

Defend the Soviet Union!

Carter's Holy Crusade Against Russia

The already threadbare fabric of "détente" began to visibly rip apart in the last month as leading spokesmen of American imperialism have hurled a rapid-fire series of heliocentric threats at the Kremlin and embarked on provocative foreign initiatives bringing U.S.-Soviet relations to the lowest point in years. The Russian leaders are still clinging desperately to their illusions of "peaceful coexistence" with the imperialists, as Soviet president Leonid Brezhnev warned in Prague of a "return if not to the Cold War, then at least to a chilly war." But they are bound to be disappointed as the chilly war is already upon us.

In the U.S. liberal Democrats in Congress and the administration are suddenly voicing alarm at the turn of events. But unlike those reformists who see the current sabre-rattling emanating from Washington as reneging on campaign promises (which ones?), i.e. those who worry whether Vance or Brzezinski have Carter's ear this week, we have pointed out since the beginning of the current Democratic administration that the axis of its policies is to rearm U.S. imperialism after the Vietnam debacle and the Watergate scandals. Thus the thrust of Carter's "human rights" propaganda offensive and of U.S. military/diplomatic initiatives have necessarily been directed against the Soviet Union.

Carter led off his two weeks of belligerent anti-Sovietism by denouncing the Russians and Cubans for complicity in the mid-May invasion of the former Katanga province (now named Shaha) of Zaïre (the former Belgian Congo). Meanwhile he was providing transport for a French-inspired nakedly imperialist plot to shore up the corrupt and shaky regime of General Mobutu with a bought-and-paid-for "All-Africa" mercenary force. He then dispatched National Security Council chief Zbigniew Brzezinski the Dr. Strangelove of the Carter administration to Peking to strengthen the increasingly explicit Sino-U.S. alliance against the USSR. There Brzezinski blasted the Soviets as "international marauders," hailed the "long-term strategic" character of U.S.-China "parallel interests" and briefed Vice



Der Spiegel



Authenticated News International

(Left) Carter preaches Cold War gospel to NATO heads of state in Washington; (right) NATO jets.

Premier Teng on secret U.S. military assessments.

In one of the more blatant examples of diplomatic double-dealing, while a UN Special Session on Disarmament droned on in New York, Carter summoned the heads of state of the 15 NATO countries for a summit meeting in Washington to push through a 15-year plan to boost Western arms spending by \$60 to \$80 billion. The U.S. also obtained a condemnation of Soviet-Cuban presence in Africa in the NATO communiqué as well as a statement that "détente is indivisible." While denying a "linkage" between Soviet aid to Ethiopia, Angola and to Rhodesian guerrillas and the Strategic

Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), Washington has established one nonetheless—by bringing the SALT negotiations to an abrupt standstill.

Carter's "Human Rights" Means War Preparations

Bourgeois commentators were, in general, surprised by the sudden hardening of the U.S.'s anti-Soviet stance, as were evidently their suddenly talkative "high-level" State Department sources. The candidate who campaigned on vague neo-populism and a God-fearing pledge of "love and decency and compassion" wasn't expected to talk so tough. Carter's speech almost exactly a year ago at Notre Dame, where he spoke

of hopes that the U.S. and Soviet Union would "build a bridge of mutual confidence in one another" was contrasted to his June 7 address to the U.S. Naval Academy commencement. Endlessly praising the American Way of Life, the "horn-again" cold warrior bragged about the U.S.'s "highest defense budget in history" and threatened "graver tensions" if the Soviets did not make the right choice between "cooperation and confrontation."

The capitalist media also marveled at the sudden pre-eminence of hard-lining anti-Soviet Brzezinski, who almost overnight was thrust on the covers of news magazines. Secretary of State

continued on page 8

Red or Black International?..... 6

Pennsylvania Wildcat Cracks Coalfield Truce

NEWS FROM
THE COAL FIELDS

JUNE 10 After being backed down on their demand for a no-strike clause in the United Mine Workers (UMWA) contract by the ranks' determined militancy, coal operators hoped that the 110-day length of the recent national strike would at least dampen the miners' willingness to go out on wildcat strikes. But the bosses' pipe dreams got a jolt last week as a local walkout by 100 central Pennsylvania miners flared into a strike involving thousands of members of the United Mine Workers. On May 31 members of Local 1880, employees of the independent North Cambria Fuel and E.P. Bender companies set up roving pickets, pledging to pull out all of UMWA District 2. The next day 7,500 miners were off the job in support of Local 1880's two-week-old strike although local judges promptly issued temporary restraining orders against the roving pickets, backed up with threats of fines of up to \$1,000. These injunctions were ignored and the mass picketing continued to be effective.

In defiance of the UMWA's long-standing tradition of "No contract, no work," the Local's leadership kept the miners on the job for seven weeks without a contract following the signing of the national agreement between the

UMWA and the Bituminous Coal Operators Association (BCOA). The operators are holding out for the establishment of individual company pension plans which would be free from financial responsibility to the national UMWA pension trust funds and would instead be liable solely for "their own" workers and only for the years the worker was employed by these companies. By tying the miners' pensions to the operators' financial success, the bosses hope to stifle local militancy.

On Friday, June 2 UMWA chief Arnold Miller met with District 2 president Val Scarton and Local 1880 president Dave Killen and called a halt to the roving pickets. Despite the evident failure of the previous two weeks of isolated local striking, following seven weeks of wasted patience with the companies, Miller's strategy is to picket only the two struck mines. This policy was echoed at the District office in Ebensburg as well. Although the pickets were bolstered with the support of militants in several other locals, District 2 board member Paul Gormesh claimed to *WV*, "It didn't help them [Local 1880] by picketing other mines."

Lacking an alternative to the bureaucracy's defeatism at International,

district and local levels, the roving pickets were dismantled. By June 7 almost the entire District was back at work while the strikers are limited by court order to maximum of four pickets per gate. As if to mock Miller's cowardly strategy, once the bulk of the District's miners were back on the job, on June 8 an Indiana County judge dissolved the temporary restraining order against picketing, ruling that Local 1880 members did have the right to appear at the area's working mines!

The independent operators' demands for individual company pension programs are an attack on the union's ability to enforce a single nationwide contract in an industry where non-UMWA coal now accounts for half of the U.S. total—down from 70 percent in 1974. Though an estimated 90 percent of the mines in District 2 are under BCOA or Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers Association contract, establishment of separate contract provisions for the independents will only encourage other operators to raise similar demands. Since the end of the historic 1977-78 coal battle the International has abandoned miners employed in numerous other independents. Miners in Lee County, Virginia (see "Coal Bosses Try to Crack National Bargaining," *WV* No.

205, 12 May) have not returned to work yet well over two months after the BCOA contract was signed. There, too, operators of seven different companies demanded separate pension agreements. UMWA militants must reassert the "No contract, no work" tradition and answer the threats of mine closures with the demand to open the companies' books to union inspection, linked to a struggle for expropriation of the mines without compensation.

The strike at North Cambria Fuel and E.P. Bender, which militants rapidly spread across half of District 2, has already shown that the uneasy truce represented by the 1978 agreement with the BCOA has not cracked the miners' will to struggle. Miners' grievances against the new contract's health insurance, which Miller handed over to private insurance carriers, are mounting all across the coalfields. The tactics of the central Pennsylvania miners also indicate that the October decision of the Arbitration Review Board (ARB 108) designed to crush roving pickets and sympathy strikes can be challenged and shattered with militant actions. It is through such struggles, and not by following Miller's legalistic strategy for defeat, that miners can beat back the coal operators' union-busting attacks. ■

On Trial for Picketing Scab Coal

Defend the Rockport Miners!

Five hundred southern Indiana coal miners jammed into and crowded around a Rockport courthouse June 6 to hear the charges brought against 194 union brothers—the result of a mass arrest in the first months of the recent coal strike. The United Mine Workers (UMWA) militants were charged January 7 for criminal trespass following police dispersal of most of a several-hundred-strong picket line which assembled at the non-union B&M coal dock on the Ohio River.

The mass picket in January was the miners' second appearance at the B&M dock, owned by notorious scabherd Paul Teagarden who loaded scab coal

throughout most of the strike. On December 9, 200 strikers defended themselves against scabs who tried to force UMWA pickets off the road with bulldozers. When Teagarden reopened the dock and the miners returned, the cops moved in for the bust.

Though the remainder of the hearing was postponed for 30 days, the miners have already gotten a glimpse of the "evidence" which will be used against them. An aging local sheriff positively "identified" the "criminal activity" of one picket from 800 yards' distance on a overcast day!

Needless to say, no charges have been

continued on page 10

For Militant UMWA Support to Stearns Strike

The nearly two-year-old organizing drive by the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) at the Justus Mine in Stearns, Kentucky is facing renewed attack by the Blue Diamond Coal Company. A meeting of the union, the company and a federal mediator was arranged for May 30 but at the last minute Blue Diamond canceled. The next day the formation of the Justus Mine Association (JMA) was announced. The UMWA responded promptly with an "unfair labor practices" suit.

Having failed to break the Stearns miners' resistance with a squadron of heavily armed gun thugs, bloody assault

by the Kentucky State Police and massive fines, jailings and injunctions issued by local courts, Blue Diamond chairman Gordon Bonnyman now hopes to defeat the UMWA by "recognizing" the scab JMA "union." The 70-man scab workforce includes—alongside 32 turncoat ex-strikers—a number of young and totally inexperienced new hires and a few old-timers who are trying to collect Social Security. The human garbage that Bonnyman has collected indicates that the companies' strategy is aimed at outright smashing of the organizing drive—a goal actively supported by scab operators through-

continued on page 10



Cops arrest Rockport miners for picketing scab coal operation.

Wide World



Rally last April to build support for Stearns strikers.

WV Photo

Peking Attacks Vietnam for Expropriating Chinese Capitalists

Relations between the People's Republic of China and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, already strained, have reached a new low in the last two months as thousands of ethnic Chinese are fleeing Vietnam. In late May China launched a violent tirade against Hanoi, charging it with racial chauvinism and a long-standing policy of harassing and expelling Chinese residents: "...more than 50,000 overseas Chinese were driven back to China in the period of one and a half months from April to mid-May this year" (*Peking Review*, 2 June).

Vietnam, in response, insists that the latest wave of refugees is the result of its crackdown on private businesses in the South, a long-overdue measure of socialization which had been postponed since the collapse of the puppet Thieu regime three years earlier. An editorial in the Vietnamese Communist Party newspaper *Nhan Dan* (29 May) queried: "One might ask whether nationalization was supposed to stop in socialist Vietnam before the wealth of a number of capitalists of Chinese origin?"

The Vietnamese Stalinist regime struck hard against private businesses in two successive waves in March and April. Following an extremely liberal policy for three years, during which private industry and trade (some 65 percent of the total market) in the South continued and were even encouraged by the bureaucracy, the crackdown came literally overnight. Tens of thousands of party members and youth were mobilized to occupy, search and inventory all private businesses on the night of March 27, following an abrupt announcement that day that "all trade and business operations of bourgeois tradesmen are to be abolished."

This was followed on April 16 by a clean-up of the open-air black markets, including the famous "thieves' market" of Ho Chi Minh City (formerly Saigon), where stolen and second-hand luxury items like hi-fi sets were the objects of vigorous trading. Then on May 3 the government announced the introduction of a single new currency for all Vietnam, including severe restrictions on the amount of cash families could retain after the exchange. This was aimed at preventing wealthy capitalists from dispersing their hoarded cash reserves on a large scale.

Singled out for heavy control was Cholon, the large Chinese quarter of the former Saigon, which was surrounded by police and soldiers just before the



June 3 Hsinhua Weekly protests "expulsion" of ethnic Chinese living in Vietnam.

March 27 announcement. Described by *Far Eastern Economic Review* correspondent Nayan Chanda as "an unreformed capitalist heart beating within the socialist body of Vietnam," Cholon historically has been the center of the Chinese merchant and financial class which has dominated private trade in southern Vietnam (as, in fact, it has in most of Southeast Asia). In particular, Cholon traders have long controlled the rice trade in the South, a key position, as agricultural production has not yet been collectivized since the incorporation of the southern half of the country into the Vietnamese deformed workers state.

Since late March there has been a massive exodus of Chinese from Vietnam to Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Hong Kong and Taiwan—but also in huge numbers to China, which claimed that some 89,700 Chinese refugees had entered its borders as of May 26. The Chinese charge Vietnam with a long-standing policy of "unwarrantedly ostracizing and persecuting Chinese residents in Viet Nam, and expelling many of them back to China" (*Peking Review*, 2 June). Heart-rending accounts of beaten and wounded refugees limping over the border are distributed daily by the official Peking Hsinhua News Agency. And in fact there is some evidence that Hanoi has been experiencing difficulties with minority populations along the Chinese border (notably

the 1976 dissolution of the Viet Bac and Tay Bac autonomous regions).

Given the long-standing animosities between the Chinese and Vietnamese peoples (which the Stalinist bureaucracies exacerbate for their own purposes), undoubtedly some genuine atrocities of ethnic persecution have occurred. Many of the fleeing Chinese, particularly those in the North crossing into China by foot, are not capitalists at all. They most likely fear racially directed victimization of "unreliable elements," particularly given the bitter border war with Cambodia, which is supported by Peking.

Nevertheless, it is absolutely clear that the main impetus for this latest flow of refugees is the crackdown on private business. Even *Peking Review* admits that the first mass entry of refugees into China came in April, after the crackdown. The Hua-Teng regime, however, has chosen to pretend the new Vietnamese economic policy doesn't exist and would seem to have never heard of such a thing as a Chinese merchant anywhere in southeast Asia. In any case, Peking's ultimate target in the propaganda barrage unleashed over the exodus of ethnic Chinese from Vietnam is the USSR.

A recent lengthy article in *Peking Review* (26 May) on the "History of Overseas Chinese and Their Glorious Tradition" is ostensibly a rebuttal to "Soviet revisionism" which "has been singing in unison with Lin Piao and the 'gang of four,' slandering that overseas Chinese belong to the 'capitalist class.'" The article—a particularly cynical and grotesque piece—seeks to provoke international sympathy for "the victimized Chinese refugees" who include black market speculators, rice traders, money-hoarders and sweatshop capitalists rushing out of Vietnam. It hides their class character in a welter of (quite true) historic facts about the exploitation of Chinese laborers building the American railroads, etc.

But while the vast majority of "overseas Chinese" are of course not capitalists, nevertheless, like the Jews in medieval Europe and to some extent the Lebanese Arabs in Africa, they have historically formed an educated, petty-bourgeois and merchant caste which has dominated private trade in southeast Asia. Peking knows this full well, having found this community quite useful as a pressure group for the expansion of

economic ties with China. In the same way as the Chinese Stalinists use Hong Kong capitalists to transact business and have deliberately maintained this colonial leftover as a vestige of Chinese capitalism, they also seek to use overseas Chinese in southeast Asia as a "fifth column"—not to spread revolutionary struggle but to serve as anchor points for establishing client relations with various capitalist regimes in the regions. China's large-scale propaganda campaign over "victimized Chinese" in Vietnam is no doubt partly aimed at winning the good will of "overseas Chinese" leaders now that the Kuomintang dictatorship in Taiwan seems definitively headed for oblivion.

Relations between the nationalist bureaucracies of the two deformed workers states have been bad for some time, strained by territorial disputes over the oil-rich Paracel and Spratley Islands, and more seriously by the continuing vicious border war between Peking-supported Cambodia and Vietnam. (Peking has of course maintained total silence on the fate of ethnic Chinese in its ally "Democratic Kampuchea" during the Khmer Rouge's brutal 1975 evacuation of Phnom Penh and total razing of the urban economy.) Long gone are the days when Mao Tse-tung embraced Ho Chi Minh as a "comrade-in-arms" in the struggle against imperialist aggression. Even as the Chinese-U.S. alliance was in its earliest stages, when North Vietnamese ports were blocked by the American navy in 1972, Peking was posing all sorts of obstacles to the transport by rail of Soviet war materiel to Hanoi. The present Sino-Vietnamese dispute is ample proof that neither regime has anything to do with the proletarian internationalism proclaimed by the Soviet Union under Lenin and Trotsky.

Peking's pronouncements against the Soviet Union have taken on a darker, more ominous character lately. Peking has begun to talk of "inevitable" war with Russia, which they claim is seeking to "encircle" China—Vietnam, in this view, is one of the Russian satellites (along with the new military cabal in Afghanistan). In the wake of the provocative anti-USSR comments by U.S. president Carter's chief "security" advisor Brzezinski in Peking and recent Washington decisions to send China sophisticated exploration equipment banned from export to the USSR

continued on page 10



Before Sino-U.S. alliance Mao pledged solidarity with Ho. Now Peking calls Vietnam instrument of Kremlin.

WORKERS VANGUARD
Marxist Working-Class Biweekly of the Spartacist League of the U.S.
EDITOR Jan Norden
PRODUCTION Ron Wallace (manager)
Darlene Kamiura (graphics)
CIRCULATION MANAGER Mike Beech
EDITORIAL BOARD Jon Brule, Charles Burroughs, George Foster, Liz Gordon, James Robertson, Joseph Seymour
Published biweekly, skipping the 2nd issue in August and with a 3-week interval following the last issue in December, by the Spartacist Publishing Co., 260 West Broadway, New York, NY 10013 Telephone 966-6841 (Editorial), 925-5665 (Business) Address all correspondence to: Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, NY 10001 Domestic subscriptions \$5.00/48 issues Second-class postage paid at New York, NY
Opinions expressed in signed articles or letters do not necessarily express the editorial viewpoint
No. 209 16 June 1978

Stalinists Sabotage Anti-Apartheid Action at Bay Area Union Conference

SAN FRANCISCO On June 10 Local 34 of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) hosted a Bay Area "Trade Union Conference on South Africa." The conference, which had been heavily promoted in the pages of *People's World*, West Coast organ of the reformist Communist Party (CP), drew 132 delegates from 64 local unions, including the ILWU, transportation unions and printing trades. But rather than serving as an opportunity for the labor movement to democratically decide how it can most effectively aid the struggle against apartheid, the conference was bureaucratically rigged to rubber stamp the organizers' liberal moral protest schemes and suppress any calls to organize powerful union solidarity actions.

Thus the 77 other union members who attended the event were classified as "observers" and denied voice and vote. As well as disenfranchising non-delegates the organizers announced that even delegates were not permitted to put forward motions counterposed to the official resolutions. Any new motions were supposed to be referred to a "continuations committee" at the conclusion of the conference.

The reason for this heavy-handed bureaucracy was doubtless the Stalinists' recollection of the stinging political defeat they suffered three years ago at a similar conference on Chile. At that meeting members of the class-struggle Militant Caucus of the ILWU demanded the exclusion of capitalist politicians (in this case a Democratic Party Congressman) and put forward a call for hot cargoing military goods to the Chilean junta. The Stalinists were so outraged at these proposals for elementary working-class solidarity that they initiated a thug attack in an attempt to silence a Militant Caucus spokesman at the microphone. This backfired when a number of delegates rallied to defend the militants.

At this year's conference the organizers were determined to rule with an iron hand. The CP and its bureaucratic allies in the ILWU leadership each

had their own reasons for holding the conference in the first place. The ILWU tops are anxious to shore up their image as "progressives" on the eve of trying to ram through another sellout contract in longshore. Their Stalinist supporters saw the conference as an opportunity to put pressure on the liberal wing of the Democratic Party to prevent direct U.S. military intervention in Africa, where cold war "hawks" are seeking to counter increasing Soviet bloc influence.

The keynote speaker at the conference was John Gaetsewe, general secretary of the CP-supported South African Congress of Trade Unions. Gaetsewe devoted a major section of his address to an impassioned defense of Soviet/Cuban aid to African nationalists. But he stressed that no major Soviet fighting force would be introduced and pleaded that the U.S., as a United Nations member (!), "be bound by majority rule" and oppose the Vorster regime. Gaetsewe came out strongly in favor of a campaign for divestment of corporate holdings in South Africa and also called for a total economic boycott of the country.

Gaetsewe's remarks were carefully keyed into the major resolution presented by the conference organizers, which called for a general boycott of South African goods and for unions to divest their pension funds invested in companies doing business in South Africa. In motivating the proposal Barry Silverman, ILWU research director, unwittingly exposed the practical absurdity of implementing this utopian (and ultimately reactionary) proposal when he observed that most pension funds (like that of ILWU Local 6) are solely administered by the employers. Silverman cynically went on to claim that unions shouldn't demand immediate divestment anyway, as it might threaten the companies' profits.

Despite the CP's bureaucratic attempts to keep the conference under their thumb, ILWU Militant Caucus members distributed copies of a resolution "For Industrial Action Against Apartheid," at the door (see box). The



WV Photo

Spartacists picketing South African ship in S.F., October 1976. Stalinists voted "hot cargo" resolutions then refused to implement them.

resolution points out that the U.S. corporations are "accomplices of apartheid and perpetrators of racism" and consequently not potential allies but enemies of the struggle against white supremacy. Rather than impotent consumer boycott and divestment schemes, "which rely on the racist 'good will' of the multinationals," the resolution called for a two-week stop work action against all cargo and communications to South Africa, a permanent labor boycott of all military goods to the apartheid regime and strike action in the event of direct U.S. military intervention in Africa. An attempt by two ITU delegates to put forward the Militant Caucus motion was squashed by the chairman, despite the opposition of a significant number of delegates.

The very fact that the Militant Caucus proposal was put forward at all was enough to throw the conference organizers into a frenzy. Leo Robinson, a phony "progressive" aspiring bureaucrat in ILWU Local 10 and frequently of CP forces in the union, delivered a foam-flecked diatribe against "those gurus of the labor movement" who attempt "to tell the workers what is best for them." What Robinson and other CP supporters really feared was that their own wretched record of sabotaging

labor solidarity actions with the oppressed South African black masses would be exposed. In the aftermath of the 1976 Soweto uprisings a membership meeting of ILWU Local 10 passed a resolution calling for a boycott of South African and Rhodesian cargo. But the motion was never implemented due to bureaucratic sabotage. In fact it was Robinson himself (backed by CP spokesman Archie Brown) who moved to "refer" (i.e., kill) a motion which called for immediate implementation of the boycott resolution moved by Stan Gow, publisher of the "Longshore Militant" opposition newsletter, at the August 1976 meeting of Local 10.

Despite their posture as opponents of the apartheid regime in South Africa the Stalinists and their friends in the ILWU bureaucracy have consistently undermined attempts to implement militant labor solidarity with the heroic black masses of South Africa. With their reformist commitment to avoid any confrontation with the bosses these misleaders must inevitably betray the victims of apartheid. Only those who, like the "Longshore-Warehouse Militant" group, uphold a perspective of class struggle rather than class collaboration are capable of defending the interests of the oppressed. ■

ILWU Militants Demand:

Labor Action Against Apartheid!

Motion to the Bay Area Trade Union Conference on South Africa:

Whereas, in the face of the white supremacist South African regime's continuing murderous repression of the black population, resistance to the apartheid system continues to grow; and

Whereas, the black working class of South Africa has the capacity to play the key role in the battle against apartheid terror by stopping production, as has been shown through such tactics as "stay at home" strikes, and thus the recognition of black trade unions would greatly strengthen the workers' hand; and

Whereas, no confidence must be placed in the U.S. government and the multinational corporations like Ford and GM which are accomplices of apartheid and perpetrators of racism in the U.S. and throughout the world, but instead the power of the labor movement must be mobilized internationally for defense of the South African workers and students through concrete acts of solidarity; and

Whereas, consumer boycotts are usually ineffectual token pressure tactics which avoid the power of specific industrial action against the capitalist ruling classes and divestment is a utopian scheme which depends on the racist multi-nationals' "good will"; and

Whereas, such actions as UAW Local 1364's rally in October 1977 calling for "...labor action to force GM to recognize all the trade unions in South Africa" and the labor boycott against all South African cargo undertaken by the ILWU during the week of January 17, 1977 to protest the banning of black and white

trade unionists are examples of specific acts of labor solidarity which can provide real support to the anti-apartheid struggle;

Resolved:

1) This conference demands immediate recognition of black trade unions, freeing of union organizers from detention and banning orders, freedom for all victims of apartheid terror, the elimination of all color bars and the smashing of the apartheid regime.

2) To commemorate the Soweto uprising and help win these demands, this conference calls for a two-week stop work action against all cargo and communications to South Africa by the U.S. labor movement and calls on labor throughout the world to join us.

3) This conference calls on all unions in the U.S. and around the world to impose a permanent embargo against the production and transportation of all military goods destined for the apartheid regime.

Whereas, it has become increasingly clear that Carter's "human rights campaign" is nothing but a cover for the U.S. capitalists to conduct a cold-war anti-communist and anti-labor offensive and to support such reactionary regimes as Pinochet in Chile, the Shah of Iran and Voster in South Africa; and

Whereas, Carter's recent foreign policy statements regarding Africa are being used to prepare for another Vietnam, this time in Africa;

Resolved:

1) That this conference go on record opposing any U.S. military intervention in Africa.

2) That this conference go on record as supporting strike action should the U.S. imperialists seek to intervene militarily in Africa.

Stan Gow,
Executive Board, ILWU Local 10
Howard Keylor,
Executive Board, ILWU Local 10

Boh Mandel,
General Executive Board,
ILWU Local 6
Peter Woolston,
Steward, ILWU Local 6

Victory to the Guild Strike!

Don't Move That Scab Daily News

JUNE 14, 2 a.m.—For the last three hours the streets and sidewalks around the New York *Daily News* building have been the scene of an on-again, off-again battle between mounted police and striking members of the Newspaper Guild. Hundreds of angry picketers had waited for five tense hours outside the paper's loading docks before learning that approximately 130 out of 160 newspaper delivery drivers would follow the orders of their union leader Doug LaChance to deliver management-produced scab editions of the *News*.

As the trucks rolled out, a cop riding shotgun beside each driver, rocks and bottles flew in the air. Furious strikers chanted "Stop the Scabs!" while the massed cops responded by chasing strikers, throwing them down on the street, beating and kicking them. In the midst of the turmoil cops kept yelling

for reporters to put on their police press passes so they could tell which ones were on strike and which ones were covering it.

The Guild's contract with the country's largest daily ran out June 6, but the union leadership "stopped the clock" and continued negotiations until early this afternoon. The strike was forced by the *News* whose provocative list of 15 "giveback" demands—including attacks on job security, sick leave, automation protection, etc.—were clearly designed to break the back of the union.

The *News* management is obviously following the script written by *Washington Post* publisher Katherine Graham during the lengthy and bitter 1975 strike, which crippled the Guild and smashed craft unions at the *Post*. As in that strike, the key to victory or defeat for the *News* workers will be the Guild's

ability to prevent production and distribution of the scab papers. Eight unions of the Allied Printing Trades Council have honored the picket lines of the 1,300 Guild members. But LaChance's vile stab in the back has put the strike in grave danger. According to reports from NBC news, LaChance agreed to scab on the Guild in exchange for the *News* bosses' offer to cancel a million-dollar fine owed the *News* for "damages" during a drivers' wildcat last year.

The *News* can successfully deliver the first scab paper in the city's history only because the labor solidarity which won the 114-day typographers' strike in 1963 is lacking 15 years later. When the New York Printers Union struck four of New York City's papers in '63, the newspaper magnates formed a consortium, locked out the typographers at the rest of the

papers, pooled resources and tried to prolong the strike as long as possible in order to bleed the printers' strike fund dry. The printers not only held out for 114 days, but with the total support of nine other printing unions they beat down the press barons and won their demands.

The Guild does not exactly have a spotless record of labor solidarity—its scabbing during the *Post* strike helped contribute to that defeat. But deliverers and all newspaper workers must realize that if the Guild is broken it is their unions that will be the next on the chopping block in the nationwide union-busting drive in the printing trades. No union in this industry can stand alone. Newspaper workers must end this vicious cycle of mutual backstabbing. Honor the picket lines! Stop delivery of the scab *News*! Victory to the Newspaper Guild strike! ■



Honor the picket lines! Stop the scab *News*!

WV Photo



Cops drag off Guild strikers sitting down in front of *Daily News* delivery vans.

WV Photo

Vote Down Gotbaum's "4 Percent Solution"

In a settlement which came down to the wire, Victor Gotbaum, head of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) District Council 37 which represents some 200,000 city workers in New York City, signed a miserable sellout contract with Mayor Ed Koch. The contract was sealed only hours before Koch flew off to appear before the Senate Banking Committee to plead for \$2 billion in long-term federal backing for city bonds. In order to put pressure on the municipal unions to settle, Koch claimed that unless he had an "acceptable" package to take to Washington his chances of securing credit from the federal government, and thus staving off a further round of layoffs and wage slashing, were slim.

The contract that Gotbaum ended up settling for could only be termed atrocious: two chicken-feed 4 percent "raises" staggered over two years (which will end up meaning a pay cut of 10 percent or more after taking inflation into account). What's more, the new contract contained nothing about the cost-of-living payments "deferred" by the union bureaucrats during the past three-year wage freeze, and Koch has publicly stated that the city has no intention of paying its employees the money it owes them.

When Koch flew to Washington June

6 to appear before William Proxmire's Senate committee he was still complaining that he had been unable to squeeze out any of the \$100 million in "givebacks" of fringe benefits he had demanded from the city unions. Proxmire, who poses as a critic of the New York banks, would prefer that the financial barons chip in more to keep the city solvent. Koch—who fronts more directly for Citibank, Chase Manhattan, Manufacturers Hanover Trust & Co.—wants the federal treasury to guarantee the city's loan payments to the banks.

Both capitalist politicians, however, agree that it is the city workers who will really have to pick up the tab. Koch defended the city's labor contract as "the cheapest package in the country," and Proxmire conceded that 4 percent a year was "modest." "It's cruel," he said, "that it has to come out of the hides of the workers, but that's the way it is" (*New York Times*, 7 June).

If Proxmire has his way, there will be only "seasonal" federal loans to New York and Koch will be forced to carry out the emergency program he outlined during last week's hearings: "I will reduce services in order of priority... we will establish an order of priorities and those services will be eliminated, and there will be massive lay-offs in order to keep our budget going."

Meanwhile, back in Albany, the

banks were lobbying to further extend the powers of the Emergency Financial Control Board (EFCB) which already has veto power over all city budgets and non-arbitrated municipal labor contracts for the next thirty years. But the bill, passed by the Albany legislature late last month, provided a "sunset" clause phasing out some of the EFCB's powers after the city had successfully balanced three successive budgets—i.e., never. Incredibly, even this patently absurd stipulation, tacked on as a sop to the unions, was too much for the banks who are insisting it be wiped off the books! In another development Governor Carey's Commerce Commissioner John Dyson proposed, in the spirit of California's Prop 13, that a new state law be passed limiting public employees to 3 percent of the state population—a move which would force the layoff of tens of thousands of state, county and city workers.

In the face of this continuing assault on the living standards of New York City workers, the only concern of the labor bureaucrats has been to maintain an appearance of equality among their separate sellouts. Transport Workers Union heads Matt Guinan and John Lawe—whose proposed two-year contract with its 6-percent raise and 3-percent cost-of-living escalator seemed doomed to rejection by an angry transit

rank and file—called for a sleight-of-hand deal to figure in part of the COLA and call it an 8-percent raise without raising the cost to the city!

Along with the call to reopen the TWU contract, Gotbaum's greatest fear was that the Policemen's Benevolent Association, which threatened to strike for a 20 percent raise, would expose his contract sellout by winning concessions he said were impossible. The cops, who are enemies of the labor movement, know that they alone can expect favors from a city government which needs their repressive force now more than ever.

Gotbaum, Guinan & Co. have already given away 60,000 jobs, \$643 million in benefits and \$3.7 million in pension funds (sunk in MAC bonds) by Gotbaum's own figures. City workers will continue to pay the price for the "crisis" foisted on them by a conspiracy of bourgeois politicians and bankers as long as they are "led" by pro-capitalist traitors like Gotbaum.

Vote "no" on Gotbaum's "4 percent solution" and the already-rejected TWU contract! Transit workers should take the lead in a city workers strike against Big MAC and the EFCB! Don't pay the banks—Cancel the city debt! service—Expropriate the banks! Dump the labor traitors! ■

RED OR BLACK INTERNATIONAL?

Spartacist League confronts black nationalist professors at Los Angeles conference.

LOS ANGELES "One big turning point. 1917. A new hall game from then on—a contest between a red international and a black international." Thus keynote speaker St. Clair Drake staked out the sides in the "50-year debate over the relationship between Marxism and black consciousness" at a UCLA symposium May 18-20. Under the umbrella title "Popular Movements in Afro-American History and Thought," the symposium sponsored by UCLA's Center for Afro American Studies—drew about 100 people to hear some of the most respected black scholars and grand old men of "black studies": Vincent Harding, C.L.R. James, St. Clair Drake, among others.

Until the Spartacist League took the floor during the discussion period to pose the revolutionary proletarian solution to black oppression, there was no Marxist pole represented. The panelists' remarks, though punctuated with Marxist phraseology, were in the main devoted to glorifying black nationalism and Pan-Africanism, as represented by such discredited figures as Kwame Nkrumah, Julius Nyerere and even Jamaica's Michael Manley. Concentrating their anti-Marxist fire on the Leninist proletarian vanguard party, the panelists could present no strategy for winning national liberation and socialism, instead limiting their real goal to the idealist notion of a historically transcendent "black culture."

The Spartacist speakers in the discussion period confronted the attacks on Leninism with a sharp defense of the need for an international proletarian vanguard party. "We stand for the red international," one comrade told the audience, clearly distinguishing the revolutionaries from the reformist supporters of nationalism and neo-colonialism. Cutting through the days of despairing and defeatist presentations, SL supporters insisted that anything short of the overthrow of capitalism means little more than putting a new black face on the oppression of black working people, that "without a party it is impossible to overthrow capitalism."

The event might have been any other academic symposium, full of the usual self-congratulatory mutual backslapping, except that the participants were devoted to the study of black history and claim to be grappling with the question of black emancipation. These black scholars—who have done some significant research (such as Drake's classic study of black urban life in Chicago, *Black Metropolis*)—feel responsibility to fight black oppression

and exercise a good deal more political influence among radicals than the typical denizens of the ivory tower.

And though these academics ignore or reject a program for class struggle, their subject is inherently political. The oppression of blacks is so powerfully posed in the past and present, their struggles so compelling, and the sources of that oppression so obviously rooted in the capitalist social and economic order that the question of black liberation immediately leads to that of revolution. So these black scholars must see themselves as immersed in a black "revolutionary" tradition and engaged in "the struggle." St. Clair Drake stated:

"No black intellectual from 1917 on can avoid coming to terms with Marxism. The question now becomes one of what kind of mix. How much black national-

ism, when and how integrated with Marxism."

indeed his spiritual disciples. For DuBois made an important scholarly contribution to the history of the struggles of black people while an active leader. He came down from the ivory tower to lead the fight against Booker T. Washington and helped found the NAACP. He had identified himself as a socialist before the Russian Revolution and had for a while been a member of the Socialist Party. But while often putting up a hard fight against the black conservatives, DuBois remained an eclectic radical-liberal fellow traveler and black cultural nationalist. When he died in 1964 he was eulogized not only by the Communist Party, which has enshrined him as its own, but also by liberal pacifist M.L. King.

Drake explains that this leading black intellectual died "in Ghana, because that's expressing his blackness, but joined the Communist Party USA the week before he left." That DuBois, who presided over the appeal to paternalist Wilsonian liberalism of the first Pan African Conference, could later join the CP is only an apparent contradiction. In becoming a Stalinist, he only continued the accommodation to imperialism that was expressed in his Pan-Africanism.

Nationalism and "Culture"

Ten years ago, during the turbulent heyday of the black nationalist movement, a forum such as the UCLA symposium would have provoked a tidal wave of interest among black students. Today, the panelists contemplate the calm after the storm without apparent wisdom. Unable to understand that the black nationalist mood was born out of despair of the possibility of racially united class struggle, in the wake of the defeat of the liberal civil rights movement, the black nationalist academics are in an articulate quandry about the disappearance of the radical black movement.

Casting about for a way to reconstitute the dissipated black nationalist movement, Drake proclaims the period since 1974 "a period of reassessment." What he wants to "reassess" are what he terms "the boundaries" between black nationalism and Marxism, wondering aloud whether some loosening of these boundaries might not be in order now. Not unlike the "anti-imperialist" African demagogues, the American black radical academics are propelled toward more of a veneer of Marxist rhetoric to cover the manifest bankruptcy of their utopian-nationalist perspectives.

Panelist William Strickland followed the logic of black nationalism to its

appropriately despairing conclusion when he argued that integration constitutes a threat to a distinct "black culture." Indeed, it is the enforced separation of blacks as slaves and their continued forced segregation and brutal ghettoization that has created a "black culture" separate from "Southern culture" and "urban culture." For Strickland, it is this product of oppression which constitutes blacks' "moral edge." In the tradition of the 1960's activists who pushed segregation under the rubric of "community control" (consistent with earlier cult figure Marcus Garvey, who attempted to effect a "Back to Africa" alliance with the Ku Klux Klan), these utopian dreams are reactionary in their political content even when presented by mild-mannered college professors.

It is ironic and tragic that after all the political activism generated in the 1960's in the name of black nationalism, the result is really accurately reflected in this symposium (and many less prestigious conferences featuring the aspiring chairmen of Black Studies departments). As the black nationalist mood waned, all that was viable in that strategy turned out to be some token academic sinecures where the debates over "black revolution" can be conducted in safety.

This total failure of perspective is reflected in the journal, *Black Scholar*. This is a "mix" that works—a marriage of residual black nationalism and Democratic Party officials. With an editorial component which includes Ron Karenga and Shirley Chisholm (not to mention the "détente" with contributing editor CPer Angela Davis), the *Black Scholar* has taken to uncritically publishing the speeches of Patricia Harris, Ron Dellums and even the "sympathetic" speeches of that very non-black elected official, "James E. Carter" (*Black Scholar*, October 1977). Thus, after murderous government persecution and internal political fragmentation destroyed the militant anti-liberal wing of the black nationalist movement—the Black Panther Party—the few black nationalists left are in full flight from the class struggle and have nested in the classroom and the Democratic Party backroom.

Leninism vs. Pan-Africanism

With the death of the black nationalist movement, a number of black intellectuals involved with the movement turned to Pan-Africanism. And what could be more appropriate? Just as American black nationalism was a product of the defeat of the liberal civil rights movement in this country, the Pan-Africanist movement was similarly



W.E.B. DuBois.

NY Public Library

ism, when and how integrated with Marxism."

For Drake and other panelists, it was a matter of "mix." But the Pan-Africanist mix is three parts bourgeois ideology and one part Marxist vocabulary as a deceptive garnish—a recipe for support of the aims of capitalism in Africa and elsewhere. Drake is correct when he asserts there is a "contest" between the programs of the red and the black "internationals." But there can be no ideological "mix" of revolutionary Marxism with counterrevolutionary nationalism.

Drake cites the political biographies of several black leaders who seem to him to swim in both streams. His best example is W.E.B. DuBois. DuBois certainly represents the model for most U.S. black intellectuals, and they are

a product of despair of revolutionary solutions for Africa.

Born after World War I and the Russian Revolution, Pan-Africanism in its earlier period appealed not to the revolutionary tradition of Lenin and Trotsky but to the various imperialist powers to use their influence to bring about "African independence." Under the impact of the developing independence movements in Africa after World War II, the Pan-Africanists, led by ex-Stalinist George Padmore, became less utopian and more class-conscious—i.e., more consciously counterrevolutionary. They saw themselves locked in mortal combat against Communism on the African continent. Padmore openly invoked the aid of U.S. imperialism against Communism:

"In this connection of aid to Africa, if America, the 'foremost champion and defender of the free world', is really worried about Communism taking root in Africa and wants to prevent such a calamity from taking place, I can offer insurance against it."

—Padmore, *Pan Africanism or Communism?*

But as the leaders of this effort to "Africanize" the institutions of imperialism became exposed as oppressors of the masses of black Africans, they borrowed more Marxist phraseology (without, of course, adding a jot of the Marxist revolutionary program). It is this fraud that Drake and others want to pass off as a "mix" of black consciousness and Marxism.

Surely Nkrumah is the best example of such a "mix." And indeed the cult of Nkrumah was much in evidence at this symposium. But what was the nature of Nkrumah's conversion to "Marxism"? In 1960 he "mixed" up Ghanaian troops with UN imperialist "peace-keeping" forces in the Congo to maintain "unity" against Lumumba, counseling the latter to "unite with your bitterest political enemies" (Colin Legum, *The Congo Disaster*). Having driven Ghana's masses into extreme poverty, discredited by his smashing of the general strike of 1961, Nkrumah was overthrown by a military coup in 1966. Out of power, he began to spout "Marxist" rhetoric against neo-colonial "African socialism."

For Proletarian Revolution in Africa!

It was between ex-Marxist C.L.R. James and the Spartacist League that

the most direct political confrontation took place. For it was James, now in his eighties, frail and white-haired, who presented the most energetic and political defense of Pan-Africanism and the most unequivocal attack on Leninism. And it was during the discussion on James' contribution that the aggressive political interventions of Spartacist supporters prompted the symposium chairman to inquire if everyone seeking the floor was a Spartacist and suggest hopefully that perhaps there was a Maoist in the house. As no Maoist came forward to take on the political questions, the debate continued between James and his SL critics.

James' presentation was an obvious attempt to justify his entire political career. James had given up an early interest in Pan-Africanism in the 1930's to join the Trotskyist movement in Britain and then the U.S. Socialist Workers Party (SWP), of which he became a leader under the party name J.R. Johnson. But James was never able to come to terms with the question of Stalinism, and he split from the SWP as the cultist head of the state-capitalist Johnson-Forrest faction. Though he briefly rejoined the SWP in 1946, he again split over the Korean War and rejected Leninism in its entirety to become the patriarch of Pan-Africanism.

With the Hungarian revolution of 1956, James generalized his one-dimensional view of Stalinism to include Leninism and all political parties:

"The real problem of the mass of people today is not the overthrow of the old order (who anymore believes in it?). It is the fear of what will happen afterwards, whether the inevitable result will be the One-Party totalitarian state."

C.L.R. James, *Facing Reality*

James' foe is still Leninism, but he now attacks it in the name of one or another African bourgeois or petty-bourgeois nationalist. At the symposium he set forth a "fundamental rule" of spontaneous Pan-Africanism:

"The conception of the party is no longer viable. The party can no longer do what is necessary to move a modern population against a modern imperialist power. The people have to move. The whole population has to move. That's what Guinea-Bissau did. That's what Mozambique and Angola have done. The whole population moved from the bottom. There were no theories, leaders

who organized them. They were organized from below."

Smearing the Leninist party as a "handicap" to anti-imperialist struggles, James glorified Nyerere and Nkrumah as "anti-imperialists." After all, he argued, "the imperialists don't like" the emergence of independent states in Africa. A Spartacist spokesman later countered:

"The capitalists don't like the MPLA, but they still like pumping that oil. They also don't like Machel or FRELIMO, but they like the fact that he sends



Kwame Nkrumah dances with Duchess of Kent on Ghana's Independence day, 6 March 1957.

100,000 contract workers to South Africa."

It was the Spartacist League which counterposed an authentic Leninist perspective to the defeatist black nationalism of the veteran black academics. SL speakers refused to redefine "Marxism" as the quest for a new flag behind which black capitalist militarists, in collaboration with imperialism, continue the grinding oppression of the working masses:

"I think it's clear when you look at the history of Pan-Africanism in Africa, in

Ghana especially, that Nkrumah was not anti-capitalist. I think Nkrumah was pro-capitalist. I think he acted as an agent for the British imperialists in Ghana. He did not nationalize anything without compensation. In Mozambique, I think the same thing is true of the FRELIMO government. In Angola, it's true of the MPLA which has not made any move whatsoever to nationalize Gulf Oil. Touré broke strikes in Guinea, and Nyerere, in my opinion as well, is simply an agent of imperialism. And I think you should apply the Permanent Revolution of Trotsky. Isn't precisely the example of the Russian Revolution and other anti-capitalist revolutions in the world, isn't the lesson that you need a party to achieve this? Lenin showed us that without a party it is impossible to overthrow capitalism. That's the lesson of the Russian Revolution, and that's the lesson the Spartacist League draws in trying to build a revolutionary party."

Another SL speaker drew the connection between James' Stalinophobia and his Pan-Africanism, which both lead inexorably toward a bloc with imperialism.

Were it not for the SL, the UCLA symposium would have been one happy little family of Pan-Africanists discussing the "good old days" in Ghana. But with the SL interventions, all the talk about a "mix" of black consciousness and Marxism went up in the smoke of heated political debate.

Though E. Franklin Frazier in *Black Bourgeoisie* denounced all black leaders as "idle overfed women" and "glamorous men" evading responsibility, black intellectuals in the U.S. have felt their political responsibility and destiny more deeply than their white counterparts in the university. But those among this very crucial layer of black intellectuals who do not want to be added to the long list of "ivory tower cheerleaders for exploiters with black faces" must come to terms with Marxism. And this does not mean some reactionary "mix" à la Nkrumah, but a confrontation with the revolutionary class content of contemporary Marxism—i.e., Trotskyism. It is through this confrontation that the SL seeks to produce political clarification in the necessary process of recruiting a black Trotskyist cadre as an indispensable component of the leadership of the proletarian revolution. ■



"The conception of the party is no longer viable. The party can no longer do what is necessary to move a modern population against a modern imperialist power. The whole population has to move. That's what Guinea-Bissau did. That's what Mozambique and Angola have done."

—C.L.R. James



The Spartacist League is for... "the leadership of an experienced vanguard party that has been tested in the class struggle. The capitalists don't like the MPLA, but they still like pumping that oil. They also don't like Machel or FRELIMO, but they like the fact that he sends 100,000 contract workers to South Africa."



"It's a contest between the Red International and the Black International. No black intellectual from 1917 on can avoid coming to terms with Marxism. The question now becomes one of what kind of mix. How much black nationalism, when and how, integrated with Marxism."

—St. Clair Drake



"I'm from the Spartacist League. We stand for the Red International!"

Carter...

(continued from page 1)

Cyrus Vance and UN Ambassador Andrew Young, who had previously grabbed headlines on their round-the-world diplomatic junkets, were suddenly shoved in the background by Carter's shift to the more bare-knuckled approach Brzezinski had been arguing was necessary to put "bite" into U.S. policy. A year ago Vance dismissed as "dangerous and futile" proposals for a "negative, reactive American policy that seeks only to oppose Soviet or Cuban involvement in Africa" and Young has repeatedly pooh-poohed the importance of the Cuban troops in Angola and Ethiopia. Now, however, Brzezinski clearly had the whip hand, as he called for a harsh "international response" to the "Red Threat" in sub-Saharan Africa and a general stiffening of the U.S. posture toward the USSR.

On the "human rights" front, while such notorious dictatorships as those in Iran, South Korea, the Philippines and most of Latin America (except for the too-outrageous Pinochets and Somozas, who have received periodic slaps on the wrist) continued to receive lavish American favor, Soviet dissidents preaching Western economic and military sanctions against the USSR became the darlings of the White House. The problem for Carter is that his incessant bleatings for "human rights" have not stirred up much enthusiasm in the U.S. populace for a real showdown with the Soviets. Moreover, the sharp rise of inter-imperialist economic competition has undermined the U.S.' ability to simply dictate orders to its imperialist allies; growing trade protectionism pits the major industrialized nations at each others' throats. Except perhaps for West Germany, none of the U.S.' NATO allies desires to heat up the Cold War and, except where their interests are directly concerned (e.g., France's African neo-colonies), they prefer to avoid confrontations with the Soviets.

If the Kremlin were to draw a hard line in response to Carter's stepped-up anti-Soviet belligerency, Carter might well find himself in a showdown he could not win. There is no indication that the American masses—or the European governments, for that matter—are prepared to support a war in sub-Saharan Africa or even a major standoff in Central Europe. So far, however, the Soviets have been backing down all across the line in hopes of salvaging détente. Undoubtedly under pressure from Moscow, Angola promised to disarm the retreating Katangan rebels, Soviet negotiators agreed to parity in troop levels between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, long a deadlocked issue, and *Pravda* was deliberately soft-pedaling its criticism of Carter.

The Storm Over Shaba

Carter chose to pivot his turn towards a tougher line with the Russians on charges that the Cubans in Angola had armed, trained and promoted the ex-Katangan gendarmes who carried out a successful surprise attack on the copper center of Kolwezi May 13. But Carter immediately ran into difficulty when he couldn't prove it. Soviet foreign minister Andrei Gromyko politely stated that the "information which the president has at his disposal is not correct" and Cuban vice president Carlos Rodríguez more bluntly told the U.N. that Carter's claims were "absolutely false" and "based on impudently repeated lies." Their suspicions aroused both by these vehement denials and the recent publication of a book by the ex-CIA station chief for Angola who revealed the spy agency's repeated lies to Congress and the public about goings-on in that country, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee asked to see the documentary evidence.

Sounding for all the world like Richard Nixon, Carter stonewalled it.

The CIA claimed it feared identifying its sources. The Foreign Relations Committee was refused the dossiers, which were turned over only to the House and Senate Intelligence Committees. While the loyal friends of the CIA on these "watchdog" committees, who regularly believe anything they're told, promptly said they were satisfied (just as the House last week voted the CIA's annual budget without the slightest notion of how much it was—that's a secret, too), the skepticism was not set to rest.

After a three-hour briefing by CIA director Admiral Stansfield Turner, even conservative Alabama senator and head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee John Sparkman said the "evidence" was "circumstantial" and "by no means conclusive." George McGovern, who read the documents, said he "regarded the sources as doubtful." Meanwhile, the *Washington Post*

"lize" the situation, again on U.S. Air Force planes, as much to quell the riotous Zairean army as to ward off another invasion.

The "All-Africa" force being built in Shaba, entirely Western-financed of course, was initially proposed by French president Valéry Giscard d'Estaing at a working White House dinner during the NATO summit. At a five-nation meeting in Paris a couple of days later, the military plan and short-term economic aid to Zaire was formally agreed to. The U.S., France, Belgium, Britain and West Germany additionally agreed to reconvene in a week, along with representatives from the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, Saudi Arabia, Iran and, almost as an afterthought, a token delegation of the Zairean government, to discuss long-range economic and military aid to bail out the shattered Zairean economy and

Namibia and Rhodesia, Carter pointedly warned the Soviets not to impede "peaceful" settlements in both countries. What the U.S. president did not mention was the vicious apartheid regime in South Africa itself. Though the West is willing to see—and figures it can manipulate—even moderately "radical" nationalist regimes in Rhodesia and Namibia, the economic and political commitment to the deeply entrenched Afrikaners will be strengthened by Carter's push against the Soviets and Cubans. Prime Minister John Vorster, who has been getting prickly under Andrew Young's criticism, hailed the sudden "change of opinion in the West about the Marxist onslaught against Africa" and even volunteered to send troops to join the "All-Africa" fire brigade in Zaire! Though his offer will not be taken up, Vorster knows which way the wind is blowing: Carter's occasionally stated "concern" about "human rights" in the hellhole of apartheid will recede as the "Red Threat" becomes more clearly the main target in Africa.

Playing "The China Card"

The African uproar also served to tighten up the U.S.-China alliance against the Soviet Union. In Peking, Brzezinski poured vitriol on the Soviets and Cubans, only to be exceeded by Chinese foreign minister Huang Hua. Huang quickly flew off to Zaire to praise Mobutu for leading "a just struggle to safeguard national independence against a new aggression being perpetrated by Soviet Socialist Imperialism" and promise the dictator Chinese support and aid. On his way to Zaire, Huang stopped off in New York to hail imperialist intervention in Africa, telling the UN that the Soviet Union, "is more aggressive and adventurous than the other superpower; it is the most dangerous source of a new world war and is sure to be its chief instigator."

It is their fundamental and shared hostility to the Soviet Union that lays the basis for the U.S.-China alliance which has been shaping up since Nixon visited Mao in 1971 while American B-52s carpet-bombed North Vietnam. The Maoist bureaucrats were quite willing to overlook the imperialist rape of Vietnam in order to court the Americans, and Nixon correctly saw the possibility of driving the wedge deeper between the competing Stalinist cliques in Moscow and Peking. Though both regimes are based on the abolition of private property, the narrow nationalist outlook of "building socialism" in their "own country" leads the Stalinists to repeatedly stab each other in the back. The vastly weaker position of the Chinese has led them directly into the arms of the U.S.

From his side Carter clearly perceives the advantages of a rapprochement with China in order to counter the Soviets globally and strengthen the U.S. in Asia. Despite widespread predictions of an American collapse in the Pacific after the disastrous rout in Indochina. In fact, the U.S. has held its own. The rate of U.S. troop withdrawals from Korea has been cut back (though revelations that up to 100 Congressmen were on the take from the Korean CIA have been embarrassing), close ties to the Marcos dictatorship in the Philippines have been maintained and the Vietnamese and Cambodians, backed by their respective Russian and Chinese mentors, have been kept busy warring with each other.

The great plans of the Trilateral Commission (the imperialist think tank which boosted its leading figures into the Carter cabinet and which Brzezinski chaired) for closer ties with the Japanese have, however, fallen on hard times. The enormous U.S. trade deficit with the Japanese, combined with charges of Japanese "dumping" of steel, autos and electronics on the American market, has cooled relations and made Washington



West German chancellor Schmidt, left, with U.S. "National Security" advisor Brzezinski at NATO summit.

continued to leak "Deep Throat"-type reports from "high Administration and State Department sources" that the "evidence" would never prove believable.

The Carter administration was further embarrassed when the *New York Times* revealed on June 11 that Castro had notified the U.S. nearly a month earlier that he had tried to stop the invasion plans when he first learned of them in April. Carter had simply suppressed this piece of information and continued to claim that the Cubans "had done nothing" to halt the raid.

In fact, bogged down fighting Jonas Savimbi's Western-backed UNITA guerrillas in Angola and Eritrean secessionists in Ethiopia, Castro had no interest in broadening his military engagement in Africa or further provoking the West by backing an invasion of Zaire. The Congolese National Liberation Front (FLNC) which carried out the raid is largely composed of ex-military policemen from the Shaba province who needed neither Cuban training nor advice. But Carter needed a "red menace" pretext to help justify U.S. involvement in Shaba and the CIA can always create the "evidence" a chief executive needs. It has, after all, had years of experience, from Santo Domingo to the Gulf of Tonkin.

Though the U.S. has only about \$1 billion invested in Zaire, Carter is determined to protect this pro-Western outpost at a time when Russian/Cuban influence is increasing in Africa. U.S. air force C-141 transports were provided to airlift in paratroopers from France and Belgium, the former colonial masters who have a far more substantial \$25 billion sunk into Zaire, most of it in Shaba, which provides two-thirds of Zaire's foreign exchange revenues from its copper and cobalt mines. As the Legionnaires and Belgian paras began withdrawing, troops from Morocco, Senegal and Gabon arrived to "stabi-

lize" the situation, again on U.S. Air Force planes, as much to quell the riotous Zairean army as to ward off another invasion. The "All-Africa" force being built in Shaba, entirely Western-financed of course, was initially proposed by French president Valéry Giscard d'Estaing at a working White House dinner during the NATO summit. At a five-nation meeting in Paris a couple of days later, the military plan and short-term economic aid to Zaire was formally agreed to. The U.S., France, Belgium, Britain and West Germany additionally agreed to reconvene in a week, along with representatives from the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, Saudi Arabia, Iran and, almost as an afterthought, a token delegation of the Zairean government, to discuss long-range economic and military aid to bail out the shattered Zairean economy and

the tyrant Mobutu. The oil-rich Saudis and Iranians were to be present not only because of their plentiful cash and strong interest in countering the dreaded Reds, but to serve as arms suppliers. With Israel currently in disfavor with the U.S., the semi-feudal regimes of King Khalid and the Shah stand to become the Pentagon's major pipeline for weapons into Africa. Together with France and South Africa, both are already channeling millions in covert aid to UNITA in hopes of toppling the shaky Moscow-backed regime in Angola (*Observer* [London], 26 March).

For Carter, the major utility of the Shaba furor was to launch a more interventionist African policy. His aides were already preparing a new Presidential Review Memorandum outlining policy options to curb the Russian/Cuban presence. Due in a few weeks, it is expected to include recommendations for aid to UNITA and cutting back trade with the USSR. Meanwhile, Carter began pressuring for a relaxation of legislative restrictions that he claimed "tied his hands," i.e., limited his unrestricted ability to undermine disagreeable or shore-up favored African regimes. The Clark amendment passed in 1975 barring U.S. military involvement in Angola is the principal irritant, though other bills prohibit aid to Zambia, Tanzania and the "radical" Mozambique, all of which Carter might like to get on the payroll to wean them from Soviet influence.

Carter's major fear is that the recalcitrant white supremacists in Rhodesia will push the nationalist guerrillas operating out of Zambia and Mozambique further toward the Russians and perhaps carry the other "front line" states into the Soviet orbit as well. Both Britain and the U.S. would vastly prefer to dump the Salisbury "transitional" government to avoid this. Promising support to "majority rule" in

less inclined to rely on or re-arm Japan, Inc.

Brzezinski's trip was a significant step towards sealing the bloc with China. Brzezinski told the *New York Times* (28 May) that, "The basic significance of the trip was to underline the long-term strategic nature of the United States relationship to China." Stressing the "parallel interests" of the U.S. and China, Brzezinski and his aides exchanged long presentations with the Chinese on the world situation, briefed them in depth on the state of the SALT talks and explained in detail presidential memorandums and security directives that are still secret from the U.S. public. As an expression of gratitude for the closer relations achieved, the U.S. reversed an earlier decision and decided to sell the Chinese highly sophisticated airborne scanning equipment which can be adapted for anti-submarine warfare, material that is still being denied to the Soviet Union on military security grounds.

Though China's "anti-imperialist" credentials are somewhat tarnished by its courting of a host of right-wing governments, including Iran, Chile and now Zaire, it is still useful to Washington to have Chinese diplomats running around deriding the Soviet Union, apologizing for U.S. imperialism and promoting more NATO spending. The abiding weakness of such pronouncements is that only Peking's most loyal running dogs take them really seriously. For example, *The Call* (5 June), organ of the slavishly Peking-loyal Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist), was probably one of the few newspapers in the U.S. or the world to actually quote the official Zairean news agency as a credible source on the details of the Shaba events or to claim that, "The entire operation... was masterminded from beginning to end by the Soviet Union...." a claim so preposterous that even Jimmy Carter and the CIA were not prepared to make it.

UN Disarmament Follies, NATO Girds for War

While the Soviet/U.S. tensions heated up, the UN Special Session on Disarmament wore on in its irrelevancy. Meanwhile, Carter brought the SALT talks with the Soviets to a halt, both to punish them for their "adventurism" and because he was not interested in agreeing to any restrictions right now anyway. Though Carter hysterically summoned the entire Washington press corps to the White House to denounce a June 1 *Washington Post* front page headline announcing the Administration's "freeze" on the negotiations, it was clear to everyone that this was exactly what had happened. Though the Soviet Union was bending over backwards to entice the U.S., offering a total ban on all new missile systems, allowing the U.S. concessions on the range of its Cruise missiles and considering restraints the U.S. had been demanding on the Soviet Backfire bomber, Brzezinski declared a haughty "no compromises" position that effectively stalled the talks. "If they [current U.S. proposals] are not accepted," he said, "we will wait until they are accepted."

Like all capitalist disarmament hoaxes, the SALT talks were intended to tie up the opposition while furiously developing new weapons and technology outside the terms of the agreement. Thus, during the tenure of SALT I, the U.S. achieved a three-to-one advantage in nuclear warheads by deploying multiple warheads (MIRVs) on its Minuteman III and Poseidon ICBMs. The other "crowning achievement" of SALT I, the banning of anti-ballistic missile defense systems (ABMs) was agreed to only after a consensus that MIRV development had rendered the ABM ineffective anyway.

While the Soviets have made gains in overall "throw weight" of their nuclear arsenal, technological developments in missile guidance have maintained the

U.S. advantage. The particularly ominous feature of the 1980's generation of U.S. ICBMs is their *extreme* accuracy. The maneuverable re-entry vehicle (MARV), for example, is projected to have an accuracy measured in several dozen yards after a flight of 6,000 nautical miles. Such precision is certainly not necessary to annihilate the Russian population and industry. It is meant for the Soviet missile silos. This reality undermines the conventional fiction that U.S. nuclear strategy is simply to deter attack through the threat of a devastating response. After all, it makes no sense to knock out the Russian silos after their missiles have

The Gospel According to Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn



Wyman/Newsweek

A message from Carter's spiritual adviser and high-priest of the great crusade against godless, camunnistic Russia, delivered with pomp, circumstance and great applause at the June 1978 Harvard University commencement.

"Your shortsighted politicians who signed the hasty Vietnam capitulation seemingly gave America a carefree breathing pause; however, a hundredfold Vietnam now looms over you. That small Vietnam had been a warning and an occasion to mobilize the nation's courage. But if a full-fledged America suffered a real defeat from a small Communist half-country, how can the West hope to stand firm in the future?"

been fired. What the U.S. is clearly striving for is rather a *nuclear first strike capability*.

Ever since the days of John Foster Dulles, the threat of "massive retaliation" with nuclear weapons has been the U.S.' big club against the Soviet Union. The threat remains today the real muscle behind NATO. But U.S. development of a first strike capacity, if it is not countered by the Soviets, will enable the imperialists to transform their anti-Communist ravings and long-held desire to "roll back Communism" into an immediate murderous threat as never before.

While striving for this killing potential, the U.S. is also seeking to gear up NATO's conventional might, which was weakened by the \$150 billion the U.S. diverted to the Vietnam war. The Warsaw Pact currently has a three-to-two superiority in manpower and vastly outguns NATO in artillery and tanks. To counter this, over a year ago, at the last NATO conference in London, Carter began chiding his allies to increase their level of defense spending. At the summit in Washington, Carter got their commitment to boost weapons allocations by 3 percent a year in order to overhaul the NATO war machine. The U.S. pledged to pick up more than half the \$60 to \$80 billion the Long

Term Defense Plan is expected to cost.

The main problem with NATO however is that it is 1978, not 1949. The once-absolute dominance of the U.S. voice has been shaken by the revival of inter-imperialist economic and political rivalry. At the same time, the European economies, still recovering from the worldwide depression of 1974-75 and paying quadrupled oil prices, are haunted by unemployment and inflation far worse than in the U.S. And the Europeans are none too happy about the U.S.' refusal to stem the falling value of the dollar against their currencies, which makes European exports more expensive and thus cuts into their share of world trade. All of this makes the Europeans less willing to snap to attention every time the U.S. commands. Though Carter prodded NATO into pledging increased weapons spending for the next 15 years, there is widespread skepticism that all or even most of the member countries will actually follow through.

The strains and weakness in NATO make it, for the foreseeable future, an untrustworthy military force in Europe at the level of a full-blown conventional war. Thus, the U.S. must continue to plan, as it has in the past, on the immediate use of its thousands of tactical nuclear weapons, backed up by its ICBMs, in the event of war with the Soviet Union. Carter re-emphasized this in his statement at the NATO summit, "Let there be no misunderstanding: the United States is prepared to use *all* the forces necessary for the defense of the NATO area."

Soviet Stalinists Cling to Détente

While Jimmy Carter has been on a Cold Warrior rampage, the Soviet press has tried to avoid drawing any conclusions about his overall aims, hoping that he will yet turn out to be a "sensible" bourgeois like Richard Nixon, whom they could work with. Soviet spokesmen have instead focused their attack on Brzezinski, labeling him an "enemy of détente" who is feeding the president bad advice. Though *Pravda* finally objected to Carter's Naval Academy speech as containing "impermissible outbursts," even this account blamed Brzezinski's influence.

The attempt to coddle Carter while blasting Brzezinski is a classic example of the Stalinists' historically futile policy of seeking to find the "progressive" wing of the bourgeoisie which can be trusted and allied with to "keep the peace" as against the pro-war reactionaries. But Brzezinski is not some bizarre right-wing nut who sneaked into the White House and somehow mysteriously hypnotized Carter. He was picked for the job and now has the president's ear because he more consistently advocates the anti-Soviet policies which are fundamental to U.S. strategy.

There can, of course, be periods of greater or lesser overt confrontation in U.S.-Soviet relations. Détente came into vogue while the Vietnam War raged, because the Soviets were quite willing to not make a fuss over American savagery there and the U.S. was too bogged down to want to escalate tensions with the USSR directly. But the fundamental lines of U.S. foreign policy are dictated by the basic conflict between the expansionist drive inherent in capitalism, which seeks to overturn the socialist property forms established by the Russian Revolution and reopen the vast potential market of the Soviet bloc for imperialist exploitation. Moreover, despite its weakened position the U.S. is still the dominant imperialist power and thus is more influenced by such basic global considerations than are the regional powers, who are more interested in improving their short-term advantages over rival capitalist states.

The Stalinists' dogged faith in détente did not begin when Brezhnev and Nixon signed the 1972 "Basic Principles of Mutual Relations" which declared that "there is no alternative to peaceful coexistence...." This outlook has domi-

nated Soviet policy since the victory of the Stalin faction in the 1920's. Stalin's heirs in the bureaucracy continue to believe that they can construct "socialism in one country" if they can just neutralize the imperialist West. Hence their reliance on détente, disarmament schemes and conciliation of U.S. imperialism wherever it seems necessary and possible.

Contrary to Carter's fear about "Red uprisings" in Africa, the Soviets have no interest in spreading genuine social revolutions which might provoke the West and weaken their own bureaucratic straitjacket on the Soviet masses. The Kremlin bureaucrats do, of course, seek to gain influence abroad, but they do so by backing petty-bourgeois nationalists or currying favor with capitalist regimes on the outs with the major Western powers. When these "allies" of the moment kick sand in Russia's face and turn back to the imperialists' embrace—as has happened in Ghana, Guinea, Somalia and Egypt, just to mention recent examples in Africa—the Soviets simply try to latch onto a new set of "friends," like the bloody Ethiopian Derg or the Angolan regime which survives with Soviet aid and the revenues of Gulf Oil.

Far from safeguarding the defense of Soviet Russia, these policies constantly undermine it. Illusions in détente pushed by Brezhnev & Co. only mislead the world's working masses, not the imperialists. The West has been able to exploit the dramatic reversals suffered by the Kremlin, as in Egypt, just as it gains points by exploiting the very real domestic crimes of the bureaucracy. The recent trial of pro-Western dissident Yuri Orlov, sentenced to seven years imprisonment for "anti-Soviet slanders," was a gift to the imperialist propaganda mills and fit right into Carter's anti-Soviet "human rights" campaign.

The inevitable war threats of U.S. imperialism will not be stopped by mere diplomatic deals or more arms control treaties, but by proletarian revolutions which disarm the rapacious capitalist class once and for all. Trotskyists defend the Soviet degenerated workers state from imperialism because of the gains of the Russian Revolution that have been preserved in spite of the bureaucracy's policies. But we also call for political revolutions, from Moscow to Peking and Havana, to dump the Stalinist bureaucracies which imperil that defense and make a mockery of socialism. The reformed Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution, is the necessary answer to Carter's Cold War threats and the specter of nuclear holocaust. ■

SPARTACIST Canada Subscription: \$2/year (11 issues)

Make payable/mail to Spartacist Canada
Publishing Association, Box 6867, Station A,
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

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 835-1515

CHICAGO

Tuesday 4:30-8:00
Saturday 2:00-5:30 p.m.
523 South Plymouth Court 3rd 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

Vietnam/China...

(continued from page 3)

(because of its potential military uses). Peking is now denouncing Hanoi as an instrument of "Soviet hegemonism" in southeast Asia. (Moscow returned the insult in a 1 June *Pravda* editorial charging Peking rulers with "great power hegemonism.") Already there have been reports of isolated bloody incidents and some deaths on the Sino-Vietnam border. The main beneficiary of the reactionary policies pursued by the Peking bureaucracy is of course U.S. imperialism, which increasingly is turning towards China as it heats up the cold war against the USSR.

As for the economic policies of the Vietnamese bureaucracy, the nationalizations were certainly inevitable, particularly given the extreme *laissez-faire* approach of the previous three years. However, it is not our task to give advice to these Stalinist bureaucrats. The recent abrupt shift in economic policy recalls the brutal 1956 North Vietnam land collectivization campaign which led to several isolated peasant revolts and a mass exodus (mostly of Roman Catholic villagers) to Diem's puppet regime in the South. Such bureaucratic methods of carrying out necessary social transformations are characteristic of Stalinist rule and are further proof of the fact that the Stalinists came to power through *military* victory, not through workers' uprisings, in the course of which (as in Russia) many of the native capitalists would undoubtedly already have been expropriated.

It is possible that regardless of the method and pace of expropriations, there would have been a mass exodus of Vietnamese Chinese to the capitalist countries of Southeast Asia as well as China. However, a genuinely communist government in Vietnam would want to retain the relatively well-educated Chinese minority and to use their talents in a collectivized, planned economy. Moreover, the integration of the Chinese minority would counter Vietnamese national narrowness and the centuries-old hostility between the Ammanite and Han peoples.

While of course Trotskyists support the expropriation of the capitalists, the precise ways in which a victorious proletarian state carries this through depend upon specific circumstances. In any case, it is the working class itself, through democratically elected soviets and a Leninist vanguard party, which must wield the power and determine the decisions of the central state apparatus regarding economic policy. Only through a workers political revolution establishing such organs of proletarian democracy by overthrowing the parasitic bureaucracies, from Hanoi and Peking to the Kremlin, will it be possible to put an end to the bloody nationalist conflicts which oppress the working people and make a mockery of the Stalinists' claims to be constructing socialism. ■

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Biweekly of the Spartacist League

48 issues—\$5. Introductory offer (18 issues): \$2. International rates 48 issues—\$20 airmail/\$5 seairmail. 16 introductory issues—\$5 airmail

—Includes *Spartacist*

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____

Make checks payable/mail to: 209
Spartacist Publishing Co.
Box 1377 GPO
New York, N.Y. 10001

Hanging Judge Hits Philip Allen with 10 to Life

The California courts' racist vendetta against Philip Allen was played out to its vicious finish in late May as the young black student was sentenced to 10 years in prison for second-degree manslaughter in the killing of a Los Angeles County deputy sheriff. Allen, who is 5 ft. 3 in. tall, was convicted of killing a deputy with another deputy's gun while he was being beaten by four hurly cops! He is obviously the innocent victim of an outrageous cop frame-up and a kangaroo-court proceeding designed to cover up the real criminals.

For three-and-a-half years the Partisan Defense Committee has campaigned in defense of Philip Allen. The PDC has argued for a class-struggle defense and the mobilization of broad sectors of labor and the left. It has warned that reliance on the capitalist courts for "justice" is a strategy not for victory but for defeat. Unfortunately, the Philip Allen Defense Committee pursued instead a policy of passive reliance on the courts in the hope of getting a reduction in Allen's sentence. This hope was dashed when vindictive Judge Laurence J. Rittenband, who declared that "Philip has not sufficiently repaid society for his deed," upheld Allen's original sentence of ten-years-to-life, with eligibility for parole only after two years in jail.

Allen is scheduled to go to prison on June 19. His mother Ellery Allen says, "We will continue to fight to get a new trial." The Partisan Defense Committee fully supports the continuation of the fight to free this innocent victim of a racist frame-up, and it continues to press for an *effective militant defense* based on mass support and exposure of the racist nature of class "justice."

Fight the frame-up—For mass protest now against Allen's jailing!

Free Philip Allen Now!

SPARTACIST LEAGUE LOCAL DIRECTORY

ANN ARBOR (313) 663-9012
c/o SYL Room 4102
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) 566-7806
Box 6765
Cleveland, OH 44101

DETROIT (313) 868-9095
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

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

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

SAN FRANCISCO (415) 863-6963
Box 5712
San Francisco, CA 94101

TROTSKYIST LEAGUE OF CANADA

TORONTO (416) 366-4107
Box 7198 Station A
Toronto, Ontario

VANCOUVER (604) 254-9166
Box 26 Station A
Vancouver, B.C.

Stearns...

(continued from page 2)

out the region.

Meanwhile, strikers' report continuous harassment by the state. Following the April 20 shooting death of one of the scabs, detectives have been snooping all over Stearns. One miner told *WV* that he came home to find his house ransacked by the cops who brazenly admitted that they were searching for a weapon to pin the rap on him. Another striker's well was searched from top to bottom with a police TV camera. When miners from Tennessee appeared at the picket line recently, several were arrested, allegedly for throwing rocks at the strikebreakers who are protected by both the State Police and professional gun thugs packing semi-automatic rifles!

For 23 months the Stearns miners have held out with little more from the International than \$100 per week strike benefits. Ignoring the lessons of the thirteen-month organizing drive at Brookside which triumphed only after a five-day nationwide "memorial period" shutdown, Miller has stood idly by while Bonnyman, the cops and courts tightened the screws on the Stearns strikers. By refusing to demand a contract at the Justus pit as a condition of settling with the Bituminous Coal Operators Association in the recent national strike, Miller squandered the best opportunity to win the strike for union recognition.

Militant miners must rely on their own organized strength and not the so-called mediation of federal labor "experts" to win this fight. Nor should strikers place any confidence in the courts, which have amply demonstrated their pro-company loyalties throughout the protracted struggle. UMWA militants should demand massive rallies of miners from across the Appalachian coalfields to assemble the desperately needed pickets for a total shutdown of the Justus pit. Militant tactics which won at Brookside in 1974 can win in Stearns today. Victory to the Stearns strike! ■

Rockport Miners...

(continued from page 2)

brought against any of the area's coal operators and their gun thugs or against the state cops who damaged the pickets' cars as the strikers were led off to jail and harassed the miners throughout the strike—even buzzing their homes with helicopters. As for the "law-abiding" operator Teagarden, he currently faces charges himself for running government safety inspectors off his property with machine guns. And the only "justice" for the widow of John Hull, murdered February 3 on the picket line by a scab, was the bill for an autopsy which she neither requested nor authorized.

The enormous turnout on the first day of the hearings resulted in the closing of the nearby Kingsbury mine, owned by Amax Coal, Peabody's Spur mine and Old Ben No. 2 mine. The massive appearance of UMWA members was spontaneous, a display of working-class solidarity with the victimized militants pointing to the need for a successful class-struggle defense "which puts all faith in the power of the masses and no faith whatever in the justice of the courts" (American Trotskyist leader James P. Cannon, writing of the policy of the International Labor Defense in 1927 during the international campaign to save the lives of Sacco and Vanzetti). The entire U.S. labor movement must rally to the defense of the Rockport 194. Union meetings, rallies and demonstrations must demand: drop all charges against the Indiana miners! ■

Drive the Nazis Out of Chicago!

The following motion submitted by Marc Friedman, publisher of the class-struggle opposition newsletter "Labor's Struggle," was approved at the June 11 regular membership meeting of United Auto Workers Local 6 (International Harvester, Melrose Park, Illinois) by a vote of 31 to 12.

Whereas, the planned Nazi march in Skokie on June 25 is an outrageous provocation to that largely Jewish community and its thousands of survivors of Hitler's concentration camps; and

Whereas, the immediate goal of these home-grown Hitler lovers is the fomenting of race hate and organized racist terror against the black population of the Marquette Park/Englewood area and their ultimate goal is to be stormtroopers to smash the labor movement and to carry out genocide against blacks, Jews and other minorities; and

Whereas, for the past two years the Skokie village officials and others have pursued a purely legalistic strategy of relying on the courts to stop the Nazis when in fact the bosses' courts will ultimately protect the Nazis, as was shown by the court ruling permitting the Nazis to march on June 25; and

Whereas, the experience of this Local in mobilizing the membership to defend the home of brother C. B. Dennis against racist violence and defending brother Bennie Lenard after he was brutally beaten by racist cops shows further that the courts and cops of the capitalist state cannot be relied upon to protect victims of racist terror; and

Whereas, the Chicago Federation of Labor and Industrial Union Council voted last Tuesday to organize a counterdemonstration of organized labor at Skokie on June 25 citing the "...vicious racial and anti-trade union philosophy..." of the Nazis;

Be it resolved, that UAW Local 6 mobilize a mass, militant contingent in Skokie on June 25 at the site of the Nazi march under the slogan "Drive the Nazis Out of Chicago!" as part of a city-wide mobilization of all organized labor, Jewish groups and the black and Spanish-speaking communities. In order to ensure that these racist labor haters will be prevented from marching, this mobilization should not be merely a "moral protest" but should demonstrate decisively that the Chicago labor movement will not tolerate the presence of the Nazis on the streets of Skokie or anywhere in the Chicago area

Workers Vanguard Forum NAZIS IN SKOKIE: How to Smash the Fascist Threat

Speaker: Paul Collins
SL Central Committee
Friday, June 23, 1978 7:30 p.m.
Room 306, Herman Crown Center
Roosevelt University
Sponsored by Spartacist League/US
Donation \$1.00

CHICAGO

NMU...

(continued from page 12)

only way we can secure the things we need.

"The Caucus members received enthusiastic applause along with other members who rose to condemn the sellout pact Wall's crew was pushing for the companies. The few flunkies of the officials who tried to speak in support of the contract could not conclude their remarks without being interrupted by loud booing and jeering from the rest of the membership. Having tested the waters, not one union official dared take the floor to discuss the contract—except for N.Y. Agent Rich, who had to make the report.

"After discussion was abruptly ended, one of the bureaucrats' typical razzle-dazzle mayhem-type vote counts was taken, with patrolmen shouting out arbitrary numbers from non-specified 'sections' of the auditorium. This in itself simply provoked a din of angry protest from the membership as they watched the engineered confusion to swindle them out of jobs, hard cash, benefits and conditions. The vote, by a show of hands, was unquestionable: overwhelmingly opposed to the contract, by a margin of almost two to one.

"Agent Rich was noticeably nervous as he barely reduced some of the irate clamor to announce his phony tally: '136 in favor and 123 opposed'! When the officials admit such a close vote it always means they were thoroughly defeated; but this vote was *ridiculously* absurd. An outcry exploded from the membership. Gene Herson, prepared for the officials' tricks to try for a sudden adjournment, jumped to the microphone, holding it with one hand, while holding the plug in the outlet with the other hand, and called for 'a division of the house,' denouncing the false vote.

"The master-at-arms was right behind Herson yanking at his arm to unplug the mike while 'recording secretary'/patrolman Zeidel prepared to kick Herson in the head. The Caucus and supporters leapt to Herson's defense while demanding a recount. The national officers, including Vice President J.C. Hughes and Secretary-Treasurer Martinez, quickly moved into the fray, which in turn brought the rest of the membership and officers down the aisles as utter bedlam broke loose. As the shouting subsided the officers declared that the meeting was adjourned, while the Caucus and the overwhelming majority of members declared the contract was voted down.

"A petition for a special meeting for a full discussion and fair contract vote was circulated by the Caucus and other active members....

"What is significant is that the membership demonstrated it has the capacity to fight. It is this potential for *membership action* that the Caucus seeks to lead along the lines of a class-struggle program to win lasting gains for NMU seamen."

—Beacon supplement, 12 June

A Caucus of a New Type

Since the hotly contested union election of 1973, the Militant-Solidarity Caucus has been the only organized opposition inside the NMU. Convinced that its chances of getting into office were nil, the much larger Morrissey grouping evaporated after that vote. With the brief spurt in shipping (prompted by the Vietnam War) winding down and thousands of additional jobs lost due to the lay-up of passenger ships, the beleaguered seamen faced massive unemployment with a reactionary union leadership unwilling to defend the seamen's interests. Concerned only with his lawsuit against the NMU officers and treasury, Morrissey disappeared altogether after winning a settlement of more than \$100,000 in 1977. Only the M-SC continued to fight against the betrayals of the leadership.

The M-SC did not merely seek to articulate the anger of the ranks but also put forward a fighting alternative to the defeatism of the Wall regime, whose program for jobs was limited to stealing them from other workers—raiding other unions and support for protectionism. The Caucus demanded jobs for all through a shorter work period at no cut in pay and organizing the runaway flag ships. In the current elections and contract period, the Caucus candidates demanded a real fight against the capitalists, calling for an industrywide

strike of seamen and longshoremen against the bosses and pointing to the need to expropriate the parasitic shipowners with no compensation.

In contrast to the usual union "reform" caucus, which comes to life only at election time to fight over cushy jobs, the M-SC has fought to lead seamen in struggle, both on internal union issues and broader social questions. In the early 1970's the Caucus led demonstrations of seamen against the lay-up of passenger ships and discrimination against lower-seniority (Group 2) seamen. It has intervened vigorously against racial discrimination, calling on the NMU (which has a high percentage of black and Spanish-speaking members) to initiate a labor/black defense to protect school children being bused in Boston. During the recent dramatic 110-day coal strike it exposed the bureaucracy's willingness to allow coal to be carried on NMU contract vessels on the rivers and called for hot-cargoing of scab shipments. Stressing the need for international solidarity, it called for U.S. out of the Panama Canal and independence for Puerto Rico.

Caucus chairman Gene Herson, 35, who has been shipping NMU for 14 years, founded the *Beacon* in 1968 as an outgrowth of a dispute which erupted in Morrissey's Committee for NMU Democracy. Morrissey had tried to censor articles on the Vietnam War, racism and the Democratic Party, thus producing the split. Morrissey's entire campaign oriented to currying favor with the liberal bourgeois press, and pursuing the unprincipled practice of calling on the capitalist government to intervene in the NMU against the union bureaucracy, à la Arnold Miller in the Mine Workers. In fact, during the 1973 NMU presidential election campaign Miller came to New York to hold a press conference endorsing Morrissey; sitting like Edgar Bergen between the two incompetent "reformers" was Democratic Party bigwig lawyer Joe Rauh, who masterminded both operations and particularly their common reliance on the capitalist government.

While the Caucus has untiringly fought against the opportunist perspective that shipwrecked the large opposition movement in the NMU in the late '60's and early '70's, the other "dissident" candidates who ran in the current elections were at best capable of nothing more than serving up warmed-over Morrisseyism. One such candidate was Roy Rydell who received over 1,000 votes in union-wide balloting for New York patrolman (equivalent to a business agent). Rydell was backed by *Labor Today*, published by Trade Unionists for Action and Democracy (TUAD) which is politically supported by the Communist Party (CP). The Communist Party itself has a long history in the NMU. At one time effectively the leadership of the union, its class-collaborationist policies—particularly during World War II when its support for the war led it to vigorously support the no-strike pledge and even turn in militants to the government in order to suppress any outbreak of struggle—paved the way for the demagogic Curran to launch a red purge which led to the expulsion of hundreds of leftists from the union. In the 1973 elections Rydell and TUAD backed Morrissey although Morrissey had earlier been a hatchet-man for the bureaucracy in the red purge and refused to oppose the union's anti-red clause.

Rydell ran a thoroughly opportunist campaign in which he simply endorsed popular demands such as more vacation days and restoration of the 20-year no-age pension. He systematically ignored any controversial issues such as the union's steady-man system, under which a minority of seamen "homestead" a ship for seven or eight months while the majority of seamen are mostly unemployed surviving on relief jobs. This system encourages sweetheart deals with management, leading to the

Election Statement

reprinted from The NMU Pilot—1978 Special Election Issue



WV Photo

Gene Herson

NMU oppositionist since 1966. Organized NMU Militant-Solidarity Caucus, founded *Beacon*. Officials' collaboration with companies/government lost jobs, no-age pension, conditions. Seven and off! Increase manning scales, day-for-day vacations. Only joint maritime strike action, including longshoremen, can win jobs. Flag-waving cargo quotas pit U.S. against foreign seamen. Instead, organize runaway ships. Union democracy, seamen must run NMU; oppose using courts against union. Autonomous union for shoreside workers. International workers solidarity; boycott military cargo to Chile, South Africa. End racial and sexual oppression. No support to Democrats, Republicans—for a workers party based on unions, and workers government.



WV Photo

Jack Heyman

Organizer of NMU Militant-Solidarity Caucus. Support Herson for President. Oppose Wall administration's sellout policies. For joint maritime strike action for jobs. Organize runaway ships. End union raiding. For genuine maritime unity. No SIU merger unless guarantee of no loss in benefits, conditions, democratic rights, and racial equality. Wall sacrifices our conditions for company profits—instead, nationalize shipping without compensation, maintaining full union rights; seamen's control of shipping. End group system. Officers' salaries no higher than seamen's. For labor/black defense guards to smash Nazi/KKK hoodlums; support busing for integration. Independence for Puerto Rico. U.S. out of Canal Zone.

erosion of union conditions and is justly resented by militants. Following in the footsteps of Morrissey (whom he has never repudiated), Rydell failed to oppose racism, demand support for busing and school integration, mention a word of criticism of the capitalist parties or oppose the bureaucracy's vicious support for protectionism. To cap it all off, Rydell claimed to run as an "independent" yet confined his "criticisms" of Wall & Co. to such milquetoast verbiage as complaining that they took the "wrong approach."

Although Rydell (a charter member of the NMU) is well aware that the maritime unions were built through militant struggles against the companies, he has consciously opposed any call for strike action against the bosses. During the contract negotiations Rydell pandered to widespread anti-strike sentiment in the ranks, many of whom are fearful that any militant action undertaken by the present corrupt leadership would end in disaster. The M-SC has answered this legitimate concern not by giving up but instead calling for democratic election of a contract/strike committee to prepare for an industrywide strike embracing all the maritime unions. Rydell's answer to Wall's sellout deal was to send it back for "renegotiation"—thus implying that the reactionary Wall regime is capable of "persuading" the companies to grant seamen what they need—without engaging in any struggle!

NMU Elections and the Left

For the most part the American left has simply sought to ignore the decade of principled struggle by the Militant-Solidarity Caucus in the National Maritime Union. In the 1973 elections most of the left backed the liberal Morrissey against Wall, sneering that the M-SC was too small and insignificant to merit any support. In fact, what they really believe is that it is impossible to achieve any influence in the labor movement by building a principled, programmatically based opposition. Instead the fake lefts have consistently thrown in their lot with big-name reformist oppositionists like the Millers, Morrisseys and Sadlowskis.

The large vote for the Militant-

Solidarity Caucus in the recent NMU elections demonstrates that you don't have to be opportunist to win authority with the ranks. And yet, with the exception of WV, the left ignored the NMU election. This is not because the M-SC is "too small" to warrant the attention of outfits like the CP, the ex-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party (SWP) or the social-democratic International Socialists (I.S.). It is because the M-SC's principled struggle is directly counterposed to the reformists' defeatist line—and exposes it—that the CP/SWP/I.S. *et al.* refused to support the caucus candidates.

The successful campaign of the Militant-Solidarity Caucus is a verification of the revolutionary program pursued uniquely by the Spartacist League: building a left-wing opposition in the unions which draws a hard programmatic dividing line between itself and all wings of the trade-union bureaucracy. In 1973 most of the left, reformists and centrists alike, whined that the M-SC was dooming itself to irrelevancy, isolating itself from the ranks of seamen by refusing to support the liberal union-suer Morrissey. In fact just the reverse was true. When Morrissey showed his true colors, the prestige and authority of the Caucus increased markedly. It won real respect for telling the truth and refusing to surrender principles.

It must be noted that because of the absence of social struggle in this section of maritime, hard-hit by demoralizing job losses, the Caucus has not yet had an opportunity to demonstrate in practice that its leadership and program are capable of winning real victories over the class enemy. It is also necessary to go beyond willingness to vote for a class-struggle candidate to actual demonstration of support for its program by active participation before it can be said that the M-SC has built a mass base in this union. But the successful campaign and the consistent course pursued in the NMU by the Militant-Solidarity Caucus point the way forward for all class-conscious workers, demonstrating, in a modest fashion, the possibility of winning support on the basis of a hard fight against all brands of trade-union reformism. ■

WORKERS VANGUARD

10 Percent of Seamen Vote for Class-Struggle Opposition

Militants Make Big Gains in NMU Elections

One thousand members of the National Maritime Union (NMU) cast their ballots in the recent NMU elections for candidates of the Militant Solidarity Caucus (M-SC) running for the union's two top national positions. While the NMU bureaucracy pads its totals with the ballots of unrelated shoreside workers, the militant challengers to the reactionary Shannon Wall regime won fully *10 percent* of the vote among deep sea, river and Great Lakes NMU sailors. Not only is maritime a strategic industry, but this impressive showing is the first time since the 1940's that a genuine class-struggle opposition has won such significant support in a national union election. The results of the April-May balloting register the fact that the M-SC has become the generally recognized opposition in the NMU.

Caucus candidates Gene Herson and Jack Heyman won 995 and 1,067 votes respectively for the offices of NMU president and secretary-treasurer. Both came in second, well behind the incumbents but *ahead* of more traditional would-be bureaucratic "reformers." Herson received more than twice as many ballots as Eli Wier, a former supporter of Jim Morrissey, the liberal dissident who garnered wide publicity in the late 1960's for his court suits against long-time NMU president Joe Curran. Moreover, in key East Coast, Gulf and West Coast ports where the Caucus' program and its ten-year record of consistent struggle are well-known, the M-SC candidates received a significantly higher percentage than the national average. *Thus in the Port of New York, Herson won 316 votes for president against 1,485 for Shannon Wall—16 percent of the port total for the M-SC against Wall's 76 percent.* In San Francisco, New Orleans, San Pedro (Los Angeles) and Port Arthur, Texas—

ports where the M-SC publication, *The Beacon*, was distributed during the campaign—the Caucus candidates received up to 12-17 percent of the vote.

As a *Beacon* supplement dated 12 June noted, the M-SC's strong vote—triple the total received by Hersen when he ran for president against Wall five years ago—came “despite a sustained barrage of red-baiting directed at our Caucus throughout the union.” Even though a significant level of anti-communism persists in the union as a residue of the red purge of the late 1940's and early '50's, “*one seaman in ten voted for candidates who were persistently labeled 'communists and left-wingers'*” by the NMU tops. The M-SC candidates did not pull their punches in the face of these McCarthyite smear tactics, running on a full class-struggle program including demands for an industrywide maritime strike, repudiation of protectionism in favor of international organizing, defense of busing, labor/black defense guards against Nazis and KKK, and “No support to Democrats, Republicans—for a workers party based on unions, and workers government.”

Storm Over Contract Sellout

A further confirmation that the M-SC is now seen as *the* opposition in the union, hy ranks and bureaucracy alike, came at a June meeting of the Port of New York where a tumultuous rank and file booted, shouted and voted down by almost a two-to-one margin the sellout contract which Wall & Co. are trying to claim was "approved" by the membership. This year's settlement followed the same course as previous contracts, trading off a modest increase in wages against a failure to provide any defense against a massive company onslaught.



Militant-Solidarity Caucus leaflets New York NMU hall.

WV Photo

against jobs through automation and runaway shipping that has decimated the ranks of the union. A major complaint at the NY port meeting was the way the companies are cutting back on jobs by continually reducing manning scales, not just on the automated container vessels but even on many of the older boom ships, without a peep of resistance by the NMU officers.

A particularly unpopular item in the new contract was the pension clause. Only six years ago NMU seamen could retire at any age after 20 years service at \$250 a month. But the precipitous decline in jobs has greatly weakened the union pension fund: some 14,000 pensioners are supported by 13,000 active seamen sharing 6,500 deep sea jobs. The result has been one cuthack after another in pensions, so for anything over the minimal \$250-a-month benefit, 25 years' service is required; moreover, seamen cannot collect payments before age 55. The new contract was another slap in the face to the NMU membership (average age 51) for whom the pension is of prime importance. For each additional \$20 monthly increase in pension benefits, seamen would be required to work an extra year. In effect the seamen, not the maritime companies, paid for even the minimal pension increases contained in this contract.

("The Contract Stinks! Vote It Down! Tie 'Em Up!" M-SC leaflet, 5 June).

Prior to the June ratification meeting at the Port of New York the M-SC had undertaken a vigorous campaign for rejection of the new sellout deal. A caucus leaflet emphasized that there was an alternative:

"The contract of the SIU [Seafarers International Union], West Coast seamen, and West Coast longshoremen (ILWU) all expire next month. This provides a powerful opportunity to take a major step forward. Together, seamen and longshoremen can shut down the docks and win a major victory against our common enemy, the shipowners."

By the time the meeting began the ranks in New York were furious. The Caucus mobilized supporters and active union members to defeat the sellout. Speaker after speaker rose to denounce the contract while the few members who attempted lamely to defend the agreement were angrily hooped down. An M-SC leaflet described the scene:

"Caucus member Jack Heyman led off the discussion in the June 5 special meeting on the contract, pointing out that the proposed agreement offers no real gains and in fact keeps seamen far behind the rest of unionized labor. When another Caucus member, Bill Savery, got the mike he stressed that a joint strike of all maritime unions is the

continued on page 11



M-SC marching in Boston in 1975 raised slogan for "Labor/Black Defense Squads" to smash racist attacks.

wv Photo