

SPANISH ELECTIONS:

No to "Reformed" Francoism!

Basque Voters Face Reign of Cop Terror

JUNE 6—Next week the first parliamentary elections in 41 years will be held in Spain. These elections, which are far from free, are the crowning jewel of the "Spanish democracy" of Prime Minister Adolfo Suárez. Aimed at consolidating a "strong state" semi-bonapartist regime with a facade of parliamentary democracy, the "Suárez reforms" hope to win acceptance for the post-Franco regime from "democratic Europe," and to foster democratic illusions among the Spanish working masses who, week after week for the last year and a half, have demonstrated their hatred of the autocratic state hequeathed by the "Caudillo."

The legalization of the Socialist Party (PSOE) and especially of the Communist Party (PCE) have certainly boosted the government's desired image of democratizing the entrenched Francoist structure. At the same time, this crucial measure was strongly resisted by Falangist ultras and army hardliners, and would never have been won without the militant strikes and demonstrations by the workers. With a militant proletarian leadership, this could upset the apple cart of "reformed" Francoism, by a heavy vote for opposition workers parties. But far from exposing the anti-democratic intent of the government's plans to shore up the Francoist monarchy, the PSOE and PCE leaders have become the strongest supporters of Suárez.

Skeletons in the Closet

Suárez has personally entered the campaign for the Cortes in the hopes of building an ostensibly "center" political apparatus—in reality somewhere to the right of Italian Christian Democracy or the French Gaullists—which could, through a combination of tough police measures, "democratic" rhetoric and mini-reforms, contain the masses while dismantling the outlived corporatist structures of the Francoist order. He chose as his electoral vehicle the Union of the Democratic Center (UDC), founded by former Franco ministers Areilza and Pio Cabanillas. Since the formal announcement of Suárez' candidacy, these two have been deposed: the former out of the UDC, the latter off to campaign in distant Galicia. Under Suárez, the UDC campaigns for the



Bilbao/Cambio 16

Barricades are thrown up by Basque demonstrators in Renteria as protection against cop attacks.

Cortes as what has aptly been dubbed "Euro-Francoism."

Whereas Suárez wants to hide the Francoist origins of his government, he has been challenged by the openly Franco-loyal Alianza Popular (AP). Former minister of the interior Manuel Fraga Iribarne and six other former Franco-era ministers (each with their own political party) have banded together in what is alternately called the "magnificent seven" (by the far-right) and "Seven Horsemen of the Apocalypse" (by the left). The AP has attacked the legalization of the PCE and similar concessions to present themselves as the inheritors of the "forty years of Francoist peace."

But while Fraga may have a better claim on blue-shirt traditions, no less than the AP Suárez' forces are the face of Francoism in these elections. While waxing on about democratic reforms, Suárez preserves his ties to the clerical-reactionary Opus Dei, leading industrialists and representatives of foreign investors who were the economic backbone of the Franco regime. Moreover, since breaking with Fraga and co-opting the UDC, Suárez has concentrated on lining up the local government functionaries and political bosses whose

main interest is to be on the side of the government. While in the main cities the opposition vote will no doubt be high, in the countryside the fabric of Francoist rule is unbroken, as the Guardia Civil and the *caciques* (local bosses) continue to hold sway. The *New York Times* (6 June) quoted a resident of a peasant town in Badajoz remarking that after 40 years of dictatorship, "there is the fear, there is the fear."

According to the current electoral scheme, small rural areas will have up to four times the representation of comparably populated neighborhoods in urban centers such as Madrid. Thus for Suárez' schemes to receive a Cortes (parliament) majority, *caciquismo* must remain intact. There can be little talk of democracy so long as the entrenched privilege, corruption and political machinations of such a system, which for forty years has been inseparable from the police state terror of Franco, remain.

The Basque Explosion

Suárez' reforms certainly carry little weight in the Basque region (Euzkadi). The electoral period in this northern region arrived outfitted in the same colors as before: the dull grey of the armed police and the olive drab of the

Guardia Civil. Repeatedly, the mass demonstrations demanding amnesty and an end to the police state of siege have been set upon by these bloody thugs of Suárez/Juan Carlos. If this ferocious repression continues, and perhaps even intensifies as the special police run amok, the "democratic" king and his "Euro-Francoist" prime minister could still find themselves with a solid Basque election boycott on their hands.

The pervasive police terror has failed to diminish the overwhelming sense of anti-government militancy and solidarity that has swept the Basque country this spring. In April, the government banned any celebration of the Basque national holiday, *Aberri Eguna*. The demonstrators who assembled in defiance of the ban were met with an occupation force of 5,000 Guardia Civil in the town of Vitoria (site of the 1976 slayings) who filled the central square with smoke and tear gas and then viciously set upon any civilians they found in the street. Despite the rubber bullets and water cannon of the anti-riot brigades, barricades were built and the demonstrations persisted.

During the course of only four days
continued on page 5

Leninism and Conspiracy

April 20, 1977

To the editor:

In the article "FBI Targets the Spartacist League" (WV No. 151, 1 April 1977), you discuss, among many other matters, the Marxist attitudes towards violence and conspiracy, or, to be more precise, conspiratorial methods. At one point you say: "According to the *Communist Manifesto*, the proletarian revolution is made by the 'immense majority.' It is not until a majority of the working people are prepared for a revolution against a capitalist government isolated and unable to rule that a proletarian revolution can occur." If this is meant literally, then one of two conclusions seems inescapable: either the Russian Revolution of October 1917 was not proletarian, and hence has no call on the loyalty of any Marxist; or else this prediction by Marx and Engels has been refuted by history. The working class of Imperial Russia was a tiny minority of the population, and while the Bolsheviks had the support of a majority of the working class in some crucial areas, it is doubtful whether this was true nationwide. The Chinese and Cuban revolutions probably did and do have majority support, but in the first place the majority was clearly not proletarian, and in the second there is considerable dispute as to whether the revolution, at the time it took place, was in any sense Marxist in character. On this basis, it follows that if a proletarian revolution takes place in a highly-developed capitalist state (which has not happened historically so far) it will have entirely different characteristics and probably different results from the Russian or Chinese, or Cuban—revolutions.

Your remarks on conspiracy as a revolutionary method are subject to a similar qualification. It is fairly clear to me from reading the *Workers Vanguard* over the past two or three years that your present method involves no conspiracy at all, in the sense of a dualism between the attitudes adopted in public and internally. However, this also represents a departure from previous revolutionary practice: Lenin's entire method and organization were conspiratorial. And certainly this type of method and organization was necessary in the context in which Lenin was working.

It seems to me that these considerations at the very least limit significantly the scope of the "lessons" which can be drawn by revolutionary Marxists in Western Europe or the United States from the Russian Revolution, or any revolution of similar type which has occurred up to this point. It is not clear to me what "Leninism" means in this context. If it implies the establishment of a disciplined vanguard party consisting of professional revolutionaries and organized in quasi-military fashion—and these are the terms in which Lenin appears to speak in *What is to be Done?* and other works—then it would seem that Leninist precedents are also not applicable to our present situation.

Insofar as it points up the conspiratorial methods used by the FBI and other government agencies in gathering information and in infiltrating or disrupting groups considered "subversive," your article performs a useful service, but, as I have tried to point out, it is not without certain implicit contradictions.

Steve Dunn

WV replies: Steve Dunn insists that he has found a contradiction between the Spartacist League and Lenin on the

question of conspiracy. The SL, he says, is not conspiratorial, whereas Lenin's Bolsheviks were. Dunn is right about the Spartacist League in this regard but wrong about Lenin.

Lenin's party was never conspiratorial. Conspiracy was considered a cardinal revolutionary principle by a number of groups and individuals of the pre-Marxist communist movement. They included Baheuf's Conspiracy of Equals, Buonarroti, the Carbonari and particularly Auguste Blanqui, whose innumerable secret societies spanned more than half a century. Later this tradition was continued by a wing of the anarchist movement that concentrated on acts of individual terrorism.

Both Marx and Lenin were frequently labeled Blanquists by their opponents and were proud of the revolutionary determination this accusation connoted. But from its very inception the Marxist movement has rejected the conspiratorial method of a handful of leaders with a secret program acting behind the backs of the masses to seize power. Thus Karl Marx wrote in June 1847 concerning the change of name of the League of the Just to the Communist League:

"The introduction of such simple, clear names serves also to remove from our propagandist League the conspiratorial character which our enemies are so keen to attach to it."

"Circular of the First Congress of the Communist League"

What was involved was not merely a change of name but the class character of the movement. Seeking to complete the bourgeois-democratic revolution which the bourgeoisie feared to carry to the end, the petty-bourgeois communists had need for conspiratorial methods. Proletarian communists, however, while preserving their own organization, act as the vanguard of the working class. For this role the greatest openness concerning the aims and methods of struggle was desirable, in order to galvanize the broadest masses into action.

The Russian Marxists, from Plekhanov on, heatedly polemicized against anarchists and populists (Narodniks) on the question of conspiratorial methods. As early as 1897 Lenin attacked the former Bakuninist, P.L. Lavrov, on precisely this question:

"Blanquist, conspiratorial traditions are fearfully strong among the former [the Narodniks], so much so that they cannot conceive of political struggle except in the form of political conspiracy. The Social Democrats, however, are not guilty of such a narrow outlook; they do not believe in conspiracies."

"The Tasks of the Russian Social Democrats"

Lenin went on to point out that, while under tsarist dictatorship the Social Democrats "have never dreamed of being able to form a workers' party in Russia legally...they have always thought, and continue to think that this fight must be waged not by conspirators, but by a revolutionary party based on the working class movement. They think that the fight against the autocracy must consist not in organizing conspiracies, but in educating, disciplining and organizing the proletariat."

As Lenin elaborated the theory of the vanguard party and the need for democratic centralism, one of his arguments was that "a strong revolutionary organization in an autocratic country" must operate in "utmost secrecy" (*What Is To Be Done?*). But the need for clandestinity by left-wing parties was a military tactical necessity, forced on them by the tsar's police. Again, Lenin sharply denied "the charge that we Social Democrats desire to create a conspiratorial organization."

Nevertheless, there were those who thought that all underground organizations were necessarily conspiratorial

and called on the Russian Social Democrats to give up their clandestine existence. Trotsky, writing from prison after the 1905 Revolution, answered such critics with biting eloquence:

"Those simpletons and liberal hypocrites who, during the past two years, have so often appealed to us to embrace legality are like Marie-Anoinette who recommended to the starving peasants that they should eat cake. Anyone might think that we suffer from some kind of organic revulsion from cake. Anyone might think that our lungs have been infected by some insatiable craving to breathe the air of the dungeons used for solitary confinement in the Peter and Paul Fortress! Anyone might think that we cannot or do not want to find a different employment for those endless hours which the jailer confiscates from our lives."

"We are as little enamored of our underground as the drowned man is of the sea bottom. But—let us say it straight—we have no more choice in the matter than our enemy, absolutism."

1905

In the aftermath of the Palmer Raids in 1920, when the entire self-proclaimed revolutionary left in the U.S. was driven underground by massive arrests and deportations, the question of conspiratorial methods was fought out in the American communist movement. With all the imperialist propaganda against Lenin's "putsch" and given the general ignorance of what the Bolsheviks actually stood for beyond soviet power, many revolutionaries saw the October Revolution as a victory for the "principle" of clandestine organization.

The pioneer American communists made this mistake and wrote into the party constitution the statement, "The Communist Party is an underground, illegal organization." Some time later a judge declared the CP illegal, which it welcomed. The other faction (the party had split immediately after the founding convention), the Communist Labor Party (CLP), by some quirk was declared legal. Yet the CLP took this as an insult to its revolutionary integrity and issued a statement proclaiming that it was just as illegal as the CP!

James P. Cannon was one of the CP leaders who first fought to come out from clandestinity when conditions opened up. The issue was taken to the Fourth Congress of the Communist International in Moscow (1922), where Cannon talked with Trotsky, who expressed "astonishment" and "amusement" at the notion that the party had to maintain an illegal apparatus as a matter of principle. Subsequently, after Trotsky had taken the matter to Lenin, the Russian Comintern leaders intervened decisively in the American commission in favor of legalizing the party.

As Cannon pointed out 20 years later, at the time of the Minneapolis trials which eventually sent him and 17 other Trotskyist leaders to jail for their revolutionary opposition to the imperialist war:

"We don't intend to surrender our possibilities of legal functioning at the very first blow. In spite of all they say, we are not 'conspirators.' We are a political movement and we want to work in the open. The advantages of public activity, agitation, propaganda, and organization are so superior and so much more economical than similar work carried out by illegal and underground means that a serious revolutionary party has to fight to the last ditch to maintain its legal rights."

"Our Party's Answer to the Prosecution," October 1941

Bolshevik democratic centralism was based on deeper political factors than the need to defend against tsarist absolutism. But when Rosa Luxemburg made her famous attack on Lenin's party organization, she imagined that his concepts had been a response to the repressive Russian situation and that such a hierarchical structure and "conspiratorial" ideas would have no place in

republican Europe. Yet gradually, particularly through the disastrous experience of the Spartakusbund as the left wing of the Independent Social Democrats (USPD), Luxemburg came to see the need for the organizational separation of the proletarian vanguard.

It was not Russian particularism or the necessities of underground functioning that lay at the heart of the Leninist party concept, but the relationship of the vanguard to the class. Because the communists represent the historic class interests of the international proletariat, and not the changing opinions or backward prejudices of the workers, they must be organized as the vanguard and not as the "party of the whole class." The organizational norm of this party, democratic centralism, enables the Marxists to work out their program internally through democratic discussion and debate and then as a combat organization fight for it in a disciplined manner within the class as a whole.

Democratic centralism is in no way conspiratorial and actually strengthens the integrity of the party vis-à-vis the masses. In loose social-democratic organizations party policy is often unclear. At the lowest levels party activists frequently are caught up in the prevailing mood of the class, while at the top the tremendous pressures exerted directly by the bourgeoisie are at work: "left" and right-wing party leaders present sharply contradictory lines. In Britain the parliamentary Labour Party frequently votes against decisions taken at the party's national conference, nominally its highest body. In a Bolshevik organization, in contrast, every member, having exercised his internal democratic rights in the determination of party policy, is duty-bound to fight for this stated policy.

It is useful to review the social-democratic objections to Leninism because many of the arguments raised by Steve Dunn are in a similar vein. His charge that the Bolshevik Revolution did not have majority support because the working class was a minority of the population is an old one. It was raised already before October by the Mensheviks and afterward by a counterrevolutionary alliance running from Kautsky through Winston Churchill to Leonard Shapiro, who all charged Lenin with taking power in a conspiratorial coup d'état.

This is flatly false. In the first place the Bolsheviks had won a solid majority in the workers soviets, and the will of the land-starved peasantry to carry out a revolution against the capitalist government was evident in the wave of peasant insurrection that swept the Russian countryside in the autumn of 1917. Already at the time of his "April Theses," Lenin had denounced the strategy of conspiracy:

"But those who want to think and learn cannot fail to understand that Blanquism means the seizure of power by a minority, whereas the Soviets are admittedly the direct and immediate organization of the majority of the people. Work confined to a struggle for influence within these Soviets cannot, simply cannot, stray into the swamp of Blanquism."

"Letters on Tactics," April 1917

As for concealing their aims, this can hardly be laid at the Bolsheviks' doorstep. In June and again in the autumn they called for "all power to the soviets" an unambiguous slogan, which was well understood by Kerensky's provisional government and the Kornilov army even before the masses had fully grasped it. And in the early autumn, while Lenin was in hiding from the "democratic" police, the party circulated his pamphlet "Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?" which

discussed the question in concrete terms.

Mao's "Red Army" and Castro's "Rebel Army" certainly enjoyed popular support. However, in contrast to the Bolsheviks, the Maoists and Castroites came to power through bonapartist military methods rather than mass insurrection and were not responsible to the democratic institutions of the working masses. The Russian Communist Party at the time of Lenin was a democratic organization, and no Bolshevik oppositionist was subjected to state repression until Stalin had usurped power by a bureaucratic coup in the party. The fate of Liu Shao-chi, Lin Biao and Chiang Ching in Maoist China and the fact that Castro's personalist regime did not hither to hold the founding conference of the "ruling" Communist Party until 17 years after the Rebel Army took power should dispel any delusions in the "democratic" character of these Stalinist regimes.

Apart from the rather obvious assertion that a socialist revolution in an advanced capitalist country will be very different from the overthrow of capital-

ism in Russia, China and Cuba, Dunn says nothing about its concrete dynamics. Certainly it will have a greater chance to internationalize and thereby go forward toward socialism than did the isolated, backward Soviet Union. But, as in Russia, it will establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, exercised through organs of workers democracy.

* * * * *

Social Democracy has long spread the treacherous illusion that in advanced countries with a tradition of bourgeois democracy, the working-class majority could achieve victory over capitalism at the polls. Revolutionary Marxists expect to lead the "immense majority" to a victorious revolution, but we do not expect the revolution to be "voted in." Electoralist illusions, such as those purveyed in this country by the Socialist Workers Party, dangerously disarm the proletariat. While revolutionary communists seek to participate in bourgeois elections as a propaganda platform and to assert our *legitimacy*, we must struggle against parliamentary majoritarian illusions, and help to

prepare the workers for decisive class battles.

In reality, revolutionary situations arise not in an orderly process of voting at elections, but when the authority of the existing government is shattered by war, depression, economic austerity and fascist terror. Capitalism's "final solution" to the social anarchy it creates in times of economic crisis was demonstrated in Nazi Germany. In such cases, Trotskyists, unlike the Stalinists and Social Democrats, do not passively accept the "parliamentary verdict" engineered by a Hindenburg and a Hitler. Our commitment is to defend the democratic rights of the working people through revolutionary mass mobilization against the conspirators.

We said in "FBI Targets the Spartacist League":

"A revolutionary conjuncture in the U.S. will be defined by the fact of *dual power*. Most probably it will pose the choice between the democratic Soviets of the working class and a tottering bonapartist dictatorship headed by a militarist perhaps in the mold of General George Brown, unencumbered by the trappings of a Congress."

The choice facing the working class then would be to take power or become the victim of counterrevolutionary terror seeking to restabilize the bourgeois order. Therefore, revolutionaries, unlike parliamentary cretins and pacifists, stand with the boldness expressed by Trotsky on this alternative, which has faced workers in the past and will doubtless face them in the future: "We say in advance that we are ready to reject such an attempt with arms in hands, and crush the fascist dictatorship by a proletarian dictatorship" ("How We Defend Ourselves," 1940).

Like Lenin's Bolsheviks, communists in the advanced capitalist countries seek the greatest freedom to bring their program before the workers. It is those who seek to prevent this, who hug our offices, tap our phones, open our mail, blacklist our comrades, send in provocateurs, plant "disinformation," arrest and even murder revolutionary militants; it is the authors of disruption plans such as Operation CHAOS and COINTELPRO—in short, it is the capitalist political police and their masters who are the real conspirators.

Welfare, Minimum Wage, Anti-Discrimination

Carter/Courts Go After Unions, Minorities

"Democrats are no 'friends of labor!'" warned *Workers Vanguard* as election time rolled around last November. But it seems the labor bureaucrats weren't listening. Indeed, why should they? The labor tops' back-slapping with the political servants of the ruling class is part of a pro-capitalist strategy which is as conscious as it is despicable. On behalf of the Democrats, the labor fakery escorted the union ranks to the polls like sheep to the slaughter. They crowed over Carter's election and termed it a "victory for labor," just like the crumbs they beg from the bosses' tables and pass off as "good" contracts.

Now the cheering has stopped. The union "leaders" are squealing like stuck pigs about Carter's "betrayal" of his campaign promises. So what else is new? The injured innocence of Meany & Co. is as phony as a three-dollar bill.

Carter's determined assault on the working people and oppressed began the day he took office. In just a few short months the administration unleashed attacks on the minimum wage, the duration of unemployment compensation and its application to striking workers. A truly incredible court ruling

will permit companies to finance their employees' suits against the unions.

New welfare proposals would force thousands of destitute people off the rolls and put others to work at hard labor at sub-minimal pay to keep a part of their welfare payment. Court decisions have denied disability pay to pregnant women and attempted to cut off Medicaid funds for abortions. School busing programs aimed at desegregation have been gutted and a Supreme Court ruling next fall may well provide the legal cover to wipe out minority admissions programs.

You Get What You Pay For

Immediately following the election, a Washington AFL-CIO leader was quoted as boasting:

"If it hadn't been for us, Carter wouldn't have a victory." He also said that for the first time in eight years, "we will have a friend in the White House." "Then he added 'Unions are more responsive—and more responsible when we have a friend in the White House.'"

Journal of Commerce, 4
November 1976

The AFL-CIO bureaucracy smugly reported that more than 70 percent of the politicians it had endorsed were victors. Then they settled back in their easy chairs and waited for somebody to come along and scratch their backs.

A *New York Post* columnist put it this way:

"They laughed when Jimmy Carter said that he was the first man in a millennium to be elected to the presidency without owing anything to anyone. 'And nobody laughed louder than the kinglys of organized labor. [who] were sure that deep in his heart Carter felt indebted to them. How could he have won Ohio, or Pennsylvania, without the money, the pavement-pounding, the doorbell-ringing of organized labor?'"

"Labor's laughter has turned to tears and cursing."

Carl T. Rowan, *New York Post*, 31 March 1977

The *Wall Street Journal* (2 June) summarized the picture simply in an editorial page headline: "Labor Striking Out on Capital Hill."

As soon as the new Congress assembled, the House defeated a

construction-sites picketing bill—a simple measure which would merely have made it legal for the different craft unions working together on the same construction site to respect each other's picket lines. Then, in March, Carter refused to endorse the AFL-CIO's meager proposal to raise the current \$2.30 an hour minimum wage (now 58 cents below the government poverty line) to \$3.00, proposing instead an insulting 38-cent increase. The "people's president" then followed this up by predictably reneging on his earlier promise to work for repeal of section 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act, under which 20 states have outlawed the union shop. The repeal of the "right-to-work" clause—a key union objective for more than a generation—is crucial to any serious effort to organize the South.

But these were just the warm-ups, and in the last two weeks the government attacks have swung into high gear. On May 26 Joseph Califano announced that a new proposal to reorganize the welfare system includes a "workfare proposal" under which recipients without young children will be required to go to work or lose their welfare grants. Modeled on the "Milwaukee Plan" already in effect in that city, the system is designed to replace unionized civil-service workers with a welfare slave-army forced to work at pay rates which are not only below union scale, but often below the pathetic minimum wage.

Another part of the plan, calling for expanding the "accountable period," will spell disaster for seasonal workers. At present most families become eligible for welfare as soon as their assets and monthly income drop below a certain level; under the new proposal, income will be accounted over a six-month or one-year period. The paternalistic Carter moralizers explain that (in addition to paring down the government's budget deficit) the system will supposedly teach families how to "balance a budget"! Even a leftover from the Nixon administration, now at Brookings Institution, Richard P. Nathan, was moved to comment about this grotesque plan: "The whole stupidity of it is that you're

telling somebody who's picking beans for four or five dollars an hour that they should save money."

Meanwhile, the courts—once the much-touted vanguard of liberal reform—have continued to whittle away at social gains for labor and minorities won through years of struggle. In a decision on May 31 the Supreme Court ruled 8-0 that states may refuse to pay unemployment benefits to any worker laid off because of a strike against his employer (even if the worker is not himself taking part in the labor action). The case was brought by Leonard Paul Hodory, a millwright apprentice at U.S. Steel in Youngstown, Ohio. In November 1974 Hodory was laid off when a UMW strike at a mine partly owned by U.S. Steel eventually led to a shut-down at the Youngstown plant due to reduced fuel supply. Hodory was denied unemployment compensation.

The Hodory decision followed only a week after a Manhattan federal district court had struck down a New York rule granting unemployment compensation to striking workers. "The law," said Judge Richard Owen, "is state intervention on behalf of the strikers, causes an employer to finance its own strikes, is in conflict with Federal labor law policies and is therefore unconstitutional and void." The ruling breathes righteous fire and brimstone for the constitutional "right" to exploit labor and break strikes.

The suit itself was brought by New York Telephone, Western Electric and AT&T Long Lines Division. It grew out of the seven-month 1971 CWA strike in which the phone company, under state law, was faced with having to pay for a large part of the \$49 million paid out to strikers in unemployment compensation. Although a decision on whether the phone company will recover the money has not yet been made, the company was eager to get the law off the books before the present phone contract expires August 6. The capitalist courts complied.

On June 2 a federal judge declared
continued on page 8

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 Jon Brule Charles
Burroughs, George Foster, Liz Gordon, 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

South Moluccan Kidnapping in Dutch Town

JUNE 3 For the second time in 18 months extreme South Moluccan nationalists living in the Netherlands resorted to terrorist actions, taking a total of 167 hostages in two sieges last week. On Monday, May 23, six heavily armed South Moluccans seized the village school at Bovensmilde in northern Holland, holding 105 children and five teachers hostage. Not far away, near the village of Glimmen, seven of their comrades hijacked a train, taking 56 passengers and crewmen captive.

The terrorists' demands were that the government free 21 South Moluccans imprisoned for previous acts of terrorism and that it provide a Boeing 747 to fly all of them, plus their hostages, to an unspecified country. More generally, the kidnap hijack operation was aimed at pressuring the Dutch government into helping them gain independence for the South Moluccas, an island chain annexed by Indonesia shortly after Netherlands colonial rule in the East Indies collapsed in 1949.

This incident must certainly qualify as one of the more ludicrous, pitiful, impotent and inept terrorist acts of recent years, but an outrage nonetheless. It is *undefensible* random terror, its victims not hated oppressors but innocent children and travelers. The terrorists, moreover, appealed to Dutch imperialism—and through it to that vehicle for international imperialist intervention, the United Nations—to take action (break off diplomatic and trade relations) against its former colony. Aside from being reactionary, the South Moluccans' desperate act is also hopeless, for the Netherlands government is in no position to force Indonesia to do much of anything.

The strange double siege which is still unfolding in rural Holland is, however, significant in revealing the murderous logic of all nationalism, even the nationalism of the oppressed. For whatever else they aren't, the South Moluccans are certainly oppressed—and likely to become even more so as a result of this deadly escapade.

Unwanted Hijackers

The Dutch government lost no time in mobilizing its forces: hundreds of soldiers were quickly stationed around the train and placed on duty outside the school. At Bovensmilde, where the town's 750 South Moluccans live in a barracks-like housing project segregated from the Dutch population, police and Royal Dutch Marines immediately sealed off the community from the rest of the town. The few South Moluccans living outside this perimeter quickly fled to the police-barricaded ghetto, fearing attacks from enraged whites whose children were being held hostage.

Dutch authorities immediately announced that no discussions with the terrorists would take place until all schoolchildren had been released. They also stated that the hostages would under no circumstances be permitted to leave the country. The kidnapers

allowed their initial deadline to pass without incident, and on the morning of May 27 one teacher and all the children (half of whom had apparently contracted a viral infection) were released.

By the ninth day of the siege, with their prospects steadily dimming, the terrorists had apparently softened their demands, no longer insisting that the hostages be taken with them if they left the country in a government-provided airplane (*New York Times*, 1 June). Mediators have also been agreed upon, among them the widow of South Moluccan nationalist leader Soumokil, who was killed by the Indonesian government in 1966. Reportedly the main item presently under negotiation is the destination of the kidnapers' plane.

An indication of the hopelessness of the South Moluccan cause is that not a country in the world has been found that will accept them. Diplomats from Iraq and Somalia denounced all terror (!) and adamantly refused to take the gunmen. It is also unlikely, according to the Amsterdam daily *De Telegraaf* (26 May), that either Libya or Algeria would take them. In London a spokesman for South Yemen condemned the hostage incident "as an 'ordinary, criminal act.'" Noting that his government had previously granted hijackers' requests for asylum, he explained that this had not resulted in the best foreign relations, adding: "We have absolutely no desire to become the refuse dump for Western Europe."

The current hostage incident is the sequel to one in December 1975, when South Moluccan nationalists hijacked a train in northern Holland and seized the Indonesian consulate in Amsterdam. Those two sieges lasted almost three weeks, resulting in the death of four hostages. The 13 gunmen involved received prison terms ranging from six to 14 years.

Hapless Former Colonial Mercenaries

Both recent incidents have been the work of extreme nationalists among the young generation of South Moluccans who are frustrated by their situation as a racially oppressed refugee community in the Netherlands. Numbering about 40,000, the South Moluccans living in Holland are descendants of East Asian and African slaves who were taken to the islands to work on Dutch plantations. Through several centuries of colonial rule in the East Indies, the South Moluccans were used by the Dutch to fight their colonial battles. Many of them converted to Christianity to emphasize their links to the European rulers of this largely Muslim colony.

During World War II the Dutch East Indies were occupied by the Japanese. The latter strengthened nationalism in the islands by eradicating the use of Dutch and making Indonesian the national language. Dutch and Eurasians who had not managed to escape were interned in concentration camps, and the former colonial administrators and



South Moluccan youth living in Holland pose before nationalist symbol.



Dagblad de Telegraaf

Train seized by South Moluccans.

officials were replaced by native Indonesians. Unlike the South Moluccans, only a small number of native Indonesians had been recruited into the Dutch colonial army, so that Japan also gave the Indonesians their first large-scale military training.

With the Japanese surrender in 1945 the Dutch were confronted with a Japanese-trained nationalist army when they attempted to restore colonial rule in Indonesia. War between the Indonesian nationalist movement and the Dutch (supported by the British) continued until December 1949, when the Netherlands pulled out of all the area except West New Guinea and turned the reins of power over to the Republic of Indonesia.

Soon after the formation of the republic, however, regional rebellions backed by the Dutch colonial army broke out. The most serious was in the South Moluccas, the historic recruiting ground for colonial mercenaries. Here the initiative came from Soumokil, an Ambonese, who in April 1950 proclaimed the "Republic of the South Moluccas." The horror stories of demobilized colonial soldiers who had returned home to spread fears of a Java-ruled, Islam-dominated, "communist" republican Indonesia whipped up popular support for the uprising.

The first response of Sukarno's republican government in Jakarta was to discuss the rebels' grievances, but the South Moluccans refused to allow the would-be negotiators to proceed to Ambon, the capital of the East Indonesian archipelago. Meanwhile they appealed to outside imperialist powers—in particular to the Netherlands, the United States, Australia—and the UN for recognition and support. Eventually Indonesia decided on military action, and by December 1950 the rebellion was decisively crushed.

Everybody's Victims

After the defeat of the ex-colonial forces, about 12,000 of those involved in the secession effort were taken to the Netherlands by the Dutch as refugees.

When they arrived they were herded into an abandoned Nazi concentration camp in Westerdork. Although they fervently expected that their former masters would soon "liberate" the Moluccas and enable them to return, the Dutch colonial empire had clearly been smashed for good. The result has been that the South Moluccans are now a deeply oppressed minority in both the Netherlands, where there is much contempt for the dark-skinned former slaves from the colonies, and in Indonesia, where the nationalist victors had no mercy for the pro-Dutch islanders.

In fact, after the nationalist victory in 1950, thousands of suspected separatists were rounded up or chased into the jungles of nearby islands. Hundreds were put to death for collaboration with the short-lived "Republic of the South Moluccas." Today, living costs in the isolated and backward (even by Indonesian standards) island group are the highest in the country; in addition, the Moluccans receive almost no government investment, and their inhabitants are ruled over as a subjugated people by Javanese bureaucrats.

To this picture must be added the notorious brutality of the dictatorship of General Suharto, which murdered more than half a million leftist and non-Muslim workers and peasants upon taking power in 1965 and still keeps tens of thousands locked up in jungle concentration camps today. The last terrorist incident in the Netherlands touched off an intense wave of repression by Indonesian officials in the Moluccas, when large numbers of suspected separatists were rounded up and detained. South Moluccans living on the islands understandably fear more government terror this time around and likely view the antics of the young nationalists in the Netherlands as doing them more harm than good.

The South Moluccan community in the Netherlands has remained extremely isolated, most of it living in camps and housing projects in rural areas. Part of this isolation is undoubtedly self-imposed by a proud people who, duped by Dutch imperialism, had previously enjoyed relatively high status in the colonies. However, their constant experience of discrimination has been a source of much frustration for the new generation of Dutch-speaking but unassimilated South Moluccan youth. Much of their anger is simply vented through street gang brawls with Dutch youth and petty vandalism. To the extent that their rebelliousness has a political character it is confined to the reactionary pro-colonialist nationalism of their parents.

No Reliance on Imperialism—Down with Indiscriminate Terror!

"Classical" anarchist individual terrorism, which seeks out symbols or

representatives of imperialist/capitalist oppression, has always been rejected by Marxists as an ineffective program, an act of despair rather than a strategy to free the exploited from their chains. But in this case, as in a number of recent incidents, we are dealing with random terrorism that takes as its victims innocent members of the population. This action, whatever its purported aim, is a crime against the working people and is wholly indefensible. Nor is indiscriminate terror a mere aberration, but a logical consequence of nationalism, which ultimately sees the entire "alien" population as the enemy, or at least fair game.

In this incident, moreover, not only is the action of the terrorists indefensible but their aims are equally reactionary. The attempt to pressure Dutch imperialism to grant "independence" for the South Moluccas has the same character as their rebellion against Indonesian nationalists in 1950. Its implementation could only result in the establishment of a client state, a military outpost of imperialism. While a utopian dream in the case of the "Republic of the South Moluccas," it was a more direct question in the case of East Timor resistance to Indonesian takeover of that former Portuguese colony in late 1975. While denouncing the Indonesian army invasion, the Spartacist League of Australia and New Zealand opposed any appeals for intervention by Australia or any reliance on the (suddenly "progressive") Portuguese colonial army.

In no sense a part of the left or workers movement, the South Moluccan terrorists get no defense from Marxists. At the same time, we adamantly oppose further persecution of the oppressed South Moluccan populations. This people, once the servants of Dutch colonialism, has become one of its tragic victims, outcasts in both Holland and their native islands. The pathetic appeals to Dutch imperialism, and terrorism against innocent victims on the part of South Moluccan nationalist desperados, serve only to deepen their oppression in the Netherlands and Indonesia.

Marxists unconditionally fight for the independence of the colonial countries from the imperialist powers, even where the result is the murderous regime of an Amin or a Suharto. By wiping the colonial question off the agenda, the masses can more easily see the need to fight their "own" national exploiters and the imperialist system, of which the bourgeoisies of the backward countries (whether nationalist or "neo-colonial") are an integral part.

The plight of numerous minor peoples—from the Berbers and the Kurds to the Tamils, Timorese and Moluccans—smarting under the tyranny of nationalist despots will be answered only through proletarian revolution. Its leadership can come only from Trotskyist parties which, unlike the Stalinists who prop up myriad "progressive" "Third World" dictators (e.g., Sukarno or Bandaranaike), struggle to smash all regimes of capitalist oppression and to reforge the Fourth International as the world party of socialist revolution. ■

SL/SYL PUBLIC OFFICES

Marxist 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

Spanish Elections...

(continued from page 1)

last month five Basque demonstrators were killed by police bullets and over 50 were wounded. In response, a massive strike wave erupted, culminating in a 600,000-strong general strike on May 16. Moreover, on May 20 a former Franco-loyal Bilbao mayor and personal friend of Juan Carlos, Javier de Yherra y Bergé, was kidnapped—presumably by ETA nationalists—and was held hostage to demand the release of the Basque political prisoners. As the electoral period was about to open on

political awareness, have increased dramatically. Last year's strike activity—all of which was illegal—was greater than that of the previous ten years combined. Even the new Ford plant in Valencia, for example, with its hand-picked workforce has locked out its 7,000 workers in response to repeated labor actions. And in the countryside, Andalusian farm laborers, who had howled before the *caciques* and Guardia Civil since the civil war, staged a protest strike against the government's economic policies earlier this spring.

The mainstay of the mass demonstrations, however, has been political. As Trotsky noted about Italy under Mussolini in 1930:

"If the revolutionary crisis were to break out...the masses of toilers,

all parties to participate in the elections.

As Marxists we point out that these democratic demands will be won not by polite negotiations with the Francoist dinosaurs in their gilded staterooms but through militant working-class struggle in the streets and factories. Thus we have called for turning the sporadic "jornadas de lucha" (days of struggle) into an unlimited general strike to win the democratic freedoms which the Spanish working people are fervently fighting for; and for building through such a strike the workers councils (soviets) which could unite the power of the proletariat to topple the Francoist regime, replacing it with a workers government which alone could guarantee these rights of the exploited and oppressed.

But at the same time we are faced with an immediate threat to winning the most complete democracy for the working people, namely the attempts of the bourgeois parties and their wretched collaborators in the workers movement to "negotiate" a reform of Francoism. So long as the state apparatus remains intact, the repressive corps the same and the autocratic politicians the same—although thinly disguised now in "democratic" garb—"reformed" Francoism will only serve to prolong the "strong state" which has oppressed the overwhelming mass of the Spanish people for the last 40 years. The demand "No to 'reformed' Francoism—For a democratic constituent assembly elected on universal suffrage!" can win the support of large sectors of the petty bourgeoisie to the workers' leadership, as well as expose the treacherous negotiations of the bourgeois democrats and the reformists who would preserve much of the bonapartist apparatus out of fear of the consequences of a truly revolutionary upheaval.

The Francoist elections do not usher in a period of bourgeois democracy in Spain. Not only is the electoral mechanism patently undemocratic (e.g., the disproportionate weight of different regions), but the Cortes is based on acceptance of the monarchy, the army and the "inviolability of the Spanish state." The king retains the right to appoint up to 20 percent of both houses of the Cortes. The prime minister is appointed by the monarch and in turn appoints the council of ministers—who have the right to enact decree laws.

There remain 67 parties which are illegal and denied participation in the elections. These range from the Carlists (the rival pretenders to the crown, who fought on the side of Franco during the Civil War but today claim to be for "self-managing" socialism) to the parties of the "far-left." (Various "far-left" candidates, however, are running as individuals in the elections.) In addition, the government controls access to the media and through the banks can determine the funds available to each party for its campaign.

The elections thus do not present the Spanish people with a democratic means of expressing and enforcing their political will. A mass revolutionary party would seek to do away with this abomination of a pseudo-parliament by fighting for a fully democratic constituent assembly. If necessary, and if the mood of the masses was such that it could have a major impact, the communists would call for an active boycott of elections such as those of June 15.

However, the existing reformist leaderships have ensured that, barring sharp changes in the political situation and with the possible exception of the Basque country, the masses of the workers will vote in the Francoist elections. For a small Trotskyist propaganda group to call for abstention on principle in such a situation would be a useless exercise in self-isolation. If the revolutionaries are not strong enough to prevent these rigged elections or gut them of any meaning, then they should

continued on page 7



Cops break up Basque demonstration.

Bilbao/Cambio 16

May 24, Basque political organizations—ranging from the left to the nationalists—announced their intentions to boycott unless the police terror is halted and the remaining political prisoners amnestied.

In the hope of rescuing the elections, the government backed down and has to date released the vast majority of political prisoners. Moreover, provisions have been made for those accused of "crimes of blood"—by and large Basque separatists—to be deported into exile. Among those who have been sent abroad are five defendants from the infamous 1970 Burgos military tribunal. As we go to press, the question of how many Basque political prisoners remain, and the impact of the government's deportation scheme on the possibility of an election boycott in that region, is unclear.

Democracy and Dictatorship

It is precisely because of the raging pre-revolutionary situation in Spain that political activity is spreading to previously passive regions and sectors of the population. Strikes, which Trotsky noted in the 1930's were the elementary form of the proletariat coming to

workers as well as peasants, would certainly follow up their economic demands with democratic slogans (such as freedom of assembly, of press, of trade-union organization, democratic representation in parliament and in the municipalities).

—"Problems of the Italian Revolution"

Marxists do not stand aloof from these struggles but actively champion the democratic demands of the working masses. Repeatedly we have raised calls for the abolition of the special repressive apparatuses of Francoism—the Guardia Civil, the anti-riot brigades, the armed police, the Tribunal of Public Order, the Social-Political Brigades, etc. We have demanded the immediate release of all victims of reactionary Francoist repression. The Spanish people must have the right to free assembly and expression, and an end to censorship; the working class must win full trade-union freedoms and the final abolition of the CNS.

A crucial democratic demand in Spain today is recognition of the right to national self-determination for the oppressed nationalities in Spain, notably the Basques and Catalans. And we demand an end to government prohibitions on political parties and the right of

"La Pasionaria": Voice of Resistance or Echo of Betrayal?

On May 13 Dolores Ibarruri, the Stalinist orator known to the world as "La Pasionaria," returned to Spain after 38 years' exile in the Soviet Union. The wife of an Asturian miner who rose during the civil war to become a leader of the Communist Party of Spain (PCE), Ibarruri was named the party's president during the exile years. Her return to Spain followed by a month the PCE's legalization by Prime Minister Suárez. Ibarruri will head the party's Asturias slate in this June's parliamentary elections.

Ibarruri slipped quietly back into the country. Party members were told not to go to Madrid airport to greet her arrival, and as soon as the plane touched down she was unceremoniously whisked off to an unknown location. According to the 14 May *New York Times*, the PCE had reached what one member called "a gentleman's agreement" with Suárez not to give Ibarruri a tumultuous welcome which might "offend" the "entrenched Francoists in the bureaucracy and the military." Thus, just as during the Spanish civil war the Stalinists strove to uphold "Republican legality" (i.e., the capitalist order), today the PCE maintains the "tranquility" of the "reformed" Francoist monarchy.

But if the PCE was playing down Ibarruri's return, the foreign bourgeois press was playing it up, with the *New York Times*, for example, trumpeting the return of "the living communist legend." The same imperialist "democrats" who led the fight against sending arms to the Republic and then supported the murderous Franco reign for decades wish to clear their names with an empty gesture of journalistic "amnesty." So now they hypocritically wax nostalgic for the good old days when the fiery voice of "La Pasionaria" was broadcast from loudspeakers throughout Madrid urging resistance against the fascists. In Ibarruri's return and the PCE's legalization the liberals seek to polish up Suárez' "reform" image, badly tattered after police brutally attacked May Day demonstrations early this month and injured hundreds throughout Spain.

To those who lived through the anxious weeks and months of the siege of Madrid, and to the world proletariat which shared from afar the anguish of the fallen martyrs, the memory of that heroic battle was and remains an inspiration to struggle. Far be it from the Trotskyists to denigrate La Pasionaria's fiery cry of defiance, "*No pasarán*!"—"They will not pass!" Captured for history in the documentary movie "To Die in Madrid," Ibarruri's voice echoing throughout the capital urging the women of Spain to pour boiling oil on Franco's invading army will not be forgotten. But beyond the image of the eloquent La Pasionaria now being so carefully cultivated lies the other side of her role which must also be remembered—that of the vicious Stalinist hatchetman and rabid anti-communist hack who spared no occasion to slander and denounce all those who proclaimed the need for revolution to win the civil war.

Slander and Murder Against the Barcelona Workers

"It is better," Ibarruri cried, quoting Mexican peasant revolutionary Emiliano Zapata in her famous speech, "to die on your feet than live on your knees." But pass the fascists did, to drown the Spanish workers in blood while the

Stalinists held open the door. With its refusals to form unified workers militias, its preaching of reliance on the bourgeois army under the "reliable" officers many of whom soon went over to Franco, surrendering entire cities to the fascists, the PCE prepared the proletariat for defeat.

From the very moment of the army rebellion, Communist Party sabotage of the workers' resistance had begun. Just the day before La Pasionaria was to make her "No pasarán" speech, on 17 July 1936 when Franco was about to rise up in Spanish Morocco, the PCE in the Popular Front was suppressing news of the invasion as an excuse to refuse the demands of the thousands of workers who had marched on the presidential palace demanding arms! When, nearly a year later, during the 1937 May Days, the Barcelona proletariat attempted to break the chains of the bourgeois government which kept the guns under lock and key and starved the munitions factories for supplies—it was only the small Trotskyist Sección Bolchevique-Leninista de España and the left-anarchist "Friends of Durruti" which fought to the end on the side of the workers.

At that time a revolutionary policy would have mobilized the masses of workers and peasants in an enormous social struggle against capitalist exploitation, such a revolutionary policy would have split Franco's army along class lines and left the fascist generals at the front without any soldiers. But the PCE, and its Catalan component the PSUC, true to Stalin's guarantee to his bourgeois allies that there would be no social revolution in Spain, manned the government barricades to put down the revolt.

In her autobiography written thirty years later, Ibarruri tries to play down the PCE's role in smashing the Barcelona rising.

"During my long years in exile, many comrades have frequently asked me: Could the Communist Party have seized power in Spain? And if it could have, then why didn't it?"

"If at a given moment of the war, for example, in 1937, when the Largo Caballero government was in crisis, certain conditions existed which would have permitted the seizure of power, the Communists did not do so (although many of our combatants desired it) for a basic reason: neither the national nor international situation was favorable to such a change."

Dolores Ibarruri, *They Shall Not Pass* (1966)

In retrospect Ibarruri sounds mellow. This is a far cry from the frothing spleen and downright slander she unleashed at the time against the revolutionary workers and Trotskyists, which has been preserved for history in her report to the Central Committee, delivered in Madrid on 23 May 1938:

"It has been them, the Trotskyist criminals, who have constantly fanned the flames of disunity among the anti-fascist forces. It was they who organized the counterrevolutionary push in May 1937, with the aim of stabbing the heroic defenders of Euzkadi [Basque region] in the back, when the enemy had launched his brutal attack against them."

"It has been they who have figured in the leadership of the greater number of the fascist espionage organizations which have been discovered up to the present by the Republic authorities..."

"It was they who, in those few places where they were able to deceive a few workers, as for example in Gerona, incited them to conduct strikes so as to prevent the population from having refugees to protect them against aggression from the air..."



Dolores Ibarruri with Carrillo in Madrid.

Socias/Cambio 16



Kappa Press

Dolores Ibarruri addressing Republican rally in 1938.

"There can be no hesitation of any kind, no sentimentality in the face of this gang of criminals. One of the results of the complete unity of the people must be to smash them once and for all."

But the Stalinists did more than slander the Barcelona workers. A PCE functionary commanded the Republican assault guards unit which precipitated the May Days uprising by attempting to seize control of the Barcelona Telefónica from the anarchist-led workers committee. While the CNT (anarchist labor federation) refused to support the workers' resistance, the centrist POUM (Workers Party of Marxist Unification) for several days fought on the barricades together with the Barcelona workers, until its leaders took fright and ordered POUM militants to lay down their arms. The POUM leadership's treachery did not protect

the POUM militants from becoming the object of a murderous witchhunt, spearheaded by the Stalinists, which eventually resulted in the assassination of POUM leader Andrés Nin, a former Trotskyist.

Today, PCE leader Santiago Carrillo wishes to wash his hands of the assassination of Nin, calling this in his book *Eurocomunismo y Estado* "an abominable and unjustifiable act." But Carrillo was head of the Stalinist youth organization at the time, and Dolores Ibarruri was a member of the PCE's political bureau. Their Pontius Pilate act conflicts with the historical record. In his book, *Yo Fui Ministro de Stalin*, the PCE minister of education in the Republican governments of Caballero and Negrin, Jesús Hernández, reports the following reply by La Pasionaria to the question of who ordered the arrest of Nin: "We did, since there was no point in getting upset over such a minor matter... What is so important about the police detaining a handful of provocateurs and spies?"

"The Government of Victory"

Along with Ibarruri's "No pasarán" speech, she is best remembered for coining the slogan "El Gobierno de la Victoria" in reference to the Negrin government, and for her speech at the departure of the International Brigades from Spain. On both of these occasions, her fiery words masked unspeakable crimes perpetrated by the Stalinists upon the workers of Spain.

The Negrin (based on the famous "13 Points" guaranteeing protection of capitalist property, an end to land seizures and withdrawal of all foreign armies) came to power as a result of the PCE's decision to topple the previous regime led by the Socialist Largo Caballero. After the Barcelona revolt the Stalinists had decided that Caballero could not be relied upon to carry out the repression of the left which was now on the agenda. "On May 9, 1937," writes Ibarruri in her autobiography, "after Largo Caballero had refused to punish those who were playing into the enemy's hands" (i.e., launch a round-up of POUM and anarchist leaders) the PCE refused to participate in the government unless he resigned. Caballero acceded

continued on page 8

Spanish Elections...

(continued from page 5)

seek to use them as a forum for their propaganda.

"Platajunta" and the Elections

Throughout the pre-revolutionary situation in Spain, both the PCE and the PSOE have amply demonstrated their fundamental commitment to the politics of class collaboration. Each coalesced popular-front alliances with bourgeois forces ranging from nationalists to christian democrats (including the hatcher of the 1934 Asturian miners insurrection, José María Gil Robles) to the Borhón and Carlist monarchists. For the PCE it was the Junta Democrática, for the PSOE the Platform of Democratic Convergence.

During their drive for legalization, neither party attempted to mobilize the proletariat to wrest democratic rights from the Francoist state; instead, both turned to ever-larger popular-front formations. In March 1976, the Junta Democrática and the Platform of Democratic Convergence merged to become the Coordinación Democrática better known as the "Platajunta." In this omnibus body were to be found the three major trade-union federations, the syndicalist/Maoist organizations, nationalists of all stripes, bourgeois forces, and, of course, the socialists of the crown (the Carlists). Uniting these disparate forces was the joint commitment to bourgeois class rule in post-Franco Spain and to "negotiate" for "democracy" with the Caudillo's successors. The "Platajunta" reached its political climax in January following the release of Santiago Carrillo when the "Commission of 10" was drawn in for joint discussions with Suárez over the application of Francoist "democracy."

Since then, and in particular in the wake of the legalization of 156 political associations, the Coordinación Democrática has fallen into disuse. With the exception of the indigenous Catalan popular front, the Assemblée de Catalunya, the legalized parties have pursued formally independent electoral campaigns—but explicitly committed to the continuation of class collaboration.

After a touch of momentary leftist bravado when the rival "historical" wing of social democracy was legalized, the PSOE has settled in to wheel and deal among the Francoists. At a recent public meeting honoring François

Communist Party at the feet of the Francoists. For the past two years, since the massive demonstrations at the time of the death of Franco and the execution of the five nationalist prisoners, we have exposed the PCE's policy of holding back any and all popular struggles in search of bourgeois "respectability." The PCE has repeatedly hoycotted and betrayed their own demonstrations to appease the present government.

First there was the fizzled "hot autumn" of class struggle in 1976: this came to naught when the PCE failed to mobilize even the workers it leads for its own November general strike. Then following the January murder of five Communist supporters at the Atocha street locale of the Workers Commissions (PCE dominated trade unions) by fascist gunmen, the PCE took the

general strike. In Madrid tens of thousands of workers heeded the call for solidarity with the Basque demonstrations against the government. However, this time the PCE openly refused to endorse any solidarity strikes and urged the Basques to return to work so as not to "jeopardize the elections." The CC.OO. tops called on the Basque workers "not to further aggravate the situation in Spain." As thousands of riot police and Guardia Civil disgorged live ammunition into crowds of demonstrators and shouted orders of "Shoot to kill!" the Workers Commissions and PCE leaders were concerned only "for the elections to unfold as freely as possible in a climate of peace" (Le Monde, 18 May).

Strikebreaking in the service of Suárez has not been the only example of

democracy, the communists seated in the next Cortes will be able to consider the crown as the constitutional regime" (Rouge, 18 April 1977).

Gone as well is the opposition to NATO and American bases in Spain, and the opposition to entry into the Common Market. Instead, Carrillo lances himself the head of the leading pro-imperialist "Euro-communist" party a party which went on record thanking Jimmy Carter for their legalization.

Now there is not even a vestige of opposition to Suárez and Juan Carlos from the PCE. The New York Times (17 May) was led to comment:

"Curiously, one of Mr. Suárez' strongest tactical allies of the moment is Santiago Carrillo, the 62-year-old secretary general of the Communist Party. Grateful to the Prime Minister for legalizing his party, the veteran politician lashes out regularly at the Popular Alliance."

To dispel the last shred of "curiosity," Carrillo, in a public press conference, stated, "Not only am I not neutral to Suárez, I am pro-Suárez!"

Conditional Opposition to the PCE and PSOE

Unable to boycott and smash the Francoist elections through militant class struggles, a Trotskyist propaganda group in Spain would seek to wage a fight against "reformed" Francoism by launching its own candidates, or, if it is unable to do this, to give critical support to candidates of another working-class party. However, the candidacies of the PCE and PSOE are the direct continuation of the popular-frontist policies which paved the way for Franco's seizure of power. Marxists stand on the principle of class independence of the proletariat and, therefore, can give no electoral support to parties engaged in popular-front alliances. The disuse of the Coordinación Democrática during the election period does not change the fundamental character of the PCE and PSOE slates.

In 1975 the international Spartacist tendency refused critical support to the Portuguese Communist Party both for its class-collaborationist alliances and



Fascist rally in Bilbao.


Leonard Freed/Magnum

occasion to line up squarely behind Suárez. As hundreds of thousands of workers occupied the streets of Madrid and Barcelona the PCE attempted to sabotage the protest and went so far as to sign a joint declaration with Suárez, the PSOE and other representatives of the "Platajunta" counseling "serenity" in the face of fascist attacks. PCE leader Simón Sánchez Montero tried to give proof of the party's responsibility by crying out "¡Viva España!"—the traditional battle cry of the far-right—to a room full of startled newsmen.

The PCE again refused to mobilize the restive proletariat in support of May Day demonstrations it had itself called.

PCE betrayal. To benefit its new "democratic" image the PCE has dropped a few "encumbrances" from the past. Gone is (of course) any reference to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and now even the clenched fist salute (which Carrillo claims is too "reminiscent" of the civil war). In their place the party has accepted the red-yellow monarchist flag—what Republicans call the flag of "blood and gold"—as "their own" and that of "all Spaniards."

Gone too is any opposition to the Francoist monarchy. Now the PCE central committee declares, "if the monarchy continues to advance on the track of reestablishing liberty and



Mundo Diario (Barcelona)

Because of the repression, sports events have become a traditional means for political expression.

Mitterrand and Mário Soares, PSOE leader Felipe González ostentatiously shared the platform with deposed UDC leader and former minister of foreign affairs Areilza. All the while rumors abound of a Suárez-González "center-left" coalition if the AP manages to forestall Suárez' maneuvers to gain a "center" majority in the Cortes.

From Treachery to Outright Grovelling

Most dramatic, however, has been the open prostration and grovelling of the

Again, when the PCE was legalized on April 10, even though the membership had been prepared for a horn-honking motorcade and mass rally to celebrate the event, all demonstrations were canceled. As in the case of the protests after the Atocha killings, the excuse was the threat of an army coup d'état. To this danger Santiago Carrillo gave the classic reformist response: do nothing, don't upset the right. Its pattern of demobilizing the workers continues.

But the most dramatic recent betrayal came in response to the May 16 Basque



Juan Carlos

Gamma



Robert Royal

Premier Suárez

for its explicit support to the bonapartist MFA control of the state apparatus. In Portugal, as in Spain today, not only organizational independence but a campaign directed against the incumbent government regime must be a precondition for critical electoral support.

As a result of the popular-front coalitions (although tenuous) and the support of the PCE and PSOE to the Francoist government, Marxists must stand in conditional opposition to both these reformist parties. We call on the

continued on page 8

“La Pasionaria”

(continued from page 6)

and was replaced by Juan Negrin Lopez. It was on the occasion of the formation of the new cabinet that Ibaruri christened the Negrin regime “the government of victory.” It went on to smash all remnants of the workers rebellion, and prepare for the final surrender to Franco.

In late 1938 the International Brigades were withdrawn from Spain, a decision which grew out of Stalin's desire to arrange the Hitler/ Stalin pact. Following the capitulation of the Western powers to Hitler at Munich, Stalin, seeing the futility of an agreement with the imperialist democracies, shifted his international orientation and decided to hand Spain over to Franco. It was on the International Brigades' last march out of Spain that Ibaruri made the speech now remembered so fondly by the liberals: “You can go proudly,” she told the departing troops who were abandoning the Spanish proletariat to its fate. “You are history,” she said, “you are legend. You are a heroic example of democracy's solidarity and universality.”

Just as nearly 35 years later, the Chilean popular front prepared the way for the Pinochet coup of 11 September 1973, by counseling confidence in the “constitutional” officer corps, so in Spain in early 1939 the PCE's trusted Republican colonel Segismundo Casado staged a coup in Madrid to unseat the Negrin government which still favored, if weakly, armed resistance against Franco. The Communist Party which had collaborated with Casado all the way down the line was profoundly disoriented by his “betrayal.” In her memoirs Ibaruri writes that “the formation of Casado's junta with the purpose of surrendering the Republic came as a surprise because of our misplaced confidence.” She describes a meeting with Casado only days before his coup in which she had requested his cooperation in storing some food shipments the PCE had received from an anti-fascist women's organization abroad:

“Casado was not only willing to aid us; he even became enthusiastic about our plans. He kept talking about how difficult it was to obtain food for the

population.

“Our conversation was so cordial that before I left he insisted that I see his little boy. He called one of the servants in his home to bring over the child, who was truly, like all healthy two-year-olds, a beautiful baby.”

“How far I was from imagining that this man had already made plans to betray the Republic and surrender the people to fascism.”

Yet even at this late date the struggle was not necessarily lost. In his book *The Spanish Civil War*, Hugh Thomas writes that in the final days while Casado was negotiating the terms of surrender with Franco, Communist-led forces remained in control of Madrid and their strength during this period was such that, had the party ordered it, the PCE could have easily defeated Casado's forces and prevented the junta's consolidation. But the Central Committee, profoundly disoriented by the coup, refused to offer the generals any direction.

Learning of Casado's orders to arrest the Communists, the Central Committee Ibaruri included—managed to escape to a small air base. Standing by a waiting airplane the leadership received word that Casado was refusing at all costs to be reconciled with Negrin. The Central Committee members simply boarded the plane and flew to France, leaving the army without instructions. Thus the Communist commanders who had control of the city militarily simply waited to be defeated!

Today, while assuming a “ceremonial” position as chairman of Carrillo's “Eurocommunist” PCE, Dolores Ibaruri has continued to praise the “socialist fatherland” of Brezhnev and Stalin. Trotskyists unconditionally defend the Soviet deformed workers state against imperialist attack, something that it is increasingly questionable that Carrillo & Co. would do. But we continue to denounce the crimes of the Stalinist bureaucracy, which ordered the assassination of Nin and Trotsky and continues to suppress proletarian democracy in the USSR.

The *New York Times* reported that at La Pasionaria's first public meeting, a mass gathering in the Basque country, a small group (allegedly Trotskyist) in the audience shouted out that Dolores Ibaruri should be sent to a psychiatric institute an allusion to the Kremlin bureaucracy's practice of locking up dissidents, particularly avowed socialists, in mental hospitals. We do not believe that Dolores Ibaruri's crimes against the international proletariat are a mental aberration, nor are we willing, as she requests, to “forget these little stories” from the Spanish civil war. We seek a workers commission of inquiry to reveal the true facts about the Stalinists' vile murders of the Spanish Trotskyists, POUM and anarchist militants, beginning with Nin. And above all we demand the handing over of that man, Ramon Mercader, the assassin of Leon Trotsky, who to this day remains a member of the Spanish Communist Party. We will know what to do with him!

Spanish Elections...

(continued from page 7)

working-class ranks of these two parties to force their leaders to break from their bourgeois popular-front allies and particularly from the Suárez government as the condition to any electoral support.

Elections in Euzkadi

The June 15 elections in addition to all their other drawbacks and limitations are not taking place under conditions of bourgeois democracy. In response to demonstrations and mass mobilizations, the hated special police squads have unleashed a terror fully the equal of that under Franco himself. In areas where the level of official terror is so intense as to prevent anything even resembling free elections, or where parties representing a substantial proportion of working people are outlawed,

the elections can take on the character of a Francoist plebiscite. Trotskyists would, in such cases, join with the masses of workers in an active boycott of the fraudulent elections. This may well be the direction of events in the Basque region and could be the case also in the Canary Islands.

There is no point to calling for boycott unless there is a real chance of success. However, in Euzkadi, under the worst police rampages seen in many years, the Basque people have held out and fought back. Town after town was overrun by police-state invasions. Peaceful demonstrations were fired upon; first with rubber bullets, then with live ammunition. But the resolve to fight has not dissipated. In the last month harricades have gone up in Vitoria, Renteria, San Sebastian and Bilbao. Strikes continue to this date.

By the admission of a leading bourgeois politician, “here in Euzkadi we are not in an electoral atmosphere. Those who vote will go to vote in a state of fear” (*New York Times*, 21 May). Although many Basque militants have

Carter/ Courts Go After Union, Minorities...

(continued from page 3)

unconstitutional a law barring employers from financing their own employees' suits against the union. An outraged Joe Rauh, the lawyer for the unions involved, bitterly remarked, “Our entire American labor policy has been based on keeping employers out of union affairs.” What hypocrisy from the lawyer for Arnold Miller and Ed Sadlowski, the man who had made his living for years by taking the unions to court!

In the midst of these anti-labor decisions, the Supreme Court made a surprise ruling May 31 in favor of a Teamsters local representing workers at a Lubbock, Texas, shipping firm, ruling that seniority systems which perpetuate the effects of past racial discrimination are “not necessarily” illegal. At issue was a Teamsters/company hiring system in which seniority for picking assignments, hours and other working conditions was granted by unit. Thus, blacks who in the past were declared ineligible for higher-paying over-the-road jobs would have to give up their seniority and start at the bottom if they transferred into these jobs now. In the majority opinion, Justice Potter Stewart said:

“Although a seniority system inevitably tends to perpetuate the effects of pre-act discrimination in such cases, the Congressional judgment was that Title VII should not outlaw use of existing seniority lists and thereby destroy or water down the vested seniority rights of employees simply because their employer had engaged in discrimination prior to the act.”

While the ruling took the side of the union in this case, its motivation was solely to protect bourgeois interests. The capitalists, particularly in the steel and telephone industries, have lately been screaming bloody murder that the present interpretation of the 1965 Civil Rights Act has forced gigantic financial settlements in back-pay reparations to women and minorities subjected to job discrimination. The present decision is expected to put a lid on the growing number of class action suits by the affected women and blacks. Moreover, by ruling that workers must now prove intent to discriminate, the courts generalize a stipulation which they have used previously to gut busing programs in many cities.

Class-struggle militants must combat the effects of job discrimination against women and blacks through plant-wide

seniority systems. At the same time, they must oppose the capitalist government, using liberal rhetoric, rewriting and outlawing union-negotiated seniority systems. Courts out of the unions! The Texas Teamster decision was not a blow for trade-union independence. Rather it was a deliberate underwriting of racist practices by the employer, practices backed up by reactionary union bureaucrats.

Despite being kicked all over Capitol Hill, the AFL-CIO tops still keep their faith in Carter and have responded to the onslaught of defeats by vowing to lobby ever harder to win the bourgeoisie's support. Like the New York City Central Labor Council which—after watching over 60,000 city workers lose their jobs during Beame's first term—now comes out and endorses his reelection, Meany's executive assistant, Thomas R. Donahue, told the *Wall Street Journal* that it's “still early in the game” and the “heaviest part of the batting order is coming up now.” The AFL-CIO thinks it still has a chance to get other more minor aspects of its labor package passed because it has now appeased the southern senators threatening to filibuster against the bill by dropping the most important demand, the repeal of the right-to-work section 14B!

Were it not for the dire consequences which will be unleashed against the whole of the working people, one could almost enjoy watching these labor betrayers and their liberal “friends” getting kicked by the man they put into office.

The crying need at the present time is a working-class leadership to unite the oppressed population and the organized labor movement in a joint defense against the Carter onslaught.

All wings of the incumbent labor bureaucracy have proven their prostration before the political servants of capital. The ossified Meanyites, whose insensitivity to the oppression of blacks, national minorities and women opened the door for the government to step into the unions, cannot escape the “credit” for Carter's victory. The outbursts of the Sadlowski ilk, who built their careers on suing the unions in the bosses' courts, are similarly enmeshed in the electoral and administrative machinery of the bourgeois state. All have more than amply demonstrated that for them, labor's political role is to provide voting cattle for the parties of the bourgeoisie.

No government intervention in the unions!

No support to bourgeois politicians! For a workers party based on the unions to lead the way forward to a workers government! ■

SPARTACIST LEAGUE LOCAL DIRECTORY

- ANN ARBOR (313) 769-6376
c/o SYL, Room 4316
Michigan Union, U. of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
- BERKELEY (415) 835-1535
Box 23372
Oakland, CA 94623
- BOSTON (617) 492-3928
Box 188
MIT Station
Cambridge, MA 02139
- CHICAGO (312) 427-0003
Box 6441, Main P.O.
Chicago, IL 60680
- CLEVELAND (216) 281-4781
Box 6765
Cleveland, OH 44101
- DETROIT (313) 869-1551
Box 663A, General P.O.
Detroit, MI 48232
- HOUSTON
Box 26474
Houston, TX 77207
- LOS ANGELES (213) 662-1564
Box 26282, Edendale Station
Los Angeles, CA 90026
- MADISON
c/o SYL, Box 3334
Madison, WI 53704
- NEW YORK (212) 925-2426
Box 1377, G.P.O.
New York, NY 10001
- PHILADELPHIA
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) 386-4107
Box 7198, Station A
Toronto, Ontario
- VANCOUVER (604) 291-8993
Box 26, Station A
Vancouver, B.C.

Workers Vanguard

MARXIST WORKING-CLASS WEEKLY OF THE SPARTACIST LEAGUE

One year subscription (48 issues): \$5—
Introductory offer (16 issues): \$2. International rates: 48 issues—\$20 airmail/\$5 airmail. 16 introductory issues—\$5 airmail. Make checks payable to Spartacist Publishing Co., Box 1377 GPO, New York, NY 10001.

—includes SPARTACIST

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____ 181

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

been released, it appears that more remain incarcerated and that major parties in the region still plan to boycott the polls.

An effective boycott of the election in Euzkadi could significantly undermine the democratic pretensions of Suárez and Juan Carlos. The treacherous appeals of the Stalinists and social democrats for peaceful elections to usher in yet another Francoist Cortes (but with their participation) must be



Felipe González



Marcelino Camacho

fought. The working masses must be mobilized to demand a genuinely democratic constituent assembly and an end to all anti-democratic legislation and special repressive organs of the Francoist regime. Through the mobilization of the working class, as in Euzkadi, the basis for the forging of soviets and workers councils on the national and regional basis can be established. Only the democracy of soviet rule will finally bury the Francoist reign of terror and free the proletariat from two generations of brutal oppression.

No to "reformed" Francoism! Down with the Francoist monarchy! For a democratically elected constituent assembly!

No votes to the parties of the popular front! PCE and PSOE, Break with the Coordinación Democrática and the Francoist regime!

For a workers republic in Spain! Forward to a Socialist United States of Europe!

For a Trotskyist party in Spain, section of a reformed Fourth International!

SPARTACIST
edition française

pour toute commande s'adresser à:

Pascal Alessandri
B.P. 336
75011 Paris
FRANCE
3,00 F.F.

Spartacist Publishing Co
Box 1377, GPO
New York, N.Y. 10001
USA
\$.75 US/Canada

S.F. ILWU Militants Demand:

"Shut Down West Coast Longshore!"

We reprint below a statement being circulated on the San Francisco docks, signed by 64 members of Local 10 of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU). Initiated by Stan Gow and Howard Kevlor, publishers of the "Longshore Militant" and executive board members of Local 10, the leaflet calls for West Coast-wide strike action to stop the employers' Pacific Maritime Association (PMA) from declaring San Francisco a "low work opportunity port" (LWOP), a move which will lead to forced transfers and mass deregistration of longshoremen.


Local 10 president Cleophus Williams has been brazenly fronting for PMA, seeking to get the Local 10 membership to "voluntarily" agree to LWOP for several months. But the LWOP designation, part of Supplement 3 of the ILWU/PMA contract, is neither "voluntary" nor of benefit to the hard-pressed S.F. longshoremen. Under Harry Bridges' sellout contract, the employers have the "right" to invoke Supplement 3 and viciously slash longshore jobs in the San Francisco port.

Williams has called an "informational" Local 10 meeting for the evening of June 9, in order to persuade Bay Area longshoremen to seal their own fate by voting "yes" on a phony referendum on LWOP he has placed on the June 10 ballot in the election for International

officers. As the leaflet explains, longshoremen must seek to defeat this ploy, insure a big "no" vote on this job-sealing scheme, and strike all the West Coast ports with the demand for a shorter workshift at no loss in pay.

On Wednesday, May 25, at the Local 10 RC (Labor Relations Committee), PMA stated its intention to declare San Francisco a Low Work Opportunity Port, giving the union one week to respond. This designation results in forced transfers and mandates that dispatch be by rotation on a one-day only basis—except for steady men. For months there have been debates involving halfway measures. The only way to stop Supplement 3 is to dump the whole contract. To assure that all longshoremen have jobs, we must strike now for a shorter work shift at no loss in pay and the abolition of all steady categories in the Master Agreement.

We cannot wait until the contract expires in 1978. By then, up to 1,100 of our members will, either be forcibly transferred, deprived of PGP [the contractual pay "guarantee"] or deregistered outright. In order to have a solid coastwide strike which can defeat both the employers and government strike-breaking, we must call on the entire coast which was unanimous at the Caucus in its opposition to Sup. 3 to join us immediately in this strike action.



Containerization has drastically cut jobs.

The International leadership have constantly tried to trick us into "voluntarily" invoking Sup. 3 and cannot be relied on to run an effective strike. To insure effective membership direction and control, there must be elected strike committees in every port representing hoards, gangs, etc., and linked up coastwide. The ILWU has the power to strangle all West Coast shipping from Vancouver all the way south to force PMA to meet our just demands, particularly when longshore is backed up by the warehouse division, the Teamster Alliance and the other maritime unions. ■

Young Spartacus

MONTHLY NEWSPAPER OF THE SPARTACUS YOUTH LEAGUE

Make checks payable/mail to: Spartacus Youth Publishing Co., Box 825, Canal Street Station, New York, NY 10013

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____

SUBSCRIBE NOW
\$2/11 issues

SOEBEN ERSCHIENEN!

SPARTACIST

Deutsche Ausgabe

Nr. 5-Mai 1977 DM 1,-/8S 7

- Vom Grossen Sprung zur Rebellion auf dem Tien-An-Men-Platz: Maos „Sozialismus“: Weder Elektrifizierung noch Sowjets
- Entstehung des kubanischen deformierten Arbeiterstaates
- Rede über die Labor Party-Frage
- Die vielen Gesichter und langen Wellen Ernest Mandels

zu bestellen über:
Spartacist Publishing Co., Box 1377, GPO, NY, NY 10001, USA
oder
TLD, Postfach 11 0647,
1 Berlin 11

Ben Chavis
of "Wilmington
Ten"

PDC Protest

North Carolina Refuses Retrial for Wilmington Ten

Attorney General Griffin Bell
Washington, D.C.

With its outrageous refusal to grant a new trial to the Wilmington Ten, in spite of the retraction of admittedly bribed testimony by key prosecution witnesses, the state of North Carolina proves that it will stop at nothing to railroad these civil rights activists framed up on arson charges. For over five years the government has conspired to persecute the Wilmington Ten because they fought to integrate the public schools in the face of violent reaction.

The Partisan Defense Committee demands that this racist witchhunt stop immediately, and the Wilmington Ten, who are guilty of no crime, be set free!

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



Keep Hunter

Arnold Miller...

(continued from page 12)

hospital treatment cards withdrawn through collaboration between the companies and the union. In 1969-71 another wave of wildcat strikes broke out, largely around health and safety issues.

The 1969 wildcat demanded a law encompassing compensation for black lung disease, and a prominent role was played in it by the Black Lung Association, of which Miller was a leader. After the murder of Joseph Yablonski, the former Boyle henchman who had broken away to become leader of the MFD, Miller became the new MFD head, no doubt in large part because of his base among pensioners, who made up fully 40 percent of the UMW electorate at the time.

The broad support that the MFD received was not surprising. The Boyle regime had become increasingly isolated and unable to control the membership, and the program of the MFD didn't in any way go beyond straight-line trade unionism, i.e., reformist class collaboration. Its essence was a series of minimal reforms that were standard practice in many American unions. MFD demands revolved around rank-and-file ratification of the contract, election of district officials, and such minimal economic benefits as establishing sick pay and upgrading the pension to a mere \$200 month.

The real issue of the 1972 elections was not the elementary reforms promised by Miners for Democracy, but the independence of the trade unions from the bourgeois parties and state. Miller himself had unsuccessfully run for office in the West Virginia legislature on the Democratic Party ticket and maintained close ties with liberal politicians. But the grossest betrayal was the MFD's invitation to the bourgeois state to intervene in the UMW. For several months prior to the elections the Labor Department literally ran the union, supervising all financial transactions and editing the *United Mine Workers Journal*.

The MFD's courting of the state against the Boyle clique only presaged its support of the courts against the Mine Workers membership once it achieved power. Our article entitled "Labor Department Wins Mine Workers' Election," published shortly after the elections, put the question squarely:

"But Miller has no real program, and he must keep faith only with the Labor Department liberal Democrat cabal which installed him at the head of the UMW.

"This is the real lesson of the UMW elections. For communists, whose fundamental aim in the labor movement is to transform the unions into a tool of the revolutionary will of the proletariat, no reform can increase the power of the working class if it is won by placing the unions under the trusteeship of the capitalist state, thus destroying the first pre-condition for their mobilization in the struggle to smash that state."

B'k No. 17, March 1973

The 1972 Elections: Acid Test

This was not, however, typical of the response of the American left, which virtually without exception added its voice to the chorus of cheers for Miller. Predictably enough, the CP uncritically backed Miller, and the CP-dominated TUAD sent Miller and other MFD candidates a congratulatory telegram after the elections. The SWP similarly campaigned against the "greater evil." A *Militant* headline (8 December 1972) blared: "Issues in Miners Election: Boyle 'Protects Bosses From the Men.'" The workerist International Socialists (I.S.) claimed that an MFD victory would insure that the new union leaders would be forced to defend the membership:

"The MFD has opened the door for democracy in the UMW, but not necessarily the kind of democracy that its leaders and their Labor Department

allies envisioned. Instead, it will be, if the ranks have their way, the democracy of an active rank and file, continually pushing their leadership to greater militancy."

Workers' Power, 19 January-1 February 1973

Within the Maoist movement, the main tendencies engaged in polemics over how much "criticism" it was appropriate to make before selling out to Miller. The October League excoriated the Revolutionary Union (RU - now the Revolutionary Communist Party [RCP]):

"On the question of supporting the Miller and Sadowski campaigns, the OI takes sharp issue with RU leader Avakian's line of 'critical support.' Faced with the growing fascist assault of gangster miner-union leader Tony Boyle and USW boss I.W. Ahel, it was



Mike Trbovich

the duty of the entire working class and its leadership to stand behind the two campaigns, which had the solid support of the rank and file."

-*Call*, August 1973


The 1972 UMW elections were an acid test for the American left. Heretofore, with the partial exception of the CP, the left was generally inactive within the trade unions. However, this vote roughly coincided with the time that most of the groups, whose cadre had been accumulated from the New Left, made their first systematic implantations in the unions. While there were very few leftists in the UMW, the positions taken on the Mine Workers elections foreshadowed the character of the various groups' own trade-union work.

The axis of the American left had been the antiwar and black movements. Overwhelmingly, ostensible communists had adapted themselves to popular-frontist and black nationalist illusions, severing these struggles from a class opposition to capitalism. A "turn to the working class" did not, however, mean an end to the opportunism of the left. It only substituted workerism, glorification of the class-as-it-is, and kowtowing before simple trade-union militancy, to its previous capitulations. Ironically, the Miller leadership would have been considered on the opposite side of the battle lines in the previous period by those who now rushed to support it. Miller & Co. had no credentials in opposing racism or the war in Vietnam. In fact, as a counter to Boyle's redbaiting, the MFD leaders published photos of themselves in military uniform, reminding the membership of their "loyalty" and "patriotism."

Nor was it merely the Stalinists and social-democratic reformists who capitulated to Miller: the UMW question was particularly important for several centrist groups claiming to be Trotskyist which were breaking to the left from Pabloist and Shachtmanite revisionism. Those who broke sharply with their past went on to fuse with the Spartacist League. Others, like the Shachtmanite

Revolutionary Socialist League (RSL) and the Class Struggle League (CSL), along with several cadre from the SWP, wrote of the need for the Transitional Program as the basis for work in the unions, but stopped short of applying it where it was crucial, as in the UMW elections.

Rejecting programmatic criteria as the key for critical support, they instead supported the MFD on the basis of the latter's temporary popularity. Denouncing the SL for its principled refusal to endorse Miller, the CSL prophesied hominastically: "The Spartacist League, unable to perceive the essence of things, is doomed" (*Class Struggle*, April 1973). Instead, it was the centrist CSL, which went defunct, robbed of any reason for existence by its vacillation between



Harry Patrick

revolutionary rhetoric and reformist practice.

The Decline of Miller

The Miners for Democracy experience has proven a complete dud. The Miller regime has acted in a fashion fundamentally identical to its predecessor, as the servant of the coal operators and the capitalist class. And just as under the Boyle regime, the rank and file has demonstrated its determination to fight for its interests, despite and often against its sellout leaders.

The UMW, under Lewis, Kennedy and Boyle, was always ruled despotically. The MFD was the first major challenge to the incumbent bureaucracy for 40 years, ever since the 1920's, when the Communist Party had considerable influence. But the illusions which thousands of miners had in the Miller administration following the ouster of Boyle have long since been dashed. The very fact that Lee Roy Patterson, a confederate of the hated Boyle, could rise to be a major contender in the elections, simply by distancing himself from the betrayals of the Miller-Patrick administration, is a crushing indictment of the policies of the current leadership.

As for Miller himself, regardless of the outcome of the elections his personal prestige, founded on a reputation of being an honest reformer, has suffered irreparable damage. The ex-New Leftists and young liberals who enlisted in the new UMW administration have deserted in droves. (Research done by Patterson shows that 29 out of 31 key aides, staffers and union officials who supported Miller in 1972 have since left.) Even Joe Rauh, the liberal king-maker, who in fact was the real organizer of the MFD victory, has recently announced that he is supporting Patrick. For the liberal bourgeoisie as a whole, the inability of the UMW leaders to discipline their ranks has considerably soured it, for the time being at least, on new experiments with "progressive" unionism.

As to the claims of fake-leftists that the MFD victory would at least provide a "democratic" framework in which militants could fight for their policies,

this stupidity has been hurried under four years of Miller strikebreaking. The massive wildcats that have shaken the coalfields are an expression of the fundamental contempt of the class-collaborationist leaders for the rank and file. All of the major contenders - Miller, Patrick and Patterson - have supported draconian measures to quash the membership, such as the September 1975 resolution of the International Executive Board which mandated powers to itself to try members who defied the directives of the International.

This resolution, passed in the wake of a wildcat that embraced two-thirds of the union, was used to victimize militants who were active in the strike; several miners were even suspended from the union. The same resolution also sought to suppress the roving picket lines, which have been the tactic utilized to spread the strikes, by ordering that any miner prosecuted for activities on a picket line outside a mine other than his own would have no access to official UMW defense resources and funds.

The UMW bureaucrats have, in fact, led the union backwards in the crucial task of organizing non-union mines. U.S. coal production under UMW contract has drastically declined from 75 percent to 54 percent. Many organizing strikes have been left to go it on their own. A bitter strike in Stearns, Kentucky is now in its tenth month in an attempt to get a first contract. One strike organizer, asked by *WV* about the failure of the contenders for the UMW presidency to build solidarity for the Stearns strike, replied frankly: "Why should they come down here? There's no votes." Until they win a contract, the striking miners cannot even vote.

While the fake-left pooh-poohed the issue of government intervention during the 1972 UMW elections, the major coal miners' battles in the past period have been confrontations with the bourgeois state. These included the successful wildcat against West Virginia governor Arch Moore's gasoline rationing in 1974 and the massive wildcat strikes against court fines and injunctions in 1975 and 1976. In all cases, following its pact with the Labor Department in 1972, the UMW bureaucracy has bowed to bourgeois legality, first by enforcing Boyle's rotten contract and then by attempting to do the same with its own. (The Miller settlement in 1974 sold out the crucial demand for the local right to strike.) The obvious significance of the question of the state was brought to the fore by the miners themselves in the 1976 wildcat: they demanded a written statement from coal operators forswearing the use of the courts in disputes with the unions, as well as demanding that all fines and injunctions be dropped, there be no reprisals and an investigation be undertaken of the judges who routinely side with the companies in every strike.

Carter's newly announced energy austerity program, designed to shore up American imperialism vis-à-vis its rivals, poses anew the necessary demand for trade-union independence from the bourgeois parties and their policies. The Carter plan projects the expansion of coal production by two-thirds from the current level over the next eight years. Clearly, the militancy of the UMW ranks could be a major impediment to the administration's goal. All wings of the UMW bureaucracy have made clear their willingness to cooperate with this plan, in exchange for a few reforms like stricter mine safety legislation. But the illusion that miners can have a "common policy" with the imperialist bourgeoisie is a fatal one, leading ultimately to defeat at the hands of the capitalist courts, cops, etc.

The Left: Nothing Learned

One might expect that Miller's obvious bankruptcy and the disappearance of Miners for Democracy would force some of their left apologists to re-evaluate their earlier support to these fakers. But such is not the case.

Although few left groups are backing the unpopular Miller with enthusiasm in the June 14 UMW elections, most of the left pursued a virtually identical class-collaborationist policy in supporting "progressive" out-bureaucrat Ed Sadowski in the February Steelworkers elections. Not a single group that backed Miller in 1972 has renounced that position, which only points to the degree to which they are mired in anti-Marxist methodology.

The out-and-out reformist groups continue to support the pitiful remnants of the Miners for Democracy, with the Communist Party in the forefront. The CP's solution to the problem of the betrayals of Miller and Patrick is simply to ignore them. In a 2 June article in the *Daily World* on the elections, Miller and Patrick are referred to exactly once, where it is merely acknowledged that they are candidates. Instead the CP campaigns against Lee Roy Patterson, the presumed "greater evil," who is denounced for, of all things, being strike-happy!

The CP warns that Patterson's call for

Support Stearns Miners!

The bitter strike of nearly 160 members of the United Mine Workers (UMW) at the Blue Diamond Coal Company's Justus Mine in Stearns, Kentucky is approaching its eleventh month. Subjected daily to massive barrages of heavy-caliber gunfire from thugs imported to break the picket line and pave the way for scabs, the strikers also face decades in prison for their courageous attempts to defend their strike. Twenty-seven miners and UMW organizer Lee Potter have been indicted and arraigned on three felony counts each—kidnapping, robbery and first degree assault—which carry a maximum sentence of 60 years! These outrageous charges are based on the incredible grand jury testimony of the often-drunk, trigger-happy gun thugs.

The miners face enormous legal costs in their defense. According to UMW officials, the Miners Legal Defense Fund has already spent \$15,000 on the cases and additional funds are urgently needed. The Partisan Defense Committee urges that donations for the embattled strikers be sent to the Miners Legal Defense Fund, 1521 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Drop the Charges! Victory to the Stearns Strike!

Patrick, Miller's second-in-command for strikebreaking, into a militant is no easy task. Even the SWP seemed bothered by Patrick's assertion that "we've got to get rid of the roving pickets." Nonetheless, the SWP claims: "All in all, Patrick's platform for defending the union and the democratic rights of miners appears to stand the closest to the original aims of the reform movement."

The I.S. and SWP both argue that Miller & Co. introduced "democracy" into the UMW, a claim which supposedly justifies left-wing support to the incumbent UMW bureaucrats despite the latter's prostration before the bosses and their state. But the institution of a few supportable reforms like membership ratification of the contract no more turned Miller into a champion of workers democracy than demanding another nickel an hour in wages makes one a communist. In fact, the Miller regime was the antithesis of workers democracy. How else can one describe a leadership which invited government intervention in the union, sided with the bosses against its striking members, suspended militant strikers, maintained the red clause, expelled the left press from its convention, etc.?

Genuine workers democracy cannot be separated from a class-struggle program. The Millers, as much as the Boyles, must suppress the UMW ranks in order to maintain discipline for their capitalist masters. The prostration of the I.S. and SWP before the "democracy" of liberal money-man Joe Rauh, the U.S. Labor Department and Arnold Miller makes them obstacles to the building of a class-struggle leadership in the unions.

In recent articles, the October League (OL) and the Revolutionary Socialist League (RSL) have opposed all three Mine Workers candidates. However, given how discredited Miller, Patrick and Patterson are today, this is not exactly a bold step. More significantly, the RSL and the OL have an obligation to explain why they backed Miller when he was popular in 1972. Unfortunately neither have had the elementary honesty

to even mention their position of five years ago in their press. These political cowards have not changed their methodology and only await the next popular laker to sell out to again.

The Spartacist League was almost alone in 1972 in opposing support to Miller. Unlike the centrists and reformists, who argued for supporting the MFD on the basis of its popularity, the SL held that critical support within union elections must be grounded on program. Should a reformist bureaucrat break from class collaboration on key issues such as opposition to government intervention in the unions, a break from the capitalist parties, expropriation of the mines—then, and only then, is it principled to extend critical support. Should such a leader later betray the class-struggle slogans around which he mobilized support, the communists are then in a position to win away his base.

However, in the absence of a programmatic break from reformism, "critical support" is sheer opportunism and hucksterism. Miller, Patrick, et al., never betrayed their program, because this program never consisted of anything more than simple trade-union reforms combined with reformist demagoguery about the need for "honest, responsive, democratic" leadership. Interestingly, Miller's 1977 campaign has been based entirely on his "record." He says not a word about his opponents.

In fact, Miller is *correct* in asserting that he was able to fulfill the major concrete programmatic demands of the 1972 MFD program: rank-and-file ratification of the contract, election of district officers, raising the pension level, introducing sick pay and other minimal economic benefits. That the introduction of these reforms is entirely compatible with the maintenance of a vicious strikebreaking regime only shows that the MFD program *never* had anything to do with class-struggle politics.

The assertion of the opportunists that "exposing" Miller by putting him in power would lead the miners to embrace a militant leadership has been proven a lie. Had the MFD been a programmatically based caucus with even a semblance of class-struggle politics, a split would have occurred in the face of the treachery of Miller/Patrick/Trbovich. There would then be today a real left alternative to Miller's reformism. Instead, in the absence of a class-struggle alternative, disappointment in Miller has mainly been expressed in a strengthening in the reactionary Patterson/Boyle wing of the bureaucracy. In a union with the most militant rank and file of any in the U.S., all three candidates are proven strikebreakers! That fact alone should make it obvious that the MFD experiment did nothing to resolve the crisis of leadership.

Despite the miners' enormous proven capacity to struggle, the question of leadership is crucial. The experience of the Miller regime is another convincing proof that the liberal reformers are no alternative to the Boyles, Fitzsimmons, Meany and Ahels. It is a powerful vindication of the position, held uniquely by the SL, that *only* on the basis of a principled, class-struggle program can a leadership be built that can offer a way out of the hellhole of capitalist exploitation for miners and all workers. ■

Philip Allen Appeal Denied

LOS ANGELES—A three-judge panel ruled May 23 against the appeal of Philip Allen. Allen was convicted on 7 October 1975 of voluntary manslaughter in the killing of a Los Angeles County deputy sheriff. The 22-year-old black college student faces a ten-year-to-life sentence on these frame-up charges.

Deputy Darden Hollis was shot with a police revolver on 1 January 1975. The story told by the cops—Allen's sole accusers—is flatly incredible on the face of it. The cops claim that Allen, being held and beaten by half a dozen six-foot policemen, finally broke from one cop's chokehold, grabbed a gun and shot Hollis dead. The tale becomes even more ludicrous when it is noted that Philip Allen is 5-ft. 3-in. tall. No paraffin test to determine if Allen had fired a gun was ever performed by the police.

The unfair and illegal conduct of the prosecutor and judge in the Allen case is instructive of the sort of "fair trial" which black youth receive in capitalist America. Trial judge Laurence Rittenband prohibited the defense counsel from questioning prospective jurors about possible racial prejudice; he allowed the defense to use only half the peremptory challenges (which allow a lawyer to dismiss a juror without an argument to the judge) to which it is legally entitled. A lie detector test which showed Allen innocent was not admitted into evidence.

The 230-page appeal brief states that the prosecution behaved belligerently and abusively toward Allen and his mother and lied to the jury in opening remarks about what evidence was to be presented. According to Allen's attorney, Peter Young, the appeal panel did not even publish an opinion in response to the appeal. Young plans to file for a re-hearing in appeals court and to file a new appeal with the California Supreme Court. At present, Allen remains out of jail on bail.

This racist frame-up must be fought. Mass support and an aggressive defense can save Philip Allen from spending perhaps the rest of his life behind bars. More than \$30,000 has already been spent on court costs, attorneys' fees, investigator services and expert witnesses; a supreme court appeal and new trial would cost thousands more. The Partisan Defense Committee, which has been active in the defense of this innocent black youth, urges all those concerned with justice to send urgently needed funds to: Philip Allen Defense Committee of the First Unitarian Church, 2936 West 8th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90005.



Lee Roy Patterson



Tony Boyle

UPI

a nationwide strike this summer against disciplines for absenteeism "could play into the hands of the companies and weaken the fight for a better contract in November." Patterson's strike call is pure electoral demagoguery; he is well known for his opposition to strikes. Recently it has been publicized that he has been receiving contributions from numerous Steelworkers' officials, including Ahel, who fear that under Miller or Patrick there may be a coal strike long enough to provoke substantial layoffs in steel (*Business Week*, 13 June).

The Socialist Workers Party and the International Socialists, who as usual are tail-ending Joe Rauh, have come out for...Harry Patrick, the author of several notorious statements like: "The contract will not be re-opened. The right-to-strike people can strike until Hell freezes over" (*Louisville Courier-Journal*, 31 August 1975). Making

Limited Edition now available:

Workers Vanguard in BOUND VOLUMES

Volume 1 includes:

- WV nos. 1-34
- Workers Action nos. 7-10
- subject index

\$15.00

order from/pay to
Spartacist
Publishing Co
Box 1377 GPO
New York, NY 10001

Australasian SPARTACIST

a monthly organ of revolutionary Marxism for the rebirth of the Fourth International published by Spartacist Publications for the Central Committee of the Spartacist League of Australia and New Zealand, section of the international Spartacist tendency

Subscription price: (12 issues):

Australia: \$3.00

Seamail, all countries: \$3.00

Europe and North America, airmail: \$10.00

All other countries, airmail: \$5.00

order from/pay to
Spartacist Publications
GPO Box 3473
Sydney, NSW 2001
Australia

WORKERS VANGUARD



Miller addressing Brookside miners at 1974 strike rally.

WV Photo



Charleston Daily Mail

Charleston cops attack miners' demonstration during August, 1975 wildcat.

Labor Department-Backed "Left" Darling

The Rise and Fall of Arnold Miller

As presidential elections approach in the United Mine Workers of America (UMW), the U.S. left and the entire workers movement has the obligation to take a position on the experience of four years of "reform" leadership in the most combative union in the country. On our part, the Spartacist League refused to support Miller or Boyle in 1972, and we oppose all three of the feuding labor fakery in the June 15 UMW elections. Not only for revolutionaries, but for all militant mine workers the lessons of the rise and fall of Arnold Miller—the dissolution of his electoral combine, the Miners for Democracy (MFD); his enforcement of one sellout contract and negotiation of another; his siding with the courts and coal operators against numerous massive wildcats; and above all the dangerous consequences of bringing the capitalist state into the affairs of the labor movement—must be a powerful demonstration of the bankruptcy of supporting one wing of the pro-capitalist labor bureaucracy against another.

"Miners for Democracy"—R.I.P.

In December 1972 the UMW International officers elected on the victorious Miners for Democracy slate issued a statement to the membership in which they heralded an end to the factional strife that had gripped the union: "We have been through a long, heated campaign. But the campaign is over. Now the task ahead is to unite and work together to build a union of coal miners that is, in the words of our UMW seal, 'one and indissoluble'" (*United Mine Workers Journal*, December 1972).

The ouster of the corrupt and dictatorial Boyle regime by the MFD was cheered on by a wide spectrum of

political forces. Richard Nixon's Labor Department was out to remove an ineffective union leadership unable to control the restive miners. The massive resources necessary to support the legal suits that culminated in a government order to re-run the 1969 election, in which Tony Boyle had "defeated" MFD founder Joseph Yablonski through massive vote-rigging, were provided by liberal Democrats headed by cold warrior Joseph Rauh. And almost the entire left jumped into the action. As early as 1970, MFD leader Mike Trbovich was a guest speaker at a conference of the Communist Party-led Trade Unionists for Action and Democracy (TUAD). There Trbovich rubbed shoulders with veteran left-talking labor fakery like James Fitzgerald of the United Electrical Workers (UE).

Less than five years later, on the eve of new UMW elections, the unity touted by the MFD leaders has totally disintegrated in the face of the bickering leaders' inability to quell repeated wildcat strikes and outbursts of militancy from the rank and file. The MFD itself, which was not a programmatically based caucus but essentially an electoral vehicle, was dissolved shortly after the 1972 elections. In addition, the three principal leaders of Miners for Democracy—UMW president Arnold Miller, secretary-treasurer Harry Patrick, and vice president Mike Trbovich—are now bitterly at odds with each other.

Trbovich broke away in 1975, when he tried to entice the Labor Department into another "investigation" of the UMW, suggesting possible violations of federal law in Miller's record-keeping. Trbovich, the erstwhile favorite of the Communist Party (CP) who is now a staunch supporter of reactionary Boyle

henchman Lee Roy Patterson, last fall expanded his denunciations of his one-time ally, accusing Miller's staff of being "socialistic, revolutionary and Communist." Patrick, who was Miller's right hand man over the first four years of his administration, suddenly announced earlier this year that Miller had, in fact, been betraying the ideals of the reform movement all along. Patrick has split to run his own campaign for president.

The inability of Miller, Patrick and Trbovich to institute a homogeneous bureaucracy flowed from the same fundamental factor that led to the toppling of the old Boyle regime: the relentless combativity of the miners and their unwillingness to tolerate the pro-company discipline that their bureaucratic leaders have attempted to foist on them. In a period in which the bulk of the American trade-union movement has been quiescent, the mine workers have been an outstanding exception. Although, primarily because of the miners' geographical isolation, this militancy did not find a ready route to other sections of the American working class, the 2 million man-days lost to wildcats in the coal industry last year have been more than a minor problem for the fuel-hungry bourgeoisie.

The Lewis Tradition

In fact, the abuses which Miners for Democracy claimed to redress preceded the Boyle regime. Following World War II, the demand for coal underwent a sharp decline, as it was replaced by oil and gas in home heating, and by diesel fuel on the railroads. John L. Lewis embarked on a campaign to nurse the declining industry back to health at the miners' expense. Demands for job security, paid holidays and other fringe

benefits were dropped and the companies were allowed a free hand in a massive program of modernization and consolidation. Negotiations were carried on in private, and open-ended contracts which remained in effect until either side decided to terminate them, were signed without strikes.

Tony Boyle, who succeeded Lewis' handpicked successor Thomas Kennedy after the latter's death, came to power in 1963. Boyle extended the despotic bureaucratism of Lewis and Kennedy. His collaboration with the bosses was notorious. The first contract he negotiated was greeted with a wave of wildcats. Right after the Farmington mine disaster, in which 78 miners were killed, Boyle congratulated the company, Consolidation Coal, for its "safety-mindedness"! In 1968 the contract even contained a provision for a \$120 Christmas bonus for miners who had not engaged in a wildcat strike the previous year. Meanwhile, Boyle tightened up against dissidents in the union. The president's term was lengthened, 19 of 23 union districts were put under receivership, Boyle's relatives were put on the payroll, a special fund was set up to allow International officers to retire at full salary, etc.

The miners, however, did not passively endure the repressive Boyle regime. Even before the expansion of the industry and the recruitment of thousands of younger miners, rebellions began to break out. In 1963-64, a wildcat broke out that lasted almost a full year in some areas of West Virginia and southeast Kentucky. This strike was, in fact, spearheaded by pensioners and partially disabled working miners, thousands of whom had had their

continued on page 10