

## NEAR EAST:

# Turn the National War into Class War!

For the fourth time in the last quarter century, national war has broken out in the Near East between Israel and the surrounding Arab states, representing yet another tragic defeat for the Hebrew- and Arab-speaking workers and peasants of the region. The concern of the bourgeois press over who fired the first shot, or who really started the fighting, is of no consequence. Whatever the particular sequence of events, this is essentially a continuation of the 1967 war, a conflict between the chauvinist, expansionist appetites of the Israeli and Arab bourgeoisies. In such circumstances the only principled Leninist position is the call for revolutionary defeatism on both sides: the working masses can have no stake in the victory of either side in this reactionary war.

Marxists will certainly have no subjective sympathy for Israel, the victors in 1967, in the current war. The willfully oppressive Zionism which has gorged itself on the blood, lands and labor of the Arab Palestinians it conquered in 1948 and 1967 must be finished with for all time. The Jewish-exclusivist "Law of Return," the second-class citizenship for Arabs in Israel, the brutal expulsions of West Bank Arabs from their homes and lands, the super-exploitation of Arab labor must be ended. Israel must leave the territories occupied in 1967 and the

Palestinian Arabs must be able to exercise the right to self-determination and to live in their homeland.

The Spartacist League supports the right of the Hebrew-speaking population of present-day Israel to self-determination. At the same time we are irreconcilably opposed to Zionism. Recognizing that it is the Arab populations of the Near East—in particular the homeless Palestinian Arabs, driven from their lands by a triumphant and arrogant Zionist state—that have borne the brunt of national oppression in the past period, we are prepared to militarily defend a struggle for self-determination for the Palestinian Arabs (even if it were temporarily under the leadership of petty-bourgeois radical nationalist forces, such as the Jordanian rebels brutally crushed by Hussein in 1970).

But so long as the Arab and Israeli states continue to be dominated by bourgeois regimes, oppressed peoples such as the Palestinian Arabs will be used as pawns and their absolutely just democratic demands will be subordinated to repeated national wars. The reactionary militarist Arab regimes are interested only in their own aggrandizement, and their victory in a conflict against Israel could result only in a repetition of the same chauvinist atrocities by the new victors. The brutal oppression of the Kurdish people in Iraq by the dominant Arab majority, and the geno-



Israeli tanks heading for the front.

UPI

cidal campaign against the blacks of southern Sudan, show yet again that national oppression cannot be ended until national chauvinism itself is uprooted by the united class-conscious proletariat of the Near East. Arab nationalism, the ideological means by which reactionary petty-bourgeois, bourgeois and feudal rulers keep a stranglehold on the Arab workers and peasants, is no more "progressive" than Hebrew nationalism—Zionism.

To be sure, Israel is a client state of the U.S. while Egypt and Syria are

currently in the USSR's diplomatic orbit. Should the U.S. become decisively involved in attempted imperialist conquest of the Arab nations, or should the USSR's involvement call into question the defense of the USSR itself, Marxists would be compelled to modify this stand, recognizing that the conflicting national appetites of the Israeli and Arab ruling classes were no longer the decisive element.

Turn the National War into Class War! Toward a Near East Socialist Federation! For National Liberation through the Permanent Revolution!

# U.S./USSR Summer Détente Cools

After all his clowning, embracing of Chuck Connors and attempting to make himself likeable to the American people, General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev must be feeling frustrated and angry. Since his visit to the U.S. in June, anti-Soviet sentiment has increased steadily both within the ruling class and throughout American society.

Taken together, the now-certain passage of the Jackson Amendment (making tariff cuts conditional upon the elimination of all Soviet emigration restrictions), the two-year acceleration of the Trident missile-launching submarine program, the defeat of the Mansfield Amendment for U.S. troop cuts in Western Europe and a large increase in the arms budget mark a sharp retreat from the Nixon-Brezhnev

détente. With his usual contempt for Congress and the rest of the ruling class, Nixon is pushing ahead with his détente. However, the advocates of a harder line against the Russians are turning this into a popular issue against Nixon.

If Brezhnev could indeed understand Marxism, as he occasionally claims to, his frustration at the short life of the détente would be tempered by comprehension of the implacable hostility of U.S. imperialism to the Soviet state.

## Sakharov/Jackson vs. Brezhnev/Nixon

The apparent enthusiasm of the American ruling class for the Nixon-Brezhnev détente earlier this year re-

flected the intersection of several distinct political currents and interests. An important interest group pushing for the détente were those businessmen, like David Rockefeller and Armand Hammer of Occidental Petroleum, who were in a position to rake in sizeable profits through trade deals and construction/management contracts. The Nixon administration itself saw an opportunity to trade economic and diplomatic concessions (e.g., the recognition of East Germany) for certain pro-American actions in Soviet foreign policy, particularly in Indochina and the Middle East.

The most reluctant supporters of the détente were the cold-war liberals concentrated in the Meany-Humphrey-Jackson wing of the Democratic Party. They were temporarily won to supporting Nixon by the argument that increased economic relations would lead to the bourgeoisification of Soviet society and the strengthening of unambiguously pro-Western tendencies.

In the long run, it is indeed true that the massive involvement of U.S. capitalism in the Soviet political economy would generate consciously pro-imperialist, bourgeois-restorationist political groupings. However, the Brezhnev regime believed it could get what it wanted out of Nixon without relaxing its absolutist political control. From Brezhnev's side, the détente was deliberately combined with a campaign of intensified internal repression symbolized by the elevation of secret-police head Andropov to the Politburo

of the Communist Party in June and the classic Stalin-type frame-up trial of liberal dissidents Yakir and Krasin early last month.

For Nixon and Kissinger the détente was another of their endless diplomatic maneuvers, specifically designed to get the Kremlin to strengthen the U.S. in certain troublesome areas in the imperialist domains. And from Nixon's point of view, Brezhnev has kept his side of the bargain. Difficult as the task is, the Soviet bureaucracy has really tried to keep Indochina in the "Free World." The Brezhnev regime helped pressure the North Vietnamese to sign the peace treaty which legitimized the Thieu regime in Saigon and U.S. financial and military support to its reactionary puppets.

Soviet diplomats collaborated closely with the U.S. to set up yet another "neutralist" Laotian government headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma, despite the overwhelming military advantage of the Pathet Lao. And most grossly, Brezhnev's government continues to recognize the mayor of the besieged city of Phnom Penh, Lon Nol, as the legitimate Cambodian head of state, although the Khmer Rouge controls the rest of the country.

The outcome of the revolutionary civil wars raging in Indochina has not yet been determined. However, should capitalism be overthrown in the region, it will be despite the best efforts of the Brezhnev regime to preserve it. For Nixon and company, the fate of

continued on page 5

## FARM WORKERS' UNION:

# Meany/Chavez Abandon Strike

PAGE 2





## Farm Workers Weary of Pacifist Protest as...

# Meany/Chavez Abandon Strike, Turn to Boycott

After almost a decade of organizing and struggle, the United Farmworkers Union (UFW) has been hurled back onto its home base, the grape fields, by the attack of the grower-Teamster alliance, during the 1973 harvest season. In contrast to the misty-eyed optimism of the maturing Chavez bureaucracy—"Sure the Teamsters have our contracts but we still have the people" (*El Malcriado*, 21 September)—militants seriously committed to the unionization of agricultural workers must consider soberly, in terms of its real impact on the class struggle in the fields, the UFW's drop from 70,000 dues-paying members in 1972 to a union with only 10 contracts covering 18,000 workers in California and Florida. It should not be forgotten that since the beginning of the century two other attempts at farm-worker unionization have already been smashed. Despite the reported pact between the UFW and Teamsters, based on Chavez' capitulation to Meany and the growers, the very existence of the United Farmworkers is still threatened. A union cannot survive on pious wishes; it must be victorious in class battles.

At the close of the picking season, the critical fact is that the UFW failed to halt production. With his policy of calling on the scabs to leave the fields with peaceful picketing, appeals to liberals and the moral protest of submitting to arrest and "filling the jails," Chavez claims only to have hurt the growers to the point that they are all losing some money on the crop. In fact it is a monumental defeat for farm workers that they are now forced—by their leadership's failure to win the strike through united labor action—to scatter themselves across the country in an attempt to reach virtually the entire population at innumerable store fronts and convince them, one by one, not to buy scab products!

In the present situation, while the Spartacist League politically opposes the adoption of the boycott strategy in place of a militant strike strategy, it stands in solidarity with the farm workers against the capitalist retailers who continue to stock scab products in their stores.

The present boycott is a direct result of the Chavez bureaucracy's refusal to lead a militant struggle during the strike. Militant mass picketing should have been combined with organized, armed self-defense and real attempts to prevent scabs from entering the fields. The only meaningful "boycott" is the prevention of scab products from reaching the market through the "hot-cargo" (refusal-to-handle) tactic on the part of the transport unions. Appeals to longshoremen, teamsters and cannery workers to link up their struggles with the farm workers by refusing to process, handle or move scab products would have met with favorable response: all these workers were themselves on strike at various points during the critical picketing period. Instead, the Chavez leadership, capitulating to pressure from the AFL-CIO, served as the ultimately most important ally of the growers by enforcing an impotent, pacifist policy and refusing to call for any of these militant measures, since they are "illegal" under grower-capitalist laws! Instead of fighting, Chavez cowers before the power and authority of the ruling class, to whose every attack he responds with a retreat. When two farm worker pickets were killed and others shot in Kern and Tulare Counties by cops and company gunmen in August, Chavez halted all picketing "until the federal government guarantees ade-



quate protection" (*El Malcriado*, 21 September).

In fact it was the Chavez leadership's sellout of the strike against the Teamsters' attempts to smash the UFW in the Salinas Valley lettuce fields which invited the Teamster-grower attack of 1973 (see WV No. 23, 22 June 1973). While the Teamsters, after signing sweetheart contracts with the growers, did "back down" and sign a jurisdictional agreement favoring the UFW, these contracts remain in force and are defended by the growers against the UFW. Chavez abandoned the Salinas strike, resorting instead to an impotent lettuce boycott.

Now the same pattern is being repeated. The UFW and Teamsters have recently announced an "agreement in principle," terms of which are still under negotiation. But the Teamster contracts will probably remain in force. In any event, the Teamsters' hired goons and sweetheart contracts, in freezing out the UFW at the critical point, have served their purpose. Most alarming of all, in an attempt to render the UFW more palatable to the growers, Chavez has expressed willingness to compromise away the hard-won union hiring hall in favor of "joint" union-management control of hiring. It was replacement of the hated contract labor system with the union hiring hall which constituted the chief gain of the UFW contracts.

### Class-Struggle Program From Militant Action Caucus and SL/RCY

The failure to conduct a militant strike strategy has not been for any lack of expressed support for the farm workers or for militant policies by California labor. A "caravan to Delano" organized by the Los Angeles AFL-CIO drew 600 workers to a rally in Delano September 8. The rally was addressed by representatives of organizations that had collected money for the farm workers, as well as by Chavez and other leaders. Jane Margolis, a former executive board member of CWA Local 9415 (Oakland, California) and a spokesman

for the Militant Action Caucus, an opposition group based on a class-struggle program, addressed the rally for MAC. In a rousing speech, she called for labor solidarity throughout the state, for hot-cargoing of scab products and for a general strike of California labor to defend the farm workers, reading a support resolution with these points which the MAC had prepared for introduction at the next 9415 local meeting. Cheering and applauding workers greeted her with an ovation.

Among the ostensibly left organizations the Spartacist League and Revolutionary Communist Youth have alone combined militant defense of the farm workers' struggle with a class-struggle policy in sharp counterposition to the Chavez leadership's sellout pacifist defeatism. Afl others—Communist Party, Socialist Workers Party, International Socialists—have been groveling before the UFW leadership, so as to appear "militant" in defense of farm workers while in reality talking alter whatever is popular like a bunch of gutless liberals. SL/RCY members have thus been the target of considerable red-baiting and harassment from UFW bureaucrats clearly worried by the evident approval our slogans receive from the workers and even some lower-level union leaders. But the UFW bureaucrats are not alone—they are abetted by supposed "revolutionists" whose whole policy is one of subservience to the union's existing reformist leadership. Chief among these is the Maoist Revolutionary Union (RU).

On 9 September about 40 SL/RCY supporters arrived at 6 a.m. to join a picket in Livingston, home of the rich Gallo vineyards. Despite the presence of a small army of thugs hired to "guard" the fields, Livingston was one of the last strongholds of mass picketing and confrontation. The SL carried bilingual signs reading: "Defend the UFW—Teamsters out of the Fields!", "Expropriate the Fields Under Workers Control!" and "Militant Defense of the UFW Picket Lines!" These slogans were well received and our chant, "Viva la huelga, la huelga general!" evoked real enthusiasm

among the farm workers.

When several bus loads of RU supporters arrived at the picket line at 10:30, they then joined the farm workers in chanting "Viva la huelga general!"...until they realized that the chant had been initiated by the SL/RCY contingent! The RU tails after any program it thinks the bureaucracy supports—even to the point of *accidentally* supporting a class-struggle slogan! At one point during the picket, the RU-led contingent stopped the whole line to shout such epithets as "you don't do anything to support farm workers!", thereby exposing the entire picket line to attack from the police. The RU ended up picketing on the other side of the road from the SL/RCY and the farm workers.

The September 9 Livingston action was typical of many throughout the state. After the picketing, SL speakers addressed the workers in Spanish, attracting interested crowds of 20-30 workers. But from the official podium came a vicious stream of red-baiting, not naming the SL directly, but referring to "outsiders," "disrupters," etc. This was then picked up by the RU supporters mingling in the crowd with talk of "patrones" (bosses) and "Teamster provocateurs." It is in this way that the false leaderships of the workers—reformist trade-union bureaucrats and Stalinists—respond to the expression of revolutionary politics, since they have only defeatism and reformist bankruptcy to counterpose as a strategy.

The SL/RCY have been able to distribute their literature and put forward their ideas in the face of red-baiting and harassment only because of the direct intervention of farm workers themselves in our behalf. The RU, though intimidated, becomes increasingly frenzied at this because it assumes that those like themselves who demonstrate their willingness to sell out—to tail the established leadership and serve as its unquestioning supporters—should be rewarded with popularity and influence, while those like the SL/RCY who oppose the bureaucrats' policies of betrayal are disrupters whom the workers ought instantly to reject. The evident popularity of a revolutionary line, despite the preaching of the bureaucracy, only drives the RU and other tailists to frustration and hysteria.

### Meany/Chavez Consolidate Grip at UFW Convention

The first constitutional convention of the UFW, held in Fresno 21-23 September marked an important step in the long transformation of the UFW from a loose-knit "movement" union into a standard AFL-CIO business union. The purpose of the convention was to consolidate the control of Meany over the union, through elimination of local autonomy, consolidation of the bureaucratic leadership around Chavez and formalization of the already firmly established boycott strategy as an alternative to militant strike struggle. (This is undoubtedly pleasing to the conservative Meany who has been saying for years that strikes are "outmoded.") With the lack of a class-struggle opposition caucus in the union, the road is now open for a Meany-Chavez-Fitzsimmons deal to accommodate the growers and sell out the farm workers.

The convention revealed the continuing adaptation of the liberal-radical Chavez clique to Meanyite business unionism in its handling of the critical question of non-citizen labor. In the official Convention Call, Chavez had whined, "The Immigration Department allows the growers to use illegal aliens to break our strikes." Thus instead of calling for open borders and international class struggle to raise the living conditions of Mexican workers now barely surviving at near-starvation levels, Chavez calls on the imperialist U.S. government, devourer of scab grapes, to shake a finger at the nasty growers for using illegal strikebreakers and to increase deportations of Mexican nationals!

The convention was from the be-



gining a tight, bureaucratic operation to ram through the policy decisions already agreed upon by the Chavez core leadership and George Meany. Several times on the first day a few delegates attempted to slow down the passage of convention rules in order to allow time for discussion, but this was no obstacle to the Chavez steamroller. Representation was highly discriminatory against large units. Worse, introduction of a resolution at the convention required the signatures of 25 delegates, a provision more restrictive than those of many more conservative unions. Discussion on the articles of the constitution was bureaucratically cut short to allow plenty of time for guest speakers: Woodcock from the UAW, Paul Hall from the SIU and Senator Edward Kennedy of the Democratic Party.

## Chavez Bares Anti-Communist Face

The adopted constitution demanded that all members "reject the use of violence in any form for any purpose whatsoever." But not surprisingly, this humble submission is aimed strictly one way: toward the bourgeoisie. Every ostensibly Marxist organization which tried in any way to disseminate its views, as through the legal distribution of literature, was threatened by a heavy squad of UFW goons! The red baiting began with an attack on the International Socialists' *Workers' Power*, which had dared to make a timid criticism of Chavez from the left. A delegate moved to expel "all newsmen distributing anti-UFW literature," pointing to someone at the rear of the hall. Chavez immediately took the podium and ordered the removal of the person, who had not been distributing anything but had merely been seen with the IS salesmen. He was immediately descended on by over a dozen goons and pushed out. Later, *Workers Vanguard* reporters were also excluded. "The press is supposed to be impartial, at least while they're here," noted Chavez; but the bourgeois dailies were allowed to remain undisturbed, with no attempt to determine their "impartiality" toward labor!

The next day (Saturday) the witch-hunt was stepped up to make the convention "clean" for the all-important guest speakers. Literature tables outside the hall were ordered removed by UFW officials and police working together: first the Spartacist League, then the Socialist Workers Party, finally the Workers League. UFW goons patrolled the mall throughout the day trying to drive off all left-wing salesmen.

## Fake Left Grovelling

The response of the left to this red-baiting, bureaucratic convention was

## WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Bi-weekly of the Spartacist League

### Editorial Board:

Liz Gordon (chairman)  
Jan Norden (managing editor)  
Chris Knox (labor editor)  
Karen Allen (production manager)  
Joseph Seymour

Circulation Manager: Anne Kelley

West Coast Editor: Mark Small  
New England Editor: George Foster  
Southern Editor: Joe Vetter  
Midwest Editor: David Reynolds

Published by the Spartacist Publishing Company, Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001. Telephone: 925-8234.

Opinions expressed in signed articles or letters do not necessarily express the editorial viewpoint.

predictably more of the same disgusting opportunism. Of the CP and RU, of course, nothing need be said. To groups whose view of the world depends on the myopic vision of the Soviet and Chinese ruling bureaucracies respectively, the UFW is the height of "progressive" bureaucracy and a vital link to alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie. Likewise, the Maoist October League turns defeats into victories through the magic of tallism: "the grower-Teamster alliance may have run into its Waterloo" (*The Call*, September 1973).

The philistine, ex-Trotskyist SWP is not to be outdone by the Stalinists. Well-practiced in talling every form of liberal, nationalist and petty-bourgeois protest politics including, on occasion, capitulation to the Democratic Party, the SWP makes no mention of even its own exclusion at the hands of the UFW goons at the convention, nor does it raise the slightest criticism of Chavez. Neatly separated from the rest of its report on the convention, the *Militant* (5 October) attacks Kennedy—gently—for "evasiveness." The SWP has been head-over-heels in love with every pacifist sellout by Chavez, underlining its own complete abandonment of any trace of working-class politics by enthusiastically contributing arguments to support such betrayals as the boycott "strategy." (The 5 October *Militant* wrote that "the Company [Gallo Wine] is highly susceptible to a well-organized boycott of its products." Not mentioned is that the lettuce boycott was a failure, and the last grape boycott lasted five years!)

## Bridges' Hypocrisy

Perhaps the most disgusting bureaucratic role during the farm workers' struggle, in addition to that of Fitzsimmons, Meany and Chavez, has been the betrayal of the Bridges bureaucracy of the ILWU. Long-time "friends" of the farm workers, this Stalinist-backed "leadership" managed by a close margin to prevent any direct criticism of the Teamsters at the Longshoremen's convention last Spring in order to protect its chummy relations with the Teamsters warehouse division during contract negotiations (see *WV* No. 22, 8 June 1973).

Now that the picking season and the longshore/warehouse contracts are safely in the background, the Bridges bureaucracy is making a few proforma noises about militancy in defense of the farm workers and "rift" with the Teamsters. On the last day of the UFW convention, Jimmy Herman of ILWU Local 34 announced, "our union is committed now to take another look, the law notwithstanding, at what we have to do to stop the grapes on those boats in some manner, shape or form" (*San Francisco Chronicle*, 24 September). Fine words for the farm workers' ears! But back home in the ILWU, the union leadership has consistently opposed any moves to hot cargo grapes—an action which would open the way for a state-wide labor offensive which could actually win the strike.

As Chavez' ties to the reactionary labor bureaucracy and the ruling-class Democratic Party are strengthened through sellouts and compromises of the interests of farm workers, the need for a revolutionary leadership that will represent the independent interests of the workers in the UFW and the labor movement as a whole takes on increasing urgency. More than ever, the lessons of the last round of struggle show that Chavez must be replaced by a revolutionary leadership based on a program that will win not merely the right to existence for the UFW but lasting gains for the working class internationally. As long as the leadership of working-class organizations limits the struggle to what is acceptable within the bounds of capitalism, workers will again see the gains of patient years of courageous struggle reversed in a matter of weeks. ■

# Defend Chile, Vietnam Class-War Prisoners

As the reactionary junta which seized power in a coup last September 11 continues to consolidate its power, the situation of Chilean workers grows even more desperate. Even the bourgeois press now confirms that more than 5,000 workers and labor leaders have been massacred during the first two weeks since the overthrow of the Popular Unity (UP) government headed by Salvador Allende. (Unofficial reports place the figure at roughly 20,000.) Mass executions are taking place daily in the National Stadium, where thousands of workers and Latin American leftist political exiles are being held. Meanwhile the air force has bombed factories and workers' districts in the Santiago area and army troops are besieging several of the copper mines. The popular-front Allende government—more fearful of the independent power of an aroused proletariat than of the forces of bourgeois reaction—allowed the workers to remain unarmed and defenseless against the bloodbath now occurring. And the worst may be still to come.

In the face of this murderous attack on the Chilean working class it is the elementary duty of all socialists and the labor movement as a whole to undertake vigorous protest actions, demanding Down With the Reactionary Junta! Free All Class-War Prisoners in Chile! Unions should undertake protest work-stoppages and other measures, such as the boycott of Chilean ports proposed by the Militant-Solidarity Caucus of the National Maritime Union (see *Workers Vanguard* No. 29, 28 September). Marxist-Leninists must wage a sharp struggle against any form of illusions in the possibility of making a revolution through a popular front of bourgeois and workers parties (such as Allende's UP government) and a parliamentary road to socialism. Precisely these illusions led to the present inability of Chilean workers to respond to the reactionary coup with civil war. No to Popular-Front Governments! For a Workers and Peasants Revolution in Chile!

The Stalinist Communist Party of the U.S., whose friends in Chile constantly preached faith in the "democratic" military, called for alliance with the Christian Democrats (who endorsed the coup) and demanded that the workers return occupied factories to their "owners" during Allende's regime, has continued its pathetic policy of begging the United Nations to intervene. The various "Chile Solidarity Committees" have distinguished themselves by demanding above all that the U.S., which helped engineer the coup, refuse to recognize the junta!

The Socialist Workers Party, which once represented Trotskyism in the U.S., has completely adapted to the Stalinist line in practice, while maintaining verbal orthodoxy in the safety



Luis Corvalán, Chilean CP head, is threatened with death sentence by the Junta. Despite CP's sellouts in Chile his execution would be attack on entire workers movement. Free Corvalán!

of its press. Thus it participates in protests not as the SWP but as supporters of the USLA, an SWP-dominated committee to aid Latin American political prisoners, and its banners and chants say nothing about the popular-front and "peaceful-road-to-socialism" illusions it purports to combat. Its real position was indicated in a September 12 leaflet of the Boston SWP which called for "defense of the Chilean people and their democratic rights." However, this failure to maintain an independent working-class line is only the beginning.

Subsequently the SWP/USLA has launched a campaign to defend 23 prominent political prisoners and Latin American political exiles in Chile in the hopes that "a campaign focused on these well-known figures will help dramatize the plight of the thousands of other political prisoners." Thus instead of driving home the point that a massacre of labor leaders and the destruction of all workers organizations is taking place, requiring a united working-class defense in this country and a struggle for a proletarian revolution in Chile, the SWP chooses to focus on the plight of a number of scientists, artists, writers, etc., as well as a few of the most prominent left politicians.

At the same time we note once again the fact that more than 100,000 political prisoners continue to languish in Thieu's jails in Vietnam and that their cause has been largely ignored by the U.S. left. It is necessary to launch a fight to FREE ALL CLASS-WAR PRISONERS IN CHILE AND VIETNAM! ■



"In conformity with the Constitution, the army is not involved in politics."

—Luis Corvalán



# The Stalin School of Falsification Revisited

PENGUIN

(Editor's Note: The recent wave of virulent anti-Trotskyism being spread by various Maoist groups relies on the standard Stalinist weapons of lies and distortion, and above all on ignorance about the true history of the communist movement. The present series, replying to the articles on "Trotsky's Heritage" in the New Left/Maoist Guardian, serves as an introduction to this history and a brief summary of the principal political issues separating Trotskyism from Stalinism.)

The last four articles of the *Guardian* series on "Trotsky's Heritage" are devoted to demonstrating that Trotskyism is reformist and "counter-revolutionary" by discussing the current policies of the Socialist Workers Party and, to a lesser extent, of the Workers League (WL). Not once is the Spartacist League mentioned. This is no accident. The SWP, which was once the leading party of the Fourth International, has long since abandoned the path of revolutionary Trotskyism for the swamp of reformism. First adapting itself to Castroism in 1961-63 by foreseeing a "guerrilla road to power" and to black nationalism with the theory that "consistent nationalism" leads to socialism, the SWP made its dive into reformism in 1965, becoming the organizer of a popular-front antiwar movement dominated by bourgeois liberals. Since then it has extended this class collaborationism into new fields, organizing single-issue movements for the "democratic" demand of self-determination for just about everyone, from blacks (community control) and women to homosexuals and American Indians.

The political bandits of the WL, on the other hand, have made their mark in the U.S. socialist left by constantly shifting their political line in order to temporarily adapt to whatever is popular at the moment (Huey Newton, Red Guards, Ho Chi Minh, Arab nationalists, left-talking union bureaucrats) only to return to a more "orthodox" position soon after. Its constants are a belief that an all-encompassing final crisis of capitalism will eliminate the need to struggle for the Bolshevik politics of the Transitional Program and an abiding passion for tailing after labor fakery of any stripe, from pseudo-radicals to ultra-conservatives.

Thus it is easy to "prove" that Trotskyism is reformist by citing the policies of the SWP and the WL. But this has about as much value as "proving" that Lenin was for a "peaceful road to socialism" by citing Khrushchev.

## Feminism and Trotskyism

Because of the rotten betrayals of the SWP during the past decade, Trotskyism has become confused in the minds of many militants with the crassest reformist grovelling before the liberal bourgeoisie. It also gives Maoists like Davidson plenty of opportunity to make correct attacks:

"Their [SWP's] approach is to tail opportunistically each spontaneous development in the mass democratic movements. Each constituency, in succession, is then dubbed the 'vanguard' leading the proletariat to socialism, with the added provision that the 'vanguard of the vanguard' in each sector is presently made up of the student youth."

—*Guardian*, 13 June 1973

This theory, formerly called the "dialectic of the sectors of intervention" by the SWP's European friends, is a denial of the leading role of the proletariat and is expressed in their programmatic capitulation to feminism, nationalism, student power, etc. Elsewhere, Davidson criticized the SWP for tailing the nationalism of the black petty bourgeoisie and the WL for tailing the chauvinism of the labor aristocracy (*Guardian*, 30 May 1973). Again this is correct.

But such criticism is cheap—it represents not the slightest step toward a Marxist program of proletarian class struggle. Thus after criticizing the SWP for tailing petty-

bourgeois feminists, Davidson counterposes the "mass democratic struggle for the emancipation of women." This is the tip of the iceberg, for behind the contention that the struggle for women's liberation is only "democratic" (and not socialist) lies a call for maintenance of the bourgeois family (simply "reforming" it by calling "for husbands to share equally in the responsibilities of the home") and for an alliance with "even the women of the exploiting classes."

## SL Embodies Trotskyist Program

Instead of capitulating to bourgeois pacifism the SL called for class-struggle opposition to the Vietnam war: for labor strikes against the war, bourgeois out of the anti-war movement, military support to the NLF, all Indochina must go communist; instead of petty-bourgeois draft refusal the SL was unique in consistently advocating communist work in the army.

Rather than capitulating to bourgeois nationalism the SL called for an end to all discrimination on the basis of race, opposition to community control and preferential hiring, for a transitional black organization on a program of united class struggle.

In the struggle for women's liberation, the SL opposed capitulation to bourgeois feminism and the equally reactionary abstentionism of various workerist groups: We called for women's liberation through socialist revolution, bourgeois politicians out of the women's movement, free abortion on demand and adopted the prospect of the eventual creation of a women's section of the SL, as envisioned by the early Communist International.

Alone of all the ostensibly Marxist organizations the SL has upheld the Leninist norms of youth-party relations, with the youth section (Revolutionary Communist Youth, RCY) organizationally separate but politically subordinate to the party.

## Nationalism vs. Class Struggle

On the question of black nationalism, Davidson criticizes the SWP for tailing petty-bourgeois nationalists... and then declares that U.S. blacks constitute a nation and should have the right to secede. The nationalist theory of a "black nation" in the U.S. ignores the fact that blacks (and the other racial-ethnic minorities) are thoroughly integrated into the U.S. economy, although overwhelmingly at the bottom levels, have no common territory, special language or culture. Garveyite "back to Africa" movements, the theory of a black nation and all other forms of black separatism have the principal effect of dividing the proletariat and isolating the most exploited and potentially most revolutionary section in separate organizations fighting for separate goals. Both the SWP, with its enthusiasm for community control, and Maoists like Davidson's October League and the Communist League with their reactionary-utopian concepts of a black nation, serve to disunite the working class and tie it to the bourgeoisie. The SWP's enthusiasm for a black political party leads it to enthrone over clambakes of black Democrats (such as the 1971 Gary convention), while black-national separatism aids bourgeois nationalist demagogues like Newark's Ford Foundation-backed Imamu Baraka (Leroi Jones).

In part the capitulation to black nationalism by wide sectors of the U.S. is a distorted recognition that this most



Leon Trotsky

# 8/ TROTSKYISM vs. SWP REVISIONISM

exploited sector of the working class will indeed play a key role in an American socialist revolution. Black workers are potentially the leading section of the proletariat. But this requires the integration of its most conscious elements into the single vanguard party and a relentless struggle for the program of united working-class struggle among black workers. Conscious of the need for special methods of work among doubly-oppressed sectors of the proletariat, the SL has called for a transitional black organization not as a concession to black separatism but precisely in order to better combat nationalism among the black masses ("Black and Red—Class Struggle to Negro Freedom," *Spartacist*, May-June 1967).

## Leninism vs. Workerism

Since the demise of the Weatherman-RYM II section of SDS in late 1969, black nationalism and feminism have been joined by a crude workerism as the dominant forms of petty-bourgeois ideology in the socialist movement. Adapting to the present backward consciousness of the working class, workerists have sought to gain instant popularity and influence by organizing on the level of militant trade unionism. Failing to heed (and in some cases denying) Lenin's dictum that socialist consciousness must be brought to the working class from the outside, by the revolutionary party, the radical work-

erists today carry out trade-union work which is in no way distinguishable from that of the reformist Communist Party in the 1930's and 1940's. Falling in behind every militant-talking out-bureaucrat, and not a few in-bureaucrats as well, they fail to wage a political struggle in the unions, saving their support for the NLF, Mao, etc., for the campuses.

Among ostensibly Trotskyist groups, workerism has taken the form of denying the need to struggle for the whole of the Transitional Program in the trade unions. Some fake-Trotskyists argue that wage demands alone are revolutionary (Workers League), others that the Transitional Program must be served to the workers in bits and pieces, one course at a time (Class Struggle League); still others verbally proclaim the Transitional Program in their documents, but see the strategy for power as based on giving "critical support" to every available out-bureaucrat (Revolutionary Socialist League). The SWP, for its part, does almost no trade-union work at all and in its press gives uncritical support to liberal bureaucrats, both in power and out.

The Spartacist League, in contrast, calls for the formation of caucuses based on the Transitional Program to struggle for leadership of the unions. While willing to form united fronts in specific struggles, the SL sees the fundamental task as the creation of a com-

continued on page 10



# Continued from page 1

## ...Détente

Soviet dissidents and Jews is a diversion from its concept of the détente; those imperialist politicians who expect the Soviet bureaucracy to weaken its own national power base are simply being unrealistic.

In contrast to Nixon, Senator Henry Jackson believes the Russian power and influence within the "Free World" should be countered primarily by military muscle; concessions which might strengthen the USSR should be granted only if the Russian political system is changed to allow the emergence of loyal pro-Western and implicitly bourgeois tendencies. The liberal wing of American imperialism believes the basis for such a pro-Western opposition exists among the dissident intellectuals and oppressed national minorities, which is why the *New York Times* has been devoting so much attention to them in recent weeks.

But it is not just the *New York Times* which is upset. For some months both liberal and conservative wings of the bourgeoisie have been dissatisfied with Nixon's handling of the "ship of state." The Watergate affair has put the moral authority of the U.S. government at an all-time low, the Phase III and IV price controls have been an unmitigated disaster and the main "benefit" of détente has been to bolster Nixon's status. Having apparently decided it would be too costly to get rid of Nixon himself, the bourgeoisie has evidently decided to dump Agnew (with Nixon's toleration—i.e., approval) as a concession to public morality and to restore some balance and imperialist order in U.S. foreign policy.

By inflicting a serious defeat on Nixon, Henry Jackson has emerged as an important and dangerous politician. In an exceptionally pure form, he represents those political forces favoring an aggressive cold-war policy toward the Soviet Union. On the one hand, he has intimate ties to the Pentagon and is the natural candidate for civilian front man for a government dominated by the military. Likewise he is the darling of the arms contractor and has well-earned his nickname, "the Senator from Boeing." On the other hand, Jackson has the direct support of the Meany-Lovestone leadership of the AFL-CIO, the social democrats and the cold-war liberal establishment in general. Of all American politicians, Jackson has the social base and orientation to lead a popular anti-communist crusade against the Soviet Union. And the rising tide of anti-Soviet liberalism might well deposit Jackson in the White House in 1976.

The role of Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn in contributing to Jackson-led resurgence of anti-Soviet liberalism is significant. The eminent physicist and writer not only provided the moral cause célèbre, but actively led in the rearming and rededication of the American cold-war liberal establishment. It was Sakharov who refurbished the "1984" image of a totalitarian Soviet monster foolishly nourished with American grain:

"Large amounts of Western technological aid to the Soviet Union, he said, would help the Russians get rid of economic problems they cannot solve on their own and would enable them to concentrate on accumulating strength. 'As a result,' he said, 'the world would become helpless before this uncontrollable bureaucratic machine.'"

—*New York Times*, 23 August 1973

In commenting on the Senate vote for the Trident submarine, an effective weapon of mass murder carrying advanced MIRV missiles (and costing \$1.3 billion each), Jackson singled out Solzhenitsyn's/Sakharov's warnings to maintain Western strength against Brezhnev's duplicity as a major impetus.

Equally important in motivating Congressional action, however, was the Soviet Union's recent successful launching of a MIRV missile at least

two years ahead of what U.S. experts felt was possible. This and the serious economic dislocations resulting from last year's mammoth Soviet wheat deal have led wide circles of the bourgeoisie to the conclusion that Nixon has been "too soft" on the Russians in trade and arms limitations negotiations.

A heavy burden of responsibility for the strengthening of the Pentagon and resurgence of cold-war liberalism lies with those who built up the moral authority of the "great humanists" Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn. This includes the American left-liberal establishment which transformed these two Russians, who apparently tolerate Marshal Thieu's South Vietnam and the Chilean junta (Sakharov's appeal on Neruda had not one word of criticism of the Chilean coup or the junta's mass executions of workers and labor leaders), into political saints. And it definitely includes the ostensibly Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party and Workers League, who mirrored the popularity of Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn among the liberal student-academic milieu and trade-union bureaucracy respectively, thereby objectively contributing to anti-communism.

### The Price of Bread and Oil

A major impetus for the détente was the belief that expanded economic relations with the USSR would be quite beneficial for American capitalism. And an important cause for the erosion of the détente has been disappointment with these expectations. In particular there is widespread sentiment within the ruling class that it got burned by the Great Grain Deal. When the Soviets bought one-quarter of the American wheat crop for a billion dollars in the summer of 1972, Wall Street was enthusiastic. Soviet imports were expected to help the U.S. balance of payments and prevent the grain "surplus" from driving down (!) domestic prices. However, years of stagnant production intersected an uncompetitive international position forcing the U.S. to *cheapen* the price of its commodities to the world market through currency devaluation. The large jump in exports to Japan and Western Europe, as well as Russia, led to empty supermarkets and galloping food prices at home—and widespread discontent in broad sections of the U.S. population. The latest public opinion polls show less than one-third of the public approving of Nixon's performance as president. The wheat deal enabled liberal bourgeois politicians to be simultaneously anti-Nixon, anti-Soviet and anti-inflation, an irresistible vote-catching combination. To add insult to injury, the Nixon administration allowed the Russians to buy the grain well below the market price, subsidizing the exporters by some \$300 million. It will be a long time before the American ruling class allows the Soviets to buy grain or anything else below world-market prices.

The sudden transformation of the U.S. grain "surplus" into a shortage is a particularly glaring example of the destructive irrationality of the capitalist economic system. In a socialist society, the remarkable improvements in agricultural technology during and after World War II would have been the basis for eliminating hunger and malnutrition for the entire human race.

Instead the increased productive capacity led, via falling commodity prices and farm incomes, and the mammoth agricultural acreage allotment program designed to keep land out of production, to a decline in agricultural resources, particularly labor and acreage cultivated. With increasing world and domestic demand against a relatively unchanging supply, it was inevitable that the "surplus" would give way to shortage and rapidly rising prices. The Soviet grain deal and devaluation simply accelerated an inherent trend in the American economy. In a planned economy, U.S. agricultural output could be tripled or quadrupled within a decade.

The American ruling class looked to the USSR not simply as an export market, but as a dependable source of

cheap fuel. In the past five years, the economic power of the feudal landlords of the Arabian peninsula has grown all out of proportion to their military or general productive power. Plans seem to be afoot to deal with the arrogant sheiks by transforming sections of the Arabian peninsula into greater Iran. In addition, elements within the American ruling class believe that the Kremlin rulers may be more cooperative to the oil cartels than the satraps of Abu Dhabi and Qatar.

However, as another cold-war liberal, Hans Morgenthau, pointed out, the security and profitability of American capital in Russia depends on an arbitrary bureaucracy over which the U.S. has no direct control. (And the Iranian army cannot take over Siberia.) The majority of the American ruling

Andrei Sakharov and Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn (right)



class has swung around to the position that it wants qualitatively greater leverage over Soviet internal politics before tying up a lot of money there. Most American capitalists believe it safer to lend money to a government which will allow a pro-Western liberal like Sakharov to denounce it than to one which will forcibly shut him up. They are, of course, right. Whether or not they can get Brezhnev to go along is an altogether different matter.

Similarly the bourgeoisie has opted for a stronger military posture against the USSR, epitomized by the passage of the Trident program and the rejection of Mansfield's program of troop cuts in Europe. In the arms-limitation negotiations the U.S. will now have to reverse the concessions on number of missiles which Nixon granted to the Russians earlier this year (*New York Times*, 26 September). On trade talks Nixon will be forced to seek stiffer terms, both monetarily and in terms of political concessions on Jews and dissidents. The euphoria of the early days of the détente is over as the basic contradictions in the interests of the leading imperialist power and the most powerful deformed workers state come to the fore. Chou En-lai recently remarked that between the U.S. and the USSR, because of their basic conflict of interests, "contention is absolute and protracted, whereas collusion is relative and temporary" (*New York Times*, 1 September). How true! (Of course, the same is true of U.S.-China relations—though Chou fails to see this.) These underlying realities are now asserting themselves, despite last summer's affirmations of everlasting harmony.

Doing business in Russia is now profitable for particular American corporations so that the expansion of trade, loans, joint projects and the like has a certain autonomy of strategic political considerations. No doubt David Rockefeller and Armand Hammer would like Solzhenitsyn and the Jews wanting to go to Israel to disappear off the face of the earth, so they could go about making money in peace. However, those capitalists interested solely in expanding their business with the Soviets are going against the majority line of the American bourgeoisie organized as a ruling class. And when the American ruling class through its state decides to engage in economic warfare against the Soviet Union, that this will mean losses for Occidental Petroleum or even Chase Manhattan will not be a major obstacle.

### 'Watergate and the Bankruptcy of Realpolitik

The Watergate scandal considerably strengthened the opponents of the Nixon-Brezhnev détente. Last spring, with most people believing his administration consisted mainly of petty criminals and his Phase III economic policy leading to Latin American-style inflation, the only thing Nixon had going for

him was his posture as world statesman. Kissinger attempted to defend his boss by advising people to put the "permanent" (the detentes with Russia and China) before the "ephemeral" (Watergate). To counterbalance its domestic catastrophes, the Nixon administration became rather desperate for diplomatic successes, real or apparent. Last spring, the bargaining position of the American ruling class was considerably stronger than Nixon's vis-à-vis the Brezhnev regime. There was an understandable feeling that a stronger president domestically could have gotten more out of the Soviet rulers.

Watergate contributed to the erosion of the détente in another way. It focused attention on the importance of democratic ideology as a mechanism of capitalist rule. The so-called "un-

natural" alliance of ideological liberals and conservatives over both Watergate and the Jackson Amendment is, in fact, unusually principled for bourgeois politics. Kennedy, Ervin, Jackson and Goldwater instinctively understand (as Nixon does not) that the American ruling class, with its aspirations toward world empire, cannot govern simply with big guns and cold cash, but must claim to act in the name of universal ideals and the interests of humanity. Nixon, Agnew and Kissinger are not well suited to rally the American people to make sacrifices to defend the "Free World." By his open contempt for even the forms of democracy and legality at home and in the USSR, and by obvious infatuation with power politics of the most petty and cynical variety, Nixon is stripping away the moral authority of the American ruling class in the U.S. and in the Soviet Union. It is the opponents of Nixon's realpolitik who are following Kissinger's advice in putting the permanent before the ephemeral.

### Communist Anti-Stalinism, Yes! Liberal Anti-Communism, Never!

Now that his guardians, the American bourgeoisie, are putting an end to Nixon's summer romance with Leonid Brezhnev, certain fundamental truths of Marxism stand revealed. One is the undying hostility of U.S. imperialism to the Soviet deformed workers state. Peaceful coexistence is really and truly a reformist illusion. A few months ago it might have appeared that Brezhnev and Nixon were like-minded reactionaries trying to run a dual world empire, a view shared by many left-liberals, "Third Camp" social democrats, "Third World" nationalists, syndicalists and Maoists. However, U.S. imperialism is not content to maintain the status quo with the Soviet Union, engaging in mutually advantageous deals. With ambitions toward world empire, U.S. capitalism strives to dominate the Soviet Union. Short of military conquest, this means fostering pro-imperialist political tendencies within the Soviet Union on the pretext of struggling for democratic rights.

Because the Kremlin so often engages in counterrevolutionary class collaboration with American imperialism, the line between left-wing criticism of the Soviet bureaucracy and liberal anti-communism is often deceptive and easily crossed. It is precisely the cynicism, opportunism, anti-democratic and oppressive practices of the Stalinist bureaucracy that provide the mass ideological basis for American imperialism. Therefore it is doubly, triply necessary for revolutionary socialists to draw the hardest line between the advocacy of democratic rights as a cover for imperialist attacks on the Soviet state and the advocacy of workers democracy as a means of mobilizing the Soviet masses against world capitalism. ■



# Zionism and Nationalism in Brezhnev's Russia

Russian dissidents have occupied a prominent place in the news recently, as Soviet-American trade relations and the right of emigration for Soviet Jews have become issues of congressional dispute. Senator Henry Jackson, the darling of the Pentagon and Boeing Aircraft, spoke in Congress on September 27 remarking that the current Trident MIRV missile program would not have passed without the "courageous protests" of Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov. These Russian "democratic oppositionists" seem to care little whether U.S. imperialism is able to bomb the USSR back to the Stone Age. While the slaughter of Chilean workers once again reaffirms the murderous treachery of the "peaceful coexistence" policies of Brezhnev & Co., Sakharov's distinctive contribution to the international class struggle recently was to refuse to take a stand on the reactionary junta on the grounds that "Chile is too far away" (*New York Times*, 26 September). Many of the liberal opponents of the Russian bureaucracy can see only their own immediate oppression while everything else—mass murder by the U.S. in Vietnam, the oppression of blacks in South Africa, the reactionary role of Zionism—means nothing to them. A revolutionary opposition, in contrast, must be internationalist in every sense. Among its tasks is a resolute struggle against all national oppression on the basis of working-class solidarity.

While the democratic opposition movement in the USSR is relatively isolated and unstable, the struggle against national oppression has at times led to mass demonstrations and protests, such as those in Lithuania last year. It has also produced popular support in some cases for nationalism, a bourgeois ideology which is opposed to proletarian internationalism. Consequently, a key perspective of Trotskyists toward the USSR and Eastern Europe must be to cut the ground out from underneath nationalism by combining the struggle against national oppression with the political revolution to replace the chauvinistic and anti-working-class bureaucracy with democratic soviet rule by the workers.

If the Soviet Union is no longer the feudal-autocratic "prison house of nations" that tsarist Russia was, it is still made up of unequal parts and is no more a free "Union" than it is "Soviet." The Moscow bureaucracy, predominantly Great Russian in origin and outlook, encourages a policy of Russification throughout the USSR, and promotes the ideology of Great-Russian chauvinism which can only cause resentment among other nationalities. It was on this issue that the dying Lenin planned to make a decisive stand against Stalin. Stalin's brutal treatment of his fellow Georgians demonstrated to Lenin that the typical Russian bureaucrat of tsarist times—the *dyerzhimord*—had reappeared, this time decked in Soviet garb. Lenin advanced a federated structure for the Soviet state in opposition to Stalin's "autonomization" scheme (which would have given the non-Russian nations only cultural, not national, rights within a specifically Russian federation).

## Russification and Nationalist Response

Today Russification primarily takes the form of the dispersal of Great Russians throughout the USSR, where, as the "leading" (and in some sense "conqueror") nation, they impose their own national culture and language. While

this dispersal is often seen by the other nationalities as a deliberate policy, the process is actually a complex combination of political factors (e.g., the fact that Russians play the leading political and administrative role in the USSR) and purely demographic trends. The surplus of agricultural population in European Russia and the rapid growth of cities in Central Asia and Siberia induce Russians, and to a lesser extent Ukrainians, to migrate to the prosperous cities of the East and Far East. Other instruments of Russification are the privileged status of the Russian language as *lingua franca* in the Soviet Union, and the assimilation into Russian national identity of the ruling elites of the non-Russian nationalities.

The response in the Baltic countries and the Ukraine has been a resurgence of nationalism on a genuinely mass scale. Rather than viewing the bureaucracy as a parasite sitting atop the property forms of a workers state, sucking off the surplus produced by the entire working class and seeking a détente with the imperialists, nationalists see it as the embodiment of centralism and the logical continuator of the imperialist expansionism of the Russian tsars. The bureaucracy has always encouraged this identification. Appealing to Great-Russian nationalist sentiments, Stalin declared World War II the "Great Patriotic War." He conciliated the Russian Orthodox Church and on 7 November 1941, anniversary of the October Revolution, admonished the Red Army to seek inspiration in such historical figures as Alexander Nevsky, Dmitri Donskoy, Suworov, Kutuzov and others, all heroes of Holy Russia and tsarist imperialism.

Responding to the consistent oppression of non-Russian nationalities during the late 1920's and 1930's, fanatic anti-Russian nationalism led many Soviet citizens to welcome even the fascists as an alternative to the oppressive bureaucracy. During World War II the Germans were welcomed in some of the border regions, and hundreds of thousands of Soviet prisoners of war of several nationalities agreed to enlist in Nazi-organized National Legions to fight against the Soviet Union (Allen Kassof, ed., *Prospects for Soviet Society*).

Today anti-bureaucratic struggles in Eastern Europe and the fight against oppression of minorities at home vitally affect and inspire the oppositionist movement in the Soviet Union. Especially the civil-rights struggle of the Crimean Tatars had a radicalizing effect on Russian intellectuals similar to that of the black civil-rights movement in the U.S. However, support for the rights of the Tatars has not taken on a revolutionary socialist character. On the contrary, key elements of the opposition have swung sharply to the right, in sympathy for "Western democracy" abroad and bourgeois nationalism at home. Thus in protesting against anti-semitism the opposition has come to look upon Zionism with open sympathy. In May 1971 Soviet physicist Valery Chalidze wrote, with Sakharov's approval, a letter to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in which he declared that "Zionism is not a reactionary political trend, not anti-communist or anti-Soviet, as represented in our press, but the concept of Jewish statehood" (*Chronicle of Current Events* No. 20, 2 July 1971). In fact, like all other forms of nationalism, Zionism is a chauvinist bourgeois ideology. It is also a major obstacle to proletarian unity in the Near East. But this

can be of little concern for Chalidze. Having procured himself a well-paying professorship in the U.S., he now declares that there is no difference between Stalinism and communism.

## Lenin and Trotsky on the Ukraine

For Leninists the key to the national question is the struggle for proletarian internationalism. We recognize the right to national self-determination, even under bourgeois leadership, in order to eliminate hostility between the workers of different countries. But while the national question has not disappeared from the stage of world history, like every other democratic demand it must be subordinate to the class question. A striking example of this was Lenin's policy toward the bourgeois Rada which declared Ukrainian independence from Russia immediately after the October Revolution: in the "Manifesto to the Ukrainian People With an Ultimatum to the Ukrainian Rada" (December 1917), he first recognized the right of the Ukrainian people to national independence,

which collectivization inflicted on the Ukrainian peasantry caused a revival of the nationalist movement, this time under the control of clericalists and fascists.

In the late 1930's Trotsky attempted to resolve the contradictions of the pre-war plight of the Ukraine and halt the spread of fascism by rousing the masses with the slogan, "A united, free and independent workers and peasants Soviet Ukraine"! He declared that the unification of the Ukraine could not be accomplished through reliance on any imperialist power, but only through proletarian revolutions in both halves of the country. "Proletarian revolution" meant socialist revolution in the west and political revolution in the east, as the masses of the western Ukraine (under Polish rule until 1939) would not voluntarily place themselves under the rule of the Russian-chauvinist Stalinist bureaucracy. Trotsky argued that the achievement of an independent Soviet Ukraine would strengthen, not weaken, the USSR in the coming war. A successful political revolution against the oppressive bureaucracy



Jews protesting in Moscow early this month because Russian government had denied them exit visas to Israel.

then asked if the Rada would continue to aid the tsarist White Guard troops against the Soviets and finally announced that if a satisfactory answer was not forthcoming within 48 hours the Council of People's Commissars would declare war on the Rada.

The October Revolution and the Leninist nationalities policy succeeded in overcoming traditional hostility and uniting the Russian and Ukrainian workers in the struggle for socialism. This achievement was symbolized by the fusion of the Ukrainian Bolsheviks with the extreme left wing of the Ukrainian national movement, the Borot'ba Party. Borot'ba continued to insist on independence for the Ukraine, but Lenin did not see this as reason for a split, since the Borot'bists loyally served the Soviet government. In the 1920's the Communist Party of the Ukraine conducted national-educational work under the slogan of "Ukrainization," a policy approved by party and Comintern, but arbitrarily reversed by Stalin in 1928. The Stalinist policy of forced assimilation of non-Russian nationalities and the severe dislocations and famine

would mobilize the masses of workers and peasants, while national independence on a soviet basis would eliminate a tremendous source of discontent that could otherwise be used by Hitler against the Soviet Union.

This contention was confirmed in the negative by the experience of World War II, when large numbers of disaffected Ukrainian peasants initially collaborated with the Nazis and participated enthusiastically in the slaughter of Jews, and the pro-fascist Bandera movement waged a bitter struggle against Soviet rule. In 1941 when the Germans occupied Lvov, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists led by Bandera proclaimed the "restoration of the Ukrainian state" and formed a government whose aim was war against the USSR. After the defeat of the Nazis, Bandera's partisans continued to struggle against Soviet rule on into the 1950's. It took the Soviet authorities several years of large-scale military and police operations to rout the Banderaites.

Unlike his latter-day epigones, Trotsky did not see self-determination



as the final goal of all human aspirations. He affirmed the necessity of social revolutions in the West and a political revolution in the Soviet Union as the guarantee of the defense of an independent Soviet Ukraine. Simultaneously he declared battle against the bourgeois nationalists for the fate of the Ukrainian masses:

"Not the slightest compromise with imperialism, fascist and democratic! Not the slightest concession to Ukrainian nationalists, clerical-reactionary or liberal-pacifist. No 'Peoples Fronts'! The complete independence of the proletarian party, as the vanguard of the working people!"

— "On the Ukrainian Question," *Bulletin of the Opposition*, May-June 1939

## The National Question Today: the Ukraine and the Baltic Countries

After World War II the Ukraine was unified under bureaucratic rule. Thus the slogan for a "united Ukraine" no longer has any meaning. Yet the Ukrainian question persists, and in recent years the repression of Ukrainian intellectuals has reached alarming proportions. In August-September 1965 there were sweeping arrests of young intellectuals in the Ukraine, accompanied by official "rumors" of nationalist activities. Ivan Dzyuba, the best-known of the Ukrainian dissidents, was arrested for protesting the illegality of the subsequent secret trials. Arrests continued to hit Kiev, Lvov, Ivano-Frankovsk and other cities with large-scale house searchings and interrogations. Again there were "rumors" of "hidden arms, secret press," etc. In

Despite the claims of the bureaucracy and its apologists, the protests against national oppression in the Ukraine and the Baltic states are not necessarily animated by bourgeois nationalism. For instance, another group, the Ukrainian Workers and Peasants Union, formulated a program for an independent socialist Ukraine and for democratization in the Soviet Union, with an end to bureaucratic methods of administering the economy, and improvement in the lot of the peasantry. The leader of this group was sentenced to death. Evidence of the potentially mass character of such proletarian movements was the demonstration of hydroelectric station workers in Kiev in May 1969, who carried placards reading "All Power to the Soviets."

Socialists must have no illusions about the mood of the masses in the Soviet bloc. Large numbers are certainly influenced by nationalism. Some, driven by blind hatred of Russian domination and by the property hunger of the peasantry and petty bourgeoisie, may actually support bourgeois restoration. But for the masses of workers and peasants such a "solution" would mean new and far greater oppression. This is why, even with their intense hatred of national oppression, the Hungarian workers and peasants in 1956 fought to replace the Russian-dominated bureaucracy not with national capitalism but with workers democracy, vigorously defending the socialist conquests and appealing to the Soviet troops as class brothers.

The political revolution in the USSR will have a large element of absolutely justified national protest against dec-

8 February 1973). In Latvia during the early 1960's, opposition to Russian chauvinism won the support of the majority of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party. This provoked Khrushchev to a purge of high-level cadre from party and government organizations, including ten CC members. They were uniformly replaced with Great Russians and Russian-born Latvians.

Ever since 1940 the USSR government has followed a deliberate policy of settling Russians in the Baltic countries so that in 1970 Latvians comprised only 57 percent of the population of the Latvian republic and 40 percent of its capital (Riga). The policy of forced assimilation was protested last year in an open letter by 17 Latvian Communists. Directing themselves to CP leaders in the West, the writers emphasized that they were Communist Party members of 25 to 35 years' standing, that several fought underground during the period of the bourgeois Latvian republic (before 1940). The open letter denounced the "policy of Great Russian chauvinism and... the forcible assimilation of the small USSR nations" as "caus[ing] great harm to the communist movement, to Marxism-Leninism..." (*Intercontinental Press*, 3 July 1972).

## Nationalism vs. Socialism

The letter of the Latvian CP leaders makes it clear that there may be splits in the bureaucracy and that some of the most dedicated fighters for socialism may come from within the present Communist Parties. But this can occur only

ment, while also supporting proletarian revolution. However, the ideology of nationalism, which places "nation" above class, ultimately serves the capitalist class and is totally hostile to proletarian internationalism. Revolutionary Marxists must know how to distinguish between just protests against national oppression and expressions of nationalism; likewise it is necessary to deal differently with the nationalism of bourgeois counterrevolutionaries and the nationalist sentiments of the oppressed working masses. But this cannot be done by claiming, as does the ex-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party, that "consistent nationalism" equals socialism and by tailing after every nationalist opponent of the bureaucracy. In the deformed workers states, "consistent nationalism" means bourgeois counterrevolution!

Cultural and political repression of national minorities constitutes only one side of the national question in the USSR, and there is another side which is usually ignored by bourgeois liberals and by pseudo-socialists who tail nationalist currents. Not only the Russians have gained from the October Revolution! The abolition of illiteracy among previously backward tribes is striking evidence of the cultural advancement of the Soviet peoples. The nationalities quota system for admittance to higher educational institutions in the USSR, despite its defects and biases, has ensured access to higher education for all nationalities. The economic boom enjoyed by Central Asia and Siberia has not been matched by European Russia; indeed, much of the migration of Great Russians has been caused by the relatively poor quality of the soil in Russia and the more rapid industrial development of other regions. And all the nationalities of the USSR have benefitted from the liquidation of capitalist property relations!

For Trotskyists, the class issue takes precedence over the national issue. In 1918 the Bolsheviks modified their position on the self-determination of nations, allowing secession from the Soviet Federation only if the majority of workers and peasants in the area supported this course. Similarly, Trotsky's call for an independent Ukraine specified that it must be a *workers and peasants Soviet Ukraine*. We do not allow democratic demands to serve as a cover for counterrevolution. Trotskyists will form a united front even with the bureaucracy itself to protect the social gains of the October Revolution against bourgeois restoration.

Of course, those like Shachtmanites and anarchists who deny that the Soviet Union is any kind of workers state must have a totally different orientation. The International Socialists' position on the Soviet national question is a systematic application of Shachtmanite doctrines. Since it was "Stalinist imperialism" that subjugated the small nations of the Russian Empire and gulped up all of Eastern Europe, it is only right to bloc with bourgeois nationalists against such "imperialism":

"Socialists oppose any form of imperialism, whether that of the reactionary capitalist world system or that of the equally reactionary Stalinist bureaucracy. Therefore we support the right of self-determination for all peoples caught up in the web of these imperialist systems."

— *Workers Power*  
No. 78, June 1973

For the SWP, which formally maintains the orthodox Trotskyist position on the nature of the Soviet Union, there is less excuse for uncritical tailing of any and all national struggles. But in practice, if not in theory, the opportunist SWP capitulates to bourgeois nationalists and the liberal imperialists just like classical Shachtmanites. It uncritically reports such groupings as the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners (CDSP) and the "Set Them Free" Committee of Canada, which have built popular fronts with liberal anti-communists around the issue of defense of Ukrainian dissidents. At the 2-4 March 1973 "international conference

continued on page 9



Due to Stalin's chauvinist policy of discrimination against non-Russian nationalities, many Ukrainians welcomed invading Germans in 1941.

January 1972 over a hundred Ukrainian dissidents were arrested, and repression continues to this day.

We unreservedly support the right of self-determination for the Ukraine, already theoretically guaranteed by the Soviet constitution, and seek to make this right real by a political revolution of the working class to overthrow the Russian-chauvinist, anti-proletarian bureaucracy. Depending on the increasing seriousness of national protests, Trotskyists may at some point again raise the slogan for an independent Soviet Ukraine, in order to combat nationalist illusions in the masses, while intersecting their struggles against the bureaucracy.

In the late 1950's and early 1960's underground political organizations supported by elements of the working class appeared in the Ukraine. The United Party for the Liberation of the Ukraine and the Ukrainian National Committee were composed mostly of industrial workers (*Bulletin of the "Set Them Free" Committee*, Vol. 1, No. 1). These movements were effectively repressed by the secret police.

ades of Russian-chauvinist oppression by the bureaucracy. Trotskyists in the Ukraine would intersect these movements with the slogan for an independent Soviet Ukraine and with the Transitional Program as a whole, while ceaselessly combatting Ukrainian nationalism. Their comrades in Russia would see as one of their major tasks winning the Russian workers to support the right of self-determination for the Ukraine and for the Baltic countries, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

In the latter countries, which had 20 years of political independence under bourgeois rule between the wars and were forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940, nationalism is very strong, even in the working class. When the self-immolation of two students and a worker in Lithuania led to demonstrations and street-fighting in Kaunas and Vilnius in May 1972, workers at a synthetic fiber factory in Kaunas struck in sympathy. More than 400 were arrested during the demonstration in Kaunas on May 19, and of the eight "leaders" sentenced last October at least half were workers (*Le Monde*,

through a consistent struggle by the Trotskyists to crystallize a Bolshevik-Leninist party around the Transitional Program of the Fourth International. Thus, for instance, the Latvian oppositionists do not go beyond Dubcek-style bureaucratic reformism in their letter. Moreover, like Dubcek they make concessions to bourgeois nationalism. One of their protests amounts to rejecting immigration from Russia and large-scale industrialization, since this would lead to immigration of non-Latvian workers. While Bolshevik-Leninists must protest forced assimilation and the liquidation of the non-Russian republics of the Soviet Union (such as occurred with Karelia), an insulated agricultural economy cannot aid Latvian workers or the cause of world socialism.

The workers movement inevitably encompasses not only those who, like Lenin and Trotsky, represent the historic interests of the proletariat and promote the development of universal human culture, but also more backward elements who are concerned with narrower questions of national develop-



# Debate SL in Cleveland RSL Reaffirms "Third Campism"

CLEVELAND—At its debate here September 28 with the Spartacist League on the class nature of the Soviet Union, the Revolutionary Socialist League (RSL) cavalierly dismissed the social conquests of the October Revolution and labeled the USSR a "state-capitalist" society. Despite continued economic planning, nationalized means of production and state monopoly of foreign trade in the Stalinist-ruled countries, the RSL claims that a bourgeois counterrevolution has already occurred and socialists must begin all over again. Behind this revolutionary-sounding position lies its refusal to unconditionally defend the USSR against imperialist attack. Such petty-bourgeois capitulation before anti-communist hysteria was the touchstone of Shachtmanism on the Russian question. As the debate revealed, the RSL merely trails after its historical patronage.

(The RSL was expelled by the right-wing majority of the International Socialists in late July. At the time it had not taken a position on the "Russian question" and democratic centralism, the issues over which Shachtman broke with Trotskyism in 1939. In the meantime the RSL appears to have consolidated around slightly revised Shachtmanite positions. It also seems to have lost its appetite for political debate with the SL. Although the RSL originally proposed debates around the country, only five of its supporters attended the Cleveland debate out of an audience of about 40. Supporters of the Spartacist League and Revolutionary Communist Youth came from Detroit and Buffalo in order to press home to the RSL the contradictions in its positions.)

SL/RCY supporters awaiting a new refurbished version of how capitalism was restored in the Soviet Union without a civil war and violent overthrow of the workers state were to be disappointed by the RSL presentation. They were instead served scraps and leftovers from Shachtman's theory of "bureaucratic collectivism," now re-dubbed "state capitalism." According to RSL speaker Cass Mayhew, although the workers suffered a major defeat in 1924, it wasn't until 1934-38 that the new ruling class was consolidated as the last of the Soviet oppositionists vanished in the Great Purges.

In his rebuttal, SL spokesman Richard Cramer pointed out the unreasonable demands this position places on dialectics and logic. If the social character of the workers state is determined simply by whether or not the proletariat controls the state, then with Stalin's capture of the Bolshevik party apparatus and the consequent political expropriation of the proletariat in 1924, surely there had been a full-fledged capitalist restoration. The goals, program and methods of operation of the

Stalinist rulers were fundamentally the same in 1929 as they were in 1939. The RSL goes through all its "theoretical" contortions to produce a two-stage theory of peaceful counterrevolution ("Stalinism in reverse") because it wishes to claim the struggle of the Left Opposition during the 1920's and 1930's as its own. But if Russia became "state-capitalist" in 1924, this would have made Trotsky deeply unprincipled, since up to 1933 he advocated a faction fight inside the Stalinized Communist Party—i.e., entering or remaining part of a bourgeois party!

Cramer challenged the RSL to locate fundamental economic changes in the Soviet Union between 1934 and 1937. If in the USSR labor exchanges as a commodity, a charge the RSL makes to prove Russia's capitalist nature, then it must never have been a workers state. There is no fundamental difference between the relations of workers to the enterprises today and the time when the Soviet state and CP were led by Lenin and Trotsky.

SL supporters pointed out that precisely when state planning (despite the enormity of its bureaucratic distortions) was first being introduced into the Russian economy, the RSL discovers the "basis of capitalist development" being laid. And precisely as the Stalinist bureaucracy was devouring its own offspring (very few Stalinists themselves survived the purges), revealing the extreme instability of this parasitic caste, the RSL proclaims the consolidation of a whole new ruling class.

Trotskyists, in contrast to the left-Shachtmanite RSL, have always insisted that the Stalinist bureaucracy represents not a new ruling class, but a privileged petty-bourgeois layer which has usurped political power from the proletariat while maintaining the property forms of a workers state. This exorcism of the workers movement must be overthrown by a political revolution to restore democratic rule through Soviets. But this does not mean there will be no economic aspects of the political revolution. A huge disproportion has arisen between the possibilities flowing from planned production in the Soviet Union and the parasitic squandering of this potential by the ruling bureaucracy. Yet the economic aspects are secondary; they are reforms. The RSL cannot distinguish between a social revolution to replace one class rule by another and a political revolution which, leaving the economic foundations of collectivized property essentially unaltered, re-establishes the political power of the proletariat.

According to the RSL, since they are "capitalists" the Stalinist bureaucracies can produce nothing resembling human progress in the epoch of im-

perialist decay. According to the feeble Shachtmanite theories, the Russian and Chinese "ruling classes" cannot have initiated new industrial revolutions over one third of the globe—so the RSL simply denies reality. (The SL speaker cited the obvious contrast between the industrial development of the Chinese deformed workers state and the stagnation of capitalist India.) For these petty-bourgeois moralists, what makes the Soviet bureaucracy a "capitalist class" is not its relationship to production but its style of life! "The SL says Brezhnev's sons will not inherit Brezhnev's positions, but [they] will live very comfortable lives indeed in comparison to the average workers," said Mayhew. (One wonders, with the RSL's methodology, why they call Russia, China, et al., "state-capitalist." Why not "state-feudalist"? If they derive such satisfaction from referring to the bureaucrats as "bosses," just think how good it would feel to call them "aristocrats"!)

SL speakers pointed out that the RSL had substituted its subjective repulsion for reality; it has transformed Marxism from a rigorous scientific theory into empty tubthumping and moral posturing.

The SL was accused of "forgetting about the class struggle" by insisting on choosing sides between imperialists and the deformed workers states, whose property forms embody the historic interests of the proletariat, despite the fact that anti-proletarian bureaucracies hold political power. In declaring that these states are not in any sense proletarian, and therefore should not be defended against capitalist attack (unless there is present some spontaneous struggle of the workers not connected with the Communist parties or Red Army) the RSL aligns itself with the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Historically, failure to maintain a Trotskyist position in defense of the Soviet Union inevitably leads to failure to maintain a revolutionary line in general. (Thus the Chinese leaders, who consider the USSR to be capitalist, see nothing wrong in calling for the preservation of NATO in order to put military pressure on Russia from the West.) The RSL wants to separate Shachtman's position on the Russian question from his general adaptation to petty-bourgeois opinion. But the most striking example of Shachtman's adaptationism was expressed by his programmatic capitulation on the Russian question when the liberals discovered the Stalinist monster after the 1939 Stalin-Hitler pact!

Like the "radical dandies" Trotsky described as hopping carelessly from twig to twig, the RSL brushes aside the conquests of the October Revolution while eclectically adopting contradictory positions on related issues (in order not to become unpopular). Cramer pointed out that the implications of the Russian question don't stop with defense of the USSR. Does the RSL take a side on the military war between Mao Tse-tung and Chiang Kai-shek? Even after the United States has withdrawn from Vietnam, the RSL retains the position of its parent, the right-Shachtmanite International Socialists, which claims that the Vietnam struggle is for "self-determination." If it were consistent in its policies, the RSL would have to consider the NLF as the agent of "Stalinist imperialism" and call for revolutionary defeatism on both sides—as the IS did until it became popular to defend the Viet Cong. But what is really occurring is not a struggle of two competing imperialisms. There is a class war going on in Vietnam, with the bourgeoisie on one side and the peasants on the other! Trotskyists take sides in the class war, while also calling for the formation of a Vietnamese Trotskyist party to replace the

Stalinist misleaders who have continually sought to accommodate U.S. imperialism and its puppets through formation of a "coalition government."

Similarly Shachtman maintained that the Stalinist parties in the West were bureaucratic-collectivist. He therefore blocked unconditionally with the trade-union bureaucracy against the CP, even when the CP line was to the left. With its own position that Russia is state-capitalist, the RSL to be consistent should claim that the Western CPs are bourgeois parties, since they are clearly agents of Russia's Stalinist rulers. However, Mayhew argued that they must be defended against the capitalist state. Why? Would the RSL, like Shachtman, bloc with the French social democrats against the CP? Or, like the German centrist group Spartacus-BL, does it maintain that the social democracy is also bourgeois? These questions were left unanswered.

Likewise the RSL failed to explain how in the Hungarian revolution, when the proletariat took over the factories and set up workers councils, 80 percent of the Stalinist bureaucracy went over to the revolution and the CP rank and file provided much of the leadership. Is this the behavior of a bourgeois class faced with a threat to its class rule?

Thus at the debate's end, while the SL/RCY had not been treated to any new explanation of "state capitalism" in the USSR, at least they received a clearer picture of the RSL. The RSL has in no sense cut off its fundamental Shachtmanite roots; its refusal to defend the gains of the October Revolution against imperialist attack makes this absolutely clear. ■

## Corrections

It has come to our attention that in WV No. 26 (3 August) the picture story on "Rightest Coup Fails in Chile" placed the earlier coup attempt on June 21. The correct date was June 29.

In WV No. 28 (14 September), the concluding article on "Trotskyist Work in the Trade Unions" cited miners' union president John L. Lewis as having supported the Republican Wendell Wilkie in the 1944 elections. Lewis supported Wilkie in 1940 and in 1944 backed Thomas Dewey (also Republican). In the same article the post-war membership of the Communist Party is given as 10,000 after a period of decline. In fact the CP membership was close to 80,000 and had increased during the war.

In WV No. 29, (28 September) the article "Defend the Detroit Teachers' Strike" has an unfortunate typographical error. After noting the militancy of Michigan teachers the article states "no thanks to the teachers" of the DFT. It should, of course, read "no thanks to the leaders" of the DFT. The article on "Chilean Leftists on Allende" in the same issue lists a source for the United Secretariat's endorsement of the MIR as *World Outlook*, 17 September 1973. It should be 17 September 1965.

Concerning the article "Woodcock Settles for Nothing" in the same issue, several auto workers have questioned whether the phrase "humanize the work force" reportedly in the UAW bargaining convention resolution might not be a misprint for "humanize the work place." It is not. Apparently the Woodcock bureaucracy not only treats the membership like animals but actually believes its ranks are subhuman.

There were also several minor typographical errors in this last issue. We are attempting to overcome these by improving our proofreading procedures and apologize to the readership.

## Spartacist Local Directory

BERKELEY—  
OAKLAND..... (415) 653-4668  
Box 852, Main P.O.  
Berkeley, CA 94701

BOSTON..... (617) 492-3928  
Box 188, M.L.T. Sta.  
Cambridge, MA 02139

BUFFALO..... (716) 837-1854  
Box 412, Station C  
Buffalo, NY 14209

CHICAGO..... (312) 728-2151  
Box 6471, Main P.O.  
Chicago, IL 60680

CLEVELAND..... (216) 696-4943  
Box 6765  
Cleveland, OH 44101

DETROIT..... (313) 862-4920  
Box 663A, General P.O.  
Detroit, MI 48232

LOS ANGELES..... (213) 467-6855  
Box 38053, Wilcox Sta.  
Los Angeles, CA 90038

MILWAUKEE  
Box 5144, Harbor Sta.  
Milwaukee, WI 53204

NEW ORLEANS..... (504) 866-8384  
Box 51634, Main P.O.  
New Orleans, LA 70151

NEW YORK..... (212) 925-2426  
Box 1377, G.P.O.  
New York, NY 10001

SAN DIEGO..... (714) 272-2286  
Box 22052, Univ. City Sta.  
San Diego, CA 92122

SAN FRANCISCO..... (415) 653-4668  
Box 1757  
San Francisco, CA 94101



Continued from page 7

# Zionism and Nationalism in Brezhnev's Russia

to defend Soviet political prisoners," held in New York, these groups endorsed a plan to 1) work together for defense of Soviet political prisoners, 2) work out "a broad formulation on the questions of social justice, democracy, and national self-determination," and 3) encourage the study of various social systems and ideologies (*Militant*, 20 April 1973). Not a word about socialism or the political revolution; not a hint of unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against imperialism!

The conference went on to collect signatures for a petition demanding the release of political prisoners in the Soviet Union. This petition appeared in the *New York Times* during Brezhnev's June 1973 visit to the U.S. and was signed by such notables as former U.S. Attorney-General Ramsey Clark and former Kennedy aide Arthur Schlesinger Jr., one of the architects of the Bay of Pigs invasion! The SWP, which has been active in the campaign to free Ukrainian socialists Dzyuba and Chornovil, organized by the New York CDSP and the "Set Them Free" Committee, has not uttered a word of criticism on the politics and strategy of these groups. Under present conditions when the most prominent Soviet dissidents, like Sakharov, are urging the U.S. Senate toward economic blackmail against the USSR, a campaign around Soviet political prisoners involving prominent politicians can only have an anti-communist thrust. In any case, the minimum condition for Trotskyist participation in any organization to defend Russian political prisoners is that it explicitly refuse to defend active counterrevolutionaries.

## Soviet Jews and Zionism

Zionism is one form of nationalism which the SWP does not support, since it represents the "nationalism of the oppressor" Israeli state. However, in the Soviet Union Zionism is the "nationalism of the oppressed," which the SWP claims leads to revolutionary communism!

After the October Revolution Soviet Jews were recognized as a separate nationality with rights to cultural autonomy, and Yiddish was legalized for schools in the Jewish areas. But Jewish national development was never very successful, as the Jews were a predominantly urban group, scattered in cities throughout the Republic. The artificial Jewish Autonomous Republic in the Far East (Birobidzhan) did not flourish, because most Jews were in fact on the road to voluntary assimilation. Before World War II, the rate of intermarriage between Jews and Russians was very high.

With the outbreak of World War II, assimilation of Jews ceased abruptly. The effect of German occupation (during which Jews in the occupied areas were decimated by the Nazis) and the anti-semitic response of large numbers of Russians and Ukrainians, startled Soviet Jews into a national identity

they had not previously developed. The post-war establishment of the state of Israel and Stalin's campaign against Jewish culture (and Jews in general) served to deepen growing national consciousness.

Anti-semitism has always been used by the bureaucracy as a cover for its predatory policies and administrative blunders. By labeling the Left Opposition as discontented Jews, Stalin aimed to discredit and isolate it from the workers. Similarly, after World War II, Stalin's crackdown on intellectuals took the form of a campaign against "cosmopolitanism" and involved a large-scale purge of Jews from party, government and academic posts. Stalin and later Krushchev always tried to place much of the blame for the country's economic problems on Jews. For example, Krushchev's "anti-speculation" campaign of the early 1960's, ostensibly directed against economic sabotage (whose main cause is bureaucratic planning methods and bureaucratic theft) was actually intended to whip up anti-semitism. More than half those sentenced to death were Jews; in the traditionally anti-semitic Ukraine, 90 percent of those sentenced to death were Jews, although Jews comprise only 2 percent of the Ukrainian population (Zvi Gitelman, *Nationalities and Nationalism in the U.S.S.R.: the Jews*).

The result of this bureaucratic discrimination is the recent upsurge of Zionism. This phenomenon mainly affects Jewish scientists and professionals of the post-war generation, who hope to gain a more comfortable existence through emigration to Israel (often a way-station for their final destination: the U.S.) and sections of Jewish youth, who are asserting a national identity in reaction to the Stalinist anti-semitism which has raised Jewish culture to the status of "forbidden fruit."

While the educated Jewish petty bourgeoisie can hope to establish high-paid careers in the West, many workers and youth who have emigrated to Israel for purely romantic reasons soon regret their error and try to return to the Soviet Union. However, for Jews who have not experienced the unemployment, capitalist exploitation and discrimination of capitalist Israel, anti-bureaucratic discontent often takes the form of Zionism, just as for non-Jews it can take the form of Ukrainian or Latvian nationalism, or even retreat to Russian Orthodox religion. Today Zionism is supported by only a small minority of the some 3,000,000 Jews in the Soviet Union; nevertheless, it remains a significant symptom of the political and cultural malaise affecting all sections of Soviet society.

Through the joint efforts of the American Zionist community, which has no intention of giving up its profitable businesses in order to go to Israel, and the Israeli bourgeoisie, which needs new sources of immigration to secure its hold on the West Bank, Rus-

sian Jews have recently become a pawn in American-Russian relations. The Jackson Amendment now under consideration in the U.S. Congress would prohibit lowering of import duties on goods from the Soviet Union until the latter permits unrestricted emigration, particularly for Jews. Socialists must oppose this legislation which amounts to using the state power of the American bourgeoisie to force concessions from the USSR through economic blackmail. Rather, the labor movement must defend the deformed workers states against imperialism, which includes supporting the unrestricted access of the USSR to world trade, and for that reason opposing the Jackson amendment.

At the same time it is necessary for revolutionaries to oppose the Russian bureaucracy's emigration tax currently being applied particularly against Jewish professionals. There is nothing wrong with insisting on recovery of the capital spent by the state in the education of highly-trained scientists, technicians, etc. In an emergency situation even a total prohibition of emigration, especially for trained professionals, can be justified. Such measures have been taken by a number of the poorer capitalist countries whose economic development is threatened by a "brain drain" of educated personnel. In July 1918 Trotsky declared he was drafting ex-officers of the tsarist army because they "had received their education at the people's expense" and now had to repay the debt (*Wall Street Journal*, 4 October 1973).

But such measures should not discriminate against any particular social or national section of the population. In the present situation, where even the Russian bureaucracy does not claim to have an emergency shortage of scientists and is permitting the emigration of trained professionals, a regulation requiring all college graduates to work a certain number of years in the USSR before being eligible to emigrate would be equitable. (This principle has long been accepted even by social democrats. In the late 1940's the British Labour government favored state education of doctors on the grounds that this would give the government the right to require the graduates to work in those areas where their skills were most needed.) The present discriminatory tax only increases pro-Zionist sentiments among Jews in the USSR and anti-communism in the West, thereby aiding the enemies of socialism throughout the world.

Revolutionary Trotskyists firmly support the right of Russian citizens, including Jews, to freely emigrate to the country of their choice. This is the counterside of our opposition to ethnically, nationally and otherwise exclusionist immigration laws. Thus during the late 1940's the then-Trotskyist SWP campaigned for opening U.S. borders to the thousands of Jews languishing in European refugee camps. Therefore, we also oppose the reported intention of the Austrian government, under social-democratic Premier Kreisky (and with the support of the Austrian Nazis), to refuse transit to Jewish emigrés leaving the USSR.

However, at the same time it is necessary to wage an uncompromising struggle against the chauvinist "Law of Return" which makes all Jews automatically citizens of Israel, while simultaneously excluding the Palestinian refugees who were driven from their homes by successive Israeli military operations. We have always defended the right of the Hebrew-speaking population to continue to live in the Palestine area, while likewise defending the rights of the Arab refugees to return to their homeland. A real peace in the Middle East is only possible by uniting Arabic- and Hebrew-speaking workers and peasants in a common struggle against capitalism. But this general proposition does not eliminate the national question in Palestine. It is necessary to recognize the right of self-determination on both sides and also to call for general secularization. The alternative is national war and possible genocide, pitting the less than three million Israeli Jews against tens of

millions of Arabs. So long as the religious-exclusionist "Law of Return" and the theocratic state of Israel remain, the Hebrew-speaking population of Palestine will be building not a Promised Land free from oppression but a death-trap for Jews.

## The National Question and the Political Revolution

The Jewish question in the Soviet Union is not a national question at this time, although the bureaucracy's anti-Jewish policies could unleash a wave of anti-semitism in the population, creating a national problem where none existed before. This can best be avoided by eliminating all ethnic discrimination and by permitting full linguistic and cultural rights for the Jewish minority. Such measures would aid full assimilation a hundred times more than a ban on emigration to Israel. Similarly, in the case of the Crimean Tatars and Volga Germans, peoples who have no possibility of forming a viable nation-state, let alone a viable workers state, revolutionaries must call for their right to live wherever they want, particularly in their former homelands, in order to partially right the wrong done to them by Stalin. To go further than this and advocate national existence would be utopian and reactionary.

However the question takes on a different and more complex character when Trotskyists attempt to relate to national movements in traditional and viable nations, such as the Baltic republics and the Ukraine. Trotskyists, unlike ultra-lefts, recognize that in these countries, the national question is still on the agenda, in spite of the international nature of the modern world economy, and unconditionally support their right to self-determination.

Trotskyists do not condemn anti-bureaucratic struggles such as the Hungarian uprising of 1956 because they include diverse elements, even bourgeois nationalists. No revolution, social or political, begins in a pure form. Rather, we seek to intervene and lead these movements onto the correct path of proletarian revolution. To place one's trust in the class-collaborationist bureaucracy, that "bourgeois organ of a workers state," rather than in the working class, as the Marcyites (now the Workers World Party) did in supporting the crushing of the Hungarian revolution, is not only criminal but in the long run self-defeating. The bureaucracy is no guardian of socialist interests! It is continually generating restorationist tendencies within itself and encouraging the rise of nationalist and even fascist elements in society at large!

When the tight lid of bureaucratic rule is lifted, even for one day, all the social forces, both healthy and morbid, which have waited as if in suspended animation suddenly come to life and vie for power. The Transitional Program permits the proletarian vanguard to intervene and polarize the situation, winning the working class and a section of the petty bourgeoisie to its banner. But the forging of the vanguard party requires a firm and consistent struggle against all forms of bourgeois ideology, including the deadliest of all—nationalism. ■

## forum

### "Women and the Bolshevik Revolution"

Speaker:  
D.L. REISSNER  
Editor, *Women and Revolution*

Saturday, October 20 7:30 p.m.  
St. Gregory's Church Auditorium  
144 W. 90th Street, New York City

## NEW YORK

For information call: (212) 925-5665

## RCY FORUM

# Counterrevolution in Chile

William L. Harkness Hall  
Room 201  
Yale University  
7:30 p.m.

Speaker: JAN NORDEN, Editor WORKERS VANGUARD

Tuesday 16 October

New Haven



TROTSKYISM

munist opposition—not just militant trade unionism. Together with Trotsky we affirm that the Transitional Program is the program for struggle in the unions. This does not mean that every caucus program must be a carbon copy of the SL Declaration of Principles—it is necessary to choose those demands which best serve to raise socialist consciousness in the particular situation. What is essential is that the caucus program of transitional demands not be limited to militant reformism, but contain the political perspective of socialist revolution.

Davidson quotes from Trotsky's 1940 conversations with SWP leaders to claim that Trotskyist trade-union work amounted to "anti-communism." We have recently published a series of articles on "Trotskyist Work in the Trade Unions" (WV No. 25-28) detailing our criticisms of the SWP's policy of one-sided emphasis on blocs with "progressive" bureaucrats and its failure to build a communist pole in the unions. However, it was perfectly correct during the late 1930's to concentrate the Trotskyists' trade-union work on opposition to the Stalinists: these were the agents of Roosevelt in the labor movement, the authors and enforcers of the no-strike pledge during World War II. Of course, no one can accuse Davidson's friends in the October League or Revolutionary Union of attacking the Communist Party (or for that matter any militant reformist bureaucrat) in their trade-union work. Rather they uniformly support left bureaucrats in office (such as Chavez of the Farmworkers) and form blocs with out-bureaucrats when the incumbent leadership is too conservative to awaken any illusions at all among the workers.

Consistent with his pattern of distortion of Trotsky's positions in the earlier articles of the series, Davidson seeks to create the impression that Trotsky endorsed the SWP's practice of blocking with "progressive" bureaucrats against the Stalinists. Not so! In 1940 Trotsky explicitly criticized the SWP for softness toward pro-Roosevelt unionists and insisted on an orientation toward the ranks of the CP.

The Struggle for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International

The degeneration of the SWP from Bolshevism to centrism did not simply occur one day in 1961, but was the result of a process of programmatic (and ultimately organizational) degeneration of the Fourth International after World War II. The critical point came with the split of the FI in 1953 which signified the organizational demise of the unified world party of socialist revolution. At the heart of the split was the program put forward by Michel Pablo, head of the International Secretariat of the FI, of "deep entry" into the reformist Stalinist parties, redubbed centrism in order to justify the new line. Pablo no longer saw the crisis of

revolutionary leadership as the key roadblock to revolution and the construction of the Fourth International as the solution. Instead he adopted the objectivist theory that the overwhelming crisis of capitalism (his "war-revolution thesis") would force the Stalinists to undertake at least deformed revolutions. Thus Pablo's "Theses on International Perspectives" of the Third Congress of the FI (1951) state:

"The objective conditions determine in the long run the character and dynamic of the mass movement which, taken to a certain level, can overcome all the subjective obstacles in the path of the revolution."

—Quatrième Internationale, August-September 1951

When it became clear that the implication of Pablo's line was the organizational liquidation of the FI into the dominant Stalinist and social-democratic parties, and when this was brought home by a liquidationist pro-Pablo faction (headed by Cochran and Clarke) in the SWP itself, the party majority reacted sharply. James Cannon wrote:

"The essence of Pabloist revisionism is the overthrow of that part of Trotskyism which is today its most vital part—the conception of the crisis of mankind as the crisis of the leadership of the labor movement summed up in the question of the party."

—"Factional Struggle and Party Leadership," November 1953

The organizational destruction of the FI by Pabloist revisionism in 1953 had come about as the result of a number of factors affecting the entire Trotskyist movement after World War II, but particularly the European sections. For one thing, virtually their entire pre-war leadership had been murdered either by the Nazi Gestapo or the Stalinist GPU. The living continuity with Trotsky had virtually been broken. Furthermore the sections had been decimated and largely isolated from the working class, while the Stalinists had been able to expand their influence through leadership of anti-Hitler partisan struggles. At the same time Stalinist regimes were set up under the protection of the Russian Army in Eastern Europe, and peasant-based insurrection in China led to the overthrow of capitalism and the creation of a deformed workers state. Faced with these unexpected developments the initial response of the Trotskyist movement was to maintain that the Eastern European Stalinist regimes were still capitalist. Not until 1955 did the SWP, for instance, decide that China had become a deformed workers state. Having unwittingly vulgarized Trotsky's dialectical understanding of Stalinism, the orthodox Trotskyists stressed Stalinism's counterrevolutionary side until their theories no longer squared with reality. This disorientation enabled the revisionist current around Pablo to justify its opportunist appetites by concluding from the limited social transformations in Eastern Europe that non-proletarian, non-Trotskyist forces can lead any form of social revolution.

The SWP had been least affected by this process, having emerged from the war with its leadership intact, its membership and ties to the working class increased and the Stalinists still relatively weak compared to Europe.

It was natural that in 1953 the SWP should lead the fight for orthodox Trotskyism. But in fact the party waged only a half-struggle, virtually withdrawing from any international work until the late 1950's. The "International Committee" which it formed with the French and British majorities who opposed Pablo hardly functioned at all. As the party lost virtually its entire trade-union cadre in the Cochran-Clarke fight, and the greater part of its entire membership left during the McCarthy years, the leadership began moving to the right in the late 1950's in search of some force or movement it could latch onto in order to regain mass influence.

It found this in the Cuban revolution, which evoked a wave of sympathy throughout Latin America and in the U.S. The party leadership declared that Cuba was basically a healthy workers state, although not yet possessing the forms of workers democracy (!) and that Fidel Castro was a natural Marxist (i.e., he supposedly acted like a Trotskyist even though he talked first as a bourgeois nationalist and later as a Stalinist).

Not surprisingly, this was the same line taken by the Pabloists in Europe. If the petty-bourgeois Stalinist bureaucracies could carry out a social revolution in Eastern Europe, they reasoned, why not also a petty-bourgeois nationalist like Castro. Thus in practice the SWP was coming over to the Pabloist line. At the same time an opposition was formed inside the SWP (the Revolutionary Tendency, predecessor of the Spartacist League) which considered Cuba a deformed workers state and criticized the SWP leadership's capitulation to Castro and the European Pabloists. The RT in 1963 proposed a counterthesis ("Toward the Rebirth of the Fourth International") to the majority's document which was the basis for the SWP's reunification with the European Pabloists to form the "United Secretariat." While the party majority supported a peasant-based "guerrilla road to power" the RT upheld the orthodox Trotskyist position that only the proletariat could lead the struggle for agrarian revolution and national liberation.

The RT was expelled from the SWP in 1963 for its revolutionary opposition to the majority's Pabloist tailing after petty-bourgeois forces. Subsequently the gap between the SWP's policies and the Trotskyism of the Spartacist group continued to widen. The ex-Trotskyist SWP capitulated in turn to black nationalism, bourgeois pacifism and feminism, to the point where today it is a hardened reformist organization with appetites to become the dominant social-democratic party of the U.S.

We must learn from this history of defeats that revisionism leads to the same consequences whether it comes from Stalinist origins or from erstwhile Trotskyists. The Maoist line defended by the Guardian in no way offers a proletarian alternative to the reformism of the SWP. Instead of the SWP's single-issue reformist campaigns in alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie (NPAC, WONAAC), the Maoists propose multi-issue reformist campaigns in alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie (PCPJ). The only road to socialist revolution is to make a sharp

break with Stalinist and Pabloist revisionism and return to the Marxist program of proletarian class independence, uniquely embodied in the U.S. by the Spartacist League. Internationally this means an unrelenting struggle for the creation of a democratic-centralist programmatically-united Trotskyist tendency to carry out the task of reconstruction of the FI. Down with Pabloism! For the Rebirth of the Fourth International! ■

Sub-Drive Report

At the half-way point of our subscription drive (three out of the total of six weeks), the national quota has been almost fulfilled. The capacity of the SL/RCY to obtain subscriptions was clearly underestimated. The main reasons for success to date have been systematic hard work by the locals, the rapid growth of the Spartacist League and Revolutionary Communist Youth over the last period and the quality of *Workers Vanguard*, which is becoming widely recognized as the only serious Marxist press in the U.S. The increased interest in WV has also been reflected in our street sales, which have increased from roughly 4,000 a month last spring to more than 7,000 every two weeks at present. On the basis of the enthusiastic response so far we can expect to substantially extend the WV subscription base, enabling us to increase our modest yet unmistakable impact on the left and aiding the efforts of the SL to affect the living struggles of the labor movement.

Short regional tours, run by each local, have contributed to the drive's success in the early weeks. This has extended the influence of the SL/RCY to many areas where we have not before been present. Along with WV, street sales of *Young Spartacus* have doubled during the period of the drive, greatly aiding its stabilization as the bi-monthly newspaper of the RCY. *Women and Revolution*, which appeared at the end of September, is also enjoying a phenomenal success with several hundred sold in the first week alone. Subscribe now! (Don't forget that in addition to being the best press on the left, WV, YS and W&R are also the fastest—being sent, at great expense, by first class mail. Because the cost of mailing alone far exceeds the subscription price, we suggest to opponent organizations on the left that one of the best ways to drive the SL into financial bankruptcy is to encourage your members to subscribe to WV!)

The subscription drive has also brought us into conflicts with company police and union goon squads at a number of plants around the country, particularly Buffalo, Cleveland and Detroit. As shown in the sub totals for these areas such clashes have not hindered the success of our sales. However, we will vigorously fight every effort to deprive the workers of the right to hear and read the views of all working-class tendencies. The right to free discussion of ideas inside the unions is intimately linked to the right to read the labor press. The same goon squads now being used to suppress the left newspapers outside the plant gates will be used for suppressing dissidents in the union meetings and, as the UAW bureaucracy's mobilization to squash the Mack Avenue wildcat this summer showed, for breaking strikes. Insist on your right to know the truth—protest all attempts to stop sales of left newspapers in the factories and on campuses! Defend workers democracy! Subscribe to *Workers Vanguard*!

	Quota	To Date
Bay Area	210	120
Boston	140	152
Buffalo	100	161
Chicago	90	103
Cleveland	100	82
Detroit	120	187
Los Angeles	90	61
New York	300	245
At Large	50	23
Total	1200	1134

WORKERS VANGUARD

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Make payable/mail to: Spartacist Publishing Co., P.O. Box 1377, GPO, New York, N.Y. 10001

includes SPARTACIST

- ☐ Enclosed is \$3 for 24 Issues of WORKERS VANGUARD.
- ☐ Enclosed is \$1 for 8 Issues of WORKERS VANGUARD.



# UAW...

knows that the wildcats were a response to real and serious grievances—which the UAW bureaucrats have done nothing about. Did these labor fakers get even the minimum demand of voluntary overtime in the Chrysler contract? Will the local settlements do anything about the intolerable safety conditions in most of the plants? No! The UAW leadership is increasingly isolated from the union ranks—last summer's wildcats make this plain for all to see. Woodcock is playing with fire. Having blamed the spontaneous revolts of the auto workers on reds, assuming the workers would accept his sellouts as a "lesser evil," he may one day soon find his ranks willing to ally even with reds, who are at least willing to pursue the class struggle.

## Local Gangsterism

The frenzy of the UAW tops is now being expressed by local leaders who encourage goon attacks like the recent criminal assault on WV salesmen in Cleveland. An 18-member, standing goon squad was formed by the Local 1005 bureaucracy, currently headed by William Brake, at the Parmaplant. The officially-inspired gang of brawlers (mostly composed of committeemen and other officials) has attacked, in addition to the Spartacist League (SL), sellers of *Modern Times*, a local Cleveland New Left syndicalist paper; *People Get Ready*, a similar paper supported by the right-wing Maoist Revolutionary Union (RU); and *Workers Power*, the paper of the left-social-democratic International Socialists (IS).

SL paper salesmen have also been harassed at the Ford and GM plants at Mahwah and Linden, New Jersey, by groups inspired by the bureaucracy. These same groups have driven off

salesmen of the fake-Trotskyist Workers League and syndicalist *News and Letters* at Mahwah and left-Shachtmanite Revolutionary Socialist League and the opportunist-adventurist Workers Action Movement (WAM—supported by Progressive Labor) at Linden.

In striking contrast to the pervasive anti-communism of the late 1940's and 1950's, in which social democrats and Reutherite trade-union bureaucrats led a widespread purge of reds from the unions, the UAW's rationale for the present witchhunt lacks even the lame excuse of the McCarthy era that Communists were "agents of a foreign power." This time, the reds are seen as the spark which set off strikes in a situation in which the bureaucrats are forced to admit that "working in [an auto] plant, or any plant, for that matter, is no picnic," because complaints "often are ignored by plant managements," and numerous other abuses are common-place (*UAW Solidarity*, September 1973).

## Partnership In a Fraud

Company provocations, such as mass firings of militants, as well as other grievances, promoted "unofficial" strikes throughout the auto industry during August and September. The calculated strike-breaking efforts of the UAW "leadership," culminating in the Mack Avenue atrocity, were an act of direct partnership with the companies in their effort to weaken and demoralize the workers before a strike, crush resistance and thereby help prevent any real gains by the workers. This is all done in the name of enhancing the supposedly "legitimate" interests of the companies in making as much profit as possible (as long as they share some crumbs with the workers!) and increasing productivity so as to improve competition with foreign capitalist rivals.

The Chrysler "settlement" confirmed the bureaucracy's success in this. Against hostile but disorganized and apathetic ranks, the bureaucrats have rammed through what is one of the greatest frauds ever perpetrated on auto workers. The contract's main purpose is revealed as improving productivity through controlling absenteeism—through a "voluntary overtime" clause which is so hemmed in with restrictions that it is bound to ensure the performance of more work rather than less! Its "crumbs," in the form of a dental plan and 30-and-out provision, are wholly inadequate, and its wage "increase" is guaranteed to result in further erosion of real wages. While this contract has been put over at Chrysler, it still must be forced on reluctant Ford and GM workers, who, moreover, have time to think about it while "negotiations" proceed, first with Ford, then GM. The official union goon squads and attacks on reds at Ford and GM plants are a direct attempt to intimidate the workers and cow internal opposition at this sensitive time, when the officials know what a rotten sellout they will soon have to defend to the ranks.

## Night-Riders in the "Leadership"

While ultimate responsibility for the Parma goon attack resides in Solidarity House, the Local 1005 bureaucracy contributes its own special impetus to the anti-red campaign, resulting in a particularly zealous, efficient and brutal record. In the early 1960's a red-neck contingent organized mainly as the "Unionist Party" won control in the local. The Dixie flag was contemptuously displayed in the union hall and racial incidents including shootings occurred in the plant, although the news was suppressed by the management and local bureaucracy. The incidents in the plant created such tensions that the International, together with GM management, was compelled to intervene. The International tacitly supported the firing of ex-president Gene Murphy, who had just returned from jail for passing bad checks, in the middle of his campaign for office, and kicked other racists upstairs to International staff. The current president, Brake,

then won election on the "Progressive Party" ticket, but his "liberalism" was a mask for the creation of a regime based on the same racist elements and including many tag-alongs from the previous administration.

Erosion of real wages, the wage-price freeze, the union's role in suppressing worker militancy and rising discontent among black workers over the local's open racism contributed to a great decline in support for Brake. Running for his third term in the Spring of this year, he lost in the primary and then barely won in the runoff election. With a new sellout coming and the militancy of workers in nearby plants such as the Chrysler Twinsburg stamping plant, which was one of the few plants to turn down the Chrysler contract, as inspiration for Local 1005 members, the already discredited Brake gang needs all the help it can get to stay in power. The standing white goon squad is a barely disguised threat of KKK night-riding terror to intimidate the black workers into submission and line up the whites, against their real interests, to see black workers and "reds" as their enemy.

The lesson of the anti-communist purge and hysteria of the post-World War II period is that anti-communism and denial of basic rights of workers democracy within the labor movement inevitably go hand in hand with the creation of an impervious, entrenched and self-satisfied bureaucracy, which is not only against reds but against any serious struggle for the workers' basic interests against the companies'. Feeding on racial hostility and the passivity of those who have given up fighting, such a bureaucracy is willing—even anxious—to sell out every important gain of the workers' struggle and preside over the decline of the unions into impotent caricatures of themselves. It is necessary for all workers interested in militant, democratic unionism to unite to combat renewed outbreaks of race hatred and anti-communism, as a necessary precondition for returning the unions to the only path for victory—the class struggle.

## For United-Front Defense Against Bureaucratic Anti-Communist Goon Attacks!

The responses of the ostensibly revolutionary left in Cleveland to the initial appeals of the Spartacist League for a united front over the attack of September 27 leave much to be desired, however. Supporters of the Revolutionary Union-backed *People Get Ready* categorically refuse to consider any joint action with the Trotskyist Spartacist League, despite our common victimization by the same anti-communist bureaucrats. This is hardly surprising, since the RU's Stalinist methods are identical to those of the trade-union bureaucracy. In June, salesmen of the RU-supported *Boy Area Worker* physically attacked *Workers Vanguard* salesmen outside the Fremont, California GM plant. When the Spartacist League mobilized in force to defend its rights the attacks ceased. The RU has reportedly also attacked salesmen of the *Workers League Bulletin* at the Milpitas California Ford plant.

## "WORKERS VANGUARD Defends BULLETIN's Right to Sell"

The Spartacist League categorically defends the right of all tendencies within the labor movement, no matter how insignificant or politically discredited they may be, to freely propagate their ideas. Only in this way will the workers be freed from arbitrary, bureaucratic restraint and able to judge courses of action solely upon their merits. Thus when the *Bulletin* (24 September) claimed that vicious attacks by the RU were continuing, the SL verbally informed the RU that attacks on the WL salesmen would be considered attacks on it, and showed up for the next *Bulletin* sale at the plant gate with a sign reading, "Workers Vanguard defends *Bulletin's* right to sell." The sale was uneventful.

At least some progressive service will have been performed if the attacks by anti-communist goons against the RU in Ohio and elsewhere drive home to the best militants of the RU the lesson that their own Stalinist goon-squad sectarianism is responsible for their plight. Like the Communist Party in the 1930's, the RU will eventually discover that its failure to practice and defend workers democracy will rebound upon it as it is driven out of the unions by the same bureaucrats it is cuddling up to today. Better to learn this lesson now!

As for the Workers League, with its cynical lack of any and all principles, deeply ingrained habits of lying and sectarian exclusion of other groups from its public meetings, it denies the need for united-front defense. Having at first denied the need for defense at the previously mentioned Fremont sale, WL supporters were spreading lies about the SL's unwillingness to defend them... until the SL showed up anyway.

The IS and its recent left-excretion, the RSL, have so far proven to be too busy (presumably out peddling their workerist, opportunist politics in safer quarters) to risk the appearance of serious cooperation in defense efforts with the "sectarian" SL. The reformist Communist Party cannot, of course, even contemplate the rupture of its comfortable relations with the trade-union bureaucracy (particularly Woodcock!) which any return to the Leninist principles of its long forgotten early years would entail. And the ex-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party, meanwhile, perhaps because the memories are just slightly fresher and its ties to the bureaucracy far weaker, has a slicker put-off: it deigns to cover its inaction by desiring to be "kept informed" of developments.

Only the minuscule and essentially irrelevant Class Struggle League and the *Modern Times* grouping in Cleveland have clearly indicated willingness to cooperate with the SL in united-front defense against bureaucratic goon-squad anti-communism. A *Modern Times* supporter accompanied the SL sales crew on September 27 and participated in efforts to fend off the attackers. The hard syndicalist and anti-political *Modern Times*, however, completely lacks the political perspective required to make the struggle against goon-squad bureaucratism a reality in the unions (where the issue, in the final analysis, must and will be settled). It opportunistically tails after simple trade-union militancy, which leads it to adapt to backwardness among the workers and to cowardly capitulation in the face of the bureaucracy even when it is under direct attack itself.

The cavalier, temporizing response of most of the left in Cleveland and elsewhere to this issue might ordinarily be simply written off as another example of its general promiscuity with political principles and opportunist groveling before the trade-union bureaucracy. However, failure at this time to defend the right of all groups to freely propagate their views within the labor movement amounts to criminal capitulation before the new anti-communist purge drive of the red-baiting UAW bureaucracy—which affects every socialist tendency and rank-and-file militant directly.

The struggle for workers democracy in the UAW must be consciously linked to the political victory of auto workers. The Chrysler contract defeat is due to the lack of an organized, class-struggle opposition to the reformist, sellout bureaucracy of Woodcock-Fraser. Now this bureaucracy seeks to ensure its continued right to betray auto workers through gangland thug attacks. The Spartacist League has consistently emphasized the need for a political opposition in the unions organized in caucuses based on a class-struggle program. In addition, the SL has struggled intransigently to combat gangsterism and promote genuine workers democracy in the labor movement. Any approach to the struggle in auto lacking these elements will be incapable of achieving victory for auto workers or the working class generally. ■

## SL/RCV Public Offices

### BAY AREA

Wednesday } 1:00-6:00 p.m.  
and Thursday }  
Saturday 2:30-6:00 p.m.

330-40th Street  
(near Broadway)  
Oakland, California  
Phone 653-4668

### BOSTON

Wednesday } 1:00-5:00 p.m.  
and Friday } 7:00-9:00 p.m.

Saturday 11:00 a.m.-3:00

639 Massachusetts Avenue  
Room 335  
Cambridge, Massachusetts  
Phone 492-3928

### NEW YORK

Monday } 3:00-7:30 p.m.  
through Friday }

Saturday 1:00-6:00 p.m.  
260 West Broadway  
Room 522  
New York, New York  
Phone 925-5665

REVOLUTIONARY  
LITERATURE



# WORKERS VANGUARD



Goons criminally assault SL supporters selling WORKERS VANGUARD at Parma, Ohio Chevrolet plant.

WV PHOTO

## Goons Assault WV Salesmen in Cleveland

# Frenzied UAW Bureaucracy Attacks Reds, Militants

CLEVELAND—Nine members and friends of the Spartacist League were assaulted and beaten by 15 thugs in a well-organized goon squad outside the Chevrolet transmission plant in Parma, Ohio, near Cleveland, on September 27. The sudden, unannounced attack took place only minutes after SL supporters had begun to sell *Workers Vanguard* on the street to workers going into the plant in the afternoon. The goons ripped the papers out of the hands of the salesmen, grabbing and beating those who made the slightest resistance. In an obviously well-rehearsed maneuver, they broke off their engagement as soon as the SL supporters were clear of the area, and disappeared quickly into the plant parking lot. (However, despite the goon squad's attempt to avoid identification, WV managed to get photographs of the entire incident and pictures of the individual thugs as they assaulted our salesmen.)

The entire incident lasted no more than a few minutes, but in the course of it two SL supporters were knocked to the ground, one was kicked in the head, another given a black eye and others badly bruised. The SL members defended themselves as best they could against the large and well-coordinated force. The obviously pre-planned attack was timed so that it took place rapidly and in the view of only a few workers, who were waiting to cross the street into the plant. The goon squad was noticeably all white, in marked contrast to the racially-mixed workforce at the plant.

This vicious attack was not an isolated incident. It was part of a pattern

of events sweeping the UAW nationally since the Mack Avenue sit-down strike in Detroit in mid-August, one month before the auto contract expirations. UAW tops mobilized 1,000 local officers into a gigantic special goon squad to crush that "illegal" strike, which they admit was part of a series of wildcat strikes in Detroit sparked by serious, real grievances. After the strike, the same goons served as an attack force against "extremists" outside the plant.

Thug attacks on leftist paper sellers continued for a few days until the bureaucrats were discouraged by such events as workers coming out of the plant at Dodge Main to defend the right of leftists to sell their papers. Meanwhile, an extraordinary article on wildcat strikes and the role of "extremists" was printed in *UAW Solidarity* (September 1973). Denouncing "irresponsible radical groups" who are "masters at exploiting" legitimate grievances, the article served as a call for the entire UAW bureaucracy to mount a purge against all leftists and militants, whether inside the union or outside selling their papers.

Woodcock's maneuver is obvious, and was spelled out explicitly by UAW leaflets distributed at Detroit plants after the Mack Avenue sit-down: blame the reds for the strikes. But if it was only "a handful of outside agitators" behind the wildcats, why did it take a 1,000-strong army of UAW bureaucrats to put them down? Every worker in those plants, whether or not he supported the particular tactics,

*continued on page 11*

## Picket Solidarity House!

The continuing attacks on left-wing paper salesmen by official UAW-backed goon squads constitute flagrant denial of the most basic rights of workers democracy. These attacks are part of a general attempt to intimidate and silence all opposition to the sell-out, reformist bureaucracy, both inside and outside the union.

The Spartacist League affirms the right of all tendencies and groups within the labor movement to freely propagate their views, in public and in the unions. We call on all those groups and individuals who stand in solidarity with the auto workers against the companies (i.e., are not strikebreakers) and support militant, democratic unionism to join with us in protesting the attacks on paper salesmen through a picket of Solidarity House, international union headquarters of the UAW in Detroit.

The united-front picket line will be open to all groups on the above basis, provided only that no attempt is made to utilize the protest in direct support of any action which crosses the class line by using bourgeois cops or courts against the union (i.e., using the protest to publicize a court suit). All groups accepting the basis of the action are of course free to raise their own slogans.

## Defend Workers Democracy!

## Stop the Goon Attacks!

Wed., 17 October—1 p.m.  
Detroit—8000 E. Jefferson Ave.

# Defend Workers Democracy