Pacific Maritime Association, the Dock Commission, being a signatory to the longshore agreement, first violated the contract when it allowed its new leasee to hire persons other than longshoremen."

Here was a clear example of the waterfront employers and the local government agencies and politicians ganging up to undermine working conditions, steal jobs and pay lower wages by cutting out the union.

The scheme failed. On June 11 the Portland politicians and their city agency capitulated and pulled out of the Pacific Maritime Association. Longshoremen established their right to all work on the docks here.

This is the first beef of this size longshoremen have won in the last 12 or 15 years. The way they did

THE MILITANT

Editor: HARRY RING
Managing Editor: MARY-ALICE WATERS
Business Manager: FLAX HERMES

Published weekly by *The Militant Publishing Ass'n.*, 873 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10003. Phone 533-6414. Second-class postage paid at New York, N. Y. Subscription: domestic, \$4 a year; foreign, \$5.50. By first class mail: domestic and Canada \$13.50, all other countries, \$20.00. Air printed matter: domestic and Canada, \$20.00; Latin America and Europe, \$40.00; Africa, Australia, Asia (including USSR), \$50.00. Write for sealed air postage rates. Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent *The Militant's* views. These are expressed in editorials.

Volume 34

Number 27

Friday, July 10, 1970

Closing news date—July 1

it—as one longshore caucus delegate put it—was to ward off the international. They successfully closed down the Columbia River and other northwest ports in spite of the no-strike clause in the contract.

This shows what can be done when the organized workers take matters into their own hands through their established unions.

Jody Heatlie

Renews subscription

Lancaster, Calif.

Here is my check for a six months' subscription.

I'm cutting down on subscriptions to several publications, but I do not like to miss *The Militant*, especially at this critical time in history. The day-to-day happenings in Indochina are frightening and should be opposed.

P. G.

Repression in Knoxville

Knoxville, Tenn.

After President Nixon visited the U of Tennessee campus, there were a number of arrests in connection with a protest that occurred. [See June 19 *Militant*] Those arrested have been charged with either disrupting a religious service or disorderly conduct.

The courts are forcing the defendants to spend as much money as possible. The original bonds, set after the arrests, were \$1,000 rather than a more normal \$250 for a misdemeanor. And when people were bound over to the grand jury, they were forced to make a new bond and pay the bondsman additional money. Many of the people arrested do not have much in the way of financial resources, and so this has created hardship.

Most of the people arrested are well known for having spoken out against injustices.

The judge hearing the cases in city court for those who waived their right to a jury trial is prejudiced against the defense. He allowed the prosecution to have a witness testify as to the religious nature of the meeting where Nixon spoke, but would not allow a defense witness testify about the meeting's political character.

The police are making unbelievable statements in their testimony. One police witness said he was from 75 to 100 feet from a defendant during the rally with literally hundreds of people between them, and claimed he heard the defendant use the word "bullshit" at least twice. A minister who had been sitting one seat away from this defendant testified that the accused had not spoken one curse word.

These examples illustrate the political harassment and repression taking place in Knoxville now. The power structure is attempting to silence dissent in the name of law and order.

Michael Lemonds



It takes Revolutionaries.

IF YOU SUPPORT THE ANTIWAR MOVEMENT, THE BLACK LIBERATION STRUGGLE, THE BROWN LIBERATION STRUGGLE, THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT, THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY IN EASTERN EUROPE, A SOCIALIST AMERICA,

Join the YSA

CLIP AND MAIL TO: YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE, BOX 471, COOPER STATION, N. Y. C. 10003

I WOULD LIKE MORE INFORMATION

I WANT TO JOIN THE YSA

NAME PHONE

ADDRESS

CITY STATE ZIP

Captured journalists' findings

Cambodia people bitter against U.S. invasion

By CAROLINE LUND

Three U.S. journalists who spent 40 days as prisoners of Cambodian and Vietnamese guerrillas in Cambodia have written a fascinating series of articles which flatly contradict the whole pack of lies spread by Washington about the Vietnam war and Cambodian invasion.

The three reporters' experience confirms that the masses of Cambodians are bitterly opposed to the U.S.-Saigon invasion of their country and that the guerrilla movement in Cambodia—both Vietnamese and indigenous Cambodian—enjoys the support of the people.

The three journalists, captured May 7 and released June 15, included Richard Dudman, chief Washington correspondent of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, Elizabeth Pond from the *Christian Science Monitor*, and Michael Morrow from the Dispatch News Service International.

They were captured on a road from Saigon to Pnompenh by guerrillas from the United National Khmer (Cambodian) Front. After a period of interrogation to determine that they were really journalists and not CIA agents, the three were treated more like guests than prisoners.

For two weeks they traveled westward along with a mass of Cambodian peasants and guerrilla fighters who were trying to escape the wide-scale U.S. bombings.

In a syndicated series appearing in the *New York Times* and elsewhere, Dudman says, "In this great migration we felt that we were watching the terrorization of the peasants of Cambodia. We felt that we were observing the welding together of the local population with the guerrillas. The peasants were turning to the fighters as their best friends. We felt that this held the most serious significance for American policy."

"The villagers appeared to offer willing cooperation and friendship to the guerrillas."

Michael Morrow, in the June 24 *Washington Post*, also recounts nighttime flights of refugees and guerrillas: "Then it was five miles overland on foot with artillery rounds slamming down all around us. There was a continual parade of soldiers and villagers traveling the same path and they seemed to ignore the danger."

"Walking along, I thought of all the money being wasted in the artillery barrage. The Front was not being slowed down or stymied one iota."

The reports by these journalists display a deep respect for the Vietnamese and Cambodian guerrillas who lived with them and protected them.

Dudman quotes one guerrilla fighter as saying, "As long as there is one of us left, we will fight on." Dudman adds, "The toughness and dedication of the guerrillas in Cambodia, as we came to know them in 40 days of captivity there, made that seem a statement of fact rather than a propaganda slogan."

All three journalists were struck by the degree to which the guerrillas had sacrificed their individual needs and desires to the struggle. They had resigned themselves to leaving their families for as long as it was necessary to fight. "The revolutionary neither has family nor needs it," said Anh Hai, a 25-year veteran of 100 battles against both the French and the Americans. "He takes all the people as his mother, father, brother and sisters. When the revolution is won, then he can return to his family and home and lead a normal life."

One of the guerrillas assigned to stay with the journalists asked if they would like to see a picture of his wife, who was killed in a bombing raid. "For five years she worried I would be killed," he said, "but it was she who was killed in the end." This guerrilla



U. S. "liberators" in Indochina

had a daughter whom he had left with some friends.

The policy of the guerrillas toward these journalists, and toward prisoners of war in general, was to treat them as potential allies. One guerrilla told Michael Morrow, "Once we take a person prisoner we never kill him. War is not to kill people but to win a cause. We believe bad people are just misled. Bad Americans just don't understand."

"We don't like to kill Americans, not even American soldiers. We know they don't understand our situation. Everyone can be educated. When we capture someone, that is the end of our difference with him."

This attitude, that the American GIs and civilians are not the enemy, is the exact opposite of the U.S. government policy of bombing, burning and dropping napalm on Vietnamese and Cambodian peasants, considering them all "Vietcong."

The day before Dudman, Morrow and Pond were to be released they were honored by the Cambodians with a ceremony of solidarity with Americans who oppose the Southeast Asian war.

Elizabeth Pond related in the June 25 *Christian Science Monitor*, "We were scheduled to be released on June 14 and on that afternoon set out across the fields to meet a vehicle. . . . To

our final surprise, we turned into a village schoolyard where a celebration was beginning.

"There was a gathering of about 1,000 villagers; there was an honor guard of Cambodian irregulars; and there were new banners that were translated for us as thanking American people who oppose aggression by the Nixon administration in Cambodia." Speeches were made, and the journalists expressed their thanks.

But despite the friendly hospitality of the guerrillas, the journalists were confronted several times with the rage of the Cambodian people at the American invasion and destruction of their country. When they were first captured, rank-and-file soldiers allowed them to be paraded through a village, while villagers shoved and shouted at them.

Morrow writes of trying to start a conversation with a boy who had a bandage over his eye. "You've been wounded, haven't you," asked Morrow. "He spat out his reply: 'Yes, fighting the American aggression.'"

The reports of these three journalists provide one more proof that the war the U.S. government is waging in Southeast Asia is a struggle aimed at stamping out the continually rising revolutionary process. But the findings of these three journalists also confirm that the reactionary U.S. efforts serve only to accelerate that revolutionary process, not arrest it.

Fight U of Texas curb on meetings

AUSTIN — Students at the University of Texas here are continuing a well-organized campaign to reverse a university ruling which prohibits more than three non-students or non-employees of the university from attending meetings of recognized student organizations.

This ruling was specifically passed, according to Frank Erwin, chairman of the Board of Regents, to prevent the campus chapter of the Young Socialist Alliance from holding their socialist summer school classes on campus and inviting non-students to attend.

On Wednesday, June 24, three-hundred-fifty people, including about 20 nonstudent community representatives and observers from the ACLU, attended a meeting on campus in open defiance of the university ruling. The meeting was sponsored by the Ad Hoc Committee Against the Regents' Ruling, a coalition of over 30 student organizations.

Guest speaker at the meeting was Mike Alewitz, a student from Kent State University who witnessed the May 4 murder of the four Kent students. He spoke on "Civil Liberties and the University."

Dean of Students Stephen McClellan, the chief of campus security, and the university attorney attended the meet-

ing but made no attempt to enforce the controversial ruling. This is in contrast to the crude manner in which McClellan intervened at a YSA summer school session on June 14. On this date, McClellan, the university lawyer and two campus cops burst into the YSA meeting and demanded identification from everyone present, with threat of arrests.

As a result of the June 14 meeting, the administration brought a formal complaint against the YSA for sponsoring a meeting at which more than three in attendance were non-students or non-employees of the university. The complaint against the YSA will be taken up at a hearing July 14, at which the recognition of the YSA as a campus organization could be revoked.

Mike Pelfrey, a leader of the Ad Hoc Committee Against the Regents' Ruling and chairman of the Wednesday night meeting, said he felt the Committee's case had been strengthened by the failure of the university to enforce its new ruling. "As long as they didn't bust this meeting, it's selective enforcement," said Pelfrey at the meeting.

Board of Regents chairman Erwin has made it very clear that he initiated the ruling specifically to limit the activities of political groups and

especially the YSA. In a recent interview he explained his thinking as follows: ". . . the Board of Regents of the University of Texas system is working overtime to repulse the Marxist elements in our universities and to keep classes open and operating for those tens of thousands of fine Texas boys and girls who want only a quality education."

Students at the university responded immediately with a fight against this new ruling. The June 4 issue of the student newspaper *Summer Texan* stated, "But the University of Texas, like any state-supported institution, is public domain, which any taxpaying citizen of the State of Texas is entitled to utilize. To deny a member of an audience this right is a denial of freedom of assembly. To forbid an invited speaker this right is a violation of freedom of speech."

Telegrams and letters of support are urgently requested by the Ad Hoc Committee. They can be sent to: Board of Regents, Main Building, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712. Copies should be sent to the Ad Hoc Committee Against the Regents' Ruling, c/o Students Association, Student Union, Room 321, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712.

CALENDAR

ATLANTA

SOCIALIST VS. DEMOCRATIC PARTY CANDIDATES FOR CONGRESS. Hear Joe Cole, candidate of the Socialist Workers Party from 4th cong. district, and Fred LeClercq and Franklin Shumake, Democratic primary candidates in 4th cong. district. Fri., July 10, 8 p.m. 1176 1/2 W. Peachtree (on 14th St.). Donation: 75c. Ausp. Militant Bookstore.

NEW YORK

RIOTS IN NORTHERN IRELAND—REPRESSION OR REVOLUTION? Speakers: Paddy Garland, editor of *Irish-American News Review*, and Gerry Foley, staff writer for *Intercontinental Press*. Fri., July 10, 8:30 p.m. 873 Broadway (nr. 18th St.). Contrib. \$1, h.s. students 50c. Ausp. Militant Labor Forum.

WHICH ROAD FOR ISRAEL—IS A JEWISH-ARAB STRUGGLE AGAINST ZIONISM POSSIBLE? Speaker: Arie Bober, spokesman for the Israeli Socialist Organization. Tues., July 14, 8 p.m. Hunter College, Room 919. Ausp. Committee on New Alternatives

Writings of Leon Trotsky (1937-38)

184 pages \$2.95

PATHFINDER PRESS
873 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10003

Stalinism and the Spanish civil war

By BARRY SHEPPARD

Mike Zagarell, a leading member of the Communist Party USA, spoke on May 22 in New York on the topic "The Inside Job—Trotskyism in the Movement." This is the second in a series of articles dealing with questions raised by Zagarell's attack on revolutionary socialism. The first installment appeared in the June 19 issue of *The Militant*.

Trotskyists are "inveterate splitters and disrupters," Zagarell charged, especially of what he called "broad people's alliances." A "broad people's alliance" in current CP jargon refers to the same class collaborationist concept as the terms "popular front" or "people's front" did in the 1930s. Zagarell referred to the Popular Front in Spain during the 1936-39 civil war, and charged that the "Trotskyites" had helped the fascists come to power by "splitting" the forces of the Popular Front.

Since the basic policy of Stalinism remains people's frontism to this day, it is useful to see how the Stalinists put this concept into practice in the acid test of war and revolution in Spain.

In the elections of February 1936, the Communist Party in Spain made a pact with the Socialist Party, the UGT (Socialist-controlled trade unions) and four liberal bourgeois parties. This People's Front won the elections, and a People's Front government was installed with a bourgeois politician, Azana, at its head.

As was explained in the previous article in this series, the key concept in the policy of the popular or people's front is to create an alliance of working-class parties and the "progressive" capitalist parties or "progressive" wings of capitalist parties. The key to winning such an alliance is to subordinate the interests of the working class and other oppressed classes to the interests of the capitalist class, through a liberal or "left" reformist capitalist policy and program for the people's front. This guarantees the domination of the bourgeois elements, whatever the physical relationship of forces in the front.

Thus the People's Front government under Azana was unable to alleviate the misery of the masses, especially the workers and peasants, because to do so would have necessitated anticapitalist measures — the very measures the People's Front excluded.

Spain's international position in the midst of the world economic crisis made it increasingly difficult for the capitalist class to grant reforms. In fact, the capitalists more and more became convinced that they had to drive down the already miserable standard of living of the masses.

The big bourgeoisie decided that its only way out was the risky one of attempting to crush all independent workers and peasants organizations and doing away with its own shaky parliamentary democracy through a fascist dictatorship.

Fascist insurrection

When General Franco launched his fascist insurrection from Spanish Morocco on July 17, 1936, he had the decisive sector of the capitalist class as well as the big landowners and the Catholic Church hierarchy behind him. This was not a "handful of generals" staging a coup, but a declara-

tion of war by the ruling capitalist class against all the economic, political and cultural organizations of the working class.

Franco appealed to the army and the nation to support him, and in the next three days almost all of the 50 garrisons in Spain declared for fascism. The Popular Front government of Azana had done its best to quiet the "rumors" of Franco's plans before July 17, and then after the fascist insurrection began, denied the seriousness of the situation while it tried to come to terms with the rebellious generals for two decisive days. In fact of the government's paralysis, garrison after garrison went over to the fascists.

While the People's Front government stood by paralyzed, the working class began to go into action on its own. The first victories against the fascists were won by the workers in Barcelona, the capital of Catalonia.

ment, were preparing to attack the barracks with kitchen knives and stones, when the soldiers inside shot their officers and gave the workers arms. A column of 5,000 dynamiters were outfitted by the Asturian miners, and marched on Madrid.

In a massive reflex, the working class went into action in a war to the death against Franco. The workers prevented the capitulation of the republic to the fascists.

The initiative was completely out of the hands of the liberal bourgeoisie and in the hands of the workers, who launched their war against the fascist challenge by revolutionary means. The army was with the fascists; a new army had to be built. The workers began to assemble militia units, equip them, and send them to the front. The sailors saved a good part of the fleet by shooting their officers, electing sailors committees to run the fleet and to coordinate with the workers. Work-

mittee were bound up with revolutionary acts. The Central Committee launched the campaign to liberate the neighboring region of Aragon from the fascists. The Catalonian proletariat conquered Aragon in a war of social liberation. Village antifascist committees in Aragon were set up, which confiscated the large estates and organized production on a new basis, usually collectives. Village militias were set up, captured reactionaries were placed before the general assembly of the village for trial, all property titles, debt documents, etc. were burned. Thus the Catalonian columns marched forward leaving behind secure antifascist fortresses in each village.

Dual power

The revolution of July 19 succeeded in saving part of the country from the original fascist onslaught. The elements of workers power appeared: workers militias, mass antifascist committees under worker domination, fac-



WELL EQUIPPED. Franco's troops with gas masks supplied by Italy and Germany. Stalinists insisted civil war was part of international effort by "democracies" to stop fascism. But while Hitler and Mussolini aided Franco, "democratic" U. S., Britain and France used "neutral" policy to block arms for antifascist forces.

[Here the workers were almost all organized in the CNT (National Confederation of Workers), the anarchist-controlled union. The POUM (Workers Party of Marxist Unification) had more members than the united socialist and Stalinist parties (PSUC — United socialist Party of Catalonia). The POUM was later to be attacked and persecuted by the Stalinists as "Trotskyist." While the POUM used many formulations that Trotskyists also used, it was actually a centrist party, standing between reformism and revolution, and was sharply criticized by Trotsky, especially when it later capitulated to people's frontism.]

Revolution of July 19

The semi-autonomous Catalonian government, following the same policy as the central government in Madrid, refused to give arms to the workers. Gathering together what arms they could, the Barcelona workers stormed the garrison on July 19 almost bare-handed. With arms from the first barracks, they smashed the fascists in Barcelona, and within a few days all of Catalonia was in the workers' hands.

Simultaneously the proletariat was mobilizing in Madrid. Barricades went up, surrounding the Montana barracks. When the news came of the Barcelona victory the barracks were stormed. In Valencia the workers, denied arms by the People's Front gov-

erners patrols were established to ferret out fascist sympathizers behind the lines and carry out police functions — on instructions from the workers organizations.

The revolutionary-military measures taken by the workers were accompanied by revolutionary-economic measures against fascism. Within a week, in Catalonia workers committees had taken control of almost all transport and industry, reestablished order and speeded up production for wartime needs. From Catalonia, workers control spread to much of Loyalist Spain.

Upon hearing of the news from the cities, peasants began taking the land. In many cases, peasant cooperatives were set up, and peasant committees were elected.

The existing governmental forms and workers organizations proved inadequate to the tasks at hand. Workers committees embracing wider layers than had even been organized were established. Broad committees representing the antifascist forces and under the domination of the workers organizations replaced many municipal governments. The most important of the new organs of power was the Central Committee of Antifascist Militias of Catalonia, organized on July 21, which virtually ran Catalonia.

In these months of revolution, the military actions of the Central Com-

tory committees controlling production, workers patrols. The beginnings of peasants committees also appeared. But the revolution did not go all the way to the taking of state power and establishing a workers state. The chief reason for this was the absence of a resolute combat party with roots in the masses capable of leading the struggle for state power through to victory. Thus there existed two powers, side by side: the very much weakened Republican bourgeois government, and the developing organs of workers power.

In the course of the civil war, the bourgeoisie gradually whittled away and finally crushed the power of the workers through the device of the People's Front, with the partial or wholehearted collaboration of the leaderships of the various workers parties, and especially of the Stalinists.

The liberal bourgeoisie was more afraid of the revolution than it was of fascism. Gradually, through a series of People's Front governments, the gains of the July revolution were taken from the workers and peasants. Gradually, the bourgeois state apparatus was rebuilt, replacing the workers patrols with regular police, taking control over the workers militias by incorporating them into the "regular" army, placing industries under the control (not ownership) of the bour-

(Continued on page 17)

Pathfinder Press, Inc.
873 Broadway,
NYC 10003

65c
48 pp

Pathfinder
Press

Leon Trotsky

Marxism
in
Our Time

Canada legal abortion fight

Women rally behind victimized doctor

By PENNY SIMPSON

MONTREAL — The women's liberation movement here is rallying to the support of Dr. Henry Morgantaler, an outspoken advocate of legalized abortion who was arrested recently. The arrest came less than a month after Morgantaler addressed an abortion-repeal rally held in mid-May in Ottawa.

The consequences of the arrest, which the government could not have failed to foresee, have been frightening and murderous. Montreal a month ago was the safest and cheapest place in the entire country for abortions. But, within two weeks of Morgantaler's arrest, a least one woman died of a botched abortion, according to the *Montreal Star*, and in one hospital alone, admissions for abortion complications have quadrupled.

Deaths and maiming from butcher abortions are the responsibility of the Canadian government. It is their so-called liberalized abortion law of 1968, with its hospital review boards sitting in judgement over desperate women, that has made it even harder to get a safe abortion and which declares any doctor and any woman a criminal for not accepting the hospital's sanctimonious refusals of 99 percent of all abortions.

Dr. Morgantaler has been charged with conspiring to commit, and the performance of, an abortion. He has pleaded not guilty, although he does not deny that he does abortions. A young woman is also charged with conspiracy to abort herself, a dangerous precedent.

Dr. Morgantaler says he was held overnight without being charged and roughed up by the police who raided his clinic. His files and equipment were seized, his preliminary hearing arbitrarily closed to the public, and a postponement of proceedings refused, although his lawyer had only three days to prepare for the hearing. The objectivity and conduct of the judge are being challenged in higher court.

The response by the movement to the arrest was immediate. In less than two days, the women's liberation movement and other supporters of legalized abortions organized a demonstration of 2-300 outside Morgantaler's preliminary hearing. A delegation of doctors also met June 16 with the fed-

eral minister of justice to demand a moratorium on abortion charges against doctors until the law can be repealed.

Montreal doctors, long silent, and dismissed by many as church-dominated and reactionary, have responded in other ways. A committee has been established to investigate hospital admissions records to find out the extent of botched abortions. They are also circulating a petition in favour of abortion law repeal among the doctors of the province. In two days, they obtained the signatures of 187 doctors and published the petition as a full-page ad in the *Montreal Star*.

The petition declares, "We, the undersigned medical doctors, believe that it is intolerable that women should have to die as a result of incompetent, illegal abortions while the law does not permit doctors to help women with unwanted pregnancies. We believe that the present Canadian abortion laws are inadequate, unreasonable and cruel. They need immediate revision. The way to prevent deaths of young women due to incompetent abortions is ABORTION LAW REPEAL."

One spokesman for Doctors for Abortion Law Repeal commented, "Our next statement—and there will be another—will have 1,800 names."

Other response has been significant. The *Montreal Star*, the largest circulation daily in the city, had a lead editorial June 16 calling for a New York State type law, allowing abortion up to a fixed time limit on the decision of a woman and her doctor.

Montreal Women's Liberation is planning a broadly-sponsored public protest meeting for July 3, and is calling on women's liberation groups across the country to hold similar meetings.

It is vitally important that a defense campaign be organized. The fact that two-thirds of the delegates at the June 9 western Liberal Party conference voted for abortion on demand indicates the extent of popular revulsion against the policies of Prime Minister Trudeau's Liberal Party government and the potential which exists for building a campaign to force an immediate repeal of the murderous Canadian abortion laws.



Right-wing vandals left book display in Chicago SWP-YSA headquarters splattered with paint.

Chicago SWP-YSA hall attacked by right-wingers

By BRUCE SCHEFF

CHICAGO, June 28—Between 11 p.m. Friday, June 26, and 6 a.m. the following day, the Illinois election headquarters of the Socialist Workers Party and the offices of the Chicago SWP and Young Socialist Alliance were broken into, robbed and vandalized. Mail, files, typewriters, a tape recorder and other office equipment were stolen, along with cash, check-books, financial records and other irreplaceable materials. There was a systematic effort to confiscate this information by rifling all the file cabinets, desks and storage units. Books, pamphlets, SWP campaign literature and newspapers were thrown in a pile on the floor, covering an area about eight feet in diameter and two-and-a-half feet high in the center.

The investigating officer from the Chicago Police Department noted that the most dangerous aspect of the attack was that the intruders had made a huge pile of flammable material in the center of the hall and soaked it with oil. He conjectured that they may have been frightened off before lighting a blaze which would have engulfed the entire building. The remaining books in the bookstore and library were splashed with paint.

This follows a series of similar attacks which have been carried out by the Legion of Justice, a small, right-wing terrorist group located in the Chicago area.

The Legion of Justice first attacked the Chicago SWP-YSA hall on Nov. 1, 1969, assaulting the four people present. It then attacked the Northern Illinois University headquarters of the YSA in DeKalb, where six people were maced and one was beaten with a tire iron on Dec. 6, 1969.

Since then the Legion has harassed and attacked a number of antiwar and radical organizations, including the Chicago Peace Council, Guild Bookstore, *Second City* (an underground newspaper), Industrial Workers of the World and several church coffeehouses.

The reaction of the police and State's Attorney Hanrahan's office to these criminal acts has ranged from inaction to outright collusion.

The Committee for Defense Against Terrorist Attacks was formed last December following the Legion's attacks on the YSA and SWP, and it has persistently tried for four months to

get the state's attorney's office to have a grand jury investigate the illegal activities of the Legion of Justice.

The committee has organized delegations to State's Attorney Hanrahan's office on three different occasions to demand prosecution of the Legion of Justice in cases before the court, and to investigate collusion between the police department and the Legion of Justice. Hanrahan's office failed to take any meaningful action following any of the visits.

Finally, on June 26, after being notified of plans for another delegation, the state's attorney's office informed the committee that a grand jury would hear the charges against Thomas Stewart stemming from the Nov. 1 raid on the YSA-SWP hall. Stewart has been publicly identified with the Legion and is a known participant in numerous attacks.

The most recent attack on the YSA-SWP headquarters occurred less than 15 hours after the committee learned of the decision to call a grand jury in Stewart's case.

In a press release issued June 27, the committee charged, "It was the lack of response toward terrorist activities of the right wing, coupled with brutal investigation and slanders of radical groups, including the Hampton and Clark case, that created the atmosphere for this morning's attack. The state's attorney's office's indifference toward the activities of groups like the Legion of Justice encourages these kinds of attacks by letting them know they will not be seriously prosecuted."

The Committee for Defense Against Terrorist Attacks announced it will continue to campaign for the state's attorney's office to call a public grand jury investigation into the illegal activities of the Legion of Justice, and it will persist in informing the public and the press of the dangerous situation that exists.

Following the attack, Lynn Henderson, Illinois SWP candidate for U.S. Senate, charged, "It is the Democratic and Republican politicians, currently engaged in an illegal campaign of violence in Southeast Asia, who are ultimately responsible for the national climate in which people feel free to use illegal and violent methods to attempt to silence those who are opposed to the war and working for social change."





Photo by Sid Sattler

Milwaukee meet proves letdown for participants



Workshop at Milwaukee conference

Photo by Warren Metzger

By CARL FRANK

MILWAUKEE, Wis. — The Milwaukee Strategy Action Conference, initiated about a month ago by Prof. Sidney Peck and others in the New Mobilization Committee, was held here June 27-28 at the U of Wisconsin campus. The declared aim was to escalate opposition to the war and to more effectively relate antiwar forces to the fight against racism, poverty and repression.

Although participants met in workshops ranging from "Consumer Boycott and Tax Resistance" to "Sexism and Racism," the conference was unable to develop a coherent strategy or adopt a concrete program of activity for the antiwar movement, or anyone else, during the months ahead.

No credentials report was available, but registration figures indicated that between 800 and 900 people attended. By the final session attendance had dropped to less than 200.

A "Summer Resistance Conference," organized in Milwaukee during the same weekend by the Brandeis Strike Information center, was sparsely attended. By Sunday, its 20 to 75 participants had merged into the plenary session of the larger body.

The conference was attended by most of the New Mobilization Committee leadership, which met on Friday evening to plan an agenda for the following days. This consisted of workshops on a variety of interests and concerns during Saturday, and a plenary session on Sunday to hear the workshop reports and decide on proposals for action.

The Saturday sessions were marked by widespread confusion regarding the aims and objectives of the conference. Some of the participants indicated that they wondered who had organized it, why they had been asked to attend, and what they were supposed to discuss.

Trudi Young of the New Mobe, who helped to chair the plenary sessions of the conference, assured everyone that this was a historic occasion, since it was "the first time that we've come to the consciousness that there is more to do than end the war."

The Sunday session, with about 350 people remaining, was convened by William Dawson, a New York community organizer.

Trying to set a unifying tone to the meeting, Dawson stated that the conference was "bringing everyone together into a movement family." "We don't have to discuss any differences," he said, "because we have so much in common."

The first item on the agenda was a report from the welfare rights workshop by Jonnie Tillman of the National Welfare Rights Organization, which had brought a contingent of 40-50 people to the conference.

Tillman stated that she felt she had come into a "blind situation," not knowing what kind of conference she was attending. She emphasized that the National Welfare Rights Organization would not participate in any plans for direct action in Washington, D. C., but she hoped that the conference participants would support the June 30 Welfare Rights actions planned in major cities around the country.

The conference voted to adopt a three-part motion on welfare rights: 1) to actively support the Senate bill guaranteeing a \$5,500 per year annual income for a family of four; 2) to support and build NWRO in local communities; and 3) to support and build the June 30 demonstrations.

The second item on the agenda was a report on the proposal for "Disruptive Action in Washington, D. C.," presented by Bernard Lafayette from SCLC. The report contained the results of the workshop on "Washington, D. C. Disruptive Action." This workshop had originally been entitled the "Long March Proposal." It was chaired by Arthur Waskow and Renie Davis, the current principal architects of New Mobe policy.

The presentation pointed to the need to form "liberation collectives" that would organize semiautonomous "liberation marches" to arrive in D. C. sometime in the fall, remaining for an unspecified time to carry out various unspecified acts of civil disruption. The demands on behalf of which such action would be undertaken were, again, unspecified.

Michael Lerner, from the Seattle Liberation Front, stressed the importance of projecting such activity. An action like this, he claimed, was necessary to provide an alternative to the Oct. 31 demonstrations to be organized around the central issue of immediate withdrawal of U. S. troops from Southeast Asia, and to transform the antiwar movement into a "people's movement."

Larry Scott, from Philadelphia Quaker Action, spoke for many of the pacifists at the conference, who supported a plan for civil disobedience in Washington, but were concerned that the nonviolent character of such activity be firmly established.

In response, Arthur Waskow stated that the collectives themselves would set the policy for the disruptive tactics.

The conference was not, however, asked to vote on this proposal for "direct action" in Washington, D. C. Instead it adopted a call for regional conferences within a month to further discuss the proposal and the possibilities of its implementation.

The third item for discussion was the report from the "Emergency Perspectives" workshop, presented by Prof. Douglas Dowd, also a New Mobe leader. He proposed the development of the tactics and strategy of nonviolent disruption which could be set in motion should a qualitative escalation of the war take place. Such a strategy, he said, could "gum up" the country. The conference voted to mandate a task force "to articulate, develop, and publicize" a "variety of direct-action-disruptive tactics."

The conference also endorsed the international anti-genocide petition, after a report by Claude Lightfoot.

The report from the workshop on "Work Stoppages" was given by Jack Spiegel of the Chicago Peace Council.

Spiegel reported on the meeting which he and several other conference leaders had on Saturday evening with representatives from the Chicago trade union Rank and File Action Conference (see story, page 15). He was given the feeling, he said, that "work-

ing people want to move away from the single-issue idea of just bringing the troops home and address themselves to other issues as well, such as the problems of racism, repression, and who profits from the war."

The conference voted to set up a liaison committee with the Chicago Rank and File Action Conference for the purpose of working out common actions in the fall. Although no date was set for an action, it was reported that the committee would seek to designate a time period in the middle of October to be used as a focus for labor-student-community activity.

The membership of the liaison committee was not voted on or discussed by the conference.

The decisions of the conference were left for implementation to either regional conferences or to bodies of unknown determination set up by the conference. No formal structure was developed or discussed at the conference. It remains unclear, therefore, who, if anyone, will bear the responsibility for carrying the conference decisions into action.

An encouraging number of participants signed mailing lists to be informed of the activity of the Peace Action Coalition formed at the national antiwar conference in Cleveland the week previous.

SMC to mobilize support for new antiwar coalition

CLEVELAND—Immediately following the completion of the National Emergency Conference Against the Cambodia-Laos-Vietnam War (see *The Militant*, July 3), the national steering committee of the Student Mobilization Committee met to discuss the conference and take up other business.

The SMC steering committee unanimously endorsed the conference decisions to build demonstrations commemorating the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Aug. 6-9; to support the Chicano Moratorium demonstration in Los Angeles on Aug. 29; and to build massive national antiwar demonstrations on Oct. 31. The discussion also brought out the perspective of working actively in the Peace Action Coalition (PAC) established by the conference.

A number of other points were taken up by the steering committee. A national SMC conference was projected for the fall in order to evaluate the effects of the May student strike and the summer of activities and to provide the final push for building the Oct. 31 demonstrations. The exact time and place of the conference were left open, but a steering committee meeting was called for mid-August, which will decide conference details.

The previous meeting of the national steering committee, held May 24 in Boston, decided to move the SMC's national office from Washington to New York. Due to the fact that Carol Lipman would not be able to move with the SMC national office, Don Gurewitz, who has been acting as national coordinator, was designated as national executive secretary until the fall conference. Bob Wilkinson, a Vietnam veteran from Boston, was designated as GI Project director and the editor of *GI Press Service*. Allen Myers, who had been acting in that capacity, was unable to continue.

The final decision made at this meeting was to formalize SMC membership. The steering committee felt that since the SMC was considered a membership organization by many SMC activists, this concept should be concretized. Membership is intended to give a greater organizational solidity to the SMC, as well as to make national gatherings more democratic, eliminating the possibility of nonmembers making policy decisions for the SMC.

Membership cards are being prepared by the national office. Membership fees will be \$1.00 and can be paid to the national office at 15 E. 17th St., New York.

GENOCIDE AGAINST THE INDIANS

Its Role in the Rise of U.S. Capitalism

By George Novack

50c

PATHFINDER PRESS

873 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10003

A letter to C. B. King from Linda Jenness

Why Democratic Party is a trap

The following letter was sent to C. B. King, who is seeking the Democratic Party nomination for governor of Georgia, by Linda Jenness, Socialist Workers Party candidate for governor of Georgia. The letter was in response to a request from King that she comment on his election material.

C. B. King is a prominent Black attorney from Albany, Georgia. In the early 1960s he was very active in the civil rights struggle there, which received widespread national attention.

Since the letter was written, a three-judge federal panel has knocked down one provision of the Georgia state election law to which Linda Jenness refers. On June 22 the \$2,125 qualifying fee was declared unconstitutional. The decision by the court to uphold the discriminatory provision requiring more than 88,000 signatures to gain ballot status is being appealed.

Dear Mr. King,

About two months ago I received a letter from your campaign secretary with a copy of your platform indicating that you publicly protested my unfair exclusion from the platform of the state convention of the Association of County Commissioners. All the announced candidates for governor with the exception of myself had been invited to address the commissioners. When I sent letters to the gubernatorial candidates asking them to object to this exclusion you were the only one to respond, and I want to thank you for this action.

At about the same time I also received some campaign material from your office with a brief note from you asking me to comment on it. I held off my response until now partly because of my busy schedule but mostly because I wanted to wait until you declared whether you were going to run as an independent or in the Democratic or Republican primaries. Last week you paid the \$2,125 qualifying fee to run in the Democratic Party primary.

I was very disappointed that you decided upon this course. The failure of both the Democratic and Republican parties to even seriously consider the key questions of how to end America's aggressive foreign policy or eliminate the intolerable conditions facing Black Americans should be sufficient evidence to convince you of your error.

The few concessions that have been won by the Black community in the last fifteen years are not due to the

efforts of Democratic or Republican Party politicians, but rather to the direct mass actions of hundreds of thousands of Black people. It has been independent struggles like the Albany, Georgia, movement in the early 1960s, the revolt in Augusta and the protest demonstrations against the killings there, the city employees' strike in Atlanta, and the demonstrations in Perry and Sandersville that have helped to put strong pressure on Democratic politicians.

At one point your platform seems

you shaking hands with Mayor Stokes. The caption reads: "Stokes endorses Black Nominee for Governor in Georgia." This political relationship with Mayor Stokes is not something I would boast about. If you recall, Mayor Stokes ordered the police attack on Hough [a Black ghetto in Cleveland] in 1968 which later led to the frame-up murder trial of Black nationalist leader Ahmed Evans, who now faces the death penalty. The Eisenhower Commission report on this incident stated that there had not been sufficient

poor whites to form a labor party.

I believe that one of the most significant developments in last year's race for mayor in Atlanta was that Dr. Horace Tate won a large percent of the vote, nearly winning a place in the run-off. He did this without backing from any section of the business community or from either the Democratic or Republican machines. He had no fancy advertising or publicity but yet was still able to poll a significant vote in the Black community. Isn't that proof that there is substantial sentiment for independent Black political action?

If you were to have built your campaign on this sentiment and run independently of the Democratic Party, you could have helped expose the pernicious role the Democratic Party has played in Georgia and nationwide. Now your campaign only helps to sow illusions about this party—the party of racist Lester Maddox and strike-breaking Sam Massell.

"But," you might reply, "I'm running a campaign to win, because I can do more good as an elected official and the only way you can do that in Georgia today is in either of the two major parties." Perhaps you will win; I don't rule that out as a possibility. But to be elected as a Democrat and to serve as a Democrat means you can be no better than a Carl Stokes or a Sam Massell despite your intentions or promises.

Furthermore, I think that if you had joined me in challenging Georgia's reactionary election laws it would have substantially strengthened the case against them and a victory would have made it possible for you to have run as an independent. As it stands now you have yet to publicly support my suit, now pending in federal court, against the high qualifying fees and exorbitant number of signatures on independent nominating petitions.

I think that your decision to run in the Democratic primary has led you to be silent on questions that demand a strong public statement. As far as I know you have made no public statement in respect to the occupation of Augusta by national guardsmen and state troopers or to the killing of six Black men there. It is true that at the SCLC-sponsored demonstration on May 23 in Atlanta protesting the killings in Augusta, Jackson State and Kent State you were on the speakers' platform. However, at that time all you had to say was, "I have only one word to say: Hello." This almost makes a mockery of the tragic deaths of six Black men shot in the back in Augusta. Where is your outrage against these crimes!

I am enclosing with this letter copies of *The Case for a Black Party* and the *Transitional Program for Black Liberation*. Both of these documents were passed by recent national conventions of the Socialist Workers Party. These will explain more succinctly than I can in a short letter our ideas about the need and timeliness of an independent Black party.

I would greatly appreciate your comments.

Sincerely,
Linda Jenness
June 14, 1970



DEMOCRATIC PARTY "LAW AND ORDER." Georgia national guardsmen stationed in Augusta after local cops murdered six Black residents. State Democratic administration sent Guard in to protect property, not Black people. C. B. King, an aspirant for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination, failed to speak out publicly on Augusta repression.

to be fuzzy about who the enemy of Black Americans is. In the section entitled "Business, Industry, and Finance", you state, "Although we are a poor man's crusade, Black and white alike, we are also no enemy to the men of business, industry and finance. All that we would demand of them is to give the less fortunate a chance."

When the demands of Black Americans and other oppressed national minorities, the labor movement, the antiwar movement and the women's liberation movement inevitably come into conflict with the profit interests of business, industry and finance, how can you say that you are not their enemy? Can the broad sectors of the population who are demanding that America's economic and political structure be geared toward social needs rather than private profits effectively challenge the political hegemony of the business interests by supporting or running candidates in the parties controlled by these same interests? Isn't running in the Democratic or Republican Party similar to a slave helping his master put out a fire on the plantation?

Perhaps the course of the Democratic Party can be changed by working inside it, by forming what you referred to in a June 11 press conference as a "coalition of poor whites and Blacks?" Nothing could be further from the truth. The business interests who control the Democratic Party are not likely to permit it to be used for purposes other than defending their interests. They can buy, coerce, corrupt, or expel any opposition that attempts to challenge the party apparatus they control.

Let's take Carl Stokes, Democratic mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, as an example. In the campaign literature you sent me there are copies of several news clippings including a picture of

evidence to prove that Ahmed Evans was responsible for killing the policemen. Despite this lack of proof, Mayor Stokes has confidently asserted that Evans' trial was "fair." More recently Mayor Stokes led a group of Ohio mayors in calling on Governor Rhodes to call up the National Guard against a 33-day Teamsters strike.

When Stokes ran for mayor he promised to help the oppressed people in the Black community. They turned out in force to elect him because they were fed up with white Democratic and Republican politicians who did nothing for the Black community. But because Stokes ran in the Democratic Party he has taken his orders from Cleveland's ruling class, not from the Black community. In fact his first major action when he took office was to increase payroll taxes to raise money to hire more police to control the Black community.

You might wonder if I am suggesting that Black leaders, like yourself, should not become involved in politics. On the contrary, I think that one of the central tasks for those fighting to change the rotten conditions in our society is to challenge the political hegemony of the capitalist rulers. But this can only be done by organizing independent of their parties and their policies.

One of the central purposes of my election campaign for governor is to promote the idea of an independent Black political party based on and responsible to the Black community and a labor party based on the trade unions. Although no such formations exist today, the inability of the capitalist rulers to grant the growing demands of many sections of the American people will inevitably lead to their creation. A successful Black party could shake up political alignments as they exist today and serve as an example to the union movement and

Large-Format Paperback Books From Merit Publishers

Produced in this format to keep prices down, these books have pages, 8 1/2 X 11 inches, containing 2 1/2 to 3 times as many words as those of the average book.

Leon Trotsky, The Man and His Work

Reminiscences and appraisals by 18 writers
128 pages, illustrated \$2.45

Revolt in France

Reports and analyses of the May-June 1968 events.
168 pages, illustrated \$1.95

Marxist Essays in American History

128 pages \$2.45

Writings of Leon Trotsky (1937-38)

184 pages \$2.95

Writings of Leon Trotsky (1938-39)

152 pages, 22 illustrations \$2.95

Writings of Leon Trotsky (1939-40)

128 pages, illustrated \$2.45

Pathfinder Press

(formerly Merit Publishers)

873 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10003

Write for free catalogue

Problems of Women's Liberation

A Marxist Approach

By Evelyn Reed

64 pages 95¢

PATHFINDER PRESS

873 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10003

SOCIALIST CAMPAIGN '70

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors has returned to committee a Public Utilities Commission request for a raise in city bus fares. It did so after a public hearing in which more than 50 persons, including SWP senatorial candidate Dianne Feeley, blasted the proposal.

The audience repeatedly applauded Feeley. She called for free or low-cost mass transportation, to be financed by a 100 percent tax on all San Francisco businesses that pollute or make money off the Vietnam war. She also demanded that the books of the transportation system be opened to public examination.

"I'm glad Kipp Dawson is running for Senate on the Socialist Workers Party ticket and not opposing me in the Democratic primary," said New York "peace" candidate Paul O'Dwyer at a June 16 Neighbors for Peace meeting. O'Dwyer had the misfortune of following the SWP candidate on the platform.

Most of the discussion revolved around points Dawson had raised. One woman pressed O'Dwyer into commenting on Dawson's claim that capitalism, not evil individual politicians, was the cause of war, racism and exploitation of women. "Like Miss Dawson," he said, "I have lost faith in the system. But unlike her, I haven't lost hope for it." Only a handful of the 200 persons present applauded.

While the New York SWP is running a campaign that deals with many issues, some are making a special impact. Letters of inquiry addressed to simply "The Women's Liberation Campaign" are being received by the state campaign committee at the rate of more than one a week.

Arguments were heard by the court June 25 in the Pennsylvania ballot suit being brought by the SWP. The suit is challenging the constitutionality of a law that bars two parties with the same or "deceptively similar" words in their names from appearing on the ballot. Both the Socialist Workers Party and the Socialist Labor Party are seeking ballot status.

Within the space of one week in mid-June, three Michigan SWP candidates had a chance to take on candidates and representatives of the capitalist parties.

Jacqueline Rice, candidate for Congress from the first district, appeared on a panel at a meeting of a new group called Blacks Against Racism. The panel included two Republicans and a Democrat.

Walter Kos, congressional candidate

from the fifth district, and campaign supporters questioned Democratic senatorial candidate Sander Levin from the floor of a meeting of UAW Local 782. Some 200 were in attendance. Kos had been led to believe that he could share the platform with Levin. The local president promised to give the SWP a half hour at a future meeting.

Evelyn Kirsch, candidate for lieutenant governor, presented the SWP's program for women's liberation at a meeting of Young Women Committed to Action, a group within the YWCA. The two other participants were Democratic candidates who presented no program for women's liberation or anything else. No one bothered to ask them any questions, and a majority of those present gathered around Kirsch afterwards for informal discussion.

What women need is not a new party but a very old party—like the one that led the Russian revolution, said Polly Connelly, Chicago Women's Liberation Union activist, at a June 12 SWP campaign rally to kick off the petition drive to put the party on the ballot. She endorsed the SWP campaign.

The rally also announced a change in the SWP slate. To prevent the possibility of the slate being ruled off the ballot due to age requirements,

Lynn Henderson will replace Naomi Allen in the race for U.S. Senate and Allen will be added to the slate as the candidate for state treasurer. Henderson was instrumental in organizing faculty support for the spring student strike at the University of Illinois Circle Campus.

Rick Congress, SWP congressional candidate from Washington's sixth district, which includes Ft. Lewis, pledged at a June 20 rally at the federal building in Seattle to use his campaign to help stimulate support for Ft. Lewis GI Willie Williams and other antiwar GIs. Williams is a Black Vietnam veteran who is threatened with court martial for circulating a petition opposing the war and racism in the Army.

Peter Camejo, Massachusetts SWP candidate for U.S. Senate, has challenged his opponent, Senator Edward Kennedy, to a debate of the major issues in the 1970 campaign "on any public platform he may choose."

"Today you say the American invasion of Vietnam was a mistake," Camejo says in a letter to the senator. "Was it a mistake for you to vote for all war appropriations and the Bay of Tonkin Resolution? How did you come to make such a 'mistake?'" This is one of many questions Camejo hopes to raise with Kennedy.

— DAVID THORSTAD

Bay Area Iranian students jailed for demonstration

By GEORGE JOHNSON
SAN FRANCISCO, June 29 — Forty-one Bay Area Iranian students are in jail and face possible deportation for peacefully protesting the murder of student demonstrators in Iran. The demonstration took place at the Iranian Consulate in San Francisco on June 26. If the students are sent back to Iran, they are certain to be imprisoned and tortured by the Shah's reactionary regime.

Several of the demonstrators were beaten bloody by the San Francisco Tactical Squad police, who were called by the consul to evict the students. The students are still in jail. Bail has not yet been announced but is expected to be high.

When asked why no warning to leave was given prior to the arrests, the officer in charge said, "Why should we warn them? They entered the building illegally." A police spokesman had claimed the students forced their way in, but this was denied by a Con-

sular official, who said they came in peacefully in groups of two and three.

Immigration officials were quick to tell the press that deportation is likely for many of the students, since only a few have permanent residence visas. The students charged the Iranian consul has pressured Immigration to deport them.

The students were trying to present demands that the Shah's regime stop torturing and murdering political prisoners. They were also protesting the visit to San Francisco, for the UN charter day, of Princess Ashraff Pahlavi, the Shah's sister and a member of the Iranian UN delegation.

The Iranian Student Association, which organized the demonstration, is planning further protests to demand that charges against the 41 be dropped. Messages of solidarity and bail funds should be sent to the Iranian Students Association of Northern California, P. O. Box 400F, Berkeley, California.

Court hears argument on Mandel ban

By GEORGE NOVACK

Arguments for a preliminary injunction restraining the government from barring the Belgian Marxist Ernest Mandel from the United States were heard before a three-judge federal court in Brooklyn June 24. The case is the first challenge to certain restrictive provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act excluding aliens solely because of their political opinions.

The suit was brought by eight professors from leading Eastern universities in association with Ernest Mandel. Its affirmation of the right of American citizens to hear all views on economic and social issues makes the case of vital importance to civil liberties.

In arguing before the court, the noted constitutional lawyer Leonard Boudin emphasized that the government's power to exclude aliens does not override the assertion by citizens of their constitutional rights. Otherwise the administration is given total censorship over what Americans can hear.

Boudin denied that Mandel's exclusion from universities where he would engage in unquestionably lawful speech and debate is rationally related to national security, as the government contended.

He noted that the Justice Department had dropped its previous grounds for refusing Mandel a visa, such as his alleged abuse of the conditions of entry during his 1968 lecture tour or any possession of "secret" information which led Attorney General Mitchell to reject the secretary of state's waiver recommendation.


"Instead," Boudin's brief concluded, "the government takes the position that the Attorney General has unbridled discretion to pick and choose the scholars and views the American plaintiffs may hear. Such a position, striking as it does at the basic rights of American citizens, is irreconcilable with the most fundamental principles embodied in our Constitution."

The government attorney, Lloyd Bacon, took precisely this position. He declared that the government's absolute right of sovereignty allows it to exclude any alien for any reason and that the right to hear is "illusory." Does this mean, asked Judge Dooling, that "a superb doctor or a man with red hair as well as red sentiments" can be kept out of the country by the attorney general? The government attorney answered yes, maintaining that no limitations can be imposed by the courts on the government's power of exclusion.

The questions put by the judges made it apparent that the central issue in the case has been narrowed down to the right of utterance, and not one of acts or affiliations. When the point was made that Mandel could communicate with his fellow scholars by way of books, tapes and telestar, Judge Dooling alluded to the pertinent fact that, while attorneys for both sides had submitted briefs, they also argued their cases in person before the judges who had the opportunity to question them.

The court reserved decision which will probably be forthcoming during the summer. It will very likely be appealed by one side or the other to the U. S. Supreme Court.

The case has been initiated by the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee with the support of the American Foundation for Social Justice and the Socialist Scholars Conference.



Michigan campaign literature

A five-page feature

Mass action: a weapon of the revolution

By Peter Camejo

The following article is based on a speech given June 14 in New York City by Peter Camejo, Socialist Workers Party candidate for U.S. senator from Massachusetts.

The purpose of this meeting is to have a discussion about the present political conjuncture in this country following the May events, how we have to relate to what is happening, and what we have to do to build the anti-war movement and the revolutionary movement.

The main questions I want to deal with are some of the arguments being raised within the radical movement against the orientation projected by the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance. I want to try to deal with these arguments in a theoretical way. That is, deal with what is basically behind the differences that now exist in the radical movement and what they represent in terms of the problems before the left in the United States.

I want to start by talking about Cambodia. If you read the newspapers of the last few days you will notice that there's a very interesting thing happening in Cambodia. The papers say that the guerrillas are winning

ground. Now, you have to be very careful whenever the American papers say that the communists are winning, because sometimes that is done simply to justify sending more troops or more arms.

But when the papers start saying it every day, over and over again, and then they start telling you what areas the communists have conquered, after a while you begin to suspect that it's true. And I'm really getting very suspicious that the people in Cambodia are starting to win.

But, there's more to it than just that. There's something else happening. The United States is not sending in any troops to stop their advance. Well, you may say, "obviously, we all know about that." Nixon says the U.S. isn't sending any more troops. The troops are supposed to be withdrawn from Cambodia by the end of June.

But Nixon is pulling them out just when the United States is *losing* in Cambodia!

Now, that's very unusual. We have to stop and think: what's stopping the United States from sending hundreds of thousands of troops into Cambodia right now, to take over the capital and secure all those little towns and cities and roads and everything else they claim they're losing? They certainly don't *want* to lose Cambodia. Nixon has the airplanes, he has the ships. What's stopping him? Russian troops? Chinese troops? Who's in the way?

If you can't answer that question, you can't understand either what is happening in this country or what has to be done. Because if you want to deal with politics, you have to understand that there's some real force stopping the war-makers. It's not just some psychological quirk of Nixon. And it's not because of some resolution that's being debated by the Senate. The power of a class, like the American ruling class, is not determined by some kind of legal paper. It's determined by a relationship of certain forces. In other words, there's a certain power that is stopping them from going full steam ahead with the war. What is that power?

Many of the so-called radicals, or people who call themselves radicals, can't answer this question. Some of them used to say that the reason the United States is not doing more in Vietnam, and is actually starting to withdraw some troops, is because the U.S. has lost the war. Remember that explanation? These radicals used to



Photo by Ron Payne

keep announcing that the NLF had won. I've always asked them to notify the NLF about this, since the NLF undoubtedly isn't aware of it. You don't say you've won a war when there are still 500,000 enemy troops occupying all your major cities.

The fact is, the United States has not lost the war militarily. The United States could put millions more soldiers into Vietnam from a military standpoint.

The U.S. had an army of 15 million in the Second World War, with a population then of some 140 million. With the present population of 220 million, the U.S. could put an army of 22 to 24 million in the field now if it wanted to mobilize on the scale it did for World War II. Which means it could put ten million into Vietnam.

And it would be economically possible too, if the government was willing to pay the price, in terms of the standard of living of the American people, that it paid in the Second World War.

That is, there is nothing militarily stopping them from escalating. The national liberation forces of Indochina couldn't physically stop them from landing two, three, or five million soldiers.

It's true that one thing the U.S. has to consider in deciding whether or not to send more troops is how China and the USSR would respond to such an escalation. That is a real consideration, because China and the Soviet Union represent real powers.

Up until now, however, all the Chinese have done when the U.S. staged major escalations is issue their 1,829th "final warning," saying that they take it very seriously and that the U.S. will have to be responsible for the consequences. The Russians have also put out their "warnings," different only in their wording.

So the restraint on the U.S. government is not mainly due to a direct or immediate fear of China and Russia. That's one consideration based on real power, but it is not the decisive consideration at this moment because the U.S. has already had a higher number of troops in Vietnam than they have right now. And they've bombed further and more intensively than they are right now.

What's stopping them from moving right now into Cambodia?

Another explanation advanced by some is that the ruling class is reforming itself, changing its mind about how imperialist to be. But that's not what is happening at all. The American

ruling class — from McGovern and Kennedy right on down to Nixon — would love to have a free hand, a situation where it would be acceptable to send however many soldiers would be necessary to take control of Cambodia and "secure" Vietnam. The war-makers haven't had any change of heart.

The real explanation is that the masses of people in this country have become a force that enters into the balance on a world scale. There is a change taking place in the consciousness of the people of the United States, and this change is altering the relationship of forces. An understanding of this fact is crucial for deciding our strategy and tactics. You can't work out tactics for how to affect the course of the war unless you understand what is affecting it at this very moment.

Failure to understand this leads to all types of dreams, schemes and fantasies which I'm going to discuss.

But first let's consider why this is true. Why is it that the antiwar consciousness of the masses of people can be such a powerful force affecting what the government can do? The reason is very simply this: contrary to what many people in the radical movement say, the masses of people have different interests than the ruling class and they have independent power.

The ruling class can, of course, influence the working class — through the leadership of the trade unions for instance. But the potential power of the working class, that independent power which was concretely reflected in the postal workers strike and the GE strike, is a power which is so strong that the ruling class has to seriously reckon with it in figuring out its strategy.

The working class in this country, if it so chose, could physically end the war in Vietnam. That's a pretty fantastic power. Students cannot end it by themselves. Soldiers could conceivably end it, but you can't consider the GIs in isolation from the rest of society.

There's a general shift taking place in which masses of workers are becoming more and more sympathetic to appeals to stop the war.

Now people say, "What do you mean? There's no sign of that. How many workers have gone on strike against the war? How many workers have thrown their bodies in the way of tanks? How many workers have burnt their draft cards, or even joined a demonstration?"

Such arguments are used to "prove" that mass antiwar sentiment obvious-



Photo by Ron Payne

'The ruling class can deal with any one individual or any small group; it's only masses that stand in their way.'

ly can't be the power restraining the war-makers. But if you look at it this way you're forgetting how this society functions.

You see, if you walk into a store that's selling refrigerators, there's nobody in that store to stop you from wheeling out a refrigerator. How many guards do they have at the door? Probably zero. They have some salesman who walks up to you. It wouldn't take much to get him out of the way. You could wheel out four or five of them.

Now, the reason you don't go wheeling refrigerators out of stores every day of the week is because there's a certain power ensuring that that refrigerator stays inside the store unless they get money for it. There are things like the police, the courts, and jails behind it. But this power isn't apparent when you look at the refrigerator and at the little salesman saying, "You'd better not take that."

In a similar way, when a union bureaucrat gets up at a rally and says, "You'd better stop the war," it isn't some helpless little guy on the street talking. There's a lot of power behind that plea.

If you don't understand the relationships which exist in this society, because they're not apparent at first sight, you can make some tragic errors.

The working class and the oppressed nationalities are mass social layers, and they can only realize their potential power when they organize as a massive social force. The ruling class can deal with any one individual or any small group; it's only masses that can stand in their way. So the potential power of the working class to stop the war is a big threat.

Now, the people who run this country are not stupid. They are not going to continue blindly along a course when then know there are dangers ahead. No one has to go up to Nixon or Kennedy and say, "If the mood that exists among students were to spread to the workers, and instead of a general student strike there was a general strike of the working class, well then you would lose more than Vietnam and Cambodia."

No one has to tell them that. They know that. And that's why they don't just keep pushing ahead, saying to hell with the students and workers,

send in another million soldiers and invade Cambodia. Send troops into Cuba, send them into Indonesia and into China. Drop the bomb on China.

They know better than to just keep pushing ahead. What they have to do is get rid of that danger, the danger that actions will bring a response from the masses who actually have power to stop them. They're not so stupid as to just go blindly forward. Because where there's real power, and real stakes, people don't play games.

You see, you can take 200 or 300, or even a few thousand people and fight in the streets, throwing rocks at windows, and putting on a big show. You can play revolution, not make revolution. But when you're talking about 15 million workers who control basic industry in this country, you don't play games. Because they don't run around throwing things at windows. They do things like stop production, period.

The postmen, for instance—all they had to do to tie up the economy was to go home. That's all. Just go home. That's power.

A question that's very important in this relationship of forces I've been speaking of is the question of who's got the majority, Nixon or the antiwar movement. The polls are going wild trying to establish this or that, and there are demonstrations and claims and counterclaims back and forth.

But what the liberals and the ultra-lefts don't understand is that what the majority thinks can be decisive. Such things as where the troops can be sent and whether bullets can be fired or not, can be determined by what the mass of the people think. Because their ability to resist, and the potential, the danger of their resistance, is dependent on what they think.

The May events

Now in May we witnessed the general student strike. We should look carefully at what the government's policy, the ruling class's policy, was toward this upsurge because it's instructive.

The answer to the antiwar upswing in the fall was Nixon's claim to have a "silent majority" behind him. That was the gist of the propaganda campaign by the ruling class to try to minimize the impact of the demonstrations on October 15 and November 15.

Then came the general student strike of May, and the massive increase in conscious hostility towards the war in Vietnam, and the invasion of Cambodia.

This strike swept the United States like an ocean wave. It was clear that this time the student-based protest reflected the thinking of millions and millions of Americans, including huge sections of the working class. This time when the students came out, they all came out. When virtually 98 per cent of the student body is striking in many schools and three-quarters of them are showing up for the mass strike meetings, you know that the movement reflects moods prevalent in the entire population. They are being expressed visually by the student layer.

What was the response to this upsurge by the ruling class? The number one point which they understood perfectly was that decisive power does not lie within the student movement, but that the student movement is a direct danger because it can act as a catalyst, spreading ideas and setting other forces into motion.

If you were to look at the students in isolation, you would say they don't have any real power. But put the students into the actual network of society—the interrelationship with their parents, the interrelationship with society as a whole, the interrelationship between each university and other universities and schools and the community around it—and the ruling class can see an immediate threat.

The goal of the ruling class was to prevent this strike—this infection, as they saw it—from spreading beyond the campus throughout the population as a whole.

They saw the student strike taking place, and they didn't want it to spread because they saw that the student strike was starting to weaken the fibers of this class society, and that if workers got involved in this movement and it began to spread, this whole society might be torn apart. So they were consciously trying to save their system, which they think is the most wonderful thing of all creation.

What did they say in the newspapers? "It's terrible. America is divided. We have to come back together." And then they started saying, "It's too bad that our children are this way." You see, it's just the kiddies. It's the generation gap. On television they say to the workers, "You're older, and this strike isn't for you. It's just our kids, and we've got to try to understand them."

Or, "It's a white strike. It has nothing to do with Black people. And it certainly has nothing to do with unions or workers!" That's the general campaign they put on.

This campaign was expressed, for instance, by Roy Wilkins, who made his famous statement about how the student strike has nothing to do with Black people. And also in the way the papers played up the May 20 pro-war demonstration in New York organized by the trade union bureaucrats and the bosses.

The May 20 demonstration

I want to say a few things about that demonstration. There are very few demonstrations that take place in the United States where people are paid to show up. Well, these demonstrators were paid to come out. They got a day's pay only if they turned

up. So this was a demonstration financed by the bosses and organized by the trade union bureaucracy for the purpose of trying to pose the working class against the antiwar forces. They wanted to make a dichotomy between the two because they understood the danger.



Peter Camejo at Cleveland antiwar

Of course, they had to pick a section of the working class from the aristocracy of labor, among the most highly paid and conservative. But I will make a prediction here that the trade union bureaucrats and the ruling class will live to regret the day they called that demonstration. Because those construction workers and other workers in New York City realized something important in the course of that demonstration. That is, they saw their own power.

Now, it's a basic rule that you shouldn't show people their own power when you're trying to rule them. But the ruling class was so desperate that they had to do this.

The reason I say they're going to regret that demonstration is that as this inflation continues and real wages start dropping for construction workers some are bound to get up in a union meeting and say, "Hey, remember what we did a year ago? We all went out on that big demonstration and threatened everybody in the world. Why don't we do that again demanding better pay? Why don't we go down and beat the hell out of the mayor?"

If you're a ruling class, it's a very dangerous thing to play with masses in motion.

In fact, we saw the response to this pro-war demonstration the very next day, when trade unions organized their first antiwar demonstration. What was new in May was not pro-war attitudes among the trade unions but a split in the union movement with unions breaking from Meany and declaring against the war. It's very dangerous for the ruling class to encourage any kind of mass mobilizations of workers, because when they see how they can exert their power through demonstrations they will begin demonstrating in their own interests.

The general policy of the ruling class is to divide the movement, divide the



Photo by Meg Rose



Peter Camejo at Cleveland antiwar conference

Photo by Petrick

students from the workers and the Blacks, and conquer it that way. Keep it divided. Keep it from spreading until the spontaneous upsurge and the student strike eventually cool off.

The "responsive" image

Now, while the ruling class was trying to prevent the movement from spreading, they launched a gigantic campaign to convince the students that the government was listening to them, that the government was responsive.

This was a very important aspect. They told the students over and over again, "We are listening, we're listening, we hear you, we hear you." More and more of the politicians announced that they were against the war. Nixon said he'd get the troops out by the end of June. He even got up at 5 a.m. on May 9 to speak to the students, remember?

Meanwhile they were campaigning to tell all the young people, "Get back into the system! This system works! Look, we're listening." They launched

Meany's for the war; the unions never do anything! They don't understand the fact that the American working class believes in its civil liberties. If the ruling class tried suddenly to take all civil liberties away, the American people could physically stop them.

So then you ask the liberal who is protecting his civil liberties? He will say, "Well, it's because our system allows it. Our system works to a certain degree." Since they have confidence that the system basically works, the only problem is to find members of the ruling class who are responsive and will help protect civil liberties, and get them in power. They continuously look for a more liberal wing within the ruling class to support.

They don't at all see that the way to change society or affect the course of events is to go to the masses. On the contrary, they accept the general bourgeois ideology of deep cynicism toward the masses. The average person in the street according to them is stupid. He can be easily manipulated. "Look, the average person in the street believes the politicians are corrupt, yet he votes for them every year. Isn't that true? Haw, haw, haw," he says.

And all the liberal "intellectuals" read the *New York Times*, and they say, "Look at what the masses read, the *Daily News*! How can you possibly expect anybody who reads that paper to be an effective force for social change?"

So the liberals don't look to the masses. They look directly to the ruling class and try to affect the course of events by relating to any differences within the ruling class.

This ideology of liberalism, finding a politician who's responsive, represents the ideology of the overwhelming majority of the student movement. Most students on the campus are suspicious because of the war in Vietnam and because of the radicalization that's affected them. Nevertheless, they're still willing to give the politicians — the McGoverns, the McCarthys and the Kennedys — another chance.

Orientation number two

There's another point of view, and that is ultraleftism. This represents a small section of the student movement, but a much larger proportion of those who call themselves radicals or socialists.

Now basically an ultraleft is a liberal that has gone through an evolution. What happens is this. They start out as liberals, and suddenly the war in Vietnam comes along. Now, what does a liberal believe? He believes that the ruling class is basically responsive to his needs. So he demonstrates.

You know, in the beginning when the antiwar movement first started there were very few ultraleftists. Most of the ultraleftist leaders of today were people who were organizing legal, peaceful demonstrations back around 1965.

But after they called a few demonstrations against the war, they noticed something was wrong. The ruling class was not being responsive. Not only that, they understood for the first time that the U.S. was literally massacring the Vietnamese people. This frightened them. It was as if you all of a sudden found out that your father was really the Boston Strangler. That's what it was like for these people. They were liberals, who believed that Johnson was better than Goldwater, who had worked and voted

for him only to find out that he was the Boston Strangler.

Now, since they had no confidence in the masses as an independent force that could stop the ruling class, since they had no confidence that the stupid worker was actually a force protecting their civil liberties, they said, "Wait a minute. If the government is being run by wild maniacs and butchers, what is stopping them from killing me tomorrow?"

Then you started hearing them all talk about imminent fascism. The underground papers discovered that there were concentration camp sites in this country, and that some of them were being cleaned up and gotten ready. They would say to each other, "See you next year in the concentration camps." This was a very common attitude, because they couldn't see any force around that was protecting their civil liberties.

Then what they began to develop was the thesis that civil liberties, elections, courts, all bourgeois democratic forms are a gigantic put-on, a fantastic manipulation. That it is all a ruling class trick. So, these people concluded that the elections and civil liberties are unreal, and the people who run the country could call them off tomorrow. Elections and civil liberties, they said, "have nothing to do with reality."

Then came the instant fascism theory. We are about to have fascism any moment now. But this is a very confusing theory. Somehow the rallies and demonstrations continue year after year. They don't put us in the concentration camps.

This theory is actually a mixture of deep cynicism, thinking that the ruling class is all-powerful, but it always is combined with a last hope that maybe they aren't completely bad. Maybe there is still someone who will listen.

Sometimes a liberal becomes frustrated not getting the ear of the ruling class, and he concludes that he's been using the wrong tactics. So he adopts a lot of radical rhetoric. He says this ruling class is apparently so thick-headed that what we've got to do is really let loose a temper tantrum to get its attention. The politicians won't listen to peaceful things, but if we go out and break windows then Kennedy will say, "Oh, I guess there is a problem in this society. I didn't realize it when they were just demonstrating peacefully. I thought everything was OK because they were in the system, but now they're going outside the system, they're breaking windows, so we've got to hold back."

These liberal-ultraleftists think that's what moves the ruling class. Actually they come close to a correct theory when they say that if people start leaving the system the ruling class will respond. *But they don't believe that the masses can be won.* They think it is enough for them to leave the system themselves, small groups of people carrying out direct confrontations.

For example, let me quote a thing from the *New York Times* that illustrates how this type of idea develops. A girl from Kent, after the killings there, was asked what she thought could be done about Cambodia and what she thought about the use of violence. This was a person who is just radicalizing, a liberal, just beginning to oppose the war.

She says, "I'm really dead set



Photo by Petrick

against violence. That's also a cop-out. But it's the only way to get the government's attention. What you're doing is drawing their attention to you, by using the same methods they use. I'm really against that. It's horrible that the only way you can get people to listen is to have four kids killed. There was really no blow-up over Cambodia until four kids were killed. You can have all the peace marches that were peaceful and quiet, and everyone would pat you on the back and say 'good little kids,' but nobody would do anything."

Now, what's in her mind? She doesn't see any independent, mass force that's standing in the way of the ruling class. She's looking at the ruling class and asking, "Are we affecting them or not? Are they being responsive?" And if not, maybe the way to get them to pay attention is to go out and break some windows and use violence. It's a very natural conclusion when you don't understand that there's a class struggle, a class relationship of forces.

Having given up on the masses, the ultraleft super-revolutionaries are really trying to influence the ruling class. A classical example of this unity between the liberal and the ultraleft approach was the Chicago demonstrations at the 1968 Democratic Party convention. The leaders of the demonstration came from the National Mobilization Committee. They were revolutionary. Jerry Rubin, Tom Hayden, Dave Dellinger and Rennie Davis were on hand, and their rhetoric was as radical as you can get.

But while the "militant" demonstrations were in process, Tom Hayden and Rennie Davis were apparently closeted with McCarthy's supporters working out an agreement to help McCarthy.

According to an article in the Jan. 22, 1970 *Washington Post*, "[Sam] Brown [Vietnam Moratorium Coordinator] said [Tom] Hayden suggested . . . that if McCarthy appeared to have a good chance by Monday or Tuesday — and if that chance might be



Photo by Petrick

o at Cleveland antiwar conference

a gigantic campaign to co-opt this movement, saying, "Come back into the fold. Thank you so much for striking. Thank you, but now we're past that stage. We're past demonstrating and striking. We're now at the stage for knocking at doors and getting votes for me, and I've just discovered that I'm against the war. We're all Americans; we're going to pull our country back together. Our system is very responsive; it will correct itself." That was the position they took.

Now, keeping this whole framework of the relationship of forces in mind, let's look at the various orientations that are being presented to us for what to do next. There are basically three of them. One is what I call liberalism. Another one is ultraleftism. The third one is what I call independent mass action.

Orientation number one

First the liberal approach. Liberals reject the concept that there is a relationship of forces between classes. They can't understand it. If you walk up to a liberal and say, "Right now the working class is protecting your civil liberties," he would break out laughing. He'd roll over on the floor, saying, "What are you talking about?"

'The independent mass action concept does not just mean mass demonstrations against the war. It's a general strategy with many aspects to it.'

hampered by public activity [demonstrations] — then we could meet to decide whether to go ahead with the public activity." Hayden has never denied this account.

Another example of this type of ultraleftism was a full-page ad which appeared in the *New York Times* June 7. It was placed by the New Mobe and signed by guess who? Rennie Davis, Dave Dellinger, et al. This ad announces in big letters at the top of the page: "It's 11:59." 11:59 to what? It's 11:59 to 1984. Fascism is due in one minute.

This is another thing that these ultraleft-upside-down-liberals have: the panic button. Since they don't see any countervailing force, they think at any moment the whole country could just go BANG! At any moment the ruling class can make a move to the right, and they don't see any way to stop it, so they throw in the towel, they just panic. The ad says: "If you're reading this — don't kid yourself any longer. Big brother is making his list. *And you're on it.* Can we stop 1984? It's 11:59 p.m. now. The clock is ticking loudly. What in hell are we going to do about it?"

Well, what solution do these ultralefts have? What do they project should be done to stop imminent fascism? In this ad they have a five-point program.

Number one, sit in at your congressman's office. With just one minute until 1984! Really effective! I guess their reasoning is that if you're in your congressman's office when 1984 arrives at least maybe they'll be a little more lenient with you!

The second point is you should sit in at your draft board and turn in your draft card.

Number three is a standard paragraph that you find in all the leaflets put out by ultraleftists, which simply says "Do something quick." "Organize antiwar actions where you work, each week. Interrupt the work day for peace. Wear black armbands. Wear peace buttons. Hold a discussion or teach-in. Have a work stoppage, a campus strike!" Anything! Just do something, everybody! For Christ's sake!

Point four, they announce a demonstration is going to be held on June 19 by the Black Panther Party.

And in point five they tell you about a conference in Milwaukee, but they assure you it won't be thousands of people; just several hundred community activists will meet to plan future actions. I suppose this future action will take place under fascism, unless they think two sit-ins, a conference and a rally will stop fascism.

Anyway, that's their program of action and their analysis of what to do, because they believe the invasion of Cambodia isn't a tactical move, limited by a relationship of forces, but a deliberate and final plan. A final solution has begun.

Now, you can see very clearly that there's nothing very different about this; it's just classical stuff like Mar-



Photos by John Gray

tin Luther King did: have a sit-in or some sort of civil disobedience confrontation to try to affect the moral conscience of the ruling class.

We're not opposed to sit-ins per se; many of us in the SWP and YSA have participated in sit-ins, such as during the early stages of the civil rights movement. We're not opposed to any specific tactic. But we look at the whole political context, the relationship of forces, what is possible, what potential exists for mass action, and we decide on that basis what tactics we should use at the moment.

Orientation number three

Let me go on to the third choice: independent mass action. What I mean here is a general strategy of trying to build movements which reach out and bring masses into motion on issues where they are willing to struggle against policies of the ruling class, and through their involvement in action, deepen their understanding of those issues. This is the fundamental strategy we're after.

We're not interested in moving 20 or 200 or several hundred community organizers to engage in some sort of civil disobedience, window trashing, or whatever. We say that is a dead end, because it doesn't relate to the power that can stop the war — the masses. You can't ask the 15 million trade unionists to sit in at a congressman's office. There just isn't enough room. Of course, the ultralefts know that 15 million workers aren't going to do that, so that call is clearly not aimed at involving workers.

This is the key thing to understand about the ultraleftists. *The actions they propose are not aimed at the American people; they're aimed at those who have already radicalized.* They know beforehand that masses of people won't respond to the tactics they propose.

They have not only given up on the masses but really have contempt for them. Because on top of all this do you know what else the ultralefts propose? They call for a general strike! They get up and say, "General Strike." Only they don't have the slightest hope

whatsoever that it will come off.

Every last one of them who raises his hand to vote for a general strike knows it's not going to happen. So what the hell do they raise their hands for? Because it's part of the game. They play games, they play revolution, because they have no hope. Just during the month of May the New Mobe called not one but two general strikes. One for GIs and one for workers.

That is the big difference between the perspective of the ultralefts and our perspective, because we DO want a general strike. We DO want a real strike. We do believe you can win the workers, so therefore we don't just raise our hands in games, we raise our hands for what really can be done, for what can begin to move masses of people.

The independent mass action concept does not just mean demonstrations against the war. It's a general strategy with many aspects to it.

One aspect is to build a mass independent Black political party. It also means, for instance, organizing to mobilize masses of women against the institutions, social norms and practices that are used to oppress them. It's a strategy that calls for doing things like building the Chicano Raza Unida Party, which is growing in the Southwest.

This is the concept of getting people into motion, into action. Not talking down to them, but organizing actions which are able to give expression to the mass opposition to the policies of the ruling class, at the level of understanding that people have reached about what's happening in this society. It's the concept of bringing masses into motion, but at all times keeping the movement independent of the ruling class.

Now, what is the best way we can implement this orientation at this point? We follow a general organizational type strategy which is simply this. You get the issues around which people are moving against the government and create a unified movement around them, in order to maximize the numbers that will come into motion.

This is the same strategy which is used by a union when it carries out a strike. When a union calls a strike, it calls it on certain demands. Higher pay, better working conditions, whatever the demands happen to be for that struggle. If a majority of the workers agree, they take a vote, and then everybody strikes together, and they put a very heavy emphasis on keeping it together.

The workers don't say, "Why don't we also take a stand on the Arab-Israeli conflict? Or on housing, or on the last bill passed in Congress?" — as a prerequisite to participate in the strike.

You've got to deal with people where they're at. When a woman comes along and says "I'm against the abortion laws. I want to see them abolished," and she wants to join a demonstration for free abortions on demand,

but she still has illusions about the war in Vietnam, still supports Nixon, what is our attitude? Do we say, "You're an imperialist pig! Don't you know what's happening in Vietnam? You can't go on this demonstration. Keep away from us. We understand these things — we're the elite. We don't want to taint ourselves by letting someone who's for the war in Vietnam join this demonstration."

The way people radicalize

Our concept is to unite people in action around the issues on which they're moving. Not because we're single-issue fetishists. Our aim, in fact, is to move people around broader and broader issues, but we've got to deal with reality, not with abstractions.

We advocate many things, but we try to put into practice those things the masses are prepared for. We advocate general strikes, but we don't call them, because we're not fools. We know there cannot be a general strike, on any issue right now, given the present level of consciousness. And you won't get to the point where there can be general strikes unless you put people in motion, precisely because when they start to move on any one issue, whether women's liberation, the war or racial oppression, people begin to question the whole society, and to see the interrelationship between the different issues. In fact, it is *the way* people radicalize.

People don't suddenly understand everything at once. Think about you're own political development. There's always one issue or another, depending on the objective conditions, which tends to wake a person up. As we've said over and over again, at the present stage the most effective weapon to stop the ruling class from moving to the right is to get masses of people in motion. The most effective way to do this, at this stage especially, is mass, peaceful, legal demonstrations in the streets.

Now, if we want to build a movement against the Vietnam war, it cannot, by definition, be multi-issue. That's like saying we want a single-issue movement that's multi-issue. The "multi-issue" antiwar movement is the trick which is the key to how the liberals and the ultraleftists can get together organizationally, politically, socially, etc. — get married, and live happily ever after.

The trick is to make the issues non-issues. Make them so nebulous that they have nothing to do with concrete realities. Instead of demonstrating to bring the troops home from Vietnam now, which is very concrete, they call for "Stop imperialism." Nothing like an abstraction. Even Nixon can say, "I'm against imperialism too



Photo by Joel Aber



Photo by Petrick



Photo by Dick Roberts

— that's what Britain and France and Holland did in the 18th and 19th centuries." But Nixon can't say, "Bring all the troops home now."

Or they say we should raise the demand "End racism." Isn't Nixon willing to say "End racism"? Don't Black Democratic politicians say "End racism"? So they make a real multi-issue program: end racism, end repression, end imperialism, end male chauvinism.

What we want is to call for concrete demands and mobilize people to win them. Demands like Get Out of Vietnam, or Black Control of the Black Schools, or concrete campaigns around specific cases of repression. But that's not what the liberal-ultra-lefts do. What they call a multi-issue program is a list of abstract reforms.

Slogans like end racism and end male chauvinism are not only abstract in their political meaning, they are also abstract because the antiwar movement cannot organize the struggle to win them. The antiwar movement cannot replace or substitute for an independent Black liberation movement, or an independent women's liberation movement, for instance. Black people and women — not the antiwar movement — must decide which concrete demands will best further their struggle and how best to organize around them.

Many students may agree with the slogan End Racism, but how many of them understand the right of Black people to self-determination, the need for an independent Black political party, and the demand for Black control of the Black community? PL-SDS, for instance, screams "smash racism" — I

mean screams — while they oppose Black nationalism, an independent Black party, Black studies programs, Black control of the Black community, open admissions, etc.

The fact that many radicals do not understand Black nationalism is evident in the expectation that if the antiwar movement adopts the slogan End Racism, then Blacks will immediately begin to join the movement. Blacks are going to be drawn to Black organizations, building a Black leadership and formulating a program for their liberation struggle.

If you have a program of a lot of reforms and abstractions, it means that you can go right back to the liberal wing of the ruling class, because that is just what their program is also. You can go right back to Senator Kennedy, who can get up, as he did in his speech accepting the Democratic Party nomination for Massachusetts senator, and come out against racism, repression, poverty and many other things.

This is precisely the orientation of the Communist Party. Get the antiwar movement to approve an abstract program which will be just like the programs of the "peace" politicians. Then there will be no problem in getting the antiwar movement to support those good Democrats.

If you look back to 1966 and 1968, you'll notice that every election year the antiwar coalitions split. Multi-issue groups were formed that ended up supporting the Democrats, and the demonstrations got smaller.

Now we're going through the same process once again, but within a different context. The great difference is that the depth of the antiwar movement

is qualitatively greater than it was in '66 or '68. Deep mass antiwar sentiment exists, and it offers the possibility, even during an election period, of building mass independent actions against the war, and therefore actually holding back the war effort.

What's happening right now is that the involvement of people in mass actions is radicalizing them on other issues as well. The antiwar movement, for example, has helped lay the basis for the tremendous growth of the women's liberation movement and it has created a greater responsiveness to certain aspects of the Black struggle. The Black struggle itself helped to inspire the antiwar movement.

A good example of this process was during the May strike movement. Many students who helped build the antiwar universities became really aware for the first time of the repression against the Black Panthers and raised concrete demands to free the jailed Panthers.

At the University of California at Berkeley during the strike, a mass meeting of 12,000 voted to set up a child-care center on campus and to institute a women's studies program. Many campuses adopted and attempted to institute concrete demands raised by the Black students. All types of radicalization took place within the context of the strikes.

Just think of a strike situation. When there is a strike for higher wages where a big struggle takes place, masses come into motion and people begin to question all types of things. What's the response among the workers, after a single-issue strike, to someone who says, "Look, none of the Democrats and Republicans supported our strike. Yet we voted for them last year."

Obviously in the context of struggle many possibilities for radicalization open up, and who is going to the masses with a concrete program of action around all these issues? The YSA and SWP. Who's pushing an independent mass Black political party? Who's helping build a Chicano party? Who's building the women's liberation movement? What other organization is working in all these fields with the aim of mobilizing masses in struggle against the ruling class?

Our Socialist Workers Party election campaigns are going to be very much a part of this whole radicalization and especially of the antiwar movement. The alternatives we create through our socialist election campaigns are going to be a part of the antiwar movement, a part of the whole context in which the antiwar struggle is taking place.

So we have to launch an offensive. The Socialist Workers Party candidates are going to get a bigger hearing than ever before, because there

are now tens of thousands of young people who are looking for antiwar candidates. Many of them, it's true, will support "peace" candidates from the Democratic or Republican Party, but with a certain fear and suspicion. Many young people will start out supporting a Democratic Party candidate, and when their candidate makes one slip and takes a bad position they'll quit the campaign and be ready to turn to socialist candidates.

In our election campaigns we've got to emphasize that it's not the individual candidate that is decisive but his or her party and which social layer the party serves. That is the real question: which social layer, which class, rules? And the Socialist Workers Party campaigns will be saying clearly, "Don't vote for the parties of war! We in the SWP, our program — not the Democrats' — represents the interests of the masses of people."

Our campaigns speak for the full program necessary to mobilize people in struggle to do away with war, poverty, racial oppression and the oppression of women. They point the way to the goal of our struggle: socialism.

But at the same time we will unite on any issue around which people are willing to struggle against the ruling class, no matter what their level of understanding of this society. This is the way to move masses in this country, to build a revolutionary party, and not only play but make a revolution.



Photo by Patrick

mod donna

By Myrna Lamb

... a play which raises the issues of the women's liberation movement. Produced off-Broadway, it addresses itself to the oppression of women and the distortion of the male-female relationship in our 'whores and wars' society. Published for the first time in the July-August *International Socialist Review*. Buy it.

Enclosed is \$1.00. Send me the July-August *ISR*.

Enclosed is \$5.00 for a one year subscription.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Send to: *International Socialist Review*, 873 Broadway, New York, New York 10003

REPORT ON QUEBEC ELECTIONS

Vote reflected rising nationalism

By ARTHUR YOUNG

The following article is reprinted from the May 18, 1970, issue of Labor Challenge, a Canadian revolutionary socialist biweekly newspaper reflecting the views of the League for Socialist Action-Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere.

The article gives a background analysis of the significant elections which took place in Quebec last April 29. The results reflected a significant increase in Quebec national consciousness.

In future issues of The Militant we plan to print other articles from Labor Challenge discussing the growth of Quebec nationalism and the Marxist position on the demand for a sovereign state of Quebec.

* * *
Montreal

The election of a majority Liberal government headed by Robert Bourassa has sent the Canadian ruling class and its spokesmen into fits of glee.

The Toronto *Globe and Mail* exulted the next day: "Today this feels like a splendid country."

Prime Minister Trudeau hailed "the end to blackmailing" (by the Quebec government) and the victory for Canadian unity.

Certainly the Liberals scored a big victory on the parliamentary plane in the April 29 elections in Quebec, winning 72 seats in the 108-member National Assembly.

But Canada's rulers have little real reason to rejoice. The elections showed, in a distorted form, the tremendous pent-up discontent and anger of the Quebec masses, closely linked with a rising national consciousness and desire for national freedom. They also demonstrated in a striking fashion that the Québécois are prepared to strike out on new paths and try out new political programs and parties in place of the traditional ones.

The governing Union Nationale was crushed almost beyond repair. Its 55 seats were slashed to a mere 17. Its percentage of the popular vote was cut in half by an irate electorate. It was wiped out of the urban areas almost entirely and confined to some marginal rural areas. Cabinet ministers went down like bowling pins. This was the worst defeat in the party's 34-year history, and could even spell its disappearance.

The wave of popular discontent flowed towards the new political formations, the Parti Québécois and the Crédiatistes. The extreme right-wing, petty-bourgeois Crédiatistes, as expected, displayed most of their strength in certain rural areas, and in the Abitibi mining region. With little money or organization they capitalized on popular discontent to elect 12 candidates. They were favored by the electoral system, with its crass favoritism for the rural, sparsely populated ridings. Their relatively small popular vote resulted in a big parliamentary delegation.

Now a Pamphlet!

Revolutionary Strategy in the Imperialist Countries

By Ernest Mandel 35¢

THE SPEECH NIXON AND MITCHELL TRIED TO BAN

Pathfinder Press

(formerly Merit Publishers)

873 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10003

The big loser in this respect was the Parti Québécois. It won 23 percent of the popular vote, more than half of the Liberal total. But this resulted in only 7 seats, less than one-tenth of the number of Liberal seats. The top three leaders of the PQ—Lévesque, Parizeau and Grégoire—were all defeated. The PQ came second in popular vote but will have fewer seats than any of the other three parties.

The fact that 23 percent of the Québécois voted for the PQ is the most notable feature of the elections. This is the first time that a party demanding a separate, sovereign Quebec state has received a substantial portion of votes. In 1966, the independentist parties got only 9 percent of the vote. The PQ built on popular feeling by

PQ. This contributed substantially to the PQ's ability to pass itself off as the party of all the Québécois.

This desertion of the labor brass left the NDP [New Democratic party—Canada's labor party] high and dry, without any base of support. Its organization was reduced to a shell, capable of presenting only 14 candidates in the whole province. The NDP leadership compounded this terrible situation by projecting no perspective of serious struggle against the other parties, candidly avowing that the NDP didn't even hope to elect a single candidate. They set themselves against the rising militant nationalist mood of Quebec by their stand in favor of federalism and bilingualism. It was no surprise, then, that almost nobody viewed the



DEMAND UNILINGUAL QUEBEC. Students and young workers in 1968 demonstrate at St. Leonard, Quebec, in support of students who barricaded themselves in school demanding all-French school system. Demonstration was first of a number of mass actions calling for a unilingual Quebec.

carefully presenting a program which seemed to meet the sentiments of the masses of Québécois, who are fed up with unemployment, rotten wages, a growing housing crisis, progressive elimination of the French language in their own nation, and domination by foreign corporations and the Ottawa government which backs them. It succeeded impressively. It got significant support in both urban and rural Quebec, in all corners of the province, and from different social layers: students, workers, and the middle class. Not surprisingly, its strongest showing was in the urban French areas.

In Montreal, the PQ took not the more middle-class seats it was expecting to gain, but the most working-class ridings.

Several figures show the strength of the PQ support. The English minority voted massively for the Liberal party. Thus the PQ averaged 30 percent of the votes cast by French Québécois. In ridings in the French half of Montreal, the PQ got 40 percent or higher. This was where it took six of its seven seats.

During the election campaign, the PQ put on a high-powered, highly professional effort. While retaining its image as a "populist" party based on the masses, it was able to compete with the major bourgeois parties in their own fields, and in some respects even surpass them. Its campaign funds were substantial (more than \$400,000) and supplemented by a veritable army of volunteer workers handling the door-to-door intensive campaign effort.

In the absence of any serious labor alternative, the Parti Québécois corralled the support of both the student movement and the organized labor movement. The labor brass, refusing to break with bourgeois politics, came out almost without exception for the

NDP as a serious alternative, and that its candidates got only 4,500 votes, not even 1 percent of the total.

To meet the multiple crises of Quebec society and the growing popular discontent, René Lévesque and the PQ proposed "The Solution," as they entitled their program—that is, a sovereign Quebec. Here was the answer, they claimed, to the constant constitutional wrangles, to the Ottawa-Quebec fight over \$200 million, to the spending of Québécois tax dollars on the Canadian army, to the declining status of the French language and culture. A sovereign Quebec would mobilize all \$6 billion of Quebec tax monies and avoid the duplication and inefficiency of two levels of government.

The Québécois, like all "normal" people, Lévesque repeated everywhere, need their own country. This is what the PQ stands for. But at the same time, for economic reasons, this sovereign Quebec would link itself to English Canada through a common market arrangement.

The PQ proposed an elaborate series of reforms which, it claims, a sovereign Quebec would carry through. The state would intervene in the economy to set economic priorities; the minimum wage would go up to \$2 an hour; there would be tax reforms; the state would "favor" trade unionism; there would be full medicare; French would become the working language; immigrants would have to learn French (the English, however, would keep their English-language schools); there would be an efficient, democratic system of government; Quebec would withdraw from NATO and NORAD [North American Air Defense Command treaty, binding the Canadian government to the Pentagon in the "defense" of North America from long-

range bombing attack]; it would be represented at the United Nations, etc.

The PQ certainly benefited greatly from its ability to pose as the only alternative to the "old parties," so deeply discredited by their past policies. But demagoguery and promises of reforms if elected are the stock-in-trade of the bourgeois parties. Only the PQ stand for Quebec sovereignty distinguished it fundamentally from the Liberals and the Union Nationale.

Not that the PQ proposed a program that could actually bring about the national liberation of Quebec. It stood for continuing, if not deepening Quebec's dependence on the foreign monopolies which now completely dominate the nation and block any attempt at national self-determination. The PQ proposed that the form, and not the reality, of this oppression should be changed, so that instead of ruling through two levels of government, foreign capital would rule through a "sovereign" national state.

The common market it proposes with English Canada would maintain the facility with which English Canadian capital now enters Quebec and withdraws its profits.

Throughout the campaign the PQ sought to prove that it was not out to attack capitalism or threaten its privileges in Quebec.

Its campaign newspaper *Pouvoir* claimed: "It is in Canada's interest to maintain its harmonious relations with Quebec. Of course some Canadian businessmen will let their emotions overrule their own interests, but surely not for long, otherwise their American competitors will quickly move to replace them in the Quebec market. As for the Americans, they are not interested in Quebec's political status. Their companies have learned to develop under an extraordinary variety of different political regimes. What they want, in the first place and above all other things, is the possibility of finding a 'valid spokesman,' that is, a strong government, which knows what it wants, and a clear and stable situation, rather than the current disorder and instability."

This and subsequent issues of the paper pointed with pride to statements by leading foreign capitalists that they did not care what kind of regime the Québécois chose, as long as it allowed them to continue their profit-gouging of the nation.

As for the alleged "radicalism" of the PQ, René Lévesque explained that the truth was quite the contrary—the party was an assurance against "anarchy," because it calmed and directed the energies of revolutionary-minded workers and youth into safe channels.

The big vote for the PQ was due not to its moderation, however, but to the fact that it, more than any other major party in the campaign, voiced the dissatisfaction and anger of the Québécois at their current status. The strong showing for the Crédiatistes, and the virtual smashing of the ruling Union Nationale reflect the same process. Of all the parties, the PQ benefited most

(Continued on page 18)

A New Merit Pamphlet

IN DEFENSE OF THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

Articles by:

Ruthann Miller, Mary-Alice
Waters, Evelyn Reed

25¢

PATHFINDER PRESS

873 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10003

Unionists hold Chicago gathering

By FRANK LOVELL

CHICAGO — A gathering of 875 trade unionists and their friends, meeting here in Packinghouse Labor and Community Center, June 27-28, wound up the business of their "National Rank and File Action Conference" by selecting a "continuations committee" to carry out many decisions that lack of time and candor prevented the conference itself from reaching.

This conference was called originally under the aegis of the monthly magazine, *Labor Today*. A list of over 200 sponsors urged militant rank-and-file unionists to attend.

The conference convened as a delegated body with 556 accredited delegates seated, according to the report of the credentials committee. Of these, 26 were officers of unions, the others representing union caucuses, "concerned unionists," rank-and-file activists, Black workers, and women workers. They were members of 31 unions, including auto, electrical, garment, hospital, transportation, building trades, teamsters, longshore, and meat cutters. Some were veterans of the union organizing days of the 1930s; others have recently come from the student movement to join the ranks of labor.

The largest delegations were from New York, Illinois, California, Michigan, and Wisconsin. In all, 26 states were represented.

All the traditional political currents of the radical and labor movement were present: social democracy, stalinism, infantile ultraleftism, some vestiges of syndicalism, and revolutionary socialism.

However, these contending political viewpoints had little opportunity to submit their different proposals to the

conference. Much time was consumed by "keynote speakers" and the introduction of such "labor celebrities" of a past era as Louis Weinstock, one-time head of the New York painters union and longtime Communist Party faithful, and Len DeCaux, first editor of the *CIO News*. Neither was ever part of the best tradition of the union movement.

The entire functioning of the conference confirmed what was apparent to experienced observers from the outset, namely, that the Communist Party was the decisive initiating and organizing force of the conference.

The short time for "panel discussions" on the afternoon of the first day precluded any recommendations to the body on key questions facing the conference.

A panel on "how to advance peace and labor political action," chaired by Al Evanoff of Distributive Workers District 65, considered endorsement of plans drafted by the antiwar movement at the Cleveland conference, June 19-21, but failed to make a recommendation. A motion to call for the building of a labor party now drew a tie vote, with chairman Evanoff voting against.


Before the National Rank and File Action Conference ended, it adopted a "statement of purposes" which denounced the antilabor moves of the Nixon administration; called for "Labor Day 1970 to be a marching Labor Day"; demanded "all candidates

for public office be called upon to declare themselves on the Nixon anti-labor program"; and called for a "petition campaign" and "a huge march and demonstration against the Nixon antilabor program in Washington, D. C., as soon as it becomes necessary."

A "continuations committee," representing all sections of the country, to develop and publicize a "rank-and-file program," was selected. Heading this committee are Rayfield Mooty and Marion T. Calligaris, both veteran unionists of the 1930s period. Mooty is a member of the United Steel Workers. Calligaris, a local president of the Brotherhood of Railroad and Airline Clerks union, was cochairman with Mooty of the arrangements committee for the conference and will continue in that capacity on the continuations committee. The conference decided to add two others to share the chairing of ongoing work. A woman and a youth are to be selected by the continuations committee of approximately 150.

A momentary flurry of excitement occurred near the end of the two-day gathering when a delegate from a caucus of social workers in New York who also identified himself as a member of Workers League attempted to explain the need for a labor party and began with the assertion that "the main issue here is whether to continue the Stalinist policy of popular frontism. . . ."

He got no further.



Al Evanoff, an official of District 65, N.Y. distributive workers, chaired panel on labor and peace political action.

There was a pained outcry from a large section of the conference. The startled chairman declared the hapless offender "out of order." And the microphone where he was speaking suddenly went dead. The unfortunate use of that unmentionable term Stalinism in a polite gathering where all pretend to be political innocents finished any further discussion of the labor party question.

Many delegates had come to the conference hoping to work out a program of action for rank-and-file unionists against the war, in defense of union democracy, and for a better society. They were disappointed, and some were wiser.

Third World Liberation Notes

Sostre victory aids prisoner rights

Martin Sostre, a Black revolutionary in Walkkill State Prison 70 miles from New York City, has recently won a landmark court decision in respect to the civil liberties of prisoners.

On May 14, federal judge Constance Baker Motley, the only Black woman on the bench, awarded Sostre \$13,020 in damages on the ground that he had been unconstitutionally punished with 372 days in solitary confinement. The amount represented \$25 for each day.

Brother Martin served the solitary confinement from June 25, 1968, to July 2, 1969, in Green Haven Prison. At the time, he was preparing legal papers on behalf on another prisoner. Prison officials moved to suppress this activity on the ridiculous charge of practicing law without a license.

But the amazing thing about this court decision is that Judge Motley: 1) demanded that New York state prison officials submit solitary confinement procedures to her within 90 days; and 2) enjoined prison officials from returning Sostre to solitary confinement without written charges and a hearing before a "disinterested official."

This latter ruling has virtually raised the roof off Walkkill prison where Sostre is now incarcerated. The state attorney general's office wrote a letter to Judge Motley on June 5 stating that the unrest among the 430 inmates was so great that the warden has advised shutting the prison down if it continues. But this unrest boils down to the fact that the prisoners have become supremely conscious of their rights, making it virtually impossible for the guards to throw anybody into solitary.

Sostre, who used to operate a Black bookstore in Buffalo, is doing 30-40 years after being framed up on a narcotics rap in that city in 1967. This was right after a Black rebellion there; the city government railroaded

him to jail. Brother Martin has spent a third of his 46 years in prison. A one-time member of the Nation of Islam, he left when Malcolm split. He spent the years from 1962-67 out of prison.

In the May 8 issue of *The Militant*, this column reported that the New York legislature was considering returning 26 wampum belts at the request of the Onondaga nation of the Iroquois confederacy. The belts, valued at \$280,000, are in a state museum, but Native-Americans were planning to put them in their own museum.

Although the state assembly unanimously voted to return the belts, the bill never got out of committee in the state senate. So it seems like the pale-faced government continues in its forked-tongue tradition toward Native-Americans.

Timex Watch Company became so upset over Sammy Davis Jr. throwing a clenched fist at the end of a television program that it withdrew its sponsorship. The program was the NBC telecast of the Grammy Awards. Davis said that the clenched fist is a normal gesture he uses, as a symbol of people getting together in brotherhood. But Timex, which is a white capitalist organization, saw it as the "Black Power Salute."

In Seattle, Washington, protests are developing over a projected state highway through the Black community. Because of pressure, the state highway commission held a public hearing on June 2-3 to discuss "design aspects" of the project. The hearing was held far away from the Central District, whose residents are scheduled to be displaced.

When the hearing did get under-

way, people did not restrict their remarks to "design," but questioned the whole project. Not only was the displacement of Black residents denounced, but also the air and noise pollution that would result from the highway.

Speakers included two state representatives; James McIver of the NAACP; William Massey, Socialist Workers Party candidate for U. S. Senate; a representative from the League of Women Voters; and a spokesman from the Seattle Liberation Front.

Larry Gossett, a leader of the city-wide Black Student Union, handed over to the commission 3,000 signatures of protesting Black residents in the area of future construction.

— DERRICK MORRISON



Photo by Petrick

John Trudell, member of tribal council on Alcatraz, addressing Militant Labor Forum in New York on June 26. He described how white institutions are used to oppress Native-Americans and explained plans to convert Alcatraz into Indian cultural center. He is on a speaking tour for Indians of All Tribes.

Three by Malcolm X

MALCOLM X SPEAKS

BY ANY MEANS NECESSARY

MALCOLM X on afro-american history

873 BR OADWAY, N.Y., N.Y. 10003

PLEASE SEND ME:

MALCOLM X SPEAKS BY ANY MEANS NECESSARY
 CLOTH \$6.95 PA. .95 CLOTH \$5.95 PA. 1.95
 MALCOLM X ON AFRO-AMERICAN HISTORY \$1.00 ENCLOSED \$

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY & STATE _____

In Brief

By RANDY FURST

MARXIST SUMMER: Across the nation last week, radicals were settling into the summer-long socialist education sessions sponsored by the Young Socialist Alliance and the Socialist Workers Party. The national summer school program is among the most extensive ever conducted by an American radical organization and is functioning in 25 major metropolitan areas. Classes deal with fundamental Marxist writings and basic Bolshevik strategy. Open to members and non-members of the SWP and YSA, the sessions are underway in the following cities: Atlanta, Austin, Berkeley, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Denver, Detroit, Houston, Kansas City, Mo., Los Angeles, Madison, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New York, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Ore., St. Louis, Mo., San Diego, San Francisco, Seattle and Washington, D. C. For more information, contact the nearest YSA local or SWP branch (see page 19) or write YSA-SWP Summer Schools, 873 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10003.

NEWSMEN WANT OUT: By voice vote the overwhelming majority of the 200 delegates at the 37th annual national convention of the American Newspaper Guild in Seattle called on Congress June 25 to accept "an immediate withdrawal of U.S. armed forces" from Southeast Asia. The delegates represented 58 locals of the

Guild, which has some 32,000 members. . . **YOUTH GETS FOUR YEARS:** Gary Deeds, 19, was sentenced to four years in the penitentiary by a Dallas judge June 25 for burning a piece of flag bunting last April. "He did it as a form of symbolic protest against the policies of the government in Southeast Asia which he considered unjust," says his lawyer, John Nelms. Deeds has been released on \$5,000 bond. A motion has been filed for a new trial.

ROTC ENROLLMENT DOWN: The Reserve Officers Training Corps enrolled 292,952 youths in 1961-2, but the rise in the antiwar sentiment has taken its toll. The Pentagon reports that ROTC enrolled only 157,830 men during the 1969-70 school year. . . **MARTIAL LAW IN TURKEY:** Martial law was declared in Istanbul June 16 after a day of demonstrations by militant workers protesting proposed changes in labor legislation. Three persons were killed in the clashes with cops—two demonstrators died along with one policeman. . . **MEDVEDEV FREED:** Jaures A. Medvedev, the internationally known Soviet geneticist and molecular biologist was released from a mental hospital June 17 after widespread protests by fellow scientists. Medvedev was picked up by Soviet authorities May 30 and locked up for schizophrenia. But his real "crime" was a public appeal for greater scientific freedom and his critique, written for the Russian underground, of Stalinist geneticist T. D. Lysenko.

INDIANS TAKE LIGHTHOUSE: Some 300 Native-Americans seized a U.S. Forest Service Lighthouse near Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., June 4, demanding that the facility be turned over to Indian youth. The takeover drew Native-Americans from the Chipewewa, Potawatomi and Ottawa tribes. William LeBlanc, chairman of the State Indian Affairs Commission, said in a telephone interview that he supported the action. "As an Indian I think it should be returned to the Indians," he told *The Militant*. . . **JURY CHOSEN FOR LOS SIETE:** The jury in the San Francisco trial of Los Siete, the seven Latinos accused of murdering a policeman, has been impaneled and includes seven men and five women. One is Black, one is Latino and one is Chinese-American. Opening arguments are expected this week.

McSORLEY'S LOSES ROUND: For 116 years, McSorley's Old Ale House in New York City had successfully prohibited women from entering the premises. Last week, however, the all-male saloon received a legal jolt. Acting on a suit by two officers of the National Organization for Women, federal judge Walter Mansfield ruled June 25 that McSorley's men-only policy was discrimination on the basis of sex. McSorley's, whose 35 cent beers rank with the best, threatened to take the case into a higher court, which is where the matter stood last week. "This is not an ordinary bar," says the bartender, who hasn't yet grasped how insulting and oppressive a men-only bar is. "This is a man-preserve," he asserts. But at the same time he says, ambivalently, he "supports" women's liberation. Some customers reflected similar confusion. Leaning against the bar, a 25-year-old railroad worker, sips a mug of ale. "I'm glad that the women are doing it," he says, "and I'm glad that the bar is resisting. But I'll come here either way." The bartender shakes his head. McSorley's is for men to drink, he says, before they come home to their wife and their family. The new ruling is "a sign of the times," he says, scooping up some change, "but it shouldn't happen."

HAYAKAWA BACKS WALLACE-ITTES: San Francisco State College



Photo by Petrick

PROTEST ACTION. Pickets at New York House of Detention June 27 demand freedom for Black Panther Joan Bird and other Panther victims of police frame-up. Protest was organized by an ad hoc formation, including Asian-Americans for Action, the Republic of New Africa, and other groups.

president S. I. Hayakawa has been discovered supporting backers of George Wallace's American Independent Party. The Sun-Reporter, a Black community newspaper has learned that Hayakawa sent a letter to the party mailing list, urging support for a rightist researcher who, said the rightist president, would counter-balance the "myths and lies that have been spread" by radical social scientists. . . **GAY LIBERATION:** Some 2-3,000 men and women homosexuals marched up Sixth Avenue in New York June 28 to protest repressive sex laws and social mores that bar homosexuality and make homosexuals subject to constant harassment and discrimination. . . **SIX SOLDIERS ARRESTED:** Six soldiers at Ft. Lewis, Washington were arrested June 26 and 27 for refusing an order to report to a replacement station for shipment to Vietnam. All six had filed for conscientious objector discharges, but had been refused twice. Four men are currently imprisoned in the stockade while two others have been confined to barracks.

HEAD OF THE CLASS: Wealthy oilman and University of California regent Edwin W. Pauley may have netted \$800,000 in 1966 through avoidance of taxes by business transactions between himself and the University of California. . . **HIGH COURT REJECTS CP CASE:** The Supreme Court ruled June 15 that the case of the Communist Party, whose ballot status is under question in Minnesota, must be appealed in a lower court. The CP is challenging the constitutionality of the Communist Control Act of 1954 which requires the CP to register. . . **MOVEMENT FILMS:** American Documentary Films offers a wide range of filmed reports on Vietnam, the Chicano movement, the Panthers, Cuba, etc. A number of free films are offered. For a catalog, write the organization at 336 West 84th St., New York, N. Y. 10024. Phone: (212) 799-7440. . . **CAMBODIAN TOLL:** Defense Department figures show 339 American GIs killed and 1,501 wounded in Cambodia since the U.S. launched the invasion April 30. The casualty figures run through June 29.

PANTHER 21 DEFENSE: The Committee to Defend the Panther 21 offers an assortment of literature and buttons with a \$10 contribution to the defense fund. Write the Committee to Defend the New York Panther 21, 11 E. 16 St., New York, N. Y. 10003. . . **LAND GRANTS TRIBUNAL:** Atty. William Kunstler reports that he will head an interna-

tional tribunal on the question of the legality of the Mexican land grants in the Southwest. Kunstler said in an interview that the tribunal will produce evidence to show that the land belongs to the Chicano population. The tribunal will be conducted in Las Vegas, N.M., he said, and the two main lawyers for the Chicanos will be himself and Tiny Martinez, a Las Vegas district attorney.

AMA PARLEY: The American Medical Association adopted a resolution on abortion at its convention in Chicago June 20-25. The traditionally very conservative association voted to approve the performing of abortions by AMA doctors provided that two additional physicians are consulted and the operation is performed in a licensed medical facility. . . **NEW DYLAN ALBUM:** Bob Dylan is back with another album. This one's called "Self Portrait." It's fine music. . . **MORE PRESIDIO REVERSALS:** The U.S. Court of Military Review reversed the mutiny convictions of privates Lawrence J. Zaino and Michael Murphey June 29 bringing to six the number of convictions overturned. The men were convicted for a 1968 sitdown at the Presidio Stockade in San Francisco.

SPECIAL PANTHER INVESTIGATION: A Cook County prosecutor has been appointed in Chicago to call a special grand jury and investigate—again—the killing of Fred Hampton and Mark Clark, the two Black Panthers shot to death by Chicago police December 4. Hampton was chairman of the Illinois Panther branch. Clark worked for the Panthers in Peoria, Ill. The new investigation follows petitions filed by three organizations—the American Civil Liberties Union, the Chicago Council of Lawyers and the Businessmen for Public Interest. "It seemed to us that there had been several state laws violated," Jay Miller, executive director of the Illinois division of the ACLU told *The Militant*. "So we wanted a state grand jury and a special prosecutor since our prosecutor was somewhat tainted—his own men were involved—and since the state's attorney was involved in what could be a violation of the law." At issue, said Miller, were questions of perjury and subordination and possibly manslaughter and murder.

Contributors to this week's report include George Johnson, San Francisco; Nancy Cole, Chicago.

Demand freedom for prisoners in Mexican jails

The Mexican Organization for the Freedom of Political Prisoners is organizing a week of meetings and demonstrations July 7-14 throughout Mexico to demand pardon for the political prisoners who have been illegally detained without trial, and in some cases tortured, since the revolutionary events of 1968. There are indications that now, although the time for them to be legally sentenced has passed, moves are afoot to sentence them before the new Mexican president takes office in the fall. The purpose of the week of protest is to denounce this latest repressive maneuver.

The organization is calling on groups and individuals abroad to plan solidarity actions July 7-14 at Mexican embassies and consulates. Messages of support should be sent to Rosa Ma. Martinez, c/o Dr. Lavista 143-403, Mexico City 7, D. F., Mexico.

...stalinism and the civil war in Spain

(Continued from page 4)

geous) state to break the workers control, and finally, dissolving the workers committees.

This took time, trickery and bloodshed. The Stalinists participated consciously and fully in this counterrevolutionary process, placing the forces of the international Stalinist secret police apparatus at the disposal of the bourgeoisie in a terror campaign against the revolutionary workers.

All who resisted the counterrevolution were labeled "Trotskyite-fascists" by the Stalinist-bourgeois bloc — tens of thousands of the best antifascist fighters, the most class-conscious workers, were imprisoned, tortured or shot. Censorship was imposed, directed primarily against the more left workers organizations. Arms were deliberately withheld from those fronts manned by the most revolutionary workers, especially the heroic fighters of the Aragon front.

People's front counterrevolution

This systematic counterrevolution was "justified" by the Stalinists on the basis of the People's Front. The "first task," they said, was to defeat fascism — and this meant allying with the "progressive" bourgeoisie on a program limited to "democracy." In actual fact, this meant the Stalinists allying with the "progressive" bourgeoisie to crush the revolution, which was the worst blow that could be dealt to the antifascist struggle. A vivid firsthand



Antifascist Spanish peasants prepare for battle.

account of the terrible demoralization and disorganization the counterrevolution carried out by the People's Front introduced among the antifascist fighters is found in George Orwell's *Homage to Catalonia*.

"Limiting the struggle to democracy" meant conscious sabotage of the revolutionary antifascist struggle launched by the workers. Subordinating the needs and demands of the masses to those of the "progressive" bourgeoisie crippled the fight against the fascists in other key ways. Basing themselves on the bourgeoisie, the various People's Front governments were unable to rally the peasants in a struggle for the land, for the bourgeoisie was connected (in many cases was identical) with the landowners and feared any encroachments on "property." Unable to carry out a land reform in its own territory, and finally moving against the gains made by the peasants during the July revolution, the People's Front government was unable to appeal to the peasant forces in Franco's armies or behind Franco's lines.

Similarly, the People's Front government refused to declare inde-

pendence for Spanish Morocco and thereby rally Spanish Moroccans against Franco. The "progressive" bourgeoisie couldn't do this in part because it was imperialist, and in part because its British and French "allies" feared any such move might influence independence movements in British and French colonies in North Africa. Thus Franco was left free to demagogically appeal to the Moroccans, and tens of thousands were found in Franco's armies. A similar position was taken by the People's Front in relation to the oppressed national minorities within Spain.

On the purely military side too, whenever their class interests conflicted with the antifascist struggle, the liberal bourgeois politicians, backed to the hilt by the Stalinists, choose the former. For example, although the revolutionary sailors had saved the fleet for the Republic, the fleet was not used to try to block Franco's free use of the sea between Morocco and Spain. The Stalinists and the bourgeoisie both feared that this could lead to an embarrassing situation for their British and French imperialist allies if Hitler or Mussolini should intervene.

Also, since there was no class difference between the fascists and the liberal bourgeois regime, and because the Loyalist bourgeois politicians and army officers had no deep basic stake in the fight against fascism as the workers did (to them it was literally a matter of life and death), there was one instance of treachery after another, and numerous defections to the Fascist side by Loyalist officials and "progressive" bourgeois forces.

Thus, putting the "fight against fascism" first — as against raising revolutionary demands — in order to obtain a bloc with the "progressive" bourgeoisie, meant opposing the demands of the workers, the peasants, the Moroccans and the national minorities which would have best mobilized them in the antifascist fight. It meant giving up the most important of the antifascist weapons, the political weapons that could have made deep inroads among the peasant and Moroccan soldiers in the fascist armies.

The People's Front policy thus demoralized and severely weakened the anti-Franco forces, and paved the way for Franco's victory.

(To be continued)

The national picket line

Miners press for safety law enforcement

The situation in the soft-coal mining industry grows more complicated with every passing day. The rank-and-file miners are angry and their anger is mounting.

In recent weeks wildcat strikes have occurred in every area, even as far west as Illinois and western Ohio. (For background, see *The Militant*, June 26.)

The so-called "wildcatters" within the UMW have organized themselves into two factions, not hostile but rather helpful to one another. One faction is the working miners who call themselves Miners for Democracy, and the other is the Disabled Miners and Widows Association. The four-pronged strikes have hit at:

- The United Mine Workers bureaucracy for its participation with the coal industry in trying to soften up the terms of the recently enacted Mine Health and Safety Act;

- The UMW for its refusal to carry out W. A. Boyle's election campaign promise to allow all districts and local unions to elect their own officials. At present a majority of the officials on both levels are named by the UMW top leadership;

- A change in the present UMW policy of picking up hospitalization cards from disabled miners (and all widows and orphans) after the working miner has been out of the mines for 1 year.

- Against both the Department of Interior's Bureau of Mines and the

coal corporations for stalling tactics, including federal law suits and injunctions prohibiting the enforcement of the Mine Safety and Health Act. The government has also proposed cutting \$40 million off the mining and mineral research program now being carried on in 20 research centers in 17 cities. This would severely reduce the research being done to improve the health and safety of mine workers.

In mid-June, Hollis M. Dole, assistant secretary of interior, called a meeting of coal operators and UMW officials in Washington to discuss the whole situation. West Virginia's Representative Kenneth Hechler, one of the House leaders who sponsored and then fought through the Mine Safety and Health Act, demanded representation for himself and his fellow representatives and was granted permission to attend the meeting. However, when Joseph A. Yablonski, son of the slain Joseph Yablonski Sr. (who ran against Boyle in the last election) demanded that he also be allowed into the meeting, he was refused. UMW representatives said they would walk out of the meeting if Yablonski was admitted. This action sparked more strikes in western Ohio and Illinois, where Yablonski support was especially strong.

The young Yablonski, in making his demand for entry into the meeting, said:

"I don't claim to be the greatest expert on mine safety . . . but I have a strong feeling that at a closed meet-

ing of that kind no one will be in there fighting for the miners' welfare. Certainly Mr. Boyle won't. And certainly the operators won't."

(Boyle has joined industry spokesmen in requesting that the Safety Act be administered in a "more practical manner.")

Four captive mine owners, United Steel, Bethlehem and Republic Steel and the Jones-Laughlin Corporation, were granted an injunction against their striking employees. The original injunction named the UMW leaders in western Pennsylvania, but the judge, on the request of the corporations, absolved all of these district leaders and substituted the names of the leaders of the Miners for Democracy group. Attorneys for these strike leaders appealed the injunction.

On June 24, at the high point of the recent strikes, there were 19,000 underground workers out, in addition to another 9,000 employed in the steel industry captive mines. More than 50 mines were closed down by picket lines.

A bus strike of 1,400 drivers and other transit employees of the Bay Area Transit District Board was settled temporarily on June 1 when the judge, hearing an appeal by the board for an injunction, ruled that the strike was legal, on the grounds that the board had granted the union involved

bargaining rights and the strike was a part of those bargaining rights. An unusual ruling indeed!

The membership of the union voted narrowly to accept an 8.7 percent interim wage increase, bringing their hourly wages from \$4.14 to \$4.50 an hour. All other workers involved will receive a similar percentage increase.

The judge's ruling set up negotiations immediately between the two parties. If no agreement is arrived at, the issues are to go to binding arbitration.

* * *

On June 20, members of the Manhattan-Bronx Postal Workers Union voted 6,649 to 733 to call a strike against the Post Office if the Senate does not act forthwith on the House-passed Postal Reform Bill. (See *The Militant*, July 3.)

Moe Biller, Manhattan-Bronx Local president of the unaffiliated National Postal Workers Union, brushed aside charges that this strike vote was aimed at putting heat on the Senate — and the president, who may veto the bill. The Administration substitute bill would have granted sole bargaining rights to the seven AFL-CIO affiliates in the postal department (See *The Militant*, July 3). Mr. Biller said his union would be satisfied with nothing less than the bill passed by the House.

—MARVEL SCHOLL

♀ Women's liberation notes

A sharp increase in the percentage of women who hold jobs was reported in the *Wall Street Journal* June 29. According to the *Journal*, it is calculated that 44 percent of all women age 16 and older are either employed or seeking work, compared with about 38 percent in the early '60s, and 35 percent in the '50s.

The number of working women with children under six has seen a giant leap forward in the past decade—from 18 to 33 percent.

At the same time, the percentage of men over 16 working or seeking work has steadily fallen, from 87 percent in 1952 to 81 percent today. The sharpest declines are among youth and old people, largely due to more men going to college and earlier retirement.

* * *

In a growing number of cities, women's liberation centers are springing up to provide meeting places where women can come to exchange ideas, buy literature, participate in classes and workshops, hold meetings, obtain abortion counseling, learn karate, and find out more about movement activities. In most areas the centers are organized democratically and the facilities are open to all in the movement, regardless of point of view.


* * *

An interesting article by *Aphra* editor Elizabeth Fisher on chauvinist attitudes in children's literature appears in a recent issue of the *New York Times Book Review* section. After investigating children's books in libraries and book stores, Elizabeth Fisher says she found "an almost incredible conspiracy" of conditioning: "Boys' achievement drive is encouraged; girls' is cut off. Boys are brought up to express themselves; girls to please. The general image of females ranges from dull to degrading to invisible."

Concretely, Elizabeth Fisher found five times as many males in the titles of children's books as there were females, four times as many boys, men and male animals in pictures, and she says that most animal characters presented are male.

* * *

Another vehicle for pounding sexist ideas into the heads of young children is the TV cartoon. After watching 34



Photos by John Gray

Increase of women in labor force has brought greater involvement in labor struggles as reflected in recent Los Angeles teachers strike.

hours of children's cartoons, Jan Sinott of *Off Our Backs* reported that "The majority of shows have no female characters at all, with only one show starring a female character."

Most of the plots really put girls in their place, Sinott says. For example, "in 'Here Comes the Grump,' a typical adventure, the hero and the Grump are male, as is most of the supporting cast. One girl, a princess, is quiet, giggles, calls 'help,' or asks simple questions."

* * *

The growth in the number of women's liberation conferences, meetings and organizations which are open to women only is apparently having an impact on the National Organization for Women (NOW), which has long included men in its ranks.

In their June newsletter, Los Angeles NOW carries a lead article on this

question by Jean Stapleton in which she admits, "There ARE times when women need to exclude men, when they need rap sessions to work out their feelings about men."

Nevertheless, Stapleton attempts to defend the traditional NOW position that excluding men from formal meetings is practicing "discrimination" in reverse. "A supremacist is a supremacist," she says, "whatever variety of body that person is housed in. . . . If we insist on fighting men on their own grounds, we might as well give up."

This antagonism to the organization of all-women groups is a reflection of the fact that although NOW has accepted the concept of women's liberation (as opposed to women's rights), they have still failed to come to grips with the meaning of this new movement. They do not yet understand that it is precisely because women are organizing as an independent power, taking action on our own behalf, that we are finally beginning to get organized in a way that can potentially reach masses of women and actually change society.

It is women, not men, who suffer sexist oppression in this society, and we are the ones who must lead the struggle against it and hammer out the program of struggle. It is precisely the process of meeting together as women that has helped us in the past several years to begin to feel our strength and to get to the root of the problem as we have never done before.

* * *

New literature: Sally Kempton's article, "Cutting Loose, A Private View of the Women's Uprising," in the July *Esquire* is well worth the dollar you have to pay for the magazine.

* * *

Chauvinist quote of the week: "We must start with the realization that as much as women want to be good scientists or engineers, they want first and foremost to be womanly companions of men and to be mothers." — Psychiatrist Bruno Bettelheim.

Quote of the week: Mae West on the women's liberation movement — "I'm for it."

— ELIZABETH BARNES

Women in Calif. press fight on education bias

By DIANNE FEELEY
SAN FRANCISCO — One of the significant indications of the growing impact of the women's liberation movement has been a series of ten bills introduced by Senator Mervyn Dymally (D.-L.A.) in the California State Assembly committee on education.

If passed, the package of bills would have far-reaching implications for the struggle for equality in education in California state colleges and universities. It would institute child-care centers for faculty, students and staff on all campuses; introduce *compensatory* hiring of women by colleges and universities; set up special financial aid arrangements for women students to enable them to go on to graduate school; exclude textbooks which portray women in stereotyped roles; and ask Congress to enact the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution.

Women from women's liberation and from the National Organization for Women testified at the hearing. Representatives of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Local 1695, representing the clerical and technical workers at U. C. Berkeley, dramatized the need for child-care. Some 30 percent of all Berkeley children who need care belong to families in the Berkeley academic community. The university, thus far, has been unresponsive to the union's demand for child-care.

Perhaps the most controversial bill was the one regarding textbook standards and the banning of sex-role stereotypes. Majorie Uran, a member of NOW, and a lecturer at Stanford University, testified on the study she had completed on California state-adopted texts. She discovered that women are rarely even pictured in the texts, and when shown, play a secondary role.

In her word-counts of stories, she found those dealing with girls to be shorter and less exciting than ones which dealt with boys. In one science text, only two women were pictured. Madame Curie was in the background of one picture, peering over her husband's shoulder as if she learned everything from him, and in the other case, a woman scientist was shown working in a team, under the direction of men. Yet after this expose, one senator said he was opposed to the bill because it "censored" books.

Many state senators found the testimony at the hearing not to their liking, and some even rudely interrupted testimony. Yet, the fact that these bills have been introduced, and they were forced to listen, is an indication of the growth of the movement today.

The introduction of these bills and the reaction of the politicians shows that it is only through the building of an independent women's liberation movement that we can effectively struggle for equal education and the passage of the measures introduced by Dymally. What Dymally is asking women to do is simply to write their congressmen stating support for the bills. But, what is needed is more than that. An independent campaign needs to be waged, on the campuses and off, if the struggle for equal education is to be effective.

... elections in Quebec

(Continued from page 14)

because the social and national discontent are profoundly fused together.

The PQ vote represents an electoral breakthrough for nationalism. The RIN [Rassemblement pour l'Indépendance Nationale] vote in 1966 came nowhere near the PQ total of 1970. Even more important, the strongest PQ showing was among the decisive sector of the Quebec working class, in southeast Montreal. This confirms the rising tide of national consciousness which has been visible for several years and which has broken out in many forms, as in the October 1969 fight against Bill 63, and the struggles in the unions for French unilingualism.

The capitalist press and many politicians have sought to dismiss this powerful nationalist rise by holding that the PQ vote was basically a protest against unemployment, housing, taxes, etc. This is wishful thinking on their part; denying what is becoming more and more clear to Québécois: that these conditions are closely tied up with Quebec's national oppression.

To what degree can we say that the

PQ showing indicates a mass desire for a separate, sovereign Quebec state? This was certainly the central PQ demand, and those who voted for the party could hardly be unaware of it, or be strongly opposed to it. If some federalist-minded persons voted PQ, how many independentists voted for the other parties? These are important questions which will be examined in subsequent articles.

Whatever the wishes of the Parti Québécois, the election of a few PQers to the National Assembly is not going to calm down militant struggles in Quebec.

In the past it has denounced such struggles as fanatical and irresponsible. As a major party now, similar denunciations will be more remarked and cost the party dearly.

Inevitably the PQ must unmask itself, compelling the labor movement to move to the fore in the struggle for political power. And, as the current elections have shown, the Québécois will not be too charitable towards parties which have cruelly betrayed their trust.

Intercontinental Press

revised third edition

WAR AND REVOLUTION IN VIETNAM

By Doug Jenness 35¢

PATHFINDER PRESS, INC.
(formerly Merit Publishers)
873 Broadway, New York City 10003

The great society

America's Park program—The AEC announced tentative selection of an abandoned salt mine near Lyons, Kansas, as the nation's first underground radioactive waste repository. The area was named Kansas Nuclear Park.

Get a good mouthpiece—Secretary of State Rogers issued a memo advising that in planning future invasions like Cambodia it's good to check out the legal aspects.

Our advancing culture—A U.S. patent has been issued for a hot dog shaped like a dog.

A gas—A Los Angeles advertising outfit is planning national distribution of its Smog Ball, a glass ball filled with genuine Los Angeles smog and mounted on a black base.

He ought to join the NLF—H. Ross Perot, the Texan who parlayed government contracts into a multimillion dollar data machine business, may have to curb some of his global efforts on behalf of "suffering" American prisoners in North Vietnam. In a single day, stock in his company plunged 50 points. With Perot holding 80 percent of the stock his paper loss was estimated at \$445 million.

Including the landlord?—A New York court upheld the validity of a lease barring dogs from an apartment.

Note to N.Y. straphangers—The New York Transit Patrolmen's Benevolent Ass'n asked that subway patrolmen be granted "hazardous-duty" pay on the basis of scientific findings that because of steel dust it is "more hazardous to work in the city subways than in a coal mine."

Really, doctor?—The magazine *Hospital Practice* advises: "Although air pollution does not produce a specific illness from which people die, it aggravates preexisting cardiac and respiratory conditions. . . ."

They tend to lose weight too—The same issue of *Hospital Practice* advises that in areas of the world where widespread hunger is a fact of existence, children "must endure the consequence of severe malnutrition."

Sheer coincidence—Rev. Billy Graham says it's unfortunate that patriotism and the flag have become synonymous with the ultraright.

That's a comfort—A *New York Times* fashion expert advises that a \$250 rabbit skin coat is as warm as a \$30,000 sable.

In lieu of insurance—Cardinal Cook blessed a \$195,000 relief shipment being sent to earthquake victims in Peru.

Like digging your own grave—Brown & Williamson, the coffin-nail folk, have come up with a roll-your-own kit including filters.

—HARRY RING

In Passing...

The Information War is a book in the honorable tradition of left-liberal muckraking. The book attempts to describe how the government and the press manipulate, censor, and distort the news.

Various aspects of the war in Vietnam, the 1965 U.S. invasion of the Dominican Republic, the 1968 Democratic Party convention, the 1968 New York teachers' strike, etc. are examined to show how misinformation is deliberately supplied to the public.

The author, Dale Minor, is a practicing newsman who has covered the civil rights struggle in Birmingham and Selma, Alabama, the Vietnam war, Israel's Six-Day War, and Greece under the colonels. He has in the past worked for Pacifica radio station WBAI in New York.

He explains how it is that the Saigon correspondents of the U.S. press are so cooperative in reporting what the U.S. government would like to have reported. He explains the concept of the "team":

"The team. What the team concept means is that any American in any proximity to any American operation is honor bound to be a member of the American team, whether as player or water boy. It is a concept that officialdom, both military and civilian (but especially military), tends to take for granted.

"On the other hand, it is a concept hotly rejected by some reporters (regrettably far too few) who see their

function in a different light."

Minor's book is about two-thirds reportage and muckraking and about one-third liberal theorizing about how to improve the press. Minor has the standard liberal illusion that his political stance is somehow a golden mean between the two "extremes" of right and left—a notion which he repeats ad nauseam.

Consequently, his solutions to the problems of government and press manipulation of information do not take into account the class basis of this manipulation, making Minor a considerably better muckraker than theorist.

(*The Information War* by Dale Minor. Hawthorn Books. 212 pp. \$6.95.)

In a panel at the recent Socialist Scholar's Conference Richard Greenman, who translated Victor Serge's famous revolutionary novel *Birth of Our Power*, reported that the publisher (Doubleday) decided to turn its stock of the book to pulp because it wasn't selling well enough.

Of course, Doubleday never advertised it very much either.

All of which reminds me of book burning.

(Pathfinder Press, 873 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y. 10003 still has a supply. The book is in hardback and costs \$5.95.)

The Bust Book is a mixed bag.

For the most part, it contains good sound recommendations, but inter-

persed with the legal advice is a considerable amount of erroneous political advice.

The Bust Book gives a (surprisingly) entertaining description of legal procedures from arrest to trial and lays out the various practical alternatives that one has in these proceedings.

It also includes passages such as this one:

"Preparation for a Demonstration: "A violent police riot is always a possibility. Cops are scared of us in demonstrations. Take these minimum precautions for your own safety:

"*For women: Wear pants, and don't wear earrings.

"*For men: Wear jock cups.

"*For everyone: Wear hard shoes, never sandals. Don't wear glasses unless it's absolutely necessary, and then secure them with a rubber band. No contact lenses or false teeth. (If knocked out, you can choke on your teeth; if Maced or gassed, lenses can erode the cornea and even cause blindness.) Long shirts with high collars and tight cuffs can protect against gas attack. Wear a belt which can be used as a tourniquet. . . ."

And it goes on like this for another two pages.

Well, this sort of alarmist approach may be fine if one is so unfortunate as to be planning to go on a small-scale trashing expedition. But it is hardly appropriate for mass demonstrations in the current period and some of it seems more than likely to get a person singled out for individual police harassment in such a demonstration.

(*The Bust Book: What to Do Until the Lawyer Comes* by Kathy Boudin, Brian Glick, Eleanor Raskin and Gustin Reichbach. Grove Press. 159 pp. \$1.25 paper.)

—MALACHI CONSTANT

Local socialist directory

ARIZONA: Phoenix: YSA, c/o Pamela Starsky, P.O. Box 750, Tempe Arizona 85281.

CALIFORNIA: Berkeley: SWP and YSA, 2519-A Telegraph Avenue, Berkeley, Calif. 94704. Tel: (415) 848-9334.

Fullerton: YSA c/o K.W. Jeter, 132 W. Valencia, #F, Fullerton, Calif. 92633.

Hayward: YSA, Gary Sommer, c/o Student Union Building, California State College at Hayward, 25800 Hillary St., Hayward, Calif. 94542. Tel. (415) 537-3656.

Los Angeles: SWP and YSA, 1702 E. 4th St., Los Angeles, Calif. 90033. Tel: (213) 269-4953.

Riverside: YSA c/o Woody Diaz, 5724 Warren St., Arlington, Calif. 92503.

San Francisco: SWP, YSA, Militant Labor Forum, and Pioneer Books, 2338 Market St., San Francisco, Calif. 94114. Tel: (415) 626-9958.

San Diego: Alan Stancliff, 5058 E. Mt. View Dr., San Diego, Calif. 92116. Tel: (714) 296-4029.

San Joaquin Valley: YSA, c/o Michael Klein, P.O. Box 873, Modesto, Calif. 95353.

COLORADO: Denver: SWP-YSA, P.O. Box 18415, Denver, Colo. 80218. Tel: (303) 333-7936.

FLORIDA: Gainesville: YSA, Box 13157, University Sta., Gainesville, Fla. 32601.

Orlando: YSA, 762 Overspin St., Winter Park, Fla. 32789.

Tallahassee: YSA, c/o Brett Merkey, 814 California St., Tallahassee, Fla. 32304.

Tampa: YSA, c/o Chip Jeffries, 904 E. Robson, Tampa, Fla. 33604.

GEORGIA: Atlanta: Militant Bookstore, 1176 1/2 West Peachtree St., SWP and YSA, P.O. Box 7817, Atlanta, Ga., 30309. Tel: (404) 876-2230.

ILLINOIS: Chicago: SWP, YSA and bookstore, 180 N. Wacker Dr., Rm. 310, Chicago, Ill. 60606. Tel: (312) 641-0147.

INDIANA: Ft. Wayne: YSA, c/o Bill Cullnane, 257 Paulette Pl, Ft. Wayne, Ind. 46825.

MASSACHUSETTS: Boston: SWP and YSA, c/o Militant Labor Forum, 295 Huntington Ave., Rm 307, Boston, Mass. 02115. Tel: (617) 536-6981 (HQ), 547-8557.

MICHIGAN: Ann Arbor: YSA, P.O. Box 408, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48108.

Detroit: SWP and YSA, Eugene V. Debs Hall, 3737 Woodward Ave., Detroit, Mich. 48201. Tel: (313) TE 1-6135.

Ypsilanti: YSA, Box 156, Charles McKenny Union, Ypsilanti, Mich. 48197. Tel: (313) 482-7348.

MINNESOTA: Minneapolis-St. Paul: SWP, YSA and Labor Bookstore, 1 University N.E. (at E. Hennepin) 2nd fl., Mpls. 55413. Tel: (612) 332-7781.

MISSOURI: Kansas City: YSA, c/o Paul Schmidlein, 4409 Virginia, K.C., Mo. 64110. Tel: (816) 561-0872.

St. Louis: YSA, c/o Bill Onasch, 316 Laurel, #A9,

St. Louis, Mo. 63112. Tel: (314) 725-3972.

NEW JERSEY: Newark: YSA, P.O. Box 627, Newark, N.J. 07101. Tel: (201) 678-6005.

Wayne: Paterson State YSA, c/o Clyde Magarelli, Paterson State College, 300 Pompton Rd. Wayne, N.J. 07470.

NEW YORK: Albany: YSA, c/o Bill O'Kain, 665 Washington Ave., 2nd floor, Albany, N.Y. 12206.

Annapolis-on-Hudson: Red Hook (Bard College) YSA, c/o Lorenzo Black, P.O. Box 497 Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, N.Y. 12504.

Long Island: YSA, P.O. Box 357, Roosevelt, L.I., N.Y. 11575. Tel: (516) FR9-0289.

New York City: SWP and YSA and bookstore, 873 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y. 10003. Tel: (212) 982-6051.

OHIO: Cleveland: SWP and YSA, 2921 Prospect Ave., Cleveland, Ohio 44115. Tel: (216) 861-3862.

Columbus: YSA, P.O. Box 3006, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Tel: (614) 294-2047.

Kent: YSA, P.O. Box 116, Kent, Ohio 44240.

Oberlin: YSA, c/o Rick Bader, 30 Carpenter Ct., Oberlin, Ohio 44074. Tel: (216) 775-0462.

Oxford: YSA, P.O. Box 321, Oxford, Ohio 45066. Tel: (513) 529-6501.

Yellow Springs: YSA, Antioch Union, Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387.

OREGON: Portland: YSA, c/o Carol Kershner, 2635 S.W. Hume St., Portland, Ore. 97219.

PENNSYLVANIA: Mansfield: YSA, c/o Ken Evans,

apt. 208-A, Corey Creek Apts., Mansfield, Pa. 16933.

Philadelphia: SWP and YSA, 686 N. Broad St., Philadelphia, Penna. 19130. Tel: (215) CE 6-6998.

RHODE ISLAND: Providence: YSA, c/o Bruce Clark, 201 Brown St., Providence, R.I. 02906.

TENNESSEE: Knoxville: c/o Larry Sullivan, 801 Gate Lane, Apt. 101, Knoxville, Tenn. 37919. Tel: (615) 584-3362.

TEXAS: Austin: SWP and YSA, P.O. Box 5586, West Austin Station, Austin, Texas 78703.

El Paso: YSA, UTEP, P.O. Box 178, El Paso, Texas 79999.

Houston: YSA, Campus Activities, University Center, University of Houston, Houston, Texas 77004.

WASHINGTON, D.C.: YSA, 1319 F. St. NW., Rm. 1010, Wash., D.C. Tel: (202) 638-0610 or 965-1943.

WASHINGTON: E. Wash. State: YSA, Rt. 5, Box 194, Spokane, Wash. 99208. Tel: (509) HU 3-6126.

Seattle: Militant Bookstore, 5257 University Way N.E., Seattle, Wash. 98105. Hrs. 11 a.m.-8 p.m., Mon.-Sat. Tel: (206) 523-2555.

Tacoma: YSA, c/o John Naubert, P.O. Box 309, Tacoma, Wash. 98401.

WISCONSIN: Madison: YSA, 202 W. Gilman, Madison, Wis. 53703. Tel: (608) 256-0857.

Milwaukee: YSA, 1682 N. Franklin Pl., Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

Oshkosh: YSA, c/o Peter Kohlenberg, 1603 Elmwood Ave., Oshkosh, Wis. 54901.

Special to New Readers

THE MILITANT

3 months for \$1.00

\$4 for 1 yr. regular subscription/For GIs: \$1 for 6 mo.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

Make checks payable to The Militant, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003

LA RAZA!

Why a Chicano Party?
Why Chicano Studies?

A Symposium 30c

Pathfinder Press, Inc.
873 Broadway, NYC 10003

Anti-Catholic drive intensified

Northern Ireland struggle deepens

By DAVID THORSTAD

JUNE 30—Since new disturbances erupted in Northern Ireland June 26, six persons have been killed and close to 300 wounded, orders have been issued to shoot to kill any civilian seen with a weapon, and the ruling Unionist government is seeking to strengthen repressive legislation. British troops in Ulster now number more than 11,000.

Although the violence has not reached the proportions of the uprisings last August, the situation today is in some ways more explosive than it was then.

The current situation appears to have been sparked by two developments. The first was the jailing of civil rights leader Bernadette Devlin in Londonderry. She was to begin serving a six-month sentence stemming from last summer's rebellion. Reelected to Parliament in the June 18 elections, she had requested permission to appeal the sentence to the House of Lords, but her appeal was denied.

In Belfast violence was ignited by a parade past the Catholic area of town by the Orange Order, a Protestant secret society similar to the Ku Klux Klan. Parades by the Orange Order are continuing.

Behind these developments lie other factors that have contributed to the current explosions of unrest. They also betray a state of ferment of which this unrest is simply a manifestation.



Bernadette Devlin

Many Catholics hoped that the intervention of British troops last year would bring about a significant decrease in the discrimination they suffer at the hands of the Protestant-based government. Today those illusory hopes have for the most part worn off, and there is an increasing tendency for the British troops to clash with Catholics.

In the months following last year's uprisings, the ruling Unionist Party has reverted to its traditional anti-Catholic demagoguery.

Early this year, the Public Order Act was adopted banning some forms of direct action, like sit-ins, and effectively giving the government a veto over parades. The government is now asking the Northern Ireland Parliament to approve without delay a measure which would further strengthen its repressive powers by making prison sentences mandatory for persons involved in "riots."

The Unionist Party apparently feels

emboldened by the recent victory in the British elections of the Conservative Party, of which it considers itself an affiliate.

British deputy prime minister Brian Faulkner has made clear that the government plans no concessions to the Catholic civil rights movement and that this movement is the target of the government's repressive measures. The June 30 *New York Times* quotes him as saying, "There can be no question at this time of anyone taking action in the streets on behalf of civil rights." Yet street marches by the Orange Order are permitted to continue and its annual supremacy parade is scheduled for July 13. This event marks the victory in 1690 of William of Orange and the Protestant garrison colony over King James II and his Irish Catholic allies.

The new repressive measures are an addition to an arsenal that already includes the Special Powers Act, passed decades ago in response to the Irish revolution. It is one of the harshest in the world. The act provides that anyone considered "dangerous to the state" may be arrested and held indefinitely, and if the victim should die in prison, no inquest may be held.

New fears have been raised by the refusal today of British home secretary Reginald Maudling, who is on a two-day visit to Northern Ireland, to give assurances that this act would not be used in the current situation.

The social polarization of Northern Ireland is continuing. A sign of it was the victory in the mid-April by-elections of the ultrareactionary Bible-thumper Ian Paisley. He had lost a parliamentary race in 1969.

The present flare-up is a symptom of the deepening political crisis of the Northern Ireland bourgeoisie. This crisis is being brought on by an attempt to modify and modernize traditional forms of British control over Northern Ireland.

With such factors at work, further turmoil can be expected.

Cops shoot way into Cleveland Panther office

CLEVELAND—The headquarters of the Ohio chapter of the National Committee to Combat Fascism was raided by police June 27. The NCCF is described as the political organizing bureau of the Black Panther Party. The raid resembled police attacks on Panther headquarters in other cities.

Shortly after noon, ten members of the Tactical Squad, wearing bullet-proof vests, climbed the stairs to the office. Witnesses outside say no shots were fired from inside and that police opened fire without warning. Two of the three occupants of the office, Curtis Johnson and Richard M. Dowell, are being held on charges of shooting with intent to kill.

The third, Fred Clark, as well as patrolman Heinrich J. Ortog were reported in fair condition following the attack.

Attempts are being made to raise \$15,000 in anticipation of high bail. Contributions can be sent to Mrs. Norman Townsend, 3028 Huntington, Shaker Heights, Ohio 44120.

Chicago grand jury indicts right-winger for felony

CHICAGO, June 29—A grand jury handed down three felony indictments against Thomas Stewart, who is associated with the right-wing terrorist Legion of Justice. The indictments for strong-armed robbery, armed robbery and aggravated battery stem from a Nov. 1, 1969, raid on the Chicago headquarters of the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance in which Stewart was positively identified as an armed participant.

The office of State's Attorney Edward Hanrahan, under heavy fire since the Dec. 4 murder of Fred Hamp-

ton and Mark Clark, had attempted for several months to shield Stewart and others associated with the Legion, including their chief spokesman, attorney S. Thomas Sutton, from legal reprisals. Despite a maze of political maneuvers, including endless postponement of Stewart's grand jury hearing and blatant mishandling of cases against Legion members, the state's attorney was finally forced to bring Stewart before the grand jury because of mounting public pressure. (For earlier story, see page 5.)

The indictments signal an important victory for the Committee for Defense Against Terrorist Attacks, which will continue to mobilize public support against the Legion of Justice and its activities.

Also on the agenda for the committee is the defense of Carl Finamore, an SWP member who faces a frame-up charge of battery in connection with a Dec. 12, 1969, incident with Legion associate Greg Schultz. Finamore's trial date is set for July 3. Charges of unlawful restraint against Finamore and Richard Hill, another SWP member, stemming from the same incident, were previously dismissed for lack of evidence.

Free clinics for abortion sought in N.Y.

JUNE 30—The Women's Abortion Project of New York held a press conference here this morning, the day before New York's liberal abortion law goes into effect. Project activists Evelyn Frankford, Sheila Doran and Stacey Seigle, Ellen Nasper and Linda Horhota of Barnard Women's Liberation and Lucinda Cisler of New Yorkers for Abortion Law Repeal stressed their dissatisfaction with projected plans for implementation of the law, and pointed out insufficiencies in the law itself. The demand for free, community-controlled abortion clinics was raised as women's liberation's answer to the problem of providing adequate facilities for abortions.

According to the Project's estimates, the demand for abortions is more likely to be 112,000 a year than the 50,000-75,000 anticipated by New York City. Even if the figure falls under 100,000, inadequate preparation and funding (Fordham hospital has a total of \$136,000 to set up and carry out a clinic program for one year) plus red tape will cause massive confusion. Already women are being told they will have to wait up to one month to get a bed, which in many cases will put them beyond the legal limit of 24 weeks.

Women's liberation activists are particularly outraged by the fact that one New York hospital which has received over \$1,000,000 in federal money from the Ghetto Medicine Bill refuses to do abortions on the grounds that it is a Catholic hospital. The New York bill's failure to provide for training of paramedical specialists was also condemned.

Speaking for the Project, Evelyn Frankford said, "The women's liberation movement is political, militant action by women to exercise control over our lives. The Women's Abortion Project, as part of that movement, opposes any interference with our bodies as intolerable."

She presented four demands: 1) free abortion clinics under community control; 2) access to and education about contraception and abortion for all women; 3) in the absence of free clinics, adequate insurance for all women, married or single; 4) no coercion for or against abortion and no forced sterilization of women.

