

U.S. Out of Korea!

American Imperialism Rattles Sabre in Korea

AUGUST 31—On August 18, two U.S. military officers were killed by North Korean soldiers using the very axes which the Americans had dragged into the "Demilitarized Zone" in order to prune a tree that "obstructed the line of sight" of a U.S.-South Korean command post. Three days later the Pentagon mobilized a "show of force": B-52 bombers, F-4 Phantom jets, F-111 fighters and helicopter gunships were readied; the USS Midway steamed into Korean waters from Japan as the spearhead of a naval task force; and 300 armed soldiers of the South Korean and U.S. armies which compose the imperialist "United Nations Command" cut down the offending 40-foot poplar.

Immediately, the bourgeois yellow press began grinding out accusations of "Communist aggression." The State Department announced that North Korean leader Kim Il Sung's message of "regret" was insufficient. What incredible hypocrisy! The U.S. imperialists have maintained an expeditionary force of 41,000 troops in place for 23 years since the Korean War armistice. This is a permanent act of aggression against the workers and peasants of that divided nation. American imperialism must be forced to pack up its troops, its land mines and tanks, its 1,000 nuclear missiles, its axes, command posts and spy ships and get out of Korea now!

The sabre-rattling that followed the recent clash in the DMZ mirrored the equally hypocritical outrage and massive U.S. military build-up after North Korea's seizure of the American spy ship Pueblo in 1968. Dozens of war planes were then flown from Okinawa to South Korean bases and aircraft carriers were stationed off the Korean coast. U.S. spokesmen thundered for the release of the ship and crew, while blithely ignoring the fact that they were part of the continual imperialist surveillance/harassment of the North.

The last 23 years have registered well over 1,000 deaths, mainly Koreans, due to skirmishes in the DMZ which snakes 151 miles across the peninsula. The "Demilitarized Zone" is still officially categorized as a "combat zone" by the U.S. military, and hardly a day goes by without some kind of incident. But the issue is not who may prune a tree. The DMZ, the cease-fire line established at the end of the Korean War, is a battle line in the class war. The South Korean and American forces who patrol it are the front line of imperialist attempts to encircle the Soviet Union and China. The North Korean forces are armed defenders of the collectivized economy of a deformed workers state. Revolutionaries unconditionally militarily defend the deformed workers states against imperialism, regardless of who wields the first axe or launches the first missile.

President Ford may believe that his dangerous show of force in Korea can



North Korean soldiers disperse U.S. and South Korean soldiers who refused to stop the pruning of a tree. The ensuing fight resulted in two deaths and over a dozen injuries.

annoint him the super cold warrior in the current election campaign, and perhaps spur some electoral activity out of disgruntled anti-"détente" Reagan supporters. But it won't work. Carter is right in line with a foreign policy no less anti-communist and no less war-mongering than Ford's. And he is reminding everyone that the cold war was the Democratic Party's baby.

The U.S. ruling class, while supporting Ford's martial provocations, is embarrassed by its puppet regime of Pak Chung Hi (generally referred to in the Western press as General Park), one of the worst in a string of U.S.-bankrolled right-wing dictatorships. Currently the Park regime is winding up a show trial of 18 leading dissidents who dared to suggest that life in South Korea is not "free" by any stretch of the imagination. The victims have been sentenced to long prison terms for violating Park's presidential decree of 1972, which according to the *New York Times* (29 August) bans "all forms of dissent including criticism of the decree itself."

The convicted victims of this latest anti-communist witchhunt include, besides professors, priests and other clergy, a 79-year-old former president of South Korea and the country's first woman lawyer. They were all found guilty of sedition for asking the dictator to resign. A three-judge panel charged that the defendants had "slandered the Constitution" and "distorted the political situation by claiming that there was no freedom in this country." These victims of an arbitrary, thought-control kangaroo court must be freed, along

with the thousands of other victims of the Park dictatorship's anti-communist repression! The hundreds of millions of dollars of U.S. aid to this miserable rightist dictatorship must be stopped!

The whole business might seem an ironic joke on imperialism's pretensions of representing a "free world," but behind it lie the executions and savage tortures by the vicious South Korean police and army, propping up a regime which causes immense misery for the workers and peasants (dreadfully low wages, widespread prostitution, etc.). But it is difficult to discover all that is going on in South Korea, because "any South Korean faces seven years imprisonment for criticizing his government to a foreigner" (*New York Times*, 23 August).

Bourgeois support for Ford's military mobilization in Korea was given with a warning against another land war in Asia, as the U.S. continues to lick its wounds sustained over imperialism's loss of Vietnam. The American public is in no mood for another Korean War. Despite Ronald Reagan and other crazed anti-communist ideologues, the opinion of the majority of the world

bourgeoisie was best summed up by the cover of the influential British conservative magazine, the *Economist* (28 August), which reproduced a 1950's vintage war-mongering racist Marvel comic book cover above the title, "Oh no, not Korea again."

Korean War and Cold War

The Korean War, which left two million dead (four-fifths of them civilians) was essentially the attempt of U.S. imperialism to "roll back" the sphere of influence of the USSR, then closely allied with China. It was also a civil war in which the U.S. and its puppet tyrants in Seoul sought to crush the struggle of the Korean masses, North and South, to reunify their country and rip it from the rapacious grasp of the capitalist/landlord clique around dictator Syngman Rhee.

Having "lost China," U.S. rulers were itching not only to "contain" the Soviet Union but to "liberate" the former realm of Chiang Kai-shek for capitalist exploitation. This was surely the intention behind the massive U.S. invasion across

continued on page 8

The National Question in the Marxist Movement, 1848-19146

Gabriel Salinas Free!

Gabriel Salinas Alvarez, 28-year-old Chilean victim of right-wing repression in Argentina, was released from Villa Devoto prison in Buenos Aires August 17 and arrived safely in Belgium the same day. One of a group of 13 rounded up last November in the Argentine capital, Salinas was held in jail for nine months. During four months the prisoners were held incommunicado, unable to contact families or lawyers. Salinas is a former teacher and a Latin American folksinger who has recorded two albums in Barcelona, "Canto a Mi America" and "Yo Defiendo Mi Tierra."



December 5 NYC demonstration demanded freedom for 13 arrested in Argentina.

Upon learning of the arrest of the 13 early last December, the Partisan Defense Committee (PDC) immediately sent telegrams of protest to the Argentine embassy in Washington, D.C., and organized a demonstration on December 5 outside the Argentine mission to the UN in New York City, involving 70 people. The PDC continued to draw attention to the case, contacting individuals, organizations and official bodies who could be of assistance and publicizing it at demonstrations and in appeals (see "Mario Muñoz Is Safe!" *WV* No. 122, 20 August). Thus the release of Salinas, coming shortly after the safe exit of Chilean miners leader Mario Muñoz from Argentina, is another victory for the anti-sectarian class-struggle defense championed by the PDC.

The original police report on the arrest of the 13, published in the 3 December *La Nación* (Buenos Aires), accused them of membership in a "Chilean Revolutionary Coordinating Committee," which supposedly ran guns and money across the border for Chilean resistance groups, and charged one of them with attending a "Rolando Guerrilla School" in Europe. Naturally, no one has ever heard of either group. The propaganda bombast around their arrest was simply an attempt to turn the arbitrary detention of a large number of Chileans into a publicity coup for the shaky Peronist regime. Significantly, no formal charges were ever brought against Salinas or any of the others.

Of the 12 arrested with Salinas, only three have been set free so far: British

Gabriel Salinas



citizen Richard Whitecross and his wife Cristina, whose case was widely publicized in the British press, and Dr. Juan José Bustos Ramirez, a former professor at the University of Chile. All the others still remain in Villa Devoto. They are eight Chileans (Guillermina Alicia Gavilán de Pizarro, Roberto Pizarro Hofer, Sergio Muñoz Martínez, Ernesto Bernardo Rejovitzky, Luis Bravo Moreno, Ximena Závala San Martín, Sergio Letelier Sotomayor, Catarina Palma Herrera) and Argentine citizen Rafael Mario Toer.

In a phone conversation with the Partisan Defense Committee the day after his arrival in Brussels, Salinas reported that Toer (author of the book *La "via chilena": Un balance necesario*) is in grave danger of losing his eyesight. In an interview with Richard and Cristina Whitecross ("Life in Videla's Jails," *WV* No. 115, 25 June) it was reported that Toer had developed conjunctivitis because of the tight blindfold police had placed on him for several days. He still has not received proper medical treatment. Salinas

himself is partially blind and was on his way to Barcelona for a delicate operation when he was arrested. He told the PDC that despite brutal mistreatment by the police his eyesight was still intact.

Salinas reported that the Argentine government has issued decrees of expulsion against Letelier, Palma and Závala, as they had in his case, and that visas are available to them, yet they remain in Videla's prison. As long as they are in the hands of the murderous Argentina junta, they are in grave danger of torture, legal murder, execution by the notorious AAA death squads or being sent back to Chile where they would face Pinochet's butchers.

In the phone conversation Salinas thanked the PDC for publicizing and pursuing his case, emphasizing the key role of international protests on behalf of the political prisoners being held by the Argentine junta. The Videla regime is extremely sensitive to its international image, he said, and it was international protest and pressure which obtained the

continued on page 9

How International Working-Class Defense Was Built

PDC Forum Hails Victory of Muñoz Campaign

NEW YORK, August 29—A hundred people attended a forum here last night on class-struggle defense work and the successful campaign to save Mario Muñoz, the Chilean miners leader whose safe exit from Argentina was brought about by a broad international campaign of protest and pressure. The talk by Reuben Shiffman—co-chairman of the Partisan Defense Committee (PDC) which initiated the campaign for Muñoz in the U.S., wrapped up a PDC victory tour which included forums in Chicago, Cleveland and Detroit.

The Committee to Save Mario Muñoz was sponsored jointly by the PDC and the Europe-based Committee to Defend Worker and Sailor Prisoners

in Chile. Shiffman explained that the campaign was a prodigious undertaking for an organization with the PDC's limited resources. The impressive international solidarity and generous financial support mobilized by the campaign testifies to the deep revulsion among trade unionists, liberal intellectuals and civil liberties exponents against the Latin American junta butchers.

The obstacles were immense. Although known in Chile as a militant miners leader, Mario Muñoz is not a figure of the sort who would be familiar to the liberal and radical intelligentsia and labor movement activists in Europe and the U.S. His case and political history had to be widely publicized. The Committee's task was to make Muñoz a symbol of the thousands of political refugees in Argentina, for whom international protest is the only hope of escape from imprisonment, deportation, torture and murder.

The Committee had to contest the giant whitewash attempted by the Videla government, which sought to portray itself as "moderate" and even "democratic" and the coup as "bloodless." Initially, the Committee was faced with a bourgeois press which blacked out or downplayed the escalating rightist terror. As reports began to filter through of arrests of Argentine leftists and unionists, raids on refugee centers and summary executions of "terrorists" by the extra-legal "AAA" death squads, the Committee's own publicity efforts played a significant role in exposing the whitewash and drawing attention to the mortal danger faced by Argentine left and labor militants and political refugees.

Bourgeois efforts to lend the Argentin-



Reuben Shiffman of the PDC reviewing work of the Committee to Save Mario Muñoz at forum in NYC. Broad international support obtained Muñoz' safety and was factor in forcing several governments to accept Latin American refugees from Argentina.

tine junta a "respectable" image were abetted by the Communist Party (CP) Stalinists, Shiffman explained. The Argentine CP had acclaimed the democratic hypocrisy of the Videla junta, echoing the junta's lies and welcoming the generals' "respect for representative democracy, social justice, the reaffirmation of the State's role in controlling society, and defense of the capacity for national decisiveness" (quoted in *Militant*, 23 April). As the murderous junta increasingly displayed "national decisiveness" in suppressing the Argentine CP, the Stalinist movement began to interrupt its silence with an occasional tepid protest.

The Stalinists' traditional sectarianism toward any campaign which includes Trotskyists was reinforced in the case of Muñoz by the Chilean miners leader's record of criticism of the

betrayals of the Allende government in Chile. The Chilean Stalinists and their counterparts internationally were the foremost proponents of the Allende popular front, which physically and politically disarmed the workers as the reactionary forces massed for the coup. To cover their crimes in Chile—crimes which they now repeat in Argentina—the Stalinists and their apologists resorted to suppression and slander against the Muñoz campaign.

The goal of the reactionary Videla regime, Shiffman explained, is the total destruction of all democratic liberties and of all organizations outside the military and government apparatus. The direct danger facing Muñoz from the Argentine central government—which showed no hesitation in deporting MIR leader Edgardo Enriquez back

continued on page 10

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 Charles Burroughs, George Foster, Liz Gordon, Chris Knox, James Robertson, Joseph Seymour

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

USLA Redbaiting: Sectarian Sabotage Fails

Class-Struggle Defense Saved Mario Muñoz

The safe exit from Argentina of Chilean miners' leader Mario Muñoz Salas in early August was a victory for the international workers movement. The broad support mobilized behind the international campaign to defend Muñoz against the four-month police manhunt in General Videla's Argentina transformed the campaign into a symbol of the plight of all victims of right-wing repression in Argentina and Chile. Labor, socialist and civil-libertarian organizations and prominent individuals on live continents endorsed and contributed to the campaign to save this courageous workers leader and his family. Coinciding with Muñoz' safe arrival in Western Europe, the United Nations High Commission on Refugees announced that six countries were now willing to grant asylum to 2,000 South American political refugees from Argentina, reflecting the impact of this exemplary militant protest campaign based on anti-sectarian, class-struggle defense policies.

Against the backdrop of this impressive victory for international workers solidarity, those groups which placed narrow factionalism above the defense of this imperiled workers leader stand out with special infamy. Criminal

a mimeographed letter dated April 1976, USLA even claimed it was launching a special campaign on behalf of victims of repression in Argentina. Not very much has been seen of this "campaign." In regard, however, to the particular campaign to save the life of Mario Muñoz—a campaign which focused international attention on repression in Argentina and was a real factor in pressuring several countries into accepting political refugees currently in Argentina—USLA's role was that of wrecker and saboteur.

At first USLA simply refused to endorse or support the campaign to save Muñoz. But the impressive and growing support for the campaign finally forced a reluctant verbal endorsement out of USLA. Then on May 17 USLA spokesman Mike Kelly informed the Committee to Save Mario Muñoz that USLA was withdrawing its endorsement because the campaign was "sectarian." Kelly's consummately anti-communist circular reasoning is perfect McCarthyite "logic": the campaign is closely associated with the Partisan Defense Committee (PDC), the PDC is closely associated with the Spartacist League (SL), the SL is "sectarian" (as every SWP supporter has been taught to



WV Photo

April demonstration in front of Argentine consulate in New York demanded end to manhunt for Mario Muñoz.

factionalism was underlined by Kelly's proposal that the Committee to Save Mario Muñoz liquidate into USLA's non-existent "campaign" against repression in Argentina.

When the SWP hypocrites wished to feign concern for the victims of reactionary terror in Argentina, they were very willing to exploit propaganda and protest carried out by the Committee to Save Mario Muñoz. The SWP's *Intercontinental Press* (3 May) quoted extensively from the "Urgent Appeal for Solidarity to Save the Life of Mario Muñoz" in an article on repression in Argentina and also reported on the April 22 demonstration at the Argentine Consulate. The demonstration report listed several liberal endorsers of the Committee who did not attend the march, while omitting the PDC and SL, both of which had prominent contingents present. Thus the alleged "sectarian domination" of the campaign—which is supposed to bear the blame for the SWP's criminally sectarian willingness to abandon Mario Muñoz to the tender mercies of the Argentine assassination squads—is conveniently disappeared so that the SWP can implicitly share credit for the defense work when it suits.

USLA's Sectarian Record

This is not the first time that USLA's sectarianism has marred the defense of the victims of reactionary terror in Latin America. In early 1974 the SL initiated the Committee to Save Van Schouwen and Romero, two leaders of the Chilean MIR imprisoned and subjected to brutal torture by the Chilean secret police. As part of the defense of all victims of the Chilean junta's rightist terror, it was particularly important to underline the cases of far-left militants, who are often ignored while support is mobilized around the defense of liberal-bourgeois opponents of the military juntas. These efforts were endorsed by the Chile Solidarity Committee, North American Congress on Latin America, Puerto Rican Socialist Party—but not by USLA. Claiming it was too busy with activities around the "respectable" Chile 7 (of whom only two were leftist political leaders), USLA from the beginning refused to campaign in defense of Van Schouwen and Romero.

Last year, USLA announced it was

launching a campaign of its own against the State Department's barring from the U.S. of Hugo Blanco, a Peruvian peasant leader and spokesman for the United Secretariat of the Fourth International (where he is a member of the same international faction which the SWP supports). USLA deliberately restricted its "campaign" for Blanco to telegrams to the American government, refusing to organize militant protest activities.

On 3 October 1975 the PDC addressed a letter to USLA proposing a demonstration on behalf of Blanco and pointing out:

"It was just such broad public, united front demonstrations combined with other forms of publicity and protest which galvanized international support behind Blanco when he was imprisoned on the Peruvian prison island of El Fronton and saved him from execution, eventually winning him his freedom...."

But the legalistic USLA would have none of it, explaining by telephone that it intended to rely on other channels.

When the PDC took the initiative in calling a demonstration on behalf of Blanco in San Francisco on October 16, USLA and the SWP openly worked to sabotage it, proclaiming they would contact sponsoring organizations and urge them to withdraw their backing. An SWP supporter intervened into a meeting on the Berkeley campus to insist that Blanco wanted only telegrams to Kissinger and that people should not participate in activities in defense of Blanco unless they were initiated by USLA.

USLA adamantly opposes militant protests because of its exclusive reliance on "different" channels. What this policy means is clarified by a set of correspondence involving USLA, Congressman Edward Koch and the State Department. USLA wrote to Koch asking him to intervene on Blanco's behalf (backed up by a personal letter to Koch from prominent pacifist liberal Dr. Benjamin Spock). When the State Department responded to Koch's solicitations by informing him that Blanco had been accused of terrorist activities in Peru, Koch backed off in a hurry—and submitted the entire correspondence to the 1 March Congressional

continued on page 11



WV Photo

SWP refused to endorse Muñoz campaign because of class partisanship of PDC. Above: demonstrators sing Internationale at NYC demonstration to save Mario Muñoz.

sectarianism could be expected from the Stalinists since the Communist Party of Argentina actually acclaimed the "democratic" hypocrisy of the Videla junta following the Argentine coup. But the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) demonstrated that it is second to nobody in its willingness to sacrifice elementary proletarian solidarity to the pursuit of reformist respectability and narrow factional considerations.

The SWP did more than bloat with the Stalinist sycophants and apologists for Videla in refusing to endorse the campaign: it consciously attempted to sabotage the defense of Muñoz. The SWP in its own name simply refused to endorse the campaign and left the dirty work to the Latin American defense organization it dominates, the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners (USLA).

USLA claims to defend victims of political repression in Latin America. In

repeat like a "Hail Mary" to ward off the evil spirit of the SL's revolutionary politics), therefore the campaign must be "sectarian."

The only concrete example of the campaign's "sectarianism" that Kelly could conjure up was the singing of the "Internationale" at the conclusion of the April 22 New York demonstration. What USLA and the SWP really object to about the "Internationale," the song of international labor solidarity, is its class partisanship on the side of the international proletariat.

USLA knew before it endorsed the Committee to Save Mario Muñoz that the PDC was the U.S. co-sponsor of the campaign and that the PDC explicitly describes itself as in accordance with the political views of the SL. Thus the redbaiting "sectarianophobic" departure of USLA was nothing but a calculated attempt to disrupt the campaign and drive away supporters. USLA's narrow

ILWU Longshoremen Must Enforce Strike Vote!

SAN FRANCISCO, August 28 Hard-pressed by an employer job-cutting offensive, longshoremen of Local 10 of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) here passed a strike motion at the August 19 membership meeting. Included in the motion was a militant program for the fight for jobs:

"... we reject all deregistrations or further cuts in gangs and boards and we will take strike action to prevent them. We commit ourselves to a fight for jobs for all longshoremen through a strike for a shorter workshift at no loss in pay."

This motion, introduced by supporters of "Longshore Militant," a class-struggle opposition newsletter in Local 10, represents a significant step toward mounting a counterattack against the maritime bosses. Along with the membership's recent two-to-one rejection of a dues increase, the passage of this motion represents a sharp rebuff to the leadership's defeatist policies.

But although the Local bureaucrats did not dare to obstruct the motion at the membership meeting, they managed to derail it at the next executive board meeting on August 26. Local president Cleophus Williams abruptly adjourned the meeting before implementation of the strike motion could be discussed. The Local leadership cannot be trusted to enforce the membership vote. "Longshore Militant" supporters are calling for elected strike committees.

The new wave of employer attacks began in July when the Pacific Maritime Association (PMA) started a campaign of deregistration of longshoremen who have allegedly violated Section 8.35 of the contract, which forbids holding a second job outside the union. Of course, the fact that many longshoremen have sought outside jobs is due to the job-cutting attacks of the companies, which have been fully supported by the International leadership under Harry Bridges (who doubles as S.F. Port Commissioner). Indeed, to holster the employer attacks, Bridges has launched a campaign against "chiselers" i.e., those who misreport their hours worked in order to get dispatched to a job. The result is a joint union management drive to further attack the victims of the job cuts!

At an earlier Local 10 meeting, on July 15, the membership had passed a motion to strike against any deregistrations under Section 8.35, a motion also put forward by "Longshore Militant" supporters. Needless to say, the Local

leadership has been sitting on this one, too. Meanwhile, the companies' PMA responded by proposing new cuts, slashing the day gangs from 43 to 20, and the night gangs from 24 to 12! The weak-kneed Local bureaucracy's response to this was to agree to take the issue to arbitration, while evidently avoiding any mention of the upcoming arbitration to the membership.

Even the inadequate Pay Guarantee Plan (PGP), which was supposed to compensate for the loss in jobs, has been undermined by the PMA with the collusion of Bridges. Recent payments have been far below what is owed, and money is already being taken from next year's PGP fund.

As the struggle has heated up in Local 10, supporters of the reformist Communist Party (CP) have once again emerged as hatchet men for the bureaucracy, just as they did in the recent northern California ILWU warehouse strike. Well-known CP supporter Archie Brown, for instance, has been vociferously calling for enforcement of the International's anti-"chiseler" campaign. He attached an amendment to the August 19 strike motion calling for a "delegation to the Coast Committee on these issues." Brown later explained, in the Local 10 "Longshore Bulletin" (26 August) which he edits, that part of the intention of his amendment was "forcing the employers to carry out their responsibility in enforcing the rules against the chiselers." With this kind of talk, we wouldn't be surprised to see Brown join reactionaries like Reagan in blaming unemployment on "wellfare cheats!"

In the same issue of the Local 10 bulletin, Brown abused his post as member of the Publicity Committee in order to launch a red-baiting attack against unnamed persons (obviously the "Longshore Militant") who advocate a strike.

"There is a lot of confusion around many of the issues, and there are people who are making it their business to confuse things as much as possible. They fall into three groups: those who don't give a damn about the union and would just as soon see it go down the drain rather than pay dues; they just don't understand that without a union they have no weapon to give them some protection against a very powerful employer. There are others who place their own political interests and ambitions within the union as more important than the union itself. They are willing to gamble with the future of the union in order to feather their own nests. The last group is very small

indeed—so small that the word 'group' is an exaggeration. The solution for everything according to these people is to strike, calling the other guy (which is everybody else) sellout artists. Only they have the correct answers from on high and advocate adventurist policies that would destroy the local and isolate it from the rest of the coast and labor movement. All this in the name of 'revolution' (they never lead any revolution themselves but are critical of all other revolutionaries as they are of various leaders of this union)."

In his efforts to write off class-struggle militants as a "small group" who attack "everybody else," Brown neglects to mention that the membership has twice supported "Longshore Militant" motions calling for strike action against job cuts and victimizations, motions which Brown and his friends ("various leaders of this union") have done their best to sabotage. In any case there should be no doubt in anyone's mind any longer that Brown, along with Harry Bridges, is dead set against a strike.

In warehouse, similar bureaucratic repression has been going on in Local 6, where the ranks are also getting fed up with the leadership's defeatist policies. In response to the recent killing of an ILWU picket by a scab truck driver in the Handyman strike, a Militant Caucus motion was raised at the August 19 Oakland warehousemen's meeting calling for a solidarity stop-work action, but the motion was bureaucratically ruled out of order. (A similar motion by "Longshore Militant" supporters was voted down by the Local 10 executive board.)

But despite hostility from the bureaucrats, another Militant Caucus motion was passed, calling for giving union black hooks to the remaining strikers at Automated Plastic Molding (APM). The four-month-old APM strike, which was hit by mass police arrests in June, has been dragged down in isolation because of the bureaucracy's fear of mobilizing the ranks.

For the same reason, other ILWU members are still facing court sentences and charges stemming from the warehouse strike. In San Francisco, in fact, one union member faces charges of attempted murder of a scab. Meanwhile, the gnons who heat up Militant Caucus leader Bob Mandel at a Local 6 executive board meeting during the strike have once again been seen at a meeting. Clearly the bureaucracy is determined to block any attempts to mount a working-class offensive against the bosses' attacks.

The votes by the Local 10 members show there is deep and generalized discontent with the sellout policies of the Bridges regime. At the same time, the base of support of class-struggle militants within the ILWU remains both very limited and episodic. The most immediate, continuing and difficult task of militant oppositionists within the ILWU is to overcome this weakness, in the process forging a broadly based leadership tested in struggle and able to rescue the embattled union from the dead end into which it has been led by the class-collaborationist Bridges bureaucracy. ■

Stalinists Scuttle ILWU South Africa Boycott

SAN FRANCISCO—At the July 15 membership meeting of Local 10 of the ILWU, the Longshore ranks passed a motion "that ILWU Local 10 will and does call for a boycott of all cargo, dock or shipside, bound for or from South Africa or Rhodesia." In light of the recent brutal repression of the black working class by the South African government, such an act of international working-class solidarity at this time could concretely aid in restraining the brutality of the apartheid regime.

But unfortunately for the suffering South African masses, this Local 10 motion was in the hands of people who were interested only in polishing their "progressive" images, not international working-class solidarity. According to a hostile letter from Longshoreman Bill Proctor in the Communist Party's *People's World* (7 August), the motion was originated by Local member Leo Robinson and brought to the International Executive Board (IEB) in early July by Local 10 president Cleophus Williams. The *PW* letter explains that the IEB decided to "hold up any action until there have been response on this question from all Longshore locals."

After the Local 10 membership adopted the resolution on July 15, the Executive Board refused to adopt a subsequent motion by "Longshore Militant" supporter Stan Gow to immediately implement the boycott.

Instead the Executive Board decided to put the question of immediate implementation up to a referendum vote on August 20, and a cautionary hint appeared in the Local 10 "Longshore Bulletin" of 13 August:

"RECOGNIZING THAT YOU MAY LOSE PGP, DIVERT CARGO FROM THE PORT AND BE SUBJECT TO A LOCKOUT, ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF IMMEDIATELY IMPLEMENTING OUR MOTION TO BOYCOTT CARGO TO AND FROM RHODESIA AND SOUTH AFRICA?" [emphasis in original]

Not even trusting the membership to get this hint, Leo Robinson got up at the August 19 membership meeting and moved to put off any action indefinitely, kicking the matter back to the IEB for more "study"! This piece of treachery was passed with the support of well-known CP supporter Archie Brown.

The 21 August issue of *People's World* again boasts proudly of the Local 10 boycott motion, which is printed in full. No doubt serious South African revolutionaries will want to see *PW* explain the sudden reversal by Robinson and Brown. Indeed a recent electoral leaflet of the Communist Party itself hypocritically complains that in the ILWU the "good and progressive policies seem only to remain on paper." At this point the boycott motion is just so much *PW* paper, thanks to the class treason of "brothers" like Robinson and Brown. ■

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

123

S.F. Muni Workers Sold Out

SAN FRANCISCO, August 25 By a vote of 790 to 564 the members of Transport Workers Union (TWU) Local 250-A accepted the final contract offer of the city's notoriously anti-labor Board of Supervisors. The close vote reflected wide dissatisfaction with the settlement and registered the mistrust of the Muni workers in the ability of the present union leadership to lead a successful strike.

During last spring's 38-day S.F. craft workers strike the transit workers watched angrily as the Central Labor Council (CLC) along with their own leaders refused to implement a general strike call which had been issued by the CLC and which was repeatedly endorsed by TWU membership votes. Muni drivers instead were limited to respecting the craft workers picket lines. During the July-August negotiations for the TWU contract the union was again caught between the ongoing wage-cutting offensive of the Board of Supervisors and a vacuum of leadership in the labor movement.

Statistics as Politics

Essentially, the final Muni package amounts to a small wage increase accompanied by massive cuts in important fringe benefits. The incredible size of the cuts was virtually buried by the bourgeois media, which centered on deliberately misleading talk of a "10 percent pay hike" no doubt designed to feed the anti-labor fires of the anonymous "taxpayers." The confusion was facilitated by the complications of city budgeting and civil service formulas.

As the union entered negotiations in July, when the new city budget for 1976-77 went into effect, Muni workers "automatically" suffered an actual *cut* in wages, from \$7.135 per hour to \$6.89 per hour, as a result of the tighter budget drawn up by "friend of labor" Mayor Moscone. According to the TWU's printed summary of the negotiations, the city's first "offer" was to cut last year's cost-of-living allowance (COLA) from \$900,000 to zero, to cut the city-paid union trust fund (used for health benefits) from \$3.1 million to zero, and to permanently eliminate the city-paid industrial compensation allowance of \$350,000! (The last item is particularly important to drivers of the antique cable cars—in fact, cable car operators voted against the final contract by 93 to 31.)

As for wages, the city's initial offer was \$7.15 per hour—a 1.5 cent raise! The traditional civil service formula would have allowed a maximum raise to \$7.56. (The formula allows the city to pay up to the average of the two highest municipal transit systems in the country, although it can legally pay less.) During the negotiations, the capitalist media hailed that the union and the Board were "millions of dollars apart," because the union was demanding *restoration* of approximately \$5 million in cuts along with a modest pay increase!

Predictably the reformist union leadership ended up negotiating over the *amount* of the cuts, and the final package only represented a reduction in the cuts. Even the trumpeted pay hike fell short of the civil service formula (\$7.46 instead of \$7.56). Local 250-A president Larry Martin apologized lamely that, "I'm not pleased with the offer, but it is the best offer we could squeeze out before walking out" (*San Francisco Progress*, 25 August).

CLC Postures for Smaller Cuts

Given the incredible arrogance of the Board's "offer," it was no surprise that Martin was able to pass a routine strike authorization motion at a union mem-

bership meeting August 15. What startled the supervisors was that the TWU leader continued to go through the motions of preparing for a strike. On August 18, Martin obtained strike sanction from CLC head John Crowley, who set a strike deadline of 12:01 a.m. August 20. Militant-sounding support came from Vince Courtney, a leader of the Service Employees union who had done nothing to stop SEIU scabbing on the city workers' strike. Stan Smith, secretary of the Building Trades Council, warned of "total chaos" and remarked that the craft workers "don't feel that they owe the City anything" (*San Francisco Examiner*, 19 August).

Taken aback by this unexpected sabre-rattling, Board of Supervisors spokesman John Molinari suddenly became more polite, indicating that there might be room for bargaining, unlike during the earlier craft workers dispute. Mayor Moscone, trying to refurbish his "friend of labor" image, even went in person to CLC headquarters to appeal to Crowley not to grant strike sanction. Meanwhile, hard-line supervisor Dianne Feinstein accused Moscone of trying to "appease labor" (*San Francisco Examiner*, 18 August). The CLC decided to grant strike sanction anyway, although Crowley carefully retained the power to withdraw it at his discretion.

The sudden change in the Board's

by many: "If there is a strike, all bets are off" (*San Francisco Examiner*, 20 August). In a final bureaucratic maneuver, Martin did not call another membership meeting to discuss and vote on the pact, instead the voting took place at the various car barns.

Collapse of the "Left"

The bureaucracy's militant posture was cheap and easy because it knew it could kill a strike at any time with very little likelihood of serious opposition. The ostensible "left" opponents of Martin within the union had been completely disoriented by the 38-day near-general strike in April-May, which exposed their lack of a program to mobilize the ranks against the bureaucracy. For instance, none of the fake-left groups consistently pushed for an elected strike committee to implement the membership's call for a general strike. In the post-strike period the opportunists, who always seek shortcuts by tailoring their program to temporary moods, emerged confused and demoralized.

Thus at the August 15 general membership meeting—the only general membership meeting held during the heated negotiations—leaflets given out by two "left" opponents of the union leadership did not even call directly for a strike.



Muni drivers president Larry Martin (top, second from right) at TWU meeting during May strike.

negotiating style indicated that its intransigence could be broken by a determined working-class counteroffensive. But this was not the intention of Crowley, Martin, et al. Just after the Board announced its final offer (less than an hour before the strike deadline), Martin went into caucus and returned to announce that the strike was postponed... allegedly so that the membership could vote on the Board's final offer. To the press Martin asserted that the union executive board was making no recommendation to the membership. However, the tape recording at TWU headquarters stated: "The executive board voted to recommend the new package to the membership for ratification."

At any rate, the mere fact that Martin postponed the strike for three days was a signal that he would not fight for anything more. No doubt supervisor Feinstein's arrogant warning was heard

The Concerned Muni Drivers, supported politically by the Revolutionary Communist Party, were distributing a resolution which tried to dodge the strike question by proposing to "strike if necessary" and calling in the meantime for all drivers to attend the Board of Supervisors meeting the next day and to "systematically *slow down* in accordance with the Rule Book and traffic laws." As for program, the Concerned Muni Drivers' newsletter, "Draggin' the Line" (12 August) simply demanded: "No Cuts in Pay, Benefits or Jobs!"

This was precisely Martin's program! The necessary demands for *more* jobs, for a *shorter* workweek at no loss in pay, for reopening *all* city workers contracts and for a political strike against the new anti-labor ballot propositions are unthinkable to the reformists. Yet it is just such demands which could mobilize the entire Bay Area labor movement.

Even more outrageous was the 15

August issue of the "Muni Defender," published by the "Muni Unit, Communist Labor Party," which *opposed* a strike in a lead article entitled "Supes Plot Strike."

"Behind the locked doors of the Chamber of Commerce, financiers and politicians conspire together to put Muni drivers out of work. Their basic scheme is dangerously simple: force drivers to strike and then stir up the working public against us.... This is *not* the year for strike-weary drivers to rush blindly into another walkout.... Instead of a walkout why not build those vital alliances with a FARE STRIKE?... A FARE STRIKE is simply when the passengers don't pay..." [emphasis in original]

Besides capitulating to defeatist sentiments, such a tactic would also be criminally stupid. Given the reformist leadership of the union, it would simply set up individual militants (who let passengers ride for free) for persecution. Thus, simply by seeking strike authorization on August 15, Martin easily outflanked his "left" opponents, who by their political cowardice reinforced Martin's undeserved "militant" image.

The potential for a powerful strike was indicated by a brief post-contract flare-up. As soon as the pact had been ratified, the Board of Supervisors cynically moved to put on the November ballot a proposition which would alter the civil service formula for Muni wages by basing the calculation on the average of the *seven* highest-paying city transit systems (instead of the top two). Naturally this would significantly lower the resulting calculation. In response to this, Martin threatened to "close it down," prompting the supervisors to withdraw their proposal for now and reconsider it in December.

But Martin has not said a word against the other anti-labor propositions scheduled for November, including one which would outlaw city workers strikes! The entire Muni struggle has revealed once again the need to oust the labor bureaucracy and replace it with a leadership to fight in the interests of the Muni drivers. Both the transit workers struggle and the city craft strike expose the total bankruptcy of the union misleaders, with their policy of support to "lesser-evil" capitalist politicians.

The Barbagelatas, Feinsteins and Moscones are hoping that a series of anti-labor amendments to the city charter will pass this fall. The entire labor movement must not only conduct a vigorous campaign to smash these reactionary referenda in the elections, but must prepare now for militant labor action, up to and including a general strike, in defense of basic trade-union rights. ■

SUBSCRIBE

WOMEN AND REVOLUTION

Contents

- Early Bolshevik Work Among Women of the Soviet East
- Kibbutzim Restore Nuclear Family
- The Pankhursts: Suffrage and Socialism
- Thalidomide Cover-up Exposed
- Socialist Workers Party and NOW: Together at Last

\$2/4 issues

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

The following two-part article is the text of a talk given at last month's European summer camp of the international Spartacist tendency.

As you are aware, our views on the national question, particularly concerning the near East, are one of the most distinctive and controversial aspects of "Spartacism." Very often this question is the most obvious and sharpest difference when we first encounter tendencies that appear to be close to us.

This talk is designed as a contribution to understanding the theoretical underpinning of our current positions. In polemics against the Spartacist tendency and within the ostensibly Trotskyist movement, there are often references to the position Marx or Lenin took on this or that aspect of the national question. Without a thorough knowledge of the evolution of the Marxist position, in its historical context, it is impossible to determine whether or not, and how, these references are relevant.

I believe that an understanding of the evolution of the Marxist position on the national question from 1848 to 1914—i.e., from the origins of Marxism to the collapse of the Second International—bears on the Spartacist position in two significant ways. First, there is no Marxist program for the national question as such. The Marxist position has always had a predominantly strategic character, aimed at creating the conditions for a successful proletarian revolution. In this sense, I think that one can draw a contrast with the Marxist position on the woman question. The position in favor of abolition of the family and for the equality of women is a fundamental element of a communist society, and therefore is not subordinate to changing political conjunctures.

The Marxist position on the national question has a much more conjunctural character historically, and is much more determined by changing empirical circumstances. Thus, it is not only legitimate, but very often obligatory, to change a specific position on a specific national question in a very short period of time. Today we are opposed to the independence of Quebec, while of course recognizing the right of self-determination. But it is certainly possible that in a couple of years, if the national polarization in Canada hardens and the working people of Quebec decisively opt for separatism, we may reverse that policy and come out for independence. Such determinations have a conjunctural and a strategic character.

The second reason I believe a knowledge of pre-Leninist Marxism is important in this question is that our position involves opposition to the notion (which is a resurrection of the earliest Marxist position) that there exist progressive nations and reactionary nations within the colonial world. We do not regard the Palestinians or the Lebanese Muslims as inherently progressive, or the Hebrews and Lebanese Maronite Christians as inherently reactionary, as outposts of imperialism. Many of our disputes with various ostensibly Trotskyist tendencies—for example, over the India-Pakistan war in 1972, over Angola and over Lebanon—involve our rejection of the notion of progressive nationalities and progressive bourgeois state-building in this epoch.

"Progressive Nations" in the Revolutions of 1848

Marxism as a political tendency begins in early 1846 with the organization of the Communist Corresponding Society in Brussels. What distinguished Marx from other German communists was his belief that it was necessary to have an alliance with the bourgeois democrats, and that the road to socialism in Germany ran through an imminent bourgeois-democratic revolution. As such, he became committed to the program of the unification of Germany

as an inherent and important component of that revolution.

The unification of Germany was organically linked to the radical redrawing of boundaries throughout Eastern Europe. Marx was committed to the restoration of an independent Poland, which would serve as a democratic buffer against tsarist Russia. Russia was the strongest military power in Europe, and was considered by Marx as the bulwark of reaction in which a bourgeois-democratic revolution was *not possible*—a position he maintained until the late 1870's. One cannot understand the Marxist position on the national question unless one realizes that for a Central European revolutionary in the mid-19th century, Russia was analogous to the United States for a South American revolutionary today. Radical democracy in Central Europe was linked to the liberation of Poland and a revolutionary war against tsarist Russia.

A more complex aspect of the unification of Germany arose from the fact that part of the German nation was in the Hapsburg or Austro-Hungarian empire. The majority population of that empire consisted of the various Slavic nations, who were mainly peasant peoples. The most important and advanced of these Slavic nations were the Czechs, and Bohemia was about 40 percent German (concentrated among the urban population) and 60 percent Czech, with virtually all of the peasants being Czech.

Marx and Engels maintained that, with the exception of Poland, the Slavic peoples of the Austro-Hungarian empire were too backward to have a bourgeois-democratic revolution. From that premise, they drew the program of dividing Central and East Europe into three great states—Greater Poland, Greater Germany and Greater Hungary—in which the western and southern Slavs would be expected to assimilate to the higher national cultures.

When the revolution of 1848 broke out, the Slavs—not unnaturally—did not go along with this program. The Czech liberals, led by Ferdinand Palacky, proposed instead a federated Austro-Hungarian state allied to a democratic Germany. Thus there was a genuine conflict between the national-democratic movement in Germany and Hungary on the one hand, and the Slavs in the Austro-Hungarian empire, who in part looked to Russia to preserve the Austro-Hungarian status quo.

This situation came to a head in early 1849, when the Russian army crushed the Hungarian national movement of Lajos Kossuth and the Croat national minority maintained a neutral position at best. At that point, Marx and Engels developed a program which amounted to the national, if not physical, genocide of the western and southern Slavs in the interests of the democratic or progressive peoples.

In "Hungary and Pan Slavism" (1849) Engels writes:

"Everywhere the forward-looking class, the carrier of progress, the bourgeoisie, was German or Magyar. The Slavs found it difficult to develop a bourgeoisie, the South Slavs were only very partially able to do so. Along with the bourgeoisie, industrial strength, capital, was in German or Magyar hands. As German education developed, the Slavs also came under the intellectual tutelage of the Germans, even deep in Croatia. The same thing took place, only later and therefore on a smaller scale in Hungary, where the Magyars together with the Germans assumed intellectual and commercial leadership. ..."

And in another article, "Democratic Pan Slavism" (1849), he concluded:

"We repeat: Except for the Poles, the Russians and at best the Slavs in Turkey, no Slavic people has a future, for the simple reason that all other Slavs lack the most basic historic, geographic, political and industrial prerequisites for independence and vitality."

Referring to the Russian-Slav counter-revolutionary movement, he wrote:

"Then for a moment the Slavic counterrevolution with all its barbarism will engulf the Austrian monarchy and

Part 1 of 2

The National Question in the Marxist Movement, 1848-1914

by Joseph Seymour



Czech rebels barricade Prague bridge during 1848 revolution.

UOS

the camarilla will find out what kind of allies it has. But with the first victorious uprising of the French proletariat... the Germans and Magyars in Austria will become free and will take bloody revenge on the Slavic barbarians. The general war which will then break out will explode this Slavic league and these petty, bull-headed nations will be destroyed so that nothing is left of them but their names.

"The next war will cause not only reactionary classes and dynasties but also entire reactionary peoples to disappear from the earth. And that too would be progress."

There was, in the Revolution of 1848, a prominent leftist who did adhere to the doctrine of national self-determination as a principle. This was Mikhail Bakunin, who wrote in his 1848 "Appeal to the Slavs":

"Down with the artificial boundaries which have been forever erected by despotic congresses according to so-called historical, geographical, strategic necessities! There should no longer be any other barriers between the nations but those corresponding to nature, to justice and those drawn in a democratic sense which the sovereign will of the people themselves denotes on the basis of their national qualities. The welfare of the nations is never assured as long as anywhere in Europe one single people is living in oppression."

translated in Horace B. Davis, *Nationalism and Socialism*

At the general theoretical level, Marx and Engels denounced Bakunin for utopian egalitarianism applied to nations, which anticipates their later conflict with Bakuninite anarchism where the same principles are applied to individuals. Thus, Engels polemicized against Bakunin in February 1849:

"There is no mention of the very real obstacles in the way of such universal liberation, of the completely different levels of civilization of the various

peoples, which they called the ruins of peoples *die Völkertrümmer* were expected to assimilate. Among these ruined peoples they counted the Scots, the Welsh, the Basques and the Czechs.

Bourgeois Reaction and Bourgeois Progress

As a result of the defeat of radical democracy in the revolutions of 1848, Marx substantially modified his program. He blamed the defeat of radical democracy and the proletarian vanguard on objective economic backwardness, not only in Germany and Austria, but also in France. Therefore, classic post-1848 Marxism placed a heavy programmatic emphasis on creating the objective conditions which would enable the proletariat to take power.

This consisted in furthering economic development, in which the unification of Germany and of Italy was considered extremely important. Only economic development would lay the basis for the organization of the proletariat and the expansion of democratic rights to provide the conditions for proletarian power.

An important component of the post-1848 program continued to be the advocacy of the destruction of tsarist Russia's military power... by anybody. Marx supported the British and French in the Crimean War and always supported Turkey against Russia, on the grounds that Russia was the great reactionary power in Europe.

The next major historical event after 1848 that bears on the national question was the Austro-Italian war of 1859. Here, Marx reaffirmed his fundamental commitment to the unification of Germany as the most progressive national development in continental Europe. He did not support the Italians

peoples, which they called the ruins of peoples *die Völkertrümmer* were expected to assimilate. Among these ruined peoples they counted the Scots, the Welsh, the Basques and the Czechs.

In his 1859 pamphlet on the Austro-Italian war, "Rhine and Po," Engels spells out this conception:

"No one will assert that the map of Europe is definitely settled. All changes, however, if they are to be lasting, must be of such a nature as to bring the great and vital nations ever closer to their *true* natural borders as determined by speech and sympathies, while at the same time the ruins of peoples, which are still to be found here and there, and are no longer capable of leading an independent national existence, must be incorporated into the larger nations, and either dissolve in them or else remain as ethnographic monuments of no political significance." [emphasis in original]

Irish Independence and English Proletarian Revolution

The first major change in this schema occurred in the late 1860's in Britain, where Marx changed his position on the Irish question from the assimilation of the Irish, who were certainly not a great historic people, to independence for Ireland.

The failure of organized Marxism in England obscures the fact that classical Marxism regarded the English revolution as central. Marx devoted much of his energy to the English workers movement. If in the 1850's Marx considered Germany and Italy underripe for proletarian revolution, he considered Britain overripe. All of the things that Marx was fighting for in Germany were realized in Britain—a large, well-organized industrial proletarian

tool of the *English rule in Ireland*. "This antagonism is artificially kept alive and intensified by the press, the pulpit, the comic papers, in short, by all the means at the disposal of the ruling class. This antagonism is the *secret of the impotence of the English working class*, despite its organization. It is the secret by which the capitalist class



New York Public Library

Lajos Kossuth, leader of the 1848-49 Hungarian revolution.

maintains its power. And that class is fully aware of it...

"England, being the metropolis of capital, the power which has hitherto ruled the world market, is for the present the most important country for the workers' revolution, and moreover, the *only* country in which the material conditions for this revolution have developed up to a certain degree of maturity. Therefore to hasten the social revolution in England is the most important object of the International Workingmen's Association. The sole means of hastening it is to make Ireland independent." [emphasis in original]

Marx to S. Meyer and A. Vogt, 9 April 1870

It was precisely the advanced nature of English society that caused Marx to anticipate the later problems of the workers movement in a multi-national state. I should point out that Marx's position on the Irish question anticipated, but was not identical with, the orthodox Leninist position. Marx expected that an independent Ireland would draw the Irish out of England—that the economic development of Ireland would lead to the repatriation of the Irish working class from England. He looked for the physical separation of the English and Irish working classes as a precondition to political unity. It was not simply the *advocacy* of independence that was important, but its *realization in fact*. As we shall see, it is with Lenin that the advocacy of the right of self-determination becomes key.

Franco-Prussian War: End of an Epoch

The next major change which rendered what could be called the 1848 program obsolete was the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. Marx initially supported the Prussians on the grounds that the war was for the defense of the precarious unity of Germany. When the Prussians defeated Napoleon III and determined to conquer Alsace-Lorraine and crush the Paris proletariat, Marx shifted sides, supporting the French. And in fact, Engels, who was a capable military critic, apparently produced a plan for the French army to defeat the Prussians. Eduard Bernstein, who was Engels' literary executor, destroyed this plan so that it wouldn't embarrass the German Social Democracy should it fall into the government's hands.

Marx and Engels' defensiveness of the French against Bismark's expansionism was extremely important in terms of enhancing their moral authority as socialist leaders. After 1870, the accusation that Marx and Engels were really German chauvinists, hiding behind pseudo-scientific doctrines, was obviously untenable. The hegemony which Marxism attained in the international workers movement by the 1890's was a direct product of Marx and Engels' absolutely indisputable internationalism.

[to be continued]



Mikhail Bakunin

Fourth International


peoples, of their equally different political needs conditioned by them. The word 'freedom' takes the place of everything. There is no mention of reality, or insofar as it is considered at all, it is represented as something entirely reprehensible, something arbitrarily produced by 'congresses of despots' and by 'diplomats'."

"Democratic Pan-Slavism"

On a more concrete level, Marx and Engels regarded so-called democratic pan-Slavism as utopian, which in practice would only serve tsarist Russian expansionism.

Marx's position on the Slav question in 1848 has drawn very considerable criticism, not least from within the later Marxist movement itself. The purpose of this talk is not to second-guess Marx and Engels' empirical judgments, but rather to focus on their methodology. I will, however, indicate the two criticisms of their position on the Slav question which I consider to be the strongest.

First, there is a too-close identification of political dominance with cultural development. The Czechs of Bohemia certainly had the economic and cultural level equal, if not greater, to the Hungarians and the Poles. Secondly, there is an overestimation of the attractiveness of pan-Slavism, and therefore the alliance of all Slavic peoples under Russian dominance.



Karl Marx

Progress

even though he favored Italian unification because the anti-German Napoleon III of France was an ally of Italy. Marx believed that a victory for the Italian-Napoleonic alliance would threaten the unification of Germany. Believing he had to choose which was more progressive the unification of Italy or of Germany he chose that of Germany.

From 1848 onward, Marx and Engels were often accused by their opponents within the left of being German chauvinists. They denied that, arguing that their position on the unification of Germany was objective, and that it did not reflect subjective nationalist prejudice. A united Germany would give an enormous impetus to the economic development of Europe, and would produce the most advanced workers movement in Europe. They were proved objectively correct in that sense. However, it was only in 1870 that they got a chance to prove demonstrably that they were not German chauvinists.

In the 1850's and 1860's, Marx and Engels had the following model of what Europe should look like: it was a Europe of multi-national states grouped around the great progressive nations: Greater Poland, Greater Hungary, Greater Germany, Greater France and Great Britain (Greater England). The other



Frederick Engels

Progress

tariat, a stable bourgeois legality and freedom from Russian invasion.

Yet politically, the British working class in this period moved backward; they were less advanced in 1865 than in 1845. So the English question was important for Marx, not only because the English revolution was strategically important, but because the contradiction between the advanced character of English society and the political backwardness of the proletariat put a question mark over Marx's entire world view.

In the late 1860's Marx believed he had found a partial key to this problem in an unresolved national question—namely, the Irish question. In England, Marx ran up against the problem of a divided working class in a multi-national state. In 1870, he wrote to two of his American followers:

"Every industrial and commercial center in England now possesses a working class *divided* into two hostile camps, English proletarians and Irish proletarians. The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life. In relation to the Irish worker he feels himself a member of the *riding* nation and so turns himself into a tool of the aristocrats and capitalists of his country *against Ireland*. The Irishman pays him back with interest in his own money. He sees in the English worker at once the accomplice and the stupid

Cops Attack Open Housing Marchers in Chicago

CHICAGO—Over 200 marchers led by the Martin Luther King Jr. Movement were turned back from Chicago's Marquette Park by police August 21, while being pelted with stones and bottles by hostile whites lining the march route. Marquette Park, an all-white enclave bordering Chicago's overcrowded and expanding Southwest Side black ghetto, has been the focus of escalating racial tension for the past year. The largely Lithuanian neighborhood, where the American Nazi party has established its headquarters, has become a symbol of Chicago's segregationist housing patterns.

Rock-throwing white youth, egged on by the Ku Klux Klan and the Nazis, who pass out swastika-embazoned "White Power" T-shirts in the park, rampaged through the black West Englewood neighborhood all weekend, attacking the homes of black families. At least three blacks were arrested by the police for attempting to defend themselves against the fascist-inspired marauders.

A previous open-housing march on July 17 by the Martin Luther King Jr. Movement ended in a bloody melee in which dozens of marchers were injured and 33 sent to the hospital. At least eight off-duty cops were spotted as rock-throwing, club-wielding participants in the July 17 racist mob, and one was actually arrested.

The M.L. King Jr. Movement led by the Rev. A.J. Dunlap is a small, liberal-pacifist organization without significant support from the more "respectable" black organizations such as Jesse Jackson's Operation PUSH and the NAACP. The latter cynically admit the King Movement's "right" to march, while turning a blind eye to the massive white terror campaign against blacks in West Englewood.

Despite the undoubted physical courage, determination and justness of their cause—to integrate Chicago housing—the King Movement leadership's tactics of continual marches with a mere handful of supporters into the racially explosive, well-organized white enclave is desperate and suicidal. It is a miracle that no one has yet been murdered in Marquette Park. The racist thugs who initiate and escalate the violence are only encouraged and spurred on by the blood they spill. Yet the M.L. King Movement has sworn to continue the marches into Marquette Park by going back every weekend in September!

Adventurists and Opportunists

In this dangerous situation the response of several left groups in Chicago has been criminally irresponsible. The International Socialists (I.S.) has plunged its small forces into the marches and into uncritical support of the religious King Movement. Its tactical advice is for "direct action" by the marchers in the face of the huge racist gangs (*Workers' Power*, 23 August). Given the tiny forces currently venturing into Marquette Park, this is a recipe for an even greater bloodbath.

The Revolutionary Socialist League (RSL), for its part, has cynically gone along with the tiny marches while arguing that they can only end in defeat. At a recent meeting of the "Trade Union Committee to Fight and Secure Democratic Rights for Blacks" (a grouping of militants who are mainly supporters of

left tendencies, including the October League and Youth Against War and Fascism), RSL supporters argued that a march of such a small number would be suicidal. They quickly caved in, however, and energetically agitated for others in the black and workers movement to join them in marching. The RSL explains: "Often at the beginning of a struggle only a few are willing to march—the others are frightened. To get others to join, it is necessary to first march alone" (*Torch*, 15 August-14 September)!

But it must be said clearly: a defeat is a defeat. The bloody endings of the July 17 and August 21 marches lead to more fear, more demoralization, more en-

"we can talk in private about that," while publicly insisting that "unity" with such red-baiters was all that counted.

For Labor/Black Defense!

The Spartacist League has repeatedly pointed out that only through the organization of powerful labor/black defense can the racist terror be rooted out. Neither the irresponsible adventurism of the I.S., the RSL's opportunism nor NAACP/SWP cringing reliance on Mayor Daley's racist cops and courts will stop the violence against blacks. Mobilization of the large Chicago labor movement to defend blacks and fight for decent, integrated housing for all is the only answer to the festering racial



Participant in July Martin Luther King Jr. Movement march arrested after vicious attack by 10,000 racists armed with bricks and bottles.

couragement to the fascist terrorists to continue their racist attacks unchecked.

Despite the openly racist character of Chicago's police force, liberal black organizations such as the NAACP and reformists such as the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) continue to push their bankrupt policy of relying on the capitalist authorities to defend black people. The executive director of the NAACP's South Side Chicago branch, Rev. Fuqua, has called for a picnic in Marquette Park (he doesn't condone the marches), bringing together a cross-section of the black and white communities to "bring all the racism in the area out into the open" (*Chicago Defender*, 26 August).

It certainly will do that! But the fascist-led violence in Marquette Park, tacitly condoned by the racist Daley machine, will not be better exposed by this suicidal tactic: it is already clear as day. Taking tiny groups of blacks and left militants into this racist hotbed is to lead them to a potential slaughter. Yet the likes of the SWP blithely prattle on about the "duty" of the cops to protect the defenseless marchers.

On Saturday, August 28, the SWP held a forum in Chicago on the Marquette Park events, inviting two black clergymen onto a panel with Andrew Pulley, SWP congressional candidate in the first district, in a maneuver to gain community support for Pulley's campaign. In response to Spartacist criticism of SWP reliance on the capitalists' hired guns, Pulley claimed the SL only sees "one side" of the bourgeois state. To the charges of black nationalist Willie Curtis that "white, European" ideas (like communism) had no place in the black community, Pulley replied soothingly,

hatred and terror racking Chicago's Southwest Side. But a successful working-class defense requires a fight against the entrenched, deeply conservative union bureaucracy.

Black workers have also recently been subjected to racist attacks while going to and from work at Republic Steel on the South Side. Steelworkers union Local 1003 president Frank Guzzo's response was a motion attacking Daley for "silence and inaction" (*Chicago Defender*, 1 August). At USWA Local 65 (U.S. Steel's Southworks plant), the Communist Party-supported Rank and File Caucus introduced a motion calling for confidence in the cops.

In contrast to these class-collaborationist policies stands a resolution introduced by the Labor Struggle Caucus of UAW Local 6 at a membership meeting last June. This militant opposition group had taken the lead in calling for and organizing a Local 6 defense guard at the home of a black union brother in a predominantly white neighborhood last year. The LSC motion called for a similar policy in Marquette Park, but it was defeated by Local 6 ex-president Norm Roth, a CP-supported reformist, who sought instead to keep the unions tied to the cops.

But the UAW defense guard was successful in halting racist nightriders last year, and an independent working-class mobilization in alliance with black organizations could quickly put a stop to the racial terrorization of blacks in West Englewood and Marquette Park. What is needed are class-struggle oppositions in the unions to dump the pro-capitalist bureaucrats who are the major obstacle to mass labor/black mobilization against the fascist scum. ■

Korea...

(continued from page 1)

the 38th parallel in the summer of 1950 following initial military successes of large-scale North Korean troop movements into the South. The 38th parallel had been established as the dividing line between Russian and American forces at Potsdam in 1945 as the Japanese were disarmed in Korea. Korea was not at first considered by American military planners to be a "crucial" area to hold on the Asian mainland, but it became so with the Chinese revolution and during the course of the Korean War.

The U.S. invasion was only the most spectacular event during the summer of 1950 as Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson mounted the virulently anti-Soviet foreign policy offensive they had sought. During the same period the U.S. committed itself to defense of Taiwan and French Indochina, tripled its military budget and, most importantly, sent four divisions to Europe under NATO command. They began to rearm Germany and set their sights on securing the Asian "rim" with a linchpin of American bases in a strong capitalist Japan. The U.S. policy of encirclement had taken hold and would remain until American imperialism could no longer enforce its hegemony in the Asian theater more than 20 years later.

It is in this context that Truman gave General MacArthur the order to cross the 38th parallel (an action subsequently rubber-stamped by the United Nations). MacArthur promised that the Chinese would not enter the war even though Peking had publicly warned it would not share the waters of the Yalu (where there were strategic Chinese hydroelectric facilities) with the Americans. The U.S. military was surprised by the massive Chinese retaliation and could no longer hope for anything more than a stalemate. MacArthur's axiom that in war there is no substitute for victory gained him little in the fight with Truman, since the bourgeoisie well understood that a no-win policy was the most that could be achieved, and even to get that they would have to strike a bargain with the Stalinists.

The U.S. got its ceasefire in place in Korea, and the stalemate was hailed in Moscow as an action that would "not only stop the massacres now going on in Korea, but would also greatly relieve world tension and open the door for further peace moves" (*Daily World*, 3 April 1953). Yet 23 years later, the U.S. army remains in place, propping up the regime of Rhee's successor which is stained with the blood of thousands of opponents of capitalist exploitation and military terror in South Korea.

Cold War and the Left

The Stalinists, however, are still singing the praises of "peaceful co-existence," angling for a deal with the imperialists at the expense of the Korean masses. The *Daily World* (26 August) reports a statement by the Canadian Communist Party warning only of the "danger of war in Korea," and saying not a word about the stake which the international proletariat would have in the outcome of such a war. Furthermore, "The statement called for the reunification of that

FORUM

Smash the Chilean Junta! For Workers Revolution!

Speaker:
JOE VETTER
Spartacist League

Saturday, September 11
at 7:30 p.m.
The Haymarket
715 South Parkview Street
LOS ANGELES

Admission: \$1.50

country to be worked out by the people and the governments involved" (our emphasis). Thus the Stalinists couple their call for U.S. withdrawal, to be effected "through the United Nations," with hackhanded recognition of the Park dictatorship.

The Stalinists have consistently sought to play the role of "peacemakers" in Korea, beginning in June 1951 when Russian spokesman Jacob Malik proposed the general outlines of the eventual armistice: a ceasefire with both sides withdrawing to either side of the 38th parallel, allowing the U.S. troops to remain indefinitely. The *Daily Worker* (25 June 1951) gave Stalin's game away with the frank admission that, "This was exactly what Secretary of

"peaceable co-existence with capitalism." In practice, this means he seeks deals with world imperialism that will stave off the threat of war on the Soviet Union. In return for such deals, he offers his services in betraying proletarian revolutions and colonial uprisings that threaten world capitalism....
Militant, 21 July 1952

During the Korean War the SWP also distinguished itself from all manner of "anti-Stalinist" social chauvinism. Patriotic support for "our boys" in Korea became the touchstone of cold war loyalty and an acid test for the left. Previous sources of left and liberal opposition to Truman's policy of global anti-Communist "containment" evaporated in the flag-waving atmosphere. Norman Thomas and the Socialist Party embraced the war effort in the name of democratic socialism. The liberal Americans for Democratic Action which had been on record opposing the witchhunting HUAC backed off from that stand. With the start of the Korean War it joined the front line of anti-communist cold warriors at home and imperialist militarists abroad.

Under this pressure the Shaehmatian Independent Socialist League accelerated its motion toward State Department socialism with its analysis of Russia as an imperialist power. The "Third Camp" headline of its paper, *Labor Action* (3 July 1950) read, "The Only War Aim on Both Sides in Korea: Which Imperialist Power Will Control Asia." Declaring the "purely imperialist character of the conflict," the ISL refused to defend the proletarian property forms of North Korea against the imperialist onslaught. It even held out the possibility that "if the government of south Korea were an independent one...its resistance to the Northern invasion would be a defense of the sovereignty of Korea from an imperialist assault by Russia" (*Labor Action*, 10 July 1950).

It was left to the SWP to point to the class character of the Korean War. In an open letter to the U.S. president and Congress, SWP leader James Cannon labelled the "UN police action" a "brutal imperialist invasion." He added:

"This is more than a fight for unification and national liberation. It is a civil war. On the one side are the Korean workers, peasants and student youth. On the other are the Korean landlords, usurers, capitalists and their police and political agents."

While upholding a revolutionary position, the SWP analysis tended to overemphasize the purely indigenous, Korean-centered nature of the war. U.S. imperialism sought to conquer North Korea as the most exposed and vulnerable part of the Soviet bloc. Today, the SWP has long since degenerated into reformism and no longer sees a need to take sides in the class war, seeing only a "danger to world peace" in heightened tensions between North Korea and the U.S. South Korean forces. In the *Militant* (3 September), the SWP warns that Ford's "dangerous aggression... could trigger suicidal nuclear war." Not one word to suggest a policy of military defense of North Korea, which is described merely as "a small country," presumably little different than South Korea. This is not the revolutionary SWP of the Korean War years that braved McCarthyite witchhunting and stated clearly in which class camp it stood; it is, rather, the SWP of the anti-Vietnam War movement when it consistently refused to call for military victory to the NLF.

For Revolutionary Marxism, Not "Kim Il Sung-ism"

North Korea's more powerful Stalinist allies are concerned above all with their own diplomatic maneuvers with the imperialists. Moscow, which cautiously doled out military aid while maintaining a strict policy of nonintervention during the 1950-53 Korean War, is anxious to prevent Japan from developing closer ties with Peking. Hence it is eager to prevent new hostilities with South Korea, a major



sphere for Japanese investment and political influence.

Maintenance of close military/economic ties with Japan, the key to U.S. policy in Asia, is the reason behind the continuing massive American presence in Korea. Japan regards the peninsula both as a vital link in its hopes of rebuilding an "East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere" and as a major part of its own defense perimeter. Despite growing inter-imperialist rivalry between the U.S. and Japan the Nixon and Ford administrations have taken steps to keep up an alliance, based on U.S. military supremacy. In a speech last year to the Japan Society in New York, Henry Kissinger underscored the place of Korea in U.S. foreign policy:

"Specifically, we are resolved to maintain the peace and security of the Korean peninsula, for this is of crucial importance to Japan and to all of Asia."
New York Times, 19 June 1975

Maoist China, for its part, is most interested in furthering its own "détente" with the U.S., and therefore also wary of upsetting the diplomatic apple cart by any precipitous move in Korea. A recent report of the British Institute for the Study of Conflict noted:

"But Peking also seems to be exerting a restraining influence over Kim. When the North Korean leader hurried to Peking in April, 1975, as Hanoi's forces overran South Vietnam, Chinese reactions were decidedly ambiguous. During this visit, Vice-Premier Teng Hsiao-Ping stated that China supported North Korea's demand that the US withdraw its forces from Korea, but attached no time limit to such withdrawal."
Times [London], 13 August 1976

Both Moscow and Peking call for the "peaceful reunification" of Korea, a self-serving attempt to hide the fundamental conflict between the proletarian property forms in the North and capitalist rule in the south. Trotskyists call instead for revolutionary reunification of Korea, through social revolution in the South and political revolution to overthrow the parasitic Stalinist bureaucracy in the North.

Standing on the terrain of nationalism, as do all Stalinist regimes, the regime of Kim Il Sung has consistently played off China against Russia, extracting large credits from both in the process. On the basis of pre-1945 Japanese industrialization and considerable mineral resources, North Korea has created one of the more advanced industrial economies of Asia. Extolled as the principle of "juche" (self-reliance), this has allowed Kim a certain autonomy from China and the USSR and permitted a more aggressive stance on the question of reunification, including periodic support to guerrilla campaigns in the South (as during 1965-70). Marxists stand in solidarity with the North in any military conflict with South Korea or its imperialist backers, but give no political support to the bureaucratic Stalinist regime headed by Kim.

Kim has built up a personality cult to rival that of Stalin or Mao. A massive

65-foot statue of him dominates the Pyongyang skyline. Every institution of importance is named after him; a museum in his birthplace is annually visited by 1.2 million people, ten percent of the entire population of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The official philosophy is not even denominated "Marxism-Leninism" but rather "Kim Il Sung-ism."

The North Korean state is not based on mass organs of workers democracy hut on bureaucratic fiat which excludes the masses from decision-making at all levels. The misnamed Korean Workers Party itself is organized at the top levels around Kim's family in a highly nepotist system. To ensure his supremacy, the "iron-willed leader" repeatedly purged the party during the 1950's, summarily executing his opponents.

The interests of the Korean working people lie in opening the door to truly socialist development by toppling the bureaucracy in the North and extending the collectivized economy to the South through the establishment of democratic soviet rule throughout Korea.

For revolutionary reunification through social revolution in the South and political revolution in the North!

Defend the North Korean deformed workers state in any military confrontation with U.S. imperialism and its South Korean puppets!

-For a Trotskyist party in Korea!

Gabriel Salinas...

(continued from page 2)

release of the Whitecrosses and Bustos, as well as his own freedom.

Another factor may have been a verdict of the Argentine federal review court on July 22 holding that the constitutional right of political prisoners to leave the country cannot be suspended or sidestepped by the government. The decision came as the result of a suit brought by a teacher who was held for seven months despite the fact that no charges were brought against her and she had no police or prison record. The decision holds that the government can hold a person "suspected" of "anti-government" activity, but that after 20 days the detainee can choose to leave the country. This is the first glimmer of opposition to the junta by the judiciary since the military took power in March.

In early December, the Partisan Defense Committee contacted individuals and committees in Europe who took up the case. The Comité Belge Europe-Amérique Latine obtained a fellowship at the Free University of Brussels and a plane ticket. The PDC also contacted Amnesty International (which issued an "urgent action" appeal publicizing the plight of the 13), and went to the UN High Commission on Refugees, which instructed its Buenos Aires office to contact Argentine authorities about the case. The Committee also wrote to the well-known doctor who had performed surgery on Salinas' eyes, who in turn wrote the Argentine government describing his patient's delicate medical condition. Due to efforts by Viki Sahnas, his wife, a deputy of the Begian parliament intervened and a Belgian visa was obtained.

Salinas reports that there are at least 15 other Chilean political prisoners in Villa Devoto prison in addition to those with whom he was arrested, as well as numerous others imprisoned elsewhere in Argentina. International protest by the working-class movement is vital to freeing these class-war prisoners and to saving the tens of thousands of Latin American refugees from rightist terror. Argentine leftists and trade unionists who today live in mortal danger from the Pinochet and Videla juntas and their anti-communist death squads. Free all victims of rightist repression in Argentina and Chile! ■



Foreign Languages Publishing House

Kim Il Sung

State Acheson, during his recent Senate testimony, indicated to be the condition of the U.S. for a ceasefire agreement."

In that period, the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), then a revolutionary Trotskyist party, sharply differentiated itself from the implicit pacifism of the Communist Party (CP), which parroted the Kremlin line of calling for Korea to revert to the status quo ante. Its answer to Malik's ceasefire proposal was a blistering retort demanding that the U.S., in the words of the headline, "Get Out of Asia! That Would Be a Real Ceasefire" (*Militant*, 30 June 1951).

In a series entitled, "Korean War - Its Class Origin and Nature: A Marxist Analysis," SWP Art Preis took the Stalinists to task:

"You will search the Worker review in vain for the words 'civil war.' Yet this phrase is a touchstone of a real Marxist analysis of the Korean War. The decisive questions regarding the nature of the Korean War are: What classes are involved? What is the social basis of the struggle? What are the real aims of the contestants? What class interests do they serve?"

"Why are the lips of the Stalinists sealed as to the true character of the internal struggle in Korea that led to civil war? The answer can be found in the foreign policy of the Kremlin. Stalin demands



\$1

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

Witchhunt in CWA Local 1101

Found "guilty" before a kangaroo court of appointed bureaucratic flunkies, four members of the United Action Caucus (UA) of Local 1101, Communications Workers of America (CWA), were ordered last week to return funds that 1101 officials allege were fraudulently collected or to face five years' suspension from the union. The trial stemmed from a fundraising raffle the caucus held last June to finance an observer's trip to the CWA convention in Los Angeles.

The four had sold tickets on a color television raffle outside a stewards' meeting, stating that proceeds would go to "the United Action Caucus of Local 1101." This led the 1101 leadership to accuse them of unauthorized use of the local's name, thereby "bringing the union into disrepute." The four charged were George Feldman, Ilene Winkler, Brent Kramer and George Wilson. Feldman told a phone worker at the trial that the group intends to bring the case to federal court.

The trial, which took place here August 17, is part of a witchhunt being conducted by the CWA International to drive oppositionists from the union before the start of next spring's contract period. Similar attacks in the Seattle phone local have resulted in the decertification of several UA stewards there, and in Louisville UA militant Harold Kincaid was purged from the union executive board and subsequently fired by the company. The UA is supported by the social-democratic International Socialists (I.S.).

That the New York case is a total frame-up was backhandedly admitted last week by the Local bureaucrats

themselves when they offered to waive the suspensions if the UA agrees to hand over the disputed funds (for return to the members who bought the raffle tickets). The deal was offered in the hopes of keeping the UA out of the federal courts where the bureaucrats fear the trumped-up charges will be found to be politically motivated and almost certainly be thrown out. In a demonstration of the absurdity of the "false pretenses" accusation, no prosecution witnesses during the trial could testify that when approached to buy a raffle ticket they had the slightest confusion over where the money was going. At press time UA was undecided about returning the money.

The attempt of the Local 1101 bureaucracy headed by Ed Dempsey to railroad an opposition caucus out of the union is an outrage and a threat to the democratic rights of every CWA member. It must be met by a full mobilization of the ranks to reverse the decision. The decision of the local executive board to go after the opposition was sparked by the returns of the recent election for convention delegate in which UA won over 30 percent of the vote and a second "opposition" slate, headed by popular black bureaucrat Dennis Serrete won nearly half. During his first term as Local president, Dempsey managed to railroad through a series of by-law changes which, among other effects, made it extremely difficult for oppositionists to get on the ballot for Local office. Nonetheless, the large opposition vote for convention delegate signaled trouble in the upcoming period for the 1101 bureaucracy.

The delegate vote was the first mass expression of protest in several years against the systematic suppression of membership rights which has marked the Dempsey regime. Since he came to office in 1973, membership meetings have been reduced from quarterly to bi-annually, militant stewards have been systematically decertified and oppositionists physically attacked at local meetings. In the service of the company Dempsey has left no stone unturned to ensure there would be no union fight against the enormous toll automation is taking in the phone industry as new switching systems eliminate thousands of craft and traffic jobs yearly.

The Local 1101 opposition groups have been singularly ineffective in the situation. Having called in 1972 on union members to vote for Dempsey (because he stood for "democracy"), UA was in a bad position to complain when he turned on it shortly after. And having earlier failed to mount a campaign to defeat the by-law changes which eliminated the requirement of elected trial juries, UA's cry that the jurors were bureaucratically appointed rang somewhat hollow.

Ironically the charges against UA were brought by one Tom Sites, Second Avenue chief steward and former UA supporter who had even leafletted for the group in the past. From Dempsey to Sites, UA's methodology is consistent—that of tailing after every up-and-coming office seeker in the hope of winning cheap union influence. And always UA is surprised when these anti-communists later turn on it.

UA's devotion—like that of its I.S. supporters—to get-rich-quick schemes through rotten blocs with even extreme anti-communist elements has backfired again and again. During the recent Teamster contract negotiations the I.S. brought together the disparate Teamsters for a Decent Contract (TDC)—now called Teamsters for a Democratic Union composed of everyone who hated Fitzsimmons, even including Holfa supporters. The willingness of the I.S. sympathizers in TDC to keep such bloc partners led in San Francisco

to a physical assault by their IDC "brothers" on I.S. comrades who were leafletting a TDC rally!

United Action's present plan to take the CWA to court is part of its never-ending search for shortcuts and one which places the entire union membership in jeopardy. UA may win in the short run, but in the bosses' courts it will not only be Dempsey who loses. As has been demonstrated time and again in the labor movement, most recently in the United Mine Workers strike against court injunctions, the government's only interest in intervening in the unions is to weaken and control them.

Ever since last June when UA was first charged, its entire defense strategy has been directed toward preparing a legal suit against the union rather than an attempt to rally the union ranks to its defense. Although some leaflets about the case were distributed, little attempt was made to reach the majority of the nearly 10,000 Local members scattered in hundreds of phone locations throughout the city. Only a handful of people was mobilized to attend the trial, during which the UA's overwhelming concern was the prosecution's violations of legal technicalities.

This approach stands in marked contrast to that of the West Coast Militant Action Caucus (MAC) when



New York General
CWA Local 1101 president Ed Dempsey

that group was on trial in 1973, similarly charged with "bringing the union into disrepute" as a result of campaign literature critical of the Oakland, California, CWA Local 9415 bureaucracy. A class-struggle opposition, the MAC is categorically opposed to taking the union to court. Understanding the key task of winning the working class to the concept of relying only on its own strength, no confidence in the bosses' courts, MAC worked tirelessly to mobilize the members to demand that the charges be dropped as a threat to the democratic rights of the entire union.

MAC rallied supporters to union meetings and gathered hundreds of affidavits from workers who testified that rather than bringing the union into disrepute, MAC members were among its best militants. MAC stood on its record of fighting for the smallest grievance on the shop floor, for union programs to end racial discrimination, for respecting all picket lines in the labor movement, for a break of the unions with the capitalist Democratic party and for a workers party to lead to a workers government. In the face of MAC's strong support within the Local, the bureaucrats soon lost their taste for the trial and shortly afterwards the charges were dropped.

MAC's approach to the trial was part of the group's perspective of commitment to the difficult task of winning the union ranks to a program of militant class struggle and working-class independence from the bosses' state and parties. Such a perspective contrasts sharply with UA's shameless appeals to the capitalist courts to interfere in the labor movement. ■

PDC Forum...

(continued from page 2)

to probable execution in Pinochet's Chile—was compounded by the virtual autonomy of official armed units of the state as well as the "AAA."

Furthermore an arbitrary military regime such as the Videla junta, Shiffman noted, might respond to efforts to publicize the case of a leftist political refugee by killing him rather than letting him go. The Committee undertook to



Hubert Schatzl
Mario Muñoz Salas—leader of the Chilean contract miners

secure Muñoz's release through open legal channels rather than by other possible means, recognizing the dangers this strategy implied if the protests were not forceful enough to compel the junta to release Muñoz unharmed.

As part of the pressure exerted by the Committee, approaches to the United Nations were important. Shiffman pointed out that the UN is "no different than its member states (the U.S., Chile...)"—merely more impotent. He reminded the audience that Muñoz was seized at a UN refuge and arrested, and read a section from Muñoz's European press conference speech which described how the police had quoted verbatim from Muñoz's statement to a UN refugee committee.

In order to secure asylum for Muñoz, not only the UN but also various bourgeois governments had to be approached. The Committee centered its efforts especially on countries with social-democratic governments, in the hope of exploiting the lip-service which these bureaucrats must pay to working-class solidarity in order to maintain their capacity to mislead their working-class base. It was the social-democratic government of Austria which granted Muñoz a visa out of Argentina. The speaker pointed out that at the very moment that Muñoz was arriving in Austria, the Austrian government was engaged in prosecuting the Austrian Trotskyist ÖBL in an attempt to suppress its publication.

Shiffman concluded by expressing the gratitude of the PDC toward all those who solidarized with and worked on behalf of the campaign to save Mario Muñoz. He asked all those who consider themselves partisans of the oppressed and exploited throughout the world to continue to support the PDC in its struggle for freedom for all class-war prisoners. ■

SPARTACIST LEAGUE LOCAL DIRECTORY

ANN ARBOR (313) 769-6376
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
M.I.T. Station
Cambridge, MA 02139

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

CLEVELAND (216) 281-4781
Box 6765
Cleveland, OH 44101

DETROIT (313) 869-1551
Box 663A, General P.O.
Detroit, MI 48232

HOUSTON
Box 28474
Houston, TX 77032

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

MADISON
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) 291-8993
Box 26, Station A
Vancouver, B.C.

SPARTACIST edition française

pour toute commande s'adresser à:
Pascal Alessandri Spartacist Publishing Co.
B.P. 336 Box 1377 GPO
Paris 75015 New York, N.Y. 10001
FRANCE USA

3,00 F.F.

\$.75 US/Canada

Muñoz...

(continued from page 3)

Record (as reprinted in *Intercontinental Press*, 15 March 1976).

To be sure, a responsible defense campaign must spare no effort to bring pressure to bear through governmental and diplomatic channels. But USIA's exclusive reliance on legalistic pressure tactics seeking to suck in liberal support by avoiding an open association with leftists and rejecting militant public protests—is a testimonial to the arid reformist bankruptcy of the SWP. In contrast, the Muñoz campaign spearheaded in this country by the openly class-partisan PDC enlisted the active support of left-wing militants and trade unionists while winning impressive backing among prominent liberals, academics and civil libertarians.

Hypocrisy and Liberalism

The broad support mobilized by the Muñoz campaign compelled USIA to respond, albeit in the privacy of the SWP internal bulletin, "Perspectives on Latin American Defense Work" (SWP

logical expression in USIA's criminal abstention from the Muñoz campaign and its McCarthyite attempt to red-hat the Committee.

Returning to the Kelly Vidal document, we find the following amazing passage: "Taking the International Labor Defense (ILD) of the 1920's as a model, USIA agrees to defend victims of political repression regardless of their political persuasion and seeks support for their cases on a civil liberties basis." To claim the ILD as the model for defense on a "civil liberties basis" is like claiming that the Third International was founded by Lenin and Trotsky on the principles of "peaceful coexistence."

According to James Cannon, the founder and first Secretary of the ILD (1925-28), writing in the January 1927 issue of the ILD's monthly magazine, the *Labor Defender*:

"Our policy is the policy of the class struggle. It puts the center of gravity in the protest movement of the workers of America and the world. It puts all faith in the power of the masses and no faith whatever in the justice of the courts. While favoring all possible legal proceedings, it calls for agitation, publicity, demonstrations—organized protest on a national and international scale. It calls for the unity and solidarity of all workers on this burning issue, regardless of conflicting views on other questions."

These are the principles of anti-sectarian, class-struggle defense upon which the campaign to save Mario Muñoz was based and to which the PDC is dedicated. They are as distant from liberal-reformist "civil liberties defense" as the class struggle is from class collaboration. A "civil liberties defense" puts its faith in the justice of the capitalist state. It was "civil liberties defense" which laid the basis for that standard bearer of civil liberties, the American Civil Liberties Union, to cave in to the witchhunt paranoia of the 1950's, refusing to defend members of the Communist Party; and in 1940 expelling founding member Elizabeth Gurley Flynn from its Executive Board because she was a Communist.

The criminal sectarianism of the SWP and the Stalinists toward the campaign to save Mario Muñoz from the blood-stained henchmen of the Pinochet and Videla juntas stands in sharpest contrast to the wide outpouring of sympathy and support for Muñoz mobilized by the Committee. All those whose solidarity and generous financial support contributed to the successful outcome of the campaign on behalf of Muñoz and his family must be proud of their participation in this significant victory for the cause of the victims of reactionary terror in Latin America ■



WV Photo

Bay Area demonstrators protest U.S. exclusion of Hugo Blanco and against anti-communist McCarran-Walter Act, October 16, 1975.

Internal Discussion Bulletin Volume 34, Number 3, June 1976), co-authored by Mike Kelly and USIA head Mirta Vidal. bluntly informs us that:

"USIA was formed in 1966 in an attempt to find the best way to defend Hugo Blanco and other political prisoners in Latin America. Existing organizations, such as Amnesty International (AI) tended to turn a cold shoulder when it came to defending revolutionaries and rejected certain effective methods of defense such as teach-ins, pickets and demonstrations."

But it is USIA which turns a "cold shoulder" or red-hating finger toward the defense of leftist militants like Mario Muñoz or Van Schouwen and Romero, while rejecting pickets and demonstrations even on behalf of the SWP's own co-thinkers such as Hugo Blanco.

From the time of its formation, USIA demonstrated that its commitment is to liberalism and not to class-struggle defense. At a founding meeting of USIA on 21 December 1966, supporters of the SL objected to the proposed "Statement of Aims" which began, "To aid in defending victims of political persecution and injustice in the countries of Latin America, regardless of their particular beliefs, affiliations or associations..." Since this class-neutral formulation deliberately does not preclude the defense of ultra-rightist action groups and outright fascists, SL supporters proposed as an alternative formulation "victims of rightist political persecution." SWP supporters, insisting that a clear statement of class partisanship would alienate liberals, pushed through their "civil libertarian" formulation. This class neutrality now finds its

Rubber Strike...

(continued from page 12)

The settlement was arrived at after five days of continuous bargaining presided over by Secretary of Labor W. J. Usery, Jr. It is no coincidence that the government intervened as 1977 car production was to begin and the massive tire supplies finally approached exhaustion. And it was the determination of the union ranks—despite the lack of a militant leadership—to stand up to the companies in the first major national strike since the 1974-75 economic crisis that finally defeated Big Four attempts to grind down and break up the URW.

That it took the rubber workers over four months to even threaten such an impact on the economy can be attributed to the misleadership of the regime of URW president Pete Bommarito. Bommarito refused to call on the United Auto Workers (UAW) for a solidarity strike, which would quickly have brought the bosses to heel. As for federal mediation, Bommarito told a *WV* reporter, "I have to complement Mr. Usery" for doing a "tremendous job for both sides."

Due to lack of a class-struggle leadership, the strike dragged on for months, courting disaster. A number of

non-Big Four tire locals deserted, including the General Tire local located in Akron, the heart of the industry and the union's stronghold. Yielding to the courts and refusing to build mass picket lines, the URW leadership permitted supervisory and non-union personnel to enter the plants. Thus, even at struck plants, production continued at a 25 percent level. Adding to this production at non-union and non-striking URW plants, overall tiremaking capacity did not fall below 60 percent throughout the strike!

Thus, despite the relatively favorable monetary settlement, a number of the stated goals of the strike—such as the \$1.65 first-year catch-up raise and the 30-and-out pension provision—were not met. Moreover, the settlement will not in itself halt the continued deterioration of the bargaining position of the relatively small and vulnerable URW. Increased labor costs will undoubtedly spur the further construction of non-union plants by the tire companies. This process has reached considerable proportions in recent years. There are now significant numbers of such plants, most of them located in the South and thus far the union has made only the most feeble attempts to organize them.

In addition, the pay differential between tire and non-tire plants continues and in many cases will be widened, thus further undermining the tenuous cohesiveness of the URW. Under the current settlement, for example, certain "distressed plants" have been given permission to settle for lower wages. These are concentrated in non-tire plants which produce hoses, golf balls, etc. At one such URW-organized plant in Windsor, Ontario, the wage settlement was trimmed to \$1.00, while a New Bedford, Mass. URW local got only a 40 cent raise (a full \$1.00 below the tire settlement!). Rather than demanding more jobs through a shorter workweek at no cut in pay, Bommarito begs for jobs by giving up wages and other benefits.

In announcing the rubber settlement, Usery explained its relative expensiveness by pointing to the fact that the rubber workers had lost considerable ground under their 1973 contract, which contained no c-o-l clause. The clear message to other unions was that the rubber settlement is not to be a model.

This warning was directed above all at the United Auto Workers, whose contracts with car manufacturers expire in two weeks. There has historically been a close relationship between the URW and the UAW. Both the government and the auto companies were clearly worried about the effect a large settlement in rubber would have on the auto negotiations. Bommarito told *WV* that the auto manufacturers exerted some of the strongest pressure against the c-o-l formula.

Had the URW struck only one company of the Big Four, the contract struggle would undoubtedly have ended in disaster. This, unfortunately, is precisely what UAW chief Leonard Woodcock is "threatening." By announcing that it will strike only Ford Motor Co., the UAW is voluntarily renouncing its most important weapon: the power to shut down the entire auto industry, which would have a massive impact on the economy. Auto workers must demand instead an industry-wide strike, encompassing auto and agricultural implements production throughout the United States and Canada. ■

Wilmington 10...

(continued from page 12)

the Communist Party (CP)-dominated NAARPR, has unfortunately been seriously weakened by the sectarian maneuvering which is a hallmark of all varieties of Stalinism.

The debilitating effects of such an approach to defense work were clearly illustrated at the August 13-15 conference of the National Executive Board of the National Lawyers Guild (NLG), where the Peking-loyal October League (OL) scrambled for influence against the traditional hegemony of the pro-Moscow CP.

Debate centered around NAARPR's resolution calling on the Guild to endorse the Labor Day march in Raleigh. Seeking to test their strength against the influence of the CP, supporters of the OL attempted to mobilize delegates to oppose the march on the sole basis that it had been organized by NAARPR.

Supporters of the resolution correctly argued that the question at issue should be not which tendency was organizing the event, but whether the demands and the struggle were worthy of support. This correct argument rang hollow, however, in the face of the fact that there was no way of endorsing the NAARPR march without also endorsing the politics of NAARPR, including the classless demand to "free all political prisoners."

Just as the CP was willing to abandon its defense of Ruchell Magee in order to save its own member, Angela Davis, so it was willing to undermine a strong united defense effort of the Wilmington 10 and the Charlotte 3 for narrow sectarian advantage. The Partisan Defense Committee, which was represented at the conference, pointed out that by refusing to organize the demonstration on a principled united-front basis, enlisting all sections of the labor movement, left-wing organizations and allies of the working class regardless of political viewpoint and with full freedom of political expression, NAARPR was sacrificing the broadest possible defense effort.

The PDC has contributed financially to the defense of the Wilmington 10 and the Charlotte 3 and has sent telegrams protesting the frame-ups, demanding immediate release of the prisoners. While opposing the NAARPR resolution, the PDC expressed its continued commitment to struggle to free these victims of right-wing repression ■

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 4:30-8:00 p.m.
Saturday 2:00-5:30 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

KOMMUNISTISCHE KORRESPONDENZ

herausgegeben von der
Trotzistischen Liga Deutschlands
Auslandsleitungsabteilung
10 ... DM (ein Jahr)
einschliesslich Spätkurs deutsche Ausgabe
zu beziehen über
1 Berlin 120 Postlagerkarte A 051 429
West Germany
Postcheckkonto Berlin West
503 57 — 107 (Wolfgang Hohmann)

WORKERS VANGUARD

Smash the Racist Frame-Up!

For United-Front Protest to Free Wilmington 10/Charlotte 3!

Raleigh, North Carolina will be the scene on September 6 of the Labor Day March for Human and Labor Rights, organized by the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression (NAARPR), which has as its focus a protest against the frame-ups of the civil rights activists known as the Wilmington 10 and the Charlotte 3.

The Spartacist League/Spartacus Youth League and the Partisan Defense Committee (PDC) demand that all charges against the Wilmington 10 and the Charlotte 3 be dropped and that these victims of right-wing racist repression be released at once.

Bourgeois "Justice" and Klan Terror

The state's "case" against both the Charlotte 3 and the Wilmington 10 is rooted in the wave of KKK terror which erupted in North Carolina shortly after federal district judge James MacMillan ruled in 1969 that the Charlotte-Mecklenberg County school system, the largest in North Carolina, must desegregate, through busing if necessary. When Klansmen were allowed to go free after murdering a black man in Oxford, North Carolina, the black community exploded in anger and the National Guard was called in.

Federal authorities made use of this situation to frame up and convict two of the most prominent black activists in the

area, Rev. Ben Chavis and Dr. James E. Grant. The feds were aided in their dirty work by David Washington and Al Hood, men with long records of narcotics dealing and assault, who had recently been rearrested. Newspaper reporters uncovered the fact that federal and state officials promised Washington and Hood that all charges against them would be dropped and that they would be given at least \$17,000 in return for testifying against Chavis and Grant. Chavis was subsequently acquitted, but Grant was convicted and sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment solely on the testimony of these bribed witnesses.

In 1972 North Carolina brought yet another case against Grant, as well as against black poet T.J. Reddy and Charles Parker, a mental health worker—now known collectively as the Charlotte 3. These men were charged with burning down a riding stable near Charlotte *four years earlier!* Once again, the only witnesses for the prosecution were the ubiquitous Washington and Hood. On the basis of their testimony the Charlotte 3 were sentenced to a total of 55 years.

Despite the fact that the *Charlotte Observer* exposed the government's bribery of the witnesses in 1972, superior court judge Sam Ervin III, who heard their appeal, ruled in September 1975 that the three were *not* entitled to a new trial. The secret payoffs, he said, were

merely a "harmless error."

The "Siege of Wilmington"

Meanwhile, government authorities had not abandoned their vendetta aimed at putting Chavis behind bars.



Rev. Ben Chavis

Daily World

Between 1968 and 1972, 78 separate charges—ranging from accessory after the fact of murder to traffic violations—were brought against him. All of these phony charges had to be dropped except for one growing out of four days of

police and vigilante terror in 1971 known as the "siege of Wilmington."

During this racist frenzy, Klansmen fired shots into the Gregory Congregational Church, in which black people had barricaded themselves, wounding at least ten. When a young black student attempted to leave the church, he was shot and killed; no one has ever been charged with the murder.

That same night a white-owned grocery store caught fire, and during intense crossfire from the vigilantes the next morning a racist who had driven his truck right up to the church barricades was killed. Only after *this* death did the city enforce a curfew (which blacks had repeatedly requested) and call for the National Guard, which immediately stormed the church.

Almost a year later, Chavis and nine others—the Wilmington 10—were charged with and convicted of conspiracy to burn the grocery. They were given a total of 282 years' imprisonment. The only evidence against them was the testimony of two men who were facing long prison sentences. Like Washington and Hood, these scum were housed at government expense at a resort hotel.

Sectarian Maneuvering Undermines Defense

The defense of the Wilmington 10 and the Charlotte 3, which has been led by

continued on page 11

Despite Bureaucratic Do-Nothingism in the Face of Union-Busting Drive

Four-Month Big Four Rubber Strike Wins 36 Percent Pay Boost

AUGUST 28—After more than 140 days on strike members of the United Rubber Workers (URW) at Goodyear plants began returning to work yesterday with locals around the country accepting a new contract. Seven of eight locals voting yesterday approved the pact with the seven remaining Goodyear locals voting today. URW locals at Firestone are scheduled to vote tomorrow on a similar pact. And while agreements have not been reached between union and company negotiators at the other Big Four rubber companies, Uniroyal and B.F. Goodrich, it is expected that they will follow suit.

The wages agreement, termed "1976's fattest" by *Business Week* (August 30) was in fact substantial. The entire

package is estimated at a 36 percent increase over three years, which exceeds the Teamsters' settlement of 32 percent. A key concession made by the companies was an uncapped cost-of-living (c-o-l) clause, which in the third year of the contract will yield a 1-cent increase for each 0.3 rise in the Consumer Price Index.

The Big Four proved unable to starve the rubber workers out over the long and bitter strike, the first nationwide strike in the industry since 1967. A number of URW tire locals representing smaller companies did refuse to join the strike. However, attempts by company bargainers to break the workers' unity by enticing URW locals to sign separate agreements proved a failure.

continued on page 11



Peter Bommarito speaking to URW members at the beginning of the strike in Akron.

WV Photo