

Karamanlis Regime Steps Up Repression

Workers Battle Cop Attackers in the Streets of Athens

MAY 31—Hundreds of thousands of Greek workers, including construction workers, public transport, airlines and communications workers, dockers and shipyard workers, mugs, printers and teachers, went out on a 48-hour national protest strike Monday May 24 against a vicious anti-labor bill then under consideration by Parliament. Railroad workers also announced their intention to join the strike but the government put them under martial law, mobilizing them into the army. The strike was also supported by many students.

The anti-labor bill, which has since been passed, was reported in the foreign press as banning "political" or "wildcat" strikes. In reality, it outlaws *all* strikes which are not authorized by the government-controlled GSEE (General Confederation of Labor of Greece).

The bill also provoked the largest demonstrations seen in Greece since the fall of the military junta which held power from 1967 to 1974. These were met by violent police repression, including arrests of hundreds.

By noon of Tuesday, May 25, the downtown section of Athens was filled with demonstrators, including many construction workers, who planned a protest march to the parliament buildings. The government has accused the Communists of responsibility for the ensuing melee, which began when cops attacked the assembled protesters. The Communists (who were so concerned to demonstrate their "responsibility" that their deputies walked out of parliament rather than vote against the anti-strike bill) in turn accused the "far left" and

"provocateurs" of taking the lead in setting up barricades and throwing rocks. But whether or not provocateurs were present, the demonstration soon became a massive expression of militant opposition to this latest outrage of the Karamanlis government.

When the estimated 10,000 demonstrators were attacked by the police, they fought back with rocks, sticks and pieces of sharp glass from broken windows. The cops attacked with tear gas and armored cars, and the demonstrators defended themselves with barricades and street fires. By evening, all the main streets in Athens were reportedly barricaded—some with overturned buses and automobiles—and many were in flames. The bourgeois Athens daily *Apogevmatini* (26 May) headlined its report "street fights all night." In a subsequent detailed account of the May 25 anti-government rioting, *Apogevmatini* (29 May) described the scene as follows:

"At 4:45 p.m. Academy Street was filled with flames. A mass of barricades was set up in Kannigos Square. Emmanuel Benaki Street overflowed with demonstrators. Many held iron clubs in their hands yelling the slogan: 'For Proletarian Revolution!' Five minutes later, 4:50 p.m., Kannigos Square was filled with barricades, smoke and fire. Themistocles Street was aflame. Shop windows were damaged and automobile windows broken."

At 5:30 p.m. a representative of the GSEE addressed the crowd over a loudspeaker: "This meeting is illegal and is being carried out by extremists among whom are mixed many provocateurs."

continued on page 4



Apogevmatini

Downtown Athens May 25 as workers demonstrating against anti-strike law clashed with police.

Lebanese Civil War: A Harvest of Blood

JUNE 1—French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing arrived in the U.S. with imperial majesty proper to a sovereign, updated through the twentieth-century technology of the inaugural Concorde flight. During his stay Giscard launched a trial balloon of what the French call *la canonnière*, or gunboat diplomacy. The setting was New Orleans, perhaps inducing in the French president nostalgia for France's lost empire, which once included Lebanon, Syria, Indochina and much of Africa as well as the lands of the Louisiana purchase.

Giscard, who like the American president is also commander-in-chief of the armed forces, told reporters on May 21 that in 48 hours he could dispatch "several regiments" into the 13-month-old Lebanese civil war which has already claimed 30,000 lives. Giscard claimed he had already cleared this proposal with his U.S. counterpart and host, imperialist chief Gerald Ford, and secretary of state Kissinger. The U.S.

president is in no position to profess disapproval, since during Lebanon's last major civil war in 1958 President Eisenhower sent in 10,000 marines. According to a *New York Times* dispatch issued the day that Giscard was rattling his sabre in the Mississippi delta, the U.S. State Department had "no objections."

The French chief further claimed that Syria would be glad to share the burden of "pacifying" its civil war-ravaged neighbor with France, its former colonial ruler. Syria is deeply bogged down in the Lebanese morass, having intervened with at least 7,000 troops from its own army and thousands more under the guise of pro-Syrian Palestinian forces. While Syria has not publicly confirmed Giscard's claim, it has not denied it either. Syria's warm relations with its former colonial masters will be highlighted by President Hafez al-Assad's visit to Paris on June 17—the first such visit by a Syrian head of state since Syria

continued on page 11



UPI

Beirut, January 1976: Muslim prisoners of the Phalangists taken in the Karantina slum district.

Letters

Who Is Responsible for Defeat of S.F. City Workers Strike?

13 May 1976

To the editor:

The *Workers Vanguard's* articles on the municipal employees' strike in San Francisco present the best analysis I've read. There are, however, one or two aspects of the analysis with which I disagree.

While I agree that throughout the strike the leaders of the municipal employees' unions demonstrated incompetence and possibly dishonesty as well, I question the idea that they alone were responsible for the failure of the rank-and-file membership to display much militancy or class consciousness. During the first few weeks of the strike, while I was living in San Francisco, I was impressed by the unwillingness of most municipal employees to honor the few picket lines which were established or to go on wildcat strikes. With the exception of the Muni workers no group of municipal workers made any substantial sacrifice in support of the striking municipal craftsmen.

Most city workers seemed to view the strike as strictly a bread and butter dispute over wages and they saw this dispute as involving no other parties except their unions and the Board of Supervisors. Instead of demanding that corporate property bear the increased cost of municipal financing most municipal employees seemed not to care who had to pay the increased cost of their labor and in so doing earned the antipathy of the small property owners whom the Board of Supervisors pro-

fessed to represent. Instead of raising the issue of why lower income groups must most heavily shoulder the burden of the current recession most city workers voiced concern for their own interests only. Non-municipal workers in general found little that appealed to them in the city workers' demands and neither did those municipal employees serve welfare recipients, homeowners, etc. The strike was unpopular with most residents and instead of becoming more general it became more isolated, in part because of the actions and attitudes of the municipal employees themselves.

M. Q.

WV replies: Certainly there was widespread scabbing during the recent San Francisco city craft workers strike. Throughout the strike a majority of the 18,000 non-craft city workers routinely crossed craft worker picket lines.

However, the cynicism and apathy which infected many of the non-craft workers in this strike did not just fall from the skies. Neither was it a consequence of some innate backwardness of this particular set of workers. Rather, the lack of militancy of many of these workers in this strike grows out of the past betrayals of the San Francisco trade-union bureaucracy.

During the 1974 San Francisco city workers' strike the same miscellaneous workers who scabbed in the just-ended strike were among the most militant strikers, while many of the craft unions scabbed. In its scope and militancy the earlier strike surpassed the 1976 craft workers' strike. Yet the labor brass, fearful of embarrassing the then mayor of San Francisco, Joe Alioto, were able to keep the strike under control and to force through a wage settlement that did

not even begin to keep pace with the soaring inflation.

Betrayed in 1974, these same workers were betrayed again in 1976. On the very eve of the craft workers' strike the labor tops pushed through settlements for the poorly paid miscellaneous workers that left many with wage increases amounting to as little as three percent a year.

The bourgeoisie and its servants in city hall were thus easily able to play upon the resentments of many of the low-wage miscellaneous workers against the much better paid, job-trusting and racially exclusive craft unions in order to isolate the craft workers' strike and to encourage mass scabbing. Their success in this ploy is a damning indictment of the abject opportunism of the trade-union bureaucracy.

It is in fact very common for the slicker trade-union bureaucrats to amnesty their sellout roles using the very argument the writer advances in the first part of this letter—i.e., that the masses are backward, conservative, unwilling to struggle, etc., etc. Certainly these bureaucrats don't believe this argument themselves. They move to crush any and every manifestation of militancy.

The unstated corollary of your argument is that the working class gets the leadership it deserves. Commenting upon this epigram Trotsky observed:

"In reality leadership is not at all a mere 'reflection' of a class or the product of its own creativeness. A leadership is shaped in the process of clashes between the different classes or the friction between the different layers within a given class. Having once arisen the leadership invariably rises above its class and thereby becomes predisposed to the pressure and influence of other classes. The proletariat may 'tolerate' for a long time a leadership that has already suffered a complete inner

degeneration but has not as yet had the opportunity to express this degeneration amid great events ... But even in cases where the old leadership has revealed its internal corruption, the class cannot improvise immediately a new leadership, especially if it has not inherited from the previous period strong revolutionary cadres capable of utilizing the collapse of the old leading party."

—Trotsky, "The Class, the Party and the Leadership"

You argue that striking municipal workers must bear the responsibility for finding some scheme whereby "corporate property" will "bear the increased cost of municipal financing." This argument implicitly accepts the central premise of the media's strike-breaking harraque: that this is in some sense "our" government and not the government of the class enemy. The very real "antipathy" of much of the petty bourgeoisie to the strikers was the product of a deliberate anti-strike campaign aimed at convincing the less conscious sectors of the working population that the "selfish" municipal workers were striking against "the people."

It is self-defeating to accept capitalism's stacked-deck framework that workers and poor people must compete among themselves to preserve their "slice" of a shrinking capitalist "pie." The working class and its allies must understand that the elimination of inequality and want will proceed, not from tinkering with tokenistic or utopian schemes for "redistribution" of wealth and social services, but from expropriation of the rapacious capitalist class, the smashing of its repressive state apparatus and the liberation of the productive forces from the fetters of private ownership of the means of production—through socialist revolution.

Gates Close On Open Admissions and Free Tuition at CUNY

On May 28, in a display of utter contempt for students and campus employees, Chancellor Robert Kibbee shut down the entire City University of New York (CUNY) in the middle of exams, formally "locking out" its nearly 300,000 students, faculty and campus workers.

Pleading impending financial default, CUNY chancellor Kibbee first announced that the 12,000 faculty would not receive their paychecks that day. Then, later in the afternoon, Kibbee ordered the entire university closed; within hours 20 campuses were emptied and the gates of CUNY locked.

The shutdown was the first step in a maneuver designed to force procrastinating politicians and bureaucrats to approve the end of the 129-year policy of free tuition at CUNY. With the city pleading poverty, the university system will be reopened only if it receives an emergency grant of state aid. However, the state legislature has made it clear that a bill providing \$24 million in such aid is contingent on accepting tuition.

Governor Carey, who terms tuition "unavoidable," is now turning the screws on the NYC Board of Higher Education (BHE) to approve tuition before he acts on any emergency aid.

State politicians are clearly undesirous of taking the first step. As Assemblyman Irwin Landes put it: "Nobody wants to go home and find people saying you voted for tuition" (*New York Post*, 28 May).

The BHE, which meets on the evening of June 1, has shown it has no intention of standing up for the no-tuition policy. Last week four members of the BHE who opposed tuition obligingly resigned rather than vote against it. Mayor Beame promptly appointed replacements for three of them. The new BHE line-up will reportedly yield a majority in favor of tuition.

To be sure, the gates of CUNY will reopen. However, the introduction of tuition (probably at the \$750-900 rate annually charged in the New York state universities) is another major step taken toward ensuring that thousands of working-class, poor and, especially, minority youth will not receive higher education. Already the BHE has gutted CUNY's open admissions program by adopting stringent academic requirements that are class-biased and racially discriminatory, geared to exclude most of those "educated" in the city's public school system. Already four entire campuses of the CUNY system are slated to be eliminated through closure and merger.

Thus far there have been sporadic protests by city students against the educational cutbacks, focused particularly at the predominantly Hispanic

Hostos College, which is slated to be closed, and at City College. However, the opportunist leaderships of these actions ensured that they would have a parochial character by refusing to even call for extending them beyond a single campus, let alone appealing to the labor movement. The newest CUNY cutbacks must be answered through a mass student/labor response, including campus occupations, demanding the immediate reopening of CUNY with full pay to faculty for all days missed; the preservation of the no-tuition policy; and the restoration of open admissions and special programs.

The attacks on CUNY take place within the context of the continuing application of austerity measures by New York City's finance czars. In the next month alone 49 day-care centers and four city hospitals are slated to be shut down, including Sydenham in Harlem and Gouverneur on the Lower East Side. This is in addition to the city wage freeze, layoffs and cutbacks in social services that have already occurred. Consequently there is widespread bitter resentment among the city's working population and poor against Mayor Beame, Big Mac and Governor Carey's Financial Control Board. A massive response to the imposition of tuition must be organized with the goal of sparking a citywide labor strike against the austerity program enforced by the bankers and capitalist politicians. ■



CUNY faculty and staff received nonnegotiable scrip Friday instead of paychecks.

Guardian Embarrassed by Peking Bloc With U.S. Imperialism

Criticizing Mao to Defend Maoism

U.S. Maoists are in trouble. Many are finding Peking's overt military political bloc with U.S. imperialism too embarrassing to defend. Chinese intervention in Angola was too unashamedly counterrevolutionary to be explained away in traditional Maoist double talk as "correct state relations" or hacking "the enemies of our enemies." The cynical Stalinist apologists around the *Guardian* are among those Maoists who have come down with a severe case of cold feet.

A literary battle has been initiated in the pages of the *Guardian* between Peking loyalists and the "critical" Maoists of this "independent radical newsweekly." The latter are charging China with "recent mistakes in foreign policy." But the debate is not likely to be very illuminating. China's class-collaborationist foreign policies are neither of "recent" origin nor can they be described simply as "mistakes." And the new-found "critical" faculty of the *Guardian* hacks will necessarily be very circumscribed indeed, for they are constrained to ignore their own history as long-time apologists for Stalinism's 50-year record of betrayal.

Let a Hundred Artificial Flowers "Bloom"

The 5 May *Guardian* presents a cautious "comradely critique" of China's "current foreign policy" by staff writer Wilfred Burchett. Alongside it is published an interview with William Hinton of the U.S.-China Peoples Friendship Association. Hinton offers a brazen defense of the reactionary dogmas guiding Chinese foreign policy, without the customary veil of Maoist mystification and diplomatic indirection:

"There was a period when the superpowers were seen as more or less equal enemies threatening not only the emerging nations of the third world, but also the independence of the lesser industrial nations of the second world. Today, between the two superpowers, one the Soviet Union is more dangerous than the other. It is, in fact, the main danger confronting the whole world today.... China judges world leaders by how well they understand this new relationship of forces. Thus they prefer Heath to Wilson, Strauss to Brandt and Schlesinger to Kissinger."

Guardian managing editor Jack Smith, in his column of 26 May, greets Hinton's pronouncement with wide-eyed incredulity:

"Is Hinton suggesting the possibility of an alliance between a more rightist,

more anticommunist administration in the U.S. and China, joined by certain other rightist regimes (Heath to Wilson, Strauss to Brandt) in Western Europe and a handful [to be realistic] of anti-Soviet governments in the third world?"

He is indeed. Smith's tone is better suited to Alice in Wonderland than to a Maoist politician, "critical" or otherwise. Or perhaps he is unaware that "orthodox" Maoists in Germany are marching under the slogan, "Germany for the German People." Perhaps he has never heard American Maoists complain that Kissinger is "soft" on Communism in allowing the Soviet "superpower" "free play" in Eastern Europe. Where could Hinton possibly get such ideas, the "critical" Maoists naively inquire. Where, indeed, but from the entire body of Mao-thought which the *Guardian* has been defending for years.

To Japanese militants protesting both the revanchist schemes of their "own" bourgeoisie and the oppressive U.S. military presence, Hinton counsels: "Until Japan is able to build up adequate defense forces, it is necessary for the Japanese people to continue to rely on the alliance with the United States." To West European opponents

will find it very difficult to unite with the wide coalition of popular forces necessary to contain the Soviet threat."

The eclectic Stalinists of the *Guardian* try hard to locate the origin of the "mistake" in China's "recent" shift from "viewing the two superpowers as equal enemies of the world's peoples to seeing the Soviet Union as the principal enemy." But nearly four years ago the Chinese regime was already denouncing

bureaucratic ruling caste, codified as the "theory" of "socialism in one country."

The "critical" Maoists' ploy is to pretend that it all began yesterday. Thus Burchett's article is summed up by his declaration of Angola exceptionalism: "China's policies in Angola and some other areas have got on the wrong track...." And Smith's column prescribes the limits within which the discussion is to be kept: "The Angola



Chou En-lai chats with Henry Kissinger.

Pictorial Parade



Felix Greene

Chou En-lai (second from left) in China's delegation to the May 1954 Geneva Conference.

of the anti-communist NATO pact, the Peking mouthpiece warns: "There is no European country that can stand alone against overt and covert pressure from the Soviet Union.... Therefore it is necessary for them to maintain their NATO alliance with the United States."

Hinton's championship of NATO is certainly appalling, but it is by no means new. Chinese support to NATO was part and parcel of its blossoming romance with U.S. imperialism. For several years Mao has been campaigning for a build-up of NATO to force the Russians to withdraw troops from Siberia and strengthen the Warsaw Pact forces. *Peking Review* (21 December 1973) carried a propaganda tract entitled "NATO Need for Improved Military Forces." A few months earlier, a Sino-French communiqué called for military unity of the NATO countries "for the preservation of their common security" (*Peking Review*, 21 September 1973). Where was the *Guardian* then?

Hinton also parrots Peking's fear that the current crop of sabre-rattling American cold warriors may not be sufficiently staunch anti-Communists: "New Munichs are already in the making. America's traditional leaders, even when confronted with this lethal threat,

the USSR as "even more deceitful than old-line imperialist countries and therefore more dangerous" (*Peking Review*, 6 October 1972).

Implicit all along in China's characterization, developed in the late 1960's and faithfully upheld by the pro-Maoist left, of the Soviet Union as "a dark, fascist state of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie" was a justification for just such an alliance with U.S. imperialism against the Russians. Six years ago the Spartacist League wrote: "Given this premise, there should be no 'principled' reason why the Chinese do not extend the old Stalinist policy of the united anti-fascist front to encompass a deal with U.S. imperialism against the USSR" (*Spartacist*, April-May 1970). At the time, of course, the *Guardian* was busy playing dumb.

Born Yesterday?

Hinton points out that Peking's Angola policy is fully consistent with the rest of Maoist historical practice. This is what the *Guardian* above all must seek to obscure. Chinese foreign policy flows directly from the Stalinists' global accommodation with imperialism to protect the privileged nationalist-

situation has disturbed a great many of China's friends.... At question, though, is not just Angola but the entire pattern of China's foreign relations that has been coming into perspective since about February 1975."

The consummation of an alliance with U.S. imperialism, symbolized most vividly in Angola, is not some recent "mistake," but rather the product of a shift in the attitude of the American ruling class, which in the early 1970's began to appreciate Peking's usefulness in undercutting Russian influence in Africa, the Near East and southern and western Europe. Nixon's 1972 trip to Peking was no "tribute-paying visit," as Burchett crowed at the time. The clinking of the champagne glasses marked a formal announcement of the new bloc.

China had demonstrated its reliability the previous year by extending economic and political accolades to the Nimeiry regime in Sudan, which smashed the pro-Moscow Communist Party; to Mrs. Bandaranaike of Ceylon, who ordered the mass slaughter of the JVP youth rebels; to Pakistani butcher Yahya Khan, who presided over the genocidal suppression in East Pakistan.

As the Spartacist League has consistently explained, Chinese foreign policy in the 1950's and 1960's was substantially identical despite Mao's denunciation of Soviet revisionism (later termed "fascism") to that practiced by the Russian deformed workers state under Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev. The guiding premise of both the Russian and Chinese bureaucracies is "peaceful coexistence" with imperialism. The greater verbal militancy of the Peking regime flowed from China's more limited ability, due to U.S. intransigence, to put this appetite into effect.

But the Maoists never lost an opportunity to betray when one was presented. China did its part to force the Viet Minh to give away the fruits of military victory at the 1954 Geneva sellout. Armed with the "Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence" propounded by Chou En-lai at Bandung in 1955, the Chinese continued to practice class treason. It was Mao's instruction to the Indonesian Communist Party to collaborate with "anti-imperialist" Sukarno

continued on page 5

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Weekly of the Spartacist League of the U.S.

EDITOR Jan Norden

PRODUCTION MANAGER Karen Allen

CIRCULATION MANAGER Anne Kelley

EDITORIAL BOARD: Liz Gordon (Chairman), Chris Knox (Labor), James Robertson (Advisory), Charles Burroughs (Editorial Staff), Joseph Seymour (Midwest), George Foster (West Coast)

Published weekly, except bi-weekly in August and December, by the Spartacist Publishing Co., 260 West Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10013 Telephone: 966-6841 (Editorial), 925-5665 (Business) Address all correspondence to Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001 Domestic subscriptions \$5.00 per year. Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y.

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

4

tial for possessing a pro-government newspaper!

Greek reactionaries find consolation in the fact that the trade-union movement is securely centralized under the thumb of the government in accord with the interests of the capitalists; that dignitaries of the Orthodox Church, who are generally sympathetic to the junta and in many cases linked to the fascist fringe of the army, are accorded an eminent position by the constitution of 1975 and are free to act as a significant pressure group on various parliamentary fractions. They are also pleased that troublesome oppositionists often seem to "disappear" or meet with unfortunate "accidents." A recent case in point was the death of Alecos Panagoulis, a symbol of liberal opposition to the junta, whose automobile crashed on May 1 under extremely suspicious circumstances.

Greece's old allies, too, have been able to accommodate themselves to the new regime without undue inconvenience. While Greece withdrew its troops from NATO's military commission in 1974 as the result of a dispute with Turkey over Cyprus, it continues to declare allegiance to the North Atlantic Treaty which spawned the anti-Soviet alliance. More importantly, NATO's bases and its political commission remain on Greek soil, and U.S. troops conducted NATO exercises in Greece in 1975.

On 15 April Greece and the United States announced an agreement to allow the U.S. continued use of four military facilities (including an intelligence "listening post") for four years in return for \$700 million in American military aid. The agreement stipulated that all intelligence received from the "listening post" will be shared with the Greek government.

Stalinists and Pabloites Support Karamanlis Government

One force, however, that is far from satisfied with the Karamanlis regime is the Greek working class. It has demonstrated this through countless strikes and the formation in a number of cases of illegal unions and parallel factory committees. But the proletariat lacks the revolutionary leadership which could win to its banners the oppressed peasants and exploited sectors of the petty bourgeoisie by waging a resolute struggle to topple the semi-bonapartist Karamanlis regime through workers revolution. Instead both reformist Stalinists and social democrats tie the masses to the present regime.

Since 1968 the Communist Party of Greece (KKE) has been split between the "interior faction," led by Leonides Kirkos, and the "exterior faction," led by longtime exile Florakis. The "interiors," who solidarize with the "Italian line," reproach the "exteriors" for unconditional obedience to the Kremlin and also for the collusion that existed between various "socialist" countries and the junta. The "exteriors," who are reportedly better organized and give the appearance of greater militancy, are therefore more successful at the moment among the youth.

In fact, however, both sections of the KKE have pursued the same opportunist course of attaching themselves totally to the Karamanlis operation in the hope that a popular-front government, similar to the one in Portugal, might be established, in which they would be included.

From the time that their press began to appear legally, both factions softened their positions on purging the government of junta supporters, adopted a chauvinist position on the question of Cyprus and refused to raise the slogan of ending government control of the trade unions. In short, they did everything in their power to convince Karamanlis of their "responsibility." Even the *Washington Post* (24 August 1974) felt compelled to comment: "So far the

Communists are acting like saints in hopes of having a 1947 ban lifted so they can contest the elections." Only their inability to make separate deals with Karamanlis (and a bit of pressure from Moscow) forced the two KKE factions to form a bloc for survival despite their deep hostility. This new formation, the Enomene Aristera (EA) also includes leftovers from the Union of the Democratic Left (EDA), the old KKE electoral front which also included petty-bourgeois democratic elements.

Karamanlis held elections on 17 November 1974—the first anniversary of the junta attack on the Athens Polytechnic in which 34 students were murdered. Playing on people's fears of the restoration of the junta, his "program" was that things could always get worse. Many left parties protested that they had not been given a chance to participate and that they were being asked to choose between "Karamanlis and the tanks," but the KKE found this program of bonapartist maneuvering entirely supportable. In "The Goals of the Nation in the Transition Period of Democracy," dated 3 September 1974, the KKE (interior) stated:

"The threat of a new dictatorship and the great dangers that flow from the Cypriot situation requires us to maintain a phalanx of social forces and the broadest possible alliance of classes and social strata.... Therefore, we support the Karamanlis government, despite the fact that the left is not included in it and despite certain negative aspects of its policies. "The KKE (interior) calls on the Greek people to work together on the basis of a broad unity of leftists, centrists, rightists, and patriots all together until our start on the democratic road is well underway and irreversible."

—quoted in *Intercontinental Press*, 23 September 1974

At that time the Revolutionary Trotskyist Movement, allied with the fake-Trotskyist "United Secretariat of the Fourth International" (USec), refused to take part in the elections because it would have had to submit to the Supreme Court a statement that its principles were opposed to any activity whose aim is the forcible seizure of power or the overthrow of "the free democratic government." Rather than compromise its integrity vis-à-vis the Supreme Court, the Revolutionary Trotskyist Movement chose...to give critical support to the Enomene Aristera, i.e., to the KKE, i.e., to Karamanlis!

More recently, USec supporters in Greece, the Organization of International Communists of Greece (OKDE) have decided that the government of their man Karamanlis is, in effect, no different from the junta. This analysis has provided them with the perfect excuse to concentrate on democratic demands, crowned by the call for a constituent assembly (OKDE May Day Manifesto, *Ergatikí Pali*, 28 April). It is perfectly correct for Marxists to demand a constituent assembly (without, of course, dropping the call for a workers government, or turning the latter into a second "stage" in classic Stalinist fashion) in the context of bonapartist regimes, such as the Francoist dictatorship in Spain, for example. But it would be a serious error to equate the post-Franco regime in Madrid with the post-junta government in Athens.

While the state apparatus continues to be infested with partisans of military dictatorship and political liberties are quite circumscribed, the Karamanlis regime maintains formal appearances of bourgeois democracy. Thus there exists an elected parliament for which the major workers party (the KKE) was allowed to run, albeit only through an electoral front. Rather than the misleading demand of a constituent assembly it would be appropriate for Trotskyists in Greece to demand new elections and abolition of all anti-communist and anti-democratic electoral regulations or constitutional provisions.

For its part, the Workers International League of Greece (EDE), which supports Gerry Healy's Interna-

tional Committee, zigs and zags its way through Greece as the IC does everywhere else! For instance, it originally characterized the Karamanlis government as a continuation of the colonels' junta, then abruptly changed its characterization to that of a bonapartist regime which could not return to a junta government "without a new civil war to bloodily defeat the workers and peasants."

Democratic demands can play an important role in mobilizing the working masses of Greece in struggle against their capitalist oppressors. Thus the demands for *people's tribunals* to try military and police officers for the barbarous crimes committed under the junta; for a *break with NATO and expulsion of all imperialist military bases* from the country; for the *abolition of all anti-communist laws, repeal of the new anti-strike law and smashing state control of the unions* would challenge the very existence of the Karamanlis regime.

Yet the alternative is not a "progressive" popular-front regime which purges a few of the most notorious criminals and torturers while leaving the capitalist state intact. It is necessary to combat such class-collaborationist Stalinist programs for defeat. Not by spreading dangerous illusions in bourgeois democracy, but only through revolutionary mobilization of the working masses around their own class interests can a return to bloody military dictatorship be prevented. Sacrificed on the altar of "peaceful coexistence" and "anti-fascist unity" by Stalin and his Greek lieutenants at the end of World War II, Greek workers must draw the lessons of this bloody defeat, by building an authentic Trotskyist party infused with the revolutionary spirit of proletarian independence, in the struggle to reforge the Fourth International. ■

Criticizing Mao...

(continued from page 3)

which disarmed that party before the reactionary onslaught that left over half a million dead, including the loyal Maoists, in 1965.

Where were the "critical" Maoists when the Shah of Iran was being fêted in the Great Hall of the Peoples in 1971? In August 1971 a joint communiqué announced the Sino-Iranian rapprochement:

"The government of the People's Republic of China firmly supports the just struggle of the imperial government of Iran to safeguard its national independence and state sovereignty and protect its natural resources."

Chi Peng-wei, then Chinese foreign minister, communicated his government's approval of Iran's membership in the imperialist CENFO pact. Soon after, China withdrew all material and military support from the insurgents in Dholar (*Le Monde*, 7 October 1973).

But the *Guardian* "critical" Maoists do not want to hear of such matters. They are incapable of seriously dealing even with the recent "mistakes" they purport to criticize. Burchett, for example, writes that "Many friends of China have been troubled by what has appeared to them to be Peking's abstention from the international diplomatic and economic boycott of the fascist Pinochet regime in Chile." In this single cryptic reference to Chile, Burchett sidesteps the incriminating details which amount to direct aid to the junta.

After the 1973 coup, Peking refused to break diplomatic relations with Chile, although virtually the entire Soviet bloc and even many bourgeois regimes did so. The Chinese embassy in Santiago closed its doors to persecuted militants threatened with torture and death, including Chilean Maoists. In October 1973, China and the U.S. were the only two countries which could not bring their elites to vote for a military resolution adopted by UNESCO ex-

pressing "profound concern" over the Chilean bloodbath.

Last year, the *London Observer* (23 November 1975) reported that China was sharply increasing its imports of Chilean copper from 8,000 tons in 1975 to 34,000 tons in 1976. Pinochet told C. L. Sulzberger of the *New York Times* that the junta was negotiating a \$58 million loan from Peking. "China has behaved well," said the hatcher of the Chilean proletariat (*New York Times*, 29 November 1975). Meanwhile the *Guardian* notes only what "has appeared" to be "abstention" from the "boycott."

Spectre of Trotskyism

The Stalinist hacks of the *Guardian* will not succeed in keeping serious militants' examination of the recent excesses of Chinese foreign policy confined within the bounds of "comradely criticism." One perceptive Peking loyalist wrote to the *Guardian* (19 May): "To completely reject China's foreign policy is, at the very minimum, to call into question the revolutionary politics from which it emanates." Those Maoists who go beyond the cynical superficialities of *Guardian*-style debates will be forced to choose between serving as running dogs for U.S. imperialism or embracing the revolutionary analysis and program of Trotskyism.

The convergence of the frenzied anti-Sovietism of the Chinese ruling elite with the strategic goals of U.S. imperialism is forcing the Peking loyalists to drink to the dregs of class treason. As the Stalinist apologists vie ever more openly with one another in courting imperialism at the expense of their rivals, the Trotskyist position of unconditional military defense of the gains of the proletarian property forms of both Russia and China stands out clearly as the only program for communist unity against imperialism. The historic gains of the Russian and Chinese revolutions can be safeguarded against the onslaughts of rapacious imperialism only through political revolution to oust the nationalistic Stalinist bureaucracies and institute proletarian democracy based on soviets and a foreign policy aimed at extending the conquests of October to the destruction of capitalism worldwide.

The "independent Marxist-Leninists" of the *Guardian* cannot undertake a consistent class analysis of the origins of Peking's bloc with U.S. imperialism: the Stalin Mao "theory of socialism in one country" and its roots in the degeneration of the Russian revolution and the bureaucratic deformation from birth of the Chinese workers state. Instead, they hope to preserve their niche within the left as a literary mouthpiece for a vacillating layer of radical fellow travelers unwilling either to break with the counterrevolutionary heritage of Stalin or to forthrightly embrace his legitimate heirs in Moscow and Peking. ■



S1

Order from/pay to:
Spartacus Youth Publishing Co.
P.O. Box 825, Canal St. Station
New York, N.Y. 10013

No Choice in June Presidential Elections

Army Strongman Candidate Threatens Portuguese Workers

MAY 30 Since the inconclusive parliamentary elections a month ago, public attention in Portugal has focused on the upcoming vote for president of the republic. By the midnight Saturday deadline five candidates, including three high military officers, had filed for the office. One of them, however, Brigadier General António Ramalho Eanes, is virtually assured of election in the June 27 balloting, with strong support from both center and right-wing forces and the bulk of the officer corps.

The April legislative elections had been seen by domestic reactionaries and foreign imperialists as an opportunity to hack up the hard-line generals now on the ascendency by electing a right-wing majority in parliament. Thus strengthened, anti-communist forces could move to a showdown with the class-conscious workers and the remains of the so-called "military left" in the name of stabilizing democracy. However, while the rightist parties increased their vote compared to the elections for constituent assembly a year earlier, they fell far short of a majority and the combined total for the workers parties was 53 percent. The architects of counterrevolution had expected to "marginalize" the Communist Party (PCP); instead the PCP extended its electoral base and bolstered its dominance in the "red belt" south of Lisbon.

Stymied by this show of strength from leftist forces, the bourgeoisie shifted its efforts toward selecting an appropriate "man on horseback" to fill the role of Bonaparte for the necessary crackdown against the workers movement. The *New York Times* (8 May), projecting the views of the ruling class onto the entire population, declared: "After 50 years of stern right-wing dictatorship and two

years of romantic revolution, the Portuguese are again seeking firm leadership." Harking back to Prince Phillip in the 15th century, the imperialist pundits quoted a Lisbon observer as saying, "This country needs a navigator, someone to steady the ship and give it direction." The fact that the country was "deeply divided without a clear governing majority," said the *Times*, explained the "concern over the choice of a strong presidential candidate."

At first the bourgeoisie hoped to put forward a "candidate of military unity"; by transforming the election into a plebiscite, with a general or admiral supported by all the major parties, the mailed fist could then be portrayed as representing "all the Portuguese." The leaders of the present center-right "sixth government," President General Francisco da Costa Gomes and Prime Minister Admiral Jose Pinheiro de Azevedo, were soon ruled out as too leftist. Ultra-reactionaries then launched the name of former General Kaulza de Arriaga, a Salazarist hard-liner notorious for his brutal military tactics against FRELIMO guerrillas in Mozambique. However, this fascist-inspired butcher would have provoked an overwhelming reaction from the workers and united Socialists and Communists against him; he did not have sufficient protective coloring to be *presidenciael* (eligible for president) in "revolutionary" Portugal. Although still in active service (unlike Kaulza de Arriaga, long since purged from the army), two other potential strongmen, air force chief of staff Morais da Silva and army northern regional commander Pires Veloso, proved likewise unsuitable, being too widely associated with former president General Antonio de Spínola, Portugal's aspiring Pinochet.

The "General Who Hides Behind Dark Glasses"

So all eyes eventually turned to the mastermind of last fall's November 25 coup by rightist "operational officers," army chief of staff Eanes. In a public opinion poll Eanes was judged first among all the possible candidates for "authority" and "firmness," although trailing Pinheiro de Azevedo in popularity (*Expresso*, 8 May). A firm right-winger politically, the army chief of staff is a man of few words, having given only one interview since his rise to prominence last fall. Thus while just as dangerous as a Pires Veloso or Morais da Silva, Eanes has not yet achieved notoriety and can parade as man of the center with "democratic" or even "socialist" convictions.

But who is the former lieutenant colonel (now promoted to four-star general in recognition of his services in putting down the paratroop rebellion) who hides behind dark glasses? During the Salazarist dictatorship, Eanes, a career officer, participated extensively in the colonial wars, serving three years in Mozambique, two years in Guinea-Bissau and during 1974 in Angola, where he was when the April 25 "revolution of the carnations" took place (*Vanguardia Operária*, 19 May 1976). Eanes was program director of the state television, a position from which he twice aided putsch attempts by Spínola.

In the first case, on 28 September



Combate Socialista

Paramilitary police in Portugal; this is what General Eanes means by "stabilizing democracy."

1974, at a key point when radio and TV stations were being guarded by troops of the COPCON (Continental Operations Command), Eanes appeared at the studios at 3 a.m. "as a representative of the President of the Republic" (Spínola), placing the communications media under military control (*Voz do Povo*, 18 May 1976). Meanwhile, Spínola had sequestered COPCON commander Otelo Saraiva de Carvalho in the presidential palace. After this power grab by the bemonocled general was thwarted, Spínola resigned as president and several of his associates (Colonel Firmimio Miguel, General Galvão de Melo and others) were eliminated. But Eanes was left in place, and when Spínolaist elements in the air force attempted another coup on 11 March 1974, Eanes made sure that the television and radio were silenced, so that leftist civilian militias were without news of developments until the workers at Rádio Renascença went off strike and reopened their station under workers control. This time following the defeat of the putschists, Eanes was forced to resign.

But the most notable achievement of the president-to-be for capitalist reaction was the November 25 operation which he planned, basing himself on the single regiment of commandos headed by another rightist officer, Jaime Neves.

While this was widely reported by the bourgeois media as an attempted leftist coup, the reality was quite different (see "Lisbon Under Siege," *WV* No. 88, 5 December 1975, for a detailed eyewitness account). *Newsweek* of 8 December provided a revealing account of how the high command, capitalizing on a confused barracks revolt, managed to put the leftist military units in the capital out of commission:

"As it happened, however, the leftists played straight into the hands of 'the Nine'—a group of moderates within the ruling Revolutionary Council. Alarmed by Portugal's continuing drift toward anarchy and by the possibility of a Communist or radical attempt to overthrow the government, the Nine and their supporters had laid a trap. In a series of quiet military inspections over the past month, a promising 40-year-old lieutenant colonel named Antonio Ramalho Eanes pinpointed crack loyalist units and worked out the logistics of moving them quickly to the capital. Last week, when the leftists struck, Eanes and his team responded with a brio and efficiency that quashed the would-be coup, gave the government a new grip on power and touched off a series of arrests and purges that stripped extremists of many heroes and too soldiers alike."

While maintaining the "leftist coup" fiction used by the right as a pretext for its own coup, the *Newsweek* account was misleading in another aspect as well: Eanes was not a member of the



LDW

"Group of Nine." The "moderate" officers headed by Major Melo Antunes, ideologist of the now defunct Armed Forces Movement (MFA), went along with the crackdown, but rightist "operational" officers, in the first instance the former (?) Spínola hacker Eanes, were the ones who brought it off.

It should not be surprising, then, that Spínola should claim Eanes as one of his own in the famous conversation with West German journalist Gunther Wallraff published in *Stern* magazine last month. Our brief sketch of his background should sufficiently demonstrate that the tight-lipped general is far more sinister than his "democratic" image being projected for the purposes of the election campaign.

"Capturing" Eanes

Imperialist mouthpieces soon declared that the choice of Eanes was to their liking. The *Christian Science Monitor* (4 May), usually a direct reflection of State Department views, praised his "success in restoring discipline to an Army where too much revolution had meant that no officer could even be sure his orders would be followed without a general discussion." In Lisbon, the reactionary Social Democratic Center (CDS) party and the "liberal" Popular Democrats (PPD) announced their support of Eanes, CDS leader Freitas do Amaral declaring that the army chief of staff corresponded to his party's "ideal" candidate. The only obstacle appeared to be the difficulty of finding a successor as chief of staff who could maintain cohesion; for this post the name of former Spínola aide Firmimo Miguel (Eanes' assistant on November 25) was mentioned.

By this point, however, the entire left began to get the jitters about their preferred strongman-elect. Prime Minister Avevedo announced his own "irrevocable" candidacy as soon as the CDS announced its support to Eanes. The Socialist Party (SP)—with 33 percent of the popular vote on April 25 and 114 out of 242 deputies, making it the largest party in the country and essential to any government with a solid parliamentary base—hesitated, fearing that Eanes had been "captured" by the right. But after discussions with the army commander, SP leader Mario Soares declared for Eanes, proclaiming that the latter would interpret the new "socialist" constitution in a "progressive" light despite his conservative reputation.

Eanes thereupon declared that if elected, "I would call the secretary-general of the Socialist party to form a government" (*International Herald Tribune*, 14 May). Although the presidential candidate did not specify conditions ("they will become known"), it is widely rumored that part of the deal going down was his support for a minority SP government. Talk of appointing Firmimo Miguel as army chief of staff also ceased, and some days later Eanes gave a long interview stressing the "socialist objectives" of the constitution, coming out for "the participation of the working classes and organizations in the definition, control and execution of all the large economic and social measures" (*Expresso*, 29 May). Had Eanes been "re-captured" by Soares?

Actually, the general was certainly much more interested in other aspects of the constitution than its protection of already accomplished nationalizations (a far cry from socialism in any case). In a press conference a few days ago, Eanes emphasized his goals as "security, tranquility, peace and freedom for all Portuguese" and listed as the precondition for achieving them, "stability in the factories, schools, offices and fields" (*Gazeta da Semana*, 20 May). How such "stability" is to be achieved can be seen from his "reforms" in the army (where all troop assemblies have been eliminated) and his powers according to the

continued on page 10

Reformists Hail Strikebreaking General

I.S. Climbs Aboard Carvalho Bandwagon

We reprint below a Spartacist League leaflet issued in the Bay Area, 21 May 1976.

The PRP's [Proletarian Revolutionary Party] candidate in the June Portuguese presidential elections is the infamous strikebreaker General Otelo Saraiva de Carvalho. From 8 July, 1974 to 27 November, 1975, while Carvalho was commander of COPCON [Continental Operations Command] he used troops under his aegis to attack the TAP (Portuguese airlines) strike and to break the postal workers' strike. He also supported the law of September 1974 which virtually eliminated the legal basis of the right to strike.

However, open support for General Carvalho is a step backward even for the opportunist International Socialists [I.S.]. The 17 October 1975 issue of *Workers' Power* noted: "When the government tried to seize worker occupied radio stations, General Otelo de Carvalho begged workers not to oppose the government. Carvalho was the MFA [Armed Forces Movement] officer who had been most identified with the revolutionary left. After this, his prestige and popularity declined steeply."

The I.S. rationale for support to Otelo is his purported popularity among sections of the Portuguese working class. This line of reasoning could be used equally well to justify support to Allende's popular front government or to Perón in Argentina.

What is new about the I.S.' open support for Carvalho and its trumpeting of "Popular Power" is not the political content, but rather the openness with which the anti-proletarian conclusions behind the I.S.' long-term policies in Portugal are stated. Last year, the I.S., both in Britain and the U.S., jumped on the PRP bandwagon, asserting that if anyone made a revolution in Portugal, it would be the PRP... Last fall, the PRP was a member of the so-called "Revolutionary United Front" (FUR), in reality a popular-frontist formation that came together in an unsuccessful attempt to prop up the bourgeois fifth government.

The FUR was explicitly committed to support for the MFA and the fifth provisional government of Premier Vasco Gonçalves. The FUR's first communiqué endorsed Gonçalves' document of August 21, "lines of programmatic action and transitional demands," which called for the maintenance of

private property, the "strengthening of the MFA-people's alliance" and the "fight for production" (i.e., speed-up and strikebreaking). The FUR also called for strengthening discipline in the army and for "organs of workers power" to be recognized by (i.e., subordinated to) the MFA.

The Chickens Come Home to Roost

These policies are classic popular-front politics and the FUR did not succeed in realizing its popular-front

that throughout its continual left-right shifts, the bonapartist MFA—including its left wing—only acted to preserve capitalism and its own privileged position, holding back the class struggle and giving counterrevolution the opportunity to mobilize. The current wave of repression and the strengthening of the right wing in Portugal is nothing but the fruit of the "MFA-people's alliance" and the logical outcome of the program of the FUR. Now instead of drawing the conclusions from the defeats their politics helped to produce, the I.S. and



Ex-general Otelo Saraiva de Carvalho. This two-faced "soldier without fear" stood aside while rightist commandos broke the back of the military left last November.

ambitions only because the Gonçalves government fell before they could achieve their goal. The American I.S. was one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the FUR, and in fact forced a split in its ill-fated Bay Area "Portugal Solidarity Committee" over the issue of support to the FUR. This split took half the people out of the Portugal Solidarity Committee and in effect killed the committee. But all the while, like an ostrich with its head in the sand, the I.S. insisted that the FUR was not a popular-frontist formation!

Well, here's the proof. Read it in *Workers' Power*. "The [Carvalho] campaign will provide a rallying point to rebuild and unify the movement for popular power in Portugal." No more talk about proletarian revolution or workers power. Just plain old popular-front style "popular power". In the past, when the Spartacist League pointed out that the PRP was supporting Carvalho, the I.S. denied it or at least tried to avoid the issue. Now the I.S. has openly come out in support of Carvalho! The fact that Carvalho and other left-wing MFA officers were eventually purged and/or jailed does not alter the essential facts

the PRP are one more time around embracing the strikebreaker Carvalho!

The British I.S. Looks for Greener Pastures Elsewhere

While the American I.S. still seems relatively content with the PRP, the British I.S. has apparently decided that their cynical "gamble" on the PRP isn't paying off, especially since the PRP isn't doing so well in the current period of reaction. Thus, [I.S. leader Tony] Cliff said in September 1975:

"The PRP is an authentic revolutionary Marxist organization which argues for the need for an armed revolution, stands squarely for the dictatorship of the proletariat, and believes in the need for autonomous organizations of the proletariat—councils (soviets)."

—"Portugal at the Crossroads"

Now Cliff says of the PRP:

"...the PRP...did not show any clear radical change of direction towards the industrial struggles, towards active participation in the trade union affairs, and towards fighting for the leadership of the workers' commissions. ...Union elections are left completely to other parties...."

"The PRP is paying a very high price indeed for its failure to understand the

continued on page 9



**\$250 Portugal
\$0,10 EEUU e Canada**

ordena de:

**Spartacist Publishing Co.
Box 1377, G.P.O.
New York, New York 10001
EEUU**

Stop Deportation of AIM Militant from Canada!

VANCOUVER, May 30—Leonard Peltier, a 32-year-old Oglala Sioux Indian, a veteran of the 71-day occupation of Wounded Knee in 1973 and a leader of the American Indian Movement (AIM), is currently fighting extradition proceedings here that could mean his being bound over to U.S. courts to face murder charges in the case of two FBI agents killed at Pine Ridge, South Dakota, on 26 June 1975. If found guilty on the murder counts, Peltier faces the death penalty. He is also charged with two attempted murders of other cops, one in Oregon and one in Wisconsin, as well as a charge of burglary.

The charges against Peltier are an obvious political frame-up by racist South Dakota authorities in collaboration with the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the FBI. In Canada, he has been refused bail and at one point before the hearing, while being held in solitary confinement, was prevented from exercising his legal right to appear before a judge. Peltier remains in isolation at Vancouver's Oakalla Prison. Moreover, visitors to the extradition hearing are frisked as they enter the courtroom, forced to stand with their hands against the wall and remove shoes and other articles of clothing.

On May 13 Peltier stood in the prisoner's dock, his hands and feet shackled as they are in all his court appearances, declaring he was innocent of the charges and requesting political asylum in Canada. According to the Canadian Extradition Act a person may not be extradited if it can be proven that he is a political refugee and that the alleged offense is "one of a political character," or if it can be established that the charges have been raised "with a view to persecute or punish him for an offense of a political nature." It is clear that the U.S. case against Peltier is political persecution, part of a broader

attempt by the FBI to smash AIM through piling up criminal charges against its leaders, just as was done against the Black Panthers.

An extradition hearing is not a trial and attorneys for Peltier are not permitted to cross-examine witnesses. The U.S. has only to prove a *prima facie* case, that is, only the possibility that Peltier *might* be guilty. Some 18 affidavits, mostly from FBI agents, have been presented by the prosecution. (However, at the time of the Pine Ridge shooting the FBI admitted having no idea who was involved, even after an invasion of over 200 federal agents onto the reservation to look for clues.) In addition, the hearing judge merely forwards to the federal Minister of Justice in Ottawa any evidence of political implications together with his recommendations. The minister, in this case Ron Basford, a Liberal, has the ultimate decision.

Frank Blackhorse, another Pine Ridge activist, was arrested along with Peltier. The Canadian government originally attempted to deport him, but found it had no legal grounds and released him only to re-arrest him on drug and firearms charges. The constant re-arresting of AIM militants on trumped-up charges is a common tactic of both U.S. and Canadian police. Russell Means, co-founder of AIM, has been arrested 12 times since Wounded Knee and currently faces eight major trials. The only thing he was ever convicted of, however, is one phony "riot" charge, and that is under appeal.

The bourgeoisie's efforts to destroy militant movements of the oppressed know no border restrictions. On 30 September 1974 during a protest by the Native People's Caravan on the steps of the Canadian Parliament building in Ottawa, a brutal police assault was launched leaving many demonstrators

bloodied, beaten by club-wielding cops. The use of deportations has also been common in Canada, most recently in the case of Caribbean militant Rosie Douglas, who was "permitted" to "emigrate" to Jamaica last month.

Lawyers for Peltier have made it clear that if the AIM leader is delivered up to the U.S., it could mean his death. A defense team survey conducted in South Dakota, where there is a history of racist anti-Indian sentiment, found that over 70 percent of the white population believed Peltier to be guilty. Since the



AIM leader Leonard Peltier

Wounded Knee incident in 1973 there have been recurring "mysterious" deaths of Indians and a continuing siege by police, military and U.S. governmental authorities against Indians at Pine Ridge.

The defense team pointed to the case of Anna Mae Aquash, a Canadian Indian woman who was found dead on Pine Ridge Reservation. According to

testimony, Mrs. Aquash was arrested in Oregon on 14 November 1975 and sent to South Dakota where she was under indictment. She was "kidnapped" by unknown persons and her badly decomposed body was found several weeks later in a snowbank in a field. The authorities claimed she died of "exposure," then cut off her hands and sent them to Washington for fingerprint identification. However, her family had the body exhumed and an autopsy by a private doctor revealed she had been shot in the back of the head!

There have been 50 murders or unexplained fatal "accidents" at Pine Ridge since 1973, eight since late January of this year. According to *Indian News* (April 1976) the reservation is essentially an armed camp with BIA police in army fatigues brandishing automatic weapons, conducting illegal search-and-seize raids on Indians' homes and even hauling off children for questioning.

If Leonard Peltier is extradited, he will fall into the hands of the racist U.S. cops and courts who have killed or railroaded into jail hundreds of Indian militants in recent years. The Trotskyist League of Canada, while denouncing the racism and victimizations by Canadian courts, has protested this attempt to hand Peltier over to a "legal" lynch mob in the U.S. Contributions to help defray legal costs may be sent to: Leonard Peltier Defense Committee, Box 758 Station A, Vancouver, B.C. The defense committee urges that telegrams demanding political asylum for Peltier be sent to Ron Basford, Minister of Justice, House of Commons, Ottawa, Ontario; or to Pierre Trudeau, Prime Minister, House of Commons, Ottawa, Ontario.

All Socialists and the entire labor movement must demand: Free Peltier! Free Blackhorse! Stop the Extradition! Cops Out of Pine Ridge! ■

Jail the Killer Cop! Drop Complaint Against Black Civil Rights Attorney!

N.Y. Rockland County Police Try to Disbar Conrad Lynn

Conrad Lynn, well-known New York black civil liberties and civil rights lawyer, is facing censure by the Bar Association of the Ninth Judicial District in Rockland County which could lead to his being prevented from practicing law.

The charges, brought by the local Patrolmen's Benevolent Association (PBA), stem from comments made by Lynn before the Rockland County Legislature's criminal justice committee regarding the March 1 shooting of Reverend Elmer Hausmann, a white minister from South Africa who was highly respected in the local black community. Hausmann was shot through the heart in the dark at his Spring Valley church by a village cop, Charles Berbenich, who was supposedly answering a burglar alarm. The church, although having a predominantly white congregation, is located in a black community. Berbenich has since been charged with only one count of criminally negligent homicide.

In South Africa, Hausmann had been a minister for the Dutch Reform Church, the ideological bulwark of the white-supremacist regime. However, he

had courageously spoken from the pulpit against apartheid and the racist Pretoria government.

Lynn is charged with saying, "the recent death of the Spring Valley minister was a case of racial prejudice. It was—just to me—it was murder." Lynn's daughter Suzanne, also a lawyer, explained: "My father believed that when police heard a noise in the church, they assumed it was a black person" (*Nyack Journal News*, 29 April). They shot first and asked questions later.

After Lynn made the remark at the justice committee where he had been invited to speak, the county sheriff got on the radio, played a tape of the meeting and demanded Lynn's disbarment, claiming the attorney's remark was "prejudicial" to the cop's defense. Since then, radio and newspapers have continued to repeat this demand in a flood of articles and broadcasts. In fact, the barrage of attacks was so massive and one-sided that one local radio station was compelled to give Lynn a half-hour interview just to provide the appearance of "equal time."

Rockland County is a conservative area with a history of racial prejudice

and police brutality. It was in the same Ninth Judicial District that black lawyer Paul Zuber, a fighter for school integration in the early 1960's, was disbarred on a trumped-up technicality. In Rockland County the cops are permitted to use "dum dum" bullets fired from a .357 Magnum, a regulation which in fact means they are authorized to "shoot to kill."

In an interview with *WV* Lynn spoke of the case in the context of the "domination and intimidation of the minority communities" by the police nationally. He pointed out at the judicial committee meeting that "the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association didn't ask for a fair trial" for the cop. "They said there should be no trial." In fact, before Lynn spoke out, the PBA had daily pleas in the local press to let the killer cop go free and claimed that the shooting was at worst a regrettable mistake but not a crime.

Lynn added that on occasions in the past, local bar associations have held proceedings over a lawyer's head for up to two years, particularly for those who are known to espouse radical views.

This could destroy his career, with people afraid to retain a lawyer under charges from the bar association. Lynn is trying to force an early decision on the case. However, no hearing date has yet been set.

An Ad Hoc Committee for Justice for Conrad Lynn has drafted a resolution calling for the dismissal of the charges against him and for an apology to the affected communities.

The Spartacist League and the Partisan Defense Committee (PDC) protest this unconstitutional attempt to take disciplinary action against Lynn for exercising his right of free speech. In a telegram sent to the Ninth District Joint Bar Association grievance committee, the PDC said: "It is apparent that the proceeding against Conrad Lynn... is racially motivated, and therefore represents an attack upon and intimidation of all minorities and poor people. The Partisan Defense Committee demands that the Joint Bar Association and the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association drop this complaint and render a public apology to Conrad Lynn." ■

Carvalho...

(continued from page 7)

central role of trade union activity, and its avoidance, in the name of 'anti-Parisan', of the struggle for the leadership of workers' commissions." *International Socialism* No. 87, March/April 1976

Cliff, however, does not criticize the PRP for its support to the MFA, to Carvalho, or the popular-front politics of the FUR. Because Cliff (and the American I.S.) agrees, Cliff merely wants the PRP to undertake the syndicalist-reformist trade union policies of the British I.S. Or, in Cliff's own words, "The most important thing is to create and strengthen the united front in the economic field" and "when we emphasize a tactic we must be prepared to bury ourselves in it" (!!!) (*International Socialism* No. 87). As Cliff prepares to ditch the PRP for greener pastures, his only comment is that the concluding chapter in a period of revolutionary opportunity must be burying oneself in trade-union reformism!

Revolutionaries, of course, must work in the trade unions and engage in the defensive struggles of the proletariat. Yet to assert that the basic problems of the Portuguese working class can be solved by Portuguese equivalents of Teamsters For A Decent Contract is patently ridiculous. What is required in Portugal is an assessment of the policies that led to the recent defeats. A revolutionary party must be built in Portugal if the working class is to reverse these defeats and go forward. That revolutionary party can only be built on the basis of a rejection of the popular-front politics of the FUR, of Carvalho and of the "MFA-people's alliance." The Spartacist League /U.S. and the international Spartacist tendency have clearly laid out these points throughout the whole struggle and have raised consistently a program for proletarian victory in Portugal. A Trotskyist party must be built in Portugal as a section of the reborn Fourth International! This is the only road to proletarian victory! ■

Anti-Labor Propositions...

(continued from page 12)

not happy with, but with the climate now we're going to recommend that it be accepted" (*Oakland Tribune*, 27 May).

Meanwhile, the bulk of the workers (clerks, hospital and social workers) represented by the SEIU are being offered a 3.2 percent increase. This is a slap in the face, particularly since management employees have been offered a 7 percent raise, and the deputy sheriffs were given a similar increase. As in San Francisco, the labor bureaucrats have spread the dangerous illusion that the cops are part of the labor movement (in this case, the deputy sheriffs belong to the Operating Engineers). The cops must be expelled from the unions!

The labor bureaucrats in the East Bay have pledged to respect each other's picket lines, but these same false promises were made before the S.F. strike. The fate of the strike cannot be entrusted to the treacherous labor bureaucracy! A class-struggle leadership must be forged to build for a powerful general strike, to defeat the bosses' renewed offensive of anti-labor propositions and contemptuous pay offers and lead the workers forward toward the struggle for a workers government. ■

West Coast Strikers...

(continued from page 12)

alleged U.S. government agents were lurking around the Associated terminals. When a *WV* photographer attempted to take pictures of the plethora of cops and guards at the company's S.F. terminal, his film was destroyed by five men claiming to be FBI agents on "undercover" assignment. Meanwhile, the San Francisco FBI investigation coincides with rumblings in Washington about new inquiries into the IBT. Just prior to the aborted national Teamsters strike in April, an investigation was announced by a Congressional committee acting on reports of corruption in a multi-part NBC television special on the union.

Last week, "dissident Teamsters" organized by anti-communist legal beagle Arthur L. Fox II joined the chorus, releasing a 177-page report on the IBT and announcing their intention to take the union to court if their wishy-washy "reform" amendments on officials' salaries were turned down by the upcoming Teamster convention in Las Vegas. The report immediately prompted a demand by liberal Republican senator Jacob Javits for an inquiry into IBT pension funds (*New York Times*, 27 May).

The FBI arson investigation could prove very convenient to Associated management, which would like nothing better than to see the best militants of 15 striking Teamster locals pursued and harassed on suspicion of sabotage against company facilities. In fact, quite a few northern California employers stand to benefit from stepped-up government snooping on the Teamsters: contracts expire tomorrow for 25,000 warehouse members of both the Teamsters and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU), and a joint strike has been planned. Employer attempts to divide the workforce have singled out the Teamsters; although the major warehouses offered a \$1.40 raise over three years, IBT Local 241 was offered only 70 cents by management.

While Berkeley/Oakland IBT Local 853 has been making strike preparations for June 2 by mobilizing its stewards for picket line activity, ILWU Local 6 has apparently made no preparations whatsoever. The Local 6 leadership under President Curtis McClain has ignored demands of the Militant Caucus (a class-struggle opposition group in the Local) for a fighting alliance with Teamster warehousemen. Among the measures advocated by the Caucus are sending ILWU delegations to Teamster meetings, calling joint stewards council meetings and holding a joint strike rally.

The fates of ILWU longshoremen and warehousemen and Teamster members are closely linked throughout the West Coast and class-struggle solidarity across union lines is essential. However, the ILWU bureaucracy of Harry Bridges & Co. and Teamster officials have been doing their utmost to prevent it. When IBT Local 85 members followed scab trucks to pier 80 in San Francisco, ILWU longshoremen honored the lines until they were broken by the police. Nonetheless, Local 85 head Ray Talavera denounced the action as unauthorized and threatened discipline against the members.

In the intense anti-union atmosphere following the defeat of the S.F. city craft workers strike, the threat of government attack on the Teamsters is clearly being used to divide and defeat transport/warehouse workers. Both in the IBT and ILWU, union militants must prepare to fight such attacks, particularly by defending any member of the labor movement framed up on phony "arson" charges in the Associated fire.

ILWU Warehousemen Advocate Militant Strike

Preparation in the ILWU for the present contract battle has involved a similar issue of militant tactics in the two-and-a-half-month-old strike at the ILWU-organized Nestlé's plant. Class-conscious Local 6 members at Thrifty's and several other Bay Area warehouses, as well as longshore clerks at pier 80, have refused to handle Nestlé's products. In contrast, the legalist-minded bureaucrats have been attempting to defeat this "hot-cargoing" of struck goods and replace it with an impotent consumer boycott. At Thrifty's, the Local 6 business agent ordered members to work the scab shipments, and Bridges capitulated to a court order allowing Nestlé's cocoa beans to move across the docks in Stockton.

The "hot-cargoing" tactic, one of the powerful class-struggle methods that built the ILWU (and the Teamsters), is so clearly necessary that last week even the conservative Local 6 General Executive Board (GEB) was finally forced to give in to the pressure of the ranks' actions. The GEB affirmed in a resolution that "Local 6 will not handle any Nestlé's cargo, in transit or not." This was a victory for the Militant Caucus, which had been demanding hot-cargoing of Nestlé's products and denounced the backstabbing action of the Thrifty's business agent in leaflets circulated to the membership.

Despite this halting step forward, the Local 6 leadership, having managed to temporarily quash Militant Caucus demands for "no contract, no work," refuses to set a definite strike date. This poses the possibility of a divided warehouse strike (with only Teamster locals going out) combined with government attacks on the IBT. Teamster head Fitzsimmons, for his part, sent in William Grami, chief hatchet man in IBT raids on the Farm Workers, to run the negotiations and prevent any chance that warehouse militancy might spark attempts by drivers to reopen the Master Freight Agreement.

At a mass pre-strike Local 6 meeting May 26, the ILWU warehousemen overwhelmingly rejected the latest insulting company offer. A Militant Caucus leaflet informed the membership of the numerous points McClain & Co. have already thrown away, but the bureaucracy moved to strictly limit discussion in order to prevent debate on these cowardly "compromises." Rather than working out a program for a winning strike, discussion turned to such subjects as the announcement by one member that workers should claim the bourgeoisie's bi-centennial as their own!

This gambit (comical except that it reflects pathetic capitulation to the bosses' patriotism ploy) reflects the views of the Maoist Revolutionary

Communist Party (RCP), which seeks to carve out a niche as left cover for the union bureaucracy. The RCP's latest apology for betrayal was its attempt to pass off the defeat of the S.F. city workers, stabbed in the back by their misleaders, as a "victory"! Predictably the same treacherous line was echoed by the Communist Party.

Asked by *WV* what the problems facing warehousemen on the eve of the strike were, Militant Caucus spokesman and ILWU Local 6 GEB member Bob Mandel responded,

"One of the central lessons of the San Francisco city workers strike is that the utmost solidarity is needed between all the unions affected. We must strike together, and there must be absolute agreement that no union or local goes back to work until all have reached satisfactory settlements which have been approved at membership meetings. To run a successful strike we must hold an immediate stewards council and elect a joint strike committee with the Teamsters locals."

"A central problem facing the strike will be the question of government intervention through the courts and cops. Mass picket lines must be built and the unions must use their full strength to mobilize and defeat all forms of government attack, calling on the rest of the labor movement to defend us and the right to strike."

For a Militant ILWU/IBT Warehouse Strike!

A militant, unified joint warehouse strike by the ILWU and Teamsters is an immediate necessity, but it faces a wide range of enemies. The bosses' government has hit strikers in the Bay Area with FBI persecution and Congressional "investigations" as well as the more normal, but increasingly draconian, anti-picketing injunctions and cop violence. In the unions the rotten Bridges and Fitzsimmons bureaucracies seek to enforce submission to bourgeois anti-union laws.

Warehousemen in Seattle are already on strike and the Bay Area warehouse strike should link up with these union brothers and sisters, extending the action Coast-wide and raising the demand for parity of all locals. The strike should also be expanded to include ILWU longshoremen, who face layoffs through deregistration of full union members on July 1. In addition, the Associated drivers' strike must be defended against employer/government attack, and the sellout Teamster Master Freight Agreement reopened.

Members of both unions must refuse to handle struck goods, and the ranks must be mobilized to defy the union-busting injunctions and defend the picket lines. However, the present union leaderships stand in the way of such a fighting program of militant labor action and solidarity. Unable to see beyond the ends of their noses, they are equally incapable of winning and instead organize one defeat after another. Strike victories will come through the struggle to oust these sellout artists and replace them with a class-struggle leadership capable of standing up to the bosses.

As to the sudden government "concern" for union democracy, the coincidence of calls in Washington for Congressional investigation of the Teamsters and the FBI arson investigation in San Francisco should be obvious to all militants. Any and all interference by the capitalist state in union affairs, even if ostensibly for "clean unions," can only hurt the ranks' ability to struggle against the employers and control their own organizations. Groupings such as Teamsters for a Decent Contract (which is endorsed by the International Socialists and includes anti-communist lawyer Arthur Fox) only aid government encroachment in union affairs through their "tactical" use of courts and the Labor Department against the unions. ILWU and IBT militants must demand: No government intervention in the labor movement, and hands off the Teamsters! ■

SL/SYL PUBLIC OFFICES

Revolutionary Literature

BAY AREA

Friday and Saturday 3:00-6:00 p.m.
1634 Telegraph (3rd floor)
(near 17th street)
Oakland, California
Phone 835-1535

CHICAGO

Tuesday and Saturday 4:00-8:00 p.m.
650 South Clark
Second floor
Chicago, Illinois
Phone 427-0003

NEW YORK

Monday through Friday 6:30-9:00 p.m.
Saturday 1:00-4:00 p.m.
260 West Broadway
Room 522
New York, New York
Phone 925-5665

Portuguese Workers...

(continued from page 1)

constitution. Under this document, approved earlier this spring, the president is simultaneously commander-in-chief of the armed forces, head of the military Council of the Revolution, nominator of the prime minister and the only person with authority to dissolve the legislative assembly (articles 136-141). He can also declare a state of siege or emergency (under which the parliament need not be consulted on anything for 30 days), and veto legislation. Only by three times voting down motions of confidence in a prime minister appointed by the president can the legislature reject his nominee.

With such wide-ranging powers, a President Eanes could easily impose the minority SP government desired by Soares (the PCP would have to form a solid bloc with the virulently anti-communist right to bring it down). The SP leader, in turn, has made clear that he is still following the same program as last year when he demanded the extirpation of all workers commissions which "pretend to be a 'parallel power' to the political-administrative apparatus of the state" and the disarming of all workers militias. Now, says Soares, "It is necessary to explain to the working class and the trade-union leaders that they must limit their demands in a realistic manner" (*A Luta*, 29 April). Thus the stage is set for a replay of the confrontations last fall in which the SP lined up with the most nefarious forces of capitalist reaction against the PCP and above all the workers commissions and soldiers committees, in a determined offensive to strengthen the capitalist state by stamping out any germs of dual power. In the summer and fall it was primarily the leftist garrisons and officers that were the target; this time around it is the workers themselves who are directly threatened.

Is Soares consciously committed to such a counterrevolutionary alliance with domestic and imperialist reaction? It is not only his actions that prove it. In a recent French book (*Portugal: Quelle Revolution?*) by *Le Monde* correspondent Dominique Pouchin, the SP leader is quoted in the following exchange:

"Pouchin: ...would you be ready to fight on the side of ELP [Portuguese Liberation Army, a fascist terrorist group, linked to Spino] activists against the supporters of people's democracy?"

"Soares: Happily the problem is not posed, since the ELP people are clandestine or have left the country. But if the Communists had taken power, that alliance would certainly have been brought about."

The "Marxist" social democrat who fronts for counterrevolution is not the only reformist to support the associate of Spinoia and author of the November 25 right-wing coup. The violently anti-Soviet Portuguese Communist Party

CORRECTIONS

Due to a typographical error, "The National Question in Yugoslavia—Part 2" (*WV* No. 110, 21 May) erroneously referred at one point to the Tito bureaucracy's "break with Stalinism." As the article explains at length, Titoism is a national variant of Stalinism, not a break from it. The phrase should have read "Following its break with Stalin..."

In "Big Four Try to Starve Out Rubber Strikers" (*WV* No. 109, 14 May) there is a reference to the "Summit County Common Police Court." This should have read "Common Pleas Court." Also, Democratic hopeful Morris Udall is from Arizona, not from Utah as was incorrectly stated in "Ford Targets Boston Busing," *WV* No. 111, 28 May.

Marxist-Leninist (PCP-ML), and its workers front, the Workers and Peasant Alliance (AOC), has also come out for Eanes, as has the Reorganizing Movement of the Proletarian Party (MRPP). These foam-flecked Maoists seek to demonstrate in every way that they are in agreement with the current Peking line that "Soviet social-imperialism" is the main danger in the world today. Thus the MRPP last winter broke with the Socialist Party after tailing it for months, complaining that Soares had gone soft on the PCP. In announcing his party's support for Eanes, MRPP leader Arnaldo Matos recently stated that he would have preferred a PPD-CDS parliamentary majority to the SP-PCP majority.

The "Soldier Without Fear" Becomes Robin Hood

The Portuguese so-called "far left," a loose coalition of "soft" Maoist, syndicalist and left-social-democratic formations which last fall formed the "Revolutionary United Front" (FUR) together with the PCP and its satellites, has evidently learned nothing from the November 25 fiasco. Having braintrustered the "revolutionary officers" of COPCON for months, they fell into chaotic "insurrectionalist" propaganda only to find themselves totally abandoned when Eanes & Co. struck out to smash the military left. As Neves' commandos waltzed around Lisbon disarming one garrison after another, COPCON chief General Carvalho appeared on TV with Costa Gomes as the latter announced a state of siege outlawing all demonstrations.

Groups such as the Proletarian Revolutionary Party (PRP), which had previously praised the "revolutionary" general as a "soldier who advances without fear," now seem determined to repeat their earlier capitulation to the bourgeois MFA and demagogic left-talking officers by backing "Otelo" for president. Having warned the workers not to be fooled by bourgeois elections in March and April, advocating abstention, these Castroite syndicalists suddenly turn around to do some fooling themselves, singing hosannas for the general (since demoted to major) who abandoned them on November 25!

They are joined by the Maoist Popular Democratic Union (UDP), an electoral front of the Portuguese Communist Party-Reconstructed (PCP-R), which last fall was tailing the pro-Moscow PCP. Having engineered a series of fusions with other Maoist groups, the PCP-R recently made a successful bid for the Peking franchise (it was officially recognized by Albania

in March) by shifting its line to declare that the Communist Party is now the main enemy. But lacking the stomach to openly side with the Spinoists, the UDP opted instead for the "revolutionary" anti-Communist Carvalho.

With his usual flair, Carvalho launched his campaign with a dramatic whistle-stopping train caravan from Lisbon to Porto. But despite the railroad cars draped with red flags, a press conference last week showed that he has not changed his act politically either. Announcing that his was a "non-party" candidacy (although supported by the UDP, PRP, Left Socialist Movement [MES] and Popular Socialist Front [FSP]), the major praised "generous military men" and harked back to the "enormous possibilities of the MFA-people alliance." While throwing in a few words about defending the workers, a key point in his program was "improving the living conditions and the unity and discipline of Armed Forces in the service of, and not against, the Portuguese people." Unable to break with the officer corps of the capitalist army, Carvalho simply serves to tie his followers to the bourgeois state.

Ever evasive on any important question, Carvalho outdid himself at this conference when asked by a journalist whether he was a Marxist. His reply: "I think it is essential to the revolution that it be done with the sense that it is for the people." When the questioner kept pressing for an answer, asking if perhaps the major was motivated by a messianic calling, Carvalho opined: "Let's say it's more romanticism, closer to Robin Hood..."!

A Portuguese Candidate Non-Candidate

In this American presidential year, newspapers are filled with speculation about that curious bourgeois electoral phenomenon, the non-candidate candidate, such as Hubert Humphrey. Coily denying that he is running, the "non-candidate" is always ready for a draft. In Portugal, today, there is an opposite phenomenon, namely a declared candidate (drafted at the last minute) who is in fact not a candidate at all. As students of Stalinist politics might expect, this is the candidate of the Communist Party, Octávio Pato.

The PCP had repeatedly stated that it considered it desirable for the president to be a military officer. Unable to drum up support for its favorites, Vasco Gonçalves (head of the PCP-dominated "fifth government") and Costa Gomes, or even for Azevedo, it was willing to consider Eanes. But the markedly rightist character of Eanes' support made it virtually impossible for the PCP to force the army chief of staff down the throats of its militants. This problem became double difficult when the Carvalho candidacy was launched, which might attract the PCP's base and certainly its sympathizers. It also feared to back Azevedo or Costa Gomes against Eanes since (a) they would lose in any case, thus demonstrating the

PCP's circumscribed influence; and (h) this would sharply divide the officer corps, whose unity (i.e., "unity" with the Spinoists) it seeks to preserve.

So the PCP designated its number two leader as a pro-forma candidate simply to mark time. The fact that it was presenting an "independent" candidate in no way represented a break from its politics of collaboration with the "progressive" officers and bourgeois forces. The PCP continues to have ministers in the bourgeois popular-front government headed by Admiral Azevedo. Likewise, it signed a pact earlier in the spring reaffirming its signature of a similar document last year, which guaranteed that during an indefinite "transitional period" all major political questions would be left to the decision of the top generals, in the form of the Council of the Revolution.

To emphasize this fact, in the press conference announcing Pato's candidacy, PCP leader Alvaro Cunhal announced that he had first visited Eanes to inform him of the decision, and to make clear that this candidacy was not directed against the chief of staff. The PCP declaration underlined once again "the advantages of the President of the Republic being a military man," hut added that given the "complexity of the situation and the lack of clarity which the positions of the reactionary parties introduce into the process, the CC of the PCP has resolved not to support, at the present time, any military candidate, without prejudicing the support which it could give to a military man after being elected President of the Republic" (*Avante*, 20 May [our emphasis]).

The Spartacist tendency does not hoodwink Portuguese militants by pretending that the Stalinists are ("in spite of themselves") fighting for the independence of the working class from the bourgeoisie. In contrast the Portuguese representatives of the Healyite "International Committee," the League for the Construction of the Revolutionary Party (LCPR), in the April legislative elections called for votes to the PCP candidates, and it now announces that,

"A massive workers vote against these candidates [Eanes and Azevedo] would be a tremendous blow against this reactionary conspiracy. The presentation of a civilian candidate of the PCP, Octavio Pato, opens perspectives for such a vote."

Vanguardia Operária, 19 May

This is unadulterated obfuscation in the service of centrist capitulation. The PCP states explicitly, and the mass of the Portuguese workers are well aware, that Octávio Pato is not running against the generals, but *for* them.

It is the duty of revolutionary Trotskyists to expose this phoney candidacy for the class collaboration it represents, not pretend that it somehow represents a break with the armed forces. This is the position of the international Spartacist tendency, which declares forthrightly that none of the candidates in the Portuguese presidential elections—neither the general, the admiral, the ex-general nor their Stalinist water boy—can serve as a vehicle for registering a vote for proletarian independence. ■

YOUNG SPARTACUS

Current Issue Includes:

- Zionist Atrocities Provoke West Bank Upheaval
- Student Strikes Sweep France
- Why We Do Not Recognize "Free Speech For Fascists"
- NSCAR Abandons "Mass Actions" in Boston
- CUNY Administration Slams Gates on 300,000 Students, Staff

And More!

SUBSCRIBE NOW!
\$2/11 issues

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State/Zip _____

Make payable/mail to:
Spartacus Youth Publishing Co.
Box 825, Canal Street P.O.
New York, New York 10013

WORKERS VANGUARD

Name _____
Address _____
City/State/Zip _____

includes SPARTACIST

- ☐ Enclosed is \$5 for 48 issues (1 year)
☐ Enclosed is \$2 for 16 issues (4 months)—INTRODUCTORY sub order from/pay to: Spartacist Publishing Co./Box 1377 GPO/NY, NY 10001

Lebanese Civil War...

(continued from page 1)

was granted independence from France in 1946.

La Canonnière Causes Uproar

The day after Giscard's New Orleans proposal to bring "peace" to the Levant through a French invasion, the French defense ministry asserted it had 20,000 men available for duty abroad and that air, ground and naval forces were ready to respond to an order to go to Lebanon "if the order is given soon" (*New York Times*, 23 May). But not everyone welcomed Giscard's grandiose imperial designs and from various quarters cold water was poured upon this mikado puffed up with the memories of former glory.

An immediate uproar went up from the French left. The Communist Party interrupted wrapping itself up in the Tricolor long enough to warn that Giscard was proposing "a new version of the Vietnam war," a war which France lost in 1954 along with her Indochinese colonies. Socialist Party international affairs secretary Lionel Jospin added a touch of realism: "We do not think this kind of conflict can be settled by armed intervention of a superpower, much less a middle-grade one" (*New York Times*, 24 May).

Giscard's offer for a massive French intervention into the former Levant colony was made on the eve of a National Assembly debate on the role of the French armed forces. The Giscard-Gaullist government bloc want the armed forces expanded and upgraded so that the "middle-grade" power might be more than a junior partner of the Yankee imperialists.

The following day word of Giscard's New Orleans pronouncement reached that master of *la canonnière*, Henry Kissinger, who was winding up a NATO conference in Oslo. Kissinger reacted cautiously to Giscard's offer: "We cannot take a definitive position on this matter until it comes up in a more formal way than it has, and until we know the views of the other interested parties in the Middle East in greater detail, Arab and other" (*New York Times*, 23 May).

Reaction to the French president was so negative that the following week the French foreign minister, Jean Sauvagnargues, claimed that the regiments-to-Lebanon proposal was a "misinterpretation" of his president's remarks in New Orleans. At the same time thumbing his nose at the imperialist superpower across the Atlantic (and contradicting his own denial that an offer had been made), the foreign minister said the proposal was "a purely independent offer and in order to make it, we did not consult the Americans at all" (*New York Times*, 27 May).

Giscard and Sauvagnargues both claimed that the offer of troops was conditional on a request from the Lebanese "government" for French intervention. But it does not appear that Lebanon now has a government to make such a request. Syrian-backed president-elect Elias Sarkis cannot take office until former president Suleiman Franjeh resigns. Though Franjeh was forced to sign an amendment to the Constitution permitting the early election of a new president, he has refused to resign until his term of office expires in September.

No doubt one reason for Giscard's New Orleans sabre-rattling was to hasten Franjeh's departure. It was perhaps no accident that the same day that Giscard proposed the French military adventure, in Beirut brigadier general Abel Aziz al-Ahdab resigned and called on Franjeh to follow his example. As *WV* readers will recall, two months ago General Ahdab, the highest ranking Muslim in the Lebanese army and commander of the Beirut garrison, seized a television station and declared himself military governor of all Lebanon, calling upon Franjeh to resign. But the Lebanese army disintegrated, rendering Ahdab's "coup" impotent. Having reached mandatory retirement age, Ahdab has finally resigned and appeals to Franjeh to follow him in the "democratic way."

In Lebanon the prospect of French troops was enough to exacerbate the bloody intercommunal strife. Muslim prime minister Rashid Karami, leader of the Muslim side in the 1958 civil war, rejected the offer announcing "We will never go back to the days of the French Mandate"—the League of Nations "mandate" under which France ruled both Lebanon and Syria between the world wars. In contradistinction, Maronite Christian forces, who have called for an "internationalization" of the Lebanese conflict and are now militarily dependent on Syrian intervention, welcomed the prospect of supplementing "radical" Syrian Ba'athist troops with French imperialist legions. Pierre Gemayel, chief of the leading party of Maronite reaction, the Phalangists, stated, "when the country is exposed to sabotage, destruction and partition it would be stupid or obstinate to refuse to accept non-Lebanese forces."

From the Crusades to the French Mandate

The current confessionalist slaughter is a direct product of French imperialist intervention in Lebanon. Ever since the Crusades, when Raymond of St. Giles, count of Toulouse, captured the flourishing port cities of the Tripoli emirate, French rulers have had interests in the Levant. The Crusaders were seen as liberators by persecuted Christian sects in the Near East, especially by the

Maronites, who were granted the juridical rights and privileges pertaining to the Latin rulers.

Franco-Maronite *amitié traditionnelle* was later used to extract from a declining Ottoman Empire "capitulations" whereby the French were recognized as the protectors of Catholic minorities. The British in turn attempted to meddle in the Levant by becoming the benefactors of the Druzes. In 1860 a massive civil war between Maronites and Druzes was sparked by a Maronite peasant rebellion in which the feudal estates were seized, the land distributed and a peasant commonwealth proclaimed.

On the eve of the French military intervention into that civil war, Karl Marx wrote:

"The conspirators of Petersburg and Paris had, however, in case their temptation of Prussia should fail, kept in reserve the thrilling incident of the Syrian massacres to be followed by a French intervention which... would open the back door of a general European conflict. In respect to England I will only add that in 1841 Lord Palmerston furnished the Druzes with the arms they kept ever since and that in 1848, by a convention with the Czar Nicholas, he abolished, in point of fact, the Turkish sway that curbed the wild tribes of Lebanon, and stipulated for them a quasi-independence which, in the run of time, and under the proper management of foreign plotters, could only beget a harvest of blood."

—*New York Daily Tribune*, 11 August 1860

In that same month France invaded Beirut with 7,000 troops. The country was partitioned, with predominantly (but not exclusively) Christian Mount Lebanon (Jabal Lubnan) stripped of its maritime and inter-mountain plains. This enclave was to be ruled by a foreign Christian governor general (*mutasarrif*) designated by the Ottoman rulers but approved by the European "concert" which included France, England, Prussia, Austria, Russia and, after 1867, Italy. The *mutasarrif* was to be assisted by an elective administrative council of 12 representatives of the religious communities, thus laying the basis for Lebanon's confessional system.

Later, the "conspirators of Petersburg and Paris" combined with the British to carve up the crumbling Ottoman Empire in World War I and in 1916 in the Sykes-Picot agreement granted France both Lebanon and Syria. In 1919 at Versailles France reversed the 1861 Constantinople partition of Lebanon in order to re-create "Greater Lebanon" and place the maximum number of Muslims, among whom nascent Arab nationalism was growing, in a common state with a Christian majority which would look to France for protection. Thus the French knowingly created a state constructed to ensure plenty of intercommunal strife to justify their imperial "peace-keeping" presence; now they use the bloody confessional hatreds which are the legacy of their "mandate" as the excuse to return.

From French to Syrian Mandate

The Lebanese "mandate" and the *amitié traditionnelle* with the Maronites—or at least with their most reactionary wing—has passed to the self-proclaimed "national socialist" Syrian Ba'athists. Even the modern *mutasarrif*, the "president," is ultimately chosen by the military junta in Damascus and not by the religious-based parliament in Beirut. The 15 May *Economist* relates how the Syrian-backed Sarkis was elected over the equally reactionary Muslim-backed Raymond Eddé:

"For an hour after parliament's scheduled opening time on Saturday, militia groups under Syrian officers were rounding up some of the hesitant deputies and leading them, politely but at gunpoint, to parliament. Without this relentless Syrian intervention Mr. Eddé expected to be chosen by more than 55 votes."

The so-called Muslim "left" organ-

ized into the National Movement (including the Lebanese Communist Party) led by Druze patriarch and Progressive Socialist Party head Kamal Jumblatt, demonstrated its bankruptcy by throwing its support behind Eddé. Both Eddé and Sarkis are Maronites. Thus while Jumblatt claims to stand for a secularization of Lebanese politics, he continues to function within the norms of confessionalism by backing one of Lebanon's most reactionary Maronite clans.

Sarkis is certainly no "clean man," as the *Economist* terms him. In 1959 along with General Ahdab, Sarkis organized the Deuxième Bureau of military officers which functioned as political police fiercely suppressing opponents of then-president Chehab. Now the governor of the central bank, Sarkis is essentially a conservative bureaucrat.

Raymond Eddé is the son of Emile Eddé, founder of the National Bloc. The National Bloc was the parliamentary grouping most closely associated with outright support for French imperialism during the "mandate." Emile Eddé was president under the "mandate" from 1936 to 1941. In 1936 he signed a 25-year treaty with the French giving Paris complete control over Lebanese foreign and military affairs while granting Beirut nominal independence. Fearing absorption into Syria and the Arab East, the National Bloc openly supported the imperialist powers against various Arab independence movements. Thus Jumblatt and most of the Palestinian factions support Raymond Eddé because of the historic hostility between the National Bloc and Syria.

But the National Bloc has been even more hostile to the Palestinians historically than to the Syrians. After the 1967 Arab-Israeli war Raymond Eddé formed the "Triple Alliance" with Phalangist leader Jemayel and Camille Chamoun (who as president of Lebanon in 1958 called for U.S. military intervention). The "Triple Alliance" demanded the expulsion of the Palestinians and supported the Phalangist militias which sought to drive them out. Thus Eddé, like Gemayel, is simply the parliamentary face of clerical reaction.

The fraudulent "election" of Sarkis has only further exacerbated the intercommunal strife. The Syrian intervention, undertaken with Soviet weaponry and the intent of preserving the Lebanese status quo, combined with Giscard's proposal for French military invasion, threatens to fulfill the reactionary Maronite slogan of "internationalizing" the Lebanese conflict—recalling what Marx called the "back door" of a general European conflict. In the imperialist epoch, it is the threat of global holocaust that is posed.

Revolutionists must demand all Syrian troops out of Lebanon, no imperialist intervention, an end to the confessional system and the election of a genuinely democratic National Assembly based on universal, direct, equal and secret ballot. Only a socialist federation of the Near East can end the senseless sectarian and national wars which threaten to spill over into a third imperialist world war. ■

SPARTACIST LEAGUE LOCAL DIRECTORY

ANN ARBOR (313) 995-9645
c/o SYL, Room 4316
Michigan Union, U. of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

BERKELEY/
OAKLAND (415) 835-1535
Box 23372
Oakland, CA 94623

BOSTON (617) 492-3928
Box 188 (617) 436-1497
M.I.T. Station
Cambridge, MA 02139

CHICAGO (312) 427-0003
Box 6441, Main P.O.
Chicago, IL 60680

CLEVELAND (216) 371-3643
Box 6765
Cleveland, OH 44101

DETROIT (313) 881-1632
Box 663A, General P.O.
Detroit, MI 48232

HOUSTON
Box 26474
Houston, TX 77032

LOS ANGELES (213) 663-9674
Box 26282, Edendale Station
Los Angeles, CA 90026

MADISON (608) 257-4212
c/o SYL, Box 3334
Madison, WI 53704

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

PHILADELPHIA ... (215) 848-9816
Box 25601
Philadelphia, PA 19144

SAN DIEGO
P.O. Box 2034
Chula Vista, CA 92012

SAN FRANCISCO (415) 564-2845
Box 5712
San Francisco, CA 94101

TROTSKYIST LEAGUE OF CANADA

TORONTO (416) 366-4107
Box 222, Station B
Toronto, Ontario

VANCOUVER (604) 299-5306
Box 26, Station A
Vancouver, B.C.

SPARTACIST LEAGUE FORUM Argentine Workers Under the Gun

Speaker:
KAREN ALLEN
Workers Vanguard Editorial Board

Special Guest Speaker from the
Committee to Save Mario Munoz

Saturday, June 12 at 7:30 p.m.
Washington Square Methodist Church
133 West 4th Street
NEW YORK

Donation \$1.00
For more information call, 925-5665

WORKERS VANGUARD

S.F. Truck Terminal Goes Up in Flames

Courts, Cops and FBI Threaten West Coast Strikers

SAN FRANCISCO, May 31 The anti-union offensive of Bay Area employers took an ominous turn last week after the S.F. terminal of Associated Freight Lines, currently being struck throughout California and Nevada by the Teamsters union (IBT), was demolished in mysterious explosions and flames. Property damage was reported at \$500,000 and a fire inspector immediately declared that, "the fire was very definitely of incendiary origin." Obviously trying to pin the blame on the union, the FBI announced that, despite the lack of any evidence, the "possibility" of a link between the fire and the strike was being investigated (*San Francisco Chronicle*, 27 May).

Associated has been trying to break the recently negotiated national Teamster Master Freight Agreement, using scabs to run some of its operations since



Viggo Peterson/SF Chronicle

Burning of S.F. Associated Freight Lines terminal during strike by Teamsters was used as pretext for FBI investigation of the strike.

early May. Its San Francisco terminal, however, has been shut down tight through the militant tactics of members of IBT Local 85. Anxious to keep the determined pickets as far away as possible, the company obtained an unprecedented injunction from Santa Clara County Superior Court judge John Longinotti, barring any picketing within 2,000 feet—almost half a mile—

from the terminal or any trucks that left it!

The company also has its facilities under heavy guard, including local cops and private guards with dogs. The alleged arson would thus have been difficult in the extreme for any strikers or their supporters to have accomplished. Moreover, observers noted that Associated owner John Pifer has been

trying to sell his S.F. terminal for some time, and in fact a large "for sale" sign still hangs outside the site.

FBI Vendetta Against Teamsters

The federal government has recently been looking for new ways to "get" the Teamsters union. Well before the fire

continued on page 9

Vote No on Bay Area Anti-Labor Propositions!

SAN FRANCISCO—Working people in the Bay Area will be confronted by June 8 ballots which include a number of anti-labor city charter amendments. That these propositions remain on the ballot today is the direct responsibility of the treacherous Bay Area labor bureaucracy. Had an effective general strike been launched against the S.F. Board of Supervisors, not only could the recent defeat of craft workers have been averted and the contracts of other municipal workers reopened, but *all* the anti-labor amendments could have been wiped out.

Although Proposition E (requiring dismissal of striking city workers) and Proposition K (spreading the proposed pay cuts over three years) were dropped from the ballot, several other amendments remain which are designed to hamstring the labor movement. Proposition B would allow the city to suspend workers for a "felony or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude" or even "immorality." This proposition was sponsored by notorious union-busting Supervisor Quentin Kopp. Proposition

J would require the Supervisors to put on the November ballot another proposition which would specifically define "prevailing rates of wages." Proposition L would allow the Supervisors to make wage agreements longer than one year, but such agreements would make it "unlawful for the employees receiving the compensation so fixed, to engage in a strike or conduct hindering, delaying or interfering with work at city and county facilities."

While the Spartacist League calls for a "no" vote on these propositions, we do not (unlike the cowardly labor bureaucracy) preach reliance on purely electoral solutions to the bosses' offensive. If these union-busting propositions are passed, the labor movement must answer with militant, unified strike action any attempt by the Supervisors to implement them.

Conflict Looms in East Bay

Across the Bay from San Francisco working people also face reactionary charter amendments to be voted on

June 8. In Oakland, Proposition R would limit the amount the city has to pay into the police and firemen's retirement system and also limit the number of employees covered. Proposition S would change the city charter so that police and firemen's pay is not pegged to increases in the private sector. The cops of course are not part of the working class, but the firemen are. These propositions must be rejected.

East Bay workers are faced with more than dangerous anti-labor electoral schemes. The vicious union-busting plans of the S.F. Board of Supervisors have clearly become a blueprint for other local governments. Already employees of Alameda County, which includes Oakland, are faced with an arrogant contract offer from the Alameda County Board of Supervisors.

In a style similar to the S.F. Board, the Alameda County Board unilaterally adopted a new "wage ordinance" on May 27. The county's 9,500 workers are largely represented by the Service Employees International Union

(SEIU), plus various building trades unions. As in San Francisco, the Alameda Board targeted the craft workers for the most vicious attack on wage increases; the 390 craft workers are being "offered" a 1 percent increase now and another 1 percent in six months. This tentative agreement, to be submitted to the membership for ratification on June 1, reportedly destroys a 20-year-old policy whereby the craft workers were paid a percentage of the current wage rates in private industry (currently 90 percent). The Alameda Board has been emboldened by the labor leaders' passivity in the S.F. strike confrontation.

The East Bay building trades union leaders have not responded any better than in San Francisco. Shamefully, yesterday's defeat in San Francisco is being used by the bureaucrats to excuse today's sellout. Dan Senechal, director of the public employee division of Operating Engineers Local 3, apologized lamely, "It's a package we're really

continued on page 9