



Anti-apartheid youth march to demand that minister of justice Kruger release militants.

Sunday Observer (London)

SOUTH AFRICAN REVOLUTION:

Black Unions the Key!

Implement International Labor Boycott January 17!

The white supremacist South African government has responded to the wave of black and "coloured" (mixed race) uprisings that has swept the country since June with a few token concessions and massive ruthless repression. According to the government's statistics (undoubtedly only a lying fraction of the real total), at least 400 non-whites have been massacred by the police.

The independent Institute of Race Relations estimates that in addition over 400 have been detained without charge, of whom at most about a quarter have been released in recent weeks. Nearly 4,200 have been arrested on such charges as riotous assembly, incitement and public violence. While most of them rot in jail awaiting trial, over 600 have been convicted and sentenced to the barbaric corporal punishment of "heavy caning."

Among these victims of apartheid repression are a number of activists associated with the nascent black labor movement. In November two dozen of these activists were served with banning orders; another half dozen were arrested. Banning orders are an elastic repressive measure, prohibiting specific activities (in this case, union organizing) and often including the virtual "civil death" of years under house arrest. The move followed an announcement by labor minister Marais Viljoen that the government will not extend legal recognition to black unions, a question which had been under official re-examination in recent months.

In response to these attacks on the black labor movement, the executive board of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), meeting in Brussels on November 25, issued a call for national and interna-

tional labor organizations "to take the strongest possible measures...to ensure that the bannings—which are tragically jeopardizing the efforts made so far by the African workers to organise themselves—be lifted forthwith." The board concretized its call by initiating an international trade-union protest campaign during the week of January 17, urging "large-scale rallies," educational activities and "industrial action," including "the grounding of South African aircraft and ships, as well as a boycott on the unloading and loading of goods destined for or coming from South Africa."

Most of those banned in November are white. Some are associated with groups like the Urban Training Project (UTP) of Johannesburg, the Durban-based Institute for Industrial Education (IIE) or the Western Province Workers' Advice Bureau of Cape Town, which engage in research and education and assist black workers in forming unions. Others are organizers for unregistered African trade unions or officials of the Trade Union Advisory and Coordinating Council, which functions as a federation of black unions in the state of Natal. Some, like UTP chairman Loet Douwes-Decker and IIE researcher Charles Simkins, teach in the universi-

ties, and seven are connected with the Wages and Economic Commission established by the National Union of South African Students in Cape Town.

The African labor movement is still tiny, comprising 24 unions with about 60,000 members and, while not formally illegal, it has no recognized organizational rights. Yet the combativity demonstrated in the extensive 1973-74 strike wave (when the bosses extended de facto recognition by negotiating with the unregistered unions) and the protest strikes organized in the non-white townships this summer make the apartheid butchers fear the potential role of organized black workers as a rallying point for mass struggles against white supremacy. Pretoria fears that concessions to the handful of existing black unions will open the floodgates to a mighty surge of social struggles by the five-million-strong black proletariat.

By the same token, the government is particularly concerned to abort any cooperation among blacks and whites on the trade-union front, indeed to crush any incipient white support to black struggles for democratic rights. The regime's anxiety does not flow from any direct threat posed by the tepid liberalism of a few anti-racist intellectuals or the staid trade-union economism

encouraged by organizations like the UTP. It flows rather from the enormous assistance that even a tiny minority of whites, with their privileged access to culture and technology, could potentially lend to a revolutionary movement spearheaded by the black workers in alliance with their Indian and "coloured" class brothers. Moreover, even the slightest instance of genuine interracial solidarity flies in the face of every tenet of the apartheid system.

If massively implemented, the call for a week of industrial action could be an important opportunity for militant workers to demonstrate solidarity with their victimized class brothers in South Africa and to marshal the strength of the international proletariat to force Pretoria to lift the bannings and free all victims of the reign of apartheid terror. However, the ICFTU-initiated campaign clearly exhibits the deforming influence of labor reformism. Thus the call is narrowly focused on 24 banned or arrested union activists and fails even to demand release of all victims of the Vorster regime's police-state measures. It also includes a call for a consumer boycott, a liberal gesture which in the unlikely event that it were successful in putting pressure on the South African

continued on page 10

How Maoists "Restore Capitalism" in the Soviet Union 6

A review of Martin Nicolaus' Restoration of Capitalism in the USSR

Crime, Punishment and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

14 July 1976

Editor, *Workers Vanguard*

Comrades:

The question of the Marxist attitude towards punishment raised in *WV* [No. 117], 9 July 1976, can stand a lot of thought. I do not claim to be a master of the subject and am interested here in improving my grasp of it through an exchange of views.

The history of meting out "justice" in all hitherto existing societies is undoubtedly a tale of unrelieved horror. It does not follow from that that repressive measures are never just; indeed they are sometimes progressive from the standpoint of anyone who recognizes the difference between the hammerblow which breaks a link in the chain of a slave and the blow that reforges that link. What does follow from the history of official violence is that it is hard to tell which forms of repression are more humane and which less. Thus I doubt that "The deterrence argument upheld by the utilitarians in the period of industrial capital represented an advance." You say it broke with "the barbarous practices of torturing and maiming criminals." I do not know who is worse off, the convicted pickpocket in Khadaffi's Libya who gets his right hand amputated in accordance with the provisions of the Holy Koran, or, say, George Jackson, convicted of taking about twenty dollars from a service station and given a 1-to-30 year "conditional sentence" under the penal code of "enlightened" California. I do not know that there is any practice more "barbarous" than locking up a human being in a steel and concrete cage for decades or for life. That is a practice never conceived of by authentic barbarians, many of whom imagined exile from the tribe to be the supreme penalty, more terrible than death even. Deterrence also goes by another name: preventive detention. How is that an advance over "getting even" with offenders? In one case the state locks you up for what you have (presumably) done. In the other case it locks you up for what it suspects you are going to do. Whatever it may have been in the days of Jeremy Bentham, preventive detention in our epoch has become a method of holding on to power equally favored by unstable bourgeois regimes and by the Stalinist bureaucracies.

I strongly agree with you that "Socialists do not proceed from the standpoint of punishing the offender." I would add that socialists can no longer believe that putting anybody in prison is going to do him or her any good. If Marx still thought in 1875 that productive labor engaged in by prisoners was "corrective," he was wrong. A century later anybody can see that "houses of correction," so-called, are not what they were cracked up to be. I hope you will not tell me that corrective labor won't work under capitalism but will after the revolution. The revolutionary party



Former members of the Russian bourgeoisie at compulsory labor, 1918.

should inscribe on its banners not the reform of prisoners through forced labor or the improvement of prison conditions but the abolition of institutions of punishment. In the struggle for socialism let us seek ways to realize the remarkable vision of Marx that "Under human conditions punishment will really be nothing but the sentence passed by the culprit on himself." (In a society whose principle is human solidarity, not the exploitation of labor and violence, it will be the responsibility of other human beings to commute that sentence.) I would like to know more about the Bolshevik attitude towards punishment. E.H. Carr's paraphrase of the 1919 party program, which you quote, contradicts the principle of no punishment, to which you subscribe. According to Carr the program calls for "a fundamental alteration in the character of punishment... applying public censure as a means of punishment," and also "compulsory labour with retention of freedom." If this paraphrase is to be trusted, the 1919 program proposes to change the "character" of punishment but not do away with it in principle. By the way, how will we ever get from "applying public censure as a means of punishment" to the condition envisioned by Marx in your quotation from *The Holy Family* where a culprit "will see in other men his natural saviors from the punishment which he has imposed on himself"?

I get a different impression of Bolshevik penal theory than the one Carr gives from a reading of Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago*. Quotations from Soviet documents in that book convey that the Bolsheviks flatly repudiated the concept that punishment is the

purpose of imprisonment. They held that defense of the revolution by isolating its opponents, quite a few of whom were armed and mobilized for several years after 1917, was the only justification for depriving anyone of liberty. They claimed no right of retribution nor did they argue that incarceration was beneficial to the imprisoned. But then the growing bureaucracy in the 1920s reintroduced the old formulas justifying prisons as places of punishment and corrective labor. (Solzhenitsyn tries to destroy the good name of the Bolsheviks in *Gulag*

reservations and leading questions which taken together suggest an approach more closely associated with ahistorical humanism or libertarianism than with the traditions of revolutionary Marxism.

Herreshoff is quite right when he says that socialists must renounce the concept of punishment, and also that some repressive measures are necessary and just in the cause of liberating mankind. In these assertions he is in agreement with our article "Abolish the Death Penalty" in *WV* No. 117. But in the form of rhetorical questions he raises differences with our position that abolition of physical mutilation in official punishment represents social progress, and he also expresses uncertainties concerning the Bolsheviks' penal policies. In both these concerns Herreshoff abstracts the questions from the actual process of history.

Marxists should not find it so "hard to tell which forms of repression are more humane and which less." Communists need not be ambiguous about the abolition of the practices of drawing and quartering, disemboweling, pulling on the rack, breaking on the wheel and crushing on the "Scavenger's Daughter" out of fear that something equally cruel will take their place. Eliminating the most barbaric practices of official physical mutilation can be supported as part of the progress associated with the bourgeois revolution.

From the standpoint of subjective psychology and ahistorical relativism, one might also find it difficult to decide which is worse: the rigors of early industrial society or those of feudalism. But this viewpoint is alien to the Marxist who ultimately views human progress in the first instance as an advance in the development of productive forces.

Marxists do not proceed from the subjective desires (real or supposed) of individual victims, which are necessarily conditioned by existing social norms and ideology. We are against the rack even if some woebegotten sinner thinks he deserves it. In this regard it is illuminating to consider the contemporary case of Gary Gilmore. The fact that Gilmore has expressed a desire to be shot before a firing squad in Utah has no bearing whatsoever on the Marxist opposition to the death penalty (see "Stop the Legal Murder of Gary Gilmore," *WV* No. 136, 3 December 1976). That Gary Gilmore and some liberal ideologues have argued that it is less cruel to die immediately than "rot in prison" is for a Marxist no reason to look longingly to the savage and terminal punishment of the death penalty.

Similarly, an individual may subjectively prefer to have his body mutilated in Libya than spend time behind bars in California, but that is no answer to the social question of punishment, which must be posed in its historical/material context. In the first place, one never gets the choice: you cannot choose to be pilloried for a few weeks in Elizabethan London rather than spend years in a miserable U.S. prison. And it should not be forgotten that the society that cuts off the hands of its victim condemns him to lifelong misery as a helpless beggar and outcast.

It makes a significant difference historically that the bourgeoisie in its

continued on page 11

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



Saudi oil minister Sheikh Yamani (center) at recent OPEC conference in Qatar. Green/Syigma



Israeli troops patrol Nablus in the West Bank after recent Arab demonstrations. David Rubinger/Time

Pax Americana in the Near East?

The fall of the Rabin government in Israel last month; the split in OPEC at its mid-December meetings in Qatar; the suppression of the civil war in Lebanon by 30,000 Syrian troops; and the PLO's capitulation to the proposal for a West Bank/Gaza Strip Palestinian "mini-state" are all part of a plea to the incoming Carter administration to impose a Pax Americana solution on the interminable Near East "crisis."

Defying for years UN resolutions to withdraw from the occupied territories, the Israeli ruling class has committed itself not to give up at the negotiating table what it can keep on the battlefield. The American bourgeoisie would certainly like Israel to make such concessions as would placate the surrounding Arab states and defuse the brink-of-war situation. However, the American ruling class is not about to apply the only form of pressure that would force Israel to do its bidding—a severe cutback in aid sufficient to cripple the Zionists militarily. To do so would cause a major political crisis in Israel, upset the balance of power in the region—which currently places the U.S. in a pivotal position—and thereby threaten a new Near East war with the danger of a direct Soviet-American confrontation.

Rabin Government Falls

The maneuvering surrounding the fall of the Israeli government of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin graphically displays the reactionary clericalist character of the Zionist state. To begin with, Israel does not have the oil wealth or the industrial base to sustain a large military apparatus and therefore must get its weapons gratis from the Pentagon or pay for them with dollars contributed by the world Zionist movement. So in December Defense Minister Shimon Peres made his annual pilgrimage for military alms to Washington, D.C.

There was the usual haggling without which, apparently, no deal can be closed between the merchants of death and their small-power clients. In the fiscal year ending 30 September 1976 Israel received \$2.3 billion in aid and requested the same amount for 1977. But since the U.S. presidential elections (with their demagogic appeals to the Jewish vote by bellicose statements of support for Israel) are now over, the State Department and the President's Office of Management and Budget pared this request to \$1.5 billion of which \$800 million would be for military credits.

While this haggling was going on a special welcoming ceremony including 3,000 spectators was held near Tel Aviv on Friday, December 10, to receive the first three of 25 promised F-15 Eagles,

the U.S.' most advanced fighter jet. For some unexplained reason the ceremony was delayed. According to Prime Minister Rabin, it concluded 17 minutes before sundown, or the beginning of sabbath. According to the ultra-orthodox United Torah Front the ceremony continued past sundown, thereby desecrating the sabbath and, perhaps even more of an affront, preventing the religious Jewish participants in the ceremony from driving home.

The United Torah Front was formed by the fusion of Agudat Israel and Agudat Israel Workers before the formation of the Israeli state in 1948. It opposed Zionist political independence because, according to strict orthodox interpretation, political independence required the redemption of the Jewish people through the coming of the Messiah. But messiah or no, the United Torah Front entered Israel's first government only to leave it again in 1951 over the conscription of women into military service.

The United Torah Front has five members in the Israeli parliament, or Knesset, and on the Tuesday following



Israeli prime minister Rabin David Rubinger/Time

the incident they put forward a no-confidence motion condemning the Rabin government for desecrating the sabbath. Irrespective of their religious convictions, many splinter groups voted for the no-confidence motion. Most embarrassing, nine of the ten National Religious Party members of the Knesset abstained. The NRP was in the Rabin government, occupying the ministries of interior, welfare and religious affairs.

On December 19 Rabin expelled the NRP from the government coalition,

reducing his majority (67 seats in the 120-member Knesset) to a minority of 57. Rather than face the humiliation of falling on a no-confidence motion put forward by the main right-wing opposition bloc, the Likud, the Rabin government resigned the following day.

Although less fanatical and more secular than the United Torah Front, the NRP is built upon orthodox religious obscurantism. Thus in 1951 it brought down the Ben Gurion government by leaving the governing coalition claiming that Yemenite Jewish children were not receiving the necessary religious education. The party also left governing coalitions in 1958, 1970 and 1974 over that perennial question of "Who is a Jew?"—a question of utmost importance in this clericalist, racist state, which was built by denying the Palestinian people their homeland and by claiming it instead as a homeland of world Jewry.

Religious Obscurantists Fight for "Eretz Yisrael"

But while the NRP embarrasses self-styled "left-wing" Zionists in the government coalition and sometimes irritates the major Zionist party, the so-called "Labor" (Mapai) Party, nonetheless the alliance grows out of mutual need through which Mapai is able to retain the reactionary clericalist character of the Zionist state without having to take direct responsibility for it.

Nowhere is this symbiotic relation of fake squabbles masking mutual dependence clearer than in the tiff between the NRP and the Mapai over the policy toward Jewish settlements in the Arab territories occupied by Israel during the 1967 war. There are now 23 such settlements built in the West Bank, 17 on the Golan Heights and 16 in the Gaza Strip. Most of the settlements have been launched by the ultra-right-wing, rabidly chauvinist and fanatically orthodox Gush Emunim movement.

All these settlements except "Camp Kadum" near Nablus have been approved by the Israeli government because they define the "security frontiers" that the Rabin government ultimately wishes to retain in any future settlement. Camp Kadum, however, is in an area heavily populated by Palestinian Arabs which the Mapai wants to leave unsettled as a negotiating chip for some future treaty with Jordan and the other Arab states. The NRP supports the demand of Gush Emunim to annex all of the West Bank as part of "Eretz Yisrael" (their "Holy Land") with the corollary of the forcible displacement of the West Bank's 650,000 Palestinian Arabs.

While Kadum has been declared

"illegal" by the Rabin government, it has continued to flourish since its foundation one year ago. Its population has increased from 120 to 200, \$700,000 has been invested there (partly by government agencies) and the settlement has two industrial plants producing goods for the defense industry and for export. Rabin has not cracked down on Kadum in order not to break with the NRP.

In addition the NRP/Mapai coalition has been strained by the provocative antics of the Gush Emunim settlement near Hebron, Qiryat Arba. Hebron is a relatively large West Bank Arab city with a population of 60,000. The leader of the Qiryat Arba settlement, the notorious ultra-reactionary Rabbi Moishe Levinger, has led his flock of fanatics



PLO head Arafat Time

into making vicious physical attacks upon Hebron's Arab inhabitants, knowing that Qiryat Arba would be defended from Arab retaliation by the Israeli occupation army. These attacks provoked rioting and desecration of Muslim and Jewish religious articles at a common site of worship (called the Tomb of Patriarchs) this past fall. Hebron was placed under military curfew and the Israeli army arrested 74 Arabs.

Gush Emunim was denounced for its provocative behavior even by conservative Israeli journals like *Haaretz* and the English-language *Jerusalem Post*. Further, *Haaretz* suggested that Israel might even have to get out of the occupied territories. The Israeli army was criticized for not containing Gush Emunim, and this criticism of the military occupation necessarily implicated Defense Minister Shimon Peres,

continued on page 4

Near East...

(continued from page 3)

Rabin's arch-rival within the "Lahor" Party.

The religious riots in Hebron are only part of a continuing Arab protest against the brutal Israeli military occupation. Most recently protests centered on the extension of an Israeli 8 percent value added tax to the West Bank, taxes which in large part go to buying advanced military hardware (like the F-15 Eagles, which cost \$24 million apiece) used against the Palestinians. These protests culminated in a 15 December West Bank general strike which spilled over into the Gaza Strip.

No doubt Rabin wants to distance himself without actually breaking from the openly annexationist demands of the NRP and the Gush Emunim in order to appease the U.S., which has been openly critical of Israeli policies in the occupied territories. On 11 November the U.S. voted with the other 14 UN Security Council members for a statement expressing "grave anxiety and concern over the present serious situation in the occupied territories as a result of continued Israeli occupation." The real issue behind the temporary falling out between Rabin and the party of orthodox rabbis is the policy toward the occupied territories, that is, partial versus complete annexation of the West Bank.

The Price of Sheik Yamani's Price Restraint

The U.S.' principal ally among the Arab states of the Near East, Saudi Arabia, is also pressuring Washington and in its own way competing with the Zionists for the good graces of American public opinion. Hence the "split" in the oil producers' cartel (OPEC) at the Qatar meetings, where the Saudis raised their price only 5 percent while other, supposedly greedier, producers upped theirs by 10 percent.

In an interview before the OPEC summit, Saudi oil minister Sheik Yamani emphasized his tender concern for the economic health of the advanced capitalist world:

"We need a strong economy in the West to achieve our industrial and development targets inside Saudi Arabia. And we do not want a recession in the West that will definitely weaken the present political systems, especially in certain areas in Europe..."

—Business Week,
29 November 1976

After the OPEC conference, Yamani urged the U.S. to show its "appreciation" for the Saudis' price restraint.

Actually, whether crude oil prices are raised by 5 or 10 percent or not at all will have a negligible effect on the world economy. The significant change in oil prices was the four-fold increase following the 1973 Arab-Israeli war. And the imperialist bourgeoisie is by no means reconciled to paying for Arab oil at many times its cost of production. To quote Robert Hormats, economist for the U.S. National Security Council:

"The question is how to survive the disaster that has already been inflicted upon us...."

"Ultimately we either have to roll back the price of oil or get OPEC to finance the [balance of payments] deficits directly or through international institutions on giveaway terms."

—Business Week,
20 December 1976

One of these days the smiles of the Persian Gulf sheiks and shahs when they talk about oil prices may be rudely wiped off their faces.

Even as a modest economic concession, the Saudi action is a hoax. OPEC is by no means the only effective monopoly operating in the world oil business. The principal financial beneficiary from the price split will be Aramco, a consortium of Exxon, Mobil, Texaco and Standard Oil of California. Aramco has a near monopoly (about 90 percent) over the purchase of Saudi crude petroleum. It can now

buy this oil at roughly 5 percent less than the price of oil in other markets.

Aramco, of course, will not pass this saving on to final consumers, but will shave the 10 percent price increase enough to expand its markets at the expense of firms lacking access to Saudi oil. After all the maneuvers there will again be one selling price to final consumers, probably about 8 percent higher than previously. Some U.S. oil majors will quietly increase their profits, while the Saudis will have their publicity coup as a supposed benefactor of the American consumer.

The Saudis have made it clear that their oil price "restraint" is also a hargaining counter for the U.S. to pressure its ally Israel into making concessions to the Arab states. As the Saudi ambassador to Washington put it: "The one point which should be made just as strongly as the economic aspect is the positive need for all parties to get on now with achieving a just and durable settlement in the Middle East" (*New York Times*, 18 December).

PLO Settles for Mini-State

While the Zionists were squabbling over how much of the occupied territories to annex, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was debating whether to propose the establishment of a Palestinian statelet in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Previously the PLO had called for a "democratic secular Palestine" which implied the destruction of Zionist Israel as well as the incorporation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, that is, recreating the post-World War I British mandate of Palestine.

This debate is a direct result of the bloody military defeat of the Palestinians in Lebanon by the right-wing Maronite militias in alliance with 30,000 Syrian troops. Since April 1975 Palestinian commando groups in Lebanon have suffered 3,000 fatalities and lost about a fifth of their leadership, while 20,000 Palestinian civilians were murdered. Saudi Arabia, which through doling out its oil wealth to Syria, Egypt and the PLO wields enormous influence over their policies, forced a reconciliation of sorts between Syria and Egypt on the one hand, and Syria and the PLO on the other.

The massive Syrian invasion of Lebanon has now been turned into an Arab League "peacekeeping force" with a fake Lebanese command. The 19-month Lebanese civil war which resulted in over 60,000 fatalities was finally suppressed, but only by ringing the Maronite communities and Palestinian refugee camps with Syrian troops. Just a couple of months earlier PLO leader Yasser Arafat was denouncing Syria as a traitor to the Palestinian cause while the Syrian government was openly calling for Arafat's ouster. To demonstrate their "reconciliation" Arafat called the first meeting of the PLO's Central Council since June 1974 for mid-December in Damascus where it would debate the future of the badly mauled Palestinian movement. The three-day meeting ended with a carefully worded declaration which made no mention of the demand for a "democratic secular

Palestine" or the need to destroy Israel or even Zionism, merely calling for an "independent Palestinian state" without defining its boundaries.

Syrian president Assad has been temporarily reconciled to Arafat's continuing leadership of the PLO, and December 14 issues of government-controlled Syrian newspapers prominently displayed photographs of the Syrian and Palestinian leaders sitting next to each other, flanked by their respective lieutenants. It should be remembered, however, that Assad came to power in 1971 by opposing Syria's support to the Palestinians in Jordan during the Black September massacre of the commandos and refugee camps. Since then he has formed a "united political leadership" with the feudalist Hashemite dynasty in Amman.

Although the 1974 conference of Arab rulers in Rabat proclaimed the PLO "sole legitimate representative" of the Palestinian people, since one million Palestinians live in Jordan, the Hashemite King Hussein is not about to give up sovereignty over half his "subjects." During the 1948 Arab-Israeli War, Hussein's grandfather Abdullah annexed the Palestinian West Bank and held it until it was in turn militarily occupied by Israel in the 1967 war. Likewise Egypt annexed the Gaza Strip after the 1948 war and lost it to Israel in 1967.

In Lebanon, which has a Palestinian population of 400,000 and where the Palestinian commandos numbered more than 20,000 (being larger, better armed and certainly better motivated than the Lebanese Army), the Palestinians constituted a state within a state. After suppressing the Lebanese civil war Syria is not about to agree to the Palestinians' having a state with any more "independence" than they currently have in the refugee camps in Lebanon ringed with Syrian troops. Syria wants to see the West Bank reannexed by Jordan under the guise of a federation in which the Palestinians would retain nominal authority.

Egyptian-Syrian "Unity"

At the PLO meeting in Damascus pro-Syrian and pro-Jordanian forces within the umbrella group attempted to get the Central Council to enlarge the Palestinian National Assembly (a kind of Palestinian parliament to which the PLO is nominally subordinate) in order to pack it with supporters of the Damascus and Amman regimes and dilute support for Arafat.

Another fake reconciliation going on between Syria and Egypt culminated in the announcement on December 21 that they too were forming a "united political leadership." Although Egypt and Syria both fought together against Israel in the October 1973 war, they have been bitter enemies, at least verbally, since Egypt concluded the "separate" Sinai Agreement with Israel in the fall of 1975. Under the pressure of Saudi Arabia,

continued on page 10

After 30 Years of Official Protection Millionaire Dutch Nazi War Criminal Snared

A dramatic escape last November by the Dutch Nazi and multimillionaire art dealer Pieter Menten only hours before detectives closed in on his 20-room mansion to arrest him touched off a political uproar in the Netherlands. On December 6 Menten was finally captured in Switzerland and has now been extradited to Holland to face war crimes charges. This is the culmination of a series of events beginning last spring with Menten's exposure as a former German SS sergeant in Poland responsible for the murder of hundreds of Jews.

Seion of a family of wealthy exporters of Dutch products to Eastern Europe, Menten first went to Poland in 1923 to run the family business. Shortly thereafter he lost a protracted court case against a wealthy Polish Jew, Isak Pistiner, an event which apparently encouraged the development of his rabid anti-semitism. By the time of the German invasion of Poland Menten had become a sergeant-major of the SS and headed up an execution squad in the Lemburg area where he ordered and supervised the mass execution of hundreds of local men, women and children.

Now more than 35 years since the crimes took place, survivors recall how Menten ordered victims to dig their own graves, then sat by and laughed as they were forced to walk across planks laid across the graves while his assistants gunned them down. The survivors also attest that in a sadistic vendetta in 1941, Menten personally ordered and supervised the execution of numerous family members, friends and neighbors of his old business rival Pistiner.

Shortly before the German defeat Menten returned to Holland and was arrested. With influential figures in the Dutch government intervening in his behalf, Menten got off with an incredible eight months' imprisonment on charges of serving in a foreign army and stealing the art collection of a Polish professor! Since then the old Nazi butcher, whose personal fortune by conservative estimates now stands at \$115 million, has risen to become a considerable power in Dutch politics.

According to his former butler, Menten inadvertently triggered his own exposure when in a bout of anti-Communist paranoia, in fearing a Russian invasion of Western Europe, he began to sell off his investments. During one of these selling sprees the auction house ran a full-page ad in *De Telegraaf*, Holland's most widely-circulated newspaper, for a sale of part of Menten's art collection. *De Telegraaf* made its way to Israel where it was read by an editor of the Tel Aviv newspaper *Haaretz*, Chaviv Kanaan, a nephew of Isak Pistiner whose parents had been killed in the vendetta! After a 32-year search for Menten's whereabouts, Kanaan published an exposé of Menten's wartime activities. In turn the *Haaretz* article was picked up by Hans Knoop, editor-in-chief of the Dutch weekly newsmagazine, *Accent*, who broke the story in Holland.

The *Accent* story sparked a wave of outrage in the Netherlands where still

FORUM— Toward the Rebirth of the Fourth International

Speaker: James Robertson
Central Committee,
Spartacist League/U.S.

Date: Sat., 29 January 1977
Time: 7:30 p.m.

Place: Barnard College *
Lehman Auditorium,
Altschul Hall

Donation \$1
Sponsored by Columbia Spartacus
Youth League
For more information call 925-5665

NEW YORK

London Spartacist Group Forum

**USec/OCRFI/"Necessary
Initiative" Maneuvers**

**Down with
Unprincipled
Combinationism!
For Revolutionary
Regroupment!**

Speakers:

RAINER BAIER

Trotskyist Faction, recently expelled
from German Spartacusbund

DAVID STRACHAN

London Spartacist Group

Saturday, January 22

at 7:00 p.m.

Roebuck Pub

108A Tottenham Court Road, W1
LONDON



Journalist Hans Knoop (left) confronts Menten in Zurich as Dutch and Swiss police look on.

today the population is strongly anti-Nazi (as well as chauvinistically anti-German). Although during World War II the Nazis regarded the Dutch as being of German stock and therefore a future part of the Third Reich, they were never able to build much support in the Netherlands. Moreover, the February 1941 announcement by Nazi occupation forces that 400 Dutch Jews had been deported to German concentration camps provoked a massive strike wave. In the munitions industry alone 18,300 workers stayed out and most major industry, shipyards, utilities and transportation were paralyzed by strikes. However, the SS broke the strike after three days with threats of death penalties and a ban on all meetings. From this point on Menten's murderous colleagues in Holland stepped up the full-scale deportation of Dutch Jews to German concentration camps. By the end of the war three out of four Jews who had inhabited Holland at the beginning of the Nazi occupation were dead (Lucien Steinberg, *La révolte des justes: Les juifs contre Hitler*).

When Menten's past was first exposed, Holland's Labor Party-dominated government coalition claimed there was no reason to reopen the case. But the public outcry, used as a parliamentary maneuver by opposition parties, forced Justice Minister van Agt to investigate the magazine's charges. Following their verification, the Amsterdam attorney general scheduled Menten's arrest for the morning of November 15.

When police arrived at his home, Menten and his wife were gone, having escaped a few hours earlier. Incredibly, no police had been ordered to watch Menten's movements nor was his passport impounded. The escape, clearly due to a tip-off from within the police, provoked a parliamentary crisis, embarrassing the government and damaging the reputation of van Agt who is expected to lead the Catholic People's Party in next year's general elections.

When, in response to the storm of criticism, the Dutch authorities issued an international arrest warrant for Menten, *Accent* editor Hans Knoop tracked him down through contacts with other journalists. When a correspondent of the German magazine

Stern informed him that the Nazi murderer was hiding in a Swiss hotel, Knoop, a photographer and a team of Dutch police flew there and finally apprehended Menten on December 6. According to *De Telegraaf* (8 December), as he was being led away by police Menten saw Knoop in the hotel lobby and snarled "Vuile rotjodd, communist!" ("Dirty rotten Jew, Communist!"). Shortly after, he took an overdose of sleeping pills and was rushed to a hospital to have his stomach pumped. It is Knoop's opinion that Menten felt the chances of an escape were better from a hospital than a jail.

Swiss law does not permit the extradition of war criminals, but a loophole was found and Menten was returned to the Netherlands on the condition that he not be extradited to a third country. Menten has yet to be officially charged with any crime and, since Menten's crimes were not committed in the Netherlands but in a part of Poland that is now in the Soviet Union, there is a real danger that the Dutch authorities may dismiss the case as being outside their jurisdiction and let him off after a sham trial when the clamor dies down and the elections are over.

Moreover the Soviet Union, which collaborated in the Dutch investigation of Menten's past, has yet to demand his extradition from the Netherlands. All opponents of Nazi barbarism must demand that this fascist butcher be extradited to the Soviet Union where he could be tried by the survivors and relatives of those he watched, laughing in his armchair, as they were machine-gunned to death.

As demonstrated by the tip-off which facilitated Menten's escape last November, there can be no confidence placed in either the will or the capacity of the Dutch government to bring Menten to justice. Moreover, that this butcher was allowed to live in peace for over three decades and re-establish himself as a respected capitalist and a political power is further proof that bourgeois democracy cannot protect society against such Nazi filth. The fascists are kept in reserve should they be needed when bourgeois-democratic methods are no longer capable of constraining the working class. Class-conscious workers demand that Menten be jailed for his crimes against the people, but it is only the victory of the international proletariat sweeping away bourgeois rule which can wipe out the fascist scum once and for all. ■

Now Available as a Pamphlet!
The Fight to Implement Busing

For Labor/Black Defense to Stop Racist Attacks and to Smash Fascist Threats

Price: 75c

Make checks payable/mail to
Spartacus Youth Publishing Co., Box 825,
Canal St Station New York, N.Y. 10013

Le Bolchéviek

publication de la
Ligue Trotskyste de France

No. 3—Novembre 1976 0,50F

pour toute correspondance: Pascal
Alessandri, B.P. 336, 75011 Paris, France



Hank deLespinaise

McBride and Sadlowski at September USWA convention in Las Vegas.

Sadlowski Sues McBride

Keep Bosses' Courts Out of the Steelworkers!

As the campaign for president of the United Steelworkers of America (USWA) enters its final month, both candidates have turned to the big guns in their respective arsenals of class-collaborationist unionism: the bourgeois courts. Amid a flurry of suits and countersuits, I.W. Abel's handpicked successor, Lloyd McBride, and steel "rebel" bureaucrat Ed Sadlowski have amply demonstrated that on the central question of safeguarding the independence of the labor movement from the capitalist state there is not a dime's worth of difference between them.

The present spate of legal maneuvers began when McBride took Sadlowski to court for allegedly violating the USWA's constitutional clause against receiving campaign funds from employers or corporations. McBride charged that Sadlowski had received funds from Bernard Soloman, a vice-president of Stop and Shop, a New England chain store which had been convicted of unfair labor practices in an NLRB case last year. On January 4 Sadlowski forces, stung by the indictment of his pretensions to militant "rank and file" unionism, filed a countersuit charging that McBride was illegally using union funds for the campaign and seeking \$5 million in damages for libel.

This appeal to the capitalist state to arbitrate internal union struggles represents not only a fundamental betrayal on the part of Sadlowski and McBride, but demonstrates once again the lack of a class alternative in this election and the need for intransigent revolutionary opposition to both candidacies. In the case of McBride, this simply continues the policies of his mentor Abel. In 1971 USWA president Abel along with AFL-CIO chieftain George Meany sat on Nixon's wage and price control board. Even in parting, Abel engaged the Labor Department to "supervise" the union elections by sending in a department task force including 50 "compliance officers," possibly including the actual tallying of the votes.

But Sadlowski is not just another candidate for union office. He has been

hailed as providing a class-struggle alternative to the Abel regime by such ostensibly revolutionary organizations as the Communist Party, Socialist Workers Party and the Revolutionary Communist Party. Behind militant-sounding jargon and the "Oilcan Eddie" image so coveted by the fake lefts lies a mainstream union bureaucrat on the make, with a consistent record of reliance on the state and bourgeois liberals to get him thre.

Sadlowski's 1974 election as director of USWA District 31 (Southworks) in Chicago was based on a court suit against the corrupt 31-year union machine leader Joe Germano and a Labor Department-run re-election. Last November, Sadlowski again went to court to seek that the court oversee the union's distribution of Sadlowski/McBride campaign literature and the coverage of the campaign in *Steel Labor* (the union magazine). In the current litigation Sadlowski has tried to use the courts to force a public disclosure of all campaign sources—i.e., subjecting the finances of the labor movement to the scrutiny of the state.

However, the treacherous bordered on the ludicrous when Sadlowski followed up his adamant denials concerning Stop and Shop funds with a press conference last Sunday where he revealed a list of his big contributors including Democrat Howard Samuels (a vice-president of Mobil Corp.), Sarah Pillsbury, Arnold Hiatt (president of the Stride-Rite Corporation, a Boston shoe manufacturer) and other bourgeois figures. Furthermore, actual conduct of the Sadlowski campaign is in the hands of Edgar James and Robert Hauptman. This pair also staged the 1972 election of that other great union "reformer" Arnold Miller of the United Mine Workers. Nor is it surprising that such anti-communist liberals as Joseph Rauh (who a decade ago was actively red-baiting the civil rights movement) and John Kenneth Galbraith play large roles in drumming up support for the Sadlowski slate, demonstrating the close connection between reliance on the courts and political links to liberal Democrats.

Sadlowski's advocacy of state regulations of such key matters as union campaign funds, disposal of union money and the editorial policy of the union press should serve as a clear warning that his victory would in no sense represent a break with the class-collaborationist business unionism of the Abels, Meany and Woodcocks.

Their capitulation to the left-talking Sadlowski demonstrates the inability of the fake-lefts to have assimilated any of the lessons of the Miller campaign. The qualitatively greater strategic importance of the USWA with respect to the UMW only heightens the crucial need for resolute opposition to Sadlowski and the need to build class-struggle caucuses to overthrow these labor lieutenants of capital. ■

Spartacist League Forum

Neither McBride Nor Sadlowski—For a Class-Struggle Opposition in Steel!

Speaker:

PAUL COLLINS
Spartacist League Central Committee

Friday, January 21
at 7:30 p.m.
5615 S. Woodlawn Avenue
CHICAGO

For more information call:
(312) 427-0003



Assembly line at Togliatti auto works

NY Public Library

How Maoists "Restore Capitalism" in the Soviet Union

Part 2 OF 2

by Joseph Seymour

Are Profits in Command in Brezhnev's Russia?

Editor's Note: In the first installment, the myth of a workers paradise in Stalin's Russia was refuted. In addition, the notion presented by Maoist economist Martin Nicolaus (recently expelled from the October League) that factory managers in the USSR were the core of a new capitalist class was debunked and the similarity of Khrushchev's regional decentralization with Chinese economic organization demonstrated.

The Kosygin reforms "restored capitalism" in the USSR, proclaims Martin Nicolaus, and he may well be the only person in the world who thinks so. (Unfortunately for his career as a Maoist, the official Peking line is that capitalism was restored under Khrushchev.) However, many commentators did regard the 1965 Soviet reforms

Review of Restoration of Capitalism in the USSR by Martin Nicolaus

associated with the economist E.G. Liberman as capitalistic because of their emphasis on enterprise "profitability." *Time* magazine ran Liberman's picture on its front cover with a story entitled "Borrowing from the Capitalists," and ten years later the U.S. Maoist Revolutionary Union (now Revolutionary Communist Party) declared that the Kosygin reforms "made the profit motive the major guiding force in the Soviet economy..." (*Red Papers* No. 7).

As Liberman points out in defending himself against charges of anti-Marxist revisionism, ever since 1921 Soviet enterprises have been expected to make "profits," or at least avoid losses. This is true. However, the overriding goal of traditional Soviet planning was to over-fulfill the output target at the expense of all other considerations, including other plan indices. The purpose of the 1965 reforms was to eliminate the waste of resources caused by pervasive and many-sided managerial parasitism.

Since both monetary income and promotion to a higher position depended on over-fulfilling the output plan, managers usually understated enterprise productive capacity so as to be assigned an easy target. Moreover, a

savvy plant executive would not over-fulfill the plan by too much, since then he would be given a much higher output goal for the following year. In his famous 1962 article, "Plan, Profits, Bonuses," Liberman addresses this problem:

"How can the enterprises be entrusted with the job of working out plans when at present all their draft targets are usually much lower than their actual capacities?"

"This can be done if the enterprises have a maximum interest, both material and moral, in making full use of their reserves..."

—reproduced in Myron E. Sharpe, ed., *Planning, Profit and Incentives in the USSR*, Vol. I (1966)

Of course, the planning authorities always knew that enterprise managers systematically understated capacity, and attempted to correct for this. Plant executives and Gosplan (plan organization) authorities played a cat-and-mouse game with one another, and the resulting output targets bore only a rough relation to actual production capacity.

Since managers were rewarded for output regardless of the usability of or demand for their products, there was a tendency to sacrifice quality and assortment of goods in order to maximize output. Targets are set in physical units (e.g., silverware in kilograms, cloth in square meters) so that managers chose items maximizing this index even if the products had little use value. In a famous cartoon from the Russian humor magazine *Krokodil*, the annual output of the nail factory (measured by weight) is shown as one mammoth nail. Another example is the notorious fragility of plate glass in the USSR: since plan targets are set in square meters, managers maximize output by producing over-thin glass. In his September 1965 speech introducing the new system, Kosygin bluntly stated the problem:

"Experience indicates that the index of volume of gross output does not stimulate the enterprise to produce goods which are really needed by the national economy and the public, and in many cases the index tends to limit any improvement in the assortment of goods and their quality. Not infrequently our enterprises produce low-quality goods which the consumer does not

want and which therefore remain unsold."

—"On Improving Industrial Management..." in Sharpe, *op. cit.*

Another problem with the traditional system was that output was measured by total (gross) value, not that added by the enterprise. So managers naturally tended to use the most expensive inputs which thereby maximized the value of "their" output. And since managers had little incentive to minimize cost, hoarding labor and building up huge inventories of supplies was the rule. In particular, there was no material incentive to



E.G. Liberman

economize on plant and equipment, because investment was financed by a non-repayable budget grant. Since it was "free," managers consistently overstated their need for new equipment.

It is clear that what we have described is nothing but *bureaucratic parasitism* at the enterprise level. A plant manager who understates actual enterprise capacity in order to receive an easy plan, or one who produces low-quality goods so as to more easily meet output goals, knows he is behaving in an anti-social manner. Some managers may be personally honest but believe they will be victimized in income and career advancement if they don't over-fulfill the output plan. Moreover, all spokesmen for the Soviet bureaucracy regard the kind of managerial dishonesty depicted above as inherent in the system.

Libermanism is a fruitless effort to overcome managerial parasitism

through more sophisticated plan indices. But no planning techniques, however sophisticated, can prevent dishonest managers from subverting the planners' intent and squandering resources. As we shall see, the 1965 reforms perpetuated some of the old problems while generating new forms of managerial dishonesty and waste of resources.

The elimination of bureaucratic parasitism at the base of the economy as well as at the top is impossible without thoroughgoing soviet democracy, which in turn requires revolutionary action by the working class to topple the Stalinist bureaucracy. Two requirements, in particular, are necessary to ensure conscientious management: selection of managers with demonstrated socialist consciousness and workers control of production.

Following the Bolshevik Revolution and during the 1920's, Soviet economic management had to rely on bourgeois experts drawing high salaries. Lenin's Bolsheviks regarded this as a necessary evil, only partly offset by workers control. A revolutionary workers government coming to power in the advanced capitalist countries through social revolution or in the USSR and East Europe through political revolution would not face the same situation today. Managers would receive straight salaries commensurate with the wages of skilled workers, and a central task of the factory committees would be ensuring against managerial wastage of resources. Under the close scrutiny of the workers in the enterprise, incorrigibly incompetent, abusive or dishonest managers would simply be removed.

Objective Pressures for Economic Reform

Managerial parasitism and the consequent squandering of resources at the enterprise level have long characterized Stalinist bureaucratic planning. Why then did pressure for reform build up in the early 1960's, culminating in the action of the incoming Brezhnev-Kosygin regime?

During the last years of the Khrushchev period a number of objective factors caused the bureaucracy to become more concerned about micro-economic inefficiency. A rising standard of living in the late 1950's made



Computer room at Moscow headquarters of the State Planning Committee

Lev Nisnevich

consumers more selective and unwilling to purchase shoddy or otherwise undesirable merchandise. Also, in Stalin's day a manager who played too fast and loose with the plan and his superiors could get into very hot water indeed. Thus the post-1956 relaxation of totalitarian state terror may have allowed greater managerial dishonesty and violation of planning instructions.

However, the basic motives for the 1965 reforms reflected profound changes in the Soviet economy. The later Khrushchev years (1958-64) saw a marked fall in economic growth, particularly in productivity increase per unit of new investment. In part this worsened economic performance reflected

increasingly harmful to the interests of the Soviet Stalinist regime.

The 1965 Kosygin reforms had four major elements. First, Khrushchev's regionalism was done away with and the economy was recentralized. Also, the key indices for measuring enterprise performance and managerial success were changed, the method of financing and determining investment at the enterprise level was altered, and the formula for setting wholesale prices was changed.

A significant effect of the 1965 measures which is often overlooked was the re-establishment of the traditional ministerial system. In one important respect the post-1965 economic structure was more centralized than it had been under Stalin, when industrial ministries tended toward autarky and "empire-building." To avoid wasteful duplication of intermediate products, the Kosygin reforms established a State Committee on Material-Technical Supply (Gossnab) as the centralized organ for allocating these goods.

It is typical of the dishonesty running through Nicolaus' book that he doesn't even mention the existence of Gossnab, although the Kosygin reforms are central to his thesis. The reason for this silence is not hard to discern: the very existence of Gossnab refutes his contention that after 1965 there was a market for producer goods created by enterprise competition. In the late 1960's this administrative organ allocated 16,000 intermediate products, and by 1971 it accounted for two-thirds of all inter-enterprise transactions (cited in *Soviet Studies*, July 1972). But according to Nicolaus the 1965 reforms ended centralized control over the enterprises, which thereafter operated on the basis of unrestrained profit maximization:

"Its essence...consists in giving the central planners the task of keeping the economy as a whole in balance while each particular unit of the economy runs riot in pursuit of its maximum profit."

This is a blatant falsification.

"Profit" in the Soviet Economy?

Since the early 1930's, Soviet enterprises have had a "profit" plan as well as an output plan and other indices. Basing herself on this, more than 30 years ago the anarcho-syndicalist Raya Dunayevskaya contended that since Soviet enterprises made "profits," the economy was capitalist (see her "A New Revision of Marxian Economics," *American Economic Review*, September 1944). However, in actuality enterprise "profit" amounts to a tax levied at the point of production, part of which is then granted to the enterprises subject to strict guidelines and instructions for its allocation.

From being a secondary and often neglected target under Stalin and Khrushchev, the profit plan was made the key index governing managerial bonuses in the Kosygin reforms. (To eliminate unusable merchandise, enter-

prises were credited only for output actually sold.) However, there is still an output plan, measured in physical units, which must be fulfilled. A manager who does not fulfill the output plan will not receive a bonus (regardless of profit), and he may also be administratively disciplined as a state functionary!

The standard Soviet work on current economic policy is *Soviet Economic Reform: Progress and Problems* (1972), which describes the relation of enterprise production to the planning authorities as follows:

"...guiding themselves by the prices set from above, production costs and the possibilities for the sale of the finished output, enterprises independently decide on the concrete, detailed assortment of output. But to reduce the probability of mistakes which separate enterprises might make, they are given administratively, as an initial basis, an assignment as regards the nomenclature [product-mix] of major output." [our emphasis]

This official description is confirmed by a leading British bourgeois expert on the Soviet economy:

"Managerial bonuses have simply redirected effort from output to profit—but only when output has exceeded the plan targets; below that level, profit counts for little." [our emphasis]

—Peter Wiles, "Recent Data on Soviet Income Distribution," *Survey*, Summer 1975

In contrast to capitalist firms, Soviet enterprises do not seek to maximize



Leonid Brezhnev

Der Spiegel

profit levels or the rate of return on invested capital. Managers are supposed to over-fulfill the output plan while maximizing the difference of realized profit over planned profit. As a result, the "reformed" system perpetuates a central weakness of the old system in a different form: instead of understating their production capacity to get an easy plan, managers now understate their ability to generate profit. So higher authorities still must intervene to offset the dishonesty of the managers.

E.G. Liberman, who of all people should know the effect of the 1965 measures, expresses disappointment in the Kosygin reforms:

"Basic shortcomings are also manifested in the striving of ministries to impose

higher sales volume on the enterprises. This is an expression of uncertainty that, independently, the enterprises will sufficiently utilize their production capacities and disclose reserves.... "The question of what the 'product-mix' of most important items' is must be clarified. At present, its definition is chiefly left to the ministries. But the ministries tend to expand rather than restrict this product-mix, and this expresses a tendency to retain the old methods—to provide a greater degree of regulation...."

—E. G. Liberman, *Economic Methods and the Effectiveness of Production* (1971)

Since Liberman's book was written, the tendency has been to restrict enterprise autonomy even more.

The continuity of the post-1965 system with traditional Soviet planning is strongly emphasized by Alec Nove, one of the foremost bourgeois experts in this field. Under a sub-head entitled "The reform that never was," Nove writes:

"The power to allocate resources and to take production decisions remains with the central authorities, and is shaped between the revived industrial ministries, Gosplan and Gossnab, under the general supervision of the higher party organs.... current doctrine regards an increase in profits due to a change in the product mix or in inputs as somehow illegitimate.... Yet this means that both the product mix and the inputs of the enterprise are laid down in a plan initiated or approved at the ministerial or *glavk* [sub-ministerial] level. It logically follows that the supply plans made in one or another of the central bodies cover the major part of industrial output, and that both its production and its delivery to designated customers must form part of obligatory plan-orders from above. This is the essence of the old system. It survives today." [our emphasis]

—"Economic Reforms in the USSR and Hungary, a Study in Contrasts," in Alec Nove and D. M. Nutt, eds., *Socialist Economics* (1972)

Are the Means of Production Commodities in the USSR?

According to Nicolaus, the 1965 measures transformed the means of production into marketable commodities:

"The 1965 measures, in sum, wiped out the legal and financial barriers that had kept the emerging market in the means of production underground during the Khrushchev years. The exchange of the means of production as commodities...became respectable, universal and amply supplied with liquidity."

Another gross falsification! One might accuse Nicolaus of conscious deceit, except this would assume he actually knows something about the Soviet economy. Far from the means of production having become commodities, as we shall show all inputs purchased by the enterprises must be approved in the supply plan; "decentralized investment" by enterprises is a small share of total expenditure on plant and equipment; and enterprise funds

continued on page 8



Alexei Kosygin

Khrushchev's regional decentralization, undertaken purely to strengthen his power base within the party apparatus. More importantly, the USSR was beginning to experience a labor shortage which put an end to the traditional Stalinist pattern of rapid industrialization.

Stalin-era economic development was extensive, with almost all investment expended on new factories drawing upon seemingly unlimited labor supplies from the countryside. Around 1960, however, the most far-sighted elements in the bureaucracy realized that continued economic growth must become intensive, concentrating on modernizing existing productive units and raising their labor productivity. Under these circumstances, traditional managerial parasitism and conservatism had become a serious obstacle to further economic growth.

Libermanism was not the answer to supposedly inherent inefficiencies in centralized planning, as some bourgeois commentators claimed; and it certainly was not capitalist restoration. Rather it was a weak, contradictory attempt at self-reform of certain types of bureaucratic parasitism which had become

Are Profits in Command in Brezhnev's Russia?

(continued from page 7)

cannot be expended outside the inherently narrow basis of the technical production unit.

Just as output targets are set from above, so supplies are allocated through a detailed annual plan. Unlike their Yugoslav, Hungarian and Chinese counterparts, Soviet enterprises cannot acquire supplies through a more or less free market. Almost all major inputs are allocated directly by Gosplan or through long-term contracts between the producing and consuming enterprises negotiated through Gosplan. Supplies neither go to the highest bidder nor are they distributed on a first-come, first-served basis. An enterprise which is willing to pay three times the official price for, say, a truck might not be able to purchase one, while a far less profitable firm will be allocated a vehicle according to the plan.

As a British expert on the Soviet economy put it:

"The material inputs which enterprises need for production are not simply purchased from producers as they would be in a free market, but are allocated to consumer enterprises by the state supply organs. In effect this is a rationing system for producer goods."

Michael Ellman, *Planning Problems in the USSR* (1973)

To drive this point home, Ellman cites an incident reported in the Soviet press in 1969. The deputy director of a state farm purchased wood (a centrally allocated item) from a quarry which had chopped down some trees in the course of its operations. As a result, the managements of both the state farm and the quarry were prosecuted and convicted for an economic crime!

In debunking Nicolaus' fraudulent contention that relations between Soviet enterprises are governed by the market, we are not endorsing traditional Stalinist bureaucratic planning methods. The detailed rationing of intermediate goods a year in advance possesses neither the virtues of socialist principle nor of economic rationality. The supply plan, involving hundreds of thousands of transactions, is always and necessarily inconsistent, resulting in untold shortages and bottlenecks. Soviet managers regularly resort to hoarding, blackmarketeering and corruption to

procure their "planned" supplies. Rational socialist planning should involve a centralized wholesale market where enterprises can purchase inputs at will. This would provide the necessary flexibility for the production process while avoiding the inefficiencies and dangers of atomized competition between enterprises.

From the standpoint of the enterprise, the most significant change caused by the 1965 reforms was in the financing of investment. Under the traditional system all new plant and equipment was financed by a non-repayable grant from the government budget. After the reforms such investment was largely financed through retained enterprise profit. In 1967 wholesale prices were revised upward in order to increase enterprise profits. And while in 1966 enterprises retained 26 percent of their profits, by 1969 this had risen to 40 percent (*Soviet Economic Reform...*).

Nicolaus naturally points to the significant increase in retained enterprise profits as key proof of "capitalist restoration":

"They [enterprise directors] became not only dictators of the production process...but also managers of important sums of money, who have the eagle eye of investors to succeed."

Any Soviet enterprise manager would find this statement utter nonsense.

According to Nicolaus' own figures, in 1969-70 only about 25 percent of enterprise investment was decentralized—i.e., was outside the annual plan. Decentralized investment means that managers do not require approval from higher bodies to spend enterprise funds. However, as we have seen, producer goods are not available in a market, but are rationed by the central supply agency. Thus an enterprise still requires approval from the Gosplan to actually implement "decentralized investment."

So the 1965 measures produced a contradiction: demand was partially decentralized while the allocation of producer goods remained centralized. The result of this contradiction is growing balances in the bank accounts of Soviet enterprises, since they cannot always use "their" "profits" to purchase actual means of production.

Nicolaus is aware of this fact but attributes it to the lack of profitable investment opportunities:

"...some enterprises cannot profitably place all 'their' funds, but accumulate what is called a 'free profit remainder,' in which case they are entitled to offer loans to Gosbank...for a certain interest fixed by the government."

Any capitalist firm in the U.S., West Europe or Japan which had excess liquidity would certainly not keep its money-capital in a bank, drawing minimal interest. It would branch out, build new factories, buy out other firms, purchase stocks and bonds, lend directly at the highest available interest and generally seek to maximize the return on its capital. Why don't the purported "capitalists" in the Soviet Union act in this way? Because they can't—because the means of production are not private property, commodities to be purchased in the market. Therefore, enterprise funds are not money-capital, which Marx termed "the universal means of purchase." To put it another way, because the Soviet Union is not capitalist.

Growing Unemployment in Brezhnev's Russia?

Along with his absurd claim that managers in Stalin's time "lacked the whip hand" over the workers, Nicolaus' contention that unemployment has been restored in the USSR since 1965 is the most obvious and incredible of his endless falsifications. He writes:

"The unemployed are made to pay materially for the official hypocrisy. An even more bitter aspect of their situation is that all the layoffs undertaken by the enterprise directors for economic reasons are strictly against Soviet law,

as embodied in the Constitution of 1936, the Stalin Constitution."

Before dealing with unemployment in present-day Russia, we have once more to debunk the myth of Stalin's "workers paradise." As we have seen, during the 1930's there were widespread obligatory dismissals for breaches of work discipline, and mass disguised unemployment existed on the collective farms. Despite the "right to work" in the Stalin constitution, a Soviet employee never had a legal right to his job.

Because the planning system encouraged managers to hoard labor, and because economic (as distinct from disciplinary) dismissals were generally regarded as anti-socialist, layoffs were and continue to be rare. But as to legal managerial rights, the 1970 Principles of Labor Legislation perpetuate Stalin's precedent. Managers are obliged to seek comparable employment for those they intend to lay off. But if the trade union agrees that management has made a honest, though fruitless, effort in this regard, any Soviet worker can be dismissed with two weeks severance pay.

Anyone with the slightest knowledge of Soviet society today knows that there is an acute labor shortage, which greatly worries the bureaucracy. In 1960, 78 percent of the working-age population was employed; by 1965 this proportion had jumped to 87 percent, and by 1970 it had increased to 91 percent (V. Kostakov, translated in *Problems of Economics*, November 1974). By way of comparison, in the United States only 61.8 percent (1975 figures) of the non-institutional population, age 16 and over, is employed (*Monthly Labor Review*, November 1976).

The problems which the extremely high level of labor force participation in the USSR poses for the bureaucracy have been clearly stated by the Soviet manpower expert E. Manevich:

"The economic consequences of the manpower shortage are very great: in a number of cases there arise serious difficulties in supplying personnel to newly activated enterprises; it is difficult to secure the uninterrupted operation of enterprises in two shifts...; manpower turnover rises; the existence of a large number of vacancies hinders the collectives in their struggle to strengthen labor discipline and is one of the reasons for maintaining clearly superfluous workers and employees, which in turn aggravates the general manpower shortage in the nation."

—"Ways of Improving the Utilization of Manpower," translated in *Problems of Economics*, June 1974

Nicolaus can nonetheless find in Soviet economic literature references to people who are not employed and are looking for work. As Manevich points out, labor shortage encourages high labor turnover. Since strikes and other forms of collective class struggle are suppressed by state terror, Soviet workers seek to improve their circumstances through individual initiative. Increasingly, workers take advantage of the tight labor market and change jobs frequently. In a formal, statistical sense this means more unemployed at any given time.

We are obliged to explain to Dr. Nicolaus that there is a difference between being the victim of a mass layoff and quitting one's job in order to find a better one. If the academic economist doesn't understand this difference, every worker in the world does. Furthermore, the difference between genuine labor turnover and unemployment can be measured statistically. The average period between jobs commonly given in Soviet literature is about three weeks. At present in the U.S., the average duration of unemployment is about 15.5 weeks (*Monthly Labor Review*, November 1976).

Under capitalism, mass unemployment is not primarily caused by technological progress, by machines replacing men. Rather, the appearance of masses of jobless workers results from a contraction of production—recessions, depressions, stagnation. Even a charla-

CP Spokesman in ILWU Retires

Requiem for a Class Collaborator

SAN FRANCISCO—Archie Brown, prominent Communist Party (CP) trade-union supporter and Bay Area longshoreman for about 40 years, retired last month. Given a few minutes at the December meeting of International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) Local 10, Brown rambled on about younger workers picking up the banner and similar platitudes. He carefully steered clear of any comment on the present abysmal state of the union except for remarking vaguely, "we're in a lot of trouble."

A long-time militant in this hard-hit industry should have no difficulty picking out issues of burning interest to the ILWU membership. Conditions for longshoremen have deteriorated badly over the last decade and a half: available jobs have been slashed by more than 50 percent through disastrous "mechanization and modernization" (M&M) contracts; lower seniority "B" men are being driven out of the union; gang sizes and "guaranteed pay" are being cut; the union hiring hall has been weakened by the introduction of "steady men," and the very existence of the ILWU is threatened by rumored merger deals with the Teamsters.

However, in order to address these issues, a fighter for class-struggle unionism would have to come up against ILWU president Harry Bridges. This Archie Brown was unwilling to do, so instead he stuck to nostalgic references to the "good old days." Appropriately enough, Bridges was the first person to speak after Brown, and he had nothing but praise for his loyal Stalinist bootlicker.

For years the Communist Party has been the chief propagator of the myth that Harry Bridges is a militant defender of the working class. As the ILWU president and S.F. port commissioner has become increasingly overt in tossing overboard vital union gains in exchange for favors from Democratic Party politicians like former San Francisco mayor Joe Alioto, even the CP has become embarrassed by Bridges' actions. But never have the Stalinists

gotten up the nerve to openly oppose the conniving, class-collaborationist longshore chief.

Archie Brown became a well-known West Coast political activist at an early age, running for California state treasurer on the CP ticket in 1934. In 1942 he ran for U.S. Congress from San Francisco. At that time the Communist Party—along with Bridges—was vigorously supporting FDR and the Ameri-



Archie Brown

can bourgeoisie in the imperialist World War II. Brown vociferously supported Bridges' wartime no-strike pledge. In Local 10, the 16 September 1942 "Longshoremen's Bulletin" (edited by a Stalinist hack) warned that if dock workers didn't accept speed-up, "it wouldn't be long until we'd be eating sauerkraut with chopsticks..." (quoted in "West Coast Longshoremen and the 'Bridges Plan,'" *Fourth International*, December 1942).

After the war the CP/Bridges bloc continued and Brown argued for extending the no-strike pledge. The ILWU president had appetites to integrate himself into the increasingly anti-Communist American labor bureaucracy, but this was made impossible by the repugnance toward red-baiting felt by rank-and-file longshoremen as well as the bourgeoisie's hostility toward him. (Australian-born Bridges was the intended victim of several deportation

continued on page 10

tan like Nicolaus who invents growing unemployment in Brezhnev's Russia cannot invent cyclical contractions in the Soviet economy. Since 1956 (as well as before then), industrial production in the USSR has increased every single year, though at greatly uneven rates.

Thus the Maoists and other believers in "Soviet capitalism" present us with a capitalism free of cyclical fluctuations—a condition quite contrary to Marx's understanding of the capitalist system. The notion that the Soviet Union is capitalist necessarily leads to a revision of the Marxist analysis of actual capitalist societies. And, in fact, the Maoists, anarcho-syndicalists and social-democratic "Third Campers" tend to believe that present-day "state-monopoly capitalism" in the West can, in general, suppress sharp economic contractions and cyclical crises.

Until recently, the "Russia is capitalist" crowd would argue that Soviet economic performance over the past decade or so was no better than some "traditional" capitalist countries like Japan or France. In 1974 this impressionistic argument blew up in their faces. Between mid-1974 and mid-1975, industrial production in the advanced capitalist world dropped 19.5 percent. The 1974-75 depression hit every major capitalist country with drops in production ranging from 13.5 percent in Britain to 33 percent in Japan (OECD, *Economic Outlook*, December 1975 and July 1976). But in 1974-75 industrial production in the USSR actually increased by 18 percent (United Nations, *Statistical Yearbook* 1975).

A serious and honest Marxist confronting these empirical facts could reach only one of two conclusions: either the USSR is not capitalist, or it is a new form of capitalism which has overcome cyclical contractions (which Marx considered necessary for the capitalist mode of production).

The latter, revisionist conclusion directly negates the fundamental Leninist position that this is the epoch of capitalist reaction and decay. The Marxist revolutionary program is not based on moral repugnance against social oppression, class exploitation and inequality; it is based on the objective condition that capitalism arrests the development of productive forces and must be superseded by a superior economic system. Thus if there exists today a capitalist system which insures the rapid and steady growth of productive forces, this calls into question the necessity and progressive character of proletarian revolution and working-class rule.

What Would Capitalist Restoration Look Like?

Nicolaus' empirical description of the Soviet economy is a mass of fabrications from beginning to end. However, the "capitalistic" features which he falsely attributes to "social-imperialist" Russia—enterprises determining output on the basis of profit maximization, a market for producer goods, widespread layoffs—do exist to some extent in other bureaucratically ruled workers states, notably Yugoslavia, Hungary and China.

Despite "radical" Maoist ideology the Chinese economy is characterized by significantly greater market orientation and enterprise autonomy than prevails in the Soviet Union. (We have already pointed out the substantial regional decentralization of the Chinese economy, another source for inegalitarianism.) The liberal American economist Lloyd G. Reynolds, who visited China in 1973, observed:

"In deciding what varieties of, say, watches or carpets to produce, the factory relies on the judgment of the sales organization that distributes its product 'Market guidance' in this sense seems more prominent in Chinese planning than in traditional Soviet planning."

—"China's Economy: A View from the Grass Roots," *Chinese Economic Studies*, Spring 1975

Reynolds' observation about the market orientation of Chinese enterprises is confirmed by a report in the *U.S.-China Business Review* (May-June 1976) concerning a factory producing firecrackers for export:

"Workers in the factory receive an average monthly wage of 72 yuan, which is a high income for a rural area. Their salaries are at least partially the result of the method used to set firecracker prices. In general, various commodities receive prices either through a unilateral assignment or through negotiations between the Foreign Trade Bureau and a particular enterprise.... Firecrackers are priced using the negotiation process. Because their price has been rising in the international market, the chance for negotiation within China has led to higher prices there too, and a resultant higher income for the firecracker factory employees." [our emphasis]

In Brezhnev's Russia one will not find anything so irrationally capitalistic and inegalitarian as the wages of a particular group of workers being influenced by their product's price fluctuations in the world market.

In any case, whether a Soviet, Hungarian or Chinese manager orders more cups produced because it is more profitable or if he can purchase a new kiln on his own initiative has no bearing on whether the economy is capitalist. Such practices merely indicate the degree of centralization within a collectivized economy.

What distinguishes the capitalist mode of production is that the means of production are commodities, a phenomenon having its highest expression in the stock market. While there is a limited market in producer goods in various of the degenerated/deformed workers states, in none of them are the basic units of production—the enterprises—commodities. Even in Yugoslavia between 1965 and 1971 (the period of maximum enterprise autonomy and market relations) enterprises themselves could not be bought and sold. Investment by one Yugoslav enterprise in another was treated like a loan that had to be fully repaid over time.

The non-commodity character of Soviet and East European enterprises is not a mere juridical principle which could be changed overnight but integral to collectivized property. Enterprises, however autonomous their operations, are not owned by their managers but are sub-units of a single collective. Commodities can only be exchanged between different, independent owners. That is why Marx wrote, "Capitalists and can only exist as many capitals" (*Grundrisse*, Notebook IV).

The prerogatives and very existence of enterprises in the deformed workers states are decided by governmental authorities. In 1973 the Brezhnev/Kosygin regime downgraded the enterprise (usually corresponding to the technical production unit) and replaced it with the association (*obydineniye*) as the basic unit of management and accountability. In 1971 the Tito regime in Yugoslavia sharply curtailed enterprise autonomy and reversed the trend toward greater market orientation. This "conservative" turn refuted those impressionistic leftists like Paul Sweezy who saw in Yugoslavia a gradual, organic and

peaceful return to capitalism.

But to assert that neither in the Soviet Union nor in any of the bureaucratically deformed workers states that have emerged since World War II has capitalism been restored is not to argue that such a development is impossible. The bureaucracy's attempts to conciliate imperialism enshrine capitalist-restorationist forces at home and abroad, and despite tremendous industrial development over several decades, the Soviet and East European economies are still far behind the most advanced capitalist societies.

Capitalist restoration in the Sino-Soviet states is possible through an essentially internal process and not only through imperialist reconquest from without. However, capitalist restoration cannot occur either through gradual evolution or a mere reshuffling of personnel at the top; it requires a violent counterrevolution.

Objective conditions encouraging the growth of bourgeois-restorationist forces were most closely approximated in Yugoslavia during 1965-71. These included the proliferation of property-owning petty capitalists (well-to-do farmers, owners of small workshops exploiting wage labor, middlemen/usurers operating with money-capital); the growing activity of foreign capital in the economic life of the country; the elimination of the state monopoly of foreign trade, allowing the world market to have maximum impact on the economy; the atrophy of centralized planning with enterprise relations largely governed by market forces; and the separation of managers from the state bureaucracy. Moreover, this economic "liberalization" was closely linked to an upsurge in Croatian nationalism, expressed not only in student protests and strivings for greater autonomy among party leaders but also in stepped-up activity by fascist Ustashi groups.

Under such objective conditions, a domestic capitalist-restorationist movement could well emerge. But this would not be a conspiracy striving for a palace coup in the manner of the Maoist fiction of a "Khrushchev restoration." It would be a visible, aggressive movement challenging the regime and polarizing society. Such a movement would require an ideology and organization capable of enlisting masses of adherents, such as the Catholic Church in Poland.

The emergence of powerful capitalist-restorationist forces would produce a "conservative" reflex among Stalinist officials anxious to preserve their social position, and also give birth to a directly counterrevolutionary wing of the bureaucracy (what Trotsky called the "Butenko faction"). However, the workers would instinctively move to defend their interests from the growing threat of reaction. Capitalist restoration could triumph only through a civil war in which the class-conscious elements of the proletariat were annihilated in the course of their bitter struggle to defend collectivized property as the economic basis for the transition to socialism.

Defend the Gains of October Through Political Revolution!

The Mao-Stalinists go from hailing the supposed establishment of socialism in the USSR with the 1936 constitution to discovering a peaceful counterrevolution secretly carried out by Stalin's heirs. Not only did such a momentous event go unnoticed at the time, but Peking has never published an analysis of how or why this occurred and Maoists in the West cannot even agree on the timing. Moreover, if capitalism can be restored by a palace coup, then presumably socialism can be reconstituted in the same manner; thereupon another Khrushchev could appear on the scene, and so on indefinitely, producing a cycle that has more to do with the Buddhist "wheel of life" than with Marxism.

As against this idealist/conspiratorial view of history, Trotsky provided a materialist analysis of the degeneration of the Russian revolution under Stalinism. "The October revolution has been betrayed by the ruling stratum," he wrote in 1936, "but not yet overthrown." He briefly summarized the nature of the regime in an analysis that remains valid today:

"The Soviet Union is a contradictory society halfway between capitalism and socialism, in which: (a) the productive forces are still far from adequate to give the state property a socialist character; (b) the tendency toward primitive accumulation created by wani breaks out through innumerable pores of the planned economy; (c) norms of distribution preserving a bourgeois character lie at the basis of a new differentiation of society; (d) the economic growth, while slowly bettering the situation of the toilers, promotes a swift formation of privileged strata; (e) exploiting the social antagonisms, a bureaucracy has converted itself into an uncontrolled caste alien to socialism; (f) the social revolution, betrayed by the ruling party, still exists in property relations and in the consciousness of the toiling masses; (g) a further development of the accumulating contradictions can as well lead to socialism as back to capitalism; (h) on the road to capitalism the counterrevolution would have to break the resistance of the workers; (i) on the road to socialism the workers would have to overthrow the bureaucracy. In the last analysis, the question will be decided by a struggle of living social forces, both on the national and the world arena."

—*The Revolution Betrayed*

Not only is the Maoist illusion of a restoration of capitalism in the USSR wrong and profoundly anti-Marxist, but it serves to justify an increasingly open counterrevolutionary alliance of the Peking bureaucracy with U.S. imperialism against the Soviet Union. In contrast, as the Russian Left Oppositionists were taken from arctic concentration camps to be shot in 1938-39 they again vowed their unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against imperialist attack. Their struggle was not one of bureaucratic intriguing in the interests of one clique against another, but rather to defend and extend the world-historic gains of the October Revolution by ousting the parasitic usurpers. It is because the Trotskyists know how to defend past conquests of the workers that the Russian Left Opposition will arise again from the ashes, while there never has been and never will be a significant Maoist opposition in the USSR. ■

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 (213) 385-1962
Box 26474
Houston, TX 77207

LOS ANGELES (213) 385-1962
Box 26282, Edendale Station
Los Angeles, CA 90026

MAISON
c/o SYL, Box 3334
Madison, WI 53704

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

PHILADELPHIA
P.O. Box 13138
Philadelphia, PA 19101

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 7158, Station A
Toronto, Ontario

VANCOUVER (604) 291-8993
Box 26, Station A
Vancouver, B.C.

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, 2nd floor
Chicago, Illinois
Phone 427-0003

NEW YORK

Monday-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

South Africa...

(continued from page 1)

economy would actually harm the cause of the oppressed non-white workers.

While calling for "the strongest measures" and specifying a labor boycott ("hot cargoing" or "blacking") of South African goods, the ICFTU executive board has given no indication that it will really mobilize its affiliates or wage a political struggle for implementation of the call. In fact, in a letter announcing the campaign (Circular No. 56, 30 November 1976), ICFTU general secretary Otto Kersten specifically referred to "token industrial action."

Instead of a tokenistic boycott, the world's trade unions should apply industrial action against those multinational corporations operating in South Africa to force them to recognize the black unions. The unions of British Leyland, which has plants in South Africa, have raised such a demand, though the corporation has resisted to date.

ICFTU's half-heartedness is hardly surprising for pro-capitalist reformists who are well aware that militant industrial action is political dynamite. The use of class-struggle tactics to aid embattled workers in other countries sets a dangerous precedent for the tame, social-patriotic union leaderships. Bureaucrats of the ilk of Britain's Len Murray and Jack Jones, who participated in the ICFTU meeting in November, will hardly lead serious actions to defend South African workers while they are busily betraying their own members with a "social contract" designed to bail out the sinking British bourgeoisie.

Near East...

(continued from page 4)

which subsidizes the economies of both countries, verbal animosity has been replaced with verbal pledges of "unity."

Of course Egypt and Syria along with Libya are already part of a "Federation of Arab Republics" formed in 1971. However, Libyan-Egyptian verbal animosity has almost been transcended by an actual declaration of war, most recently over a Libyan-backed coup attempt against the Egyptian-backed Sudanese government. The defunct "federation" still has a federal cabinet and parliament and even a phony ceremonial capital at Heliopolis, a suburb of Cairo.

The new Egyptian-Syrian "unity" is more reminiscent of this fake "federation" than their last unity move, the ill-fated United Arab Republic, which lasted from 1958 to 1961. While every Arab ruler, whether Arabian sheik or bonapartist colonel, pays lip service to pan-Arab unity, they all jealously defend their borders, the product of imperialist balkanization, and seek "unity" only through territorial aggrandizement against their neighbors.

The real motivation behind the current Egyptian-Syrian "united political leadership" is the desire to avoid another "Sinai"—that is, to prevent a separate deal with U.S. imperialism. So instead they are proposing a common deal with U.S. imperialism in which a West Bank/Gaza Strip Palestinian mini-state would be jointly supervised by Jordan and Egypt—i.e., a return to the pre-1967 situation. Up to now both the U.S. and Israel have refused to have the PLO at the Geneva Conference because Arafat refuses to recognize Israel. Clearly what Syria and Egypt have united on, together with Jordan and Lebanon, is the subordination of the "sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people" to a joint Arab delegation of the so-called "confrontation states" (the Arab states which horder Israel and whose main confrontation has historically been with Palesti-

Class Collaborator...

(continued from page 8)

attempts.) The ILWU was expelled from the CIO but refused to implement a red purge.

The 26 November 1961 *People's World* (West Coast CP weekly) praised Brown for his participation in a court suit fought on his behalf by the ILWU which successfully challenged the constitutionality of the section of the Landrum-Griffin Act prohibiting communists from being elected union leaders. This was an important victory, but no one should be deceived that Archie Brown defends workers democracy for anyone but himself and his reformist cronies.

In 1949, at the same time that CP leaders were being hounded to jail under the Smith Act, the Stalinists refused to defend James Kutcher, a legless veteran

Such protest campaigns are intended as inexpensive gestures which serve primarily to bolster the "leftist" credentials of their social-democratic initiators. Feeling little compulsion to project a left face, the American AFL-CIO refused to lend even paper support. In a typical display of naked anti-communism, reactionary AFL-CIO head George Meany rejected the ICFTU call for labor protest, accusing it of having a "double standard" and making an indirect but transparent call for boycott of the Soviet Union (*AFL-CIO News*, 18 December).

To turn such a protest into a

nian liberation, in collaboration with Zionism). Further, by accepting the mini-state "solution" the PLO will implicitly accept the sovereignty of Israel's pre-1967 borders.

The PLO and Arab rulers know full well that the West Bank and Gaza Strip—poor land that occupies a mere 18 percent of the old British mandate of Palestine—can neither provide the basis for a modern state nor the haven for 3.5 million Palestinians. But the Arab rulers have no intention of permitting the Palestinian people to have genuine political independence of any sort. After all, from 1948 to 1967 the West Bank and Gaza Strip were under the control of Jordan and Egypt respectively and the Palestinians had hardly more rights then under their Arab oppressors than they do today under their Israeli rulers.

For a Socialist Federation of the Near East

We demand that Israel get out of the Arab territories. But the Palestinian people cannot realize their national liberation only in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The fate of Palestinian liberation is intimately intertwined with the revolutionary overthrow of the reactionary regimes in Amman, Damascus and Beirut, as the Jordanian Black September and the Lebanese civil war have so graphically demonstrated. The Israeli state and Zionism must be destroyed, but through an alliance of the oppressed Arab masses and the Israeli proletariat, which in November shook the Rabin government with the most militant strike wave in Israel's history.

Subjected to a 37.5 percent inflation rate, the highest taxes in the world and a rapidly falling standard of living, the Israeli proletariat can be broken from its garrison mentality by an Arab-Hebrew revolutionary workers party which while firmly fighting for the Palestinian right to complete self-determination does not deny the right to self-determination of the Hebrew people. Such a party must necessarily be committed to the perspective of international proletarian revolution embodied in a reformed Fourth International. ■

who had been witchhunted out of his government job because he was a member of the then-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party (SWP). At a Local 10 meeting in July of that year Brown suffered a tremendous drubbing when a motion defending Kutcher passed by a vote of 2,800 to 12, despite a concerted effort by Stalinists present to malign and slander Trotskyists as "agents of the bosses."

Thankful for being granted a safe haven from the cold war red purges sweeping the labor movement, the Communist Party became the most abject apologist for the Bridges bureaucracy. Not only did they fail to attack the ILWU tops for sacrificing union gains, but the Stalinists voted for job-cutting automation contracts.

Unwilling to antagonize Bridges with a program for saving the ILWU through militant class struggle, Brown spent much of his time at the December meeting reminiscing about his role in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade during the

genuinely effective labor action requires struggle against both the do-nothing AFL-CIO dinosaurs and the slicker but no less opportunist social-democratic bureaucrats in Europe. A demand that they lead strike actions to win full citizenship rights for all foreign workers would quickly expose the chauvinist underpinnings of the ICFTU bureaucrats' internationalist posturings.

The ICFTU campaign raises the unsupportable and dangerous proposal of an open-ended and total economic boycott of South Africa. The World Confederation of Labor, based on Catholic-originated unions like the French CFDT, declared: "This should not be a symbolic action for one week only but a sustained effort which will affect the economic and strategic interests of South Africa—boycott on South African produce, cessation of arms deliveries and investments" (quoted in *Daily World*, 6 January).

The Stalinist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions, which is supporting the January 17 protests, also champions the position of a total boycott, a long-standing panacea among liberal pacifists, social democrats and Stalinists alike. Such a policy is rife with contradictions and illusions. It is most often merely an empty expression of moral condemnation by reformist misleaders who would never risk their bureaucratic sinecures in the confrontations with the bourgeois state to which any serious industrial action would inevitably lead.

The reformists fall back on appeals to the imperialists to isolate weaker bourgeois regimes judged to be qualitatively more reactionary. But this is nothing but the crassest liberalism, drawing a fundamental line between "democratic" capitalism and dictatorship. During the post-war period, the U.S. government (operating within the confines of bourgeois democracy) has played an infinitely more reactionary role than third-rate despotisms like South Africa, Iran or Spain. Nor are the major capitalist powers about to sacrifice profitable trade and investments to the dictates of "conscience."

But "what if" an unusual conjuncture of events (probably associated with inter-imperialist conflicts) somehow gave rise to the reformists' goal of effective imperialist economic "sanctions against South Africa? What then? Only in the imagination of muddle-headed moralists and cynical opportunists does crippling the economy of an entrenched reactionary regime lead to its overthrow by the aroused masses. Quite the contrary, a forced contraction of foreign trade, resulting in greater unemployment, could actually weaken the capacity of the workers to struggle. The significant wage gains won by South African black workers through the strikes of 1973 and 1974 followed a

Spanish civil war. In the same breath he praised the Chilean resistance and remarked, "The Spanish working class is once again fighting for democracy." But "Archie" was only pulling his punches. The real meaning of this apology for popular-frontism came out at a December 1970 "Northern California Rank and File Action Conference" where he boasted of murdering Trotskyists during the Spanish civil war, the act of a vile class traitor.

Nor have the politics of this veteran class collaborator changed one iota over the years. At a June 1975 Bay Area trade-union conference on Chile, Brown unsuccessfully tried to mobilize a goon squad to stifle opposition to the disastrous policies of the Allende popular front, which had left Chilean workers defenseless before the bloody Pinochet coup. Among those who successfully beat back Brown's attempt to exclude class-struggle politics at that conference were Local 10 executive board members Gow and Keylor. In their newsletter to

decade of industrial expansion in which their strategic weight in the economy increased markedly.

A really major blow to the economy (a catastrophic drop in the gold price along with imposition of oil sanctions, for example) leading to extreme social and economic dislocation could actually lead to the Zionist solution of "separate development" of which the right-wing Afrikaners dream. The compacting of the oppressor white caste into a nationally distinct group (a desperate nuclear-armed white *laager* defending an autarkic economy) is precluded only so long as the economy depends on black labor.

Fortunately, such a disastrous "achievement" is not within the capacity of the "left" labor reformists and "Third World" nationalists who advocate it. Instead, they are limited to token labor boycotts, which usually do not employ enough effective force to win even limited goals like the lifting of the banning orders on trade unionists, or to impotent and often ludicrous consumer boycotts. First prize in this latter regard must go to the U.S. Communist Party which rages against the evils of eating South African sardines.

The absolute absurdity of such a boycott is indicated by the South African exports itemized in the 6 January *Daily World's* list of "racist unpalatables." After canned fish, lobster tails and wines, it notes: "South Africa also exports diamonds, gold, seal skins and uranium to the U.S., but such items are generally not open to direct access by the average consumer." Thus the success of a boycott campaign directed at petty-bourgeois intellectuals and youth depends on moral sensibilities of society matrons, power companies, the Atomic Energy Commission, the American Dental Association and above all the U.S. Treasury.

But there is action which class-conscious militants can take to aid their victimized comrades in South Africa. Beyond implementing the call for a week-long labor boycott of South African cargo and transport, a "blacking" of all military production and military cargo for South Africa would be a powerful expression of labor solidarity and a concrete blow against the repressive machine of the apartheid regime. In addition, industrial action against multi-national corporations operating in South Africa to force them to recognize the black unions is a key tactic furthering the growth of proletarian organization in the apartheid state. Such class-struggle measures, however, will not be undertaken by the social democrats, Stalinists and business unionists of the ICFTU, WFTU, WCL or AFL-CIO. It requires the forging of a revolutionary opposition in the unions capable of mobilizing the international proletariat around its historic class interests. ■

the membership they explained the danger represented by the Stalinists' popular-front politics:

"The Chilean workers parties attempted major reforms without seeing the need for completely abolishing the old state and its key institutions, the army and the police. They failed to independently organize the working class—either politically or militarily. Both Allende and Corvalán, head of the Chilean CP, consistently told the Chilean working class to have faith in the liberal capitalists and their allies, the 'democratic' military. When the coup came, the workers were unprepared."

—"Longshore Militant," 25 June 1975

Brown, a past master at writing meaningless resolutions, once authored a Local 10 motion calling for boycott of Chilean cargo. But when Gow and Keylor together with other ILWU members pushed to implement this resolution—and successfully stopped Chilean cargo on the San Francisco docks during a two-day international protest in September 1974—Brown was nowhere to be seen. He didn't want to upset Bridges and the shipping companies.

Popular-frontist to the end, Brown also continued to support the top ILWU misleaders. At the December Local 10 meeting Bridges advocated jurisdictional war with other waterfront unions over the shrinking job pool. Predictably, when a supporter of "Longshore Militant" later tried to present a motion condemning any raiding, one of Brown's sidekicks dissolved the meeting with a quorum call. Such underhanded tricks may put the Stalinists in the good graces of labor fakers like Bridges, but in the end the working class will prove more powerful than all the slimy maneuvers and strong-arm methods of the bureaucracy. ■

Yoshimura...

(continued from page 12)

cornerstones of bourgeois "justice." Asked why she fled after the arrest of Brandt, Rubenstein and Bortin, Yoshimura replied:

"I began to think of the government's racist attitude toward Asian people, my concentration camp experiences [she was born in a Japanese internment camp in Inyo County in 1943], what happened to my parents [they were sent to the camp shortly after World War II began], the same kind of racist attitude continued with the Vietnam War."

That Wendy Yoshimura's fears of racist victimization were fully justified was demonstrated when she had the misfortune of being arrested together with Patty Hearst in September 1975. Soon after her arrest, "Patty" was holding hands with her parents in jail; Yoshimura, however, was shipped off to the Santa Rita detention center where her parents could only talk to her through wire barriers. When "Patty" was released on bail, "daddy" paid the tab from his pocket money, but the bail for Yoshimura was raised by Japanese Americans who also remember the horror of the "relocation centers" (see

"The Agony of Japanese Americans in U.S. Concentration Camps," *WV* No. 139, 7 January 1977); her defense committee received contributions from more than 1,000 individuals and organizations including the Partisan Defense Committee.

Patty Hearst was convicted for her admitted role in a holdup by the killer-cult "Symbionese Liberation Army," but she agreed to aid the government in fingering those who harbored her during her flight. Today the wealthy heiress sits in a posh penthouse suite sipping cocktails with her reactionary multi-millionaire newspaper magnate father. Meanwhile, Wendy Yoshimura, daughter of a Japanese American gardener from Fresno, refused to be a government informer. She is being railroaded to prison.

The Yoshimura case is a prime example of how the government uses conspiracy charges to stage a show trial in the absence of any evidence. For the state's prosecutors, the conspiracy rap is a legal dream come true, but for the innocent victims it is a nightmare of jail sentences. Here, truly, is bourgeois justice American style:

- First Brandt, Rubenstein and Bortin are tried, convicted and jailed for "conspiring" to blow up an ROTC building that never blew up, for "plotting" to explode a naval architecture building whose architecture remained intact and for "planning" the kidnapping of mass murderer Robert McNamara who never was kidnapped.

- Then the state went after Yoshimura as an accessory to these "crimes" that were never committed.

- But since they had no evidence to connect Yoshimura to these phantom crimes, they began to hound her about her years as a fugitive after the non-existent blow-ups and kidnappings. By asking her these questions the government is able to send her to jail on charges of contempt.

There is a conspiracy here, but the conspirators are capitalism's cops, prosecutors, judges and legislators in their vengeful drive to frame antiwar protesters. Other victims of this rigged "justice" are two Pennsylvania men, Jay Weiner and Phillip Shinnick, who have been jailed since November for refusing to testify before a federal grand jury witchhunt "investigating" those who aided Patty Hearst during her flight. Under a law whose spirit finds its counterpart in the Middle Ages, these men must remain in jail on contempt charges until they decide to become informers or until the grand jury is discharged.

As we previously stated, the state's real purpose in prosecuting Yoshimura is to strike a vicious blow at all those who have struggled against U.S. imperialism's war on the Indochinese workers and peasants. For this reason and because this case is a symbol of the deep and incurable rottenness of capitalist justice and the rule of the American bourgeoisie, the workers movement must demand the immediate and unconditional freeing of Wendy Yoshimura! ■

Crime, Punishment ...

(continued from page 2)

ascendancy renounces the maiming of prisoners in favor of a penal reform which claims as its primary purpose the protection of society rather than the infliction of pain upon the offender. The bourgeois revolutionaries sought to introduce a "rational" society in which the penalty was "equal" to the crime. That is also the sense of the U.S. Constitution's proscription of "cruel and unusual punishment." But the bourgeois state can no more protect the general population against crime than it can fulfill the promises of "liberty, equality and fraternity." In the period of capitalist decay the bourgeoisie's "law and order" is in fact the mass organization of crime through social disorder and cop terrorism. The recrudescence of the rack and screw in bourgeois society in their modern electronic forms, as well as the reinstitution of the death penalty from Argentina to the U.S., is bloody confirmation of capitalism's irreversible decay.

As Herreshoff implies, U.S. prisons today are a form of torture, particularly for the blacks and other minorities who make up such a large percentage of the prison population. While we demand an immediate halt to such barbaric practices as the death penalty, solitary confinement, virtually unpaid menial labor, preventive detention and all forms of torture, we understand that capitalism in its death agony maintains its prisons as an instrument of reactionary social coercion beyond any significant reform. In the very first issue of *WV* (October 1971), in an article on the Attica massacre, we demanded: "Smash the Prisons!"

The socialist revolution not only smashes capitalist prisons but also lays the material basis to rid society of all its prisons. But, as in the question of abolition of official mutilation, the question of prisons after the proletarian revolution cannot be abstractly posed as a matter of comparative felt pain. The revolutionary Bolsheviks intended their prisons to isolate counterrevolutionaries and criminals for the protection of society rather than for the punishment of the individual offender. But everyone understood that such isolation was punishing from the subjective point of view of the prisoner, and the Bolsheviks at times even used the word "punish."

The question of penal policy is really the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The proletariat cannot wage ruthless war against the bourgeoisie one day and wake up the next morning to the dawn of idyllic socialism—the first stage of classless society. The newly fledged workers state must not only repress outright counterrevolutionaries in a civil war, but also deal with crime in a society (although it has abolished capitalist exploitation) still contains members corrupted and driven to crime by continuing economic scarcity and remnants of bourgeois and lumpen class violence.

Neither forced labor nor prisons are the norm for a healthy workers state. The reason that prisoners in revolutionary Russia were placed in a regime of forced labor is that in a society suffering economic collapse universal compulsory labor was the necessary rule. But even under these conditions of extreme hardship the Bolsheviks insisted that prison working conditions were covered by the general labor code providing trade-union rates, food rations and other conditions applying to the non-prisoner workforce (Margaret Dewar, *Labor Policy in the U.S.S.R.*).

Instituting prison labor was not a remedial program for individual rehabilitation. The Bolsheviks and Marx were not starry-eyed about eliminating crime through individual rehabilitation. It should be made clear, moreover, that Marx's reference in the *Critique of the*

Gotha Program to productive labor was directed against the Lasalleans, whose program was to enforce idleness in prisons in order to avoid economic competition with non-institutionalized labor. Against that position Marx argued that prisoners must not be deprived of productive labor.

The revolutionary Bolsheviks' early penal policies were summarized in Bukharin and Preobrazhensky's *The ABC of Communism* (1920). They explained that "a large number of professional criminals, trained to become such in the old order, survive to give work for the proletarian courts. But these courts are entirely free from the spirit of revenge." So long as prisoners had to be isolated, the incarcerated individuals were offered "full opportunities for moral regeneration" rather than being forced to remain there "without any occupation, [in] enforced parasitism, the penal method so frequently employed under the tsarist regime." Therefore the Bolsheviks sought a "complete transformation of the customary penal methods," including the introduction of some which "have been recommended by the best bourgeois criminologists. But in bourgeois society they remain a dream."

The important point with regard to the Bolsheviks' prisons is that they were meant as temporary measures to be abolished as the society advanced toward socialism. It is this understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a transitional period that is missing in Herreshoff's static comparisons of "houses of correction" under the bourgeoisie with the prisons in revolutionary Russia. *The ABC of Communism* states clearly that the "courts will gradually change in character. As the State dies out, they will tend to become simply organs for the expression of public opinion. They will assume the character of courts of arbitration. Their decisions will no longer be enforced by physical means and will have a purely moral significance."

Unlike the state apparatus in capitalist society which can only more or less effectively organize for class oppression, it is the special character of the state apparatus of the dictatorship of the proletariat that it can wither away. But this transition to socialism demands a material abundance possible only with the spread of the revolution to the advanced capitalist countries. Stalinism is the result of prolonged national isolation. The answer is not an alternative penal policy but political revolution in the degenerated/deformed workers states and social revolution in the advanced capitalist countries.

Herreshoff's questions and comparisons could imply a political continuity between Leninism and Stalinism which is held by liberals, anarchists, tsarists like Solzhenitsyn and, of course, by the Stalinists. Certainly there were prisoners under Lenin and prisons under Stalin. But the prisons in the Soviet Union of Lenin and Trotsky were filled with active counterrevolutionaries and cannot be equated politically with Stalin's concentration camps filled largely with innocent people as well as old Bolsheviks, left-wing intellectuals and class-conscious workers. Bolshevik prisons in 1917-23 required an all-sided political counterrevolution to become the new Stalinist economic category of multi-millioned forced labor based upon mass terror and bureaucratic intimidation.

No workers state under conditions of national isolation and economic backwardness can move forward to socialism—i.e., abolish prisons. To answer Herreshoff's "by the way" (how can we get from the dictatorship of the proletariat to a society without prisons?): Only by internationalizing the revolution, opening the way for socialism on a world scale, which can and will abolish all the repressive instruments of class society and usher in that society which Marx said was worthy of the name human. ■

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

INTERNATIONAL RATES: 48 issues—\$20 airmail/\$5 seairmail, 16 introductory issues—\$5 airmail

140

WORKERS VANGUARD

Victimized Because She Won't Turn Informer

Stop Court Vendetta Against Wendy Yoshimura!

OAKLAND—In a shocking display of courtroom vengeance, the trial of Wendy Yoshimura took a dramatic turn last week as the trial judge cited the defendant five times for contempt of court, then ordered that all her testimony be stricken from the record just as her defense attorney was resting the case. This outrage is the state's answer to Yoshimura's courageous and principled refusal to fink on people who had aided her after she went into hiding in 1972 following the arrest of three companions—Willie Brandt, Paul Rubenstein and Michael Bortin—who were accused of attempting to blow up an ROTC building at the Berkeley campus of the University of California.

Alameda County superior judge Martin Pulich's high-handed actions were part and parcel of a deliberate government attempt to rig the trial against Yoshimura. Although the defendant told of her activities and associations *before* the 1972 arrest of

her companions, she announced in a prepared statement that "It is impossible to explain my life after 1972 without suggesting or providing information about the people and friends who have helped me during these years... I am morally obligated to bring them no harm in any way possible."

The prosecution, well aware that it has a flimsy case against Yoshimura on charges of possession of explosives and a machine gun, directed all its cross-examination at the period *after* the 1972 arrests. These questions had nothing to do with the matter under prosecution in this trial but allowed the state to trigger contempt of court charges and demand that her testimony on the weapons allegations be removed.

Judge Pulich willingly cooperated in this crude ploy to railroad Yoshimura to jail. He "graciously" asked the defendant whether she wished to claim privilege under the Fifth Amendment (against self-incrimination), knowing

that if she did so she would have to answer questions about her associates. But Yoshimura's courageous refusal to plead the Fifth exposes the government's cynical maneuver: if the information the prosecution is seeking would *not* be self-incriminating, then it is irrelevant to the case.

From the very beginning of the trial it has been clear that the prosecution's case against Yoshimura is based, in the words of her defense attorney, on nothing but "innuendos and disconnected facts." Unable to come up with a single piece of hard evidence that Yoshimura had committed any crime, the prosecutor, Jeffrey Horner, has instead tried to weave a lurid conspiracy theory portraying the defendant as a member of a sinister gang planning an "all-out war against society."

Horner (who at one point in the trial proceedings attempted to show the jury a technicolor film of the effects of an AK-47 rifle on a can of tomato juice!) pulled his latest shabby maneuver by demanding Yoshimura tell the jury the answers to the following questions:

"Who called her at 5 a.m. on the day three men were arrested by Berkeley police as they entered a Berkeley garage-bomb factory she had rented?"
"Where did she go when she fled the Bay Area?"
"What mode of travel did she use?"
"Did she go back east?"
"Did she apply for a driver's license in New Jersey under the assumed name of Joan Shimada?"

—*San Francisco Examiner*, 6 January 1977

Clearly these questions are nothing but a fishing expedition to gain information for a further government witchhunt against anyone who aided Yoshimura between the time of her flight and her

arrest in September of 1975.

Yoshimura's lawyer, James Larsen, correctly objected that the questions were irrelevant and inflammatory. When he repeated his client's statement that she couldn't answer these questions out of a moral obligation not to betray those who had helped her, Judge Pulich snapped back that he didn't recognize "moral obligations."

The judge then slapped Yoshimura with five counts of contempt of court, each worth up to six months in jail. He also refused a motion for a mistrial by Larsen. And in case any juror failed to get the message, this tribune of bourgeois "justice" instructed the jury that "the defendant's refusal to answer questions can be considered by you on the issue of the credibility of her testimony" (*San Francisco Examiner*, 6 January). The next morning, after Yoshimura again refused to turn informer on the witness stand, Judge Pulich ordered that all her testimony be struck from the record ("as if it hadn't been said").

But Mr. Assistant District Attorney Horner is not satisfied. He is insisting that the testimony of Yoshimura's father, Frank Yoshimura, also be struck from the record, presumably because of his daughter's refusal to be a stool pigeon! When one of the incredulous spectators exclaimed, "What?" as Horner put forward this motion, he was ordered removed from the courtroom.

From start to finish the capitalist government's vindictive harassment and persecution of Wendy Yoshimura has been a case study in the racism, class bias and anti-communism which are the

continued on page 11



Anne Dowie/SF Bay Guardian

Wendy Yoshimura

PDC STATEMENT:

Free Wendy Yoshimura!

The government's vindictive attempt to break Wendy Yoshimura on the witness stand is a modern inquisition. The questions as to the details of her life during the years that she was hounded by a wanton FBI manhunt are neither intended to bring to light facts "relevant" to the prosecution's frame-up, nor even as a test of her credibility. Rather, they seek to turn Yoshimura's trial into an exercise in McCarthyite entrapment and coerced testimony. The judge's action declaring her in contempt of court for refusing to answer such outrageous questions proves that this trial has been rigged in advance.

The Partisan Defense Committee hails Yoshimura's principled and courageous stand in refusing to turn informer for the state's witchhunt. This innocent woman, born in a racist U.S. concentration camp, propelled into action against American imperialism's war against the workers and peasants of Southeast Asia, and now being persecuted in this vengeful show trial, has become a symbol of resistance for the entire working class and all those who struggle for democratic rights.

We demand that the judicial persecution stop immediately. Drop the charges against Wendy Yoshimura!

Partisan Defense Committee
Box 633, Canal Street Station,
New York, N.Y. 10013