

Racist Supreme Court Upholds Union-Busting Bakke Backlash

The Supreme Court continued the codification and legitimizing of the mounting racist backlash with its Bakke decision on June 28. Fresh from dumping court-ordered busing and sanctioning ever more sharply segregated school districts, the court struck down a minority admissions quota at the University of California at Davis medical school and ordered the admission of Allan Bakke, a 38-year-old NASA engineer.

The Allan Bakke case is more than the story of an over-age would-be medical student. Over the past year his case has become a legal battering ram in the reactionary assault on the democratic gains of blacks and other minorities made during the 1950's and 1960's. The cries of "reverse discrimination" first raised by mobs of racists in the streets were echoed from the editorial offices of the major capitalist newspapers and journals to the antechambers of federal court rooms. In a Berkeley, California demonstration last October a gang of Nazis put the issue most clearly with their banner: "Bakke=White Power."

With the recent history of racist reaction hacked up by government attacks on social services, employment and democratic rights for blacks and other minorities, it is not surprising that the high court ruled in favor of Bakke. The decision marks an important setback for blacks, minorities and the entire working class. While the court's verdict will not result in any immediate return to the lily-white student bodies of years past, the ruling clearly gives the green light to racist forces who, charging "reverse racism," are forcing the gradual reduction of minority enrollment.

Affirmative Action Means Union-Busting

Although the court outlawed university admissions quotas in the Bakke decision it was careful to preserve the legal basis for the government's affirmative action programs in employment. In a case decided later in the same week (Communications Workers of America v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) the Justices let stand a lower court's approval of the affirma-

tive action program at AT&T, the largest single such program in the U.S. When Attorney General Griffin Bell announced that the Bakke decision "confirms our position and what we've been doing," he made clear that the Supreme Court's message in the Bakke and CWA cases is that affirmative action, so long as it is accomplished by "goals" or "guidelines" instead of quotas, is a legitimate means by which the capitalist state can continue to subvert hard won trade-union gains in the name of combating racial discrimination.

Though it may appear otherwise to the liberal and leftist enthusiasts of affirmative action, there is no real contradiction between the Supreme Court's "no" to school admissions quotas and its "yes" to affirmative action on the job. While the government has absolutely no commitment to integration (quite the opposite in fact), the ruling class and its courts and cops do have a stake in hiring programs for minorities and women which weaken the power of the trade unions. Affirmative action promotion and hiring goals usually require bypassing union hiring halls and overriding union seniority systems, two important labor conquests against the arbitrary authority of the bosses.

The distinction between affirmative action in education and employment is obviously appreciated by the Justice Department. The court's unanimous decision to let the CWA ruling stand, giving approval to AT&T's massive violations of union seniority, was an affirmation of the Justice Department's policy of obtaining the "voluntary" compliance of employers with court orders mandating race and/or sex goals in hiring and upgrading. The decision implies, as the *New York Times* observed, "that the government would continue to view quota systems in employment discrimination in a different light from the kind of university admissions quota the Justices struck down...in the Bakke case" (*New York Times*, 4 July).

Affirmative action in employment arose as a divide-and-rule policy by the bourgeoisie in response to the mass black agitation and ghetto upheavals



April 15 anti-Bakke protest in Washington, D.C.

WV Photo

of the 1960's. The Nixon administration, beginning with its Philadelphia Plan for the construction trades, sought to turn the seething discontent of the impoverished black masses against the organized labor movement. And the socially reactionary, racist Meanyite bureaucracy served as a particularly easy target for liberal and even right-wing bourgeois anti-union demagoguery in the name of minority rights.

The Justice Department's aggressive advocacy of affirmative action in employment will surprise only those readers who have been taken in by the myth that affirmative action is another anti-discriminatory reform. In the past several years the real, albeit tokenistic reforms, such as busing for school integration, have succumbed to racist attacks with the approval and partici-

pation of the courts and Justice Department. The government wants to preserve affirmative action in employment only because it sees in affirmative action a useful tool to weaken the unions and pit minority workers against organized labor.

Black Liberals and the Bakke Decision

The response of the mainstream black liberal organizations to the Bakke decision has been ambiguous and confused. NAACP head Benjamin Hooks first declared that the decision was "a clear-cut victory for affirmative action." Under pressure, Hooks later stated that the official NAACP position is that Bakke represents "a victory and a defeat." Vernon Jordan of the

continued on page 11

PAGE 4

Liberal
Stalinist
in
East
Berlin

PAGE 6

Coal Miners:
Hate
Miller,
Hate
the SWP!

PAGE 8

Death Wish
in
Crown
Heights

Herman's Longshore Contract Stinks

Vote No and Strike!

SAN FRANCISCO On July 1, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) president Jimmy Herman announced a tentative contract agreement with the Pacific Maritime Association (PMA) to replace the three-year pact which expired only hours before at midnight, June 30. Herman's giveaway contract will, if he succeeds in bamboozling the membership into ratifying it, speed the already precipitous decline of the union's strategic and hard pressed Longshore Division.

Herman is faithfully following in the footsteps of former ILWU president Harry Bridges, whose notorious "mechanization and modernization" contract in 1961 opened the door for an employers' offensive that has destroyed thousands of longshoremen's jobs. The new contract proposal is nothing but a wholesale capitulation to the maritime bosses' demand of fewer men to do more work. Now is the time—indeed, it is long overdue—for longshoremen to call a halt to the bosses' job stealing, to vote "no" and to organize for immediate strike action!

The situation confronting the union remains quite dangerous. Herman, Rubio, McClain & Co. have the membership working completely in the dark, with unconfirmed reports that the contract has been extended. While the employers have allegedly agreed to wait until the membership votes before acting, the possibility exists that at the first sign of major resistance the employers will refuse to renegotiate and immediately lock the union out, catching the membership unaware. The stage could be set for a rerun of the disastrous 1976 ILWU warehouse strike. Then, the warehouse membership was suddenly out on strike with no warning several days after the contract expired. Many Local 6 members discovered they were on strike only by seeing pickets at other houses while on their way to work. That lack of preparations led to massive police scabberding, picket lines which leaked like sieves and endless arrests.

Herman's refusal throughout the long negotiations to seriously prepare the union for a strike only emboldened the PMA negotiators, who took a hard line on everything, including flatly rejecting the diversionary sop which Herman was ballyhooing at the beginning of negotiations. Thus, the key demand of the original Officers' Report—calling for a heeled up Pay Guarantee Plan (PGP), as the "cornerstone of our job security program"—was simply dropped. Despite the Coast Caucus's demand for a 40-hour guarantee, calculated weekly, with no cap on PGP payments, the PGP fund remains virtually the same.

Similarly, Herman's gimmick of a Container Royalty Tax to help stem the loss of jobs simply disappeared! The ranks' concern to stop extended work shifts (compulsory overtime, frequently in violation of the contract) was ignored, as was the popular call for a shorter workshift. There is also no mention of manning scales nor any cost-of-living allowance for pensions or wages (the COLA for wages was cut out in the 1975 contract)! These were both Coast Caucus demands. Needless to say, no-strike/arbitration machinery remains intact.

But perhaps the most ominous development is the new contract's provision for more "steady men" (who work steadily for one employer rather than rotating through the union hiring hall) and more specialized highly skilled workers, combined with a marked widening in the wage gap between skilled and non-skilled. As mechanization has drastically cut the available jobs, the income gap between "steady men" and "hall men" has widened considerably, exacerbating antagonisms and undermining union solidarity. For several years, the ranks have been demanding abolition of the "steady men" clauses. Both the S.F. and Seattle locals voted to make it a strike issue this year. But the new contract would not only *strengthen* the steady man category, but would undermine traditional coast wide unity by providing *separate*

steady men agreements for the three major ports (Los Angeles/Long Beach, San Francisco, Seattle). In addition, for the first time the ILWU would officially sanction the steady man category. Previously the practice was tolerated, but henceforth the steady men will be *jointly certified* by the union and the PMA.

Despite rhetoric from Herman about doing away with the notorious Supplement 3, it has not only been retained but strengthened. Supplement 3 permits the designation of ports as Low Work Opportunity Ports (LWOP) leading to forced transfers and, more importantly, to deregistrations (layoffs). To try to insure that LWOP procedures are not obstructed by local militancy as happened in San Francisco last year, the new contract specifies that the power to designate LWOP ports lies with the Joint Coast Labor Relations Committee (JCLRC), thereby by-passing the locals altogether. Thus, if the employers' scheme to play steady men against hall men and port against port takes hold, the JCLRC will have the unobstructed contractual right to lay longshoremen off.

With all these incredible giveaways, it is clear that the only way Herman can sell the contract is by lying and spreading defeatism about striking. The 30 June issue of the *Dispatcher*, headlined "Big 3-Year Dock Pact," boasts of the wage boost of \$2.55 over three years and improvement in pension and health and welfare benefits. Then the article hints vaguely at "breakthroughs in the ILWU's effort to improve job security," and "important modifications in the rules governing the employment of steady men," without ever spelling out the provisions which will, in fact, mean less work in the hiring halls. Even though Herman announced a settlement on July 1, the contract has yet to be distributed to the membership. (Longshoremen in L.A. report one copy was posted in the Local 13 union hall, while Local 10 has yet to take even this token step.)

Instead, the Coast Caucus, stacked with various local officers, will first peruse the contract beginning July 10 and then make a recommendation to the membership. (In a major departure from past practice, the negotiating committee is dominated by International officers.) During the negotiations, the Caucus had been under discipline against "leaks" to the membership, and virtually nothing has appeared in the local labor or bourgeois press about the negotiations or the settlement. This secrecy has been typical of the entire negotiating process; making the ILWU look more and more like most other highly bureaucratized unions in the U.S. Needless to say, the employers are not in the dark: "actual copies of the agreement were being distributed to top management by the union and the PMA" (*Daily Commercial News*, 5 July).

In the ILWU's key San Francisco Local 10, Herman has been aided in this conspiracy of silence by the former "oppositionists" who now hold local office—such as Local secretary-treasurer Herb Mills and president Larry Wing. The collapse of the fake "opposition" has given Herman & Co. a free hand in sealing off the membership from the negotiations. And the local fakers have aided in dispersing the restive ranks through such ploys as holding the special April pre-Caucus contract demands meeting as a Saturday meeting (rather than a stop-work meeting) with virtually no publicity.

At that meeting, Wing ruled that in the absence of a quorum the membership could take no action on contract demands. Yet at all the previous membership meetings the officers had refused to allow other contract issues to even be discussed. Doubtless they were afraid of a continuation of the militancy displayed early in the year when the Local 10 membership overwhelmingly voted to make abolition of steady men a strike issue.

In their drive to rob the ranks of any control of or even influence over the negotiations, the Local 10 leadership has been aided by Communist Party supporter Bill Proctor and his close collaborator Leo Robinson, who have all along refused to call for a strike. When Stan Gow and Howard Keylor, Local 10 executive board members and publishers of the class-struggle opposition newsletter "Longshore Militant," sought to expose the Caucus's refusal to designate any of the key demands as strike issues, Robinson, anxious to justify his actions as a Caucus delegate, argued that first you see what the employer is willing to offer, then you set your strike demands. But the prostrate posture of the union negotiating committee encouraged the employers to headline it on virtually all union demands.

While Herman and his lackeys have done nothing to prepare for a strike, the employers of the PMA have made it clear that they are prepared. Longshoremen have reported that the PMA has done the best stockpiling job ever, with a sudden surge in shipping activity for two months before the contract expired. According to the *San Francisco Chronicle* (1 July), some cargo was diverted to East Coast ports or to Vancouver, Canada in anticipation of a possible strike. In Los Angeles, the U.S. government made clear its anti-strike preparations by announcing that all agencies of the government were prepared to

continued on page 10

Contract Voted Down Again

Strike NYC Transit Now!

NYC transit workers have done it again. On July 6, after the bureaucrats had tried every trick in the books to demoralize them, the ranks of Transport Workers Union (TWU) Local 100 voted for the second time to reject their sellout contract. This time they voted "no" by 10,825 to 8,506. But never ones to say die, the Guinan/Lawe TWU leadership simply added in the votes of some 5,000 workers who are not employees of the Transit Authority (T.A.) and have nothing to do with the T.A. contract. Then the bureaucrats blithely declared the contract had been voted up.

Since March 29 the TWU ranks have had nothing but delaying tactics, double talk and tricks from their leaders whose efforts in the service of the T.A., Mayor Koch, Governor Carey and the Wall Street hanks never cease. First the TWU in March voted unanimously to author-

ize a strike when the contract ran out, only to have Guinan "stop the clock" on the negotiations. This made a mockery of the union's commitment to "no contract, no work." Then, after the ballots in the first ratification vote were returned with what everyone knew was a sure "no" vote, the bureaucrats along with so-called "dissidents" of Concerned Transit went to court and got the ballots impounded. Guinan subsequently stalled for more than a month in sending out the second ratification ballot for fear another rejection could reopen the city workers contract. And when six weeks later they still came back marked "no," he simply stuffed the ballot boxes and stole the vote!

Transit Workers! How long are you going to put up with this flim-flam? You have already rejected the contract twice! Do not be stopped by Guinan and Lawe, some of the sorriest sellouts running any

trade union in New York City. Just as bad are the pathetic collection of would-be bureaucrats and union-suers in the various "Concerned Transit" groups who have shown that they too, like the TWU leadership itself, will go to any lengths to head off a strike. Rather than mobilize the angry TWU ranks in *strike action* against the bosses, these fake oppositionists drag the union into the bosses' courts. Indeed these groups are so enamored of capitalist "justice" that last week they had no less than three suits running at the same time. Transit workers must place no reliance in the courts—part of the same government that has put New York city workers on bread and water rations—but must rely on their own tremendous power.

The contract has been voted down *TWICE!* No Contract, No Work! Strike NYC Transit *NOW!* ■

Spanish Cops Murder LCR Member, 135 Injured

Fascist Corrida of Death in Pamplona

JULY 11 As thousands of tourists assembled for the yearly running of the hells, the Spanish authorities in the Basque city of Pamplona unleashed a far more lethal antagonist: the Francoist police. A violent cop rampage through the crowded streets left one left-wing militant dead—shot through the head—and at least 135 injured. The running battle began when police charged Basque nationalist demonstrators who paraded around the Pamplona bullring with a banner reading, "Amnesty! Freedom!" The fighting lasted for ten hours and continued after the funeral march of several thousand yesterday for the slain militant, Germán Rodríguez, a 27-year-old member of the Liga Comunista Revolucionaria (LCR).

A *New York Post* correspondent on the scene when the shooting began tells the harrowing story:

"I watched in horror as riot police turned the celebrated festival of San Fermín into an orgy of shooting this weekend . . .

"Down in the arena, I saw 15 young Basque separatists unfurling a banner demanding amnesty for prisoners. There was a disturbance as other youths tried to restrain them, and protests were shouted from the stands. There was a scuffle. Nothing serious.

"Without any warning about 70 grey-uniformed riot police charged into the jammed arena with machine guns blazing. I saw a tracer bullet arch into the seats to my left, and I realized that the frenzied cops were aiming at everyone.

"Later I learned that some of the bullets were rubber, most were real."

New York Post, 10 July

As we go to press protests continue to rock the Basque region. A Reuters dispatch reported Pamplona looking "like a battlefield with wrecked cars, barricades in the street." In San Sebastian there was an immediate outcry against the police attack in Pamplona as demonstrators set up barricades and blocked the principal rail lines and roads in the area. One man was shot and wounded as police again opened fire on demonstrators. The major trade-union federations in Euskadi called for a one-hour general strike, and the bull-running ceremony, made world-famous by Hemingway, was forced to close for the first time since the Civil War.

Protests Hit Francoist Atrocity

These latest police attacks come only days after the repressive apparatus inherited from the Francoist dictatorship was given increased powers to hold "suspects," tap phones and open mail in their "war against terrorism." For the Spanish left and the working people of the Basque region, "anti-terrorism" is the all-too-familiar rallying call of the Francoists for a bloody last-ditch stand against the enemies of "Christian Spain." The murder of Rodríguez is a threat to all the victims of Francoist terror and must be vehemently protested by the workers' movement internationally.

In response to the latest atrocity, the Spartacist League (SL) and our Canadian comrades of the Trotskyist League (TLC) called demonstrations in front of the Spanish consulates in San Francisco and Toronto today. In Toronto 20 people turned out on short notice to demonstrate as TLC members carried placards reading, "Spanish Workers

Will Avenge Their Dead!" "For the Right of Self-Determination for the Basques!" and "No to 'Reformed' Francoism—For a Workers Republic in Spain!" The fake-Trotskyist Revolutionary Workers League, Canadian "comrades" of the Spanish LCR, failed to show up at the Toronto demonstration, as did their co-thinkers in the American Socialist Workers Party in San Francisco.

Franco's Cops are the Cops of Today

The murder of Rodríguez is the most dramatic example of the escalating police provocations of the left-wing and nationalist organizations of the Basque region (Euskadi). Two months ago the LCR was victim to another police attack which landed dozens of their members in Pamplona in jail—in this case the cops simply finished up what their out-of-uniform fascist brethren began.

On May 10 a fascist *corrida* began at the end of a funeral procession of a hated Guardia Civil shot down by the Basque nationalist ETA. Fascist hands took to the streets intent upon intimidating the local population. Armed with revolvers, sticks and clubs, the die-hard Francoist ultras set upon the local offices of every Basque nationalist and left-wing organization in Pamplona. After besieging the headquarters of the Basque National Party and raising the flag of Franco's Spain overhead, this gang of thugs arrived at the headquarters of the LKI, the LCR's Basque affiliate. Hooded members of the ultra-rightist Warriors of Christ the King led the mob, and more than twenty bullets pierced the LKI's door as assembled leftists huddled it out with the marauding fascists.

In an act as foolhardy as it is treacherous, the LKI turned to the local police to come to their aid! The cops did in fact come—only to complete the fascist attack on the LKI by arresting everyone in sight! When the ensuing assault on the LKI office was over, nearly 60 people found inside were in custody and 48 were arrested and held by the same "forces of order" that had been called in only hours before. Only after several protest work stoppages and demands by trade-unions and left-wing organizations for the immediate release of those arrested were the last 47 LKI members freed.

The Fraud of Reformed Francoism

With each cop attack, the apostles of "Spanish democracy," Prime Minister Adolfo Suárez and King Juan Carlos, show their true colors: the olive green of the Guardia Civil and the metal gray of the Policía Armada. Reliance upon these "forces of order" for protection against fascists is a sure-fire recipe for suicide for any left organization. But in the Basque region of Spain, which on a daily basis is under virtual military occupation, it borders on sheer insanity. The dividing line between the fascist terrorists and the Francoist police is most often simply whether they are in uniform or not. In fact, the only two rightists arrested in the May Pamplona assault (picked up only because they had been wounded in the fighting and could



Scene in Pamplona bullring during murderous rampage by Francoist cops. Wide World

not leave the scene) turned out to be out-of-uniform policemen (*Intercontinental Press*, 29 May).

While the Spanish Communist Party (PCE) and the social-democratic PSOE join in voting the police expanded powers, the ostensibly Trotskyist LCR sows equally dangerous illusions in relying on the bourgeois state of "reformed Francoism." For the LCR/LKI, the call for police protection in May was not simply an aberration or a measure born of extreme danger. *In extremis* it would not be unprincipled for Marxists to call in police against a particular fascist attack—although, as the LCR found out the hard way, it is well-nigh suicidal to call on the Francoist cops with their intimate ties to virtually every fascist terror group in Spain. But although the LCR is on paper in favor of working-class self-defense, in practice it increasingly relies on the "forces of order" commanded by the hated Martin Villa.

When fascist gunmen murdered workers' commissions' organizers in Madrid at the infamous Antocha Street massacre over a year ago, the LCR adopted a stance only slightly to the left of the call by the PCE and PSOE for the working class to remain "serene." The LCR's response (the Barcelona *Comuniqué* of January 1977—signed with other left-wing organizations, bourgeois parties and even monarchists) condemned above all the killing of three policemen in Madrid and begged that the state take "immediate action against the . . . fascist and para-police organizations" (see "Fake-Trotskyists Embrace Francoist 'Democracy,'" *WU* No. 143, 4 February 1977).

In response to the earlier Pamplona attack the LCR placed the demand for the "dissolution of the fascist gangs" on the front page of *Combate*. Rather than applying their oft-repeated slogan of the united front to the formation of workers' defense guards, the LCR turned to the

"unity" of a joint appeal to the provincial civil governor. Along with eleven other parties, including bourgeois forces such as the Liberal Party and the Liberal Citizen Action, the LCR appealed for "police protection of democratic rights."

In the 1930's Trotsky made very clear that the policy of reliance on the state to fight fascism was a betrayal of the most elementary proletarian class instincts. In "War and the Fourth International" (1934) Trotsky wrote, "To turn to the state, that is, to capital, with the demand to disarm the fascists means to sow the worst democratic illusions, to lull the vigilance of the proletariat, to demoralize its will."

Down with Franco's Heirs!

The PCE and the PSOE have propagated the treacherous myth that a few parliamentarians from workers organi-

continued on page 11

WORKERS VANGUARD

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

EDITOR Jan Norden

PRODUCTION MANAGER Darlene Kemiura

CIRCULATION MANAGER Mike Beech

EDITORIAL BOARD Jon Brule, Charles Burroughs, George Foster, Liz Gordon, James Robertson, Joseph Seymour

Published biweekly, skipping an issue in August and a week 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. 211

14 July 1978

Liberal Stalinist in East Berlin

Translated & Abridged from
Kommunistische Korrespondenz
April 1978

Rudolf Bahro's book *Die Alternative* [The Alternative] and his arrest by the East German Security Police (SD) occupied the West German press for weeks and led to a lively discussion in the West German left. Just when the topic was threatening to lose some of its publicity value *Der Spiegel* brought out with much hoopla the "Manifesto" of a purported "League of Democratic Communists of Germany" (BDKD), which lent new impetus to the debate since the Manifesto's anonymous authors appeal to Bahro as a co-thinker. With scant justification, to be sure, since Bahro in his confused way proposes a reform of the Stalinist bureaucracy, whereas the "BDKD" program for reunification boils down to a scarcely veiled restoration of capitalism in the DDR (East Germany). But no matter whether it is the product of West German intelligence, the SD or of an insignificant group of East German technocrats, this "manifesto of the first organized opposition in the DDR," as *Der Spiegel* termed it in one of its most aggressive promotional campaigns, served to clearly direct public attention once more to the German question, so eagerly overlooked by both governments. And here lies, in part, the significance of Bahro's *Alternative*....

What Does Bahro Want?

Bahro's political ideas are a contradictory mixture of utopian New Left elements and reform Stalinism. His understanding of Marxism (as he himself admits) closely parallels that of Erich Fromm, an intellectual progenitor of the New Left. His criticisms of the Soviet Union coincide on many points with Rudi Dutschke's bankrupt *Versuch, Lenin auf die Füße zu stellen* [Attempt to Put Lenin Back on his Feet]. Bahro not only defends the inevitability of the bureaucratic degeneration of the USSR, since for him the international proletarian revolution—the one force which could have altered the fate of the fledgling Soviet state—simply does not exist. He also rejects the working class as bearer of the socialist revolution. Inside the deformed and degenerated workers states Bahro places his hopes in the progressive function of the idealist, psychological category of an "excess consciousness" which, although supposedly present in

all layers and realms of society, Bahro locates above all among the "intelligentsia" and the "ideologues."

Thus he writes, "However, there are so far no indications... that under our conditions 'the workers' could be a 'class for itself' and that their 'objective interests' could bring about the next step towards general emancipation" (*Die Alternative*). In the West he hacks the class-collaborationist strategy of Eurocommunism:

"Since under these conditions [in the capitalist countries] the working-class movement is too narrow a base from which to transform society (don't the specific interests of the workers more and more often play even a fundamentally conservative role?), the West European and Japanese Communists are already in the process of adapting themselves to the need to transform the world which is common to practically all progressive elements, no matter to which traditional class, layer or sector they belong. Entirely different interest blocs are clearly being formed, which already point toward an order beyond the previous economic bases."

His toadying to bourgeois collaborationism reaches its high point in a criticism from the right of the Portuguese CP. He reproaches the party of Cunhal for having been responsible for "splitting the country's political spectrum to the left of center instead of to the right, and in addition splitting the left wing of the army and burning out its best forces." The officer corps, the command structure of the mailed fist of the bourgeois state, is thus turned into its opposite and hailed as the bearer of "social progress." Such statements are in the classical tradition of Stalinist popular-front betrayals. And Bahro also makes it clear that he, along with the Eurocommunists and other Stalinists, regards Marx' and Lenin's conception of the state as outmoded:

"Under these conditions the state is far more than the 'joint executive board of the capitalist class.' For why else are the Communist parties, where they are so influential, as in France and Italy, posing as their task taking over the state machinery instead of smashing it?"

Bahro and the Prague Spring

Bahro's formative political experience was the Prague Spring of 1968—which in contrast to the Hungarian uprising of 1956, where there was spontaneous crystallization of soviets, constituted primarily an attempt at reform from above, a self-reform of the bureaucracy—and its bitter end through the deployment of Russian tanks. This is



Rudolf Bahro

Der Spiegel

evident from many passages in his book, such as:

"Once in the 60 years since the Russian October Revolution the forces pressing for a new organization of non-capitalist industrial society emerged into the full light of history... This was in Czechoslovakia in those eight months of 1968, unforgettable to all those interested in socialist progress in the East European countries."

Bahro's fundamentally positive attitude toward Dubček is characteristic of his overall conceptions. Thus *democracy per se* assumes for him central importance not the *soviet democracy* of the genuine dictatorship of the proletariat, but rather a *grassroots democracy* whose class character is left unspecified and which in some undetermined way is to be based on neighborhoods and communities....

Nor is Bahro's "cultural revolution" any more revolutionary. The Trotskyist program for the deformed and degenerated workers states is the overthrow of the parasitic bureaucracy by the working class led by a Leninist-Trotskyist workers party, the establishment or re-establishment of soviet democracy, and the international proletarian revolution, which through an international planned economy will for the first time lay the material basis for the full unfolding of all human potential. Bahro's notion, divorced from the perspective of an international revolution, is, in contrast, a subjectivist utopia:

"What is now imminent and indeed has already begun is a *cultural revolution* in the truest sense, an overturn of the entire subjective mode of existence of the masses, comparable only to that other transition which on the road from patriarchy, the vertical division of labor and the state led to class society."

Hence the model for Bahro's "upheaval" is not the Leninist vanguard party which must be built anew to lead a proletarian revolution. Bahro is far more reminiscent of efforts to reform the Catholic church:

"The oppositional grouping which under these conditions will necessarily crystallize spontaneously, will not strive to become or (more precisely) to remain a second party alongside the old one. On the contrary, it can only have the intention... of seeing that the party is internally constituted for the next stage in a way such that it is as far as possible safeguarded against losing its revolutionary potential. The split is a passing moment of the historical process."

Bahro does not see the necessary conclusion of smashing the bureaucratic state party. His definition of the *League of Communists* which he would like to see huilt would lead only to another

elitist model of organization having nothing in common with a revolutionary vanguard party. He calls for "a coming together of generally equally qualified individuals sharing common views, i.e., who are interested in solving the same problems in the same direction...." Thereby the *League of Communists* becomes the only possible form of political organization. Its claim to be an association of the best among equals cannot be put to the test through political struggle. A workers soviet, on the other hand, would permit all the tendencies and parties in a proletarian state who accept soviet rule.... Bahro's schema testifies to his training in the Stalinist apparatus. It can provide no alternative to the working class in the deformed and/or degenerated workers states.

The Russian Question

Bahro's critique of the DDR and Soviet bureaucracies is an act of incontestable personal courage. However, his political confusion, his inability to undertake a Marxist class analysis, leads him to fatal conclusions. He ahistorically imposes his analysis of various "bureaucratic" systems of domination (that of the Incas, of Pharaonic Egypt, of imperial China) on the base and superstructure of the deformed and degenerated workers states. Is the bureaucracy a new class with a historically necessary function in the process of social reproduction? Or is the bureaucracy, as Trotsky analyzed it, a parasitic layer with the function of a gendarme, owing its existence to the backwardness and isolation of the Soviet Union?...

Bahro is incapable of providing a clear answer to the question of whether the deformed and degenerated workers states are at a higher socio-economic stage than "late capitalism." Neither does he say whether the proletarian bases of the workers states are to be defended against imperialism. Since he is caught up in the politics of "peaceful coexistence" he does not even raise this decisive question. Bahro's solution is a petty-bourgeois disarmament policy....

For Trotskyists the defense of the gains of the October Revolution is a fundamental postulate of our politics. We defend the workers states against imperialism while simultaneously fighting for the overthrow of bureaucratic rule. As long as the imperialist powers exist they will aim at reimposing their rule in the workers states.... For this reason we say with Trotsky: Disarma-



1953 street fighting in East Berlin.

PhotoWorld

ment? But who will disarm whom? We are for the working class disarming the bourgeoisie internationally. Wanting to disarm the workers states in the face of the restorationist appetites of the imperialist bourgeoisie means sabotaging, abandoning the proletarian property forms in those countries. Not Bahro's variant of "peaceful coexistence" but only the victory of the international socialist revolution on the road to a classless communist society will make the arsenals of the workers states, as well as these states themselves, *superfluous*....

The flattery [of Bahro] by Pahlöists such as Ernest Mandel, member of the so-called United Secretariat of the Fourth International (USec), is diametrically counterposed to the revolutionary positions [of Trotskyism] which they occasionally mention in bits and pieces. Mandel calls Bahro a "magnanimous revolutionary" and a "well-educated Marxist." In an article, "Bahro's Bomb," in *Was Tun* (22 September 1977), he refers to Bahro as a "true internationalist." He terms *Die Alternative* the "most important theoretical work on the character of the transitional society to have reached us from the East Bloc since the end of World War II."

Bahro stands in the tradition of reform critics of the regime like Roy Medvedev (see "Roy Medvedev on the Soviet Dissidents," *WV* No. 82, 24 October 1975) and Robert Havemann, who criticize Stalinism without politically transcending it. This does not mean that the rise of such currents is unimportant. But the building of a new Marxist party in the workers states only can be accomplished by the sharpest political criticism of the inadequacies of such socialist oppositionists, not by uncritical adulation. Thus the Trotskyistische Liga Deutschlands (TLD—German section of the international Spartacist tendency), unlike the GIM (Gruppe Internationale Marxisten—German section of the USec), did not pander to East German balladeer Wolf Biermann when he was forcibly expatriated from the DDR. We wrote at the time:

"Our solidarity with Wolf Biermann does not prevent us from calling him what he is. Biermann... is a confused liberal Stalinist who ultimately accepts the foundation of 'socialism in half a country.' He is not the great revolutionary which the GIM tries to glorify him as."

*Kommunistische
Korrespondenz* No. 16,
December 1976

The National Question in Germany

At a public meeting in West Berlin on the "BDKD" Wolf Biermann came out against a reunification of Germany, which he clearly could conceive of only as a unification of the two states on a capitalist basis.... But the demoralized Biermann, who has long since ceased to believe in the revolutionary power of the working class, cannot sweep the German question under the rug with... moral appeals.

Germany constitutes a historically evolved unity, split into two state formations, the capitalist Federal Republic and the deformed workers state of the Democratic Republic. More than three decades of a divided Germany have not destroyed national consciousness. It has been kept alive not least of all by the fact that after the end of the war, in the 1950's and at the time of the construction of the Berlin wall, whole waves of refugees poured into West Germany, so that numerous family ties span the border. The media, above all television, also do their part.

The DDR is confronted with the much more powerful economy of the imperialist Federal Republic. The West German mark has become the "second currency"—that is, currency for the privileged—in the DDR. This pressure of imperialism also leads to opposition to the ruling party regime which, as the "Manifesto" [of the "BDKD"] printed in *Der Spiegel* demonstrates, tends to

the right, toward an ultimately counterrevolutionary political and economic rapprochement with the West. But the DDR bureaucracy will not succeed in hiding from such tendencies behind such empty doctrines as the thesis of two nations arising in Germany after 1945.

The bureaucracy's characterization of the 17 June 1953 Berlin uprising as a provocation by West German agents was the product of its fear of the revolutionary proletariat. For June 17 constituted the greatest threat to its bonapartist role. On June 17 East German workers called upon their West German class brothers to support a struggle which had actually begun as a protest against a threatened raising of piece-rate norms but quickly took on a much broader political character. Slogans were heard like, "If you sweep out the dung in Bonn, we'll clean house in Pankow" [Berlin-Pankow, then the capital of East Germany], but also many indicative of the still deeply social-democratic consciousness of many workers: "We don't want Ulbricht or Adenauer—we want Erich Ollenhauer!"

June 17 was not a day of reaction. In the old East German bastion of the workers movement, factory committees were set up and disciplined demonstrations held to the accompaniment of traditional workers' songs. Since this revolt was put down with the arrival of Soviet tanks a new generation has grown up in the DDR. Opposed to this generation of workers is an ossified bureaucracy which has been unable to significantly regenerate itself since Ulbricht and Stalin. In any future Berlin "spring" it will be necessary to fight against all social-democratic illusions, against all restorationist attempts by the bourgeoisie through its agents in the workers movement, but also against all restorationist tendencies in the East German bureaucracy itself, to fight for the revolutionary program of Trotskyism.

In West Germany on the other hand these feelings of national identity converge with the "*Drang nach Osten*" (Drive to the East) of a capitalist world power. The German question can be solved in two ways: by the [imperialists] smashing the deformed workers state to the east through a military onslaught....

Or the German question can be solved by the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat of both parts of Germany for the overthrow of the bureaucracy and the smashing of West German capital, no matter where the first spark happens to ignite. The conservative bureaucracy cannot solve this question, since it is concerned only with protecting its own privileges, with maintaining the status quo. To this end it resorts to repressive measures internally and makes the



Photo Reporter

Liberal Czech Stalinist Alexander Dubček with Brezhnev (left) and Ulbricht (right) at August 1968 Bratislava meeting shortly before Kremlin invasion put an end to "Prague Spring."

hopeless attempt to live in "peaceful coexistence" with imperialism....

In 1933 the organizational tradition of Trotskyism was destroyed by the victory of fascism. The weak forces which attempted to reknit their ties to this tradition after 1945 were destroyed by the liquidationist policies of Mandel and his followers in the course of the degeneration of the Fourth International. The politics of the Pahlöists consisted of making advances to Tito as a supposedly anti-Stalinist force... and finally in a decade and a half of entrisim in the SPD, which was abandoned only in the late 1960's in order to be better able to tail after the student movement.

The task of the TLD consists in taking up and continuing the traditions of revolutionary Trotskyism organizationally smashed in 1933 and politically liquidated at the beginning of the 1950's. Our task is to ensure that Trotskyism becomes known to oppositionists in the DDR for what it is: the revolutionary program of class struggle, not the GIM's Pahlöist program of opportunism and

class collaboration.

When Bahro admits that, "in a certain phase of breaking with rule by the apparatus... every revolutionary communist after 1917 had Trotskyist leanings," only to add, "but this position is in fact historically hopeless" (Rudolf Bahro, *Eine Dokumentation*) he pays indirect tribute to the power of Trotskyist ideas, which for 40 years remained practically without an organizational existence and embodiment in Germany. Not Trotskyism, the Marxism of our time, but rather Stalinism with its ideology of "socialism in half a country" and its politics of "peaceful coexistence" and collaboration with the bourgeoisie is hopeless.

For the immediate release of Rudolf Bahro!

For the creation of Trotskyist parties in both parts of Germany!

For the revolutionary reunification of Germany in the struggle for the socialist united states of Europe!

Forward to the rebirth of the Fourth International! ■

Free DDR Dissident Bahro!

Reacting to the pressure of a growing dissident movement, on June 30 the East German (DDR) government convicted dissident author and economic planner Rudolf Bahro of treason and sentenced him to eight years in prison. A long-time member of the ruling Stalinist Socialist Unity Party (SED) and Dubček-style critic of the DDR leadership, Bahro was arrested last summer on vague charges of carrying out "intelligence activity" in the service of imperialist espionage agencies. But his only "crime" was the publication in West Germany of his book, *Die Alternative*, in which the author criticizes the policies of the bureaucratic regimes in the DDR and East Europe from the point of view of economic rationality. According to the 8 July *Economist* Bahro courageously chose to face a prison term rather than renounce his East German citizenship and go into forced exile in West Germany.

An economist and SED functionary

at an East Berlin engineering concern, Bahro first became oppositional over the 1968 Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia. But he did not attract serious disfavor from the bureaucracy until three years ago when he produced a critical analysis of East European economic planning. A virtual unknown until last summer, Bahro was arrested last August after the broadcast of an interview on West German television plugging his new book.

Bahro's arrest was part of a general crackdown against dissidents in the DDR, which until recently had one of the tightest Stalinist regimes and most quiescent opposition movements in East Europe. When the 1976 forced exile of singer/songwriter Wolf Biermann set off a storm of protest among DDR artists and intellectuals, the Honecker bureaucracy reacted with a heavy hand: expulsions from the country, firings, house arrests. With the general accessi-

bility of Western television, large-scale tourism from West Germany and the freedom of movement provisions of the 1975 Helsinki accords, the East Berlin bureaucracy feared that open dissidence could intersect popular discontent in an explosive manner.

The appearance of Bahro's treatise signaled the spread of oppositional sentiment to sections of the bureaucracy itself. Unlike the pseudo-Trotskyist United Secretariat we do not blur the distinction between the revolutionary program of Trotskyism and the confused call for bureaucratic reform and "cultural revolution" by the liberal Stalinist Bahro (see accompanying article). However, the international Spartacist tendency vehemently denounces the outrageous, cowardly imprisonment by the parasitic, anti-revolutionary DDR bureaucracy. Free Rudolf Bahro! For Trotskyist parties in both parts of Germany! ■

The coal strike of 1977-78 posed in its most dramatic form in recent years in the United States the central question of our epoch—what Leon Trotsky referred to in the founding program of the Fourth International as the “crisis of proletarian leadership.” The cynically treacherous conduct of the strike by the Arnold Miller bureaucracy of the United Mine Workers (UMWA) demonstrated, to anyone who is honest, that these self-styled union “reformers” hoisted into office by the Labor Department and the liberal bourgeoisie are no more able and willing to defend the workers against the bosses than the Old Guard of the trade-union bureaucracy headed by the likes of George Meany.

Five years ago we were virtually alone in refusing to jump on the bandwagon of Miller's Miners for Democracy (MFD). But today, when thousands of miners are themselves demanding the ouster of the backstabbing UMWA president, defending Arnold Miller is not a popular task. Most of the left which hailed his election in 1972 has simply sought to avoid the subject; none of these fake socialists has, to our knowledge, met the issue head on.

The SWP recently published in its *Militant* (23 June) a lengthy polemic by Shelley Kramer entitled “Socialists and the Miners' Strike—Where Sectarians Go Wrong.” Ostensibly directed at ultraleftists, Kramer's article is a thinly disguised apology for Arnold Miller and the trade-union bureaucracy. Kramer castigates the “sectarians” for attacking the UMWA leadership as the central obstacle to victory in the coal strike, for criticizing Miners for Democracy, even for advocating labor boycotts of coal and solidarity strikes with the miners. According to Kramer, this is what can be expected from “small groups well isolated from the working class,” whose ideas ostensibly have nothing whatsoever to do with the real needs of the masses of working people.

One of the central targets of Kramer's attack is the Spartacist League. We are not the least bit surprised at her charges; indeed, as Trotsky observed, the accusation of sectarianism, coming from reformists and opportunists, is most often a compliment. We welcome the opportunity to demonstrate anew that our program for the coal strike, far from being sectarian, addressed the burning questions of the hour and found at least a partial echo in the working class. It is rather the SWP, which has supported one of the vilest labor traitors of all time, whose positions must be put on trial here.

Is Arnold Miller A Trade-Union Bureaucrat?

With the exception of one or two sentences (out of a two-and-a-half-page article) of mild criticism of Miller's conduct during the strike, designed to provide the SWP with a cheap left cover, Kramer's diatribe is directed at leftists, particularly for daring to attack Miller during the strike. Kramer writes:

“But to target Miller as the enemy, as the sectarians did, could only steer the miners away from the real, immediate threats to the very existence of their union.”

It is common enough for union bureaucrats to accuse those who criticize their misleadership of a strike as “disrupters.” Very often the union hacks and their apologists are able to convince a number of strikers that this is the case. But this time Kramer has bitten off more than she can chew. Does she really think that she can get away with characterizing those who felt that the Miller bureaucracy was the fundamental obstacle to winning the strike as a small band of wild-eyed ultraleftists sitting on the sidelines of the class struggle?

That is a gross insult to the coal miners themselves, who repeatedly

An Answer to Reformist Miller Lovers

COAL MINERS: HATE MILLER, HATE THE SWP!



Union “reform” kingmaker and Democratic Party broker for Labor Department control, Joe Rau (center) with proteges Arnold Miller (left) and former NMU dissident James Morrissey.

demonstrated their disgust for Miller's policies:

- They held out on strike for almost four months, repeatedly voting down Miller's sellout deals. And when they finally returned to work, scores of miners made clear to the press that they accepted the final settlement not because they liked it, but because they thought they could get nothing better under the present leadership.
- The miners held mass rallies in the coalfields, as well as outside UMWA headquarters in Washington, denouncing Miller and his contracts.
- Thousands of miners signed petitions demanding Miller's recall during the heat of the strike.
- Miller himself, realizing how isolated and hated he was, took to hiding out in obscure hotels in West Virginia, packing a pistol, and surrounding himself with hodyguards.

Does Kramer also think that 100,000 miners were “sectarian” for demonstrating their hatred of Miller during the strike?

The SL's press coverage of the strike focused on the stark contradiction between the fighting aspirations of the miners and the sellout policies of the UMWA bureaucracy. We sought to intersect the justified disgust of the miners at their leadership by raising the slogan of a democratically elected strike/bargaining committee to replace Miller & Co. in conducting the strike. In contrast, the *Militant* did all it could to cover up the militancy of the miners barely alluding to the roving picket lines

that shut down scab coal—while systematically glossing over the treachery of the Miller gang: labeling the defeated strike a “victory,” playing down the anti-Miller sentiment among the ranks, even going to such lengths as cropping photographs so as to eliminate strikers carrying anti-Miller placards (see photo this issue!).

The reason why the SWP felt compelled to cover up for Miller during the strike is simple; namely, it regularly gives political support to Miller and his ilk. It is instructive to note that nowhere in her long polemic does Kramer refer to the necessity of building left-wing oppositions in the unions based on the Trotskyist Transitional Program. Nor is this an accidental oversight. For the reformist SWP, bureaucratic “reformers” like Arnold Miller and steel “rebel” Ed Sadlowski who are actually hought-off lackeys of the Labor Department and the liberal bourgeoisie represent a genuine alternative to the Meanyites. The SWP denies the need to build a communist leadership in the trade unions, instead viewing its own role as being advisers and lieutenants of the liberal bureaucrats.

Kramer tries to slander her opponents by implying that those who oppose the Sadlowskis and Millers necessarily support their reactionary bureaucratic rivals Steelworkers president Lloyd “no strike” McBride and Miller's gangster predecessor, Tony Boyle. To prove this, Kramer constructs a phony amalgam between the Workers League and the SL. Aha, says Kramer—pointing to

the Workers League's idiotic position of hacking Boyle supporter Lee Roy Patterson in the last UMWA election—the McBrides, Boyles, etc. are “lesser evils for the sectarians.” Of course Kramer knows full well that there is no correspondence between the wildly gyrating opportunist positions of the WL and those of the Spartacist League. In fact, the political handits of the WL supported Miller in 1972 and Sadlowski in 1976—policies which it held in common with the SWP!

Eventually Kramer trips over her own contradiction. The real danger, she asserts, comes from “those who are in reality undermining trade-union independence and democracy—the Tony Boyles, Lloyd McBrides, George Meany's, and Douglas Frasers.” (Noticeably absent from this list are such “progressive” labor fakers as Sadlowski, Miller, etc.) But then Kramer makes the mistake of providing us with an orthodox description of what trade-union bureaucrats do:

“The trade-union bureaucracy enforces restrictive labor laws, crushes the initiative of the union ranks, concludes contracts and social pacts sacrificing the workers' interests, and imprisons the unions within the bosses' political parties. In short, the bureaucrats act as ‘political police’ for the capitalist class.”

Sounds like a perfect description of Arnold Miller to us!

- “Enforcing restrictive labor laws”: like demanding that anti-strike court injunctions and Taft-Hartley be obeyed?
- “Crush the initiative of the union ranks”: how about suppressing wild-cat strikes?
- “Concluding contracts...sacrificing the workers' interests”: even Kramer agrees that “behind closed doors, Miller agreed to a series of disastrous provisions and then tried to sell several contracts to the ranks.”
- “Imprison the unions within the bosses' political parties”: how about Miller's support to Jimmy Carter, his kowtowing to strikebreaker Carter during the strike and Miller's own history of running on the Democratic Party slate?

The fact is, it is impossible to even come close to the Leninist definition of the trade-union bureaucracy—as a caste within the workers movement which reflects the ideology of the capitalist class, and indeed functions as the “political police” of the bourgeoisie—without including in its purview the Millers, the Sadlowskis, etc.

The MFD and the Government

Kramer's attempt to defend Miller's and Miners for Democracy's use of the bosses' government against its opponents in the UMWA similarly ends in a shambles. While paying lip service to the principle of trade-union independence from the state, the petty-bourgeois SWP entirely subordinates this to some classless conception of “democracy.” For Kramer, the Trotskyist position that the achievement of genuine workers democracy is *integrally linked* to the struggle for trade-union independence is dismissed as “sectarian.”

Thus, Kramer attempts to ridicule this position as follows:

“But not by the sectarians' logic. According to their rule book, the trade union struggle must proceed in two distinct stages. First comes the fight for trade-union independence. Then, and only then, are workers allowed to fight for democracy in their unions.”

“The precondition for union democracy,” according to Workers Vanguard, “is the fight for independence of the workers movement from the capitalist state.”

Ultraleft? Sectarian? Here's what Trotsky wrote on this issue in “Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay”:

“The second slogan is, trade-union democracy. This second flows directly from the first and presupposes for its realization the complete freedom of the trade unions from the imperialist or colonial state.” [our emphasis]

Thus, in addition to the SL and thousands of coal miners who hate



The SWP School of Falsification: Militant distorted its coverage of coal strike as it cropped photograph—to cover up miners' opposition to "company man" Arnold Miller.

Miller, Kramer may as well add to her list of "sectarians" Leon Trotsky.

It is in fact not the SL but Kramer and the SWP who have a stages conception of trade-union work—who believe that independence of the trade unions and the other key principles of the Transitional Program can be jettisoned in favor of the reformist slogans of liberal bureaucrats like Miller and Sadlowski. Kramer takes as good coin the claims by Arnold Miller that he instituted democracy in the UMWA. Her proof? Miners have the right to ratify their contract. Of course, revolutionaries do defend this right, but its existence is hardly proof that union democracy is flourishing. East Coast longshoremen in the ILA and members of the Teamsters have the right to ratify their contracts; does Kramer believe that Teddy Gleason and Frank Fitzsimmons run democratic unions?

The absurdity of abstracting a particular supportable demand from the context of the class struggle is shown by the miners strike itself. The strike was, in fact, conducted in an extremely *undemocratic* fashion by the Miller leadership of the UMWA. Bargaining was conducted, as Kramer admits, behind closed doors; the ranks had no power to choose their negotiators or to formulate strike strategy and strike demands. Eventually, after 100 days of a heroic battle and after rejecting two of Miller's sellout proposals, the miners exercised their right to ratify—by voting for a deal that gave up their miners' health card and still did not include the right to strike. (This rotten contract, worse than the 1974 sellout which sparked three years of wildcats, was termed a "victory"

by the SWP, incidentally. In the UMWA this view is held by almost nobody outside the dwindling number of Miller supporters.) Why did miners vote for this contract they despised? Because they had no confidence that their leadership could win anything better, and they saw no way to replace this leadership.

As Trotsky continually emphasized, the fight for workers democracy is inseparable from the fight to build a class-struggle leadership of the unions. The labor bureaucracy, which is wedded to the maintenance of private property, must inevitably seek to stifle the militant instincts of the rank and file. In the UMWA, the decisive issue has been the MFD's reliance on the bourgeois state. From the time Miller was boosted into power by the Labor Department in 1972, he has assiduously demonstrated his fealty to the capitalist legal order, repeatedly demanding that wildcats be stopped in accord with anti-strike court injunctions. This culminated in the current contract battle, when Miller and the majority of the UMWA district officials literally took their marching orders from Carter and the Labor Department.

In order to carry out their policies, Miller and the UMWA bureaucrats have time and again clashed with the ranks. Does Kramer wish to deny the considerable evidence of the bureaucratic suppression of democracy in the UMWA:

- Redbaiting of opponents and militants.
- Formulation of the notorious ten-point program designed to discipline

participants in wildcats.

- Attempted suppression of one wildcat after another, including dispatch of goon squads to dismantle picket lines.
- Expulsion of the left press from the 1976 UMWA convention.
- Behind-closed-doors contract bargaining, both in 1974 and 1977-78; attempted railroading of sellout deals. No provisions for elected strike committees, etc.

None of this matters to Kramer and Arnold Miller. According to them, miners can vote on contracts and therefore there is "democracy" in the UMWA. As for the SL, we have no intention of allowing the union hacks and their "left" lackeys to claim that Miller's pistol-packing strong-arming thuggery, secrecy, redbaiting and strikebreaking add up to workers democracy!

The SWP goes to considerable lengths to find a precedent for suing the unions. Accompanying Kramer's article in the *Militant* is a box entitled "Minneapolis Teamsters and the Courts," which boasts that the Trotskyists made use of Minnesota governor Stassen's "slave-labor law" against Teamster president Dan Tobin. At that time Tobin was raiding the Minneapolis truck drivers, who had just disaffiliated from the AFL Teamsters and affiliated with the CIO. The raid was part of a vicious witchhunt launched by Tobin's master in the White House, Franklin Roosevelt, which culminated in the famous Minneapolis sedition trial of 1941 and the imprisonment of 18 Trotskyist leaders. As one could readily surmise from the circumstances, the

appeal to the courts and the government against Tobin was doomed to failure (a fact which the *Militant* neglects to mention).

The injunction sought against Tobin, though incorrect and contrary to the Trotskyist program, was a minor incident in the history of the SWP's work in the Minneapolis Teamsters. Nor was it the only mistake made by the party in this work; Trotsky, for example, more than once criticized the Teamster fraction for adapting itself to the politics of the pro-Roosevelt trade-union "progressives." But such criticisms in no way vitiate the revolutionary core of the Minneapolis Teamster organizing of the then-Trotskyist SWP. At its high point, such as the 1934 general strike, Trotskyist leaders mobilized the workers directly in the face of the vigilantes, cops and National Guard. Today, the degenerate, reformist SWP chooses to make its points about the character of the capitalist state not by pointing to such struggles, but by eulogizing a two-bit court suit against the Tobin bureaucracy.

As a matter of fact, the SWP, before it abandoned the Trotskyist heritage and sank into reformism during the 1960's, fought bitterly against finking to the courts against the union bureaucrats. Today Kramer whines of the SL position:

"By this [SL] logic, union militants who protest corruption and discrimination—even murder—through the courts pose the main threat to the independence of the unions."

Protest union corruption and bureaucratism by appealing to the capitalist courts? In 1957 when the McClellan hearings were convened to investigate the Teamsters, the SWP fought it tooth and nail. From the standpoint of union democracy and corruption, probably few unions were worse than the Teamsters of Dave Beck and Jimmy Hoffa. But the still-revolutionary SWP took a clear class position:

"Union bureaucrats of the Hoffa-Beck type who have been the initial targets of the McClellan probe are notorious for their thievery, gangsterism, and other corrupt practices in union office. But their removal is the internal business of the unions, not a matter to be left to capitalist politicians whose aim is to undermine the unions themselves on the pretext of fighting bureaucratic corruption."

from resolution of 18th National Convention of SWP, 1959

And as to the Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959, the legislation utilized by all the finks today to sue the unions, whether it is big-timers like Miller and Sadlowski or smaller fry like Pete Camarata of

continued on page 10

"Sectarian," whines the SWP about calls to stop scab coal. On right: "sectarian" miners stop scab coal.



WV Photo

Renoyd Ferguson/St. Louis Post-Dispatch

No to Ethnic Vigilantism!

Death Wish in Crown Heights

During the last two weeks of June the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn reverberated with protest demonstrations, marches and furious community meetings sparked by a series of grotesque racist attacks. First there was the June 14 strangling death of Arthur Miller—a killing so brutal it stunned even the hard pressed residents of the Brooklyn ghetto who time and again have seen their defenseless black children shot down by trigger-happy cops. No anonymous school kid, Miller was a solid black businessman and community leader. When he was clubbed to the ground by 15 cops, then strangled to death in broad daylight before scores of witnesses, the district went up in arms. Expressing widely felt sentiment, one black leader said, "If the police could kill a man so well known, then none of us are safe."

Two days later a small army of Hassidic goons jumped Victor Rhodes, a black youth, and beat him to a pulp. Police found his unconscious body on Union Street and carried him to King's County Hospital where he lay comatose for weeks. As with the macabre Miller killing, the vicious Rhodes beating threw a spotlight on the ethnic tinderbox of Crown Heights. Here on the border of Bedford-Stuyvesant some 35,000 Lubavicher Hassidim, tragic remnants of Russian *shtetl* Jewry, co-exist with some 125,000 blacks and Latins, themselves the uprooted populations of Jamaican and Puerto Rican villages.

The Hassidic vigilantes originated as a response to years of lumpy violence, predominantly by black youth, against their community. This poor and pacific religious sect had seen their old people victimized and their youth harassed. Once the Hassidic vigilantes went into action, they naturally developed a militarist esprit de corps and went on the offensive. They adopted the conventional racist attitude that the only "good" (not dangerous) black youth in their neighborhood was one with both his arms broken. In short, the Hassidim reacted to lumpy crime in a way which made racist atrocities, like the assault on Victor Rhodes, inevitable.

Whether or not Crown Heights provides the catalyst for a new round of ghetto explosions, the bourgeoisie has already managed to separate oppressed groups both from each other and from their possible allies among the working class, poor and petty bourgeoisie. Tragically, in the Crown Heights events what should have become united protests against a classic case of police brutality and ethnic vigilantism is now being diverted by rival poverty program-funded ministers and rabbis into a fight of blacks against Jews, a vicious battle over who will get the most from a shrinking pork barrel.

Miller, a 36-year-old Bahamian, was well known in the district as the owner of a small construction firm and the founder of the Four Star Block Association, a poverty agency through which federal CETA projects were funded. He was a familiar figure to the cops of the 77th Precinct as well—he helped them cool out the situation during the blackout. One area resident remembered how during the blackout the cops kept calling Miller up to Nostrand Avenue: "Hey Artie, we need you over here." A year later they showed how much they appreciated Miller's help.

Why did they kill him? State senator Vander L. Beatty of Brooklyn asserts that Miller was murdered because he



Crown Heights residents express outrage at meeting after death of community leader Arthur Miller.



Lubavicher Hassidic "anti-assimilation tank."

refused to pay the cops kickbacks they demanded. Miller's partner in the construction outfit, James Haynes, said Miller had told him of several occasions when the police had demanded bribes to avoid minor traffic tickets. The night he was killed cops stopped one of the construction trucks near Nostrand Avenue to arrest the driver, Miller's younger brother Sam, for some outstanding parking tickets on which the fines had already been paid! Someone ran up Nostrand Avenue to find Arthur; by the time he arrived there were some 20 cops on the scene. As an eyewitness later told *Daily News* columnist Jimmy Breslin:

"Arthur walks up and holds up his hands and says to the police: Can't we talk this over? Now all the police say they saw a gun on his belt when he raised up his hands. I don't know about that. I know nobody had any guns out. This white detective runs up behind Arthur and shoves him down. They handcuff Arthur's hands behind his back. Then they got him kneeling on the sidewalk here, and one of them comes

from behind and holds a nightstick across Miller's Adam's apple. The rest of the cops, they start beatin' on him. They even let a private security guard, from the model cities or something come down with a stick and start whackin' Miller. The private security guard was a black man, too."

—*Daily News*, 20 June

For a full day the cops insisted Arthur Miller died of natural causes. After the medical examiner said he died from force applied to his larynx, probably by a nightstick, they said he must have strangled himself. When nobody bought that, the cops said they had only been applying the police training manual recommended "rear restraining chokehold" procedure considered so safe that one cop said, "I use it on my own kids.... It gets to be instinct" (*Daily News*, 25 June). However, Police Commissioner Robert McGuire grudgingly told the press the manual states that the chokehold is potentially fatal if used for more than a few seconds.

A few days later hundreds marched

on City Hall in protest. Koch met them and promised there would be a full investigation and "no whitewash." Nobody believed him, for good reason. The inquiry is being jointly conducted by the police department and Brooklyn district attorney Eugene Gold. It was Gold who last year conducted the "investigation" into the death of 15-year-old Randolph Evans, the black youth shot in the head at point-blank range by white cop Robert Torsney. The all-white jury chosen by Gold's office acquitted Torsney on grounds of temporary insanity. Moreover, despite mounting pressure the mayor has endorsed Police Commissioner McGuire's categorical refusal to suspend (or even transfer!) the killer cops involved, pending the outcome of the investigation.

Two days later the cops found Victor Rhodes' body lying on Union Street. His face had been stomped on; he was bleeding and had heel marks on both sides of his head. Witnesses told police that about 12:30 a.m. on June 16 three panel trucks and a '78 Chevy screeched to a halt whereupon some 30 to 50 Hassidic youth jumped out and began to club Rhodes. Black leaders claim the youth were part of a Hassidic "crime patrol squad" which has been operating in the neighborhood for the past two years, terrorizing and beating up blacks who refuse to submit to its brutal "identification checks." The Hassidic leaders do not deny the existence of the vigilante squads, but say they were not involved in the Rhodes attack; instead it was just a rowdy band of Hassidic boys on their way home from a wedding. Two of them were arrested and charged with assault.

Pork-Barreling Diversion

At a packed community meeting held June 19 at P.S. 283, Rev. Herbert Daughtry directed his fire not against Miller's killers, but made his main target the Hassidic patrols. He frankly acknowledged to a *New York Times* reporter that the protest coalition he heads consciously sought to combine the unrelated Rhodes beating to the Miller death in order to publicize the "imbalance" between services available to Hassidic Jews and blacks in Crown Heights. Alluding to the Hassidim's supposed special relationship to the Jewish mayor, he deliberately tried to whip up anti-Semitic sentiment: "Every group looks out for its own.... Koch rewards his own kind." He called for countering the Hassidic vigilante squads with black patrols: "When the people of the long black coats meet our men, let us see what will happen."

And at a later meeting June 27, which drew some 500-750 Crown Heights black residents, it was evident that the call to establish black defense squads is primarily motivated by the desire to provide a counter-vigilante force against the Hassidic patrols. One local minister insisted the local black population would retaliate for what was done to Victor Rhodes, and in an emotional speech Rhodes' mother compared the Hassidic Jews and the cops to modern-day Hitlers. Another black church leader mimicked the absurdities of white racism as he called for shipping the Hassidim "back to Israel," proclaiming that the Police Department was run by the Hassidic community and Israeli premier Begin.

At a July 11 meeting of what is now called the "Black United Front"—

Israel Convicts Sami Esmail of Anti-Zionism

On June 12, in one of the most arrogant legal persecutions of recent memory, an Israeli court sentenced American citizen Sami Esmail to 15 months imprisonment for the "crime" of allegedly being a member of a Palestinian organization, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP). Esmail, who denies the charge, has been convicted not of any criminal act, but of the "thought crime" of anti-Zionism.

It is standard practice for capitalist garrison states like Israel to imprison, torture and even murder those of their citizens who are deemed to hold "dangerous" views. But with the Esmail case the Zionist rulers have gone further, trumpeting their "right" to carry out such vicious "justice" against anyone, anywhere in the world judged to be "anti-Israel." The trial judge said of Esmail: "He has a clean past and he is not a violent type. He is young, talented and well-educated. But in order to set an example for others the court has decided to make the sentence significant" (UPI dispatch, 12 June).

Esmail was convicted solely on the basis of an extorted confession and the fact that he once visited Libya for two weeks. Yet had it not been for widespread international publicity about his plight, he could well have received a full 25-year sentence. Terry Fleener, a 23-year-old Texas woman tried secretly for "anti-Israel" activities shortly after Esmail was seized, and whose case went virtually unpublicized, received a sentence of five years.

The Esmail case gained recognition because it intersected the growing rift in the Israel/U.S. connection and because the logic of Zionist expansionism has undercut Israeli pretensions of being an "island of democracy" in a sea of sheiks and colonels who "cut off the offending arms" of their citizenry. With the seizure of large tracts of Palestinian land, along with a population of two million that it must subdue in the occupied territories, Zionist terror has reached incredible proportions. Last summer Israel was severely embarrassed by international exposés of torture such as a well-documented London *Sunday Times* investigative report which concluded:

"Torture is organized so methodically

that it cannot be dismissed as a handful of 'rogue cops' exceeding orders. It is systematic. It appears to be sanctioned at some level as deliberate policy."

—*Sunday Times*, 19 June 1977

Despite loud cries of "distortion" in the pro-Zionist press, these charges were confirmed by the United Nations. A UN Security Council panel last November charged Israel with "torturing detainees, overcrowding its prisons and abusing prisoners."

In the wake of these exposures the Esmail case struck an exposed nerve among American liberals. The U.S. bourgeoisie has become increasingly annoyed with Israeli premier Menahem Begin, an unregenerate right-wing terrorist whose intransigence has made him a pesky obstacle to U.S. plans for a pacified Near East devoid of Soviet influence. Basing itself expressly on Jimmy Carter's anti-Soviet "human rights" campaign, the National Committee to Defend the Human Rights of Sami Esmail was able to win significant support among liberals who suddenly found it convenient to discover that Palestinians, too, have "human rights." U.S. Senator James Abourezk and Representative Robert Carr demanded to know about the role of the FBI in Esmail's prosecution, and the Detroit City Council went on record calling for a "fair trial" for the Michigan State student imprisoned while going to visit his dying father in Israel. The National Committee focused its strategy on pressuring the State Department to defend this native-born U.S. citizen.

Yet even with the increased isolation of the Israel lobby, the Committee's liberal strategy very nearly backfired. American liberalism remains strongly imbued with pro-Zionist sentiment. With the revelation that Esmail had once visited Libya, the Committee lost its most important liberal support: Abourezk and Carr pulled out and the Detroit City Council rescinded its motion.

Meanwhile, the frustrated and defensive Zionist lobby went to work trying to denigrate Esmail, in the hopes of debunking charges of Israeli terror and torture and thereby refurbish Israel's tarnished image. In a despicable article which appeared in the 2 June issue of the

New York Times (displayed prominently on the Op Ed page, while the few news articles on the case have been buried on inside news pages), Monroe Freedman and Alan Dershowitz, leading members of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), attempted to shore up sagging support for Israel by attacking Esmail's defense committee with McCarthy-style slanders and outright falsifications.

The Esmail case, they say, "presented a unique opportunity to investigate charges of systematic denials of human rights in Israel." The conclusion of their "investigation" is that Esmail was not tortured; that is, he was only punched "once—but not very hard," and the "charge that he was made to stand completely naked evaporates by half..." since he was only "half-naked!" These nauseating statements are intended to justify Esmail's "interrogation" for six days without an attorney and with almost no sleep. These Zionist civil libertarians also deny that Esmail was held incommunicado, although for four days he was permitted no visitors while Israeli police denied that he was in custody.

Freedman and Dershowitz assert that, "the critical confession turned out to be written in English, a language in which Mr. Esmail is fluent." However, there were in fact *three* "confessions." One was written by his captors in Hebrew—a language he does not read. The second was an incoherent seven-page tract written in English by Esmail during his ordeal. The third was an additional two pages dictated to him by the interrogator. The pressure of international publicity caused the Israeli court to throw out the Hebrew confession (and most of his English statement) because of "inaccuracies." This left the dictated "confession."

In fact, Esmail was abducted by force, questioned without sleep for days on end, stripped, punched, spat on, refused an attorney and told what to confess and where to sign—from which the two eminent law professors conclude that "there had been no torture." No? Here is what Sami Esmail told the Israeli court about that extorted "critical confession": after rejecting the seven pages he

had written, the interrogators told him, "You're going to rot. You're going to die.... We're going to continue to come in and interrogate you by the hour and drive you insane unless you write down you were trained and went to a camp." I said, "I could not do that because it never happened...." Then after two hours of just hassling, I went hysterical.... I said, "Whatever you want. Go ahead, write." He [the interrogator] started dictating. I wrote it down. I was crying. I was a complete wreck. My nerves were killing me. I wrote."

—from supportive material for a petition to the UN Human Rights Commission

Zionist apologetics to the contrary, torture of Palestinians in Israel is brutal, widespread and systematic. Sami Esmail's relatively tender treatment at the hands of the notorious Shin Beth (Israeli secret police) is at least in part out of deference to his American citizenship. As a foreign consular official in Israel noted, Esmail's prosecution "strikes people in the West Bank as being nothing out of the ordinary.... They have relatives who are hauled in every day and given the same kind of treatment so it seems to them routine" (*Washington Post*, 8 June).

Following the failure of its liberal strategy, elements within Esmail's defense committee sought to narrow the committee into a propaganda organization for Palestinian nationalism. The new statement of principles produced by the Detroit area committee requires endorsers to support both Esmail's freedom and "the Palestinian people's struggle for national self-determination and...their legitimate representatives" [our emphasis]—code words for political endorsement of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Esmail's "mere" 15-month sentence is an outrage, his conviction a symbol of Zionist arrogance. The answer to the persecution of the Sami Esmails and of the thousands of Palestinian militants in Israeli jails for the "crimes" of demonstrating against Zionist expansionism, police/army brutality and the like must be a socialist revolution by the Arab and Hebrew-speaking working people who will mete out proletarian justice to all the oppressors. Free Sami Esmail, Terry Fleener and all victims of Zionist repression! ■

primarily a bloc between the right-wing nationalists and Crown Heights church leaders—the increasingly reactionary direction the protests are taking was clear. Anti-Semitic ethnic slurs abounded, such as the remark of one spokesman who criticized Carter's "human rights" campaign because it would only free Soviet Jewry to emigrate to Brooklyn! A cultural nationalist group threatened that members of a leftist group would be dealt with if they persisted with plans to hold an anti-police-brutality demonstration in Crown Heights. But most serious was the call to hold a 16 July march through the Hassidic hocks in Crown Heights to terminate at a Crown Heights synagogue (!)—a provocation which could lead to a bloody communal riot.

Daughtry's group, the Coalition of Concerned Leaders and Citizens to Save Our Youth, was formed last December by about 20 black churches and civic groups to protest the Torsney acquittal. But the group has sought to use the furor around the Miller death as a means to achieve its own pork-harrelling ends. Behind Daughtry's insidious demagoguery lies the growing dissatisfaction of a broad layer of traditionally Democratic Party-loyal

local black leaders toward the Koch administration's policy of malignant neglect toward the ghetto areas. After being elected mayor on a two-point platform—get the unions and restore the death penalty (code language for "get the blacks")—Koch has remained faithful to that reactionary program. Since January thousands of poor have been thrown off the welfare rolls. Under the pretext of "house cleaning" many of the poverty programs, initiated as sops to the turbulent black population in the 1960's, were "reorganized" into liquidation.

Vigilantes in Gabardine

As yesterday's mainstream liberal Jewish population swung to the right under the impact of Zionist expansionism in the Near East and black militancy in the U.S., the Lubavicher Hassidim of Crown Heights have followed suit. Known for their aggressive proselytizing they have in recent years split the Hassidic movement with their militant support for Israel. With their fanaticism, their Zionism, they have been actively recruiting to their religious sect on the college campus with revivalist techniques such as their "anti-

assimilation tanks" and "succah on wheels" ritual shows.

Communists must have no quarter for the marauding bands of Hassidic vigilantes. Yet at the same time it must be understood that these survivors of the pogroms of Poland and Russia still feel besieged in the U.S. In 1975, to take one grotesque example, a Hassidic funeral for a man murdered during a Sabbath hold-up was disrupted by schoolchildren and bystanders yelling "Hitler was right!" Not wealthy and not liberals, the well-organized Lubavicher are determined not to be driven out of their few square blocks of Lubavich in Brooklyn. "We are those who said, 'You can live with blacks,'" said the head of the Lubavicher youth organization. "We haven't made statements for equal rights and then run for Connecticut" (*Soho Weekly News*, 29 June).

Having escaped the Nazi holocaust to settle in their Brooklyn ghetto, the Hassidim would no doubt like to "reverse the terms of oppression." They have sought to make up for what they lack in financial resources by acting as a disciplined political bloc, nurturing ties to City Hall and the police. There is no doubt they have more "clout" than the disorganized Caribbean blacks who

surround them. The Lubavicher rabbis have been adept in obtaining poverty program funds for various social projects, including for running their vigilante squads.

The squads are organized by the Crown Heights Jewish Community Council, which is a major recipient of federal funds. They work in connection with the police. Jewish Council leader Rabbi Yisroel Rosenfeld is a member of the 71st precinct community relations council and other police boards. Nevertheless, while the dominant mood among the Hassidim is no doubt white racism, they remain an isolated, threatened community and their patrols are fundamentally communal vigilantes rather than KKK-style terrorists.

Not Jew Against Black, But Class Against Class

What is so striking about the response of the black community leaders is their essential identity of aim and outlook with the Hassidic rabbis. Both are practicing traditional American ethnic politics, although the stakes are explosive. The "self-improvement" activities of Arthur Miller's "Four Star Block Association" were also federally funded

continued on page 11

ILWU...

(continued from page 2)

maintain the flow of goods through Mexico, while the Mexican government made similar assurances. And no doubt this meant Jimmy Carter was dusting off the Taft-Hartley anti-strike law which he slapped on the coal miners earlier this year and which Richard Nixon used to stop the 1971 ILWU strike. When Herman responded to all these threats by meekly praising the wonderful accomplishments of the "collective bargaining process," it was not surprising that the major Bay Area business newspaper noted with relief, "only ratification of the contract by ILWU members remains to lock up three more years of waterfront peace" (*Daily Commercial News*, 5 July).

So far the waterfront is quiet, as longshoremen await explanation of the details of the proposed contract. But beneath this simmer the accumulated grievances and discontent of the longshoremen waiting for the leadership capable of leading them in a counterattack against PMA's assaults. In an unprecedented vote of no confidence, the Local 10 membership at its June meeting refused to accept the Negotiating Committee report. More importantly, at the mid-June meeting of Local 13 (Los Angeles/Long Beach), the membership reportedly passed a motion authorizing the Coast Caucus delegates to call a strike if necessary (the International has been trying to avoid strike votes). In addition, the Local voted that in the event of a strike, all cargo would be stopped (unlike the disastrous 1971 strike, where Bridges exempted "perishables" and military cargo).

But the Local 13 leadership has no intention of squaring off against the International. For instance, Dave Arian, president of the ILWU's Southern California District Council, a Local 13 Exec Board member and a Caucus delegate, issued a leaflet on July 5 ("Bloody Thursday—Today's Contract") which bemoaned, "our negotiating committee, headed by Jimmy Herman, has not negotiated a contract that will protect our hall here in Wilmington." But the leaflet ends with no concrete proposals—not even a call to vote no!

While it is likely that under pressure from the ranks, a substantial majority of the Local 13 leadership will urge a no vote on the contract, it is certain that they will not fight for a strike. They are

setting the stage for a repeat of 1975 where they (and the CP sympathizers in S.F.) broke down the membership's resistance by permitting a series of "no" votes against the contract while refusing to take any action to organize and initiate an effective strike.

Militant longshoremen of Los Angeles! You must have no illusions in your local leadership! As they permitted Herman to sabotage the solidarity strike in defense of the miners against the Taft-Hartley, so they will permit him to sabotage your own strike preparations! Los Angeles longshoremen have a unique opportunity to reverse the International officers' policies of capitulation and defeat by vetoing the employers' insulting and provocative contract "offer." By aggressively appealing to the rest of the coast to join them in opposition, they can open the door to a successful coastwide strike.

The passivity and fear that presently grip the longshore ranks can be broken. As the "Longshore-Warehouse Militant" of 6 April said,

"The ILWU leadership should be trusted to support, much less lead, a longshore strike for more jobs through a shorter workshift with no loss in pay. They are the Arnold Millers of the waterfront. But a longshore strike for jobs must take place. The central weakness of the coal miners' strike was the absence of an elected authoritative centralized strike leadership to wrest control of bargaining and the direction of the strike away from Miller and the sell-outs on the Bargaining Council. The longshore strike must be run by an elected strike committee to mobilize the full power of the ILWU in all its divisions and the rest of labor to defy Taft-Hartley and smash government strikebreaking through the same type of strike action the ILWU demanded to defend the miners."

To wrest control from Jimmy Herman & Co. the membership in every port must elect strike committees from every gang, board and dispatch category, centralized in each port and coordinated coastwide. These committees should seize the opportunity to link up with the seafaring unions, most of whom are still negotiating with the PMA. It is not sufficient to simply vote no as some reformists might suggest—it is necessary to strike! Only the "Longshore Militant" group in Local 10 has projected a winning strategy by calling for elected strike committees to prevent the ILWU brass from bypassing and stifling the ranks.

For a militant coast-wide strike to fight for a shorter workweek at no loss in pay; one hundred percent COLA on wages and pensions; full manning scales on all operations; abolition of the steady man system and all other attacks on the hiring hall; smash the no strike clause! Vote no and elect strike committees! Take a strike vote and set an immediate strike date! Recall the Caucus—Dump the negotiating committee—Elect new delegates committed to fight for our jobs and work. All of West Coast labor should rally to the side of the longshoremen if they reject Herman's contract, pledging solidarity strike action to smash a Taft-Hartley injunction! ■

SWP/Miners...

(continued from page 7)

Teamsters for a Democratic Union, the SWP wrote:

"To ask the capitalist government in Washington to defend the rights and interests of union members is like asking a pack of ravening wolves to preside over the reform of a hen house. The trade unions are the most elementary form of working class organization with interests diametrically opposed to those of the owning class. The task of defending the rights and safeguarding the interests of union members is the primary responsibility of the unions themselves—both members and leaders. This task cannot be farmed out to the representatives of the business interests who rule the roost in Washington. The attempt to do so is a blatant confession of bankruptcy and can only lead to the most dire consequences."

Militant, 17 August 1959

A far cry from the SWP today, which cheers on Labor Department-ordered union elections, seniority-husting affirmative action suits, etc.

Strike Solidarity

The other section of Kramer's polemic is an attack on the class-struggle policies proposed by the SL for the trade unions in defense of the miners strike. In particular, Kramer takes umbrage at our denunciation of the empty "solidarity" rallies the SWP helped organize and uncritically hailed. In reality, these rallies had nothing to do with genuine solidarity; their purpose was to allow various trade-union bureaucrats to "make the record" in support of the miners, while insuring that any real act of solidarity would be squelched.

A perfect example was a Bay Area strike support meeting held March 11. The International Executive Board of the ILWU had voted for a one-day coast-wide dock shutdown in opposition to use of Taft-Hartley against the miners and called on the rest of labor to join in. When this motion was presented to the rally, SWP supporters present not only voted *against* it but helped mobilize the most rabidly right-wing elements of the labor bureaucracy to defeat it, by a margin of roughly 120-70 (see "For Strike Action to Defend the Miners," *WV* No. 198, 24 March). The gutless SWP, which must cover up every sign of militancy, never even reported the ILWU strike call in its own press. (Unfortunately, the ILWU bureaucrats refused to implement the call.)

In contrast to such cowardice, the SL and its supporters in the trade unions fought to have transport workers hot-cargo seah coal, called on steel workers to wage a joint strike with miners, and in the face of Taft-Hartley demanded protest strikes. *WV* publicized the ILWU strike call, along with similar motions passed by Chicago's UAW Local 6 and BART (rapid transit) workers in San Francisco. Kramer and the SWP do not have the guts to openly denounce the resolutions for sympathy strikes passed by the UAW, ILWU, and Amalgamated Transit workers as "sectarian" and "ultra-left." That is why they simply refuse to report that these trade union bodies passed such strike calls.

The real point is that the "strike support" policies of the SWP were no different from those of the trade-union bureaucracy. All wings of the bureaucracy, from Meany to Sadlowski, fearing to alienate their allies in the Democratic Party and the Carter Administration by proposing a militant defense of the miners, limited itself to token donations of money and food (whose distribution to the miners Miller & Co. then sabotaged). Exactly how much these labor fakers "supported" the miners is demonstrated, for example, by Meany's support to Carter's Taft-Hartley injunc-

tion and UAW president Doug Fraser's advocacy of a strikebusting federal seizure of the mines. The real question, comrade Kramer, is why the "strike support" policies of the SWP were identical to those of such scoundrels as Meany and Fraser. The answer is simple: the political program of Meany & Co., of the Sadlowski/Miller "reformers," and of the SWP is fundamentally the same.

And Through the Picket Line

Finally, our readers, and particularly the coal miners among them, are entitled to be informed of the SWP's scandalous record on the issue of respect for picket lines. While in the coalfields the tradition of honoring picket lines is so strong that a union official would be risking his career were he to urge miners to cross such a line, the same is hardly true in other unions. Indeed, it is not at all uncommon for unions at the same work location to officially sanction scabbing on each other's strikes. And the SWP, with its gutless tailing after the trade-union bureaucracy, goes right along with this policy.

A case in point was the recent strike by a Bricklayers local at the huge Inland Steel complex outside Chicago. The president of the Inland local, USWA Local 1010, announced that steel workers who refused to cross the Bricklayers' lines would not be defended by the union against company victimization. This was tantamount to organized scabbing. Two young steel workers at Inland who refused to cross the lines challenged this policy, first at a Local 1010 meeting and then at a District 31 Conference meeting. In both instances they were ruled "out of order," in the second case by District 31 head Balanoff, Sadlowski's handpicked successor. The story was covered in the bourgeois press, but the SWP, which supports the Balanoff/Sادلowski leadership of District 31, and whose trade-union supporters routinely cross such picket lines, has said not a word about it in the *Militant*.

An even more dramatic instance grew out of the pressmen's strike at the *Washington Post*, which began in October 1975 and lasted for well over a year. As a result of extensive scabbing, initially by members of the Newspaper Guild, the strike and the pressmen's union were broken. In the midst of the strike there was an election in Washington-Baltimore Local 35 of the Guild. The SWP publicly supported Tom Grubisich for president. Grubisich, who advocated leniency toward scabs, was narrowly elected over the incumbent Warren Howard, who at the time advocated disciplinary action against scabs. Having been put into office by scabs, Grubisich subsequently crossed the picket lines himself. He later ran for convention delegate on a program of bringing no charges against the Post scabs (see the 2 July 1976 *Militant*). SWP trade-union leader Frank Lovell praised the Grubisich campaign as a model one, and the SWP gave the scab candidate "full" support.

Of course, to the SWP respect for a picket line as well as hatred for the sellout policies of Arnold Miller and other trade-union bureaucrats is "sectarian" and alien to its brand of "socialism." Fine. We are more than happy ourselves to publicize these treacherous positions of the SWP. But militant miners and other class-conscious workers should know that there is one party in America that is not a scab party. It is a party that stands four-square for the Marxist program of working-class independence from the capitalist state, for the Trotskyist Transitional Program. This is the party that told the truth about the Arnold Millers, Sadlowskis and their likes from the word go, and provided a fighting program for victory at every step during the great 1977-78 coal strike. That party is the Spartacist League. ■

SPARTACIST LEAGUE LOCAL DIRECTORY

ANN ARBOR c/o SYL Room 4102 Michigan Union U. of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI 48109	(313) 663-9012
BERKELEY OAKLAND Box 23372 Oakland, CA 94623	(415) 835-1535
BOSTON Box 188 MIT Station Cambridge, MA 02139	(617) 492-3928
CHICAGO Box 6441 Main P.O. Chicago IL 60680	(312) 427-0003
CLEVELAND Box 6765 Cleveland, OH 44101	(216) 566-7806
DETROIT Box 663A General P.O. Detroit, MI 48212	(313) 868-9095
HOUSTON Box 26474 Houston, TX 77207	
LOS ANGELES Box 26282 Edendale Station Los Angeles, CA 90026	(213) 662-1564
NEW YORK Box 1377 G.P.O. New York, NY 10001	(212) 925-2426
SAN DIEGO P.O. Box 7034 Chula Vista, CA 92012	
SAN FRANCISCO Box 4717 San Francisco, CA 94101	(415) 863-6963
TROTSKYIST LEAGUE OF CANADA	
TORONTO Box 7198 Station A Toronto, Ontario	(416) 366-4107
VANCOUVER Box 26 Station A Vancouver, B.C.	(604) 254-9166

SL/SYL PUBLIC OFFICES

Marxist Literature

BAY AREA

Friday and Saturday
1634 Telegraph, 3rd floor
(near 17th Street)
Oakland, California
Phone 835-1535

CHICAGO

Tuesday
523 South Plymouth Court, 3rd floor
Chicago, Illinois
Phone 427-0003

NEW YORK

Monday-Friday
Saturday
260 West Broadway, Room 522
New York, New York
Phone 925-5665

Crown Heights...

(continued from page 9)

and the association participated in the community relations council of the 77th precinct. Rev. Daughtry is quite open about wanting to use the recent Crown Heights events to gain more pork-barrel projects and political influence "downtown" in competition with the Hassidim. And he is equally clear that the projected black patrols (which include black cops) are intended to give the Lubavicher vigilantes "some of their own medicine." The stage is thus set for the kind of vicious communal confrontation such as the year-long battle between Williamsburg Hassidim, blacks and Puerto Ricans over the number of allotments for each group in a new housing project.

The black population as well has nothing to gain and everything to lose from allowing the present protests to be diverted into pork-barreling communalist conflicts. For one thing, the numerical inferiority of the Lubavicher Hassidim does not necessarily spell military defeat, although both sides would suffer tremendous losses in a real explosion of ethnic riots. It is certainly true that, in the context of the ruling class onslaught against New York City's workers and its poor, the blacks, forcibly segregated at the bottom rungs of the economy, will *always* get less. That is why a mobilization of the labor movement leading behind it the black population and all sectors of the oppressed in a united political struggle against Koch, the banks and the capitalist government is the only road forward for the black masses. But instead, just as in the late 1960's when Mayor Lindsay and the Ford Foundation joined hands with aspiring petty-bourgeois nationalist black administrators in "community control" schemes—ultimately forcing the 1968 NYC teachers strike—the capitalists have managed once again to "divide and rule." In Crown Heights the black community leaders have provided an escape valve for Koch and taken the heat off the killer cops by deflecting the struggle into a vicious communalist war with the Hassidim.

Everyone, black or white, has the right to *defend himself* against violent attack, whether attacked by ethnic-community vigilantes or lumpen criminals. To this end gun control laws must be repealed and everyone in New York City should be legally permitted to own and carry firearms. At the same time, the most dangerous enemies of black people, the cops, must be *disarmed*. If the residents of Crown Heights and Harlem had firearms and the cops did not, the level of police atrocities and general brutality would go way down.

Black people also have the right to and need for organized, collective self-defense against massive attacks by white racist forces. However, the vigilantes of the numerically small and isolated Hassidic Jews are not engaged in such

mass terror against their black neighbors. Rather, in their community vigilante patrols, the Hassidic goons land on random black youth. Therefore, Daughtry's black "defense" squads would necessarily involve themselves mainly in *reprisals* after the fact against Hassidic Jews. The outcome will be black/Jewish gang warfare, only this time conducted by adults, and escalating communalist violence.

The real beneficiaries of increased black/Jewish hostility in New York City will be right-wing reactionaries, the banks and the cops. In supporting Daughtry's call for black vigilante groups, the reformists of the Communist Party and Socialist Workers Party as usual play the capitalists' game; they perpetuate the deep ethnic/communal divisions which are the central obstacle to a working-class socialist movement in this country. Not black against Jew, but the working class and poor against the cops, the banks, Koch and Carter! ■

Bakke...

(continued from page 1)

National Urban League similarly opined that "we may not have won the victory we wanted, but we averted the defeat that would truly have been crushing..." (*Amsterdam News*, 8 July).

The reason for the black liberals' "victory and defeat" reaction to the court's decision is that while the loss of college admissions quotas was a blow to their program of tokenistic reforms, the preservation of employment affirmative action upheld the position, which they share with the Justice Department, that more black jobs can come only at the expense of the "white" unions. NAACP labor director Herbert Hill revealed his organization's view of the union movement when he described the AFL-CIO as "committed to white male workers against the vital interests of women and minorities" (*New York Times*, 29 June 1977). The NAACP sees a "victory" in Bakke *because* the decision was a defeat for the power of organized labor.

Some black "leaders" such as Jesse Jackson and Ron Dellums attacked the Bakke decision with more verbal militancy. Jackson, for example, pronounced Bakke "a devastating blow to our civil rights struggle." But this is only the cheap bluster of a politico who, while seeking to capitalize on black outrage at the Bakke decision, offers no strategy to combat racial oppression any different from that of Hooks and Jordan.

The left-wing supporters of affirmative action simply echoed the rhetoric of Jackson and Dellums, denouncing the decision in the shrillest possible tones. The Communist Party (CP) *Daily World* approvingly quoted Justice Thurgood Marshall's dissenting opinion while CP leader Henry Winston obliquely criticized the NAACP's positive response to the Bakke ruling. Winston's attempt to distance the CP from Hooks' position was complete hypocrisy, since the Justice Department's anti-quota, pro-affirmative action brief had earlier been hailed by the CP itself as "a sign of what can be accomplished, given the determination of people's organizations to fight on issues" (*Daily World*, 22 September 1977).

SWP: Reformist Muddleheads

The ex-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party (SWP) similarly waxed indignant at the overturn of quota systems, slamming the decision as "the most staggering blow to the long-denied hopes and aspirations of oppressed nationalities and women" (*Militant*, 7 July). What threw these reformists for a loop, however, was the CWA case demonstrating the government's continued support for anti-union affirmative action. The SWP, which completely supports programs like that at AT&T,

was nonplused by the Court's decision because it actually believes that affirmative action is a real gain for minorities now threatened by a racist court. Unable to comprehend that the union-husting aspects of these SWP-supported programs are in the interest of the capitalist state, the SWP can only explain the CWA case as a ruling-class trick: "The ruling rich are proceeding cautiously in their effort to dismantle civil rights gains. They are careful to mask their real aims and to test the public response at every step" (*Militant*, 14 July). In reality, of course, it is the SWP which has masked the real aim of the government in affirmative action.

Unlike the SWP and others who warned that Bakke posed a threat to all affirmative action programs, the Spartacist League understood that the underlying class interests at stake dictated to the Supreme Court the position it eventually took. Last October we wrote, "The Supreme Court will not rule on Bakke in the language of 'reverse discrimination' but in the spirit of white chauvinism...the Supreme Court will not challenge the *formal* notion of black equality nor will it strip away the *formal* conception that 'race can be a factor' in deciding admissions policy. But in a sense Bakke has already won" ("Down With Bakke!" *WV* No. 177, 14 October 1977).

The reformist SWP attached such overwhelming significance to the Bakke decision because they imagined that the crucial questions of racial discrimination would be decided in the courts and not in the streets. In reality the Bakke decision served only to ratify what has already occurred: the decline of special admissions and the checking of school integration in general by rampaging racists unchallenged by the mass labor mobilization that alone could have halted the reactionary backlash. Affirmative action in employment survives not by judicial oversight or duplicity but because the government *wants* it, but for reasons which have nothing to do with minority rights.

Decades of liberal/reformist reliance on the capitalist state to advance the interests of blacks and other minorities have produced in the end only union-busting dressed up as "affirmative action." Only reliance on the power of the labor movement along with the fight for a class-struggle, anti-racist union leadership holds out any promise of reversing the reactionary defeats to minority rights.

Under militant leadership the unions would use their power to push for a truly

egalitarian educational program. While the Spartacist League and Spartacus Youth League have defended college admissions quotas against the racist backlash, such quotas fall far short of the program necessary to smash race and class privilege in the colleges. For open admission, free tuition and state stipends for all students! Nationalize the private universities!

Class-struggle leadership in the unions would put the weight of the organized working class behind the fight for minority jobs not through union-husting affirmative action but with union-run minority recruitment and training programs. Most importantly, such a leadership would wage a struggle for jobs for all through a shorter workweek with no loss in pay.

Such leadership is needed to resist the present onslaught of racist reaction. For more is lost in the Bakke decision than a special admission program to an elite medical school. It is part of a deeper social reaction directed at blacks and minorities in general. Millions of black children are trapped in their increasingly segregated public schools, no longer even taught to read and write before they hit the streets jobless and desperate. That is the social context in which the Bakke decision must be understood and in which the fight for its reversal must be undertaken. ■

Pamplona...

(continued from page 3)

zations voting in the Cortes bestowed by Franco's heirs, seated under the Francoist flag and singing the Francoist anthem under the baton of Franco's hand-picked king have fundamentally changed the nature of the Spanish state. The brutal murder of Rodriguez shows once again that beneath the "democratic" facade of Suárez/Juan Carlos beats the heart of the still intact Francoist state apparatus.

A genuine Trotskyist party in Spain would intransigently defend working-class independence rather than tailing after the PCE and PSOE in sowing treacherous "democratic" illusions.

—No reliance on the cops, murderers of Germán Rodríguez! For workers self-defense against fascist terror!

—For the right of self-determination for the Basque region!

—For a workers republic in Spain, part of a soviet federation of the Iberian peninsula in a socialist united states of Europe! ■

Buy Now!

Here is the true story of the Great Coal Strike of 1978—from the miners' side of the barricades. And much more besides: the bankruptcy of Arnold Miller and Miners for Democracy; class war in Harlan and Stearns; wildcats in the coalfields; crisis in the UMWA. Not just reporting but hard analysis...and a program for victory!

a Workers Vanguard pamphlet

\$1.50



THE GREAT COAL STRIKE OF 1978

Single copy, \$1.50;
20 copies or more, \$1.00 each.
Enclosed find _____ for _____ copies.
Make checks payable/mail to:
Spartacist Publishing Co
P.O. Box 1377 GPO New York, N.Y. 10001

Name _____ Phone _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Biweekly of the Spartacist League

48 issues—\$5. Introductory offer (16 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:
Spartacist Publishing Co.
Box 1377 GPO
New York, N.Y. 10001

211

211

WORKERS VANGUARD

CHICAGO, July 10 For the second time in just two weeks, Chicago cops yesterday mounted a massive show of armed force to protect a rally of Frank Collin's vile Nazi sect. Over 1,000 riot-equipped and mounted police manned barricades to protect two dozen would-be storm troopers in their highly publicized race-hate fest in Marquette Park on the racially tense Southwest side. An additional 400 plainclothes cops circulated through a crowd of over 2,000 which was sharply divided between anti-Nazi protesters and local residents sympathetic to the fascists' racist diatribes. Over 1,000 more anti-Nazis, members of leftist, church and black community groups, were halted over a mile away from the rally site by police who kept Marquette Park sealed off. Safeguarding the Nazis' "freedom of speech," their guardians in blue made over 70 arrests by the end of the day.

The Nazis' access to Marquette Park was cleared through a June 22 court deal which granted the fascists the "right" to spew their racist filth in Marquette Park in exchange for calling off their planned march on the heavily Jewish suburb of Skokie. And the Nazis certainly took advantage of the government offer. Two-hit Nazi Führer Frank Collin taunted the several hundred Jewish counter-demonstrators in the park, "Do you want us to put you in the ovens? We will. First of all, I don't like your ugly face. Second of all, you marched the niggers into our neighborhood. We say one more time, all you Jews are going to get it."

As the protesters frequently drowned out Collin in his 25-minute race-hating harangue, hundreds of local racists sympathetic to the Nazis chanted, "Gas them, gas them," and numerous fist fights broke out between pro- and anti-Nazi demonstrators. Next to a banner emblazoned with the swastika and the slogan "White Youth Fight," Collin exhorted his followers, many clad in "white power" tee-shirts, "We'd rather see Marquette Park a battleground and the graveyard of integration. It will not be taken over by the blacks."

Just as Collin had predicted after his rally in the downtown Loop two weeks ago, which drew 3,000 angry anti-Nazi demonstrators, his reception in Marquette Park was quite different. Heavily populated by ethnic whites, especially Lithuanian émigrés, Marquette Park has housed the local Nazi headquarters for 14 years. Two years ago it was the scene of rampaging racist mobs who attacked open-housing demonstrators. While the crowd that gathered Sunday was in the main curious if not neutral to the Nazis, it tolerated a strong pro-Nazi component. It is not accidental that Collin and his pack of Hitler-lovers has targeted Marquette Park, immediately adjacent to the large and heavily black Southside, for their genocidal organizing.

That the Nazis would be guaranteed the "right" to march in Marquette Park was the result of decisions made at the highest levels of government. At the White House, in Congress and in the federal courts, Jimmy Carter's "human rights" campaign translated into the "right" of the Nazis to organize and propagate their racist terror. The Justice Department's Community Relations Service was given the job of sealing the deal. The *Chicago Defender* last week published excerpts of letters from Richard Salem, midwest regional director of the agency, to Collin, negotiating over terms for use of Marquette Park.

Also aiding the fascists were the

Cops Defend Race-Hate Rally in Marquette Park

Labor: Drive Nazis Out of Chicago!

spineless liberals who had threatened a demonstration of tens of thousands in the well-to-do Jewish suburb of Skokie but who were quite willing to hail out if it were "only" the blacks on Chicago's Southside who were being terrorized. When the Nazis canceled their Skokie rally after winning their court fight for their right to pollute Marquette Park, the liberal Jewish, black and labor organizers of the proposed counter-demonstration rushed to call the whole thing off.

At a press conference held July 6, which had been billed as an announcement of plans for a Marquette Park anti-Nazi counter-demonstration, representatives of Jesse Jackson's Operation PUSH, and community organizations such as the Woodlawn Organization and the Kenwood-Oakland Community Organization committed their groups only to "witness" the events planned for July 9. The "progressive" leadership of the Amalgamated Meatcutters and Butcher Workers howled out by announcing plans for a forum at their Southside union hall at the same time as the proposed counter-demonstration in Marquette Park. Though representatives were present from United Steelworkers District 31 (led by the "dissident" bureaucrats Jim Balanoff and Ed Sadlowski), the Meatcutters, the Coalition of Black Trade

Unionists and Mailhandlers Union Local 306, these bureaucrats did nothing to really mobilize the ranks of Chicago labor to oppose the Nazis. On the day of the fascist rally in Marquette Park, there were no contingents from organized labor present among the counter-demonstrators.

It is not simply that the reformists, liberals and their "left-wing" hangers-on lack the guts to confront the Nazis or that the trade-union bureaucrats, who preside over unions with hundreds of thousands of members in the Chicago area, lack the resources to do so. Rather, these groups ultimately look to the bourgeois state, which has over and over again demonstrated that it will defend the Nazis, to do just the opposite. In a "Statement on Nazism" issued at the July 6 press conference and signed by Steelworkers District 31; the Equal Rights Congress (ERC), dominated by the Stalinist Communist Labor Party (CLP); and the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) front group, the Student Coalition Against Racism, these groups "call upon the highest authorities of this city, Mayor Blandie and Police Superintendent O'Grady, to use their offices and influence" to end "Nazism and related evils." The ERC demonstrators at the Marquette Park counter-demonstration carried signs pathetically appealing to the government, busy protecting the

fascists, to "Ban the Nazis." The SWP, which has in the past steadfastly defended the fascists' "right to free speech" and claimed not to call on the government to ban them, proved quite willing to put its signature to this document, currying favor with the liberals they habitually mimic.

At Sunday's demonstration, the will of 1,000 anti-Nazis who gathered outside Marquette Park was frustrated by the massive deployment of Chicago cops and the fractious disunity of leftists and liberals. JDLers threatened to bolt the demonstration if the "reds" were not excluded, while contingents of Progressive Labor Party (PL) and the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP) jockeyed for leadership of the march with the church leaders and ERC-types who ultimately turned the march around when they confronted police lines at the entrance to Marquette Park.

Notoriously adventurist groups like PL, the RCP and the small Revolutionary Socialist League sought a "hash" with the cops defending the Nazis. (Last April a handful of PL supporters attacked the Marquette Park Nazi headquarters, managing to leave one young woman behind. After being beaten and stabbed, she was arrested and is now charged with several felonies.) The more "respectable" forces of the ERC, the Communist Party/YWLL and church elders looked for accommodation with the bourgeois armed forces who protect the fascists. Both sides miss the crucial necessity to mobilize the strength of the organized labor movement to smash the fascist scum once and for all.

This Marxist program is uniquely upheld by the Spartacist League. The SL contingent at Sunday's counter-demonstration at Marquette Park chanted, "Smash the Nazis! Smash the Klan! Only Workers Defense Guards Can!" and carrying placards reading, "No Platform for Fascists!" and "Labor Must Smash the Fascist Threat!" Groups like PL, the RCP and the RSL, all of which have at least some supporters in the Chicago-area trade unions, have made absolutely no attempt to mobilize their unions against the fascists. However, United Auto Workers Local 6, at the Melrose Park International Harvester plant, passed a resolution submitted by a class-struggle militant calling on area unions to drive the Nazis out of Chicago.

Fascism is still a marginal phenomenon on the American political spectrum. The bourgeoisie, though shaken by the debacle of its Vietnam defeat, the shame of Watergate and the loss of its worldwide economic hegemony, still has no need to resort to the tiny fascist sects to maintain its rule. But the massive armed protection afforded the Nazis in Chicago should give notice to all that the government will keep these race-hating, labor-hating scum in reserve for when they are necessary to assault the workers movement and minority populations in the U.S.

That 2,000 anti-Nazi militants would mobilize around Marquette Park to halt the fascists is a tribute to the powerful hatred of fascism in the American working masses. But that an almost equal number of pro-fascist elements could swarm to Marquette Park to call for genocide of Jews and blacks is a threatening revelation of the racist reality in Carter's land of "human rights." Fascism must be nipped in the bud—and only the labor movement can destroy it. Labor must drive the Nazis out of Chicago! ■