



NEWSWEEK

## Nixon on the Brink

# Impeachment Is Not Enough!

OCTOBER 21—By refusing to turn over the now-famous Watergate tapes, forcing the resignation of Attorney-General Richardson and then firing his own appointed replacement (Ruckelshaus) in order to get rid of Special Watergate Prosecutor Cox, Richard Nixon himself may have finally managed to surpass the bungling of his Watergate associates by bringing down his Administration and thoroughly discrediting the U.S. government in the eyes of just about everyone.

During his term in office Nixon has repeatedly attacked the interests of the working masses. The saturation bombing inflicted on the peasants of Vietnam and Cambodia places him in the company of war criminals of the Nuremberg Trials variety. In the U.S. he has openly and shamelessly attempted to place the cost of economic crisis on the backs of the working class (through inflation, budget cuts for social services, wage controls). Nixon and his deputies have shown an arro-

gance toward working people on a par with Marie Antoinette. Secretary of Agriculture Butz's answer to skyrocketing food costs: "eat less meat"; chief Nixon domestic advisor Laird's answer to the "fuel crisis": "buy sweaters." In the uproar over the Watergate affair these items are, of course, rarely mentioned. All this the ruling class would gladly forgive Nixon, for they are deemed necessary crimes committed in the "holy" cause

continued on page 10

## Down with Holy War— For Workers Revolution!

# No U.S. Aid to Israel!

OCTOBER 22—The renewed outbreak of war in the Near East is a struggle to redraw the "ceasefire" lines of the 1967 conflict which left Israel occupying substantial Arab territory. However, after some initial Arab successes in the current round of hostilities, the Israelis appear to have restabilized their position, and in any event are unlikely to sustain a major military defeat so long as the U.S. continues its massive aid and diplomatic support (including the effective neutralization of Jordan, whose participation in the war is token).

The U.S. and USSR have been able to impose a partial ceasefire on their respective client states. However, it is unlikely that an in-place ceasefire, leaving Israeli troops on the West Bank of the Suez Canal and Egyptian troops on the East Bank, can long survive. Both sides have shown a strong desire to continue the fighting, the Arab states to shore up popular support by deflecting mass discontent into a holy war and Israel because its government believes itself militarily superior. The present ceasefire could well be a very short breathing space in the 25-year-old Arab-Israel conflict.

The Egyptian armored tanks that smashed through Israel's Maginot Line, the Bar Lev Line of air-conditioned bunkers, should have also smashed through the Zionist illusion that every Palestinian peasant exiled, every Arab village bombed and razed, every strip of Arab land seized somehow enhances the security of the Hebrew-speaking population of the Near East (or, as the Zionists claim, of Jews throughout the world). Unless a class mobilization of the working masses of the Near East can cut through the chauvinist antagonisms being hysterically fanned by the Arab and Israeli bourgeoisies, the workers and peasants of both sides will pay in blood for the genocidal aspirations of their rulers. The alternative to unified proletarian revolution is a carnage from which neither the Arab nor the Hebrew-speaking masses can benefit; ultimately, it poses the extermination of the hopelessly outnumbered Hebrews as the reactionary "final solution" of the arrogant Zionist aspirations for a "Jewish homeland" carved out of the territory of the indigenous populations.

### Zionism Destroys Jews to Build Israel

The Zionists' search for a territorial solution to anti-Semitism took

them to the reactionary, anti-Semitic pogromist courts and ministries of pre-World War I tsarist Russia, the Ottoman Sultanate, imperial Germany and Britain. In World War II it took them to the Allied capitals, where they lobbied for the closing of borders to the Jews fleeing Hitler's "final solution" so that the refugees would have nowhere to go except Palestine. The Zionist state, populated by the victims of European fascism, was founded on the Jewish version of the same racist ideology as Nazism, complete with its own doctrine of Lebensraum, and created by driving the Palestinians off their land through genocidal terror (as with the Deir Yassin massacre) and through the expropriation of the land of the Palestinians who fled the battlefields of the 1948 war.

Thus the fulfillment of the Zionist dream of a "Jewish homeland" was a byproduct of the worst defeat of this century for the international working class, the triumph of Hitlerite fascism in Germany, and was facilitated by the closing of borders to Jewish immigration (including those of the U.S., whose rulers' tears for Soviet Jewry today are pure hypocrisy). But despite the reactionary foundations of the Israeli

state, a Hebrew-speaking nation has in fact been created, possessing legitimate national rights. Just as the Palestinians must not be made to pay for the tragedy of European fascism by their extinction as a nation, so the Hebrew nation must not be made to pay for the sins of the Palmach generals, the Meirs, Dayans and Beginis, the Zionist "Old Guard" which has ruled Israel these past 25 years.

But the "Right to Return" law which the Zionists claim entitles any and all Jews to automatic Israeli citizenship should in fact apply not to world Jewry but to the Palestinians who were driven from their homes. The land cannot simply be given back to the fellahin—the Palestinian landlords, who will simply sell it once again to the Jewish Agency as they did before 1948—but must be returned to those who worked the land, the fedayeen. The framework for the resolution of the conflicting national claims of the Palestinians and the Hebrews must necessarily be anti-Zionist and bi-national, anti-nationalist as well as anti-imperialist, socialist as well as democratic. Nowhere is the mandate of Trotsky's permanent revolution clearer than in the Near East,

continued on page 5



GOLDA MEIR



ANWAR SADAT



CAPTURED ISRAELI POWS



# Frisco NMU Officials Assault Militant

In the finest traditions of waterfront goon violence San Francisco National Maritime Union officials viciously assaulted NMU Militant-Solidarity Caucus member Bill Savery on October 15. Their attempt to suppress the expression of opposition viewpoints in the union was unsuccessful, however, and distribution of Caucus literature in the union hall continues.

According to a recent Caucus leaflet, Savery was passing out Caucus literature including the M-SC's newspaper (the *Beacon*) in the San Francisco union hall when the port agent, two patrolmen and other officials demanded that he cease the distribution. Savery protested this arbitrary order and suggested that officials contact the National Office in New York. Port Agent McKinley responded with a threat to "kill" Savery, then forcibly ejected him from the hall with the aid of Patrolmen De Rouseff and Greaves.

Outside the hall Savery was knocked to the ground and kicked by at least five men, including the three officials. His union book was grabbed upon his re-entry into the hall on the pretense of "investigating his union status." The

bureaucrats were well aware of Savery's membership status as he was known to them from his previous participation in Caucus activities, including Gene Herson's campaign for NMU president as the M-SC's candidate in last spring's elections. Savery had distributed literature in the San Francisco hall on other occasions and spoken in union meetings there.

The next day M-SC members confronted national officers in New York. The bureaucrats in effect condoned the West Coast assault in their refusal to investigate the incident. That day, however, Savery's union book was returned to him. And on the following day leaflets condemning the thug attack were distributed in both the New York and San Francisco union halls without physical incident.

The San Francisco port officials have been notoriously eager to employ hooligan violence, even by NMU standards. *Workers Vanguard* sales teams selling outside the hall have been regularly threatened with violence and, on occasion, attacked. Recently this practice has been curtailed as some NMU members, disgusted with the contempt

for democracy displayed by their "leaders," have physically defended our sales.

The M-SC has consistently fought for the right of all members to express their views in the NMU and for workers democracy within the entire labor movement. The bureaucrats claim that only "official literature," such as the union newspaper, the *Pilot*, can be distributed in the hall. However, the *Pilot* is closed to all but the bureaucracy's views. When reformist out-bureaucrat James Morrissey was arrested in the New York hall for distributing his campaign material he was defended by the M-SC despite significant disagreements with his program. The case against Morrissey was laughed out of court by the judge.

During last spring's NMU elections even the Honest Ballot Association, pawn of the incumbent bureaucrats, ruled that oppositional literature could be distributed in the hall. At that time the main concern of the Curren-Wall administration was "reform" candidate James Morrissey's threatened federal court suit charging "undemocratic election procedures."

But with the end of the elections, as the NMU receded from the public eye and the liberal pro-Morrissey bourgeois press, the union bureaucrats have escalated their attacks on the rank and file. As pointed out in the M-SC's 17 October leaflet "Stop Officials Thuggery":

"The recent goon attack in Frisco is an attempt to reestablish thuggery as a way of life in the NMU. If the officials are successful there, they will attempt to spread this practice to other ports. Recent talk of merger with other maritime unions by NMU president Shannon Wall make it particularly important that NMU officials demonstrate their ability to 'control' the membership to their bureaucratic pals in the SIU, Marine Cooks and Stewards, etc."

The Caucus called for NMU members to pass resolutions aboard ship and in port condemning the thug attack on Savery and for public repudiation of this act by the national officers. Real union democracy can be achieved not by appealing to the bosses' courts, as Morrissey does, but through action by the workers themselves to ensure the exercise of democratic principles within their movement. ■

## MLOUSA, SL Defend Against Philippine Nationalists

SAN FRANCISCO—On Saturday September 22 a coalition of groups dominated by Philippine nationalists held a march and demonstration in San Francisco on the basis of "opposition to martial law" in the Philippines and for the "restoration of civil liberties." The September 22 Coalition which issued the call for the rally, made it clear by its actions, as well as in its printed pamphlet, that it is interested only in the restoration of "normal" bourgeois order via parliament, which would maintain Philippine subservience to U.S. imperialism. According to the Coalition's pamphlet:

"The only way that such a tragedy [another Vietnam] can be prevented is if Marcos steps down from power at the end of his elected term on December 30, 1973, and restores civil liberties

and democratic processes. The U.S. government should condition its policy of giving aid to the Philippines upon the restoration of democracy there. . . . "Here in the United States, we patriotic Filipinos and freedom-loving Americans have consistently opposed the anti-popular and unjust policies of Marcos' Martial Law dictatorship."

The Coalition leaders quickly made it clear that they are opposed to civil liberties for the working class in general and communists in particular. When SL/RCY salesmen arrived, a large goon squad emerged and physically harassed our comrades—pushing, shoving and ripping away papers. Not surprisingly, among the goon squad were members of the Maoist Revolutionary Union, who explained that there had been a "decision" that no one should be allowed to sell papers at the demonstration (no doubt in the name of "civil liberties").

Thus the logic of Stalinist/Maoist theory—the "anti-imperialist" bloc with the bourgeoisie—emerged in practice as full-blown anti-communism. The organizers even denounced us with a bullhorn as "provocateurs" and "wreckers." The SWP was allowed to sell the *Militant* after explaining in cringing reformist fashion that, of course, it has nothing critical to say about the Coalition or China!

After a brief march, the Coalition played the Filipino national anthem while the goons again engaged in highly provocative threats and harassment—RCY salesmen were pushed, papers torn up, glasses knocked off and one member was struck in the face. An organizer at the mike again denounced us as "divisive" elements, and this was followed by playing once more the Filipino national anthem in an attempt to whip up chauvinist hysteria.

As could be expected, the ex-Trotskyist SWP refused our request for a united defense bloc, as it has totally abandoned the concept of workers democracy. Similarly, the NCLC remained non-committal when approached. The only group present which agreed to and carried out a united defense bloc was the Marxist-Leninist Organization of the USA (MLOUSA), a mostly black group which traces its ideological lineage to Stalin. It is also a group which is seriously interested in open political discussion within the workers movement and has criticisms of Maoism.

The single MLOUSA member originally present accompanied an RCY salesman as we sold our respective press and explained why the RCY was being banned. This took considerable physical courage in the face of intense harassment from a growing goon squad. Several more MLOUSA sup-

porters soon arrived and joined in the common defense effort, during which a member of MLOUSA had leaflets torn from her hands. This menacing situation ended only when our defense bloc aroused sufficient sympathy in the crowd to force the Philippine-nationalist and Maoist leaderships to pull back. Afterward a member of MLOUSA stated that at first he thought he didn't want to get involved with a "Trotskyite" group, but then realized that if we couldn't sell our papers criticizing Mao, they too could be stopped from selling their literature critical of Mao. He correctly considered workers democracy a matter of principle.

The Bay Area Spartacist League subsequently wrote to MLOUSA thanking it for its principled defense of workers democracy during the September 28 march and repeating our proposal of last December for joint MLOUSA/SL discussions. We noted the serious differences separating ourselves as Trotskyists from a group which considers itself to represent the continuity of Stalin's policies in the current period. However, MLOUSA's positions on international work and the question of blacks and other racial-ethnic minorities in the U.S., as well as its serious attitude toward the building of a vanguard party, do provide a basis for discussion between the two organizations. ■

## Letter

October 17, 1973

*Workers Vanguard*  
Editor,

In an otherwise accurate report on the expulsion of the Revolutionary Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party printed in the Sept. 28, 1973 issue of your paper, you incorrectly stated that I was "organizer of the Hayward, Cal. branch and a delegate to the 1971 SWP convention. . . ." The truth is that I was the organizer of the Hayward local of the YSA and a delegate to the 1969 YSA convention, where I, along with two other comrades, voted against the "Youth Radicalization" document.

In general, you should be congratulated for your consistent publication of the WV even if you must provide space every week or so for corrections. It is because you do publish so frequently now that you can make corrections in time which will be understood by your readership. Your desire to be accurate is also a reflection of your political seriousness. Keep up the good work.

Comradely yours,  
Gerald Clark

## Correction

In WV No. 30 (12 October), the article "Nationalism and Zionism in Brezhnev's Russia" contained the following statement: "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, this "reported intention," based on the closing of the Schönau Castle transit center, was a systematic deception by the pro-Zionist U.S. press. The *New York Times* repeatedly referred to "the Austrian government's publicly announced decision to suspend emigration in groups" (30 September). However, its report of the initial statement by Chancellor Kreisky mentioned only the closing of Schönau Castle as a special facility of the Jewish Agency, and a promise "to stop any facilitation for groups" (*New York Times*, 29 September). Kreisky explicitly permitted the "individual transit of Jews through Vienna" in the same statement, and the term "facilitation" is quite vague. *Newsweek* (15 October) later

reported: "the Austrian leader emphasized that he never intended to stop their transit. 'All we've promised is to close down the camp at Schönau,' he said."

While defending the democratic right of emigration and transit, we wholeheartedly support the closing of the Israeli-run transit camp in Austria. The Schönau Castle transit center is an extra-territorial extension of the Israeli state, policed by Israeli soldiers and excluding Austrians (!)—a Zionist garrison in Austria. A major purpose of the transit center is to screen suspected Soviet spies from entering Israel. The Schönau Castle center is equivalent to the British-ruled enclaves in pre-1949 China. The identification of the closing of the transit center with a prohibition of Jewish emigrants traveling through Austria is typical of the Zionist attempts to equate the democratic rights of Jews and the Hebrew nation with the military expansion of the Israeli state.

We support the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate and its legitimate extension, the right of transit through third countries. However, the closing of the Schönau Castle center does not restrict the legitimate right of transit.

## 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 neces-  
sarily express the editorial  
viewpoint.



# West Europe's Imported Labor: A Key to Revolution

Despite (in reality, because of) the Gaullists' aspirations to make France the most dynamic economy in West Europe, Paris now looks like a Latin American city surrounded with sheet-metal shantytowns crowded with Algerians and Senegalese. A decade of West European "prosperity" has generated an army of impoverished, wretched workers—"the blacks of Europe." In the past decade, foreign laborers in Western Europe have increased from one million to ten million, many of them illegal. Seven percent of Belgium's labor force is foreign, 9 percent of West Germany's and fully 14 percent of France's. These gross figures even understate the dependence of West European capitalism on the Mediterranean labor basin, since foreign labor is concentrated in key industrial sectors of the economy. Half of Belgium's miners are foreign; Arabs run West Germany's railroads and most of Paris' unskilled construction workers are Portuguese. There are so many Turks working for Ford in Cologne that news dealers find it lucrative to sell the Ankara daily paper at the plant gates.

In addition to being a virtually unlimited supply of cheap labor, Mediterranean workers in Western Europe are systematically superexploited. Unskilled foreign workers in West Germany receive \$1.70 an hour on the average, compared to \$2.20 for those Germans still employed in unskilled jobs; foreign construction workers in France receive only 60 percent the wages of French workers (*Business Week*, 31 March 1973). The payment of lower wages for identical work is, of course, key to the attractiveness of foreign labor for the bourgeoisie. It is lack of legal protection of the foreign workers' right of residence which has effectively prevented any trade-union activity or strike action by this key section of the working class until quite recently. In addition, these workers are subject to all the kinds of victimization that bourgeois society normally metes out to a despised social group. A Catholic Church study of the Ruhr found that 85 percent of all foreign families live in old buildings, squeezed into half the space occupied by the same numbers of Germans and paying a third more rent than Germans do.

## The Necessity of the Reserve Army of the Unemployed

While bourgeois economists and their revisionist co-thinkers have developed elaborate, often Rube Goldberg type theories to account for West European capitalist expansion, they have virtually ignored the labor market conditions which permit a satisfactory rate of exploitation for the bourgeoisie. Fundamentally more important than the Bretton Woods fixed-exchange rates, indicative planning or inflationary deficit finance in accounting for the "success" of West European capitalism in the last decade has been the existence of the Mediterranean labor pool as the reserve army of the unemployed. During the 1966-67 economic downturn in West Germany approximately 300,000 foreign workers, one quarter of the total, were "sent home" (*OECD Observer*, February 1968). If this additional burden of unemployment had been borne by German workers, it would have greatly intensified conflict within the unions since the Social-Democratic bureaucracy openly trades holding down wages for promised full employment. Now that foreign workers are causing trouble their vital impor-

tance to European capitalism is becoming obvious.

The mechanism by which capitalism blocks its own growth is that conditions of full employment cause wages to be bid up, thereby reducing the rate of surplus value. In the absence of further available labor, capitalists respond by substituting more valuable, technically advanced equipment for scarce labor. This in turn drives down the rate of profit from the other side. Thus a large reserve army of the unemployed is a necessary condition for capitalist expansion.

Significantly, the more technocratic West German economists are now complaining that the unlimited availability of cheap foreign labor is retarding productivity increases as capitalists are choosing labor-intensive rather than the most advanced technology. This is indeed true. However, the goal of capitalist production is not to increase labor productivity, but to maximize the private return on the value of the means of production. Without the low wages of the foreign workers, and their indirect effect of holding down the wages of native workers, Western European capitalism would be unable to compete with the U.S.

## National/Racial Stratification of the Working Class

The vital economic significance of the reserve army of unemployed is often overlooked, as it appears to be a case of racial or national oppression and pervasive bigotry. Thus in some leftist circles, Marxist economic analysis and the revolutionary role of the proletariat are dismissed on the grounds that the real oppressive divisions in the contemporary world are racial and national. However, bourgeois society has an inherent tendency to combine national/racial and class oppression by transforming the reserve army of unemployed into a national/racial caste. The essential characteristic of the oppression of blacks in the U.S. is their concentration in the reserve army of unemployed—the lumpenproletariat.

The tendency to make the reserve army of the unemployed into an oppressed national/racial caste results from both the conscious social chauvinist policies of the ruling class and the working of atomistic market forces. The bourgeoisie always grants differential concessions to the dominant nationality/race in order to strengthen its own popular base. This is starkly demonstrated by the contrast between the West German government's treatment of the East German immigrants and of foreign workers. When the German government pleaded poverty as an excuse for the wretched housing of its foreign workers, an Italian Common Market official remarked acidly, "West Germany housed 3.5 million East German refugees in record time, but has been unable to produce decent housing for 600,000 Italians in a decade" (*Business Week*, 31 March 1973). However, it was important to the interests of the German imperialists that its "fellow countrymen" from the East were satisfied in the West and loyal to its government. In contrast, all the German bourgeoisie wants out of the hundreds of thousands of Italians, Turks and Yugoslavs who work there is that they produce surplus value and don't make trouble.

The official discrimination against foreigners, in turn, retards their capacity to compete with native workers in the market. The foreign workers are often handicapped by language, peasant origins and accordingly higher accident rates, etc., so that em-



Workers storming Ford plant during Cologne wildcat.

ployers tend to regard native workers as a natural elite. For example, Dow Chemical's West German plants, with highly sophisticated equipment, will hire only Germans.

The issue of foreign workers in Western Europe resembles the black question in the U.S. in another important way. Just as achieving racial unity is central to working-class consciousness in the U.S., so integrating foreign workers into the labor movement is now key to deepening the internationalist consciousness of the French and German proletariat. Conversely, anti-foreign-worker policies are now the main axis for West European reaction. When the French fascist "Ordre Nouveau" (New Order) reasserted its public presence recently, it did so through a rally to expel foreign workers. The struggle against the oppression of foreign workers is at the same time crucial to winning the West European proletariat to socialist internationalism.

## The Ruhr Wildcats and the Marseilles Riot

Two events this August highlighted the opposite poles of the effect that foreign workers have had on West European society. The West German wildcats, centered in the industrial Ruhr, revealed the capacity of foreign labor to lead the working class in militant struggle. In contrast, the murderous anti-Algerian riot in Marseilles showed the vulnerability of foreign workers as a target for growing reactionary forces.

The almost four million foreigners in France—mainly Algerians, Spaniards, Portuguese and, increasingly, black Africans—face the worst conditions in Western Europe. This is partly because of the general weakness of the French trade unions and partly because a relatively large percentage of the foreigners are there illegally and therefore are completely at the mercy of their employers. Although wage discrimination is officially against the law, foreign construction workers regularly get 60 percent of the French wage. Since so many are in the country illegally, they dare not

protest to the government. About ten percent of the Algerians in France live in "bidonvilles"—hovels made out of sheet metal—partly because they can't afford better housing, but also because so many are in the country illegally they are afraid to have permanent, official addresses.

More so than in West Germany and the smaller West European countries, foreign workers in France bring their families. This flood of would-be immigrants has produced a sharp racist reaction. In particular the large number of Algerian and Portuguese children in the schools has produced a hue and cry over the debasement of French education and culture. There are powerful political forces pushing toward the mass expulsion of foreigners. In 1972 the Gaullist regime proposed the notorious "Fontanet circular" according to which any foreigner not employed would lose his residence permit and could be instantaneously deported! And despite the current economic boom, not all foreigners can find jobs, particularly since French workers are always hired first. The Fontanet circular was met by hunger strikes by some threatened foreign workers early this year and was an indirect factor in the Renault wildcat in March. In response to these strikes the government retreated. However, the imminent threat of massive deportations faces all foreign workers in France whether employed or without jobs, those holding legal residence permits and those without them.

In addition to being the lowest of the low in French society, the Algerians are the main target of organized reaction, part of whose social base is the "pied noir colons" forced out of Algeria by the revolution. The Mediterranean port of Marseilles is a center of ex-colon activity. When an Algerian, with a known history of mental illness, shot a French bus driver, it provoked a racist riot, with soldiers and cops among the rioters, killing at least eight Algerians. The Pompidou government reacted by taking even harsher measures against the foreign workers! Immigration laws

continued on page 9



# Racial Hysteria

braintruster efforts to corner scarce construction jobs for blacks by busting construction unions and displacing white workers, rather than posing a united class struggle for elimination of all discriminatory practices by unions and employers and a shorter workweek at no loss in pay as the basis for full employment. Sniffing the possibility of a new rake-off and an ethnic power base like that of the Irish and Italian lawyers who control the City Council and School Committee, these black liberals have given full support to Mayor White's proposal to replace the citywide School Committee with 35 local school boards. Once in power they would undoubtedly follow the lead of New York's Ocean Hill-Brownsville community school board which in 1968 sought to blame racial discrimination largely on the teachers and to "solve" the problem by busting the teachers' union. The black liberals' reaction to increased crime in the black neighborhoods was a March Against Crime led by a black deputy superintendent of the Boston Police Department. And in response to the Wagler murder 65 such black community leaders issued a platitudinous statement deploring "the hostile environment and official indifference which dehumanizes all of us and which breeds frustration, anger and distress which all too often lead to violence" and pinning the primary blame on the School Committee. Kevin White's main opponents within the factional lineup of the Boston bourgeois political establishment.

These tame liberals in black nationalist garb maintain their alliance with the liberal Democrats and their political stranglehold on Boston's blacks primarily because of the size and stability of the petty-bourgeois layer of the city's black population, which has a long history. As early as 1850 significant numbers of free black artisans, attracted by the abolitionist sentiment and religious liberalism of the "Boston Brahmins," settled in the city and opened small businesses. It was no coincidence that at the turn of the century the most important black newspaper in the country, Monroe Trotter's *Guardian*, was published in Boston or that Booker T. Washington chose the city for the founding conference of the National Negro Business League.

The black petty bourgeoisie has, in fact, grown remarkably in the last decade. The number of black professionals in Boston jumped from 1800 in 1960 to 3400 in 1970; the number of black managers more than doubled. This is with the conscious help of the white liberal bourgeoisie. Not only have poverty funds been coordinated by the Black United Front, but black businesses have been bankrolled by the banking/insurance giants which dominate the city's economy. (Thus the Unity Bank was inaugurated with the transfer of some of John Hancock's lucrative real estate mortgage holdings. And the opening of Mattapan to blacks in the late 1960's by the real estate board created a small gold mine for black real estate operators.) In return, white and the liberal bourgeois establishment

have tried to create a black liberal political coalition based on ties to poverty pimps, City Hall handouts, Ford Foundation grants and a dose of black capitalism. Up to now they have been relatively successful, with Roxbury electing White-backers such as Tom Atkins, Ken Bolling and Mel King to city and state offices. Also the city officials have obtained enough money for a substantial public housing construction program following the 1961 Roxbury riot. Their success is not unrelated to close ties with top levels of Nixon's cabinet, including the Department of Housing and Urban Development which sought to make Boston a new model for "urban renewal" as New Haven had been earlier.

This is the explanation for the relative quiescence of Roxbury in the past and the general inability of "revolutionary" nationalists to make any serious inroads. They have in the past either been reduced to irrelevance or have consciously tailed the "pork-chop" nationalists. Thus, the main activity of the Republic of New Africa in Boston has been to spray paint slogans on walls while the Black Panthers concentrated their small efforts on visiting prisoners, free clothing collections and health services, largely in cooperation with the Black United Front. At present the pseudo-Marxist, Pan-Africanist tendencies of black nationalism are limited to a small collective publishing the newspaper *Struggle* and De Mau Mau—a paramilitary organization whose main activities are patrolling shopping centers and subway stations on welfare "check day" and harassing left-wing groups in Roxbury.

While such groups are extremely small, a sustained period of large-scale racial conflicts could lead to their growth and political challenge to the explicitly pro-bourgeois, Democratic Party black groups that now dominate the community. So also could a stop in the income and political gravy generated by the housing/school construction schemes. If segregation increases this could lead to a wave of black nationalist sentiment. Portents of this can be seen by looking at the isolated, run-down, largely black and Puerto Rican Columbia Point housing project—the one place in Boston where the RNA had some influence (initially expressed by several conflicts with Puerto Rican nationalists) and the scene of several of the incidents earlier this month.

The Communist Party has the most support of all the ostensibly revolutionary organizations attempting to operate in the black neighborhoods. Pat Bonner-Lyons, chairman of the local YWLL, narrowly missed winning a seat on the School Committee in 1971. She is running again this year and, as the only black candidate, stands a fair chance of winning. Her campaign is typical of the CP's attempt to turn the alliance of the black petty bourgeoisie with the liberal white bourgeoisie into a mini-popular front, grabbing a piece of the action for itself in the process. The Bonner-Lyons campaign emphasizes her race while downplaying her politics; when speaking to the mass media she usually omits mention of her connection with the YWLL/CP. She is supporting White's decentralization plan and directing all her criticisms at the School Committee. In return she has been supported by the black liberal politicians, organizing much of the campaign out of the office of State

Representative Melvin King, former head of the New Urban League. Bonner-Lyons' main slogan has been the apolitical "save the children" and her proposals center on the reformist idea that "the school committee must become the instrument for effective communication and cooperation...." Not an iota here of the Leninist conception of the state as the executive committee of the ruling class! Take it over by electoral means, implies Bonner-Lyons. Not surprisingly she has been endorsed by the *Boston Globe*, Americans for Democratic Action, the Ward 4 Democratic Club and six state representatives. With this solid respectability she received 7,975 votes in the September primary and may be elected this time around. This is significant because Bonner-Lyons' 1971 campaign garnered proportionately more votes than any other CP effort and was hailed at the time by Gus Hall as the way forward. However, the CP's orientation toward interracial harmony is simply a cover for a class-collaborationist strategy of uniting with black and white liberals. In previous elections it has backed former White-aides Tom Atkins, Hubie Jones and Reginald Eaves. Such a rotten opportunist approach only drives the wedge deeper between black and white working people while reinforcing the ties between proletarian blacks and their petty-bourgeois pro-capitalist betrayers.

Also running in the School Committee election was Don Gurewitz, candidate of the ex-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party. In an effort to tail alter black nationalism, the SWP platform calls for "Black and Puerto Rican control of the schools in their communities." While it is important to call for massive improvement of educational facilities, especially in ghetto districts where the schools have been deliberately run down by city officials, "community control" demands serve only to set one ethnic group against another in competition for scarce resources. What is needed is a united working-class struggle against the capitalist system which produces inferior schools for working-class and poor communities and racial discrimination against minorities.

Moreover, the logical (and in Boston, massive) response to calls for black community control is the racist backlash, in effect calling for white control of schools in their communities! While Hicks and the School Committee have for years stirred up white racism by opposing busing, the SWP tries to ignore the question, claiming the black community should decide it. Revolutionaries, in contrast, support busing as a limited (though inadequate) step toward integration.

Progressive Labor's activities in the black areas have consisted largely of occasional marches against unemployment, demonstrations at high-priced supermarkets and choreographed confrontations with school administrators, housing authorities, etc.—in short, mindless activism. In response to the recent killings their leaflets combine nostalgia for the "ghetto rebels of the 60's" with an incredible attempt to suggest that the Wagler murder may have been a gangland killing (tacitly implying that the only racism that exists in Boston is that of whites).

"Maybe the police built the terrible story up to make it look like a race killing?"

"Even if the cop's story is true, how come these women were living in Grove Hall, notorious for drugs and crime? Could they have been involved? The cop's story sounds like a gangland murder. Maybe the gangsters thought Wegler [sic] was a competing pusher."

—"Fighting Shafts Black and White Workers," PL leaflet

Thus in a situation of increased black-white tensions and the threat of large-scale racial clashes, the ostensibly socialist left responds with mini-pop-frontism and appeals for interracial unity with the black and white bourgeoisie (CP); mindless enthusiasm for "ghetto rebellions" which in the past have led only to massive police, army terror against the black communities

(PL); tailing after black separatism with "community control" demands that indirectly foster white racist backlash (SWP).

These groups only reveal their utter inability to pose a class-struggle program to deal with the material basis of racial hatred on the part of both blacks and whites. And given the numerical, political and economic dominance of whites in this country, all of these approaches mean continued violence and discrimination against blacks and other oppressed minorities.

Racism can be smashed only by demonstrating concretely that there is an alternative to the competitive scramble for a declining quantity of jobs at a living wage, decent housing and real educational opportunities. Rather than busting the job-trusting construction unions in order to provide a few jobs for blacks, united class struggle must be waged to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination by the unions and achieve equality in hiring. Fight for a shorter workweek to provide jobs for all at union wages! Rather than ethnic community control and blaming racism on teachers' unions, we should fight for worker-student-teacher control of the schools. Such demands cannot be won, however, without an explicit political perspective. Rather than relying on the two parties of big business, Democratic and Republican, or calling for a racially exclusive black party (as does the SWP), we must struggle for a workers party based on the unions to fight for a workers government.

Revolutionaries do not favor race riots. In the first place, they almost invariably go against the oppressed minority (for instance, the 1919 East St. Louis riots or the 1943 Detroit riots). Even where it is a case of black resistance to police brutality rather than a white-black clash, the destruction and killing are concentrated against the oppressed rather than on the capitalist class which is responsible for their misery. In sharp opposition to white racist demagogues who demand more police protection and the petty-bourgeois opportunists who demand community control, we call for the removal of the police from the schools and from the troubled areas and for the protection of working-class and poor neighborhoods by armed, interracial workers' defense groups organized by the unions.

Though Boston is not a great proletarian center, this is not an abstract proposition; it is the only alternative in the interests of all working people. The absence of such a solution in Detroit, where the relevance and immediate practicability of such workers' defense groups are obvious (given the tens of thousands of black and white workers in the UAW), led to the wanton murder of hundreds of defenseless blacks by the Army in the 1967 riot. In Boston, meatcutters', auto workers', hospital workers' and municipal employees' unions all have large black and white memberships from the Dorchester, Roxbury and South Boston areas and could thus organize interracial workers' militias.

Simple shop-floor organizing is not able to provide the political organization of the most advanced sector of the working class which is the key to smashing the bureaucracy's stranglehold. Likewise, undirected and isolated community organizing, engaged in by many former New Lefters in Boston and other radical centers, can only lead to impotent anguish, such as that of Wagler's friends who blamed her death on "the system" but had no strategy or means to change it. In turn, young blacks attracted by Panther-style confrontationism (favored today by De Mau Mau) need only look at the large-scale killings by army and police during the Detroit 1967 riot and the evolution of the Newton-Seale wing of the Panthers into the worst kind of "pork-chop" reformism to see the two dead ends to which this leads. Not mindless community organizing, apolitical shop-floor militancy and dead-end "pick-up-the-gun" rhetoric are needed, but the fight for the political program of united class struggle and its embodiment the Trotskyist party! ■

## Studies on the Left

- academic socialist journal, predecessor to SOCIALIST REVOLUTION
- many back issues still available
- only 50¢ each (scarcer issues \$1 a copy)
- free circular available listing issues in stock and description of contents

Write to: GLOBE DISTRIBUTORS c/o SPARTACIST  
Box 1377, GPO—NY, NY 10001

—advertisement—



# No U.S. Aid to Israel!

where the only genuinely democratic solution to the national question must immediately place the tasks of the socialist revolution on the agenda.

## Arab Regimes Crush Palestinian Resistance

The Arab regimes sanctimoniously bewail Israel's violation of the national rights of the Palestinians, while making it clear that the most they hope for is the return of the occupied territories. Only those vicarious Arab nationalists found in such abundance on the U.S. left are cynical enough to claim that either in 1967 or in the present war the victory of the reactionary, obscurantist Arab regimes would bring the dispossessed Palestinians one step closer to regaining their rights or would lighten in any way the yoke of imperialism on the Arab masses.

These same Arab states entered the 1948 war not to defend the Palestinian nation but in a mad scramble to divide Palestine (both Arab and Hebrew-speaking areas) among themselves. Abdullah of Jordan even had secret meetings with Golda Meir to see if they could reach agreement on carving up Palestine. From the

1948 war Jordan carried off the West Bank and Egypt took Gaza. For nineteen years neither Jordan nor Egypt granted the Palestinians living in the West Bank or Gaza national autonomy or any other democratic rights, or made any attempt to integrate them into their economies. Instead, the Palestinians have been kept locked in their refugee camps, living off their 9 cents a day United Nations rations. The American left apologists for the Arab regimes who called for an Arab victory in the 1967 war were in fact defending the continued suppression of the national rights of the Palestinians by Nasser and the Hashemite rulers, while the social democrats and Zionists who supported Israel were advocating Israel's acquisition of the power to continue that subjugation.

The only road to national emancipation for the Palestinians, in the West Bank and Gaza, in Israel and in the Arab states, was and remains *revolutionary defeatism* on both sides in the Near East war—i.e., not Arab worker against Hebrew worker, but Egyptian worker against the Nasserite bonapartist regime and the bourgeois class it defends, Jordanian worker against the Hashemite throne, Syrian worker

against the "progressive" Ba'athist colonels and Israeli worker against the militarist Zionist bourgeois regime.

The six years since the Six Day War have been an irrefutable confirmation of our revolutionary defeatist position in 1967, as in the current war. They provide decisive refutation of the opportunism of those tendencies which aspire to play the cheerleaders to the yet non-existent "Arab Revolution" rather than struggle for the multinational proletarian party in the Near East which alone can make a real revolution. In the past six years the Arab regimes have systematically liquidated the Palestine resistance movement as an independent political and military force. They have responded to Israel's terrorist attacks against the Palestinian refugees whom they so reluctantly host by terrorist reprisals of their own against the refugees.

Thus after the Six Day War, Hussein followed Israeli shelling of East Bank villages and refugee camps with civil war directed against the Palestinian movement. Up to ten thousand Palestinians, many of them unarmed refugees, were massacred during the 1970-71 civil war. Then it was Sadat of Egypt who negotiated the surrender of the Palestinian commandos whereby they were forced to disarm, disband and move out of their bases on the East Bank. Likewise, following vicious Israeli air attacks on Palestinian refugee camps, in which hundreds were brutally murdered supposedly in reprisal for various hijackings, the Munich abduction, etc., the Syrian and Lebanese regimes "replied" to the Israeli "reprisals" with their own assaults on the Palestinians. For example, one month after an Israeli commando operation in Beirut killed three leaders of the Palestinian resistance movement and some 30 others earlier this year, Lebanon sent its army into the refugee camps and arbitrarily machine-gunned the refugees. The message was clear: the Arab regimes are more than willing to take over from Dayan and Co. the liquidation of the Palestinian resistance and the policing of the refugees.

The Spartacist League called for the unconditional defense of the Palestinian resistance fighters against their brutal suppression by the Israeli and Arab regimes. In that context, the SL supported the military victory of the Palestinian commandos in the 1970 Jordanian civil war against the Hashemite kingdom, whose sole financial base is U.S. military aid. But unlike the opportunists, who simply enthused over the exploits of the Palestinian guerrillas, the SL recognizes guerrillaism as essentially bonapartism out of power: the attempt of an armed petty-bourgeois elite to substitute itself for the political organization of the working masses in avenging injustice. Moreover, in the case of Palestinian nationalists it is a case of utterly hopeless guerrillaism, given the military balance in the region.

The resistance movement, including its most leftist expression, the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, never broke from the two-stage theory of revolution, which posited a "national-democratic" stage led by "progressive" representatives of all classes of Palestinian society. The Jordanian civil war destroyed the resistance movement's illusions about an alliance with the Arab regimes and "progressive" wings of the army. But unable to break from nationalist ideology to envision a common struggle with the working masses of the Arab states and Israel, all wings of the isolated Palestinian resistance in desperation fell back on atomized terrorist exploits offering no way forward.

## U.S. Imperialism: Between Exxon and Zionism

Oil is the key to the apparently contradictory policies of U.S. imperialism in the Near East. U.S. imperialism is not so much a consumer as a producer of oil. Five of the seven oil corporations that control 80 percent of the world's oil production are U.S.-owned, including such important companies (and major contributors to

the now-infamous Nixon campaign) as Texaco, Exxon and Gulf. These companies are adamantly pro-Arab—i.e., pro-Arab sheikdoms and emirates. At the same time, domestic political expediency, as well as the need to maintain an outspokenly pro-imperialist enclave in the Near East, demands that the U.S. government avow a belligerently pro-Israeli political and military policy. In fact, the U.S. bankrolls not only the Israeli army but also the armies of Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Outright U.S. military grants to Israel in the 1949-68 period totalled \$369 million, while outright grants to Jordan totalled \$556 million. Thus both Israel and Jordan are direct clients of U.S. imperialism although they are on opposing sides in the current war.

While the long-run interest of any imperialist power in the Middle East is the struggle for a monopoly of its strategic raw materials, i.e. oil, in the short run "oil politics" play into the hands of the U.S. capitalists against their competitors in Western Europe and Japan: Western Europe meets 80 percent of its oil demand from sources in the Middle East and North Africa, and Japan more than 90 percent; the U.S., a little over 5 percent.

Not surprisingly, therefore, Western Europe and Japan have taken a neutral or pro-Arab stance in the present war. Britain placed a total arms embargo on the Near East war, which has mainly hurt Israel since most Israeli tanks are British-built Centurions completely dependent on Britain for replacements and parts. In the past few years France has cut off her supply of Mirage jets to Israel while providing them to Libya. However, cutbacks in production and price rises hurt primarily Western Europe and Japan, not the U.S.

## Against Balkanization—For a Multi-National Revolutionary Workers Party!

The fundamental U.S. political strategy in the Near East—the logic behind the bankrolling of both the Zionist and Hashemite armies—is "Balkanization": the artificial creation and manipulation of national divisions and conflicts and the use of these divisions to perpetuate reactionary regimes, notably in Israel and Jordan. U.S. imperialism originally supported the creation of the state of Israel as part of its post-war strategy to take over former British, French and Japanese spheres of influence.

In 1956 when Egypt nationalized the British-owned Suez Canal, the U.S. blocked with Egypt and the Soviet Union against the alliance of British and French imperialism with Israel. When Nixon announced recently that the U.S. Sixth Fleet would be beefed up with additional aircraft carriers and marines for a possible direct American intervention into the present conflict, he compared this to the U.S. intervention into Lebanon in 1958 and its threat to intervene into the 1970 Jordanian civil war—both internal civil wars with no direct bearing on Israel.

The Soviet Union, which twice since World War II has directly intervened in the Near East to prevent social revolution, lavishly squanders on Syria and Egypt the sophisticated weaponry for which the North Vietnamese and NLF were so desperately starved in their confrontation with U.S. imperialism. The Russian Stalinists' aim is quite unashamedly to maintain the "balance of power"—an uneasy stalemate intended to forestall the development of overt class antagonisms within the Arab states and Israel.

The struggle to replace the genocidal national war by class war in the Near East is intimately linked to the struggle for a multi-national proletarian vanguard which champions the rights of all national groups—Hebrews and Arabs, but also South Sudanese blacks and Kurds. Only such a party can acquire the political authority to address the Arab and Hebrew workers, to cut through the years of manipulated chauvinism and accumulated mistrust to address them with the program of the permanent revolution—the program of a reborn Fourth International. ■

# NMU Militant-Solidarity Caucus Resolution

*Whereas*, the officials of the AFL-CIO maritime unions have issued a call, in the name of all U.S. maritime workers, to support Israel in the Near East war by threatening to boycott cargo and ships of the Soviet Union, unless it stops sending aid to the Arab states for use against Israel, and

*Whereas*, Israel and the Arab countries are both capitalist oppressor states: Israel seeking a victory to continue the suppression of the Palestinian Arabs' just struggle for self-determination, racist persecution of non-European Jews and of Arabs in Israel and the conquered territories, and capitalist exploitation of both Arab and Jewish workers; while the Arab states similarly seek a victory not to liberate but to oppress the Arab masses themselves, and

*Whereas*, in such a war, workers must be opposed to *both* sides, since the victory of either side means only further oppression and misery for the the laboring masses, and

*Whereas*, the American government is sending military aid directly to Israel for use in the reactionary war, while trade with the Soviet Union, on the other hand, is at most a very indirect contribution to the war aims of the Arab states, and

*Whereas*, a boycott of the U.S.-Soviet trade would hurt Russian working people more than the Arab states and furthermore be a step toward renewed cold-war hostility by providing support for U.S. imperialist aggressive designs against the Soviet Union, and

*Whereas*, this call by the AFL-CIO officers is part of their hard-line support for cold-war policies, reflecting their general political support to American big business (the oppressors of maritime and other workers around the world), which is contrary to the cause of labor,

therefore be it  
*Resolved*, that this port meeting of the National Maritime Union does

- 1) oppose the call for a boycott of trade with the Soviet Union and condemn it as a proposal for a reactionary political strike wholly unsupportable in any way, and
- 2) call on all maritime workers in the U.S., whether members of the AFL-CIO or other unions, to do the same, through special and regular meetings of their unions, aboard ship and in the ports, and thorough discussion of issues involved, and
- 3) raise instead the demand for a boycott of all military aid being flown or shipped from the U.S. to Israel as being the most important way American workers can oppose this reactionary war, and
- 4) oppose any attempt by the U.S. government to intervene in the labor movement on this question by forcing our unions to follow its foreign policy, calling on the workers instead to set our own house in order by uniting to oppose any attempt to support the reactionary Near East war, and
- 5) demand that since labor political strikes are possible, as indicated by the call of the AFL-CIO maritime officials, that this tactic be applied in the interests of labor, rather than in the interests of Israeli, U.S. or other ruling classes, through such actions as the "hot cargoing" of scab lettuce and grapes to support the California farm strikers, and,
- 6) address the call of American maritime workers to our brother maritime and transportation workers in the USSR to oppose Russian aid to the reactionary Arab states as we oppose aid to Israel and to struggle against their false leaders for the institution of a working-class Soviet international policy of providing aid to the workers' struggles around the world, that is, to Arab workers, not their bosses.

—Militant-Solidarity Caucus, 22 October 1973



# New Left Maoism: Long March

## THE REVOLUTIONARY UNION

For a considerable period the Chinese Communist Party, and Mao Tse-tung in particular, enjoyed an undeserved reputation as a militant revolutionary force standing considerably to the left of the reformist Russian bureaucracy. This reputation was based on Mao's successful overthrow of Chiang Kai-shek in the late 1940's (against Stalin's instructions); the Sino-Soviet dispute of the early 1960's, when the Chinese attacked Khrushchev for advocating a "peaceful road to socialism"; and the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution," during which Mao and Lin Biao told Red Guards "it is right to rebel" against "rightist" party bureaucrats (i.e., those who had not yet assimilated Maothought).

But for the last several years, the "Great Helmsman" has been progressively disillusioning thousands of his erstwhile followers by zigzagging to the right both domestically and internationally. Thus he turned off the Cultural Revolution with a flick of the wrist by imposing the so-called "Three-In-One" Combination, giving control of the country to the army and "reformed" bureaucrats. Internationally Mao has been pushing the Chinese version of peaceful coexistence, which has involved the People's Liberation Army orchestra's serenading Richard Nixon with "Home on the Range" while U.S. B-52s bombed North Vietnam; calling for the strengthening of NATO in order to increase imperialist military pressure on the Soviet Union; sending tanks and guns to the "anti-imperialist" militarist butchers of Pakistan, arms which were later used against the masses of Bengali peasants and workers with the approval of Mao; and endorsing the Ceylonese government's brutal repression of a 1971 uprising of student and peasant youth.

These moves amply confirm the Spartacist League's characterization of Maoism as a reformist, Stalinist current of the workers movement. Unlike various fake-Trotskyist tendencies which have characterized Maoism as "centrist," supported the Chinese against the Russians in the Sino-Soviet dispute of the early 1960's or sided with Mao against Liu Shao-chi, the SL has consistently maintained that Mao represents the interests of a parasitic bureaucracy which, while based on the property forms of a workers state, continually seeks compromise with imperialism as opposed to pursuit of a policy of class struggle.

Maoism does, of course, have its own specific features as a Chinese version of Stalinism. Its apparent militancy in earlier years was derived from the unwillingness of U.S. imperialism to accept the overthrow of capitalism in the key country of mainland Asia. As we termed it, Maoism is "Menshevism under the gun." Likewise its guerrillaist strategy of peasant-based "people's war" and the "anti-imperialist united front" is simply a translation into the conditions of backward countries of such traditional Moscow-line Stalinist standbys as the "popular front" and "anti-monopoly people's coalition."

For years Mao tried to arrange a coalition government with Chiang, even agreeing (in 1945) to overwhelming Kuomintang domination of the government and unified army. It was Chiang who rejected the popular front. And the Maoists' support for the bourgeois nationalist Sukarno in Indonesia, leading to the 1965 massacre of over 500,000 Communists, is no different than Moscow's support of the Allende pop-front government. The famed Cultural Revolution, in turn, was a conflict between two wings of the bureaucracy which

were not qualitatively differentiated (whence the ease with which this "revolution" was terminated and the re-appearance in high government positions of leading "capitalist-roaders" of yesteryear).

### Western Maoists in Search of a Strategy

While the end of the Cultural Revolution and Nixon's trip to Peking have led many former Maoists to drop out of politics and others (such as the Communist Working Collective and Buffalo Marxist Caucus, who subsequently fused with the SL and RCY) to examine Trotskyism, leaderships of Western Maoist groups have been forced to explicitly reaffirm their fundamental Stalinist policies. But here the Maoists are faced with an intractable problem: they agree with the Moscow-line Communist parties on the key questions (such as socialism in one country, popular frontism), yet they must simultaneously appear as a left opposition to the blatantly reformist pro-Russian CPs. And they are saddled with the fact that *there is no specific Maoist strategy for the advanced capitalist countries.*

As a good reformist and nationalist, Mao has never seen the need to form (or even call for) a united world party of socialist revolution (Stalin, for his part, dissolved the Communist International in 1943 as a favor to Churchill and in practice subordinated the Comintern to the interests of Russian state diplomacy some 15 years earlier). Moreover, Mao has never even bothered to make pronouncements on any of the key questions facing communists in the West save one: the need for armed struggle. But what about syndicalism? Are blacks in the U.S. a nation? Is feminism partly progressive? U.S. Maoists dispute these questions, but Mao remains silent and there is nothing in Maoism that in resolving such disputes can provide a consistent revolutionary strategy in the industrialized countries.

In practice Western Maoists are reduced to empirically tailing after various petty-bourgeois movements and capitulating to the present backward consciousness of the working class. The result has been marked national differences between the Maoist movements of different countries and an inability even to unite various currents into a single Maoist party in any major Western country. Thus in Italy, for instance, there are several different Maoist-syndicalist groups, while in France Maoist-anarchist collectives predominate. In West Germany the 40-odd Maoist organizations by and large represent Stalinist opposition to the reformist policies of the East German bureaucracy and its satellite in the Federal Republic, but in Sweden the Maoist movement grew out of support for the Vietnamese NLF.

In the United States, one can identify three broad currents of Maoism—namely New-Left Maoism, Stalin Maoism and Third-World Maoism. The largest category is the first, including principally the Revolutionary Union (RU) and October League (OL), but also terrorist-Maoists such as Weatherman, guerrilla-Maoists such as Venceremos, syndicalist-Maoists such as the Sojourner Truth group and others. All of them tail black nationalism as a key aspect of their politics, and all were earlier part of the RYM wing of SDS. The leading Stalin Maoist organization is the Communist League (CL). In an earlier phase Progressive Labor (PL) could have been classed in this category as could (loosely) the for-

mer American Communist Workers Movement (Marxist-Leninist)—ACWM(ML). By and large the Stalin Maoists tend to have a more militant rhetoric without differing qualitatively from the politics of the New-Left variety. Finally, among the politically less-defined Third-World Maoists the largest groups are the Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization (PRRWO—formerly Young Lords) and the Black Workers Congress (BWC—a wing of the former League of Revolutionary Black Workers).

Despite the various rumors of imminent fusions, notably between the RU and OL on the one hand and the CL and ACWM(ML) on the other, none of these groups have succeeded in uniting. The OL, RU and ACWM(ML), however, have all succeeded in picking up a number of local Maoist collectives over the past two years.

### Maoism in SDS: Waving the Red Book Against the Red Book

As the student movement began to radicalize and grow on a mass scale during the mid-1960's its main organizational focus was the New-Left Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Two currents formed within the organization, one pro-working-class and led by Progressive Labor, the other a loose conglomeration of student-power advocates. The latter wing tailed after black nationalism, arguing that the white working class had been "bought off" by U.S. imperialism. The PL-led wing, however, grew steadily in influence, and by late 1968 it was evident that it would soon have a majority. This led to the formation of the "National Office Faction," headed by Bernadine Dohrn and Mike Klonsky, which operated initially as a secret clique with little political agreement except common hatred of PL.

During the spring of 1969, PL's "Worker-Student Alliance" faction made rapid nationwide gains, particularly as the result of its domination of the Harvard student strike. Meanwhile, in the anti-working-class wing, subterranean maneuvering had reached mammoth proportions, with Dohrn reportedly switching cliques several times. But even though the maneuvering in large part may have derived from personal hunger for power and the desperate effort to "stop PL," political struggle usually requires some sort of programmatic rationale. In consequence there arose three different sections of what became, at the June 1969 split convention, the RYM wing of SDS.

Klonsky led the RYM-II group which argued that a mass youth movement must be built on the program of support to the Vietnamese NLF and the Black Panthers. A group around the Columbia student strike leadership (Rudd and others) and the Michigan-Ohio region

formed Weatherman, which called for an urban guerrilla army of white youth whose job would be to aid "third-world" struggles by confrontations with the police and (eventually) terrorism. The third group was the Bay Area Revolutionary Union, led by Bob Avakian, which argued for working-class community organizing although agreeing that the "principal contradiction" in the world was not that between proletariat and bourgeoisie but between oppressed peoples and the imperialists.

The RU had grown out of several working-class community- and factory-organizing collectives which had earlier spun off the Berkeley New Left and white supporters of the Black Panther Party. Although the RU made its public debut at the April 1969 SDS National Council meeting, the initial leaders had begun working together during 1967 to build an alliance of the Berkeley white left with the BPP. They first opposed work inside the Peace and Freedom Party, a petty-bourgeois group with a classless reform program which ran Eldridge Cleaver for president in 1968, because it was dominated by the anti-communist social-democratic International Socialists. However, their opportunist appetites won out later as they became a mushy Radical Caucus of the PFP. At Berkeley they formed an equally programless Radical Student Union to fight PL influence.

The RU sided with RYM-II and against Weatherman in the coalition which led the June 1969 split in SDS. However, it never sharply counterposed an alternative line to the urban guerrillaism of Rudd and Company. Part of the reason was the fact that the RU itself included a proto-Weatherman section centered around Stanford University professor Bruce Franklin. While Franklin had been involved in community organizing, Bob Avakian was connected to the factory-organizing groups. There were continuous sharp debates between these sections, but little political clarification. Their binding tie was support for the Panthers, who they believed would lead in the formation of the vanguard party. Although RU leaders were privately critical of the Panthers for allying with the reformist Communist Party to build the "United Front Against Fascism" conference in Oakland during the summer of 1969, all public criticism of the BPP was suppressed.

Without going into the SDS split itself (see "New Left's Death Agony," *Spartacist* No. 13, August-September 1969), it should be mentioned that the RYM wing immediately split again as Weatherman headed toward its terrorist orientation and soon disappeared altogether. Indicative of the lack of seriousness of the various forces leading it was the fact that Klonsky, who had been leading the youth-movement forces, soon turned toward Maoist "learn-



Fram right: RU leaders Greenberg, Avakian, Wright.

THE REVOLUTIONARY UNION



# to Peaceful Coexistence



David Rockefeller, left, chairman of Chase Manhattan Bank, negotiating with Chinese Premier Chou En-lai this summer. According to Rockefeller: "the atmosphere could not have been better."

from-the-people" factory agitation in California, while the other RYM-II leader, Noel Ignatin, turned toward syndicalist factory organizing in Chicago. And despite the RU's words about the role of the working class, when at the SDS split convention it was proposed that the RYM wing adopt in its list of principles (which included support for North Korea and Albania!) a statement about the leading role of the industrial proletariat in the socialist revolution, Avakian denounced this as "sectarian":

## Revolutionary Union: CP Reformists in Mao Suits

Although it has recruited primarily from New-Left students, the RU has its roots in the same reformist Communist Party it now claims to oppose. A key section of the RU leadership consists of a layer of veteran CPers, two of 20-year standing. Many of these ex-CPers passed through the Fosterite PLP, joining the RU as PL moved left in the late 1960's. They represent an important element of continuity with orthodox Stalinism. Today they are acting as apologists for the Chinese bureaucracy and its policy of peaceful coexistence with U.S. imperialism, just as they fronted for Stalin and the Russian bureaucracy's identical policies when they were in the CP. It was likewise in the Stalinized Communist Party that they first learned the theory of socialism in one country (which denies the need for a real International) and the practice of tailing after "progressive" trade-union bureaucrats characteristic of the RU today.

Many of the RU's ex-CPers left the party during the late 1950's, in the wake of Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin at the 1956 20th Congress of the CPSU. In this country there were several attempts to rescue Stalinist "orthodoxy" from Khrushchev revisionism, which led to a series of splits and expulsions during 1958-61. Among these groups were Hammer and Steel in Boston, the Negro-Labor Vanguard group in New Jersey and the Progressive Labor Movement in New York.

The ideological roots of both the RU and the OL go back in particular to the first pro-Stalin opposition in the CP, a grouping which, having been expelled in 1958, became the Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute the Marxist-Leninist Vanguard Party in the USA (POC). This left faction, which included many of the old-time CP black and Latin worker-activists, was particularly attached to Stalin's "Third Period" call for a "Negro Nation" in the U.S. South.

While nominally to the left of the CP leadership (which at the time confined party activities largely to work inside the Democratic Party), it did not provide a clear class opposition by rejecting characteristic Stalinist policies of "popular fronts" and "peaceful coexistence." Subsequent to its expulsion the POC decomposed into a myriad of tiny splinter groups, its only direct descendant today being the Communist League.

The POC's "black-nation" mania is in one form or another characteristic of virtually the entire present-day U.S. Maoist movement. It appears in disguised form in both the RU's original position that blacks are an "internal colony" and in their later view that any concentration of blacks constitutes part of this suppressed nation for which, however, because of its dispersal, proletarian revolution will offer the sole course to liberation; more openly in the OL's position that a black nation does exist in the South, though separation should be opposed; and quite unabashedly in the CL's position that the old southern Black Belt (with today a majority of "white Negroes") constitutes a "Negro Nation" whose national liberation should be supported. In the case of the RU and OL, the function of these theories is to provide a means and excuse for tailing after black nationalism; while for the CL they express more a rejection of the CP's latter-day liberal integrationist legalism in favor of a more radical "Third-Period" policy.

The RU quotes Mao as saying that nationalism is "applied internationalism" and thus calls for support for "revolutionary nationalism" both in backward countries and in the U.S. In a 1969 reply to Weatherman Jim Melien, two RU leaders devoted several pages to the argument that workers were not "bought off" as "white-skin-privilege" theories maintained, instead accepting as their starting point the Maoist tenet that:

"The most basic truth that all revolutionaries must grasp, the starting point for our action, is the fact that the principal contradiction in the world today is between the oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the imperialists, headed by U.S. imperialism. What distinguishes Marxists from pseudo-Marxists is the question of support for the national liberation struggles.... Within the U.S. this means support for the third world liberation struggles...."

—Bob Avakian and Marv Treiger, "Revolutionary Youth and the Road to the Proletariat"

In fact the dividing line between Marxists and pseudo-Marxists is the recognition that the fundamental contradic-

tion is that between the "two principal classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and that the role of the communist vanguard is to struggle for the political independence of the workers from their class enemy. By supporting black nationalism, the RU, OL and other Maoists tie black workers to black capitalist politicians like the Ford Foundation-backed Imamu Baraka (Le-roi Jones) and poverty agency-financed Reverend Jesse Jackson, as well as to nationalist reformists like the Black Panthers' Bobby ("I am a Democrat") Seale. Because they have not yet been able to exploit the black masses on a large scale and thus reveal their political essence, bourgeois nationalists are in fact the most dangerous enemies of the oppressed racial minorities whose liberation depends on a united class struggle led by the most exploited sectors of the workers.

In addition to falsely locating the "principal contradiction" between oppressed nations and U.S. imperialism (leaving U.S. workers somewhere in the middle), the RU was initially characterized by three other propositions: criticism of Khrushchev's "peaceful coexistence" policies, support for "revolutionary nationalism" against PL's assertion that all nationalism is reactionary and the strategy of an anti-imperialist united front.

Claiming to support the Chinese against the Russians, the RU wrote:

"Not satisfied with only pursuing its own Great Power interests, the Soviets have developed a series of 'theories' which are no more than modern extrapolations of the old Second International's fight against Leninism.... 'Peaceful transition', 'Peaceful Coexistence', and 'Peaceful Competition' have become the rallying cries for right opportunists everywhere."

—"Against the Brainwash," Red Papers No. 1, 1969

The problem with this statement is that it does not represent the real Chinese position, nor that of the RU's hero Stalin. In their principal document of the early 1960's Sino-Soviet dispute, the Chinese leaders wrote:

"Since its founding the People's Republic of China too has consistently pursued the policy of peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems, and it is China which initiated the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence...."

"It is absolutely impermissible and impossible for countries practicing peaceful coexistence to touch even a hair of each other's social system."

—"A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement," 1963

This is identical to Stalin's philistine comment in an interview with an American journalist in 1935 that it was im-

permissible to "export revolution." While Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Mao occasionally have made orthodox-sounding remarks about separation of party and state relations, the essence of their common policy of long-term peaceful coexistence with imperialism is to sacrifice international revolution to the immediate diplomatic appetites of the bureaucracies of the deformed workers states.

Behind the RU's support for "revolutionary nationalism" stands the classical Stalinist concept of a two-stage revolution. Instead of struggling for socialism, workers in the backward countries must first join with the "national bourgeoisie" in a "democratic" revolution against feudalism, claimed Stalin and Mao. Trotsky held the opposite position, namely that because of the dependence of the colonial bourgeoisie on imperialism and the feudalists, the democratic tasks of national liberation and agrarian revolution could be accomplished only by the proletariat's establishing its own class rule, supported by the peasantry. According to the RU:

"They [PL] maintain they support the Vietnamese by 'supporting the dictatorship of the proletariat as the only solution'. It is here that they degenerate into classical Trotskyism. The Vietnamese, the Chinese, and all oppressed peoples must fight, or in the case of the Chinese, have fought, for the new democratic revolution as the only way to reach socialism.... The Chinese Trotskyites called for the dictatorship of the proletariat and claimed thereby that they supported the revolution, when in fact they cast themselves as the pariahs of the revolution, mistaking one stage for another and objectively sabotaging the struggle."

—"Against the Brainwash"

It is certainly true that the Chinese Trotskyists fought for the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that Mao until the very last moment vainly tried to form a coalition government with the "patriotic bourgeoisie" led by the butcher Chiang Kai-shek. This is why Mao has kept the Trotskyists in jail for the last 20 years! This is why Mao never had any support in the Chinese working class before the revolution and took power on the back of a peasant uprising rendered possible by the complete collapse of the hopelessly corrupt Chiang government. But although PL broke empirically with Stalinism on the national question, it has been unable to generalize this into a consistent Leninist strategy of proletarian independence. Instead it is currently tailing after various left-talking union bureaucrats and participated in McGovern's Democratic Party election campaign

cont. next on page 8



# New Left Maoism

during 1972. But no one can accuse the RU of such inconsistency: since 1967 it has only reinforced its commitment to the Stalinist stages-theory and its policy of unconditionally tailing after nationalists and reformists of all stripes.

An important part of the RU policies, one which ostensibly divides it from the OL, is the concept of a strategic anti-imperialist united front. On the one hand, this has been a device to permit the RU to claim it rejects the Communist Party's reformist "two-stage" strategy in *this country* (while supporting it for China), but maintaining it in practice. Thus:

"The United Front Against Imperialism is the strategic road for the proletariat in establishing its dictatorship.... A minimum program, short of the dictatorship of the proletariat, provides the basis at this time for struggle against imperialism. Communists, of course, also have a maximum program—socialism and communism—which we always advocate and propagate, but our basis for uniting in this period is the minimum anti-imperialist program....

"No one can predict exactly when or how the dictatorship of the proletariat will come to the fore in the mass movement, but we can say that it will develop dialectically through the struggles led by the proletariat around the united front line and program."

— "The United Front Against U.S. Imperialism: Strategy for Proletarian Revolution," *Red Papers* No. 2, 1970

We do not reject the united front. As the continuators of the tradition of Lenin and the early Comintern, Trotskyists have always upheld its importance as a tactic to unite the workers organizations in action around a specific, usually defensive, goal (e.g., to defend the unions against the bosses' state). But as the CL resolutions repeatedly stated, this must be a *prole-*

*tarian united front against capital*; it is not an excuse for class collaboration.

The "strategic anti-imperialist united front" is used by the RU in order to justify downgrading the struggle for the communist party. For Lenin and Trotsky the united front was, rather, a tactic to build the vanguard party and win support for its program of class independence. If successful in forcing the participation of reformist and centrist workers organizations, it will unite the proletariat against the common class enemy and open a contradiction between this particular action and the remainder of the reformist program—whose general perspective is to tie the workers to the bourgeoisie. If, however, the reformists do not agree to a united struggle, for objectives that are clearly in the interest of all workers, the defeatist consequences of their policies will stand openly revealed to their own memberships. But to talk of a *strategic* united front can mean only liquidating the vanguard into the class. And this is precisely its function for the RU, which opposes "united-front work" to "party-building":

"At the present time, the building of collectives on a local basis, and the exchange of experiences between them, can contribute the most to the creation in the near future of a Marxist-Leninist party."

— "Statement of Principles," *Red Papers* No. 1

## Reformism and Anti-Communism

In line with its perspective of a "strategic united front," the RU has focused on publishing a number of local community papers such as the *Bay Area Worker*, *People Get Ready* (Cleveland), *People's Voice* (Chicago), *On the Move* (New York), etc. Supposedly limited to "anti-imperialist" politics, these papers breathe not a word about

socialism—not to mention the need for a Marxist-Leninist party. The RU itself did not even have a newspaper until early this year when it began publishing *Revolution*.

Another expression of the RU policy is its tailing after the Chavez leadership of the United Farm Workers Union. At a time when Chavez is actively sabotaging the grape strike, endangering the very existence of the union itself (see "Defend the Farmworkers!" *WV* No. 27, 31 August 1973) and substituting pacifist-religious vigils and middle-class boycotts for a militant defense of the picket lines, the RU not only does not criticize the UFW leadership but ignores it altogether, hardly even bothering to mention the existence of a union (*Revolution*, September 1973)! The RU has developed non-criticism of the reformists into a fine art. Having shamelessly tailed after the Panthers for years, when BPP leader Bobby Seale ran for Oakland City Council as a Democrat earlier this year *Revolution* simply avoided the issue.

While refusing to criticize opportunist, fake-militant labor bureaucrats, the RU (like Stalin) uses physical violence against socialist opponents in blatant defiance of workers democracy. In June RU supporters attacked *Workers Vanguard* salesmen at the Fremont, California GM plant and reportedly attacked salesmen of the Workers League's *Bulletin* at the Milpitas, California Ford plant. Afraid to let the workers read anything more militant than its own reformist pabulum, the RU adopts the methods of the union bureaucrats. When a union-inspired goon squad at the Parma, Ohio Chevrolet plant recently attacked not only *WV* salesmen but also those of the RU-supported *People Get Ready*, the Revolutionary Union categorically refused any joint action with the Trotskyist Spartacist League despite our common victimization by the same anti-communist bureaucrats.

By capitulating to the bureaucrats the RU simultaneously bows to the existing backward consciousness of the working class. Thus in Spring 1972 at the Glass Bottle Blowers Association Local 141 (Owens-Illinois in Oakland, California) a motion was proposed to send union officials to a \$25-a-plate fund-raising dinner for COPE (the AFL-CIO support group for the Democratic Party). Union militants opposed the motion with arguments for an independent workers party and against any support to either capitalist party. RU supporters, however, spoke against this and voted to send the union officials to the dinner.

At the following union meeting a motion was introduced to instruct the GBBA delegate to the Central Labor Council to introduce a motion for a one-day general strike in Alameda County to protest the wage freeze and the war. This was opposed as premature by both the local bureaucrats and RU supporters, since "the workers aren't ready." Instead, the RU supporters suggested an amendment calling for a "day for labor to express opposition to war and call a gathering of all working people to discuss further action to take against the war"—in other words, one more antiwar rally.

This policy of supporting only those minimal reform demands which can win instant popularity has led the RU to tail after a variety of would-be bureaucrats in recent union elections. Notably these ostensible revolutionaries gave "critical support" to Arnold Miller in last December's United Mine Workers' elections. Miller was the candidate of Miners for Democracy, which had sued the UMW in the capitalist courts to force a rerun of an earlier election and was braintrustered by Joseph Rauh, a prominent liberal Democratic lawyer. His program consisted of no more than those few vague promises about "democracy" which are the stock-in-trade of every fake militant (see "Labor Department Wins Mine Workers' Election," *WV* No. 17, March 1973).

At Fremont GM, this policy led the RU to give enthusiastic support to the

Brotherhood Caucus, a bloc of OL and RU supporters with leaders of three different local cliques which is headed by a former bureaucrat. The Brotherhood won the elections and has subsequently become increasingly negative toward its OL/RU tail. Like the "progressive" bureaucrats supported by the Communist Party in the 1930's, these fake-militants may soon turn on their radical hangers-on and give them a taste of old-fashioned McCarthyism in a vivid demonstration of the need for an independent class-struggle opposition in the unions rather than Stalinist lesser-evil tailism.

This reformism (along with its anti-communist consequences) is also reflected in the RU's student work. Following out the logic of its anti-imperialist strategic united front, the RU created the Attica Brigade, whose program consists of nothing but warmed-over New Leftism. During demonstrations against budget cuts at the City University of New York (CUNY) last year, liberals refused to let the Revolutionary Communist Youth (youth section of the SL) march with signs calling for "Open Admissions with Stipend," "Nationalization of the Universities under Worker-Teacher-Student Control," "Only the Working Class Can Defeat Capitalist Attacks," and "Fight for Socialism." When the liberal leaders called the cops to remove RCY supporters from the picket line, the Attica Brigade showed its appetites by uniting with the liberals and the cops. The consequences of this anti-communism are now becoming manifest as the Queens College chapter of the Attica Brigade has joined the liberal anti-communist New America Movement (NAM).

## Mao's Foreign Policy: Liquidate Revolution

Since Mao set out after a "Third World" Nixon-French alliance against the Soviet Union during the late 1960's and early 1970's, Maoists in the U.S. have had a much more difficult time of simultaneously fronting for Chinese foreign policy and maintaining a pretense of revolutionary politics. A hilarious example of the acrobatics to which this can lead is the RU's 1972 pamphlet "China's Foreign Policy: A Leninist Policy." No longer able to attack the Russian revisionists for seeking peaceful coexistence with the U.S., RU leaders argued that "the Chinese uphold peaceful coexistence as the correct basis for relations only between countries with different social systems," whereas:

"...the Soviets try to make peaceful coexistence the general line for all relations with the imperialists, even between the imperialists and the people and nations oppressed by imperialism....

"The Chinese line is to make diplomacy serve the struggle of the people, in all parts of the world. When diplomatic relations come into conflict with support for the struggle of the oppressed people, diplomatic relations must take a back seat."

Then the pamphlet goes on to explain that although the Bengal of East Pakistan suffered national oppression this was an internal affair of Pakistan. India's invasion of East Bengal, however, was expansionism, thereby, according to the RU, justifying China's aid to the Pakistani government against India! A *revolutionary* policy would have been to call for revolutionary defeatism on both sides in the Indo-Pakistani war while maintaining the right of Bengali self-determination.

The writers also attempt to explain why it was correct for China to send representatives to the Shah's celebration of 2,500 years of monarchy in Iran at the same time as the RU was supporting demonstrations of Iranian students against the celebrations. In 1971 a mass uprising by Ceylonese students and peasant youth was brutally put down by the "anti-imperialist" Bandaranaike government. Despite platitudes about diplomatic policy taking a back seat to the struggle of the people, the RU

## SUBSCRIBE

In the Fall of 1973 *Women and Revolution*, a Marxist journal dealing with issues of particular significance to the struggle for women's liberation, made its reappearance as a publication of the Woman Commission of the Central Committee of the Spartacist League.

The journal will carry critical analyses of the various ostensibly revolutionary organizations and will bring to light new or long-neglected material from the history of communist work among women, as well as topical articles and reviews. For the January issue, we are projecting articles dealing with the relationship between feminism and utopian socialism, the pamphlet "The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community" by Mariarosa Dolia Costa, the Berkeley/Oakland Women's Union and the history of the recent struggles of working women in the Communications Workers of America's Militant Action Caucus.

We invite all *Workers Vanguard* readers who have not already done so to subscribe now to *Women and Revolution*. Issues will appear three times a year (September, January and May) and the subscription price is only \$1.00 for four issues.

# Women and Revolution

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

Make checks payable/mail to: SPARTACIST PUBLISHING CO.  
Box 1377, GPO, New York, NY 10001



# West Europe's Imported Labor

have been tightened up; and the government expelled a Swiss cleric who had been working among the Marseilles immigrants.

West Germany's two and a half million "guest workers," mainly Turks, Italians and Yugoslavs, endure a more ordered form of exploitation than their French equivalents. They contain a larger proportion of single men than in France and are, therefore, less of an immigrant population. This is a direct result of a German law which prohibits foreign workers from bringing their families until they find adequate housing for them! This is virtually impossible, with most foreign workers living in company dorms. All foreign workers are recruited through a federal government labor office (illegal entry is difficult) and are essentially a massive pool of contract labor.

justifies China's aid to crushing the rebellion on the grounds that the objective effect of the uprising would be to create a crisis enabling the old right-wing government to come into power. Similar explanations are given for why China supported the Sudanese military government at the time of its massacre of Communist Party leaders in 1971 and for Mao's support to Ethiopian emperor Haile Selassie who is currently suppressing a liberation movement in Eritrea.

## Reform or Revolution?

Increasingly the Maoist Revolutionary Union is finding it difficult to distinguish its own policies from those of the arch-reformist Communist Party. Internationally it is attempting to play the same role for Peking that the CP plays for Moscow—shameless apologist for secret deals behind the backs of the masses, two-faced exculpator of bloody betrayals. Mao separates state diplomacy from the revolutionary struggle in other countries, and the former "takes a back seat" to the latter? Look at Ceylon or Bangla Desh! Mao advocates only peaceful coexistence between states but not a peaceful transition to socialism? What about Indonesia? Study history!

The conflict between the revolutionary pretensions of the RU and its cravenly reformist practice also reveals itself domestically. In left-wing unions led by supposed "progressive" and even "socialist" bureaucrats like Chavez' UFW and Bridges' ILWU, RU supporters are barely distinguishable from the CPers. Not only do they oppose any but the most minimal sub-reformist demands, but whenever the bureaucracy counterattacks they simply collapse (see "Progressive" Bridges Announces No-Strike Agreement," WV No. 22, 8 June 1973). During recent farm worker support activities their reformist frenzy has led RU supporters to offer themselves to the UFW bureaucracy as thugs to keep away communists in the hopes of ingratiating themselves with Meany-Chavez. Such policies may make the RU temporarily tolerable to anti-Communist union leaderships as a kept opposition or as boot-licking toadies, but they can never lead to victory for the working class in the struggle against the class enemy and its agents in the workers movement.

Gooning for the labor tops and apologizing for massacres of communists and workers versus an intransigent struggle for working-class independence and the program of Trotskyism—these are the alternatives. Only by re-examining the fundamental aspects of Stalinism and assimilating the lessons of the struggle of the Left Opposition and the Fourth International can this conflict be resolved in the interests of socialist revolution. ■

During the last year, foreigners have taken the lead in organizing wildcat strikes in a country noted for its rigid bureaucratically controlled labor movement. In July, a group of Spanish workers staged a wildcat in a North German heavy machinery factory demanding higher pay. They got their pay increase, but the strike was marred by German workers crossing the Spaniards' picket lines.

The Ruhr strikes in late August revealed a quite different relationship between German and foreign workers. The initial wildcat was triggered when the Cologne Ford plant fired 300 Turks who had returned late from vacation and their fellow countrymen also went out to get them rehired. But the Germans went out with the Turks, transforming the strike into a general wildcat centering on higher wages to offset the highest rate of inflation in twenty years. The Ford walkout sparked a rash of wage-demand wildcats, including at the huge Opel works, which at its peak involved 200 plants and 50,000 workers. The German government claimed that some of these strikes were led by radical groups (*Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 27 August). In general, the wage demands were quickly granted by a panicky bourgeoisie. The German-foreign labor unity broke down somewhat toward the end of the strike as some Turks held out for more and some Germans forcibly crossed the picket lines. However, the German ruling class got a premonition that their foreign workers, whom they had regarded simply as objects for exploitation, could be the point of a dagger that would rip their guts out. Social-Democratic Chancellor Willy Brandt had to put in an emergency television appearance appealing for class peace in fighting inflation.

## Strategic Importance for Trotskyists

The emergence of foreign workers in key sectors of the West European economy presents unique historic opportunities for the Trotskyist movement. The principal obstacle to the development of mass revolutionary parties in Western Europe has been the established authority and organizational power of the social democrats and Stalinists. The German Social Democratic Party and French Communist Party are particularly efficient organizations in policing their labor movements against revolutionaries.

Throughout its history, the only way that the European Trotskyist movement might have achieved a significant working-class base would have been through splits destroying the hegemony of the mass reformist parties. This remains the fundamental condition for winning the leadership of the class as a whole.

Today, however, a large and vital section of the West European work force has no historic loyalty to the traditional reformist parties and is largely free of ties to the established labor bureaucracy. The mass reformist parties have not even attempted to extend their hegemony to the foreigners, being at best indifferent, and at worst downright hostile, to the foreign worker population. While the SPD and particularly its youth group have attempted a reformist posture toward the migrant workers, the French CP has been openly chauvinist toward foreign workers—opposing their right to vote and calling for the expulsion of illegal entrants.

A relatively small revolutionary organization can have an enormous impact in shaping the political consciousness and activity of the volatile, rootless foreign workers in Western Europe. With a correct program and

appropriate transitional organizations, an aggressive campaign directed toward foreign workers could provide the Trotskyists with a significant working-class base in the next period. Of course, the organization of foreign labor by revolutionaries, no matter how successful, cannot substitute for winning the West European proletariat through discrediting and destroying the mass reformist parties. To hold that view would be a kind of domestic "wretched of the earth" theory. However, a solid and extensive base among foreign labor would provide Trotskyists with an invaluable weapon in the decisive battle with the Social-Democratic and Stalinist bureaucracies.

Foreign workers in West Europe should not be regarded as already an unconscious vanguard in the manner of the fake-Trotskyist United Secretariat's "new mass vanguard." The term "vanguard" implies conscious adher-



Wreckage caused by an anti-Turkish riot in Rotterdam, 1972.

ence to revolutionary politics. In contrast, the potentially leading role of foreign workers in West Europe's revolution is based on negative qualities—their lack of ties to the bourgeois society that they work in and to its labor bureaucracy. The winning of any section of the working class to socialist consciousness, whatever the factors which ease or hold back this process, requires the relentless struggle of the Trotskyists for their party and its program of proletarian class independence. And the obstacles to transforming the foreign workers into a genuine vanguard layer are great.

There are the practical obstacles of language barriers and of overcoming a natural tendency toward clannishness. Since they can easily be deported to a murderous despotism for political activity, foreign workers face a degree of repression qualitatively greater than native West European workers. Although prone to explosive militancy, foreign workers are generally less concerned about the future political character of the countries they work in than native West European workers. Many Mediterraneans work in the North to save up enough money to start their own business back home, a not unrealizable goal. Therefore, classic petty-bourgeois aspirations, which the West European proletariat has basically outgrown, are common among foreign workers. Despite these formidable practical and political problems, a strategic orientation to foreign workers is warranted for revolutionary organizations in Western Europe.

Only quantitatively less important than the role foreign workers can play in the West European revolutionary movement is the role they can play in their countries of origin. Due to the thinness of its cadre and its material poverty, the Trotskyist movement has had great difficulty in initiating and developing organizations under conditions of illegality and severe repression. However, because of the massive and ill-regulated traffic in people with the backward despotisms of the Mediterranean basin, West Europe offers an unusually favorable base for exile work. Effective organizing among for-

eign workers in Western Europe can lead to initiating Trotskyist organizations where they have never existed (e.g., Turkey, Portugal, Sub-Saharan Africa) and developing Trotskyist organizations where they have been shattered or arrested by repression (e.g., Greece, Spain, Algeria).

The million Yugoslav workers in Western Europe have a particular importance for Trotskyists in two senses. The ostensibly socialist government of Marshal Tito is pursuing the same policy as the backward despotisms of Turkey and Portugal in encouraging its poor youth, mainly from the Serbian peasantry, to seek work in the advanced capitalist countries. This is partly to gain foreign exchange and also to relieve the political pressure of mass unemployment. A major programmatic demand for Trotskyists in their struggle against Yugoslav Stalinism is the reintroduction of centralized planning for economic development that will absorb and integrate the growing, particularly peasant, population into the urban, industrial working class. At the same time, at present the million Yugoslav migrant workers, mainly in West Germany, provide a unique opportunity to establish a Trotskyist opposition in a Stalinist-ruled country.

## Full Rights for Foreign Workers

The line between reformist social chauvinism and proletarian internationalism in Western Europe must be drawn on the demand that all foreign workers are entitled to immediate and full citizenship rights in the nations where they labor. As any Jamaican or Bengali "citizen" of Britain will attest, formal citizenship rights do not automatically end the oppression of immigrants. However, winning full citizenship rights for West Europe's foreign workers would be a great victory for proletarian internationalism.

As a first step toward full democratic rights, the socialist movement must support demands that all foreign workers have an inviolable right to remain in the country for a definite, lengthy period (at least several years) and cannot be deported for trade-union or political activity, unemployment, etc. This is an essential condition for the effective political organization of foreign workers.

Foreign workers must get the same wages as indigenous workers and the labor movement must make sure that any laws to that effect are rigidly enforced. Employers and the state must provide foreign workers with housing at comparable quality and rent as indigenous workers have. Foreign workers must also have equal rights for unemployment compensation, state medical benefits and other social services. Cruel, discriminatory laws, such as West Germany's effective prevention of migrants bringing their families with them, must be abolished.

If foreign workers intend to assimilate into French or German society, they must eventually master the native language. However, at present the language barrier is important in keeping foreign workers at the bottom of West European society. This is especially true for the educational opportunities available to their children. Therefore, in localities where the foreign population is relatively large, such as Munich or Marseilles, a second or third official language should be introduced.

The short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic of 1919 made virtually every political mistake in the book. It was, despite this, a genuine workers government. This is demonstrated by Section 12 of *The Constitution of the Hungarian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic*:

"The Soviet Republic proclaims the proposition of the unification of the proletarians of all lands and, therefore, grants to every foreign proletarian the same rights that are due to the proletarians of Hungary."

The Constitution of the United Workers States of Europe will have a similar provision. And that is one of the major reasons that there will be a United Workers States of Europe. ■



# Impeachment Is Not Enough!

of maintaining capitalist rule.

In the eyes of the American bourgeoisie Nixon is guilty of three serious crimes against his own class. First, and least important, are his financial operations growing out of a personal brand of crooked politics. Even when Tammany Hall reigned supreme the White House was supposed to be off-limits for the influence-buying and pill-fearing of the public till which was the rule elsewhere. But today Nixon and his gang act like a military junta in a banana republic, their main goal to rake off as much as they can before their hour is past. If they had a sense of irony, the country's rulers would treat Nixon in the manner of Al Capone and convict one of the greatest criminals of the century...for income tax evasion!

Nixon's campaign financing boggles the imagination. Not only did he reportedly approach major corporations with the hard-sell approach of a protection racket ("we are expecting a substantial contribution, on the order of..."), amassing the largest campaign fund in history despite the fact that it was obvious from the first weeks that he would win a landslide victory, but Nixon used every possible loophole to disguise contributions, solicited illegal contributions and received at least several hundred thousand dollars from various disreputable figures such as gambling tsar Howard Hughes. Nixon's obscure income tax manipulations (whereby he virtually escaped paying any tax at all) show an incredible contempt for public opinion on one of the most sensitive subjects in bourgeois politics.

For his own personal expenses, Nixon showed the appetites for sumptuous living of a nouveau not-so-rich. To be fair, this was also true of Johnson, who in so many ways was a kindred spirit of his successor, but on a more modest scale. Nixon had none of the modesty of humble scions of finance capital such as Franklin Roosevelt or Nelson Rockefeller. On an income of "merely" \$200,000 a year he attempted

to maintain a life style reminiscent of the Sun King, Louis XIV. The bourgeoisie will certainly think twice about soon putting in another poor boy as president.

### Democracy for the Ruling Class

Second were Nixon's attacks on bourgeois democracy, particularly his contempt for elections (Watergate and related campaign "dirty tricks") and continued defiance of the legislative branch. Essentially this was the product of an insatiable appetite for personal power superimposed on a system of pronounced structural bonapartism. (If this were a European parliamentary system, the Nixon Administration would long since have fallen and been replaced after new elections.) While the bourgeoisie successfully buried this issue during the election campaign and pursued the Watergate hearings with a schizophrenic attitude, first pushing ahead as if determined to get the president, then pulling back when it became clear he could be toppled by the revelations, nevertheless, the question of bourgeois democratic norms is not irrelevant to the ruling class.

Anyone who has followed the repeated revelations of government frame-ups against the Panthers, weathermen and other radicals will easily understand the limits of bourgeois democracy. So, too, will the postal workers who saw the courts rule their strike illegal and the government quickly break it by mobilizing the National Guard. But for the capitalists themselves, bourgeois democracy is, after all, the only kind of democracy they've got. Nixon treated the Democratic National Committee as if it were the Russian Embassy—and there is a difference!

The ruling class is no partisan of "pure democracy," or even of a strong legislature. The U.S.' tasks as the leading imperialist power require a

dominant executive. Italy can muddle along without a stable cabinet because the real business of government is carried on by the permanent civil service. Not so for the U.S., which must be able to maneuver rapidly in continual international crises, like the current Near East war. Thus even the bill recently passed by Congress, and certain to be vetoed by Nixon, limiting presidential war powers, permits the "Commander-in-Chief" to do just about anything he wishes for 60 days, subject only to the most minimal review by Congress. But Nixon's behavior has convinced even the most authoritarian that some curbs are needed against a megalomaniac. Similarly his claims to absolute executive privilege during the Watergate controversy must have sounded to members of the Congress something like papal declarations of infallibility would to Protestant preachers. Nixon clearly went beyond the accepted rules of the game.

Third among his crimes against the bourgeoisie is Nixon's catastrophic mismanagement of the economic and diplomatic affairs of state during his second term. This is directly related to his Watergate methods of finances and politics. Nixon's style in handling the economic interests of the capitalist state resembles that of a sidewalk magician ("keep your eye on the moving ball"), relying on one dramatic move after another to keep a step ahead of disaster. In a qualitatively new situation in which the U.S. had lost its absolute dominance over all other imperialist powers, Nixon and his Metternichian aide Kissinger were able, through a series of adroit maneuvers, to cut U.S. losses in Vietnam while temporarily preserving the Thieu regime, form alliances with both Moscow and Peking and induce Japan and the Western European capitalists to give up competitive trade advantages in order to shore up the U.S. balance of payments. Domestically Nixon was able to keep inflation within limits for a time by seducing the union bureaucracy into holding down wages—i.e., making the workers pay for the damage to the American empire.

But in his second term Nixon has let earlier successes cloud his vision of reality and given free vent to his personal needs and appetites. Nixon/Kissinger's call for a "new Atlantic Charter" struck European governments as a Hitler-like *Diktat*. The Soviet grain deal, in turn, whatever it did for the U.S. balance of payments, was a financial lemon and introduced severe dislocations into the domestic economy. Typical for the Nixon Administration, these possibilities were admittedly not even considered. His decision to abandon price controls in order to drive up profits for his financial backers set off a round of South American-style inflation never before seen in the U.S. If Nixon's other sins were combined with brilliant performances on the economic and diplomatic front, the ruling class might have overlooked Watergate as a mere breach of etiquette. However, as it is, the various crises feed on each other.

The combined effect of these crimes has been to totally discredit the government in the eyes of the population. The incredible spectacle of the President

of the United States of America openly defying the courts and the United States Senate; his claim that he alone has the right to determine war and peace; even the pathetic spectacle of Nixon secretly choosing the vice-president to replace Agnew and then presenting him like a debutante to the assembled, supposedly sovereign Congress looked much more like the court of Louis XVI than one of the oldest continuous bourgeois democracies in the world.

The guardians of the established order cannot permit such mockery indefinitely. When the chief proponents and enforcers of "law and order" turn out to be a gang of petty crooks, the masses will soon lose respect for the bourgeois state itself. Indeed, if governments were not, as Marxists claim, based in the final analysis on the force of arms, but rather, as the bourgeoisie pretends, on moral authority alone, the Nixon government would long since have fallen in a shambles.

## California Used Car Dealers and Florida Real Estate Operators

What's behind it all? Various theories circulate about conspiracies: western capital vs. eastern, big capital vs. small, new money vs. old, etc. This misses the essential lessons of Watergate entirely. There are certainly conspiracies abounding. A look at the way Nixon managed to dump Vice President Agnew as a sop to public morality will show that. However, there are not now any sharp policy differences dividing the bourgeoisie on, for instance, liberal-conservative lines. Others assert that Watergate is only a concrete expression of "The Crisis," just like the price of gold, Peronism in Argentina and anything else that happens in the world. The Watergate affair is being played out against the backdrop of the loss of U.S. imperialist hegemony and intersects with the economic and political consequences of that defining circumstance. But it also has a certain relative autonomy, expressed, for instance, by the fact that it is coming to a head in the middle of the Arab-Israeli war when maximum ruling-class unity is required. Finally there are those who see the Watergate affair as a sign of impending fascism or full-scale bonapartism. In fact, it is just the opposite—Congress is restoring the norms of U.S. bourgeois democracy, and the power of the government has been greatly reduced.

In effect, Nixon is fighting back like a cornered rat (a behavioral trait that can be detected throughout his career) and has managed to stage a coup against himself. He apparently believed his "compromise solution" of summarizing a (presumably cleaned-up) version of the Watergate tapes for three southern senators (Stennis, Ervin and Baker) would still the public outcry while removing the troublesome Cox. Nixon utterly failed to understand the importance to the bourgeoisie of at least an appearance of legitimacy to their class dictatorship. Cox and Richardson were both mandated to act as representatives of Congress to restore public confidence in the Administration. Moreover, they both have close ties to decisive sections of

## Spartacist Local Directory

BERKELEY- OAKLAND..... (415) 653-4668 Box 852, Main P.O. Berkeley, CA 94701	LOS ANGELES..... (213) 467-6855 Box 38053, Wilcox Sta. Los Angeles, CA 90038
BOSTON..... (617) 492-3928 Box 188, M.I.T. Sta. Cambridge, MA 02139	MILWAUKEE Box 5144, Harbor Sta. Milwaukee, WI 53204
BUFFALO..... (716) 837-1854 Box 412, Station C Buffalo, NY 14209	NEW ORLEANS..... (504) 866-8384 Box 51634, Main P.O. New Orleans, LA 70151
CHICAGO..... (312) 728-2151 Box 6471, Main P.O. Chicago, IL 60680	NEW YORK..... (212) 925-2426 Box 1377, G.P.O. New York, NY 10001
CLEVELAND..... (216) 696-4943 Box 6765 Cleveland, OH 44101	SAN DIEGO..... (714) 272-2286 Box 22052, Univ. City Sta. San Diego, CA 92122
DETROIT..... (313) 862-4920 Box 663A, General P.O. Detroit, MI 48232	SAN FRANCISCO..... (415) 653-4668 Box 1757 San Francisco, CA 94101

# 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.

## Sub-Drive Report

ONE WEEK TO GO!

	Quota	Sold	Percent of Quota
Buffalo	100	280	280%
Detroit	120	269	224%
Chicago	90	192	214%
Boston	140	225	161%
Cleveland	100	140	140%
Bay Area	210	254	121%
New York	300	359	120%
Los Angeles	90	90	100%
At Large	50	50	100%
Total	1200	1859	155%



finance capital and in recent months they, together with Laird and Kissinger, have represented Nixon's principal direct tie to his masters.

By himself Nixon represents at most the fusion of southern California used-car dealers, Nevada casinos and Florida real estate operators. This bloc hardly possesses the social, political and economic weight to rule. Nixon was overwhelmingly re-elected in 1972 because he had performed well for the bourgeoisie in his first term. Today he is opposed by virtually the entire bourgeoisie which fears that his actions threaten the stability of its continued rule. Faced with this overwhelming opposition Nixon did not cede but continued to repeat "I am the state!" If the ruling class is forced to remove the first president in history, it will not be without extreme reluctance.

## Meany Strengthens Nixon's Bonapartism

There is at this time a sharp political crisis at the top of U.S. society—one of the three conditions listed by Lenin for a revolutionary situation. There is also considerable economic distress, particularly the uncontrolled inflation. What is lacking is a movement of the working masses expressing their refusal to tolerate existing conditions any longer. There is, in fact, very little movement at all at the base of society. Every leading capitalist paper has commented favorably on the "moderation" of union wage demands over the last six months and the absence of major strikes. Meany and Co. were not only direct accomplices of Nixon but have constituted his main "popular" prop. Therefore, the recent AFL-CIO motion calling for Nixon's impeachment indicates the depth of opposition to him within the ruling establishment. By fully supporting a U.S. victory policy in Vietnam and state wage control, Meany is uniquely responsible for *suppressing* the political struggles of the American working

class against Nixon's reactionary government, strengthening Nixon's attempts at bonapartist rule.

To grasp the tremendous potential unsettling impact of the present political crisis, one has only to ask what would have happened to wage controls if the union bureaucracy had refused to comply instead of shoving them down the workers' throats? What would the economic situation be at this time, and what would the political situation be like if at this moment there were a militant national auto strike against the Big Three? The union bureaucracy is today the main obstacle preventing the working class from kicking out the thieves and replacing them with its own government.

The present situation, where a severe crisis at the top is isolated from any movement at the bottom of society, will not last for long. A molecular process is going on in the working class, as larger and larger numbers of workers are looking to Marxism and consistent class struggle as the only answer to their oppression. Today this process may be reflected in increased plant sales of socialist newspapers (far more responsive than college campuses for the first time in more than two decades) and large votes for fake-militant reformist caucuses. Tomorrow it could be transformed suddenly into a massive social explosion on the order of the French 1968 May events. The job of the revolutionary vanguard party is to expand its ties to the class, winning leadership through its leading role in partial struggles and its struggle for the Trotskyist program of working-class independence from the bourgeoisie, thereby preparing to lead the class as a whole to victory in the future.

Part of this struggle must be an energetic response to the present political crisis in the bourgeoisie. The working class is not indifferent to questions of political democracy and in fact demands the fullest possible democratic rights to organize itself around its own class program, exposing the secret machinations and oppressive actions of the capitalists. This is an integral part of our program for workers power, which would in fact be the greatest

Continued from page 12

# Goon Attacks Protested in Solidarity House Picket

is not unreasonable to assume that the local SWP chapter got cold feet about participation especially since the SWP has fulsomely supported taking unions to court (e.g., the UFW against the Teamsters, or the Mine-workers for Democracy against the UMW).

The International Socialists, with a relatively large membership in Detroit, sent only two of its supporters who marched briefly with the picket line. In its current work in the UAW, the IS is spending most of its energies trying to pressure Jordan Sims, a leader of the United National Caucus, into opposing Woodcock; in turn Sims, president of an important Chrysler local, is now spending most of his energy explaining how he was "duped" into supporting the recent sellout Chrysler contract.

Three supporters from the small, semi-underground *Spark* participated in the demonstration. An extreme expression of syndicalist economism, *Spark* wages its major shop-floor campaigns around cleaning dirty washrooms and fixing broken vending

machines. Despite our opposition to this kind of inept economism, we note that in the entire U.S. left, only the *Spark* group responded in a serious manner to our attempt to organize opposition to the Woodcock bureaucracy's use of violence to prevent radical literature from reaching the workers. The very small ultra-left *Workers Truth* group in Chicago sent a telegram supporting the demonstration, but could not participate.

The trade-union bureaucracy—liberal and openly conservative alike—is becoming increasingly isolated from and unable to control its base, as was demonstrated in the series of wildcats in Detroit this summer. To maintain its grip, it will continue to escalate the red-baiting and goon attacks on militants. The Spartacist League has always insisted that the struggle for workers democracy in the unions must be consciously linked to a political answer to the bureaucracy, and to the construction of an opposition in the unions, organized in caucuses based on a class-struggle program. Dump the bureaucrats—for a workers party based on the unions! ■

and most consistent democracy in history for the working masses.

## For an Immediate Election and a Workers Party!

Nixon's attempt to bury the Watergate investigation by a deal with the "great Constitutionalist" male chauvinist Ervin and his "impeccably honest" racist/militarist colleague Stennis demonstrates that the ruling class cannot be trusted to reveal Nixon's crimes—even when directed against itself. No confidence in the courts or Congress! For a full disclosure of Nixon's crimes to the American people! PUBLISH THE 1970 SECRET POLICE PLAN!—PLAY THE WATERGATE

## TAPES IN FULL ON NATIONWIDE RADIO!

The deep distrust the American public now has for the government provides an excellent opportunity for a campaign to limit and weaken the repressive apparatus of the capitalist state. The FBI's sealing-off of the Watergate task-force offices to prevent staff members from removing their papers should give a clear idea of where the forces to run a police state would come from. Outlaw *all* government wiretapping! Destruction of all political dossiers! ABOLISH THE SECRET POLITICAL POLICE (FBI, CIA)!

The Chilean coup clearly shows that the *real* answer of the ruling class when a "democratic" government can no longer hold down the masses is to resort to the generals and admirals. In supporting the Pentagon and West Point, the American working people would be supporting their potential executioners. ABOLISH THE STANDING ARMY AND ITS OFFICER CORPS! FOR A WORKERS MILITIA BASED ON THE TRADE UNIONS!

Socialists should support a congressional move to impeach Nixon. The removal of Nixon and choice of his successor must not be left to the "most exclusive club in the world"—the U.S. Senate. The direct recall of elected officials is an essential democratic right. It will be a fundamental principle of socialist constitutionalism under a workers government. FOR AN IMMEDIATE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION!

It is necessary to provide an answer to the rotten system which produces Watergates and Vietnams. Forcing a new election would prove a hollow victory for the working class if it simply resulted in a "cleaner" Republican or Democratic president to carry out Nixon's basic policies—holding down wages by anti-labor laws in the face of unprecedented inflation; squandering American wealth and youth to support reactionary regimes throughout the world (such as Thieu's South Vietnam and Meir Dayan's Israel) instead of aiding the workers and peasants in the task of socialist construction. The construction of an alternative to the twin parties of capital must in the first instance be a fight also against their agents in the workers movement—the labor bureaucracy. BREAK WITH THE REPUBLICANS AND THE DEMOCRATS—DUMP MEANY WOODCOCK—FOR A WORKERS PARTY BASED ON THE TRADE UNIONS! FORWARD TO A WORKERS GOVERNMENT! ■

## SL/RCY Public Offices

### BAY AREA

Wednesday and Thursday 1:00-6:00 p.m.  
Saturday 2:30-6:00 p.m.  
330-40th Street (near Broadway)  
Oakland, California  
Phone 653-4568

### BOSTON

Wednesday and Friday 1:00-5:00 p.m.  
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 through Friday 3:00-7:30 p.m.  
Saturday 1:00-6:00 p.m.  
260 West Broadway  
Room 522  
New York, New York  
Phone 925-5665

## Women and Communism

CLASS SERIES

- Oct. 29 Feminism vs. Marxism
- Nov. 12 Marxist Analysis of the Family
- Nov. 26 Bolshevik Work Among Women
- Dec. 10 Why Stalinism Betrayed the Gains of the Revolution
- Jan. 7 The Trotskyist Transitional Program
- Jan. 14 The Vanguard Party

Boston University  
George Sherman Union  
Room 322 7:00 p.m.

### BOSTON

For information call:  
(617) 492-3928

SUBSCRIBE TO

# Young Spartacus

Organ of the Revolutionary Communist Youth,  
youth section of the Spartacist League

## Formerly the RCY NEWSLETTER

The RCY has changed the name of its press in accordance with its stabilization as a regular bi-monthly paper, reflecting the RCY's growth and increasing influence as a vital, interventionist Leninist youth movement. In taking the name *Young Spartacus*, the RCY links itself to the revolutionary traditions of the Spartacus Youth League, youth group of the early U.S. Trotskyist opposition.

50¢  
6 ISSUES

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

Make payable mail to: RCY Newsletter Publishing Company  
Box 454, Cooper Station, New York, N.Y. 10003

REVOLUTIONARY LITERATURE



# WORKERS VANGUARD

## Racial Hysteria Fanned in Boston

In recent weeks black-white tensions in Boston have been broadcast throughout the country with front-page coverage and inflammatory headlines suggesting impending race war. The vicious "torch murder" of a young white woman, Evelyn Wagler, the reported stoning of an older man by a "gang of 40 black youths" and a number of racial clashes among public school students have inflamed the fears of Boston's white neighborhoods. These white racial fears were fanned by the police and news media. Thus the reported mob stoning turned out to be a fabrication; moreover, the Metropolitan police, which first arrived on the scene, reported nothing of the sort of racial violence announced by the Boston police. As for the press, the conservative *Herald-American* published a photo story re-enacting the "torch murder" and the liberal *Globe* published the stoning story even though its own reporter argued it was implausible (*Free Paper*, 16 October). As the conservative politicians raised a hue and cry about "crime in the streets," the representative of Boston's liberal big bourgeoisie, Mayor Kevin White, called on the FBI to intervene and offered a \$5,000 reward to apprehend the murderers. This united campaign by the bourgeoisie, police and press naturally produced a defensive reaction in the black masses. On all sides there were nervous fears of the kind of massive race riots that the city has never seen.

In late September three schools in Dorchester, an old Irish working-class neighborhood whose racial composition is rapidly changing, were the scene for an escalation of individual fights between white and black students into

generalized racial hostility and widespread clashes between students travelling to and from school. On October 4, two days after Evelyn Wagler was forced to douse herself with gasoline by six young blacks in Roxbury and then burned to death, black teenagers robbed and stabbed several whites (one of them fatally) in three separate attacks near the Columbia Point housing project. On October 6 the body of a white taxi driver, presumably a murder/robbery victim, was found in a lot in Roxbury. The particularly vicious and gruesome nature of the Wagler murder, the implied racial overtones of the other incidents and the closeness with which they followed each other, combined with the normal sensationalism of bourgeois newspapers eager to boost their sales, created a widespread image of black gangs consciously organized for the wanton murder of whites.

However, with the exception of the Wagler murder, whose only apparent motive was race hate, these killings were not particularly unusual for a city which has already had 95 murders this year. The extensive and lurid front-page coverage of these murders is a key reason for the garrison mentality that now exists in Boston. Thus the media were considerably more restrained in their coverage of the sniping murder of a black teenager by two white youths in June or the "torch murder" in September of one black youth and severe burning of another by a white who robbed the sandwich stand where they worked. Neither was the FBI called in on these cases nor a \$5,000 reward offered by the Mayor. Similarly, both press and city officials reacted mildly when a Boston policeman murdered a black patient at City Hos-

pital in April 1970. While not consciously desiring a race war, which they could not easily contain, Boston's local rulers manifest the deeply ingrained racism of bourgeois institutions in their response to these killings and their maneuvers to gain maximum political advantage from the tense atmosphere.

Racism, thinly veiled with populist rhetoric, is the stock in trade of many Boston politicians. Untalented conservative lawyers, like Louise Day Hicks and most of the incumbent City Council and School Committee, have found lucrative careers in championing "neighborhood schools" (i.e., opposing busing as a means of integrating schools) and denouncing "crime in the streets." The racial fears of white workers have been deliberately whipped up by Boston's initiation of a cross-busing program consciously designed to generate its own destruction by forcing white students to attend vastly inadequate schools in the city's black sections rather than improving all educational facilities and opening the better schools to blacks. The bourgeois politicians who run the School Committee have steadfastly opposed busing, as well as every other measure designed to improve the inferior educational opportunities for blacks and Spanish-speaking residents or to aid integration in any way. Support for such measures would threaten their political careers which, in different formulas, are based primarily on fostering racism. When forced by the courts to implement busing, they did so in a manner designed to maximize white hostility, closing down white schools and sending the students a considerable distance to predominantly black schools, including vastly inferior ghetto schools.

Of course, the Boston Police Patrolmen's Association, with the support of its conservative political friends, eagerly latched onto the current situation to berate Mayor White for cutting its budget and leaving the city defenseless in the face of "mob terror." White working-class neighborhoods have generally responded with greater hostility toward blacks and an increased reliance on racist cops and politicians. On October 10 violent harassment and threats forced three families, two black and the other interracial, to move out of the predominantly white Charlestown section.

On the other hand, the defensive turning inward of the black neighborhoods represents something of an opening for black nationalist tendencies that have largely been frozen out of Boston in the past. Unlike Watts, Harlem, East St. Louis, etc., the Roxbury-Dorchester sections of Boston have not seen the significant growth of radical nationalist groups like the Panthers or Republic of New Africa. Black nationalism in Boston has from the start been based on an alliance of the black petty bourgeoisie with the white liberal establishment rather than the organization of lumpen blacks on the basis of "Third Worldism" and adventurist confrontations with the police.

Organized primarily through the New Urban League and the Black United Front, aspiring petty-bourgeois blacks like Chuck Turner, Mel King and Hubie Jones have siphoned off a piece of government poverty funds and Democratic Party campaign money from the liberal wing of the local establishment. Typical lackeys of the bourgeoisie, such "leaders" have

continued on page 4

## Goon Attacks Protested in Solidarity House Picket

Chanting "Defend the UAW! Defend Workers Democracy!" two dozen picketers marched in front of the UAW's Solidarity House on October 17, protesting the continued harassment of leftist paper salesmen by bureaucrat-inspired thugs. Participants included Spartacist League supporters from Cleveland, Buffalo and Detroit along with three supporters of *Spark* and a token number of supporters from the International Socialists. Other groups on the Detroit left claiming to adhere to the principle of democracy within the workers movement revealed the flimsiness of their principles by their sectarian abstention from this demonstration.

The Spartacist League initiated the call for this united-front demonstration in response to the assault to which members of the SL were subjected in Cleveland when, attempting to sell *Workers Vanguard* at the Parma Chevrolet transmission plant, they were attacked by a goon squad composed of local bureaucrats and hangers-on. Other groups, including the Maoist Revolutionary Union and *Modern Times*, a local syndicalist tendency, have also been driven away from this plant by the 18 member standing goon squad.

Recognizing that the Cleveland inci-

dent was part of a national pattern in the UAW the Spartacist League called for a united-front demonstration at Solidarity House, UAW headquarters, to protest the attacks. *Workers Vanguard* pointed out that the bureaucracy's anti-red offensive would be used to silence any and all oppositional voices raised inside the union against the traitorous policies of Woodcock, Fraser, etc. Besides protesting the current wave of attacks, the demonstration affirmed the legitimacy of socialist tendencies within the workers movement. The UAW once prided itself on its openness. In its earliest days the union was strengthened by the open political discussion and democratic political struggle whose result was a conscious and militant rank and file. But an active, conscious rank and file is a direct threat to the pro-company policies pushed by the UAW tops.

### The Left Abstains on the Question

Left groups and working-class tendencies throughout Detroit were contacted well in advance of this demonstration and asked for their participation on the basis of agreement with the following demands: 1) defense of the

right of tendencies within the labor movement to distribute their press publicly; 2) solidarity with the UAW against the company and defense of the UAW as a necessary defensive organization of the class; 3) support for militant democratic unionism; 4) no utilization of the demonstration in any way as part of an attempt to bring in the bourgeois state to coerce the union (e.g., to publicize a court case).

In a display of the grossest workerism, the Revolutionary Socialist League, recent split-off from the IS, claimed to be in full agreement with all the demands raised in the call for the united front and still refused to support or participate in the picket line. The RSL's justification? Not enough "real workers" would be at the demonstration to render it relevant and significant (read: popular) enough to merit the support of the RSL. Like anti-communist union bureaucrats, the RSL defines "real" workers as including only those who do not support socialist organizations. The fact that many UAW members would be reluctant to picket union headquarters for fear of being victimized is, of course, irrelevant to those like the RSL. To cover the superficial nature of its defense of workers democracy the RSL sent a "defense guard," arriving 20 minutes late, to defend the picket in the unlikely event of a goon attack.

After initial assurance from Pete Kelly that the United National Caucus certainly did support the right to distribute papers at the plants, the definitive position of the UNC was given by Art Fox who stated that, "We don't

bloc with non-trade-union groups," again giving tacit support to the red-baiting of the bureaucrats.

The CP's district organizer could not be reached, but organizers of the picket were informed of the CP's national policy of refusing any blocs with "Trotskyites." No response at all was forthcoming from Progressive Labor WAM, the Workers League, the Communist League or from two local social-democratic groups, "Control Conflict and Change" and "From the Ground Up." Supporters for PL, WL and the CL have all come under attack from the union leadership and from the companies in recent months. In the absence of defense campaigns of their own, any militant worker must assume that these groups do not take seriously the task of defending their supporters and other victimized workers. The Revolutionary Union (RU) refused to bother with a response, despite the fact that its own comrades have been victimized at the same Cleveland plant as the WV salesmen. Like PL, the RU is well-known for its own Stalinist gangster tactics.

The Socialist Workers Party's position on the united-front defense was to verbally promise to attend and then fail to show up. Organizational sloppiness cannot wholly account for this abstention. The SWP had expressed reservations about the section of the united-front call which states, "Agree not to utilize the demonstration in any way as part of an attempt to use the bourgeois state to coerce the union," when first contacted. Therefore, it

continued on page 11