



## 1,000 Students Hold Militant March in NYC

by Melody Farrow  
NEW YORK CITY: FEB. 16  
Today more than a thousand Seward Park H.S. students (Lower East Side) stormed City Hall, chanting 'Hey, Mr. Mayor, come down to Seward Park sometime,' making liars of those who picture working-class youth as not caring about education. Seward Park has long needed a new Annex to replace the run-down element-

(Continued on Page 4)

Unrest in  
Mexico  
•  
page 4

# Bulletin

OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

Hands Off  
China  
•  
page 2

Vol. 3, No. 14 - 56

Mar. 13, 1967

Ten Cents

contract deadline nears

## Bosses' Court Jails Hoffa; Strike Threatens

As we go to press, Jimmy Hoffa, president of the largest trade union in the world has been put behind bars. This is a blow aimed directly at the working class and the organized labor movement. Implicated in this legal lynching is that great "liberal" Bobby Kennedy. The article below discusses the tasks before teamsters at this critical juncture.

by Dennis O'Casey

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters is the most powerful union in America today. From the Minneapolis Teamster victories of 1934 through the signing of the first national contract in 1964 and up to the present the IBT has persistently sunk its roots deeper and deeper into the American economy. Today, Hoffa boasts that by striking six major terminal cities he could bring trucking to a virtual standstill nationwide. So entrenched is the trucking industry in the American economy today that neither air, rail, nor shipping could perceptibly alleviate the total paralysis of the economy that would result from a national Teamster strike.

### teamsters' demands

Negotiations now going on in Washington to renew the Teamsters National Freight Agreement expiring on March 31 should be viewed in the context of this power. The pages of union demands now before the employers could be won if it was made clear that the alternative was a paralyzing strike. The Teamsters' demands call for a three year contract, with an annual 1/2 cent per mile increase for drivers of long distance trucks. These rates now average about 11¢ per

mile and thus the increase will amount to 4.5%. For non drivers and local cartage drivers the union is demanding a 25¢ hourly increase per year for about 7% as these rates now range from \$3.10 to \$3.50. The Teamsters have demanded the retention of their cost of living escalator which they permitted to be suspended during 18 months of their last contract. They have also demanded increased employer contributions to health, welfare and pension funds increased vacation time and in some cases more paid holidays. These items comprise the core of this year's demands. In view of the scuttling of Johnson's 3.2 guideline and the average 5% settle-

### program for militants

## Minneapolis Honeywell Strike--Lessons for Labor

by Robin Hill

On January 31st a rank-and file no-contract vote forced the leadership of Minneapolis Teamster Local 1145 to reverse their acceptance of

Honeywell, Inc's contract offer. Sixty-seven percent of the 10,500 member union voiced their rejection of what one member termed "a sell-out" that stinks to high hea-

demands that have been submitted. It is also high time that the teamsters put forth the demand for a 30 hour week.

Though the IBT is capable of forcing great concessions from the bosses, this weapon has never really been at the disposal of the 1,700,000 strong rank and file. As a result of the centralization of all teamster power in the hands of Hoffa the IBT is actually in danger at this time. While negotiations proceed nobody knows for sure whether or not Hoffa will be jailed on his jury tampering conviction before contract talks are completed. It is well known that such a development could seriously undermine the bargaining po-

sition of the union as Hoffa has deliberately resisted the development of competent second line leadership. Thus the prospect that Hoffa might soon be jailed inspired Trucking Employers Inc. to walk out of contract talks in a dispute over the format of negotiations.

### trap

The trap in which Hoffa appears about to be caught and the teamsters along with him has been in the making for three decades. Hoffa has consistently shown himself to be more concerned with the extension and centralization of his power than with using

(Continued on Page 4)



HONEYWELL WORKERS PICKET IN FRIGID WEATHER.

ven." Within a week and a half, after much internal strife, and with the additional job security of the right to transfer from "surplused" production lines added, the union membership voted 2,579 to 2,291 to accept the company offer and end the 11-day old strike.

The lessons of those 11 days are important to all trade union militants. For the Honeywell strike is a powerful example that the happy marriage of management and union bureaucracy can and must be torn assunder. And even if the bureaucracy with the aid of the international Teamsters leadership managed to keep its head above water with a more moderate, less odious sellout, the rank and file dissenters showed their ability to stand up and fight. Viewed in this light the Honeywell strike was not simply a defeat but rather a

part of the awakening of greater consciousness and militancy in the American working class.

### rebel

The opposition to the original contract offer formed as a reaction against the union bureaucrats' decision to have the contract vote by mail referendum rather than in a mass membership meeting. This tactic allowed no public discussion or debate. Rather, the union officials gave glowing descriptions of the "finest offer of a settlement which Local 1145 has ever received." Unfortunately for the bureaucrats not only their methods, but also their value judgements came under criticism. Soon the dissenters were renouncing the contract itself and demanded higher across the board wages, the assurance of the right to

(Continued on Page 4)

# WHAT THE CHINESE PEOPLE ARE FIGHTING FOR

## Hands off the Chinese revolution

(The following is a summary and excerpts of a speech given by Bulletin editor Tim Wohlforth at public meetings in defense of the Chinese Revolution in New York, Minneapolis-St. Paul, San Francisco and Berkeley during the month of February.)

This is a very special kind of meeting. We are not here simply to comment on past developments. History is being made right now and we consider ourselves participants in the revolutionary developments taking place at this time.

Our purpose is not to speculate in the way some of the Japanese correspondents do, or the Hong Kong observers who don't even get as far as reading the wall posters. We are not interested in speculation on personalities and petty power politics. They empirically balance the pros and cons, weighing positive and negative aspects. Deutscher leans towards the opposition, Sweezy towards Mao and the Red Guards. But their method is the same, the method of commentators who watch the world being changed but do not want to dirty their hands in helping to change it. This is not our method.

### participants

We are interested in these developments as participants, even though we are not ourselves in China. This is our struggle, and we must understand it precisely in order to intervene, to change the world, and for no other reason.

Despite the difficulty in getting information, we can understand the fundamental social forces involved, if we don't get sidetracked on minor or subsidiary points.

On the one side is the bulk of the party and the state apparatus, the bureaucracy. It is significant that not a single provincial leader of a municipality has come out in support of the Red Guards, and that they have all been criticized by the Red Guards. This is the first fundamental feature of recent events we must grasp, that the Red Guards have been conducting a struggle against the decisive section of the bureaucracy.

What about the other side? It is led, as we know, by Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao. They are almost totally isolated in the Chinese Communist Party. Mao has turned outside the party for support, seeking to mobilize 100 million youth as a weapon in this struggle. This is the second momentous fact about the so-called cultural revolution--the mobilization of masses of youth, 10 million in Peking, for example, and millions in other cities. This is not a demonstration of 10,000 or 20,000 people. It is 100 million youth organized to battle bureaucracy and, as they say, to smash the old world to smithereens.

This is not the first time that the youth have been turned to in the battle against bureaucracy. There is a precedent which Mao is not likely to refer to, and that is Trotsky's struggle against the Soviet bureaucracy. At the time of its initial growth and its consolidation of power, Trotsky also turned to the youth. In 1924, in The New Course, he said:

"The student youth reacts in a particularly vigorous way against bureaucratism. Not for nothing did Lenin propose to draw largely upon the students to combat bureaucracy. By its social composition and its contacts the student youth reflects all the social groups of our party as well as their state of mind... Its youthfulness and its sensitivity prompt it to give an active form immediately to this state of mind. The more pugnacious of the apparatus men are making a great mistake in turning up their noses at the youth. The youth are our means of checking up on ourselves, our substitutes, the future belongs to them."

### Bulletin of International Socialism



editor - Tim Wohlforth

art director - Marty Jonas

circulation - Fred Mueller

Published bi-weekly by the Workers League. The Workers League is in political solidarity with the International Committee of the Fourth International. Editorial offices: Rm. 8, 243 E. 10 St., N.Y. 10003. Midwest Office: Box 14002, University Sta., Minneapolis, Minn. 55414. Western Office: Box 1663, S.F. Calif. 94101.

VOL. 3, NO. 14 (56) MAR. 13, 1967

printed entirely by union labor

Lenin, before his death, was looking to the student youth to battle against the bureaucracy of which Stalin was to become the major representative.

What are the programs of the contending forces in China? This is a bit more difficult to assess, because of the school of Stalinism in which the Chinese have been educated. The contending forces do not fight on clear ideological levels.

We must, however, try to get to the roots of the programmatic differences, understanding that program is not simply a matter of words, that it is reflected in action as well. Let us begin with the Liu-Teng opposition. The Socialist Workers Party and other non-Marxist groupings ask us how we can say that these elements are taking the capitalist road if we don't have their program written out before us.

Yes, of course we would like to see their program, but it might not be that meaningful if we saw it on paper. What they are, not simply what they say, indicates what these forces stand for. The threat of capitalist restoration comes not from what people say, but from the existence of a parasitic bureaucratic caste. The bureaucracy seeks to defend itself. Of course it tries to defend itself with revolutionary phraseology. This is not surprising: the Soviet bureaucracy can only continue to exist by claiming to be Marxist, publishing the works of Lenin, and betraying the working class in practice.

It is only possible to say that the conflict in China is simply an intra-bureaucratic one if one ignores the fact that the overwhelming section of the bureaucracy itself is fighting for its existence against the Red Guards.

As Trotsky pointed out in his analysis of the Soviet Union the essential economic contradiction of the kind of society existing in China today was that alongside socialist productive relations there were unequal bourgeois norms of distribution. The bureaucracy is a compromise between these two forces, which will have to be crushed before long by one or the other. It is in the protection of this stratum from criticism that capitalist restoration is prepared. This is the capitalist road as we see it, and the opposition stands for this road.

What is the program of the Red Guards? Here we have the words, since the Mao faction controls the press. But here too we cannot view these words in abstraction. We must view them not simply as words but in the way they affect millions of people in struggle.

### against bureaucracy

What would you do if your government or a section of it came to you with the statements that Mao has come to the Red Guards with, and mobilized you in the millions? It is clear that this is not simply a matter of words, that the words are turning into action which has a logic of its own.

To quote from an article in the December 23 1966 Peking Review:

"In the course of this great cultural revolution our party has given support to the creativeness of the revolutionary masses and their widespread use of such forms of extended democracy as the free airing of views, putting up big character posters, carrying out great debates and going to other units and places to exchange revolutionary experiences. The masses have the right to criticize and raise suggestions about party and state policies and every aspect of the state apparatus. The masses have the right to criticize leading cadres at all levels no matter how meritorious their service, how high their position, or how senior their qualifications. A system of general elections, like that of the Paris Commune, is introduced without exception for all organs of power leading the cultural revolution. The masses have the power to replace through election or recall any elected member at any time. Without such extensive democracy, without hundreds of millions of people paying attention to state affairs, supervising the organs of the party and the state, and supervising leading cadres at all levels, it is impossible to prevent the usurping of leadership of the party and the state by the counterrevolutionary revisionists."

This is absolutely true, this is the program Lenin and Trotsky fought for their entire lives. The question is not whether the Mao faction means it, but that it is saying it, and 100 million youth def-



BULLETIN EDITOR TIM WOHLFORTH ADDRESSES FIRST M

initely do mean it.

Peking factory workers, at Machine Tool Plant No. 1, stated in a manifesto:

"There has never been a saviour, we depend solely upon ourselves to liberate ourselves... No white terror can frighten us, nor can any sugar-coated bullets topple us. Who cares for their stinking money, we want socialism."

Did Stalin do such things as this? Absolutely not. All he ever mobilized inside the USSR was the secret police. He did not trust the masses, he feared them more than anything else. Stalin did, however, mobilize the masses once, only partially and bureaucratically, and not inside the USSR. It was in Poland and Finland in the beginning of the Second World War.

In some ways that situation was similar to the present one. Then as now there was a tremendous outcry among the liberals, at Stalin's war on Finland. Trotsky fought during the last year of his life for the continued defense of the USSR. He recognized that when the Soviet Union went into Poland and Finland the Red Army was forced to mobilize people in struggle, from on top, but in struggle nevertheless. We appealed then to the masses being mobilized to go beyond their leaders, but we did and do still support the masses in spite of their leadership whenever they are in motion for their own interests.

### cynicism and struggle

There are many so-called socialists who are in reality extremely cynical and worn out people, and who think that people can be turned on and off like a water faucet. They are completely wrong. What they have done is to adopt the Orwellian 1984-type view of the human race. But human beings are not robots, as they have proved time and time again.

We support all kinds of processes started by all kinds of horrible people, as long as these processes are objectively correct and revolutionary. Anyone who doesn't do this is abstaining from real struggle. We have nothing but contempt for this kind of 'radical'.

To quote from what one Red Guard said to the French journalist Karol:

"Things will never be the same again. The party has asked us to criticize our leaders, and to look into the functioning of our institutions. We will never renounce this right."

This is one of the Red Guards speaking, and there are others who agree with him.

The third fundamental feature of the events is their international context. There is a growing accommodation between the USSR and world imperialism, and the Chinese are resisting this alignment.

The latest newspaper headlines announce, "Russia Backs Anti-Mao Rebels". Kosygin says, "The Soviet Union sympathizes with the people who are struggling against the dictatorial regime of Mao

# FIGHT FOR AND WHO THEIR REAL ENEMIES ARE

## Revolution--defend the red guards



...ES FIRST MEETING IN U.S. TO DEFEND 'RED GUARDS.

Tse-tung."

The new international context can be seen most clearly over the war in Vietnam. The Soviet Union has one line, and China has another. The Soviet bureaucracy has been seeking to pressure the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front to go to the bargaining table.

Although it is not always clearcut, the Chinese are definitely resisting imperialism, and the USSR is not. This is the essential fact of world politics which must be understood.

Everything is reversed in the Militant, the newspaper of the SWP. They say nothing of the fact of US-USSR rapprochement against the Chinese Revolution. They constantly hit out instead against the Chinese. They speak of the self-imposed isolation of China. It is all China's fault.

### a strange bloc

The SWP has this in common with Washington and the Kremlin: they all support the opposition against Mao and the Red Guards. A campaign of slander has been let loose in this country. The position of Washington is clear. In a State Department publication, "Problems of Communism", they rave about anarchists and fanatics, against the reasonable men who are just trying to run the country. The SWP actually supports this slander campaign! A common thread runs through the analysis of the Kremlin and of the SWP, and that is a great fear of going to the masses outside the party. Stop attacking the party, they say over and over again. Pravda says:

"Why have non-party youths and schoolchildren been called upon to criticize Communists, to judge the work of party bodies? For what cause was it necessary to replace the lawful agencies of peoples' rule in China and violate the

constitution and elementary principles of legality?"

We expect this drivel from Pravda, this mortal fear of revolution. But what does the Militant say?

"Instead, Mao went outside the party and the Communist League of Youth and hastily called into being a force of an extra-legal character. He hurled them against those sections of the party apparatus which he considered oppositional and therefore unreliable. Wouldn't it have been more democratic to have first tried to convince the party ranks of the correctness of his ideas and the need for an imperative cleansing of the party apparatus under the direct control of the ranks? Why didn't Mao do that if he was primarily concerned with extending democracy?"

The authors of this were once Trotskyists, and they ask us why you don't go about trying to cleanse the Communist Party. What is our assessment of the social character of the CP, in China as well as in the USSR? The CP and the regime are totally bureaucratized. The Trotskyist position, right or wrong, has been that this regime must be completely destroyed by a political revolution. But now the great democrats of the SWP talk about cleansing, about reform. And on these grounds they oppose Mao! This is the way the SWP defends democracy, just as they send telegrams to Mrs. Kennedy, and praise Earl Warren as the voice of reason. We want none of this kind of democracy, in China or here.

Now I must say something about the Spartacist group. In a leaflet they have just issued for a public meeting, they print the headline, "Maoism vs. the Working People". They say nothing about defending the revolution, of course. The Mao-Lin Piao group, it seems, is the main internal enemy. Just as when the American CP says Goldwater is the main danger, this means you're for the other side as the so-called lesser evil. With all sorts of phony disclaimers and qualifications, Spartacist is actually supporting the bureaucratic opposition, along with the SWP and the Kremlin.

Spartacist's method is pure formalism. They completely ignore the major features. In Shanghai, for instance, the surface development is that some workers supported the Liu-Teng group. The reality is that the entrenched bureaucracy has tried with some partial success to buy off the workers. Thus Spartacist sees only the surface appearance, misses the real struggle, and winds up supporting the counterrevolutionary bureaucracy.

There is another aspect to Spartacist's behavior. Spartacist exists within the U.S. There is hysteria now just as there was against the USSR in 1939. Spartacist reacts to this class pressure. With its position Spartacist can say that it is clean, that it doesn't support all these things that all the petty bourgeois liberals are so upset about. Thus a group that begins with revolutionary intentions but unfortunately little else winds up in the enemy camp.

### roots of the crisis

The fourth major feature of the events, as fundamental, is that Mao is attempting to destroy his own creation. Mao's own policies created the monster which is strangling him, but he does fight this strangulation. To say one of these things without saying the other is false and negative. Progressive Labor, for instance, simply eulogizes the creation of the bureaucracy and now it supports the struggle against this bureaucracy. It is not surprising that it is we and not they who are holding meetings in defense of the Red Guards. Recent events must embarrass them precisely because they prove the depth of a crisis that Progressive Labor has maintained did not exist.

Mao cannot face up to the fact that he is fighting his own creation, so he fights in an idealist and distorted fashion. There is a reason why he calls this struggle a cultural revolution. It is viewed as a perpetual struggle against bourgeois ideology to which revolutionaries tend to succumb. Yes, bourgeois ideology does exist but not in the abstract. It is no ghost, no monster, as Mao implies. It has its roots in material reality and the struggle against it is a concrete manifestation of the class struggle.

It is in the state apparatus that capitalist ideology persists. Mao struggles against this, but refuses to recognize its material basis. Thus he has no analysis of the real danger of capitalist restoration which has its roots in Stalinism. Indeed, Mao embraces Stalin, and has not broken from Stalin's line

of socialism in one country and revolution by stages in the colonial countries. The differences of course are also important. Stalin was the gravedigger of revolutions, and indeed tried more than once to bury the revolution that Mao eventually through a combination of circumstances, led to at least partial success.

### fight for the revolution

Finally, what are the essential tasks in China today? First, we must recognize the process, the struggle, and support it regardless and if necessary in spite of, its leadership. This is the test of any professed revolutionist.

Secondly, we say carry this struggle to completion. Criticize all your leaders and carry out the model of the Paris Commune, which includes the right of different working class tendencies to exist.

## Leon Trotsky Writes On Bureaucratic Impulse And Fire Bugs

Trotsky had much to say in "In Defense of Marxism" which is relevant to an understanding of the current struggle in China. Here are just two examples. In writing about the Soviet invasion of Eastern Poland at the beginning of World War II, Trotsky noted that even Stalin was forced to mobilize the masses.

"It is not a question of 'bureaucratic revolution' but only a bureaucratic impulse. To deny this impulse is to deny reality. The popular masses in Western Ukraine and Byelo Russia in any event, felt this impulse, understood its meaning and used it to accomplish a drastic overturn in property relations. A revolutionary party which failed to notice this impulse in time and refused to utilize it would be fit for nothing but the ash can." The ash can is precisely where the SWP and Spartacist belong today!

The fact that bureaucrats may initiate revolutionary action does not mean we entrust revolution to bureaucrats. Trotsky writes of someone who sets a house on fire and then proceeds to rescue five out of its ten inhabitants. Do you give such a chap a medal, he asks? He answers his own question by referring to a soldier in a Victor Hugo novel, This soldier is given a medal and then shot.

Mao was one of the principal initiators of the process of bureaucratization which today threatens to destroy the Chinese revolution. Yes, we recognize the fact that Mao is now seeking at least partially to fight the fire he lit. But we do not entrust the defense of the revolution to Mao. We do not choose a fire-bug to be fire chief.

Thirdly, there must be a complete break with the conception of socialism in one country. China cannot survive in the long run without the spread of the revolution to the advanced countries. We stand for a return to the communist internationalism of Lenin and Trotsky.

This program is not Mao's program. Only the International Committee of the Fourth International and its supporters fight for this program. And unless this program is fought for, the revolution must stop halfway. Even there, of course, things will not be as they were.

Mao has turned on the faucet, so to speak. Do we simply sit around and wonder when he will turn it off? NO! We fight for the life of the revolutionary process, we do not sit and wait for its death.

We applaud every gain, no matter how small, made by the masses, just as in a trade union struggle.

We agree with Mao that struggle is happiness. Every socialist should support the Red Guards in their struggle against bureaucracy. We don't abstain from any fight. We say to the Red Guards, no matter who gets in your way, carry your struggle further.

The future world party of the working class is going to be built only by participating in all of these struggles. HANDS OFF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION! CONDITIONAL SUPPORT TO THE RED GUARDS! FOR THE WORLD PARTY OF SOCIALISM!

### JUST OUT QUESTIONS FACING PROGRESSIVE LABOR 20 cents



BULLETIN PUBLICATIONS, rm 8  
243 E. 10th St. NYC



# THESE PEOPLE ARE FIGHTING FOR AND WHO THEIR REBELS hands off the chinese revolution--defend the red guards

his death, was looking to the struggle against the bureaucracy of the party to become the major representative

programs of the contending forces is a bit more difficult to assess, the school of Stalinism in which the party has been educated. The contending forces are on clear ideological levels.

However, try to get to the roots of the differences, understanding that it is not simply a matter of words, that it is a matter of action as well. Let us begin with the opposition. The Socialist Workers Party and non-Marxist groupings ask us how it is that these elements are taking the capitalist road while we don't have their program written

since we would like to see their program written. It might not be that meaningful if we were to see it. What they are, not simply what they say, but what they do. What they do is to carry out capitalist restoration comes not from the bourgeoisie, but from the existence of a bureaucratic caste. The bureaucracy has created itself. Of course it tries to do so with revolutionary phraseology. This is the case with the Soviet bureaucracy can only be destroyed by claiming to be Marxist, publicizing the works of Lenin, and betraying the masses in practice.

It is possible to say that the conflict in China is not only an intra-bureaucratic one if one recognizes that the overwhelming section of the party itself is fighting for its existence and the Red Guards.

As pointed out in his analysis of the essential economic contradiction in China today was the socialist productive relations there are bourgeois norms of distribution. The bourgeoisie is a compromise between these two which will have to be crushed before the other. It is in the protection of the masses from criticism that capitalist restoration is prepared. This is the capitalist road and the opposition stands for this

program of the Red Guards? Here we see the Red Guards, since the Mao faction controls the party but here too we cannot view these things in isolation. We must view them not only in the way they affect millions but in the way they affect millions in struggle.

## Against bureaucracy

What do you do if your government or a section of it turns against you with the statements that Mao is against the Red Guards with, and mobilized millions? It is clear that this is not a matter of words, that the words are a matter of action which has a logic of its own. From an article in the December 23 issue:

the course of this great cultural revolution has given support to the creation of the revolutionary masses and their use of such forms of extended democracy as the free airing of views, putting up posters, carrying out great demonstrations to other units and places to revolutionary experiences. The masses have the right to criticize and raise suggestions against party and state policies and even against the state apparatus. The masses have the right to criticize leading cadres at any level no matter how meritorious their services, high their position, or how senior their qualifications. A system of general elections for all organs of the party, including that of the Paris Commune, is in fact without exception for all organs of the party in the cultural revolution. The masses have the power to replace through recall any elected member at any time without such extensive democracy, hundreds of millions of people paying attention to state affairs, supervising the work of the party and the state, and supervising cadres at all levels, it is impossible to prevent the usurping of leadership of the state by the counterrevolutionary

It is absolutely true, this is the program Lenin fought for their entire lives. The question is whether the Mao faction means it, or is saying it, and 100 million youth def-



BULLETIN EDITOR TIM WOHLFORTH ADDRESSES FIRST MEETING IN U.S. TO DEFEND 'RED GUARDS.'

initely do mean it.

Peking factory workers, at Machine Tool Plant No. 1, stated in a manifesto:

"There has never been a saviour, we depend solely upon ourselves to liberate ourselves... No white terror can frighten us, nor can any sugar-coated bullets topple us. Who cares for their stinking money, we want socialism."

Did Stalin do such things as this? Absolutely not. All he ever mobilized inside the USSR was the secret police. He did not trust the masses, he feared them more than anything else. Stalin did, however, mobilize the masses once, only partially and bureaucratically, and not inside the USSR. It was in Poland and Finland in the beginning of the Second World War.

In some ways that situation was similar to the present one. Then as now there was a tremendous outcry among the liberals, at Stalin's war on Finland. Trotsky fought during the last year of his life for the continued defense of the USSR. He recognized that when the Soviet Union went into Poland and Finland the Red Army was forced to mobilize people in struggle, from on top, but in struggle nevertheless. We appealed then to the masses being mobilized to go beyond their leaders, but we did and do still support the masses in spite of their leadership whenever they are in motion for their own interests.

## cynicism and struggle

There are many so-called socialists who are in reality extremely cynical and worn out people, and who think that people can be turned on and off like a water faucet. They are completely wrong. What they have done is to adopt the Orwellian 1984-type view of the human race. But human beings are not robots, as they have proved time and time again.

We support all kinds of processes started by all kinds of horrible people, as long as these processes are objectively correct and revolutionary. Anyone who doesn't do this is abstaining from real struggle. We have nothing but contempt for this kind of 'radical'.

To quote from what one Red Guard said to the French journalist Karol:

"Things will never be the same again. The party has asked us to criticize our leaders, and to look into the functioning of our institutions. We will never renounce this right."

This is one of the Red Guards speaking, and there are others who agree with him.

The third fundamental feature of the events is their international context. There is a growing accommodation between the USSR and world imperialism, and the Chinese are resisting this alignment.

The latest newspaper headlines announce, "Russia Backs Anti-Mao Rebels". Kosygin says, "The Soviet Union sympathizes with the people who are struggling against the dictatorial regime of Mao

constitution and elementary democracy?"

We expect this drive from the party out of fear of revolution. But what does

"Instead, Mao went outside the Communist League of Youth and into being a force of an extra party apparatus which he considered and therefore unreliable. He has been more democratic to have convinced the party ranks of the need for an improvement of the party apparatus under the leadership of the ranks? Why didn't Mao primarily concerned with exte-

The authors of this were once asked why you don't go about the Communist Party. What is the social character of the CP, in the USSR? The CP and the bureaucracy. The Trotskyists are wrong, has been that this regime is completely destroyed by a political cleansing, about reform. And they oppose Mao! This is the way to democracy, just as they send Kennedy, and praise Earl Warren for a reason. We want none of this in China or here.

Now I must say something about the group. In a leaflet they have just published, they print the heading "The Working People". They are defending the revolution, of course. The Piao group, it seems, is the main danger, this means the side as the so-called lesser of two evils. Just as when the American CP was the main danger, this means the side as the so-called lesser of two evils. Just as when the American CP was the main danger, this means the side as the so-called lesser of two evils. Just as when the American CP was the main danger, this means the side as the so-called lesser of two evils.

Everything is reversed in the Militant, the newspaper of the SWP. They say nothing of the fact of US-USSR rapprochement against the Chinese Revolution. They constantly hit out instead against the Chinese. They speak of the self-imposed isolation of China. It is all China's fault.

**a strange bloc**

The SWP has this in common with Washington and the Kremlin: they all support the opposition against Mao and the Red Guards. A campaign of slander has been let loose in this country. The position of Washington is clear. In a State Department publication, "Problems of Communism", they rave about anarchists and fanatics, against the reasonable men who are just trying to run the country. The SWP actually supports this slander campaign! A common thread runs through the analysis of the Kremlin and of the SWP, and that is a great fear of going to the masses outside the party. Stop attacking the party, they say over and over again. Pravda says:

"Why have non-party youths and schoolchildren been called upon to criticize Communists, to judge the work of party bodies? For what cause was it necessary to replace the lawful agencies of peoples' rule in China and violate the

## JUST OUT QUESTIONS FACING PROGRESSIVE LABOR 20 cents



BULLETIN PUBLICATIONS, rm 8  
243 E. 10th St. NYC

## roots of the cr

The fourth major feature of the cultural revolution, is that Mao is attempting to create his own monster which is strangling him. Mao's own creation, so he fights it in a distorted fashion. There is a perpetual struggle against bourgeois ideology does exist. It is no ghost, no monolith. It has its roots in materialism. The struggle against it is a concrete class struggle.

It is in the state apparatus that the struggle persists. Mao struggles against the state apparatus to recognize its material basis. The struggle against it is a concrete class struggle. It has its roots in Stalinism. Mao braces Stalin, and has not broke

# INTERNATIONAL Unrest Spreads Through Mexico

(The following report on worker and student struggles was sent to the Bulletin from a correspondent in Mexico. The strike struggles described in the last paragraph are located in several western provinces of the country. The Bulletin hopes to report regularly on the class struggle in Mexico.)

A port workers' strike at Veracruz was prevented by government intervention and a contract signed included a 10% pay increase--9% in base salaries.

## STUDENT MARCH

(Continued from Page 1)

any school into which Main building overflow is crammed; the Annex has been long promised; the Annex has been long delayed.

Today, ignoring their teachers attempts to herd them into a polite file of two-by-two they surrounded City Hall, angrily shouting their demands. It was clear that they are fed up with the vague promises, and the hypocritical claims of poverty, from the Board of Education.

Isn't the education of a working-class kid worth as much as the murder of a Vietnamese peasant? Why is there money enough for the bureaucrats salaries, but not enough to patch the falling plaster in classroom ceilings? These are the questions that students are beginning to face; and, faced with them, are increasingly coming to the realization that they will wait a long, long time indeed if they wait for the men who control the

## TEAMSTERS

(Continued from Page 1)

that power in showdown battles to secure better wages and working conditions for the rank and file. This is not to say that he has not followed a policy of comparatively high wage settlements. However Hoffa has more than once fought side by side with trucking magnates to hold down wages in high wage areas like San Francisco so that he would

Possible nationwide boycotts against price violators (retailers) are being considered by the Labor Congress (includes all labor organizations). Earlier demands by CROC (Revolutionary Confederation of Workers & Farmers) that government inspectors crack down on price violators have gone unheeded.

A second student strike at the National Teachers School took place Jan. 30. A week ago striking students and their teachers occupied the secondary school buildings. The

city purse-strings to better school conditions of their own will. Students must take matters into their own hands and, through their united strength, force action on a rotten City Administration.

### anger

Anger moved more than a thousand students to march on City Hall; their anger was real; their anger was given voice. But anger, by itself, is not enough. Students must unite, unite with their common goals clear before them, and with a clear program for reaching those goals.

The need for a program is obvious. The leaflets distributed at the Seward Park demonstration by REVOLT, a socialist youth organization dedicated to the working-class struggle, contained one. It called for:

Employment of East Side youth, at union wages, for the necessary construction.

Use of existing city money for this needed work.

CITY ACTION NOW!!!

not suffer a loss of prestige as a bargainer in areas where settlements were lower. It is also true that Hoffa's open end grievance procedure exists more as an instrument through which he can exercise single-handed authority and extend his prestige with workers and management alike than as an instrument for the solving of grievances.

### government attack

Legislative efforts by the federal government to check the expansion of teamster power have also driven Hoffa farther away from the rank and file. As trucking corporations found themselves more and more helpless to resist the teamsters' secondary boycotts and other techniques the task of resistance fell to the government. Legislative checks came with Taft-Hartley in 1947 and Landrum-Griffin in 1959. The NLRB and ICC have also forced the Teamsters to choose between open defiance of the law or the adoption of more covert and "sophisticated" tactics. Hoffa's response to this restrictive legislation has never been to mobilize the rank and file in open revolt. Rather he has turned inward to friends in



CAPTION: YES, THE CHILDREN OF SANCHEZ ARE MY RICH RELATIVES IN THE CITY. noticeable change this week was the amount of "outside propaganda" urging stronger demands. Some demands include: removal of some professors, fulfillment of agreements made last year, and non-violation of the students "constitutional rights." Within the last two months

## HONEYWELL

(Continued from Page 1) transfer on production lines, and, most important, either a one year contract (rather than the proposed three years) or an escalator clause. As one worker put it, "without a cost-of-living increase clause no contract is good beyond a year." By the time of the referendum enough workers were convinced to vote against the company-bureaucracy endorsed contract proposal.

The strike call was immediate and so was the company's response--no compromise. In addition Honeywell filed a restraining order against the workers in order to keep the non-union office help working. In the midst of this the dissenters' militancy grew. At its high point they demanded the resignation of all union officials. But at this crucial juncture the major weakness of the dissenters appeared. They were unable to offer an alternative program to lead the rank-and-file. Not sure of the next step they began to waiver. Some of them turned back for

fear of "splitting" the union. Others were threatened with physical violence. And finally the bureaucrats brought in Harold Gibbons, a Teamster international vice-president, to "aid" in negotiations. He and the other negotiators managed to gain one demand (the least expensive to the company)--the right to change production lines at the same pay level rather than at a lower wage as was the previous set up. At the February 11th mass membership meeting (where 8,000 members came, but only 5,000 voted in classic example of bureaucratic-induced confusion) the tract was accepted and the

### program!

During the 11-day strike leadership was left in a vacuum, eventually to fall to the only group with any program -- the bureaucrats. While rank-and-file demands were backed by a willingness to fight, the ingredient necessary for a real victory was missing. This ingredient--a consistent, developed program

for struggle--was what the dissenters, for all their good points, failed to supply. Lack of a correct program is a weakness not only in Local 1145 but throughout the trade unions. The bureaucrats have grown fat off the "boom" years and have become more and more conciliatory to management, while the crisis of international capitalism is everywhere more acute. The escalation of the war in Vietnam, growing inflation, beginnings of large scale layoffs, anti-union legislation are all in the offering for 1967. Only a fulltime struggle for program, beginning with the formation of militant caucuses, will build the strength necessary to defend and advance the workers gains. Honeywell teamsters have already shown their willingness to fight both company and union bureaucracy. Now is the time for them and all others involved in labor's struggle to battle for a concrete understanding and, flowing from that, a correct program for action.

the Democratic and Republican parties. But Hoffa has never mobilized the ranks against the attacks to break the power of the teamsters. One of the most essential roles the IBT could play in the labor struggles of 1967 is to publicly oppose the anti-labor Democratic and Republican parties and call for the formation of a labor party in the United States.

All indicators forecast that 1967 will be a year of major struggle for the American working class. American workers can be expected to rebel against a deteriorating economic situation in which fat corporate profits are skinned off workers' backs while taxes eat bigger chunks out of pay checks to pay for the war in Vietnam. Yet at the very moment labor readies its 1967 offensive many economic indicators point to a downturn in production and possible recession. Corporations faced with the need to hold down labor costs can be expected to raise the cry for federal anti-strike legislation louder than ever before. A national Teamster strike threatening "irreparable

damage to the national interest" could provide Johnson with a convenient occasion to push this legislation through.

Hoffa has long been on record against the idea of a national teamsters' strike. Since it is just Hoffa's talent for manipulating within the law he would hardly welcome an open confrontation with the bosses and government in which his particular talents would be eclipsed in the mobilization of the rank and file. We say this is the year for the teamsters to fight for all their demands, Hoffa or no Hoffa. Rather than balking before government threats the Teamsters should make it clear that they will defy any and all anti-strike legislation the government chooses to pass. The way to defeat the anti-labor drive is to fight it, not retreat before it. If the teamsters do this they can not only win their own demands but will be fulfilling their responsibility as the most powerful union in America to give leadership of the rest of the labor movement which is all too ready to follow the militant lead of the IBT.

## Subscribe Now!

enclosed 50¢ for ten issue introductory sub.

enclosed \$2.00 for full year's sub.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

St. \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Send to: Bulletin of International Socialism, Rm. 8, 243 E. 10 St. NYC 10003. Checks payable to: Bulletin of International Socialism.