

Class Struggle Against Racism, Cold War Austerity!

Reagan's War on Labor

Democrats, Labor Fakers Beat Anti-Soviet War Drums

By firing an entire national union and throwing 12,000 air traffic controllers on the street, Ronald Reagan has launched the most aggressive assault on labor rights since the rise of the CIO in the 1930s. He wants to turn the clock back to the days before industrial unions when sweatshop conditions and 14-hour days were the norm not just in little garment shops, but in steel, auto and the rest of American industry. His High Noon confrontation with labor pushed the sellout union bureaucracy to mobilize at least a gesture of labor opposition on September 19 in Washington.

No doubt the turnout for this, the largest labor demonstration in U.S. history, far exceeded the expectations of the cowardly AFL-CIO tops, especially given the refusal of the bureaucrats of the strategic industrial unions in the Midwest to build for it. The anger and discipline demonstrated by workers in Washington showed *they were prepared to fight*. And so did the favorable reception received by the Spartacist League banner "Fight for Workers' Rights! Build a Workers Party! Smash Reagan!" and the sale of over 8,000 copies of *Workers Vanguard* with the headline in defense of the air traffic controllers: "Labor Must Shut Down the Airports!"

At the recent AFL-CIO convention in New York City the labor traitors on the platform only trumpeted their dedication to a strategy that has led labor from defeat to defeat: back the Democrats in the next election and support Reagan's militarist foreign policy. Reagan's war on the working class is part and parcel of his massive military build-up and war drive against the Soviet Union. But the AFL-CIO tops from Kirkland to Fraser have been in the front line of the anti-Soviet superhawks. They were beating the drums for the Cold War while Reagan was still making movies.

Now, as the economy falls apart and the anti-Soviet war drive heats up, the givebacks and austerity will be demanded more openly as sacrifices for the "national defense" against the USSR. Race terror and witchhunting will be the domestic face of the Cold War. Defense of the gains of the 1917 October Revolution which overthrew capitalism in Russia is key to the defense of the workers' interests at home. That is why the struggle to unleash the power of labor in its own interest must be a *political* fight to oust the Cold War bureaucrats.

The labor movement has the power to turn back Reagan's attacks, but not by installing the old set of capitalist



Labor Day 1981: Anger at the base against strikebreakers Reagan/Koch.

WV Photo

"friends of labor" three years from now. *Through militant action, labor can bring down Reagan!*

The Newest "New Deal": War Drive and "Sacrifice"

The AFL-CIO national convention last month was full of ritualistic denunciations of Reaganomics. But the heart of Reaganomics is *not* "supply-side" fiscal quackery. It is the massive military build-up intended to secure first-strike nuclear capability against the USSR as well as to fight conventional wars, from the mass graves in El Salvador to the shores of Tripoli. The anti-Communist fanatics of the AFL-CIO executive board support Reagan's anti-Soviet war drive to the hilt—more so, in fact, than some Democratic politicians. A *Wall Street Journal* (18 November) editorial argues that Lane Kirkland & Co. should be less hostile to Reagan and friendly to the Democrats since "clearly, their [the Reaganites'] attitudes toward foreign policy are more in harmony with the AFL-CIO's strong anti-communism than were the accommodationist [!] notions of the Carter administration."

At the convention the AFL-CIO tops displayed this strong anti-Communism by fulsome support to the only "trade union" in the world that Reagan likes, Poland's Solidarność. It was fitting that the fervently anti-Soviet leader of Solidarność, Lech Walesa, was invited

to receive the "George Meany Human Rights Award." (Had this award existed during the Vietnam War, it would no doubt have gone to General Thieu and Marshal Ky.) Decades of Stalinist bureaucratic rule have driven much of the Polish working class into the arms of the Vatican, the International Monetary Fund and NATO imperialism. And now the loyal lieutenants of the Pentagon and Wall Street are doing what they can to bring Poland into the "free world" (i.e., to incite capitalist counterrevolution).

Acting as imperialism's labor auxiliary is nothing new for the AFL-CIO leaders. Their American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD) is a notorious CIA front. Last fall the infamous CIA provocateur Irving Brown offered to set up "free trade unions" in UNITA-held areas of Angola—undoubtedly to aid South Africa's efforts to overthrow the Cuba-supported nationalist government in Luanda.

Lane Kirkland's keynote speech at the convention bemoaned that Reagan's blatantly anti-labor policies have resulted in "the destruction of domestic support for necessary military expenditures"! In order to win support for a hard-line militarist program which would *appear* less anti-labor, Kirkland brought the Democrats to the convention in a big way. Teddy Kennedy was

there to receive a standing ovation; Fritz Mondale was there too, as well as Tip O'Neill. With all the speechifying, it looked more like a Democratic Party gathering than a labor convention.

And while the AFL-CIO convention delegates squabbled over which token black bureaucrat to add to the executive board, Reagan's austerity drive has hit the black population first and foremost. More than 50 percent of black teenagers are without jobs, not counting those who have given up looking for work. Welfare and food stamps have been slashed and job training has been "zeroed out."

The basis of Kirkland, Fraser & Co.'s new New Deal with the Democrats is *not* the usual liberal/reformist "butter vs. guns" promises. Now the bureaucrats and Democrats unite on the impossible program of guns *and* butter: *more missiles* along with the restoration of some of the social services cuts. This would be paid for either by higher taxes—as Mondale now proposes—or the kind of banana republic-style inflation experienced in early 1980 under Carter. In either case it is the workers and poor who will continue to pay for the anti-Soviet war drive.

This policy is not popular among the union ranks. The memory of the grim economic conditions under Carter hasn't been erased by Reaganomics. If

continued on page 11

Racist Provocation at Wayne State

SYL: "Run Out Racist South End Editor!"

DETROIT—An outcry at Wayne State University has been sparked by the racist "cartoon" published in the *South End* student newspaper November 18. The "cartoon" printed by editor E. Dale Lee, entitled "How many honkies are in this picture?" and depicting five stereotyped black players dribbling basketballs around a white-sheeted club-wielding KKKer, is a racist provocation. Last week the Spartacus Youth League (SYL) initiated a "Committee to Oust Racist Editor Lee" at a meeting attended by over 30 black students, Arabs, Jews and socialists. The Committee has called a rally/demonstration at Wayne State on Thursday, December 3 to run out the racist FBI-loving editor.

Activists in the Committee have already been subjected to physical threats and attacks for protesting this atrocity. An organized group of Lee's supporters repeatedly disrupted a November 24 meeting to form the Committee and refused to leave when asked to. At the meeting's end, a hefty white male thug in his forties suddenly burst into the room and asked a Lee supporter, "Did you get it all down?" referring to

his copious note-taking at the meeting. When both men left, a photographer for the Committee and a black Committee organizer sought to take a picture of the racist disrupters. Moments later the thug charged at the woman photographer, trying to grab the camera and forcing her against a banister over a two-story drop where she could have been killed. He then reached into his pocket as if he had a gun and repeatedly physically threatened the black Committee member.

Last year the SYL initiated the Ad Hoc Committee to Oust *South End* Apologists for Klan/Nazi Murder, in order to remove the editors of the *South End* who wrote an editorial cheering the acquittal of the KKK/Nazi killers in Greensboro, North Carolina. Now the new editor Lee is an open sympathizer of the FBI. Lee not only brags he has a girlfriend working for the feds, but also sports an FBI T-shirt and decorates his office with FBI paraphernalia from mugs to an FBI target with authentic bullet holes. However, many blacks know the murderous history of FBI racism—from the COINTELPRO at-

tacks on Martin Luther King, Jr. to the secret police involvement in the KKK/Nazi Greensboro massacre.

In response to the outrage, Lee printed the cartoon again and commented snidely, "I never had slaves and I don't want them." "Racial discrimination is more fallacy than fact," he added, and Detroit black mayor "Coleman Young...is racist." This business is no joke. Lee's provocative racist "cartoon" fits neatly into a pattern of KKK/Nazi attacks against blacks and other minorities in Michigan and throughout the country. Recently, Robert Guy of Battle Creek, a leader of the Coalition Against Police Brutality, was killed in a bomb explosion. An SYL leaflet pointed out:

"Enough! The editor thinks 'racial discrimination is more fallacy than fact.' This in Reagan's America where the Klan/Nazi terrorists are growing. Remember Cynthia Steele! She had her hand blown off when the KKK threw a pipebomb into her home on Detroit's west side last winter. Maybe Lee thinks the Nazi death camps are a 'fallacy' too. Jewish concentration camp survivors in Southfield tried to stop a Nazi provocation there last spring. In October 1979, two foremen paraded around the Rouge

plant in KKK hoods. Later they claimed it was a big joke too. Thousands of black, white and Arab auto workers didn't think so. They drove them the hell out of the plant. E. Dale Lee must get the same treatment!"

Given the provocative and potentially explosive character of the "cartoon" incident at this largely minority and working-class school in the heart of black Detroit, the campaign to oust racist editor Lee has received wide attention. This included a front-page *Detroit Free Press* article and coverage in the *Houston Chronicle* which, given skyrocketing unemployment in Detroit, is widely read here for its want ads section.

The Committee rally is scheduled the same day as a meeting of the student council which has called on Lee to appear to explain his "cartoon." Because of the furor, the student council has tabled the budget of the *South End*. The Committee calls on all those who stand against racism, who want to stop Klan/Nazi terror, who defend democratic rights for minorities and workers, to attend the rally and the student council meeting to ensure the ouster of racist FBI-lover Lee. ■

SL Court Suit Gains Support

Defeat California McCarthyite Smear!

SAN FRANCISCO, December 1—Congressman Ron Dellums has become the most recent endorser of the Spartacist League/Spartacus Youth League's civil suit against California attorney general George Deukmejian. Filed last July, the suit demands that Deukmejian retract the inclusion of the SL/SYL in his 1979 report on "Organized Crime in California—Part 2, Terrorism." The report wrongfully and viciously labeled the SL/SYL as "terrorists" and as a "dangerous faction with which law enforcement will have to deal," targeting us for persecution and violence by police agencies and right-wing outfits.

Support for the suit by Dellums, a nationally known black Democrat and a leading spokesman for Michael Harrington's Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee, helps gain a hearing for the lawsuit in broader circles.

The Partisan Defense Committee (PDC), which has undertaken to support this case, has been meeting with public officials, civil liberties activists and others who, while not sharing the

SL/SYL's Marxist views, nevertheless know by experience and reputation that the SL/SYL are neither "terrorists" nor "criminals." Not surprisingly given the targeting of blacks and minorities by Reaganite reaction, the case has evoked interest and sympathy from black spokesmen. Northern California NAACP counsel Oliver Jones endorsed the suit. Oakland City Councilman Wilson Riles, Jr. and Alameda County Supervisor John George, both black Democrats, have also endorsed. George also authored a letter (see accompanying box) to help raise the thousands of dollars necessary to win the case.

PDC representatives also got a good response from many of the delegates at the statewide conference of the Black American Political Association of California, held in Sacramento November 6. A common reaction was that Deukmejian's attacks threaten another period of McCarthyism. One black Superior Court judge who went to law school with Deukmejian said he would personally call the attorney general demanding the retraction be made.

With Deukmejian mounting an aggressive right-wing campaign for the governor's office in next year's election, there are many who know that Deukmejian's attacks are not limited to the SL/SYL. One state Democratic Party central committee member who has assisted in the fundraising remarked, "Hell, Deukmejian's so right-wing he thinks we're terrorists!"

There may be a settlement in the works, but the case has already cost many thousands of dollars. Your help is urgently needed. As the PDC states in its most recent fund appeal mailing:

"The Partisan Defense Committee believes it is of the utmost importance that this suit be fought to a successful conclusion. Reagan and Deukmejian may dream of the post-World War II period of loyalty oaths, McCarthy and Un-American Committees, but that is not the same as getting it. The Moral Majority and Reagan/Haig have not yet been able to mobilize national sentiment in favor of a McCarthyite witchhunt. The time to fight back is now. Retraction of the labeling of the



JOHN GEORGE
SUPERVISOR, FIFTH DISTRICT

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

November 25, 1981

Dear Friend:

I encourage you to read the enclosed letter regarding a civil suit filed against Attorney General George Deukmejian by the Spartacist League and Spartacus Youth League (SL/SYL). The case is in response to the Attorney General's annual report entitled "Organized Crime in California - 1979" in which, as the suit states, the SL/SYL were falsely branded as "terrorists" and as "dangerous and violent" organizations.

I have already endorsed the case, which demands that Deukmejian retract his wrongful and defamatory characterizations and publicize this retraction. On occasion, I have participated in united front activities sponsored by these organizations - most recently by speaking at a public protest against the acquittal of KKK/Nezi members who shot dead five anti-fascist demonstrators in Greensboro - and I find Deukmejian's characterizations of the SL/SYL to be totally unfounded.

Personally, I welcome the opportunity to support this case which I see as part of the fight against right-wing attacks on civil liberties and the threat of a new McCarthyism in this Country. I trust that you will aid the efforts being made by the Partisan Defense Committee to bring this case to a successful conclusion.

Very truly yours,

John George
JOHN GEORGE

JG/emw

1221 OAK STREET, SUITE 530, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612-4151 (510) 874-0781

WORKERS VANGUARD

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

EDITOR: Jan Norden

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Charles Burroughs

PRODUCTION: Oerlene Kemlure (Manager),
Noeh Wilner

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Linde Jarreau

EDITORIAL BOARD: George Foster, Liz
Gordon, Mark Kellermann, James Robertson,
Reuben Semuels, Joseph Seymour, Marjorie
Stenberg

Workers Vanguard (USPS 098-770) published
biweekly, skipping an issue in August and a
week in December, by the Spartacist Publishing
Co., 41 Warren Street, New York, NY 10007
Telephone: 732-7862 (Editorial), 732-7861
(Business). Address all correspondence to: Box
1377, GPO, New York, NY 10116. Domestic
subscriptions: \$5.00/24 issues. Second-class
postage paid at New York, NY.

Opinions expressed in signed articles or letters
do not necessarily express the editorial
viewpoint.

No. 294 4 December 1981

SL/SYL as 'terrorist/criminal' organizations will be a blow against renaissance McCarthyism of Deukmejian and Reagan.

"Your generous support is urgently needed to ensure that victory. The SL/SYL suit faces the resources of the State of California as well as right-wing agribusiness tycoons who call the tune for

the new McCarthyites. Already we are thousands of dollars in debt. This suit is important. Please help. Make the checks payable to: PARTISAN DEFENSE COMMITTEE."

Send contributions to: Partisan Defense Committee, P.O. Box 5555, San Francisco CA 94101. ■

"Former" Agents Arm Qaddafi

The CIA's Libya Connection

According to the newly concocted Cold War myth of Soviet "international terrorism," Muammar Qaddafi, the unsavory Islamic dictator of Libya, is behind every terrorist bomb and bullet, and the Kremlin is behind Qaddafi. General Haig calls him the "patron saint of terror." The bible for this propaganda campaign is Claire Sterling's *The Terror Network*, which devotes an entire chapter to Qaddafi, whom she calls the "Daddy Warbucks of international terrorism." This chapter was recently reprinted by *The New Republic* under the headline: "A murderer, a maniac—and Moscow's man." Hardly a week goes by without a new charge from Washington of Qaddafi-sponsored terrorism: alleged plots against U.S. ambassadors in Europe and now even supposed plans to assassinate Reagan (*Newsweek*, 30 November).

Haig has been repeatedly (and unsuccessfully) ordering reports on the Soviet master plot. But at last the evidence of a Qaddafi connection is in. Exposés in the *New York Times* and other major newspapers show where Libya gets explosives, detonators and experts to turn them into sophisticated bombs—not to mention training terrorists and serving as hitmen against Qaddafi's opponents—and where it got the planes to supply Libya's intervention in Chad last year and the pilots to fly them. But it isn't the Russians who are exposed as the Libyan connection. It's Wilson & Terpil, Inc.—described as just a couple of home-grown entrepreneurs peddling the wares of Terrorism Made in U.S.A. And behind all the allegedly former CIA agents, munitions makers and Green Berets involved there looms the whole murky apparatus of what is called the U.S. "intelligence community."

Pushed into a federal investigation of the affair, a U.S. government confidential report stated bluntly: "The United States, in effect, has become a major supplier of [military] hardware and technology in support of worldwide terrorism. Former Central Intelligence Agency personnel, military special forces personnel and U.S. corporations combine to supply products and expertise to whomever can pay the price" (*Boston Globe Magazine*, 22 March). At a time when the supposed Russian international terror operation is the excuse to "unleash" the CIA and the rest of U.S. imperialism's secret agents, this evidence is more embarrassing to the



New York Times



New York Times



Cameron/Sygma

CIA "Old Boys" Edwin Wilson (above left), Francis Terpil (above right) delivered for Libyan dictator Qaddafi.

government than no evidence at all.

Which is why they've tried to keep the lid on it for years, and they're now trying to limit the damage by blaming it all on rogue "former CIA operatives" run amok.

To the Shores of Tripoli

At the center of the CIA's Libyan connection are two of these "former" CIA agents, Edwin Wilson and Francis Terpil. Beginning last summer the *New York Times* launched a major series on

the affair. Two long articles in the *New York Times Magazine* (9 and 16 August) by one of the favorite journalists of leakers, Seymour Hersh, and regular coverage of the case in the daily *Times* have extensively detailed the exploits of Wilson and Terpil. Five years ago, Hersh reported, these spooks-for-hire "made a deal with Col. Muammar el Qaddafi to supply the Libyan strongman with explosives for huge sums of cash. They also hired former Green Berets to set up a training

school to teach the Libyans the latest techniques in assassination and international terrorism."

The articles related stories of former Wilson/Terpil employees such as the CIA-trained bomb technician who told how Americans "had constructed a laboratory [in the former palace of deposed King Idris] and were manufacturing assassination bombs disguised as rock formations, ashtrays, lamps and tea kettles." Wilson's arms buying for Qaddafi, the *Times* reported, was run through a series of CIA-connected businesses and long-time suppliers (among them J.S. Brower & Associates in California, which illegally shipped over 20 tons of explosive plastique—almost the entire U.S. surplus available at the time—to Libya on passenger flights, marked as "drilling mud").

The Wilson/Terpil affair is still news: Eugene Tafoya, currently on trial for the attempted assassination last year of a Libyan student opposed to Qaddafi, claims he was working for the CIA and that Wilson was his agency contact. Tafoya stayed for four months at an English farm owned by Wilson, and Tafoya's bank, telephone and personal records all indicate his connection to Wilson (*New York Times*, 2 November).

On Company Time?

It is interesting that while the American bourgeoisie is closing ranks behind a campaign to patch up the tattered moral authority of the U.S. secret police for the anti-Soviet war drive, the *New York Times* is pushing its exposé of Wilson and Terpil. For years neither the government nor the bourgeois press wanted to bring attention to this case. A *Washington Post* editorial noted with some pique that "four years ago reporter Bob Woodward disclosed information suggesting that at least a small handful of former covert operatives, including a man named Edwin P. Wilson and some anti-Castro Cubans" had "gone into the terrorism business" for Qaddafi. "The same story, elaborated, is enjoying a new life."

The case was forced into the open by one Kevin Mulcahy, a former CIA agent from a CIA-loyal family who worked for Wilson in Libya in 1976. After defecting from the operation, he went to the U.S. government to demand the Qaddafi connection be investigated. He

continued on page 9

"A Buck Is a Buck Is a Buck"

The dirty details of the CIA agent business have been compiled in the histories of Edwin Wilson and Frank Terpil. Wilson made a fortune in the covert action business, becoming a multi-millionaire while serving as a CIA operative and naval intelligence agent. A member of Washington's Georgetown Club, he had purchased his 2,000 acre gentleman's farm in Virginia (currently valued at over \$9 million) before he officially left the secret service. Here he entertained the Washington elite at fox hunts and harbecues.

"I'm just a little man here, a little man who runs a business," says millionaire Wilson from his Tripoli base, sounding like the Meyer Lansky figure in *Godfather II*. Wilson started off working for the CIA's office of

security in 1951, after a stint as a marine in Korea becoming a full-time CIA contract agent in 1955. Early on his assignment was as an officer of the Seafarers International Union, which he described as "an unwitting U.S. labor organization" (*New York Times*, 8 November). According to the *Times* account, "In his capacity as a union official, Mr. Wilson helped coordinate various C.I.A. activities against Cuba, including the Bay of Pigs invasion. He supplied foreign agents with arms and took part in operations designed to harass Fidel Castro...." He was also involved in the hunt for Che Guevara in Bolivia (*Los Angeles Times*, 28 August).

In 1971 Wilson joined "Task Force 157," a Navy covert action and spy group, while simultaneously setting up

private businesses with CIA associates and suppliers. There have also been allegations that Wilson was involved in the assassination of Chilean former ambassador Orlando Letelier. According to Donald Freed (*Death in Washington* [1980]) an investigation by the Institute for Policy Studies suggested Wilson as a possible supplier of the blasting caps (C-4 plastique explosive detonators) used by Michael Townley in the murder of Letelier. Freed states categorically that "Townley met with Frank Terpil one week before the Letelier murder...."

Wilson claims to have met Terpil, who set up the business with Qaddafi, at a party in 1976. A former CIA employee supposedly dumped in 1971, apparently either for counterfeiting money in Tibet or smuggling liquor into India, Terpil says, "A buck is a buck is a buck." He's patriotic, though: "If you're knocking off Americans it'll cost you 40 percent more," he told undercover agents posing as South

American guerrillas. Didn't help: a New York judge sentenced him *in absentia* to 53 years in prison last May on gun-running charges. Besides his Libyan operations, according to documents found in Ugandan ex-dictator Idi Amin's files after his overthrow, Terpil sold Amin \$3.2 million worth of equipment in August 1977, including explosives, tape recorders, remote-controlled radio detonators and a "variety of interrogation devices" (*Boston Globe*, 22 March).

Terpil told Mike Wallace on CBS's "60 Minutes" he sat through a state dinner in Uganda which began with Amin serving the severed head of an opponent on a silver platter. "He served the security problem on the plate," Terpil said with peculiar humor. "I think it was the defense minister, not too sure." The second course saw another minister fall into his soup, shot dead by Amin with a gun Terpil said he had given him.

In Poland today, history has become a political battlefield of the class struggle. American liberal academic Robert Darnton reported that "when the strikers in Gdansk met to assess their victory over the government last August [1980], they discussed not only practical questions about how to organize their new union but also the need for a 'new history'" ("Poland Rewrites History," *New York Review of Books*, 16 July 1981). "New history" turns out to be an interpretation of the Polish past to reinforce the present nationalist, pro-Western and anti-Soviet fervor of Solidarność.

One of the most controversial questions, reports Darnton, is the Warsaw Uprising of 1944:

"A film shown every day in the Warsaw Historical Museum shows German troops leveling the city after the uprising of 1944. Finally the Soviet troops liberate the rubble, having been detained on the east bank of the Vistula, as official history would have it, by overextended lines of communication. According to accounts that circulate by word of mouth, the 'liberators' let the Germans do their dirty work for them, in order to encounter no opposition when they extended their empire to the west. That version is generally accepted in the West, but nothing could be more heretical in Communist Poland...."

This "history" is anything but new. Rather, it is an old anti-Soviet myth which has been peddled for years by "captive nations" emigrés and Radio Free Europe. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, premier of the Polish capitalist exile government in London during World War II, gives the standard version in his book, *Rape of Poland*. Mikolajczyk refers to the Red Army as being "in the suburbs of Warsaw from which it wouldn't budge." He implies that *if they had wanted* to the Russians could have easily captured Warsaw and saved the city from destruction, also saving the lives of many of the 300,000 Poles who died in the two months of fighting.

But it is not just the Pilsudskite emigrés who push this tale. The London-Polish version is accepted without qualification by "third camp" social democrats, like those of the British International Socialists:

"Stalin's fear of any kind of spontaneous action was demonstrated clearly in August 1944 when an armed insurrection against the Germans broke out in Warsaw. Although the initial decision was taken by Poles exiled in London, the rising was a magnificent display of courage and mass activity. Not only did Stalin refuse to alter the plans of the Red Army to liberate Warsaw; he even refused to allow British planes to use Russian airfields to bring arms and supplies to the insurgents. The Germans were given a free hand to burn and massacre. The callowness of the Russian leaders can be explained only by the fact that they were concerned to prevent at all costs the emergence of any anti-Nazi movement that was not under their political control."

—Jan H. Birchall, *Workers Against the Monolith* (1974)

What is the truth? The evidence indicates that it was heavy German counterattacks, not conscious Russian sabotage, that prevented the Soviets from entering Warsaw in early August 1944. Whether the Red Army could have smashed through the panzer ring to link up with the insurgents while fighting was still underway in Warsaw is less certain. What is clear, however, is that this did not begin as a spontaneous revolt. The Polish bourgeois exile government in London and the pro-London leadership of the Home Army (Armija Krajowa—AK) launched a criminal adventure whose purpose was to *prevent* the Red Army from liberating Warsaw. They wanted to receive the Soviets as a sovereign authority, resting on the laurels of a victory won (ostensibly) by a people in arms, in order to assure the capitalist politicians of prewar Poland a place in a postwar government. But at no point did the Home Army possess the strength to defeat or even hold the Nazis militarily; their only hope was a German collapse or a Red Army victory. It was an anti-

Exploding the Anti-Soviet Myth

The Warsaw Uprising of 1944



Ullstein Bilderdienst

300,000 dead, 90 percent of Warsaw devastated by Nazis: anti-Communist Polish "Home Army" leadership must share responsibility.

Communist gamble that backfired—with horrendous consequences.

Storm Against the East

The political strategy which motivated the Home Army's Warsaw Uprising had been formulated long before. The "doctrine of two enemies," namely against both Germany and Russia, had been articulated by AK commander Grot-Rowecki as the strategy of the internal resistance even while the London exile government was formally allied with the USSR against the Hitler regime. Fearing the assumption of power by a pro-Moscow regime in postwar Poland, the pro-London AK commanders refused *all* cooperation with the Polish Workers Party (PPR)—established in 1942, some years after Stalin had dissolved the Communist Party of Poland on charges of Trotskyism—and with the PPR's partisan force, the People's Army (AL).

When the "doctrine of two enemies" was first put forward, the Nazis had complete control of Poland and were pushing to the gates of Moscow, Leningrad and Stalingrad. But as heroic battles by the Soviet Red Army against the German imperialist attack drove the Wehrmacht back, the Home Army's policy became openly one-sided... against the Soviets. The internal resistance issued a statement on 8 September

1943 declaring: "The Germans have ceased to be the No. 1 enemy.... The struggle against communism is today our essential task and perhaps even our only task." And AK's confrontations with the Communists were not restricted to a political level.

In 1943 Home Army commander Grot-Rowecki advocated anti-Soviet military operations—sabotage activities in the east, destroying lines of communication as far as the Vistula and San, pitched battles against the Soviets in areas where even minimal opportunities for success existed. In the event of decisive Soviet victory in the east Grot-Rowecki felt that the Home Army *should refrain from fighting the Germans, remain underground and await further developments*. This was the very tactic that the pro-London Poles accused the Russians of carrying out in Warsaw!

By the spring of 1944 a campaign of "intensified diversionary activity," code-named *Burza* (Tempest) was underway in the east under Home Army commander Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski (who succeeded Grot-Rowecki after his capture by the Gestapo in July 1943). Commanders were to carry out operations independently of Soviet forces: coordination with the Red Army would reduce the political impact that AK units would gain by posing as the

"liberator" of a particular city or town. Already, Bor-Komorowski was preparing for confrontation with the Soviets. On 19 April 1944 he wrote to the London government:

"...we must be prepared for an open collision between Poland and the Soviets, and on our part we would have to demonstrate to the full, in this collision, the independent position of Poland."

—quoted in Jan Ciechanowski, *The Warsaw Rising of 1944* [1974]

The Preparations

Burza failed in the east. After the Soviet army occupied Wilno and Lwow, the London Poles looked upon Warsaw as the last chance for a major battle with the Germans. The Warsaw Uprising was to be a final confrontation with Stalin to assert the hegemony of the Home Army and prepare for the postwar return of the London government. When AK commander Bor-Komorowski asked for authorization from his political superiors the question was formulated: "Whether the representatives of the Council of National Unity believe that the entry of the Soviet troops into Warsaw should be forestalled by the seizure of the capital by the Home Army?" And General Monter, Home Army commander in the Warsaw region during the rising, later wrote:

"The political aim was to be achieved by the seizure of the capital by our own forces before the entry of the Red Army. In the liberated capital of the sovereign state, power over the entire country was to be assumed by the legal authorities.... The idea was to manifest to the entire world that the Government was in its place and that there was no need for the installation of candidates imported from the East to govern the country."

—quoted in *ibid.*

As for the timing, according to Ciechanowski: "Bor-Komorowski and his staff feared that procrastination on their part might lead, at the moment of the Red Army's entry into the city, to a spontaneous or Communist-inspired outbreak of fighting, impossible for them to control or exploit." Or, as one of the AK commander's chief lieutenants put it, "After five years of bloody German occupation the hearts of the inhabitants of the Polish capital would have been open to temptation"—of supporting a Communist-led Soviet-backed insurrection. A participant in the uprising recorded in his diary the response of Home Army soldiers to an



Der Spiegel

Polish Red Army Marshal Rokossovsky in liberated Lublin, 1944.

announcement by Radio Moscow that the liberation of Warsaw was at hand: "We have been sitting here for almost a week, and now the Communists are going to beat us to the fight" (Julian Kulski, *Dying We Live* [1979]).

The political purpose of this action was clear, but what of the military situation? On 14 July 1944 the AK commander reported to London, "In view of the present state of the German forces in Poland and their anti-insurrectionary preparations...the rising has no prospect of success." Their arms were wholly inadequate—almost no mortars and antitank guns of any sort, and a large part of their stock of submachine guns and ammunition had been sent east for the failed *Burza* campaign. Yet on 21 July 1944, Bor-Komorowski ordered AK troops on a "state of alertness for the uprising." This decision coincided with the formation in Lublin of the Polish Committee of National Liberation, which was supported by the Polish Communists and backed by the Soviet Union. The Lublin committee would act as a provisional government and nominal head of a new Polish army resulting from a merger between Polish forces recruited in Russia and the Polish Communists' AL.

On July 26 Mikolajczyk in London authorized the Home Army to launch a general insurrection when appropriate. On July 31 the Home Army command met to discuss the possibility of beginning operations in Warsaw. Bor-Komorowski reported on the military situation: in view of the state of the German forces in Warsaw, estimated at 12 first-class divisions (including two crack SS armored divisions), and the Home Army's lack of weapons and ammunition (only enough for 3-4 days), operations planned for the last day of the German retreat were not feasible in the immediate future. Yet later that day Bor-Komorowski issued the order to prepare the rising after receiving a report (incorrect as it soon turned out) that Russian tanks were already arriving in Praga, the eastern suburb across the Vistula from Warsaw.

The decision to act was influenced by the false assumption that the Germans would abandon Warsaw under the first

Soviet attack. The London leaders thought the Nazi regime was on the point of collapse, that the defeats in the East which had led to the destruction of 25 German divisions, Anglo-American successes in Normandy and an attempt on Hitler's life in late July signaled catastrophe for the Germans. But they were wrong.

The Uprising

The success of the Warsaw operation depended on the Polish victory being secured by the Red Army. The timing of the rising was therefore critical, and close military coordination between the Home Army and the Soviets was of the greatest importance. But the Poles deliberately had *no communication* with the Russians. In fact they had cut all lines to the PPR-led partisans in Warsaw. It was from Mikolajczyk (who was in Moscow at the time for talks with Stalin) that the Russians first learned of the Home Army's plans for Warsaw on July 31, *three hours after Bor-Komorowski had given the order to begin*. Not even the command of the People's Army detachments in Warsaw had been informed of the uprising, but their units immediately joined the fight once it had begun.

Bor-Komorowski's call to arms coincided, not with the crossing of the Vistula by the Red Army, but with heavy German counterattacks on the advancing Soviet troops. The Wehrmacht command decided to throw in all its reserves to stop the Russians. On July 30 the right flank of the First Byelorussian Front clashed with the Germans on the approaches to Praga, east of the Vistula. On August 1 the Second Soviet Armored Army was forced to break off its attack here and go on the defensive. The left flank of the First Byelorussian Army managed to cross the Vistula 60 kilometers southeast of Warsaw. German attacks did not dislodge the Russians, but they were unable to extend the bridgeheads.

In the next weeks, 50,000 Polish combatants fought alone in desperate conditions. The Soviet army was thrown back from Praga by the German counteroffensive "nearly 100 kilometers" (65 miles) according to the Soviet



Eastfoto

Soviet-sponsored Polish army reaches devastated Warsaw, 1945.

commander, Marshal Rokossovsky. Moscow refused to allow English and American aircraft to land on Soviet territory after dropping supplies to the AK insurgents because it "did not wish to associate themselves either directly or indirectly with the Warsaw adventure" (Foreign Minister Vyshinsky). However, the British *did not intend to send supplies* and Bor-Komorowski was informed of this two days *before* the uprising (Ciechanowski, *The Warsaw Rising of 1944*). The first supplies from the West were air-dropped only three weeks after the outbreak of the fighting, and 2,000 Polish paratroopers in England who volunteered to go to Warsaw were refused permission (*Militant*, 25 November 1944). From mid-September Soviet airplanes dropped considerable arms, food and other materiel on Warsaw, but by then it was too late.

The Red Army finally captured Praga on September 14, and between

September 16 and 19 General Z. Berling, commander of the new Soviet-sponsored Polish army, managed to put across the Vistula and into the Czerniakow district of Warsaw six battalions. These battalions were instructed to make contact with the insurgents in that district, carry out reconnaissance and create a bridgehead. But Warsaw is a natural strong point, situated on bluffs overlooking the floodplain of the Vistula, and overwhelming German artillery fire prevented their success. The forces that had been able to cross were beaten back to a narrow strip along the river, and on September 21 Marshal Rokossovsky decided to withdraw the forces with heavy casualties.

The initial Home Army attack within the city itself was met with blistering German resistance. The AK suffered heavy losses and was forced to call off the attack. As early as the second day it

continued on page 10

Cannon vs. "Third Campism" on the Warsaw Uprising

The initial response of the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party (SWP) in the United States to the Warsaw Uprising was an editorial (*Militant*, 5 August 1944) hailing the Warsaw workers who "have not fought for the predatory interests of British imperialism and its Polish henchmen of the London 'government-in-exile.' Nor have they battled in order to submit to the reactionary rule of Stalin's bureaucracy and his Polish puppets." A second *Militant* (19 August 1944) editorial, entitled "Warsaw Betrayed," claimed:

"No sooner did the Red Army approach the outskirts of Warsaw, than the Warsaw proletariat rose up and arms in hand, launched a full-scale battle to drive out the Nazi oppressors...."

"Undoubtedly, the Warsaw proletariat expected that the Red Army would hasten its assault on the city, and thus through their joint efforts, from within and without, the Nazi tyrants would be driven out and destroyed."

"But instead of launching more energetically the military onslaught and redoubling their efforts, the Red Army attack was brought to a sudden standstill, by order of Stalin's generals...."

"The Warsaw proletariat must draw the lessons.... Only through their independent revolutionary actions will they be able to organize fraterni-

zation with the Red Army soldiers and help the Soviet masses to settle accounts with the bloody Bonapartist dictatorship of Stalin."

This line, which uncritically accepted Western accounts of the Warsaw Uprising, put forward in particular by Churchill, was sharply challenged within the party. A letter written on 16 August 1944 by an associate of James P. Cannon (the founder of American Trotskyism, then imprisoned for the SWP's revolutionary opposition to the imperialist Second World War) was sent to the Political Committee protesting this abandonment of the party's unconditional defense of the Soviet Union:

"In our opinion, the editorial on Poland in the August 5 *Militant* falls into error through a tendency to leap over the incompleteness of European events—the Soviet Union's life and death struggles against the armies of Hitler. 'With their own armed forces they [the Polish workers] must continue their independent revolutionary struggle' the editorial states, and adds in a later paragraph 'against all the agents...of the counter-revolutionary Stalinist bureaucracy.' This sweeping statement can be understood as implying armed struggle against the Red Army.... We must not forget that as long as the Red Army remains locked in combat with the armies of a capitalist Germany, our slogan 'Unconditional defense of the Soviet

Union' retains its full content, regardless of Stalin's counter-revolutionary policies in occupied areas beyond the Soviet borders."

A second letter from Cannon's associate dated 23 August 1944 protested:

"The August 19 *Militant* editorial, 'Warsaw Betrayed,' goes even further afield than the previous editorial we wrote about in muddling up our line of 'Unconditional Defense of the Soviet Union' in the struggle against the Nazi-imperialist invaders. To call upon the revolutionary Polish workers to 'organize fraternization' with the Red Army soldiers, as the editorial does, is to think in terms of establishing contact with the rank and file of a hostile military force. But the Polish workers must be the allies of the Red Army in its war against Hitler's armies, no matter how reactionary Stalin's policy is.... The editorial also takes for granted a version of the Warsaw events about which there is little information, none of it reliable and many uncertainties. A full-scale battle against the Nazis by the Warsaw proletariat is assumed, as is the 'order of Stalin's generals' in halting the Red Army attack on the city. The Moscow charge that the London 'Polish government in exile' ordered the uprising without consulting the Red Army command is brushed aside without being clearly stated, much less analyzed in the light of the current Soviet-Polish negotiations. No consideration is given to the question of whether or

not the Red Army was able at the moment to launch an all-out attack on Warsaw in view of its long-sustained offensive, the Nazi defensive preparations along the Vistula, the necessity to regroup forces and mass for new attacks after the not inconsiderable expenditure of men and material in reaching the outskirts of Warsaw, the fact that there was a lull along virtually the entire Eastern front concurrent with the halt before Warsaw, etc. Nor does the editorial take up the question of the duty of the guerrilla forces—and in the circumstances that is what the Warsaw detachments are—to subordinate themselves to the high command of the main army, the Red Army, in timing such an important battle as the siege of Warsaw. On the contrary, the editorial appears to take as its point of departure the assumption that a full-scale proletarian uprising occurred in Warsaw and that Stalin deliberately maneuvered to permit Hitler to crush the revolt."

It is remarkable how these two letters, described in an SWP Internal Bulletin as written "in the name of Martin [Cannon] and his collaborators," focus precisely on the crucial fallacies of the anti-Soviet myth of the Warsaw Uprising. Most important, however, is the political heart of Cannon's critique.

The Warsaw Uprising of 1944 posed one of the first battles between the Trotskyist majority of the SWP, led by Cannon, and the Goldman-Morrow minority which had succumbed to the democratic pretenses of Anglo-American imperialism. A. Roland (Jack Weber) explains the background of the Martin (Cannon) letters on the Warsaw Uprising: "Those members of the

continued on page 10

Trotskyism and the Labor Party Question

"Dump the Bureaucrats! For a Workers Party!"

We reprint below a transcription of a talk on the labor party question given by comrade James Robertson of the Spartacist League Central Committee at a 5 October 1972 internal youth educational in Boston. The speech centers on the SL slogan, "Oust the Bureaucrats! Build a Workers Party, to Fight for a Workers Government!" and is directed against various reformists and centrists who look to the American union bureaucracy to form a reformist labor party. This program is not only absurd (the Meanyite gang of labor fakers will never break with the bourgeois parties), it is reactionary.

The "labor party question" has long engendered controversy in the American socialist movement. As pointed out below, it is the American version of the united front, a tactic for revolutionaries to gain authority through the struggle for proletarian unity against the capitalist class. The slogan was suggested by the Comintern in 1922 as a way to bridge the gap between the small size of the communist vanguard in the U.S. and the need for an independent political party representing the interests of the working class. However, this correct objective was soon perverted as opportunist leaders of the CP used it to justify their reformist maneuvering for a "farmer-labor party" in 1924. After this fiasco, the labor party slogan was shelved until the 1930s.

At the beginning of that decade the expelled Trotskyist Left Opposition of the CP rejected the call for a labor party in the belief that American workers could make a leap over the heads of the arch-reactionary AFL craft union leadership. In contrast, the former CP Right Opposition, the Lovestoneites, were always agitating for a labor party "in general"—so much so that they were commonly dismissed as the "labor-party

some seven or eight years ago—whether we should favor a labor party or not, whether we should develop initiative on this score—then the prevailing sentiment was not to do it, and that was absolutely correct. The perspective for development was not clear. I believed that the majority of us hoped that the development of our own organization [would] be more speedy. On the other hand I believe no one in our ranks foresaw during that period the appearance of the CIO with this rapidity and this power."

—"Discussion in Mexico City, April, 1938," in *Leon Trotsky on the Labor Party in the United States*

The Trotskyists underlined that the labor party slogan was inseparable from a revolutionary program. As Trotsky had put it, "A Marxist, a proletarian revolutionist, cannot present himself before the working class with two banners. He cannot say at a workers' meeting: 'I have a ticket for a first-class party and another, cheaper ticket for the backward workers'" ("Letter from Prinkipo, Turkey, May 19, 1932"). In raising the call for a labor party in 1938, the SWP did so on the basis of "a program of revolutionary transitional demands":

"We propose, in order to advance the Labor party movement toward class struggle and not class collaboration, that you [the workers] adopt a program calling for workers' control of production, for militant Labor Defense Guards to protect our democratic rights and combat fascism, for the expropriation of the industrial and financial dictators of the country, etc., etc."

—James Burnham and Max Shachtman, "The Question of a Labor Party," reprinted in *WV* No. 248, 25 January 1980

This program retains its validity today in the struggle to break the stranglehold of the pro-capitalist labor traitors on the workers movement. Under present conditions, the labor party tactic is essentially a propagandistic expression of working-class independence, as part of the struggle for a workers government.

For the many varieties of reformists and centrists, however, the labor party slogan has commonly been applied as a way to capitulate to the union bureaucracy. In the early 1970s the Healyite political handits of the Workers League (WL)—whose rightward motion eventually took them out of the workers movement altogether to become messengers of Libyan Islamic dictator Qaddafi—ludicrously projected a "labor party" based on complaints against the Democratic Party from George Meany and Steelworkers head I.W. Abel. A typical headline of the WL's *Bulletin* (17 July 1972) trumpeted: "AFL-CIO Tops Threaten Labor Party at Miami." No matter to these cynics that Meany/Abel represented the most reactionary wing of American labor officialdom, protesting that the Democrats had been invaded by commies, pinkos, homosexuals and women's libbers! The Healyites' call was for a party of racist Cold War anti-Communism.

Recently there has been a flurry of "labor party" talk from some union tops as they found it difficult to sell the unappetizing bourgeois "alternatives," Reagan and Carter. In California, state



NYC Labor Day march, September 7: SL called on labor to shut down the airports.

AFL-CIO secretary-treasurer John Henning endlessly threatens to "consider" a labor party while remaining a close ally of Democratic governor Jerry Brown. Last year Machinists leader William Winpisinger theatrically walked out of the Democratic convention (wearing a "Kennedy in '84" button!), and instantly reformists from the CP to the now anti-Trotskyist SWP heralded Wimpy's cheap talk about a labor party (see "Social Democrats' Labor Party Hoax," *WV* No. 269, 28 November 1980). And this September, when the union tops mobilized 500,000 demonstrators in Washington to listen to empty anti-Reagan rhetoric, virtually every fake-socialist in the country waved the "labor party" as their solution—devoid of a class-struggle program against the sellout bureaucrats, of course.

Meanwhile, the ghost of "labor-party parties" past has emerged in the shape of the Revolutionary Workers League (RWL), a centrist-posing lash-up of the Ann Arbor cult/sect of Peter Sollenberger and a tiny ex-Healyite clot in the Bay Area, Steve Bryant's now-defunct Socialist League Democratic-Centralist (SL-DC). The Sollenbergerites are wont to lift Spartacist slogans out of *WV*, while carefully stripping away the communist cutting edge. Thus an RWL/SL-DC joint leaflet for the May 3 El Salvador demonstrations repeated the SL call to dump the bureaucrats, break with the Democrats and build a workers party. But one of their fusion documents, "Resolution on the Struggle for a Labor Party in the U.S.," contains only a pro-forma criticism of sections of the union bureaucracy, and elevates the labor/workers party from a tactic to a "decisive question for the American working class." Regardless of historical circumstances, the RWL is committed to a labor party:

"While we fight for socialist policies as the program of a workers party, Trotskyists must critically support the formation of a mass workers party, even if that party initially lacks a clear socialist program."

—*Fighting Worker*, July 1981

For the RWL, a labor party, even an anti-communist reformist labor party, is a necessary stage which the American working class must go through. And here they are in direct contradiction to Trotsky, who wrote in 1932:

"I will never assume the responsibility to affirm abstractly and dogmatically that the creation of a labor party would be a 'progressive step' even in the United States, because I do not know under what circumstances, under what guidance, and for what purposes that party would be created. It seems to me more probable that especially in America, which does not possess any important traditions of independent political action by the working class (as Chartism in England, for example) and where the trade union bureaucracy is more reactionary and corrupted than it was at the height of the British Empire, the creation of a labor party could be provoked only by mighty revolutionary pressure from the working masses and by the growing threat of Communism. It is absolutely clear that under these conditions the labor party would signify, not a progressive step but a hindrance to the progressive evolution of the working class."

—"Letter from Prinkipo"

But one can't accuse the RWL of ignorance. Its Healyite "method" of calling on the present union bureaucracy to form a reformist labor party comes straight from Bryant, who once wrote that "Trotsky's initial perspective towards the Labor Party question was very similar to the sectarianism of the Trotskyist movement today" (*Labor News*, January 1976).

Over the years, Bryant has consistently opposed any "sectarian" program for his Meanyite labor party—even busing for school integration! Today the



Fake-lefts tall Democrat "socialist" IAM president William Winpisinger, who talks "labor party" while stabbing PATCO in the back.

party." As labor struggles picked up, in 1934 there were three citywide general strikes (Minneapolis, San Francisco, Toledo) led by ostensible socialists and communists. But then came the rise of the mass industrial unions, and in 1938 the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party (SWP) revived the labor party slogan. Even so, Trotsky did not repudiate their earlier stand:

"When for the first time the League [Communist League of America, the U.S. Trotskyist organization in the early 1930s] considered this question,

RWL's Bay Area Committee for a Labor Party spends its time trying to get John Henning to run for public office. But a reformist labor party led by the Hennings and Wimpisingers would mean a stab in the back for the air controllers, the miners and any other workers who dare to wage militant labor action. A class-struggle workers party will be built over the political corpse of the "labor lieutenants of the capitalist class."

This report is intended to be a presentation of a series of interlocked home-truths and a comment on the search for deviations, of which in a hardened way we seem to have discovered only two. Its origins are that in the West Coast Labor Day pre-conference discussion the issue of the labor party quite thoroughly dominated the discussion. A great deal of uncertainty, confusion and a very considerable spread of opinion on the labor party question presented themselves there, and we had to thrash them out.

At this point the slogan which I have been defending and want to defend here is the slogan "Dump the Bureaucrats! For a Workers Party Based on the Trade Unions." Another slogan which was debated and which presents an aspect of rank and file-ism, of syndicalism, would be the slogan "For a Labor Party Without Bureaucrats." Now that slogan lacks the contradictory tension of a struggle and suggests simply rank and file-ism and possibly, by implication, the development of an organized, mass workers party counterposed to the trade unions: perhaps the political equivalent of the red unions of the CP's third period.

I gather that on the Coast there is perhaps a comrade who objects to the first part of the slogan, "Dump the Bureaucrats," and just wants to have a slogan "For a Labor Party Based on the Trade Unions." In New York there is a comrade who just wants to have the slogan "Dump the Bureaucrats! For a Communist Party."

There is a great deal of confusion. The confusion centers along two separate axes, and that's why it's a great deal of confusion, or rather, complicated confusion. Furthermore, in the last debate in New York, I spent all my time in the decisions of the Third and Fourth Congresses [of the Communist International]. I'm going to evade that this time and simply point out that the labor party slogan is the current American version of the issue of the united front. It's posed in the absence of a massive political expression of reformism or Stalinism in the United States. Rather, with the organization of industrial unions with a deeply committed pro-capitalist trade-union bureaucracy, it is toward them [that] the issue of proletarian unity and the process of communist triumph in struggle is centered on the labor party question.

There are two axes of confusion over the labor party. One is the importance of realizing that this is a propagandistic demand for us today, which has no relationship to what will happen in the future. That is, today, the Workers League to the contrary notwithstanding, the idiots who think that Meany because he does not like Negroes, homosexuals or abortion laws is therefore building a labor party in order to carry out these anti-capitalist demands—it's nonsense. There has to be a sense of proportion, which the Communist Party originally lost in 1924. In the first place, the labor party is not the issue for propaganda. The workers government is. Now we stumbled into this. If you read the early issues of *Workers' Action*, you will find out that the final, triumphant, ultimate statement of position in the *Workers' Action* program was for a labor party. Uh-uh. We are for a workers government, in the unions, in the plants and in



SWP trade-union leader Farrell Dobbs meets Leon Trotsky in Mexico: "What counts is the content of the labor party"—Trotsky.

our general education and approaching students with the conception of proletarian power. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a formulation which suffers certain problems. A popular understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat is that the workers are going to be put into concentration camps, like in Russia. If you talk of some kind of socialism, you get an image of happy Sweden maintaining its high alcoholism and suicide rates through victoriously staying out of two world wars. [Laughter] But what should be clear in every way, over every kind of issue, is that the working people need their own government.

But—how do you get a government? That implies a political party of the working people—a class party. And it is as a subordinate element of the achievement of a workers government, which is an algebraic expression, as the saying goes, for the concrete realization of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that they require a workers or a labor party, which in its concrete, arithmetical expression is a revolutionary labor party: a Bolshevik party.

That's a propaganda presentation.

Now what's really going to happen in this country? Who knows?... Only [NCLC guru] Lynn Marcus. [Laughter] I'll give you some variants.

One is: we have an unpolitical, extremely combative working class, with a bureaucracy that at present and without the aid of a thousand YSAers, is incapable at any serious level of struggle of controlling this class. Part of the residue of the enormous class struggles in Europe is the presence of an extremely sophisticated, able, political bureaucracy in depth. Can you imagine the capacity of a George Meany to cope with an American general strike the way that the CP did in France in '68? It's

impossible. Which is where [SWP honcho] Jack Barnes and his gang think they've got their opening.

So it's entirely possible now, as indicated in the fundamental premises of the Transformation Memo, now that American hegemony has been lost, reducing the United States to merely a very effective, the most powerful of the capitalist/imperialists and with the fundamental preconditions for severe social crisis laid down on the planet, that the American working class may be impelled into massive political actions without a party, without a revolutionary party, without any party at all and overwhelm the bureaucracy. That will be in the best case a fruitful catastrophe, rather akin to the Paris Commune and the 1905 Revolution. It is not something, therefore, that we work for. But as a smaller propagandistic group we'll do our job. If it comes to that, if we are unable to have the capacity as revolutionists to place ourselves at the head of insurgent masses, we will fight anyhow, even if we have to go through an experience as the Spartakusbund did in 1918/1919. The next time around it will be different, then.

That's a possibility—that's if the motion at the base in the class accelerates.

It is possible to go to the other extreme—given an orderly, stretched-out intensification of social crisis, the capacity of the growing communist movement to keep ahead of developments, a thing which had begun to suggest itself classically in 1934 in this country when three [ostensibly] communist organizations led three city-wide general strikes (in Toledo, San Francisco and in Minneapolis): the possibility that the communist party could simply grow in linear fashion.

The other possibility would be the

realization of a labor party either of a revolutionary or of a reformist character. That is, under the accumulated mounting pressures of social struggle, the bureaucracy begins to be torn asunder through the pressure from below, [from] developing class antagonisms, and it becomes stretched. With a successful communist agitation at the same time, the labor party could be formed in what will be a very convulsive act.

What is behind so much of the conceptual garbage that the Workers League puts out is that the labor party is an easy thing. (By the way, there's a book by Henry Pelling, *Origins of the Labor Party*, which is useful for guidelines.) If you study the history of the achievement of political class consciousness by any proletariat, you'll see that it is a convulsive, historically monumental act—sometimes compressed, sometimes stretched out—but always enormous in character, even if the outcome after the dust begins to settle is the restabilization of a pro-capitalist bureaucracy. The impact of ripping the mass of the working people away from capitalism, so that the assertion is: we need a society in which the working people govern, the productive property is nationalized, is enormous. And on top of this is laid the reformist and Stalinist labor skates. That will be a convulsive period in American history, substantially larger than that of the sit-down period from '35 to '37.

But what will happen bears no particular relationship to our present advocacy, which is a way to pose the question of working people becoming the government and developing the political instrument to achieve this, to link up that objective, fundamental need with the present consciousness of the bulk of trade-union-conscious American workers. The attempts to telescope with "what ifs," as though there is a particular relationship, a linear connection, between what we say today and what will happen in mass motion is the source of a great deal of confusion and error.

I left open the question of the outcome, of the character of the labor party in the third case. In the Bay Area somebody said, "Ah, but how can there be a revolutionary labor party? Obviously by definition it's reformist." And immediately there came to mind the examples of the transformations of the Italian and French mass Socialist parties into Communist parties and, more engagingly, because of the similarity in name and origins, the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (Majority) is commonly taken to be a revolutionary labor party. But that depends on

continued on page 8



Trotskyists lead Minneapolis General Strike, 1934.

Labor Party...

(continued from page 7)

the relationship of forces in the development between the revolutionists and the reformists who associate themselves with such an insurgent move on the political plane—approximately the same way that John L. Lewis and a section of the AFL bureaucracy did with the CIO industrial organizing in 1935. So that's one kind of confusion.

The other axis of confusion is over the question of why advocate a labor party and what is the relationship between the advocacy of a labor party and its political character? Will it represent the general historic interests of the proletariat, i.e., be a revolutionary labor party or will it represent special, partial, narrow, limited, aristocratic, chauvinist and nationalist appetites within the proletariat, i.e., [be] a reformist labor party? And therefore, why advocate a labor party at all since it seems to have a kaleidoscopic character?

There is, of course, a perfectly good circumstance in which [our] present propagandist and limitedly agitational advocacy of a labor party would be abandoned. And that is if we began to see that a communist party began to be recognized by advanced sections of the proletariat, not even very large ones but significant layers, and had the capacity to struggle in a linear way, by bootstrap operation, to become the authentic and literal vanguard of the class. At that juncture we would probably see a section of the bureaucracy form a labor party very fast in an attempt to head this off. The progressive wing of the bureaucracy would counterpose the development of a labor party. And it would be necessarily, from its birth its essential purpose would be that of an anti-communist labor party. We would fight such a thing in every way. We would try to united-front it to death, we would denounce it to death, we would raid it to death, we would do everything we could to smash it in the egg at every step.

But that is a far cry from the present situation. It is literally not possible by qualitative orders of magnitude—not just one, but qualitative orders of magnitude—to advance at this juncture the Spartacist League as the answer to the felt mass problems of the proletariat. But those felt mass problems exist. [And] what does exist in a mass way is the trade-union movement. Therefore one can point out (and should!) that the trade-union movement, the economic organization of a section of the working class, has the responsibility to offer the political as well as the economic answers to the plight of the working people. And so it is an address made to that one institution that exists in the United States—the organized labor movement.

Now I've got a couple of other points to make in this connection. To go back

to the workers government slogan, which is the purpose of the labor party agitation, we should be clear what is meant by a workers government. It is nothing other than the dictatorship of the proletariat. There have appeared some speculations or projections either in a hypothetical way or at one point as an ephemeral possibility in history that a workers government is not simply a synonym for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Interestingly enough, in the formulations of the Fourth Congress of the Communist International, where there was a vagueness and an abstraction about the projection of the conditions under which a workers government would be achieved, both Hal Draper and Joe Hansen zeroed in on that material as they did on a phrase in the *Transitional Program* in order to "prove" that from the British Labour Party [government] of 1945 to [Ben Bella in Algeria] to Fidel Castro's Cuban government—[all] were workers governments.

The concrete possibilities that Trotsky posed in the *Transitional Program* were roughly of the following formulation: it is conceivable that under mass revolutionary pressure reformist elements might go much further in the direction of a workers government than they ever conceived they would at the outset. That was a "what if" question, a generalization on the following condition that took place in the Russian Revolution between February and October: the slogan of the Bolsheviks addressed to the Provisional Government, which was a coalition government of Social Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, the minuscule Trudoviks of Kerensky and the Kadet Party, that is, the Constitutional Democrats, the effective liberal bourgeois party, was the slogan "Down with the ten capitalist ministers, form a government purely of the workers parties," coupled of course with the social and political and economic demands that the Bolsheviks were raising. Posed in a "what if" way, the question is, what if under mass pressure the Kadets had been thrown out of the government? You would have a murky period at that point, something not very stable, in the context of what already is inherently a historical episode of a dual power situation between a bourgeois government and the existence of organized nationwide soviets. What that would represent is not a workers government separate and apart from the dictatorship of the proletariat, but an episode immediately on the way. But of course the centrists make much out of non-viable episodes possible in the histories of revolutions in order to try to construct a sort of third camp between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the administration of a bourgeois state by the reformists.

Now another question's been raised, just lately: a useful question has been



George Meany, Lane Kirkland, Thomas Gleason. Reformists call on AFL-CIO superhawk Cold Warriors to form a labor party.

posed by comrade Seymour's article on the labor party, I think, because it's not a clear-cut case and it shows some problems in actual application. And that's the experience of the Communist Party in 1923-24 with the Farmer-Labor Party and the Federated Farmer-Labor Party and the general issue of the possibility of a bloc between the communists and, as Cannon put it, the progressive section of the labor movement. You know, apparently it is never too late to learn something, because after 25 years, while reading Seymour's piece, it suddenly occurred to me, Farmer-Labor Party—wait a minute, that's a two-class party, we're opposed to a two-class party, what the hell are we doing in a two-class party situation? "One step forward..." Furthermore, the thing has got to be reformist: because if you think, what kind of interests of both workers and farmers could be contained within a common program? The farmers produce their commodities, they sell them themselves, they're interested in high prices, squeezing out the middlemen, getting to the export market directly, all this kind of stuff is the economic program of the farmers. Sometimes of course farmers can be pretty restless and make a lot of trouble. But those interests of the workers that you could possibly put together could only be extremely narrow, the circumscribed interests of the American working class, even if you just sat down and said, "Let's cook up a Farmer-Labor Party." Necessarily it would have to be episodic and limited in a reformist way because there are a lot of antagonisms between petty- and not so petty-bourgeois producers, which is what farmers are, and the proletariat. And that's the key to what was wrong in 1924 with the Communist bloc with the Chicago Federation of Labor. From the outset it was preordained that the struggle was going to be for a reformist labor party, i.e., throwing in the farmers to boot. And it was on that basis that a bloc was constructed then: that the Communists would simulate a reformist party hoping to maneuver on the inside, courtesy of Brother Pepper. It's on that basis and probably from that experience that Shachtman wrote his excellent article in 1935, where he asked, "Who needs a second-class, fake, reformist, hidden Communist Party?"

Now we, for our part, should have no reason to be opposed to a bloc with a section of the labor movement, including the labor officialdom, providing that bloc goes in the direction we want it to go.

But looking back to 1923, on what basis for heaven's sake is this Chicago Federation of Labor going to give us what we want? That is, an agreement to struggle for a labor party together in the first place and in the second place to struggle with each other over the character of its program and its cadres. On that basis we'll make a bloc with people. If Meany says, "I'm for a labor party—you guys are for a labor party," fine: we'll all go and organize for a labor party and we'll fight like hell to

determine its program.

Yeah, we'd accept such a bloc and we'd fight—we'd seek such a bloc. The problem with a bloc is the nice old phrase of Bismarck that every alliance consists of two components—the horse and the rider. [Laughter] So that I do not know how we would realize the bloc because I'm afraid our projected horse would bolt. And the Communist Party clearly was doing the donkey work—or proposing simulating doing the donkey work for the trade-union officialdom except that they also wanted organization control by the Communists plus a reformist program. This is not in aid of anything, and that's the basic reason why they got such a mess out of it.

So that in reviewing the historical experience—we aren't ever for a Farmer-Labor Party—we oppose it. [But] a Farmer-Labor Party—it's not going to happen in America. An interesting point that James Burnham made in 1938: he said, "Comrades, the *Transitional Program* says that we should be for a workers and farmers government in the United States." But he observed already then, I believe, that there were more dentists than farmers in the United States, and therefore why not a workers and dentists government? [Laughter] Comrade Gordon waxes irate with me because I find the formula of a workers and "x" government very useful while on national tour. You know, there's a workers and students government if you're speaking on a campus—you go out to the military base, it's a workers and soldiers government, you know, and you gradually move through all sections of the population. I suppose in Berkeley a few years ago it would have been a workers and women's government. The final achievement is one that boggled my own mind. The Argentine Pabloists came out a few years ago for a workers and peoples government. [Laughter]

Well, we're for a workers and "x" government, all right, the problem with motley America is that "x" stands for a wide variety. But behind that is a truism: that the dictatorship of the proletariat will be centrally, but not simply or purely, proletarian. There is a wide layer of oppressed sections in American society—racially, ethnically, socially oppressed, ranging from old people to Latins, blacks, students, soldiers. This is quite real, it's quite true, although a workers and peoples government is not exactly the formulation that one wants. But it senses something that's particularly important: if one says a labor movement or a labor party right now, there is very good reason to see it right now in the most encrusted, aristocratic, racist, chauvinist, George Meany-like fashion. It's extremely important and one of the reasons for the formulation "Dump the bureaucrats! For a Workers Party!"

There's no difference in conception between a workers party based on the trade unions and a labor party based on the trade unions, except that the terminology projects a somewhat different conception. ■

SPARTACIST LEAGUE LOCAL DIRECTORY

National Office

Box 1377, GPO
New York, NY 10116
(212) 732-7860

Amherst

c/o SYL
P.O. Box 176
Amherst, MA 01004
(413) 546-9906

Ann Arbor

c/o SYL
P.O. Box 8364
Ann Arbor, MI 48107
(313) 662-2339

Berkeley/Oakland

P.O. Box 935
Oakland, CA 94604
(415) 835-1535

Boston

Box 840, Central Station
Cambridge, MA 02139
(617) 492-3928

Champaign

c/o SYL
P.O. Box 2009
Champaign, IL 61820
(217) 356-1180

Chicago

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

Cleveland

Box 6765
Cleveland, OH 44101
(216) 621-5138

Detroit

Box 32717
Detroit, MI 48232
(313) 866-9095

Houston

Box 26474
Houston, TX 77207

Los Angeles

Box 26282
Edendale Station
Los Angeles, CA 90026
(213) 662-1584

Madison

c/o SYL
Box 2074
Madison, WI 53701
(608) 255-2342

New York

Box 444
Canal Street Station
New York, NY 10013
(212) 267-1025

San Francisco

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

TROTSKYIST LEAGUE OF CANADA

Toronto

Box 7198, Station A
Toronto, Ontario M5W 1X8
(416) 593-4138

Vancouver

Box 26, Station A
Vancouver, B.C. V6C 2L8
(604) 681-2422

Labor: Protest Killer Cops!

Black Outrage in L.A.'s "Signal Hill"

LOS ANGELES—Black outrage continues to boil over the cop murder of Ron Settles last July in the mean little oil town of Signal Hill. Settles was a 21-year-old black college football star who was killed in his jail cell by local cops after being picked up for speeding. Scores of blacks and Chicanos suffer the same fate every year in the L.A. area. But Settles was not just another nameless, faceless victim of police terror. Five months after his death, protest demonstrations continue to draw hundreds of angry minority students and youth who are fed up with beatings and murder by the racist cops.

Now even the bourgeois press treats the Ron Settles murder as front-page news. They're afraid that this cold-blooded killing could trigger another Watts upheaval, so they try to head it off. They have reported the vicious brutality of Jerry Lee Brown, the uniformed thug who arrested Settles. They have documented the racism of the local police, the town's history of one-family rule. They want to make Signal Hill cops look like an isolated exception. But they are only small-town imitations of the notorious LAPD, which has killed more than a hundred victims (most of them black and Latin) in the last several years.

Even though a coroner's jury ruled that Ron Settles' death was homicide rather than the suicide claimed by the Signal Hill police, even though several cops have been granted immunity in exchange for testimony, district attor-

ney Van de Kamp still refuses to prosecute the killer cops. He says he needs two more months to review the evidence. Actually the DA just hopes that with a little more time the publicity and demonstrations will die down, and yet another cop killing of a black youth can be swept under the rug. In the last 29 years not a single policeman in Los Angeles has been prosecuted for murder.

A Countywide Coalition for Justice has called a march on Signal Hill for December 5. But cries of outrage are not enough—the issue is how to fight racist murder. Michael Zinzun, one of the main organizers of the protests, talks about black self-defense and then cynically helps organize a movement to replace the DA. Stokely Carmichael's black-nationalist AARPR calls to "pick up the gun or pick up the pen" to write your congressman! And once again Zinzun's Coalition Against Police Abuse along with the reformist Communist Party raises the impotent call for a civilian police review board. Investigations, boards, letters will do nothing. The killers are known. The point is to stop this racist cop terror.

The Spartacus Youth League (SYL) has actively participated in protests around the Settles murder. The SYL points out that in Reagan's America, cop terror is on the rise as union busting and race hate go hand in hand with the imperialist war drive against the Soviet Union. We call for labor and blacks to mobilize against racist attacks. It can be



SL/SYL protests Ron Settles murder in demo outside DA's office in Los Angeles, October 27.

done. Signal Hill is surrounded by the integrated industrial city of Long Beach with its docks and refineries. Labor demonstrated its strength last summer when 20,000 workers shut down Long Beach and San Pedro ports for one day to protest Reagan cutbacks. The powerful labor unions—ILWU, OCAW, Teamsters—many of them with large minority memberships, must lead the ghetto masses in the fight against racist murder.

The sadistic badge-toting killers in blue are spawned by the capitalist system. Their job is to keep labor and minorities down, to protect the life and property of the rich. Only through the struggle for socialist revolution against racist American capitalism can the deaths of Ron Settles and thousands of other victims of cop terror be avenged. Jail the killer cops! For labor/black mobilizations against racist terror! ■

Libya...

(continued from page 3)

hit a stone wall. The case was deliberately ignored as Wilson and Terpil expanded their activities in Libya. A mountain of evidence was available to prosecute Wilson and Terpil on obviously criminal charges. But the government refused to prosecute. Fearing for his life, Mulcahy blew the whistle so loud the government took up the case.

Yet it took four years to finally indict the pair in 1980 on federal charges that included illegal export of explosives as well as conspiracy and solicitation to commit murder. And even after Wilson and Terpil became fugitives they continued to travel freely in and about the U.S., Europe, Africa and the Middle East observed by many people, but never picked up. Wilson was even seen dining within a famous Washington restaurant with former employees. Terpil was able to jump bail. Hersh writes that the embittered Mulcahy is "deeply disturbed by what he regards as a monumental lack of resolve, competence and communication within the Federal Government in handling the case." Mulcahy and the *Times* are careful not to offer the more obvious explanation of a government cover-up.

Much of the story as presented by the *New York Times* is an attempt to show that former agent Mulcahy thought he was still working for the CIA, but that Wilson and Terpil were not agency, just "former" CIA agents. Thus the media campaign to "expose" Wilson/Terpil serves to limit the damage of this case to the U.S. secret police. For the ever-"responsible" *Times* the vexing problem is what to do about "rogue" retirees such as Wilson and Terpil. The *Boston Globe* article by Stephen Kurkjian and Ben Bradlee, published some months prior to the *Times* series, throws the same facts in a much sharper light:

"In the murky world of intelligence, few things are certain, but several elements of this case point to government

knowledge, if not participation, in the scheme.... Two civilian engineers conducting top-secret research for the CIA and other government agencies were given leaves from their jobs at the China Lake Naval Weapons Station in California to go to Libya, and later returned to their posts. And finally, a Green Beret at Fort Bragg was also given a leave from active duty to go to Libya, and military intelligence personnel at the base were thoroughly briefed on the affair at all times."

There is plenty of evidence to back up their suspicion of official complicity.

- Putting together a deal for some thousands of delayed-timer devices for explosives for Libya, Mulcahy and Wilson had meetings with Theodore G. Shackley, the deputy director of CIA clandestine operations.

- When the Libyan operation needed 300,000 timers, Wilson arranged a meeting at a Virginia bar. Mulcahy met there with long-time CIA supplier Scientific Communications Inc. At this meeting was William Weisenburger, a branch chief in the CIA. At the bar that night Wilson sat with senior CIA official Thomas Clines, with Mulcahy spending the night "table-hopping" as the plans were worked out.

- Kurkjian and Bradlee report that one of the Green Berets involved in setting up the military training camp in Libya became suspicious that the Wilson/Terpil operation might be the work of agents provocateurs, so he informed military intelligence at Fort Bragg of their overture. The *Globe* article quotes him: "I was told they had checked the operation out and there was nothing wrong with it.... They said it was legal and aboveboard and to go ahead and pursue it. I assumed that they meant I was going to do a job for the (CIA). I laid out the story to a colonel and he said to me, 'You're working for the agency.'" To participate in the project, the Green Beret was immediately granted a 30-day leave.

Even the *New York Times* (14 September) acknowledged that "although the agency has repeatedly denied any knowledge of or involvement in Mr.

Wilson's activities, questions linger about unofficial links between Mr. Wilson and senior agency employees. Some federal investigators believe that Mr. Wilson may have received tacit approval from agency officials to establish his ties to Libya in the hope that they would produce intelligence unavailable from other sources." And the CIA's own "plausible denial" on the Wilson/Terpil affair was practically an admission: "The investigation establishes that there was no official encouragement or involvement by the C.I.A.," said the agency statement (*New York Times*, 27 August). But what is official and unofficial in the underworld of "dirty tricks" by the imperialist spy agency? And what does it matter?

It has always been convenient for the murderous and illegal work of the CIA to maintain people of authority on and off its official payroll. To paraphrase the voice on the "Mission Impossible" tapes, it is understood that if caught the agency denies any responsibility. This has become more difficult as disaffected agents have begun to tell what they know. Moreover, after 1975, following the post-Watergate exposés of some of the CIA's dirty work, the agency was required by law to inform a leaky Congress about its covert actions. The CIA found it useful to maintain contract agents and a semi-permeable network of agents symbiotically connected to various "private" gun runners and businessmen, who it was generally understood had the blessings of the CIA. With Wilson and Terpil types the CIA has complete deniability.

And the "intelligence community" guards this practice very jealously. The same agency for whom no job of international terror is too large or small, from tapping phones and opening mail to the assassinations of heads of state and junta coups, becomes very concerned about the rights of citizens to sell C-4 plastique explosives, detonation timers and terrorist training on the international market. General Vernon Walters, former deputy director of the

CIA, now Reagan's ambassador at large to Latin American dictators, last year made \$300,000 for his role in one weapons deal. As far as attempts to restrict Wilson/Terpil activities, this top spy sounds like the white knight of the Bill of Rights: "I think that would be a restriction on the individual's freedom" (*New York Times*, 22 September). And even Alexander Haig, recently confronted with the Wilson/Terpil Libya connection at a House Foreign Relations Committee hearing, replied that after all it was a "free society."

There is now talk of laws to restrict the actions of "former" agents. The targets of this legislation are not Wilson and Terpil, but Philip Agee and other ex-CIA agents who publicly blow the whistle on their former employers. Hence the consummate hypocrisy of the ruling class striving to protect and cover up their dirty work, not least their blunders and stupidities. The more "mature," now geriatric, British rulers codified all this in their "Official Secrets Act." Now the CIA wants theirs. Down with secret police terror! ■

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Biweekly of the Spartacist League

24 issues—\$5
Introductory offer (10 issues) \$2
International rates: 24 issues—\$20 airmail/
\$5 seamail
10 introductory issues—\$3 airmail
—includes Spartacist

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____

Make checks payable/mail to:
Spartacist Publishing Co.
Box 1377 GPO
New York, NY 10116

Warsaw Uprising...

(continued from page 5)

was clear that only the entry of the Soviet troops could save the city. But as a result of the treacherous adventure of the Home Army leaders, the population now had no choice—it was fight to the end or die on their knees. Hitler ordered his commanders to wipe Warsaw off the face of the earth, which they proceeded to do. The Warsawians heroically continued the battle for two months despite terrific odds and extreme shortages of weapons, ammunition, food and water. When on October 2 Bor-Komorowski surrendered to the Germans he had only 10,000 soldiers left.

Three months later, the Russians crossed a now solidly frozen Vistula and entered a city of graves and ruins. Three hundred thousand had been killed during the fighting and nine-tenths of the city destroyed.

Stalin and the Warsaw Uprising

According to the London Polish government in exile, the Russians could have prevented this massacre, if they had wanted to. The Stalinist bureaucracy certainly *did* want to control and even avoid a popular rising, in favor of iron-fisted Russian military and bureaucratic control. But the destruction of Warsaw and its population was not part of their plan—it cost millions of rubles to rebuild the Polish capital. In response to a joint appeal from Roosevelt and Churchill warning Stalin of the repercussions of world public opinion “if the anti-Nazis in Warsaw are in effect abandoned,” Stalin replied on August 22:

“Sooner or later the truth about the group of individuals who have embarked on the Warsaw adventure in order to seize power will become known to everybody. These people have exploited the good faith of the inhabitants of Warsaw, throwing many almost unarmed people against the German guns, tanks and aircraft. A situation has arisen in which each new day serves, not the Poles for the liberation of Warsaw, but the Hitlerites who are inhumanly shooting down the inhabitants of Warsaw.

“From the military point of view, the situation which has arisen, by increasingly directing the attention of the Germans to Warsaw, is just as unprofitable for the Red Army as the Poles.”

—quoted in George Bruce, *The Warsaw Uprising*

Stalin’s comments in themselves are hardly decisive, but they are repeated even more emphatically by Marshal Rokossovsky, a Pole who had joined the Red Army during the 1918-21 Russian Civil War and was now commanding Soviet forces on the threshold of liberating the capital of his homeland. On August 26 he said that the Russians would have taken the city earlier in the month if it had been possible to do so. “A fearful mistake was made by the AK leadership,” he went on:

“Bor-Komorowski and the people around him have bailed in—*kak ryzhy v tsirke*—like the clown in the circus who pops up at the wrong moment and only gets rolled up in the carpet.... If it were only a piece of clowning it wouldn’t matter, but the political stunt is going to cost Poland hundreds of thousands of lives. It is an appalling tragedy, and now they are trying to put the blame on us. It makes me pretty sick when I think of the many thousands of men we have already lost in our fight for the liberation of Poland.”

—quoted in Alexander Werth, *Russia at War*

German accounts of the Warsaw Uprising corroborate the Russians’. General Heinz Guderian, then chief of the German General Staff, wrote in his memoirs (*Panzer Leader* [1951]): “We Germans had the impression that it was our defense which halted the enemy rather than a Russian desire to sabotage the Warsaw uprising.” He added, “The Polish uprising... had, from the enemy’s point of view, been begun too soon.” Most significantly, some later state-

ments by leaders of the Home Army agree with this assessment. According to Ciechanowski, officers of AK General Okulicki’s staff in October 1944 “un- equivocally ascribed the Russian failure to take Warsaw to ‘the general collapse of the Soviet offensive on the Vistula’”; in 1965 Bor-Komorowski wrote that the Germans had managed to “check the Russian attack on the capital” by August 5.

Once before, the Red Army had been stopped on the banks of the Vistula—in 1920, under Lenin and Trotsky, when no one doubted their will to take Warsaw and defeat Pilsudski’s French-backed anti-Soviet regime (see “The Bolsheviks and the Export of Revolution,” *Spartacist* No. 29, Summer 1980). Contrary to the anti-Soviet myth which has the Red Army leisurely waiting on the east bank while Warsaw freedom fighters were mercilessly slaughtered by German firepower during August-September 1944, this period saw some of the bloodiest fighting of the last year of the war. Between August 1 and September 15, the First Byelorussian Front took 166,000 casualties in Poland; in August alone the Second Ukrainian Front lost 122,000 men. Altogether 600,000 Red Army soldiers died fighting for the liberation of Poland from the Nazi yoke.

This historic achievement was made not by Stalin—who had repeatedly sought to conciliate the imperialists, both fascist and “democratic”—but by a Soviet army founded by Trotsky which for the second time fought a terrible war to defend the achievements of the October Revolution from obliteration. Many of its top officers were among those who held firm while Stalin, the gravedigger of revolutions, sabotaged the defense of the USSR. Marshal Rokossovsky, who commanded the Soviet troops at Warsaw, had been purged along with Tukhachevsky and other top Soviet generals in 1937. Later rehabilitated, he was among those who sounded the alarm in June 1941 when Stalin refused to believe Hitler was about to attack. And in October 1941 when the Generalissimo panicked and fled Moscow, it was Rokossovsky who saved the Soviet capital by throwing in the last reserves as they disembarked from the troop trains. This authentic Soviet war hero remarked: “Do you think that we would not have taken Warsaw if we had been able to do it? The whole idea that we are in any sense afraid of the AK is too idiotically absurd” (Werth, *Russia at War*).

But it was the Stalinists who ruled in the Kremlin, not Lenin and Trotsky, and the policy they dictated was that of nationalist bureaucrats rather than internationalist communists. The advance of the Red Army through Nazi-occupied East Europe unleashed revolutionary hopes among the working masses—and Stalin, along with the rest of the usurpers, feared an upheaval of the proletariat would “infect” the Soviet workers and threaten their own privileged position atop the socialized economic foundations of the bureaucratically degenerated workers state. That is why Stalin sold out the Greek revolution, tried to do the same in Yugoslavia and why the program of the Moscow-backed Lublin Committee pledged to uphold capitalist property.

We will never know the full truth about the Warsaw Uprising until the Soviet (and imperialist) military archives are open. Certainly it was German armor rather than Stalinist treachery that prevented the Russians from taking the Polish capital in early August. It is indisputable that the uprising was called for *counterrevolutionary* purposes. But once the fighting had begun, the existence of the Warsaw proletariat was at stake. This was nothing to a Stalin, a bonaparte who relied on the army’s guns not the workers’ will and ability to fight. For Trotskyists, however, the preservation of the proletariat is a vital goal; a genuine communist leadership would

have committed itself to relieving the city—if that were possible. Had they succeeded, the Red Army would have been welcomed with open arms—and then the AK generals would have tasted proletarian justice for their monstrous crime. Instead they became martyrs, to be used 35 years later by a new generation of anti-Soviet Polish nationalists in the service of capitalist counterrevolution.

Prologue-Epilogue

It was the politics of the London Poles and the anti-Communist Home Army leadership which led to the bloody massacre. They must share responsibility for the Nazi destruction of Warsaw and its inhabitants. Their hypocrisy in blaming the Russians is dramatically underscored by events which took place the year before. During the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising in 1943 the Home Army was guilty of the very act of which it later accused the Russians. AK officers stood by and watched the extermination of Warsaw’s Jews.

Then Home Army commander Grot-Rowecki argued that to rise against the Germans to help the Jews would result in terrible losses and only help the Soviets. This argument was merely a shallow cover for the virulent anti-Semitism of many of the Polish underground leaders. A bulletin published by Antyk (acronym for Anti-Communist Agency—an organ of the underground administration) in 1942 at the time of the great liquidation of the Warsaw ghetto (the transport of thousands of Jews to the gas chambers of Treblinka) said that Poles must not save “Jewish brats” or “curly Benjamins” and that the liquidation of the ghetto was bound to weaken the Communist movement in Poland and was therefore a “positive development” (Reuben Ainsztein, *The Warsaw Ghetto Revolt* [1979]). Antyk also published the names and addresses of Poles belonging to the Home Army whose crime was to take part in the work of the Council for Helping Jews. This information might as well have been turned over to the Gestapo directly.

Only under pressure from Jewish organizations abroad and the threat of publicity in the British press, did Grot-Rowecki recognize the Jewish Fighting Organization (ZOB) which led the anti-Nazi resistance in the ghetto. In December 1942, after repeated pleas, the Home Army command ordered ten (!) pistols with a small amount of ammunition to be supplied to the ZOB. Grot-Rowecki argued that providing the Jews with weapons was a waste since they wouldn’t know how or have the courage to use them! The rescue of 30 Jews from the ghetto sewers by an unknown Home Army detachment is the only known case confirming Bor-Komorowski’s claim that the AK saved some of the ghetto fighters.

When the Warsaw Uprising of 1944 broke out, Isaac Zuckerman, as commander of the ZOB, offered the services of the ghetto survivors to the Home Army command. After waiting 24 hours for a reply, Zuckerman was told that there was no room for Jews in the AK. As many as 2,000 Jews fought in this new uprising against the Nazi butchers. But those who fought in the Home Army units did so almost without exception under false names which they assumed when they became “Aryans.”

* * * * *

The agony of the Warsaw uprising has been portrayed in Andrzej Wajda’s film *Kanal*: the tragedy of a hopeless battle, which ended in the sewers just as in 1943; the heroism of many fighters (despite the perfidious calculations of their commanders, which are never mentioned). The epilogue is seen in another Wajda film, *Ashes and Diamonds*, which tells of a student veteran of the AK underground who (on orders) assassinates a popular Communist official in the turbulent days following liberation. In the months after the Soviets swept the Germans out of

Poland, this was a common occurrence as the Armia Krajowa became a network of anti-Communist terrorists. Bor-Komorowski’s successor, Okulicki, formally dissolved the Home Army in January 1945, but it was replaced by the secret NIE (for Niepodległość—Independence) organization, still headed by General Okulicki, which was responsible for the murder of over 100 Soviet army men and scores of officials of the PPR/Lublin Committee. The NIE was gradually mopped up; Okulicki was captured and tried in Moscow, but amnestied in 1946 as part of the negotiations for a short-lived coalition government. Only three years after the Soviet army’s victory did Stalin finally move to expropriate the Polish capitalists and landlords and carry out a bureaucratically controlled social revolution from above, in response to Washington’s Cold War offensive which began even before Germany and Japan capitulated.

This is the history of the Warsaw uprising that neither Solidarność nor the Stalinists will tell. ■

“Third Campism”...

(continued from page 5)

[Political] Committee who still held to the old line, who did not know what had transpired at the center [because they were locked up in Sandstone Federal Prison!], immediately recognized that there had been a change, one with which they disagreed” (“We Arrive at a Line,” [SWP] *Internal Bulletin*, December 1944). The “old line” was that of Soviet defensism against imperialism, despite the reactionary Stalinist bureaucracy. The “new line,” was, as Roland put it, that due to Red Army victories “our unconditional defense must begin to retire to the background.” So a good year before the defeat of Hitler, this revisionist tendency wanted to “retire” the defense of the USSR!

This anti-revolutionary program was not limited to East Europe. The Goldman-Morrow faction claimed that the main danger in the Fourth International was ultraleftism. Predicting a period of bourgeois-democratic illusions among the masses, based on the “less rapacious” character of American imperialism, they stressed “more democracy.” Their program for Italy was summed up in the slogan for a republic (Felix Morrow, “The Political Position of the Minority in the SWP,” *Fourth International*, May 1945). Thus while calling for armed struggle in East Europe “completely apart from, and in opposition to, the Stalinists” at a time when the Soviet Army was fighting crucial battles against the Nazis, in West Europe they considered calls for soviets “ultraleft” even as France and Italy were in the throes of revolutionary crises, the fascist and collaborator regimes in ruins and the economy shattered. It took the combined resources of American capitalism and Stalinist treachery to put West European capitalism back on its feet.

The Goldman-Morrow faction, represented by the *Militant*’s August 1944 editorials on the Warsaw Uprising, capitulated before “democratic” imperialism. It was not surprising, therefore, to find that they had engaged in secret discussions with Max Shachtman’s Workers Party, which refused to defend the USSR with the line that it was no longer a workers state of any sort. In May 1946 Goldman and Morrow left the SWP to join Shachtman’s WP, and after a brief sojourn went over to the bourgeoisie directly—Goldman politically, by joining the Cold Warrior Socialist Party, and Morrow financially in a quest for cash. Thus the political struggle over the Warsaw Uprising presaged a general battle for the Marxist political program of the Trotskyist movement. ■

Reagan...

(continued from page 1)

real take-home pay for the average worker has fallen 4.5 percent under Reagan, what about the incredible 14 percent decline under Carter between late 1978 and mid-1980! This nearly unprecedented fall in the living standards of U.S. workers was the work of union leaders who imposed "voluntary wage restraints" on their own members in the face of rapidly accelerating inflation. Such was the cost, in dollars and cents, of the labor movement's support to the Democratic Party.

Bosses Demand Givebacks

The founding father of American business unionism, Samuel Gompers, once summed up his philosophy of the labor movement as "more." Today in labor negotiations it is the capitalists who are demanding more from the unions and getting it. The *New York Times* (12 October) observes:

"Confronted with management assertions that jobs, plants and perhaps the viability of industries are at stake, labor unions are agreeing at what appears to be a record rate to reopen contracts and to accept reduced wages and benefits for their members."

The class traitors on the platform at the AFL-CIO convention have run the powerful American labor movement into the ground. Union membership, which was 25 percent of the workforce in 1970, is less than 20 percent now. Strikes are at the lowest level in decades, emboldening the bosses' anti-labor assault. The once-powerful United Auto Workers now has more than a quarter of its membership on the dole!

Pointing to the UAW's concessions in the 1979 Chrysler bailout, Ford and GM are now demanding that the union accept wage and benefit reductions making labor costs comparable to those in Japan. Other depressed industries like steel and rubber are extorting similar givebacks. Even the Teamsters, which used to posture as a tough business union which really delivered for its members, has offered to forego any wage increase in its upcoming master freight contract (with inflation this means a real wage cut).

In contrast to the union bureaucrats, social democrats and Stalinists who tied the workers' fate to a bankrupt Chrysler and relied on the capitalist government to bail it out, the Spartacist League advocated militant class struggle to defend the workers' interests. While the reformists called for the bourgeois "nationalization" of Chrysler, the SL said, Workers: Seize the plants! If Chrysler's broke, then sell it off and keep the proceeds. The seizure of Chrysler by its workforce could have sparked a class-struggle response to capitalist austerity, layoffs and plant closures.

Oust the Bureaucrats

Today the policies that built the

Spartacist League/ Spartacus Youth League Public Offices

—MARXIST LITERATURE—

Bay Area

Fri.: 5:00-8:00 p.m., Sat.: 3:00-6:00 p.m.
1634 Telegraph, 3rd Floor (near 17th Street)
Oakland, California Phone (415) 835-1535

Chicago

Tues.: 5:30-9:00 p.m., Sat.: 2:00-5:30 p.m.
523 S. Plymouth Court, 3rd Floor
Chicago, Illinois Phone: (312) 427-0003

New York City

Tues.: 6:00-9:00 p.m.
Sat.: 12:00-4:00 p.m.
41 Warren St. (one block below
Chambers St. near Church St.)
New York, N.Y. Phone: (212) 267-1025

Trotskyist League of Canada

Toronto

Sat.: 1:00-5:00 p.m.
299 Queen St. W., Suite 502
Toronto, Ontario Phone: (416) 593-4138

Racist Cop Terror in Battle Creek

DETROIT, November 25—A court inquest last week placed the stamp of approval on the racist murder of prominent black activist Robert Guy, Jr. in Battle Creek, Michigan. Guy, head of the local Coalition to End Police Brutality, was killed August 31 in an explosion outside the El Grotto Lounge. An all-white jury of the Calhoun County district court claimed that Guy died at his own hands, supposedly when a pipe bomb he was said to be carrying blew up in his face. But Coalition spokesmen insist he was killed in a planned assassination. According to the *Michigan Chronicle* (24 October):

"A woman companion told police, as they pulled into the El Grotto lot they noted three men in a black car. One got out and went behind a gray van, she said, and as Guy approached the Lounge, she heard a loud explosion and saw Guy fall. The man then re-entered the car and the occupants drove away laughing."

Robert Guy's death was the culmination of a long campaign of police violence and terror directed at Guy and other black activists in Battle Creek, a company town in southwestern Michigan owned lock, stock and barrel by the Kellogg Corporation. The racist police force is heavily infiltrated by the Klan—cops regularly stop black youths, put on KKK hoods and then beat them to a pulp. Even conservative black ministers, NAACP and city officials—as well as the Guy family—have had crosses burned on their front lawns. Guy's Coalition had futilely asked the Justice Department to intervene to curb the racists in blue. Indeed, things were so bad that the FBI put

the Battle Creek cops under "surveillance" for several years.

The cop vendetta against Robert Guy began several years ago when his brother Larry started investigating incidents of police brutality. Then a member of the youth group of the NAACP, Guy came across an autopsy report that revealed a black man had been shot in the back, contrary to police reports. Two years ago Larry Guy was beaten into unconsciousness by five cops who then planted a gun on him and sent him to prison for five years on a phony concealed weapons charge. Shortly after, two policemen were caught in the act of placing a car filled with explosives outside the Guy home. According to the *Chronicle*:

"Former police officer Larry Shoultice admitted that he and another officer, Bruce Harvey, had planned to throw dynamite on Guy's front lawn and shoot him when he came out of the house. As a result they were both asked to resign."

The two cops incredibly got off without legal action, and one is now a cop in Grand Rapids!

With Robert murdered and Larry in jail on frame-up charges, the Guy family has now received several anonymous phone calls threatening that "the rest of you" are next. This is how they stop courageous black activists from protesting cop terror in Kellogg's town. But these fighters of racist cop terror in Battle Creek must not stand alone! Michigan is a labor stronghold, and the unions—from the Grain Millers to the UAW with its many thousands of black members in the Detroit area—must take the lead in fighting the racists in white sheets and blue uniforms.

industrial unions in the 1930s are urgently necessary to prevent a throw-back to the days when unionists were shot down with impunity. But the AFL-CIO's alliance with the Democratic Party is predicated on the union leaders' willingness to prevent proletarian militancy. Now this alliance cannot even promise crumbs for the poor: it means layoffs, wage cuts, givebacks and war build-up. Working-class self-defense requires a struggle to break with the Democrats through ousting their agents in the labor movement, the Kirklands, Frasers and Winpisingers.

Reagan's assault on the working class is linked directly to his anti-Soviet war drive. His attacks on the unions and the poor cannot be fought without confronting head-on his drive to overthrow the lasting gains of the October Revolution. But most of the American left joins Lane Kirkland in hailing Solidarność' counterrevolution in Poland. Defense of the Soviet Union against imperialism is integral to the defense of labor rights against Reagan's domestic war drive!

"Pure and simple" union militancy is no alternative to the bureaucrats' class collaboration. As the capitalist government gets more and more directly involved in the business of union busting and war against the Soviet Union, every workers' struggle becomes a political fight requiring class-struggle leadership. Union militants must therefore link the fight to oust the labor misleaders to the building of a party that can serve as a revolutionary vanguard.

In 1934 the Trotskyists showed what a workers party with a revolutionary program could do, when they led the Minneapolis labor movement in a powerful and victorious general strike. Today such a mass workers party would organize to shut down the airports tight until the air controllers were rehired and all their demands met. It would lead a

labor drive into the open-shop South, mobilizing black and white workers in a joint struggle to smash the remnants of Jim Crow. It would mobilize tens of thousands to crush the Klan wherever it came into the open. It would prevent black and labor cities like Detroit from turning into ghost towns by organizing plant seizures against mass layoffs.

A class-struggle workers party would smash the Reagan/Democratic war drive and fight any imperialist attempt to restore capitalism in Cuba, Poland or the Soviet Union. It would fight for a workers government to expropriate capitalism and end once and for all the irrational social system that turns the enormous industrial wealth squeezed out of the blood of the working class into misery, poverty and the threat of global nuclear holocaust. For workers' action to bring down Reagan! For a workers party to fight for a workers government! ■

Nicaragua...

(continued from page 12)

America is the hottest spot in the anti-Soviet Cold War.

Conservative columnist William Safire recently noted that the administration will have to look to labor for "support for the mining of Nicaragua's harbors" as well as for "wage restraint" when the economic crisis "begins to bite next year." If it depends on Lane Kirkland, Reagan won't be disappointed. The AFL-CIO convention last month passed a resolution condemning the Sandinistas for trying to establish a "Marxist-Leninist totalitarian dictatorship" that would be "more oppressive" than the Somoza tyranny. While hypocritically criticizing the ban on strikes (the two AFL-CIO-affiliated labor

federations in Nicaragua are closely linked to the CIA), these veteran Cold Warriors naturally say nothing about the arrest of more than 100 Communist Party militants in the Sandinistas' futile attempt to carve out a "middle road" between capitalism and workers revolution.

The American workers movement must militantly oppose the war plans of U.S. imperialism. Reagan wants to give the PATCO treatment to everyone from Harlem welfare mothers to Salvadoran guerrillas, Nicaragua's Sandinistas and the Cuban and Soviet deformed/degenerated workers states. Labor militants must call for and implement a boycott of all military goods to El Salvador and other Central American right-wing dictatorships. We demand: Down with Reagan/Haig war threats! No Cold War blockade! Hands off Nicaragua! Military victory to leftist insurgents in El Salvador! For workers revolution! Defense of Cuba and the Soviet Union begins in Central America! ■

Reformists Call Cops...

(continued from page 12)

Fedayeen supporters to lock arms in an attempt to separate off the SL contingent and its banner "For Workers Revolution Throughout Central America! Hands Off Nicaragua! No Blockades!" To no avail. In Chicago a spirited 50-strong Spartacist contingent contrasted sharply with the miserable turnout of the official coalition. Even though we made up one half of the entire demo, the organizers refused a speaker to the SL. But as the rally broke up, an SL spokesman took the podium, calling for defense of the gains of the Cuban and Soviet revolutions and for workers and peasants governments to expropriate the bourgeoisie throughout Central America.

As the reformist flops call the cops, they only show their treacherous colors. Bringing in the class enemy against a workers organization is gross provocation, particularly at a Latin American demonstration where the police could go after undocumented Latinos. Now of course the SWP would like to slide out of taking responsibility for blocking with the cops—the racist enemies of all workers—against the revolutionaries. No doubt the SWP is scurrying around looking for others to blame it on. What others? The SWP's own front groups? The Communist Party, whose mobilization for this demo was obviously subminimal? In any case the SWP hasn't even managed a hypocritical objection in its press to the use of the cops. How different it would be if something genuinely unauthorized had occurred. Imagine, for instance, that an SWP-built demo had been the occasion for some adventurist types to throw bricks through UN windows. Does anybody doubt the SWP's *Militant* would have rushed into print with a condemnation? The SWP and all its bloc partners stand condemned by their deeds and by their silence.

For the past year the reformists have tried in vain to seal off the movement from the revolutionary politics of the Spartacist League. But it will not work. We alone have told the plain truth, and fought Reagan/Haig's anti-Soviet war drive instead of trying to pretend it doesn't exist. Everybody knows there can be no deal with the butcher Duarte—in El Salvador the leftist rebels must win or they will die. And today the imperialists are openly saying that while their Cold War sights are trained on El Salvador and Nicaragua, they are targeting the "source": the deformed/degenerated workers states of Cuba and the Soviet Union. Now more than ever: Military Victory to Salvadoran Leftists! Defense of Cuba and USSR Begins in El Salvador! ■

WORKERS VANGUARD

Stop Reagan/Haig Cold War Blockade! Hands Off Nicaragua!

The Reaganite warhawks' threats of military action against U.S. imperialism's enemies in the Caribbean intensified last week as top administration spokesmen warned, in the words of General Haig (on ABC's "This Week with David Brinkley," 22 November), that "the hours are growing rather short" to stop Sandinista Nicaragua's "drift toward totalitarianism." In a coordinated "message," the same words were used on the same day by top presidential aide Edwin Meese 3d, interviewed on CBS' "Face the Nation," who said that the "hour is late" in Nicaragua and, "Whether we'd utilize a naval blockade or not would depend on circumstances." War secretary Weinberger (on NBC's "Meet the Press") was a little cagier, talking of "a number of options" for military moves in Central America.

Trying to head off a public outcry, Reagan at his November 10 press conference said the U.S. had no "plans" for sending American ground troops into combat. Presumably the intended victims are supposed to be thankful that they are facing gunboat diplomacy, large-scale naval maneuvers, a "quarantine" on arms shipments or a full-scale blockade. Meanwhile, Haig calls on the "forces of freedom" in Nicaragua and "especially those in neighboring states" (Salvadoran death squads, the Honduran army and Somozaist mercenaries) to work with the U.S. in "security areas." A week later Meese again said a blockade "has not been precluded." When a reporter asked if all this bluster might make Washington look like a paper tiger if not carried out, Meese replied, "I don't think we'll look

like a paper tiger."

It is crystal clear that the threats against Nicaragua are aimed at Cuba and the Soviet Union, falsely labeled the "source" of arms for Salvadoran leftist rebels. Reagan/Haig are trying to bring down the petty-bourgeois Sandinista regime installed after the overthrow of the hated U.S.-backed Somoza dictatorship. In the latest episode of this campaign of "destabilization" by starvation, Washington just this month canceled a \$30 million loan from the Inter-American Development Bank. The problem for Yankee imperialism is that the more it tries to "punish" the Sandinistas, the more they are forced to seek help from Cuba and the Soviet Union. Thus, with El Salvador in flames and Nicaragua under the Pentagon's guns, Central

continued on page 11



WV Photo

SL demands "Break with the bourgeoisie! Workers to power!"

SL: "Defense of Cuba, USSR Begins in El Salvador!"

Reformists Call Cops on Reds

Small demonstrations were held across the country over the weekend of November 21 to protest Reagan/Haig's threats of blockade and other military action against Cuba and Nicaragua. But as defense of Cuba and Nicaragua is now placed at center stage of world politics by the war threats of U.S. imperialism, the reformists and popular frontists are doing everything they can to avoid siding openly with "the enemy." The various sponsoring coalitions even refused to call for "Hands Off Cuba" and called on the cops to exclude the revolutionaries, so concerned were the opportunists to keep their movement "Ready for Teddy" Kennedy and the other imperialist "doves."

At El Salvador demonstrations last spring they violently opposed our demand "Military Victory to Leftist Insurgents," even attempting to physically block protesters at the May 3 march on the Pentagon from attending an Anti-Imperialist rally sponsored by the Spartacist League (SL). Against our call that "Defense of Cuba and USSR Begins in El Salvador" they screamed "provocation." And after their anti-communist exclusions failed, they appeal to the guns and the clubs of the imperialist state to do their dirty work. They did it in Chicago May 30 and again

in New York November 21.

Last week's "Stop U.S. intervention" demonstrations were a pathetic response to the war threats emanating from Washington. This was in part due to the squabbling and maneuvers of their reformist sponsors. The Socialist Workers Party (SWP) after boycotting May 3 figured it would steal a march by initiating the November 21 demos. But the Communist Party (CP), Workers World and various El Salvador solidarity committees countered by refusing to mobilize. The only thing they could agree on is keeping out the reds.

Thus in New York the organizers of the "Emergency Campaign Against U.S. Intervention in Central America and the Caribbean" called in the police to keep the Trotskyist politics of the SL out of their liberal peace crawl. As the Spartacist contingent arrived at the Times Square assembly point, CP/SWP goons ineffectually tried to block us and force the SL to the other side of the street. When this didn't work representatives of the Antonio Maceo Brigade asked us to take down our banner, "Defense of Cuba and USSR Begins in El Salvador," but backed away when met with a flat refusal. Thereupon "Emergency Campaign" spokesmen called the cops to keep out the commu-



WV Photo

November 12, NYC: Reformists use cops to exclude SL contingent, which called for defense of Cuba, USSR against imperialist war threats.

nists. When the SL protested, the police went back to the "Emergency Campaign" spokesmen who once again appealed to the armed thugs of the class enemy to cordon off the revolutionaries.

But at the rally site, the 70-strong SL contingent marched in with our red flags flying, alongside the Cuban flag and the FMLN banner of the Salvadoran insurgents, chanting "No Cold War Blockade, Workers Bring Down Reagan/Haig!" "Our Political Solution—Workers Revolution!" and "Junta Butchers on the Run, Leftist Rebels Need Russian Guns!" While the 600 or so demonstrators stood around

listening to desultory speeches, Spartacist salesmen and supporters permeated the crowd, making dozens of contacts and drawing them into animated discussions around the SL literature table. Many protesters were upset at the cop exclusion and a number of people crossed the police barricades to join us, including some high school students from Brooklyn and a group of college students from Queens.

In San Francisco some 600 demonstrators picketed and marched under a steady rain. At one point "monitors" dispatched a half dozen Stalinist and

continued on page 11