

# Abolition Not Reform:

## The Origins of the Police and a World Without Them

*Virginia Rodino unpacks demands to defund the police, arguing that the police are a violent and racist tool of class oppression that cannot be reformed and must be abolished altogether.*

**Socialists argue that the police** are the first line of defense for the ruling class. The first police force in the United States that employed full-time officers paid with public funding was created in Boston in 1838. It is no surprise that at the time, Boston was a large shipping commercial center and business owners felt compelled to protect their property from non-property owners, such as the Irish immigrants who lived in deprivation in the port city.

### Racist Beginnings

During the same time period in the South, police forces were created not for the protection of shipping interests, but for the preservation of the slave system. Slave patrols—organized groups of armed white men—enforced discipline on slaves in the antebellum South, chasing down runaways and quashing slave revolts. The first formal slave patrol was created in North and South Carolina in 1704. After the abolition of slavery, during Reconstruction, the slave patrols were transformed into sheriff's departments, enforcing segregation and disenfranchising freed slaves.

Describing this period, police studies expert at Eastern Kentucky University Victor E. Kappeler writes:

...New England settlers appointed Indian Constables to police Native Americans..., the St. Louis police were founded to protect residents from Native Americans...and many southern police departments began as slave patrols. In 1704, the colony of Carolina developed the nation's first slave patrol. Slave patrols helped to maintain the economic order and to assist the wealthy landowners in recovering and punishing slaves who...were considered property....The similarities between the slave patrols and modern American policing are too salient to dismiss or ignore. Hence, the slave patrol should be considered a forerunner of modern American law enforcement.

### Controlling Unions, Strikes, and Elections

When workers began forming unions to fight for improved working conditions and fair wages, the police served the interests of the factory owners. By the late 1880s, all major U.S. cities had police forces, borne out of fears of the unionizing of large waves of Catholic, Irish, Italian, German, and Eastern European immigrants.

At the same time, the police were used as a tool to wield political power. Olivia B. Waxman notes in a 2017 *Time Magazine* article that “the late 19th century was the era of political machines, so police captains and sergeants for each precinct were often picked by the local political party ward leader, who often owned taverns or ran street gangs that intimidated voters. They then were able to **use police** to harass opponents of that

*(continued page 2)*

### Inside This Issue:

Abolition Not Reform: On the Police.....	page 1
Report from Portland: The Police and the Feds.....	page 2
Mutual Aid Networks: Towards a Constructive Critique.....	page 4
Teachers Resist Push for Unsafe Schools.....	page 6
More articles on Labor and Black Lives Matter, Lebanon, and more, as well as info on meetings, at the Marx21 website.	

particular political party, or provide payoffs for officers to turn a blind eye to allow illegal drinking, gambling, and prostitution.”

Police departments have a 400-year-old history of racism that is built upon the capitalists’ need to **control large, defiant crowds** in order to protect their wealth, property, and position in society. Those in defiance have often been people of color, have often been immigrants, and have always been members of the working class.

### Why not reform?

The police have become increasingly militarized and have been trained to escalate rather than deescalate explosive situations. Because of the militarization of the police, how the police are trained, and who the individuals are who join the **police**, ordinary people need to start to make the decisions about what safety looks like for their communities — we have to end this racist institution.

We are seeing a revolutionary turn in the present movement to defund the police. BLM has moved from trying to make the police “nicer” to taking control of the capitalists’ tool of disciplining us. In his book *The End of Policing*, Vitale (2018) observed that “by conceptualizing the problem of policing as one of inadequate training and professionalization, reformers fail to directly address how the very nature of policing and the legal system serve to maintain and exacerbate racial inequality.... At root, they fail to appreciate that the basic nature of the law and the police, since its earliest origins, is to be a tool for managing inequality and maintaining the status quo. Police reforms that fail to directly address this reality are **doomed to reproduce it.**”

As Brett Grant, director of research and policy for Voices for Racial Justice, a Minneapolis non-profit, explained in a June 2020 *CS Monitor* **interview**, the campaign to defund the police represents

nothing less than a chance to redefine the social contract. “We can’t just focus on the police if we’re talking about addressing systemic oppression and historical racism,” he says. “We have to talk about inequities across society. We need to connect the dots.”

### Defunding is the revolutionary turn we need

Divesting from the police and investing in other social programs that communities want and need is a serious revolutionary step forward, showing ordinary people that they can control the budgets for their states and municipalities and take over state apparatuses. Students on college campuses, parents and teachers in schools, and working families in communities across the country are eliminating one of the most powerful and reactionary institutions on the planet — the militarized U.S. police force. They are proving to themselves

and others that it is possible to take complete control over significant parts of society and that the existence of police is not an innate, unchangeable factor. By empowering ordinary people with the ability to dismantle this racist and corrupt institution, the cracks are forced even wider to reveal how unnatural the entire system is. We are seeing how we can control the wealth we produce.

Police forces are not a natural part of human nature or human society. They were created to protect capitalism. The struggle to abolish them is inseparable from the struggle to build a better socialist world.

We can create a better world without the racist trappings of the old.

#DefundThePolice

#BlackLivesMatter

## Police and Feds: Two cheeks of the same arse (report from Portland)

*Sean Cumming and Bob Bacon report from the frontlines in Portland, Oregon, arguing that the ruling class is divided over how best to quash the ongoing anti-racist rebellion, and that advancing a clear socialist strategy within the movement will be essential in the coming weeks.*

**The world is in crisis**, as is the nation, as is the city of Portland. This crisis is rooted in economic disaster, systemic racism, and the repression and murder by **the police** necessary for the capitalist state to defend itself against a working class that might unify. Yet the capitalist class is divided on how it might best remediate this uprising, and as street protests intensify and young Portland workers become more militant in their insistence for justice, the state has answered with violence.

First, the Portland Police Bureau, with Mayor Ted Wheeler at its head as police commissioner, gassed those who stood for Black lives, and when that failed to crush the movement, the feds were brought in to do the same, and have escalated the violence. While in the past, the local cops would typically wait for the crowd to thin before shooting their gas grenades, the feds have decided to shoot into crowds of thousands, and brutalize those who have come to protect young protesters, such as the now famous Wall of Moms.

Portland has in recent years been the site of many protests against  
*continued page three*

the far right which have at times descended into pitched battles with both police and fascist gangs like Patriot Prayer.

There is a sense amongst the right that Portland is a liberal playground and this city has been an obsession of the right for a number of years. This is of course an inaccurate description of a city that is deeply segregated by race and class, yet it has become a testing ground for the federal government's push to increase the role of the Department of Homeland Security and border police.

These thugs are well-schooled in cruelty, abduction, and intimidation. Many are ex-military, or [mercenaries](#) trained in the US's never-ending wars in the Middle East and elsewhere.

Yet the feds have so far failed, perhaps because they're used to terrorizing isolated immigrants and Muslims, and were not expecting the sustained demand for justice resonating from Portland's streets night after night. Now, the state finds itself in a bind, and the ruling class is split on how best to deal with the triple crisis of protests, pandemic, and economic collapse.

A space has now opened for the working class to imagine how they would run a more just society. This is why the liberals attempt to shift protesters away from



*Protesters resist tear-gas outside Portland's Federal Building*

generalizing about the systematic abuse and systemic racism to specific ideas of identity, personal responsibility, and 'regional community.' They want us to misidentify the source of our oppression and direct our anger toward channels that don't challenge the power of the state.

It is revealing that the young people we spoke to at the protest told us they were radicalized by a connection between the economic situation and the Black Lives Matter protests. In an encouraging sign of the generalization of the struggle, [this weekend](#) will see workers take to the streets in 'defense of Black Lives.' Teachers, cooks, lawyers, medical personnel, the unemployed, gig workers, all sectors of the American working class are mobilizing. That these actions are organized by both official trade

union locals and ordinary rank-and-file workers is a sign that after the July 20 labor actions for Black lives, class is becoming central to the current moment — even if it is not yet acknowledged by its current leaders, or the media. Anti-racism and the fight for Black lives has been part of the labor movement since its beginnings but this shift is a sign of it becoming a central issue to the working class.

These encouraging signs come with a caveat. As the working class rises to demand that Black Lives Matter and to push back against the increasing violence of the state, what is the role of the left? Will spontaneity be enough to overcome the contradictions of capital? Will it be enough to take the streets night after night? How can people exist in a state of perpetual heightened tension and terror from the armed wing of the ruling class?

We believe the argument most lacking is one that places the working class at the center of the movement for change. Ideas of racism, homophobia, transphobia, and sexism are all tied to the exploitation of class society. Racism is class war by the ruling class, and we must fight it. As Marxists we argue that it is the historic role of the working class to build a society that places the needs of all over the drive for profit and exploitation. This is not because the working class is somehow more virtuous but it is by their role as sole creators of all wealth. Ours is the only



*Portland residents stand off against police*

class that can put its shoulders to the wheel and in doing so destroy the machine of capital. In the process the working class has at times in history created alternative organizational structures that challenge those of capital. This goes beyond ideas of autonomy to the idea of a different system of democratic workers' control. We must at once oppose all exploitation and attempt to build the confidence of the working class to fight for this better world.

That is why we point to the lack of organized, democratic leadership in the movement in Portland, or nationally. Good demands have been raised, such as throwing out so-called police unions from the labor movement and defunding the police to reinvest in needed social services, however these are coming mostly from long-term anti-police violence organizations such as Don't Shoot PDX, who are a boon, but not enough. The socialist left is small and scattered.

While some small left groups have been organizing and are deeply involved, there has been a noticeable lack of obvious involvement by the DSA, on paper the largest organization on the left here in Portland (although individual members and some caucuses are deeply involved). There is a trepidation by the left whereby they do not want to 'co-opt' the movement. This has, in most cases, led them to dissolve into it.

This raises the questions: The movement is powerful and growing, but for how long? How can we sustain and deepen the struggle? The first challenge for socialists is to place themselves openly in the struggle, have discussions about how we organize and why, try to build the confidence of organized workers to fight back in every sphere, and be unafraid to debate our politics openly. We must build on the labor actions of July 20, connect the ideas of anti-racism to the failure of the state, to war, to imperialism, and to exploitation.

This requires organization, debate, and a political party that can put forward these ideas and tie them more deeply into the radical struggle. There is a need for clarity on the streets. People are looking for a solution.

The role of socialists is to win people to a vision that goes beyond individual identity, moralism, electoralism, or the dead-end of liberal politics. We must argue to push working class organizations to the center of the movement for liberation, agitate to build bigger and

deeper strikes, and connect the isolated sectors of the working class to the struggle. There is no victory without a long-term, unified anti-racist coalition with deep roots in the working class struggling alongside a political party that can point to viable solutions and is big enough to influence the movement as a whole. We need a party capable of providing a vision beyond liberal capitalism — a vision that demands unreserved justice for Black people and liberation for all.

## Mutual Aid Networks: Toward a Constructive Critique

*Thomas Hummel explores the emergence of mutual aid networks during the COVID-19 pandemic, offering a comradely critique of mutual aid as a political strategy and putting forward socialist alternatives.*

**Mutual aid organizations** have appeared all over the country in response to coronavirus and the economic shutdown. Very often these organizations are vital, keeping people alive and putting food on the table for families that would otherwise go hungry.

Many of the best activists are currently involved in mutual aid work. The extent to which I understand the importance of these organizations is illustrated by my involvement with the one in my neighborhood where I've helped with grocery runs for undocumented immigrants and donated some of my stimulus money to keep the organization going. The organization in my neighborhood has raised over \$30,000 and has delivered food and essential aid to an impressive number of our neighbors.

While these efforts are incredibly important, we cannot forget that they should be unnecessary. Capitalism and the state that supports it are responsible for a

situation in which millions are suffering from privation. In this crisis, the state has been primarily concerned with the maintenance and health of capitalism and has provided only scraps to the vast majority, even as it spends generously to rescue the wealthy.

Mutual aid groups have formed to fill this void left by the state's total disregard for the survival of the most vulnerable.

But since these projects often depend upon us sharing our meager resources, they can be very difficult to maintain. The group in my neighborhood, for example, despite its impressive fundraising, is having difficulty continuing its efforts as new donations dry up. If the left were organized and strong, instead of having to scramble to provide these resources for ourselves, we would be able to apply material pressure and demand them from the state and the wealthy elite that the state protects.

*continued next page*

## Origins of mutual aid

Looking at the origins of mutual aid philosophy is illuminating. Mutual aid derives from the political philosophy of Anarchism. The term “mutual aid” comes from the anarchist Peter Kropotkin’s 1902 book of the same name, which sought to explore how cooperation, what Kropotkin called “mutual aid,” was “a factor in evolution.”

The issue at hand bears some similarity to a debate going back to the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century between Marx and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon. Proudhon was a utopian socialist and the father of modern anarchism. Proudhon believed that a new, post-capitalist society could be created alongside capitalism and slowly grow to the point where it became dominant. This process, he believed, could happen in a decentralized way. Marx, by contrast, judged that the capitalist state would never allow this to happen, and would attempt to destroy and undermine these forms of collective care. He argued that the state must be challenged with a fighting organization of the working class. This organized resistance can put pressure on the state and the wealthy, forcing them to provide resources that ordinary people need. But, for Marx, a better society could only come when our forms of organization were strong enough to directly confront the state and replace it with something better.

What’s at stake today is something similar. While acts of solidarity and mutual aid organizations are extremely important, there are limits to what they can achieve inside capitalist society. Organized solidarity entails not just sharing our limited resources between ourselves, but fighting to take them from the rich, whether directly, or indirectly through political demands on the capitalist state. In order for this to be a political movement, and not just a form of charity, organized acts of solidarity

and demands on the state need to be made in ways that build class consciousness and organization.

Many socialists have taken on the language and strategy of mutual aid wholesale. In doing so they have unconsciously adopted an anarchist theory of social change and the state. The anarchist theory argues that placing demands on the state only recognizes its authority, strengthens it, and weakens the workers’ movement. Revolutionary socialists, by contrast, share the



*mutual aid in progress*

anarchist opposition to the capitalist state, but think the anarchist approach of ignoring or attempting to circumvent the state is wrong. We believe that the organized working class must engage with and make demands upon the state, while avoiding the social democratic trap of working exclusively through the state, and relying on its reforms. Workers can only achieve a better society by building it for ourselves, brick-by-brick, from the bottom up.

For instance, revolutionary socialists, anarchists, and social democrats can work together with tenants in supporting realistic rent strikes during this time of mass unemployment, and mutual defense against evictions—sometimes cited as a form of mutual aid. But it is also a political act to extend

these pressures to demands on the state for a blanket end to evictions, and for rent and mortgage cancellation or moratoriums.

## Mutual aid and class struggle at work

“Occupy Sandy” provides a revealing illustration of the merits and limitations of mutual aid work. During the hurricane, a number of New York activists previously involved with “Occupy Wall Street” organized themselves into “Occupy

Sandy” around a politics of “mutual aid, not charity.” The group was involved in a lot of important work and provided crucial help to people who were impacted by the storm. However, the political distinction between mutual aid and charity was not always clear to those giving or receiving aid. And despite all its impressive efforts, getting the electricity back on and the subways running ultimately depended upon the state. When the crisis ended, the group left no form of organization behind.

The scale of the crisis today is orders of magnitude larger than it was during the hurricane in 2012, and a much larger portion of the working class has been impacted. The government is currently spending trillions of dollars to prop up **banks and corporations**.

Working people, who create all the wealth in society, need to be getting a share of that. We need to develop strategies that not only spread our limited resources around, but reappropriate what the wealthy have taken from us.

Labor unions, where working people are organized and have leverage against the bosses and corporations, are crucial in the battle for wealth redistribution. An **illustrative example** comes from the experience of workers in the airline industry. The recent bailout provided the industry with \$75 billion. When workers learned this was happening, they organized to ensure that this money would go to help workers and their families get through the crisis. The Flight Attendants Association, led by Sara Nelson, was able to force the airlines into setting aside \$29 billion for their workers. This will help pay salaries through the end of September. In a commendable display of solidarity, the union fought for a portion of this aid to go to airport workers as well. The airline workers displayed a willingness to use their power to secure what they needed from their employers. More

union actions like this—especially if they were to include greater direct involvement from rank-and-file airline workers—could not only win important material gains, but would also strengthen working class self-organization for future battles against the state and corporations.

### **Combative social movements will get us the goods**

In order to be effective, resistance cannot be the province of a revolutionary minority alone. Since capitalism is creative to the same degree that it is destructive, it tends to breed resistance among people of all walks of life — revolutionary and non-revolutionary alike. It is the role of revolutionaries not to take over these movements, but to intervene and fight alongside those affected in order to win them over to revolutionary politics. Mutual aid networks can be a starting point for people who are radicalizing, but they are most effective when connected to wider movements for change, not seen as an end unto themselves.

We need to build social movements that strive not only to redis-

tribute the few resources available to us, but which also work to reappropriate from the rich the wealth they have taken from us. These movements can translate material pressure into material resources for the majority. They can secure concessions such as Medicare-for-all and the inclusion of the undocumented in government aid programs. Bernie Sanders had proposed \$2,000 per month for everyone for the duration of the crisis. This is a proposal that combative mass social movements could have the power to actually secure.

Organization, defined as mass involvement, solidarity, and unity-in-action toward a common goal, is the only tool that can give us enough power to take on capital and the state. Without it, we risk just papering over the cracks in capitalism.

Only with this tool can we move toward a society based not upon mindless profit for a few, but upon meeting the needs of all. This will allow us to eliminate the conditions that make mutual aid groups necessary, and construct a society based upon solidarity.

## **“So Many Questions Still Unanswered”: Why NYC Schools Should Not Reopen in the Fall**

*New York educator Emily Helen explains what is at stake as the new school year approaches, arguing that there is no safe way to reopen schools during the pandemic—and teachers are ready to fight.*

**2020 has certainly been a year of changes** and disruptions for all of us. One of the foremost shifts for NYC students, parents, administrators, and union activists was the move in March to remote learning. As September fast approaches, one question looms: Will children and teachers be returning to school?

The question of whether in-person classes will or even should resume rages across the country. In Florida, which is currently

besieged by Covid-19 after the governor refused to take preventative action against the pandemic, **the teachers’ union has sued the state** to stop an emergency order that would require schools to open with in-person instruction in August. Some school districts in California and Texas have decided that it is unsafe to reopen this month and plan to take precautionary measures by keeping learning remote. On a federal level, Trump

has **threatened funding** for any schools that do not fully reopen for in-person learning, and liberal and conservative media alike have consistently wrung their hands about how not reopening schools is a **“threat to business.”** Childcare, many opine, must be provided so that parents can go to work and stimulate the suffering national economy.

At the writing of this article, no formal decision has been made

about whether or not NYC students and teachers will find themselves back in the classroom in the fall. Though NYC effectively drove down Covid-19 cases and deaths between March and July — in which some 22,000 people died from the disease — a few hundred new Covid-19 cases are still being recorded daily. The virus, though nowhere near the presence it was in earlier months, lingers, creating very real concerns about the health and safety of the 1,100,000 children and 75,000 teachers who would be returning to schools should they reopen — as well as the millions who live in NYC and would be affected by a school-originating second wave of the virus.

that a majority of parents were comfortable with returning to schools, when in reality the number was 28%. Yet, the city has pushed forward tenuous initiatives. Principals have been asked to put together committees to plan a reopening of schools using a blended model, in which students come into schools in small groups 1-2 days a week and do the rest of their learning remotely. Parents have also been given the opportunity to opt out of in-school learning for a 100% remote model on a DOE **survey**, though the survey also states that if a parent does not fill out the survey, it will default to blended learning. Despite all the talk of gathering data and waiting to make

stated, falls on the mayor, not the DOE. Mulgrew also made clear that after the city's delayed closure of schools in March in response to the very clear threat of the pandemic (which led to the illness and deaths of many teachers and students' family members) has left the union and teachers with "no trust, no faith." The union is working closely with the DOE on issues of safety and instructional protocol, Mulgrew assured us, but he himself consistently came back around to the fundamental uncertainty of the moment: "so many questions still unanswered."

As of August, 3000 teachers who qualify for **one of eight medical conditions** have applied for accommodations to do fully remote teaching in September. For the rest of us, our futures are unclear. Is it truly safe to have any number of students or staff in a building, even at one-third or one-fourth capacity? Will students and staff be tested before schools open? Will they be tested regularly while schools are open? Will taking students' temperatures at the beginning of each school day truly be an accurate measure of risk? Will all public schools really be able to hire contact tracers and nurses? How will we enforce social distancing or wearing masks? What happens if a teacher or a student tests positive? What about the many old and poorly ventilated school buildings in NYC? Ventilation and air flow have become key to the debate in opening schools as they play a major part in the transmission of Covid-19. Even with a change in filters and assurances of nightly "deep cleaning," many NYC schools still could not have adequate ventilation to pass a safety test — not to mention the lack of funds to support the realization of these plans.

On an instructional level, further questions abound: If we use a blended learning model, how will teachers coordinate their efforts between in-person instruction and remote instruction? If each section



*New York teachers march against unsafe openings with DOE guillotine*

So, what is going to happen? This is a very complex question with a complex and ever-changing response. On a city level, Mayor Bill de Blasio and NYC Schools Chancellor of Education Richard Carranza have stated that an official decision will be made closer to the end of August, after months of monitoring Covid-19 in the city and evaluating data from students, teachers, and parents. At the end of June, staff and parents were asked to share their comfort level with returning to schools in a survey whose results were later grossly misquoted by de Blasio, who stated

a decision, the undercurrent from the mayor's office is clear: Schools should and will reopen. When Stuyvesant High School prepared a fully remote reopening plan, it was flatly **rejected**.

In a United Federation of Teachers Town Hall phone meeting on July 21, UFT president Michael Mulgrew addressed NYC teachers' growing concerns about what will happen in September: First, he stated, he has made clear to de Blasio that teachers are not babysitters and that schools cannot reopen simply to provide childcare services. That responsibility, he

of students is split into 3 – 4 sections and each of those sections must come in for in-person instruction separately one day a week while also completing remote work the other four days of the school week, what are the best instructional practices to ensure success for all students? Is it possible for teachers to provide this instruction within a blended model without elongating work days or taking away prep periods, protections ensured by the UFT’s legally binding contract with the city? If a large number of parents at the school opt-out of in-person learning, how will teachers coordinate efforts to teach some students fully remotely and others in a blended environment? What platform will schools be using for remote learning — and when will teachers get access to it to begin planning their curricula? Will state tests return, including the Regents, necessary for graduation from high school? How will state curricula be amended to accommodate for the slower pace of remote learning? What is a “year’s growth” using a remote or blended-learning model? How will special education and ENL teachers provide adequate support for their students? Should certain populations come into school more often?

All of these questions and their proposed solutions only lead to more questions. As an ENL (English as a New Language) teacher on the instructional sub-committee for reopening at my school, I have continuously raised concerns about my English Language Learners and their distinct linguistic and pedagogical needs, but have often felt overwhelmed by how one proposed solution about in-person learning leads

to another problem. For example, say that we decide that it would be better for ELLs (English Language Learners) to have more access to the building to receive one-on-one help from teachers. As we are required to wear masks, ELLs—even in this “preferable” situation of increased in-person teacher support—would face another problem: the loss of being able to read teachers’ and other students’ lips, one of their greatest tools for understanding a new language. A friend who teaches English in South Korea confirmed to me that this has been a huge issue for her students. Is it truly fair to ask these students to learn a new language through a mask?

At the center of all these questions lives another enormous question: Should we, the NYC teachers, fight this push to return to schools? Should we take up the mantle of the Floridian teachers and sue? Is it time to strike? Groups such as the MORE caucus have called openly for a NYC teacher strike and have been providing training for teachers on how to organize at their individual schools. Other sources have even called for a nationwide teacher strike, the rationale being that if we, the teachers, do not take matters into our own hands, our students, our coworkers, and all of our families will be put in jeopardy by politicians who care more about a return to business-as-usual than our lives. A meme much-circulated on teacher Twitter and Instagram states, “1995: There are six inches of snow. School is cancelled. 2020: There’s a global pandemic that will kill some of your parents and teachers and a few of you. Don’t miss the bus.” Though hyperbolic, the sentiment is clear: Students and

staff are not frontline workers. Why are we being put at risk? If teachers’ usage of PPE is having to be considered “as if in a hospital setting” (as Mulgrew stated in the Town Hall) is this not adequate evidence that schools should not be reopened? Why is the city creating a hospital setting unnecessarily and jeopardizing the lives of its teachers, students, and families when the resources are available to continue remote learning, a much safer (if still complicated) option? The truth is that the push to return to school is less for the benefit of children than it is part of a concerted effort to get their parents back to work. Once schools are reopened, there will be little to stop the momentum into business as usual, and those millions of workers who have safely managed their jobs from home will have no choice but to return to work, safe or not.

It is well known that the UFT is not a union to be trifled with, and by all means Mulgrew has indicated that it will stand by its members. In a question we’d all been waiting to hear answered in the Town Hall meeting, a teacher asked Mulgrew what will happen at the end of August if the DOE demands that students and teachers return to schools for in-person instruction and the UFT does not believe this to be a safe option. Mulgrew paused for a moment before responding: “We are preparing to do whatever we need to do,” he said. “That’s all I’m going to say on this call.” As one of many thousands of NYC teachers, I say this: Should de Blasio demand an unsafe return to schools, we’ll see you in the streets.

**Marx21 is an organization of revolutionary socialists across the United States. We stand in the tradition of socialism from below: the idea that workers can only emancipate themselves through their own struggles.**

**Marx21 is connected to other like-minded socialist groups around the world in the International Socialist Tendency.**

**Visit our website to learn more and get involved.**



See our website for updates and more articles on Labor & Black Lives Matter, Pride, Belarus, Lebanon, and more.

