

Reagan's Allies at Each Other's Throats



Editorial Atlantida
"¡Por Dios, Patria y
Anti-comunismo!"



Press Association
"For God, Country and
Anti-Communism!"

Falklands: Nowhere War

APRIL 27—Reagan and Haig must think they're having a bad dream. Their staunchest anti-Communist allies in Europe and Latin America respectively are actually going to war against one another. The first shots have already been fired. And over what? A couple of god-forsaken islands close to Antarctica. When the crisis first broke, Reagan stated pathetically, "We're friends with both countries." But the friend of one's enemy is scarcely one's friend. So whoever wins the Falklands war, U.S. imperialism will lose. And that is all to the good.

One unhappy Western diplomat

summed it all up when he said the Russians "are the only winners in this crisis. Everyone else winds up with egg on his face" (*Newsweek*, 26 April). Hard as they try, anti-Communist hysterics have been unable to pin the Falklands fiasco on the Kremlin. Displaying a peculiar respect for "international law," the Soviet bureaucrats did not even veto Britain's emergency resolution in the UN Security Council. All they've shown so far is a diplomatic tilt toward Argentina, which is, after all, their main trading partner in the Western hemisphere.

While the Kremlin Stalinists bewail

the threat to "world peace," revolutionary socialists can only look forward to the spectacle of these two hated right-wing regimes sinking each other's fleets on the high seas. There's an old saying: war is the mother of revolution. The bloody Argentine junta, wracked only a few weeks ago by massive labor protests, and the despised Thatcher government, which has driven the British people into the poorhouse, *can be brought down* as a result of defeat and humiliation in war.

Fantasies of Victoria

"Be pleased to inform Her Majesty

that the White Ensign flies alongside the Union Jack in South Georgia. God Save the Queen!" This was not an emissary of Queen Victoria during the heyday of empire, but a message beamed to Tory prime minister Margaret Thatcher. With the surrender of less than 200 Argentine marines and sailors on South Georgia Island, including the crew of a damaged vintage 1944 submarine, the Royal Navy has finally struck a blow for the honor of the empire a month after the Argentine seizure of the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas).

If this is one of the more bizarre
continued on page 10

War Criminals Lead "Peace" Campaign

Cold War "Freeze"?

"To those who protest against nuclear war, I can only say, I'm with you." The words of a Hiroshima survivor? A Quaker pacifist? A Russian détenteur? No, it is the itchiest nuclear gun in the West, Ronald Reagan, speaking of the burgeoning "Ground Zero" and "Freeze" campaign. Here is the "peace" campaign that delights the capitalist media, a campaign which belongs in Orwell's 1984. For here is the "peace" campaign for imperialist war.

Reagan's statement reveals more than the boundless hypocrisy of the American president (about which

more than enough is already known)—it exposes this popular crusade which some on the left are already blessing as the savior of us all from the horrors of nuclear holocaust. In the Reagan statement there is a sense that this campaign against his policies is a fraternal dispute—a quarrel among friends with common objectives but tactical differences. And for the freeze campaign Reagan is on target.

Of course all the reformists on the left have gone positively gooey over the "broad roots" of what they call the "new peace movement." The freeze campaign however is not a peace

movement at all (utopian as that might be); it isn't anti-militarist, and it isn't even against new U.S. missiles as are mass demonstrations in Europe. It isn't a "movement," but an ephemeral outburst of bourgeois pacifism organized by influential capitalist circles which want to put the U.S. war arsenal on a sounder economic foundation than Reaganomics: "Men of peace" like Teddy Kennedy and his Camelot killers, certified war criminals Robert McNamara and McGeorge Bundy. Men of god like Nixon's evangelist, Billy Graham. And visionary "experts" like Ground Zero's top man

Roger Molander, until last year a flunky for the National Security Council.

Large and growing sections of the bourgeoisie recognize that Reagan's policy of combining the most massive military buildup in peacetime history with economic recovery (while cutting taxes) is impossible. They argue that with the Soviet Union at rough nuclear parity, the U.S. nuclear threat loses some "credibility." So they want more than just the nuclear option. They want more bang for the buck. This means a leaner, meaner military, centered on (but not limited to) the thermonuclear doomsday machine, to wage war in the interests of U.S. imperialism around the globe.

Since arms "control" is now viewed universally as controlling nothing, the word "freeze" has become convenient in this intrabourgeois debate. The nonbinding Kennedy/Hatfield resolution calls for "mutual disarmament" and of course "verifiability." Reagan

continued on page 11

How to Fight the Fascists

March 15, 1982

Dear Walt:

I read the material you gave me on the Ann Arbor Klan struggle and thought over our discussion of last Friday. I told you on the phone that I disagreed with your strategy on the way to struggle against the Klan in Ann Arbor and promised to write you a note on the problem. Actually I think our discussion was somewhat off target. We discussed in some depth the successful struggle against Gerald L.K. Smith in 1945. But that struggle was really quite different from the problem presented by the Ku Klux Klan. Smith ran a public propaganda campaign of hate that was well financed, winning him a growing base of support, numbering in the thousands. The Ku Klux Klan is a horse of another color. It is a conspiratorial, hooded gang of killers that used to do its killing in dead of night. It is now trying to gain legitimacy, to go public, so to speak. The best way to do that is to use the cops to protect them. And how to get the cops to protect them? By provoking the radicals into battles of the Klan's choosing.

And how can one mobilize tens of thousands of workers in a united front of labor to fight 15 ugly men? Those would be odds to make heroes of the cowardly night riders. An approach to the labor movement is understandably an exercise in futility.

Then what can be done? For something certainly must be done. I think an *effective* strategy should be to take care of them the way the workers took care of scabs in the Thirties. In those years the bosses hired professional strike breaking companies to bring in scabs to break up a picket line or sneak scabs into the shops to work. One of the ways we countered these assaults was to photograph the scabs. We gave them publicity. We found out where they lived and where they went to church and we let their neighbors and their friends know who they were and what they were doing. Scabs were in general disfavor, as I think the Klan is today. They want publicity? Then give it to them—individually, not as a group. In the meantime, of course, their organization should be penetrated so we know in advance of their murderous plots. (Such a

Ann Arbor,
March 20—
SL-organized
mobilization
of 2,000
drives Nazis
out of town.



WV Photo

strategy also takes a leaf out of the FBI book.)

Anyway, you have already called for a united demonstration. So the problem now is to safeguard that counter-demonstration. The biggest problem there is to protect the demonstrators from provocateurs. If the Klan is out for more than publicity, if it is out for blood as it was in Greensboro with the help of the police, the CIA and the FBI, then they could use an agent to shoot blanks at the Klan to justify either Klan or police fire. Even against a thousand antifascists, the 15 Klansmen would then have a victory. Don't underestimate the enemy! They are not just "nuts", and they often get professional advice, also as in Greensboro. If you have a moral victory over the Klan, and only that, I urge you to choose a more effective set of tactics.

Sincerely,
Myra Tanner Weiss

WV replies: Myra Tanner Weiss is a veteran socialist who was for decades a leading spokesman of the Socialist Workers Party prior to its full reformist degeneration and her own departure from the SWP in

the direction of "socialist-feminism." Her letter declining to endorse the Spartacist-initiated March 20 Ann Arbor mobilization against fascist provocation (the Nazis in this case, not the Klan) brings up the then-Trotskyist SWP's labor-centered struggles against G.L.K. Smith only to dismiss this general strategy as somehow inapplicable to the present.

The Klan and Nazis, the fascist "fringe" of Reagan reaction, are becoming bigger and bolder. In the present climate of aggressive racist reaction and agonizing economic crisis, they smell the possibility of real prominence for themselves as the "militant" wing of racism, anti-Sovietism and anti-gay backlash. They can and must be interdicted from the major urban centers by mass mobilizations based on the integrated strength of the labor movement.

Comrade Weiss suggests photographing individual fascists as an alternative and more effective "strategy." This is a tactic which can be a useful adjunct of—but hardly a substitute for—mass actions like picket lines and demonstrations. Nor is her proper objection to futile radicals vs. cops confrontations a response to our perspective.

The root of her objection, which Weiss states almost as an afterthought, is that today "an approach to the labor movement is understandably an exercise in futility." All our experience shows precisely the contrary. From the November 1979 Detroit rally of 500 mainly black unionists and leftists, built despite the opposition of the UAW bureaucracy (a "united front from below"), to the April 1980 San Francisco mobilization of 1,200 endorsed by officials from 28 area unions, working people goaded beyond endurance by Reagan reaction and union busting have shown the will to fight back against their oppression behind a strategy that can win.

In Ann Arbor on March 20, a broad-based demonstration of 2,000 students and workers chased the Nazis out of town. Despite the sectarianism and sabotage of the fake-leftists and concerted violence-baiting by the city administration and media, labor's response to our call to action was enthusiastic. Union locals—UAW, AFSCME, transit, firemen—endorsed as well as numerous union officials and minority spokesmen. Hardly an "exercise in futility"! The Ann Arbor victory, organized by our small socialist organization, was an example of the anti-fascist strategy which Comrade Myra Tanner Weiss despairs of, the strategy which is a key to unchaining the power of labor, now shackled by a defeatist "leadership," for united struggle in its own class interests. ■

On Recruiting Blacks

The following letter was addressed to Spartacist, English-language organ of the International Executive Committee of the international Spartacist tendency. For reasons of space we have not been able to include it in recent issues of Spartacist and are therefore running it along with a reply in WV.

Columbus, Ohio
August 7th, 1981

To: Editor of Spartacist

I am a regular reader of your magazine and paper, and supporter of many of the concepts expressed therein. However, I ran across an item in your Winter 1979-1980 [No. 27-28] issue which I find at the same time perplexing, disgusting and ridiculous. In the article about the international Spartacist Conference,

in the section about the RWP of Ceylon, a delegate states that "...U.S. blacks...are five times as hard to recruit and five times as much trouble inside when you do recruit them."

But why should this be? American blacks are in general more opposed to war, American chauvinism, racism, police terror, big business and budget cuts, etc., than whites. This is confirmed by numerous sociological surveys. So why should it be so difficult to win black people to communism? How about "yes, they tend to be more rebellious against this system but they lack the (intelligence?) or (discipline?) or (cultural level?) to be revolutionaries." But of course, the delegate you quoted was arguing that the party must exert maximum efforts to recruit (troublesome) blacks anyway. Is this the five fold (!) "white man's burden" of the Spartacist League?

Fortunately for the U.S. working class however, black workers have no such incapacity for, or aversion to, communism. This is why tens of thousands of American blacks joined the Communist Party in the 1930's, 40's and 50's. But if the Spartacists are indeed encountering such great obstacles as the delegate states, perhaps the problem can be located within the organization rather than with black people.

Sincerely,
David Mann
Columbus Critic

Spartacist replies: Bursting with moral righteousness our critic takes strong exception to the statement that "blacks are five times as hard to recruit and five times as much trouble inside" as whites. "Why should it be so difficult to win blacks to communism?" he asks rhetorically, implying it shouldn't be difficult at all.

Unfortunately, oppression oppresses. Evidently Dave Mann, trained in the Progressive Labor school of "fighting racism" through moral exhortation and campaigns against racist textbooks, finds this hard to understand. But racial oppression consists of more than just ugly ideas in people's heads. It is rooted in the structure of American capitalist exploitation and fed by every aspect and institution of American society.

For many blacks, welfare mothers with several children, for example, the basic struggle for economic survival totally dominates their lives, making sustained political activism all but impossible. Blacks shaped by the hellish conditions of ghetto existence have to struggle a lot harder than most whites to achieve the minimally stable economic and social existence which makes disciplined political commitment possible in "normal" times. Reading *Workers Vanguard*, to say nothing of writing for the internal bulletin, can be a laborious process for blacks "educated" in ghetto schools. From high blood pressure to legal problems, if it's bad for you, blacks have more of it.

These unpresent facts of life are recognized in every serious black organization. Each in their own way the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Muslims and the defunct Black Panther Party have had to contend with the destructive effects of impoverishment and racial oppression among its supporters. That is why exhortations about "dignity," "self-respect" and "being a man" play such a large part in the internal life of black organizations in the U.S.

Certainly American blacks are far less prone to flag-waving chauvinism and "free world" anti-Communism than whites. But communist consciousness is not simply a rejection of Middle-America values; it is above all the understanding that the organized proletariat is the central agency in liberating mankind from *all* forms of social oppression. Here the deeply racist AFL-CIO bureaucracy hardly inspires in black people the view that working-class unity in struggle will break the chains of their oppression. Blacks in the U.S. do not tend to be *class* conscious (even in the reformist sense that European workers are), but rather have a racial-populist view of society. They are distrustful, to say the least, toward the organized labor movement as it now exists. Thus, most blacks, including black workers, will support government union-busting "affirmative action" or preferential seniority schemes in the unions. In this sense blacks retain considerable illusions in the bourgeois-democratic American state.

continued on page 11

WORKERS VANGUARD

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

EDITOR: Jen Norden

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Charles Burroughs

PRODUCTION: Oarlene Kamiure (Manager), Noah Wilner

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Linda Jerreau

EDITORIAL BOARD: George Foster, Liz Gordon, Merk Kellermann, James Robertson, Reuben Samuels, Joseph Seymour, Merjorie 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. 304

30 April 1982

Phone Militants Expose CWA Collusion

Ma Bell Plans Mass Firings

LOS ANGELES—Phone workers here recently learned of a secret phone company plan to eliminate thousands of jobs through harassment, firings, forced transfers, downgrades and layoffs. While officials of the Communications Workers of America (CWA) were told of the scheme in late March, they pledged secrecy to Ma Bell and sat on this crucial information for weeks. On April 13 Local 11502 president Janice Woods finally broke the conspiracy of silence and announced to a shop stewards' meeting that the L.A. area workforce would be cut 6 to 10 percent by the first quarter of 1983. According to a spokesman for the Militant Action Caucus (MAC) in the CWA, Woods added that the job cuts in northern California would hit employees with up to 12 years' seniority. *Workers Vanguard* has also learned that the cuts will wipe out 30 percent of the Bell workforce in Oakland.

These attacks are the direct outcome of a union-company agreement for "employee protection" (!) signed by CWA president Glenn Watts on March 26. This pact, which contains not a shred of real protection for phone workers, puts a formal stamp of approval on AT&T's "authority...to lay off or discharge an employee." One section explicitly states, "Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to prevent the...AT&T organization from offering...a downgrade to a lower rated job or another reduction in wages and related benefits as an alternative to layoff." In other words, give back or get lost! The agreement amounts to a solemn pledge by the CWA leadership not to fight AT&T's job cuts.

Watts and the CWA brass have gone on campaign footing to see that this vow is carried out. District 11 vice president Bill Beners came to Local 11502's March meeting to tell the workers they'd have to give up "sacred cows" like seniority and premium time. Givebacks are in order, said Beners, because the union has reached the point where it isn't fighting for bread and butter, but "caviar"! When he asserted CWA members had become middle-class, one angry splicer invited Beners to come into his manhole in the street and then tell him he was no longer working-class. Beners' "you never had it so good" rhetoric was picked up in the April *CWA News*, where an article entitled "Nobody Likes Strikes" carried the bureaucrats' no-struggle message: strikes hurt workers. As far as Watts & Co. are concerned, AT&T is free to carry out its job-slashing policies with impunity.

And these policies are vicious. In L.A. the company plans to reorganize the job function of each central office, which will mean forced relocation of thousands of workers—some over 35 miles from their current work sites. Job elimination will come through "attrition," with layoffs as a last resort. For Ma Bell attrition means harassing people until they quit, firing those who can't maintain impossible attendance or productivity standards, and pressuring for

the Militant Action Caucus immediately called for strike action to defend jobs. In contrast, at a recent union meeting the Local 11502 leadership could only point to the various avenues of retreat: pleading for layoffs as an "alternative" to mass firings; a 32-hour workweek (at 32 hours pay), etc. Local president Woods even explained that the minimal protection of a no-layoff clause in the contract would threaten AT&T's profitability—heaven forbid! Said

refused, even though they were threatened with suspension and discharge.

Within the CWA the MAC is unique in its call for international working-class solidarity, an issue that is particularly important to the tens of thousands of "illegal aliens" from Latin America who populate this city. In the midst of the election campaign, MAC fought for a labor-centered demonstration against the wholesale deportation of undocumented workers and for asylum for

Bay Area MAC: Expropriate Ma Bell!

SAN FRANCISCO—The Militant Action Caucus is currently running candidates for convention delegate in CWA Locals 9410 (San Francisco) and 9415 (East Bay). When news of the union-management job-slashing deal came from Los Angeles, MAC added a bulletin to its campaign flyer and leafleted dozens of phone work locations on both sides of the Bay with a call for: "Strike action to stop layoffs, forced transfers and downgrades! Dump the sellouts—no secret meetings! Expropriate Ma Bell without compensation! That's the kind of 'reorganization' we need!"

The news spread fast in the local membership. When MAC's campaigners appeared to leaflet work entrances, workers came out of the buildings for extra copies. Inside, they lined up at bulletin boards to read the leaflet. At one location a steward arranged for a MAC member to address three work crews at lunch for ten minutes.

Numerous workers on both sides of the Bay came forward with confirming evidence of how the company intends "forced distribution" to affect their departments, and who will be declared "surplus."

At an April 23 demonstration against "Job Pressures" called by Local 9410 to protest mounting grievances and company atrocities, the MAC leaflet and signs calling for a fight to save jobs attracted more attention than the official union activities, which included a screening service for high blood pressure. Evidently feeling a little pressure himself, a testy James Imerzel, Local 9410 president, told *WV* that the MAC flyer was "horseshit" with "absolutely no basis in fact." At the demonstration, the Associated Press interviewed Kathy Ikegami, MAC leader and candidate.

The next day an enraged Imerzel put a frothy "rebuttal" on the union's



WV Photo

tape-recorded call-in service, denouncing MAC and Ikegami as a "lunatic fringe" and asserting "No layoffs are projected," and "normal attrition" will cover the reduction! As Ikegami told *WV*, "People are *already* being 'surplus.' The time to fight is now—while we still have jobs!"

early retirement. Take the case of L.A.-area business phone repairmen, a top-paying craft job. The company declared 147 jobs to be "surplus," and announced plans to get rid of 15 jobs per month! How? They doubled the area these repairmen have to cover each day in order to drive the older workers out.

AT&T's "war of attrition" comes on the heels of the much publicized company-Justice Department agreement calling for the "reorganization" of the phone monopoly. Workers have no reason to take a side for or against this "reorganization," but they desperately need a leadership with a program to fight the company's job slashing and wage gouging. When Woods leaked out the phone company's job-cutting plans,

MAC spokesman Barbara Britton, "The kind of reorganization we need is to expropriate Ma Bell without compensation!"

MAC's consistent fight for a class-struggle program in phone has earned it a hard core of support in the ranks of CWA members. In recent convention delegate elections, MAC candidates polled a solid 22 percent of the vote, with a significant increase over the last election of ballots marked *only* for MAC. The wide respect won by MAC was shown at one work location where management ordered Local 11502 stewards to take the Caucus' campaign material off union bulletin boards, singling it out as "derogatory to the company"! The stewards courageously

Central American refugees from junta terror (see page 3).

And when the 11502 bureaucrats quietly tried to restore a yearly contribution to a CIA labor front, Operation South America, the phone militants went into action. MAC circulated a fact sheet and *Los Angeles Times* clippings which demonstrated Operation South America's ties to the imperialist spy apparatus, and its purpose: purging communists and making Latin America safe for the U.S. profit makers. The opposition organized by MAC at the April union meeting forced several vote counts and a standing division of the house on the question. The vote tied—until president Woods broke the deadlock by backing the CIA's dirty work.

The campaign issue of *Militant Action* (23, March) aptly linked up the bosses' assault on the unions to Reagan's drive "to make the world safe for American corporate profits":

"Reagan is out to get us!... To stop him we must have a class-struggle leadership in the unions willing to use the power of organized labor to stand up to Reagan's anti-Soviet/Cuban war drive and its domestic component, the attacks on the working class, minorities, and poor. Half a million union members marching against Reagan reaction on September 19 proved that power exists. If that power and desire to fight were mobilized into strike action, Reagan could be stopped cold."

The MAC leaflet calls for "labor action to bring down Reagan" and a workers party based on the unions to fight for a workers government. It is this program that points the way forward—against the phone company's attacks, against Reagan, for a workers future. ■

L.A. Cops Shoot Pregnant Black Woman

LOS ANGELES—In a grotesque example of killer-cop racism, on April 16 L.A. sheriff's deputies gunned down a 22-year-old black woman, nine-months pregnant, in her Duarte, California home. The cops' bullets left Delois Young hospitalized in serious condition and killed her unborn child. According to investigators the murderous attack was part of a provocation by the cops, who had phoned in a bogus report of a family squabble at the Young residence in order to bust in without a warrant, allegedly in search of drugs.

It was the middle of the night, about 2 a.m., when six L.A. County cops showed up at the door and without identifying themselves began banging and trying to kick it in. Delois Young, suspecting robbers, answered the door with an unloaded .22 rifle pointed toward the floor. The cops opened up, shooting her in the stomach and chest at pointblank range. One of the bullets lodged in the head of the full-term fetus. Then they shot her again while she lay helpless on the floor. Family members were forbidden to help her while, bleeding profusely, she waited

30 minutes for the paramedics to arrive.

While Los Angeles County district attorney John Van de Kamp has made some noises about prosecuting these killer cops, it's clear the state stands by its thugs in uniform. And Van de Kamp is the very same D.A. who refused to prosecute the cop murderers of black college football star Ron Settles in Signal Hill last year. An outraged family friend remarked, "Justice should be done...if it had been one of us, it'd have been the electric chair—guaranteed" (*Los Angeles Herald Examiner*, 24 April). The deadly L.A. cops will kill and kill again unless organized labor mobilizes the masses of blacks, Chicanos and all opponents of racist cop terror in powerful protest. Jail the killer cops!

SL Replies to Slanders from Peron's Grandchildren

Morenoite Lies Exposed

We reprint below a letter by the Revolutionary Workers Front, a Los Angeles-based group of supporters of Argentine adventurer Nahuel Moreno, and a reply from the Spartacist League.

RWF to Spartacist League

OPEN LETTER TO THE LEFT
RE: Spartacus League provocateurs
FROM: Revolutionary Workers Front
DATE: March 5, 1982

Dear Comrades:

The Revolutionary Workers' Front and Revolutionary Unity League held a forum in San Francisco on March 5 on international workers' struggles, specifically Poland, El Salvador and the U.S. Around 35 people attended, including 4 members of the Spartacus League and representatives of the RWL and CRSP.

Before the beginning of the meeting the 4 Spartacus Leaguers launched an organized disruption attack by yelling at and verbally attacking members of other organizations in the audience. They tried to destroy the meeting itself by disruptive yelling, walking around the room and provocative remarks.

In the question and answer period the chairman gave the floor to a Spartacus Leaguer, who started his speech with non-political, outrageous and vile insults. The chairman, Comrade Nicholas, from RWF, interrupted and stopped the Spartacus Leaguer, pointing out that non-political terminology and aggressive insults are alien to the atmosphere of workers democracy.

He pointed out that RWF welcomes hard political discussions and firm terms between left groups, but will never allow non-political Stalinist-type provocations or insults that serve no interest except the bourgeois desire to destroy the whole left.

After this warning the chairman again gave the floor to the Spartacus Leaguer to continue his speech in political terms. When the forum was adjourned at 10:45, three hours after it started, the 4 Spartacus Leaguers threatened the forum's organizer with violence, saying, "Next time we'll come prepared to destroy your meeting." This kind of threat is wholly unacceptable and amounts to bourgeois provocation.

We send a copy of this letter to the Central Committee of the Spartacus League with the message that we welcome any hard political discussion in public meetings when a discussion period is organized. We never try to force any tendency to agree with our positions. We believe any political criticism can be raised in a discussion period. But acting as provocateurs is another matter. *Such methods are alien to the working class.*

We hold the Central Committee of the Spartacus League responsible for

any consequences of their members' threat of violence. As we have informed the Spartacus League in San Francisco, we will take any measures necessary to defend workers' democracy and to protect, from alien provocateurs, the workers' right to left wing political discussion.

Sincerely yours,

LEON PEREZ
National Organizer
Revolutionary Workers Front

* * * * *

Spartacist League to RWF

April 13, 1982

Revolutionary Workers Front
P.O. Box 27421
Los Angeles CA 90027

Attn: Leon Perez
National Organizer

On 11 March 1982 we received your "Open Letter to the Left" dated 5 March 1982 in which you falsely accuse the Spartacist League of disrupting a forum in San Francisco sponsored by the Revolutionary Workers Front (RWF) and Earl Owen's Revolutionary Unity League (RUL). We would like to remind you that the forum was held on 6 March 1982, not on 5 March as you curiously state in your letter. You can verify this by examining your own scab-printed leaflet advertising that event. In the interest of helping you get at least one fact straight we enclose a copy of your leaflet.

The truth is always concrete and an examination of the events of the evening of 6 March show that the disruption came from RWFer Nicholas Kramer whose notion of workers democracy has more in common with Peronism than Marxism. The facts of the meeting are as follows.

Prior to the meeting there were a series of sharp political exchanges between SL comrades and members of the wretched Revolutionary Workers League. No one present at the time, RWFers included, characterized these arguments, which all occurred before the meeting was called to order, as "an organized disruption attack."

During your meeting our comrades sat quietly in their seats and listened to the speakers. Following the speakers and a showing of a video tape there was a discussion period. The first person called upon by the chair was indeed a comrade of the SL. This is what he said:

"In case there's anybody in this room who believes this group has anything in common with Marxism or Trotskyism, it does not. The tendency headed by Nahuel Moreno is historically and presently subordinate to the bourgeoisie.

"Let me read you something from the first issue of *Working Class Opposition*:

"U.S. Imperialism has silently supported Jaruzelski's repressive operations... Is there anyone who believes this? Perhaps Reagan's telethon with everyone from the head of the AFL-CIO to the Turkish prime minister in support of Solidarność was just a dream? What about the billions of dollars being spent on new weapons systems against the USSR, the sanctions, the anti-Soviet war drive? The speaker on Poland did not even mention defense of the Soviet Union.

"Her speech was 100 percent Third Camp. I could have been sitting in any Third Camp meeting. Either she or another member of this rotten swamp..."

At this point Kramer, chairman of the meeting and a leader of the RWF (formerly the Los Angeles-based Sandinistas for Socialism), unable to stand the truth jumped to his feet and screamed:

"One more insult and I will blast your head! If you came here for a fight we're all family here and you'll get the biggest fight you've ever seen. You can call us reformist but you cannot insult us..."

Kramer continued this disruptive diatribe for several minutes before subsiding and enabling our comrade to conclude his brief remarks.

Apparently the RWF, like Joseph Stalin, believes paper will take anything written on it. And Stalin too was a partisan of your version of workers democracy, where criticism of you is permissible if, and only if, you deem it acceptable. Whoever transgresses is threatened with a beating or worse. Of course no attack on our comrades was attempted since the RWF/RUL is well aware of both our reputation and capacity for defending workers democracy.

We point out to the little gentlemen of the RWF that the "rules of polite discourse" you are trying to smuggle into the workers movement find their

fullest expression in Erskine May, the official bible of British imperialism's parliament. "Unparliamentary" expressions include words such as "calumny," "dishonest," "duplicity," "guttersnipe," and "hooligan." British MPs are forbidden to call their opponents "dogs," "cads," "Pharisees," "swine," "rats," "stool-pigeons," "villains," and "hypocrites."

It is no accident that these proscribed words are among the most apt in the English language for describing the swindlers who sit in this "august" body of decrepit imperialism. Likewise the RWF would like to ban such expressions from the workers movement because many hit too close to the mark.

For example, speaking of international allies, Trotsky once remarked, "Tell me who your friends are and I will tell you who you are." The RWF has linked itself to Nahuel Moreno. Surely it is relevant in polemicalizing with you to point out that your *lider máximo* has been the object of more charges of swindling and embezzlement than Nicholas Kramer has toes on his feet.

Finally, as you well know, our comrades *did not* threaten to "destroy" your next meeting. You have concocted this lie to justify a policy of trying to suppress our revolutionary criticism of your course: the Morenoite tendency, which once attached itself leech-like to bourgeois Peronism and then to Castroism, has now attached itself to the corrupt body of social-democratic anti-Sovietism. You may not like the image but it is accurate. Those of your members who did make threats to shut us up "next time" were told that we would defend our democratic rights. We mean what we say.

Joan Parker
for the Spartacist League

Spartacist Educational Weekend

Topics:

From El Salvador to Detroit—
Smash Reagan Reaction!

Break with the Democrats—For Labor Action to Bring Down Reagan!

Defend the Gains of the Russian Revolution!

Political Revolution, Hungary 1956 vs. Solidarność Counterrevolution, Poland 1981

Spartacist Internationalism:

Hail Rosa Luxemburg—Poland's Communist Tradition!



**Berkeley/Oakland
May 1-2**

UC Berkeley Life Sciences Building

For more information: P.O. Box 32552, Oakland, CA 94604 (415) 835-1535

Spartacist League/Spartacus Youth League • registration fee: \$5 (students \$3)

Get the Goods!

Forty-one pages of documentary exposure:

- **Moreno in Argentina I:**
From Left Peronism to Social Democracy
- **Moreno in Argentina II:**
Back to Peronism
- **Moreno's Left Face:**
Portugal, Angola, Eurocommunism
- **Opportunist Chameleon Sul Generis**
- **Moreno the Swindler**

Price: \$1.50

Order from/make checks payable to:
Spartacist Publishing Co., P.O. Box 1377 G.P.O., New York, NY 10116



No Contract, No Work!

NYC Transit: Arbitration Trap


Since April 1, 33,000 members of Transport Workers Union (TWU) Local 100 have been working without a contract—for the first time in the union's history. Pointing to the defeat of the 1980 strike (which stung TWU members with \$800 fines) as evidence that strikes don't work, Local 100 president John Lawe discarded the union's longstanding "no contract, no work" tradition and handed dictatorial power over the new contract to a panel of "impartial" arbitrators in the strike-breaking city administration. Then on orders from racist, labor-hating mayor Ed Koch, arbitrator Ted Kheel was purged because he was supposedly too pro-union. This about a man who has served the bosses' government for 33 years imposing "class peace" on the militant transit workers!

Last fall Local 100 militants correctly labeled Lawe's no-fight binding arbitration scheme "slow death." Arbitrators aren't interested in saving jobs, saving benefits or saving unions; their job is to make any ruling they think the bureaucracy is capable of shoving down workers' throats without "interruptions in service." Many transit workers are now seeing this as they anxiously await the arbitrators' decision. Meanwhile copies of the Transit Authority contract proposal are being passed from hand to hand. As they read through the 12 pages of TA takeback demands, TWU members realize that the union's survival is on the line.

TA bosses are demanding no union business on company time; a 25 percent cut in health benefits; an end to seniority job bid rights and hard-won "past practice" rules; slashing of weekend and night differentials; cuts in paid sick days and vacation time; unpaid meal breaks; six years substandard pay for new hires; cuts in pay rates in the already underpaid, largely black job titles; \$4 per hour for those in training, etc. TA bosses Ravitch and Simpson obviously want to run the dilapidated subway system with unskilled high school dropouts; who else would take such a job if the TA gets even a third of what it's after? "It's slavery!" said one black car maintainer after reading the TA demands. "They want to run the system like they did before the union was organized!"

In fact, the capitalists and their flunkies in City Hall want to run the whole city the way they did before unions came on the scene and before blacks and other minorities began to fight for their rights. Ever since the fiscal "crisis" of 1975-76 their program has been to make the working people and the poor pay: by dumping union pension funds down the Big MAC

rathole; by turning subways into death traps by "deferred maintenance"; by boarding up ghetto hospitals like Sydenham. The subway-riding poor are prime victims of crime and cop brutality—just last week an unarmed black youth was gunned down by TA



Militant transit workers in 1978 at strike vote.

plainclothesmen because he didn't "freeze" fast enough! The bosses' strategy to keep workers and minorities down is the old plan to "divide and rule," pitting white against black, employed against unemployed, transit rider against transit worker.

High on the TA's list of union-busting demands is the call for unrestricted hiring of part-time workers without

seniority or benefits. Such a demand is particularly ominous in a city where more than half the black youth are unemployed. It's not just cheap labor the TA is after. Rather, the bosses want to destroy the heavily black TWU, the most powerful union in the city, by dividing the transit workforce every way possible. What's necessary to defeat this threat is for the TWU to lead the unemployed, minorities and other city unions in a joint struggle against the racist austerity drive imposed by "Mayatollah" Koch, Reagan and the bankers who run New York. For free mass transit and massive creation of jobs through reducing the workweek with no reduction in pay (30 hours work for 40 hours pay, union-controlled hiring with full benefits and seniority).

Such a struggle requires a militant leadership. Lawe's reelection last December on a clear anti-strike platform primarily reflected a deep distrust of the Local 100 tops' ability to win a strike. Both Lawe and "dissident" out-bureaucrats like Arnold Cherry fear nothing so much as a strike, thereby disarming the union in the face of this vicious union-busting assault. After five months of silence, Cherry is now issuing leaflets proclaiming "Binding Arbitration: A Bad Deal for Transit Workers." But what about last September's TWU convention, where Cherry and Communist Party (CP) supporters voted in favor of a resolution to: "Establish procedures for impartial resolution of collective bargaining disputes... Eliminate policy of 'No Contract/No Work'" (quoted from Cherry's own report, "From the Convention")?

During the Local 100 elections, the only time presidential candidate Cherry even mentioned binding arbitration was

when he put out a statement disavowing responsibility for the 1980 strike and redbaiting militant candidates Ed Kartsen and David Brewer for insisting that "It took strikes to build the unions, it will take strikes to defend them." Cherry was supported in those elections by the Socialist Workers Party (SWP). And at a car maintenance division meeting in March, SWP supporters urged Lawe to give more attention to public relations, moaning, "We can't have a strike... the workers are all depressed!" In contrast to these no-strike "socialists," James P. Cannon, the founding leader of American Trotskyism, pointed out long ago that "the public" is a myth. Classes and class interests are what count, and finally in any strike "power alone decides the issue" (*Notebook of an Agitator*). It is by leading a class-struggle fight against Reagan reaction and givebacks that the TWU can win the kind of "public" support that counts.

In last fall's Local 100 vote, only two candidates opposed abandoning the TWU's principle of "no contract, no work": militants Kartsen and Brewer. They alone put forward a program to fight and win a strike: calling on the union to lead black and white to smash the Reagan/Koch cuts; denouncing the bi-partisan anti-Soviet war drive; and calling for a break from the strikebreaking Democrats to build a class-struggle workers party. The strategy of trade-union reformism embraced by Lawe and Cherry allowed the capitalists to begin the nationwide giveback drive here in New York in 1975-76. Transit workers have the power to put a stop to the givebacks here and now. To do so they must get rid of the sellout bureaucrats who police the labor movement for the bosses. ■

Boston Transit Walkout

BOSTON—On April 16 a surprise early morning strike by the 3,300-member Boston Carmen's Union shut down the region's aging mass transit system, the MBTA. The walkout, honored by 2,700 "T" workers in some 27 (!) other unions, was sparked by 35 bus drivers who staged an unauthorized three-hour walkout the day before. They were protesting the hiring of 20 part-timers and their assignment to preferred shifts in total disregard of seniority. When their protest went system-wide, the governor rattled his sabers, the media went wild and traffic backed up seven miles on the Southeast Expressway—but the trains and buses didn't budge.

The Carmen have endured 700 layoffs during the 15 months they've been working without a contract. These attacks are part of a frontal assault by the government on all workers, minorities and the poor in Massachusetts. In the name of "Prop 2 1/2," the Bay State's version of California's "tax-cutting" Proposition 13, attack after attack has been mounted against state aid to public education, medical care, libraries, firefighting and mass transit as well as against public employees' unions in general. Democratic governor King is pushing for "workfare," i.e., forcing welfare mothers to take minimum wage jobs on pain of losing any government assistance whatsoever.

King's pronouncements on "workfare" and in support of the death penalty have also given the green light to the racist thugs that helped the politicians kill school integration. Recently not a week passes without a new instance of racially motivated assault in the "Cradle of Liberty." On March 13 a black man, William F. Atkinson, was beaten or chased to his death on the Dorchester subway tracks by white punks from Savin Hill. His killers were charged with assault, not murder. As Boston's most powerful union, the Carmen should have led protests over this racist murder, just as the labor movement should have taken the lead in defending busing against segregationist mobs in the mid-'70s. But the union misleaders did nothing, and now the reactionary budget cutters are waging an assault on labor and minorities alike.

Carmen president John Gallahue quickly called off the strike when the governor alerted the National Guard, and three union officials were jailed for 90 minutes. But for 24 hours the strikers pointed the way out for working people. The racist austerity mongers in both the Democratic and Republican Parties can be beaten back only by militant labor action. What's needed to lead such struggles is a workers party, built in the fight to oust the pro-Democratic Party labor fakcrs, to rally all the oppressed.



Runci/Boston Globe

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

What's Missing from "Missing"

Did the United States participate in the preparation and execution of the bloody 1973 Pinochet coup in Chile? You can bet your life it did. Charles Horman accidentally found out, and it cost him his—a bloody casualty in the massacre of 30,000 Chilean workers, peasants and leftists assassinated by the U.S.-backed generals, and the sufferings of tens of thousands more who were tortured and shoved into concentration camps from the Atacama Desert to the Antarctic wastes of Dawson Island.

Missing, the first Hollywood film by Greek director Costa-Gavras, deals with the search for Charles Horman by his father and wife. The young American writer living in Allende's Chile "knew too much" about Pentagon involvement in the coup. The film shows how he stumbled across U.S. military specialists who had been sent down to "do a job" on the leftist Unidad Popular (UP) government. It indicates how, with obvious U.S. complicity, he was "disappeared" and murdered at the hands of the junta. It documents the American embassy's stonewalling and cover-up of the Horman affair. With an eye on El Salvador, administration supporters were plenty upset after the film was screened in Washington.

So in a most unusual step, the State Department issued an official statement in response to *Missing* denying "the possibility that U.S. government officials might have initiated, condoned, or failed to act effectively in Horman's disappearance and death." In the age of Salvador "White Papers," such denials are taken with a pound of salt. But interestingly the State Department did *not* deny U.S. complicity in the coup itself. Here the "free but responsible" *New York Times* (10 February) stepped into the credibility breach, asserting that the 1975 Congressional investigations into the CIA and an inquiry by the *Times* had "found no American involvement in the death of Horman or in the 1973 coup."

Earlier, liberal columnist Flora Lewis had written a crude hatchet job on Costa-Gavras, calling his film a "fiction" (*New York Times*, 7 February). *Times* reporter Seymour Hersh had found "no evidence of U.S. involvement," she claimed. And she found U.S. ambassador Nathaniel Davis' protestations of clean American hands "believable" because of his "own personality" and the "meticulous care" with which he tried to whitewash his role in the 1973 coup. As for the spooks, Lewis quotes then CIA director William Colby as saying that when his people heard of



Armando Cardoso

Before the coup: Cordones industriales (workers committees) demonstrate in Santiago, 1973. Allende's popular front refused to arm the workers.

coup plots beginning in May (!) 1973, "they followed what was going on... but they were not involved in any planning."

No wonder official Washington and the semi-official press let loose such a string of implausible denials. *Missing* nails them, but good. Nevertheless, this is an irritating film whose liberal politics are laden with imperial arrogance. Here is a full-length movie on the Chilean tragedy in which there is not one Chilean protagonist! And by portraying the Pinochet putsch through the eyes of a quintessential "middle American," Costa-Gavras tries to play the worn-out theme of American innocence abroad. In this sense *Missing* is another of the Watergate-era exposure films in which decent citizens learn to their shock and dismay what dirty business their government is up to. This may work for *All the President's Men*. But where fundamental social conflicts are involved, as in the historic Chilean events, such an American liberal lens can only distort.

What's missing from *Missing* are the political struggles that led to the bloody massacre of 11 September 1973. There is nothing about the previous three years of unrelenting U.S. hostility and provocation which set the stage for the coup, assuring the generals of Washington's approval. Missing is the powerful Chilean working class, whose militancy sent domestic and imperialist reactionaries into paroxysms of plotting to

"crush the communist threat." Missing, too, is the treacherous role of the UP popular front which disarmed the workers politically, preaching faith in "constitutional" officers. In short, missing from *Missing* is the historical reality from which the lessons of the Allende experience can be drawn, so that another generation of militants is not led into the same dead end.

CIA Up to Its Neck in Chilean Blood

The basic facts of American imperialism's assault on Allende are so well known that only the most cynical Big Liars would attempt to deny them. Unlike Costa-Gavras' movie, the book *Missing* by Thomas Hauser sets the assassination of Charles Horman in this context. There was Henry Kissinger's outburst over the UP election victory: "I don't see why we need to stand by and watch a country go communist due to the irresponsibility of its own people." There was Nixon's instruction to "make the [Chilean] economy scream." There was ITT's offer of a million dollars to stop Allende. There was the \$20 million the U.S. spent to keep him from being elected in 1964, and the admitted \$8 million the CIA spread around to try to topple him after he took office six years later. There was the U.S.' "quiet blockade"—a highly orchestrated attempt to strangle Chile economically, which Allende described in detail in a December 1972 speech to the United Nations.

U.S. participation in plots against the elected president of Chile began in September 1970, even before Allende took office, with Nixon's infamous "Track II" plan—directed by Kissinger and Haig—that involved, as Kissinger later remarked, "a more direct role for the CIA and actually organizing a coup." In Chile they got in touch with perennial plotter General Viaux, who proposed to kidnap army chief of staff General René Schneider in order to eliminate a troublesome "constitutional" and precipitate a coup. Although the CIA had supplied the plotters with guns, Kissinger claims he tried to call it off, but too late—the operation was carried out and Schneider murdered in the process. Charles Horman did some investigation of his own into the Schneider assassination and came to the conclusion that the U.S. had masterminded it, something that was publicly admitted only a couple of years later.

But what got the young writer killed was what he stumbled onto in Septem-

ber 1973. The Pinochet coup caught Charles Horman and a friend, Terry Simon, vacationing in the seaside resort of Viña del Mar. Unable to return to the capital, they hung around the hotel where the next day they ran into Arthur Creter, "a retired naval engineer on special assignment for the United States Navy." Creter bragged to Horman, "We came down to do a job and it's done." On September 13, Horman met Creter's superior, Lieutenant-Colonel Patrick Ryan, deputy chief of the U.S. Naval Mission in nearby Valparaíso, who was fully informed of details about the coup and talked of it freely. Two days later Horman and Simon got a ride back to Santiago with Ray Davis, head of the U.S. Military Group in Chile. On September 17, Charles Horman was arrested at his house, taken to the National Stadium and, not long after, shot.

On 27 October 1974 an article appeared in the London *Times* based on an interview with former Chilean General Carlos Prats. Prats was Allende's defense minister up until August 1973 when he resigned under pressure from the officer corps, then finalizing its coup plans, and was replaced by another reputed "constitutionalist," General Augusto Pinochet. Prats said that the coup had been planned and coordinated from Valparaíso. (In fact, joint Chilean-U.S. naval exercises, Operation Unitas, had been slated to begin on September 10. The Chilean ships steamed out of Valparaíso harbor on schedule, but under cover of night they returned to port and marines quickly occupied the city hours before the coup was unleashed in the rest of the country.) "That," said Prats, "was where officers in the conspiracy secretly met with a U.S. Marine, and Admiral Toribio Merino (the senior naval officer at Valparaíso) kept touch with the same man—Lieutenant-Colonel Patrick Ryan."

What does it all prove? Several investigations have been blocked by the U.S. government's refusal, citing reasons of "national security," to release scores of vital documents requested by the Horman family under the Freedom of Information Act. But what's strongly suggested by these facts is that Charles Horman was eliminated, at least with the knowledge and possibly at the instigation of American officials, because he had found out about key U.S. operatives involved in the Pinochet putsch. A former Chilean intelligence officer, who later sought asylum at the Italian embassy, reported that he saw Horman being held at the Defense Ministry in the days following the coup: "They told me this guy was an American whose name was Charles Horman... [that he] knew too much and that he was supposed to disappear... It was the Chileans who got rid of him, but the CIA was behind that."

To this day the U.S. tries to maintain the fiction that it had nothing to do with the ouster and murder of Allende. Kissinger claims in his memoirs (*Years of Upheaval*) that "our government had nothing to do with planning his overthrow and no involvement with the plotters." But as one expert told *Newsweek* (23 October 1974) when the revelations about CIA activities in Chile first broke, "How can you work for three years to upset Allende and then claim you didn't have anything to do with the coup?" CIA deputy director Thomas Karamessines later testified, "Track II never really ended. What we were told to do in effect was, well, Allende is now President... but continue our efforts... The seeds that were laid in 1970 had their impact in 1973." And Kissinger's

continued on page 9



After the coup: thousands of workers are murdered in the stadium in Santiago.

El Salvador and the Left

Isn't Everybody for Leftist Military Victory? No!

The assorted rad-libs who want to "end the war" in El Salvador face an impossible political problem: answering the Spartacist League (SL) which calls for Salvadoran leftists to win the war against U.S. imperialism and its junta. CISPES (Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador), PAM (People's Antiwar Mobilization), the Democratic Party "doves" and reformist pseudo-socialists have tried everything to seal off the Trotskyists of the SL. They have linked arms, forming giant goon squads to prevent us from marching, and repeatedly brought in the police against the SL-initiated Anti-Imperialist Contingent. Yet many of their own supporters still don't understand why those who raise the banner of "Military Victory to Leftist Insurgents" in El Salvador should be kept out of El Salvador protests. Especially since the rebels have been winning on the battlefield, and the recent mock-election "victory" by ultra-rightist mass murderers makes talk of a negotiated "political solution" utterly utopian and nothing short of suicidal.

The rad-libs and reformists are trying to defend the indefensible, and this drives them to a frenzy. They want to pretend that the Salvadoran conflict is simply U.S. aggression, i.e., there is no civil war going on; and that it has nothing to do with American Cold War against the Soviets. But the Pentagon hasn't made El Salvador the third-largest recipient of U.S. military aid in the world, and it isn't spending \$2.3 trillion on MX missiles, B-1 bombers and the like, just to protect Hills Brothers coffee plantations and oppress the peasants. The stakes in Central America are global, and in the conflict between U.S. imperialism and the Soviet Union—over Poland, Afghanistan and elsewhere—these Cold War pacifists line up not only with the liberal Democrats but also with Reagan/Haig. They want to hide this essential fact, which is why they must exclude the Spartacist League which uncompromisingly says what is. Our call for an outright rebel victory in El Salvador and our defense of the Soviet bloc against imperialism mucks up their attempts to play ball with the bourgeoisie.

So these shameless sellouts, who call on and provoke the capitalist cops to exclude the communists, resort to



Washington, March 27—Anti-Imperialist Contingent was excluded by a massive display of police power at behest of Democratic "doves" and their reformist lackeys.

slandorous cop-baiting of the SL. The people who proudly read greetings from Teddy Kennedy and invited Democratic Congressmen to speak from their platform in Washington on March 27 accuse us, who call for "Break with the Democrats—For Labor Action to Bring Down Reagan," of being agents of the capitalists! They claim that the Spartacists are aiding Reagan—by calling for the defeat of American imperialism, for military victory to the guerrillas of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) and workers revolution throughout the region! Since even those well versed in the Stalinist Big Lie find this a hard line to sell, they've come up with a new ploy. Suddenly the "doves" who have been pushing for a deal between the opposition Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR) and the butcher junta are saying "What's all the fuss about? Isn't everyone for a leftist victory in El Salvador?"

The problem, they claim, is that the "Trots" (today pronounced "Sparks") have the bad taste to say it out loud. Columnist Alexander Cockburn wrote in the *Village Voice* (6 April) that the SL "line on victory to the FDR/FMLN is unimpeachable," but... "they should just learn to stop acting like assholes" since "most of the demonstrators on the main march probably espouse victory for the FDR/FMLN too." The next week this organ of rad-lib opinion featured a letter which (after trying to justify the massive police repression against the SL on March 27 with lies like we were "armed with billy clubs") coyly claims, "For the record: CISPES supports Salvadoran self-determination by military victory or negotiation...." Even the reformist Socialist Workers Party (SWP) is getting into the act, alleging that, "It is a strength of the new antiwar movement in the United States that a large component consciously supports the victory of the rebel forces" (*Intercontinental Press*, 5 April).

Well, as Stalin cynically remarked, paper will take anything that's written on it. What an eloquent self-condemnation: here are the El Salvador "doves" claiming to support the pro-

gram they have repeatedly tried to squelch over the last year. They are caught on the two-pronged hook of the Russian question and the popular front, which is everywhere and always the question of revolution. They oppose a leftist military victory in El Salvador because their mentors, the liberal Democrats, can well see that this opens the door to social revolution in Central America. They refuse to defend Cuba and the USSR because it is a matter of past revolutions which, no matter how bureaucratically degenerated and deformed, all wings of the bourgeoisie—hawks and doves alike—seek to destroy. And since exclusion and slander are not enough to cover their asses, they simply lie.


Who's for Leftist Military Victory

Let's begin by setting the record straight. CISPES has never raised a call for victory by the FMLN guerrillas in El Salvador. Instead they march under the banner "Support Franco-Mexican Recognition of the FDR," a diplomatic attempt by more far-sighted imperialist sectors to head off social revolution in Central America by negotiating a

compromise "political solution" between Salvadoran leftists and the junta. French Socialist president Mitterrand spelled out his anti-Communist purposes in a recent interview: "...the United States has to see that by opposing the demands of the people they create the openings for Cuba and the Soviet Union" (*New York Times*, 26 April). If many protesters in Washington supported a rebel victory, it was no thanks to CISPES, and no thanks to the SWP which had not previously mentioned the issue, except to condemn the SL's call as "ultraleft."

The reformist SWP is playing a double game, at least, on the issue of siding with the El Salvador insurgents. For international consumption, Fred Feldman claimed in the pages of *Intercontinental Press* that, "To a far greater degree than during the Vietnam War, protesters consciously identified [on March 27] with the rebels the U.S. government seeks to crush." The cop/goon exclusion of the SL's Anti-Imperialist Contingent was not even mentioned. In a very different article for domestic consumption, however,

continued on page 8



CISPES wants to "clean up" U.S. foreign policy.

CISPES hails initiative of anti-Soviet French social-democratic president François Mitterrand.



Military Victory...

(continued from page 7)

Suzanne Haig writes in the SWP's *Militant* (9 April) on the same Washington march without a word about support for "victory of the rebel forces." Instead she denounces a Spartacist placard saying, "No Negotiations with Butcher Duarte!"

The reformists' main line of defense, however, is to hide behind the FDR/FMLN. The *Militant* article on the March 27 march accuses the SL of organizing a "counterdemonstration... against the leadership of the Salvadoran liberation forces and their call for peace and negotiations...." And FDR representative Arnaldo Ramos said in Washington on March 27:

"Militarily, in the last two years the FMLN forces have successfully contained every major offensive against their zones of control. However, we don't take pride in our military activity. We make it very clear both to the U.S. administration and to the American people that we want peace. That we are ready today, tomorrow, to sit, to negotiate, to try to stop this Central American war from taking place."

Earlier, Zamora had told *Newsweek* (15 February), "A military victory of the [rebels] will find the U.S. completely hostile.... And the people in the business community and the professions would get out. Under these circumstances, what are the chances of pluralism?"

Is this the voice of the Salvadoran "liberation forces"? An article in the *Los Angeles Times* (15 March) points to increasing differences in the FDR/FMLN coalition of five guerrilla groups and several marginal bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties:

"[FDR head Guillermo] Ungo speaks of moderation and of social and economic justice....
"The Popular Liberation Front of Salvador Cayetano Carpio, who split with El Salvador's Communists 20 years ago because he thought they were too moderate, talks not of negotiation but of a long, bitter war and military victory."

Cayetano Carpio, however, calls for a "democratic revolutionary government, not for a Socialist government," including everyone from "large businessmen to small farmers and merchants" (*New York Times*, 9 February). Rather, tensions appear to be growing between the fighters in the field and the popular-front politicians working the cocktail circuits of Mexico City and Washington, D.C. The *Los Angeles Times* article reports:

"The rebels in the field do not want a cease-fire, which they believe would give the government a rest while new troops are being trained in the United States. But the rebel political organization based in Mexico is now saying it would agree to a cease-fire if talks began."

In addition to the Ungos and Zamoras, the Mitterrands and López Portillos, American imperialist liberals are concerned about the threat to "plural-

ism" (i.e., capitalism) if the leftist guerrillas win the war in El Salvador. An aide to Democratic representative Michael Barnes, a leading Congressional proponent of a "political solution," told the *Los Angeles Times*:

"If the left wins a military victory, almost by definition it would be dominated by the guerrillas. Look at Nicaragua, where we in fact did let the left win a military victory—that is, the armed extreme left...."

"Johnson feels that the United States should have sought a political solution in Nicaragua before the left won a military victory. Once the guerrillas captured Managua, he said, it was tough for the moderates."

"These guys (the Sandinistas of Nicaragua) feel they're revolutionaries. They fought the revolution, they won the revolution, they're the vanguard of the revolution," he said. "Now, they're in power and they're not going to give it up. That's the way revolutionaries are...."

"In El Salvador, he said, the United States should encourage negotiations with people of the moderate democratic left, like Ungo, who are needed as go-betweens by the radicals...."

"So I think the moderate left would rapidly lose out if there were a military victory, and the more extreme left would consolidate its power."

These are the Salvador "doves" supported by CISPES and the SWP: calculating imperialist spokesmen whose calls for a "political solution" are aimed at keeping the "extreme left" out of power.

The "Institutionality" of the Army

What would such a "negotiated settlement" consist of? A lengthy article in the 18 March *New York Times* spelled out the Salvadoran opposition's plans in detail. According to correspondent Alan Riding, they include: a "broad-based interim government that would include representatives of the army, conservative political parties and the private sector as well as of the F.M.L.N. and the F.D.R., with no single group exercising control"; completion of the land reform plan initiated by the junta; "respect for existing foreign investment"; a "nonaligned foreign policy, with special emphasis on maintaining friendly relations with the United States."

Above all, the key is "preservation of the 'institutionality' of the army, which would 'purge itself' of officers blamed for the current repression and would subsequently incorporate elements of the guerrillas." Riding quotes an unnamed rebel leader saying, "The [Nicaraguan] Sandinists won an outright victory because Somoza's National Guard collapsed. We're willing to make concessions in a negotiated solution before the Salvadoran army collapses." Roberto Roca, one of the five top FMLN commanders, is also cited: "The best guarantee [to the United States] is to avoid total defeat of the army." And another FMLN leader, Fermán Cienfuegos: "We see the offensive as consolidating our military position for negotiations." To Marxists, who understand that the core of capitalist state power is the armed forces, particularly the officer corps, which cannot be reformed into its opposite but must be *smashed*, such liberal proposals spell bloody disaster.

"Preserve the institutionality of the army"—sound familiar? Sure, Chile! In order to obtain Congressional confirmation as Chilean president in 1970, Salvador Allende Gossens, leader of the Unidad Popular (UP) popular front, agreed to a Christian Democratic demand "that the organic and hierarchical structures of the Armed Forces and the Carabineros [National Police] be respected" (Alain Labrousse, *El experimento chileno*). The Statute of Constitutional Guarantees voted by the UP and signed by Allende made it unconstitutional to form workers militias or to appoint police or military officers not trained in the respective academies. Like the Salvadoran FDR/FMLN, which praises "progressive" officers like Col-

Zeltzer: "It Was Only an Idea"

RWL Invite to CIA Agent

What kind of "socialist" would invite a representative of the CIA to "educate" workers about international labor affairs? The scab "socialists" of the grotesquely misnamed Revolutionary Workers League (RWL), that's who. On March 8 RWL supporter Steve Zeltzer chaired a meeting of their mini-front group, the Bay Area Committee for a Labor Party (BAYCLAP) in San Francisco to plan for an educational conference on AFL-CIO foreign policy. The featured speaker, proposed by BAYCLAP at a previous meeting, was to have been William Doherty, executive director of the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD).

The AIFLD is a well-known CIA "labor" front in Latin America, the organization behind the "land reform" massacres in El Salvador (see "Reform by Death," *WW* No. 272, 16 January 1981). Doherty himself was described by former CIA operative Philip Agee in his book *Inside the Company: CIA Diary* as a "CIA agent in labour operations," one of the "principal agents" in communications unions. When members of the Spartacist League and the Militant Action Caucus, a class-struggle

opposition in the Communications Workers of America (CWA), confronted Zeltzer with these facts, Zeltzer tried to weasel, claiming that the Doherty invitation was "only an idea," and presumably not such a bad one since "Doherty is an AFL-CIO official."

By the time of the March 8 meeting, the plan to invite Doherty had been shelved in favor of asking California state AFL-CIO head John Henning to "build" the conference. BAYCLAP is practically a "John Henning Fan Club" because of this labor faker's occasional calls for a British-style reformist labor party. And lest anyone think that Zeltzer & Co. were out to "expose" Henning, a former Kennedy administration appointee as ambassador to New Zealand, BAYCLAP's spokesman Marge Clouser revealed that the idea to invite Henning had been a "suggestion" made to her by local CWA bureaucrats.

The "Statement of Purpose" drawn up for the BAYCLAP educational conference never made it clear whether the education would be for or against AFL-CIA policy. Obviously this was no accident.

onel Majano, Allende's UP preached reliance on "constitutional" officers like... General Pinochet. The result: 30,000 murdered in the 1973 coup, 100,000 arrested, close to a million forced into exile.

A deal with the Salvadoran junta, like Allende's agreement to respect the "institutionality" of the armed forces, won't "end the bloodshed." On the contrary, it will lay the basis for a Chilean-style bloodbath against unarmed workers. Recall the familiar scene where the rebel leaders sign an agreement with the tyrant, the insurgents hand over their arms and then the massacre begins. Today the CP accuses the Spartacists of "urg[ing] the Salvadoran people to continue the armed struggle to the last drop of campesino blood" (*Daily World*, 30 March). In Chile during the last months before the coup the Stalinists were similarly pushing the treacherous slogan, "No to Civil War." In the face of civil war those who raise pacifistic slogans to "end the war" rather than to win it are the most dangerous enemies of the working class. The only way to end the massacres, to end the spilling of campesino blood, is to sweep away the hangmen and butchers through workers revolution. That is the program of the Trotskyists, which the popular-frontists will go to any lengths to repress.

Anti-Imperialism Abroad, Class Struggle at Home

The Spartacist League says El Salvador is the front line of U.S. imperialism's anti-Soviet war drive. CISPES/PAM/SWP/CP/WWP and the few ragtag centrists know and fear that this is the case. That knowledge fuels the hypocritical vehemence with which they deny it. They argue that Reagan's intervention is unjustified because the Soviets are not intervening. The converse is that Soviet intervention would justify American intervention! This is the premise of the Kennedy liberals, which the rad-libs and reformists accept. That is why they raise the absurd demand, "Stop the U.S. War in El Salvador"—as if there were no domestic base for counterrevolution there; as if El Salvador had nothing to do with the Cold War.

The popular-frontists say, who are we

to tell "the Salvadorans" what to do: "Self-determination through military victory or negotiation," whatever Professor Ungo says. This is a hallmark of social-democratic reformism. Lenin's Bolsheviks had none of this patronizing liberal imperialist arrogance. Here is how Leon Trotsky put it:

"What characterizes Bolshevism on the national question is that in its attitude toward oppressed nations, even the most backward, it considers them not only the object but also the subject of politics. Bolshevism does not confine itself to recognizing their 'right' to self-determination and to parliamentary protests against the trampling upon of this right. Bolshevism penetrates into the midst of the oppressed nations; it raises them up against their oppressors; it ties up their struggle with the struggle of the proletariat in capitalist countries; it instructs the oppressed Chinese, Hindus or Arabs in the art of insurrection and it assumes full responsibility for this work in the face of civilized executioners. Here only does Bolshevism begin, that is, revolutionary Marxism in action."

—"What Next? Vital Questions for the German Proletariat," January 1932


El Salvador is no exception: Guatemala, 1954; Santo Domingo, 1965; Vietnam, 1945-1975—as long as the imperialist system persists there will be new El Salvadors, new Vietnams. Key to the destruction of imperialism is the working class of the imperialist centers. The SL struggles for American labor to boycott all military goods to right-wing dictatorships in Central America, to launch political strike action in the event of direct U.S. intervention. The most concrete solidarity with Latin American revolutions is to build a communist party to lead workers revolution "in the belly of the monster."

Leftist military victory in El Salvador opens the door to workers revolution throughout Central America and extending to the powerful proletariat of Mexico. It poses the urgent need for socialist revolution in the United States itself. We say it. They fear it. That's why they want to crush the Spartacists. But these tasks are inexorably posed by the struggle against Reagan and his puppets. The only real choice is revolution or death, socialism or barbarism on a global scale. Those who seek to evade the choice are fools or charlatans, or both. ■

Class war in El Salvador. From La Manzanilla massacre of 1932 to the front line of Reagan's Cold War. Articles from *Workers Vanguard*, Young Spartacus.

(40 pages, \$1.00)

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



Reagan's El Centro Concentration Camp

Asylum for Salvadoran Refugees!

EL CENTRO, California—The fate of those escaping junta terror in El Salvador, making their way by foot over mountains and desert across the U.S. borders, is often to be rounded up and imprisoned, without trial or charges, in Reagan's concentration camps. One of the most notorious is the "El Centro Processing Center," a holding pen in the Imperial Valley where hundreds of refugees, predominantly Salvadoran, swelter in 100° plus sun by day, by night packed into overcrowded, filthy barracks.

El Centro is closed to visitors, and few have ever seen it. But on February 26, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), responding to mounting pressure, permitted a one-day press tour. *WV* was there, as well as a number of other journalists. On that day, hoping to clean up the camp's image, the INS served prisoners special foods, and had the floors in the barracks freshly washed. But it all backfired, as prisoners, forcibly confined in a large fenced-in pen known as the "recreation field" (called "el corralón"—the big corral—by the inmates) rushed up to the 12-foot wire fence to talk to reporters about conditions inside.

Refugees told *WV* about the filth, the poor food, the small soap rations, the difficulty of communicating with the outside world, and most important, the isolation and boredom. Passing through the holding pens, the mess halls and barracks, our reporter was struck by the notices on bulletin



WV Photo

boards detailing procedures for "voluntary" return to one's home country. The camp exists as a high security holding compound designed to isolate, demoralize and terrorize prisoners so that they will eventually "volunteer" to return. Of course, should they continue to refuse, they are simply deported back to near-certain imprisonment and death at the hands of the junta. Reporter Laurie Berkland of the *Los Angeles Times* (28 February) wrote of prisoners' complaints of

rough treatment from the guards, harassment, being coerced into giving up their legal struggles, and denial of medical care. She spoke with one Salvadoran refugee, 22-year-old Rafael Antonio Vega, who said, "My parents told me to leave El Salvador, to run because I was a student and you see students' bodies everyday in the street. Boys of 13 and 14, you see with their arms and legs sliced."

These victims of right-wing terror are Reagan's "criminals," confined

without trial, without charges, without lawyers, beaten down and demoralized at El Centro. Meanwhile, Reagan and the U.S. bourgeoisie fling the doors wide open for thousands of right-wing *gusanos* from Cuba and Nicaragua, many of whom are being wined and dined and trained with the latest weapons as commando troops for reaction.

Asylum for Salvadoran refugees! Free victims of Reagan's concentration camps!

Missing from "Missing" ...

(continued from page 6)

own last instruction to coup plotter Viaux in 1970 was: "The time will come when you with all your other friends can do something. You will continue to have our support."

As for the *New York Times'* claim that the U.S. Senate's Church Committee investigation had produced "no evidence" of U.S. involvement in the coup or Horman's death, Frank Church himself, after seeing *Missing*, commented: "From what we learned then [in the 1975 hearings], the film seemed very plausible." And Seymour Hersh? He says angrily that all he ever told Flora Lewis was that he could find no proof that the U.S. actually "pulled the trigger" in September 1973. If there is a dearth of direct evidence, it's because they got rid of those who knew the truth. Like Charles Horman.

Treacherous Popular Front

U.S.-sponsored plotting against even mildly leftist regimes in Latin America is so notorious that no genuine revolutionary can pretend to explain the fall of Allende by simply writing it off to CIA machinations. If the coup was coming, and that was obvious, why weren't preparations made to crush it in the egg? As we wrote immediately after the Pinochet coup:

"In order to excuse their own betrayals in Chile the Stalinists are now claiming that the coup is the work of fascists and extreme reactionaries in league with the CIA. There is no doubt that the ultra-right provided leadership of the coup and was in contact with the U.S. government. ITT's offer of \$1 million in 1970 to dump Allende is certainly not unrelated to the 'accidental' presence of American navy ships in Chilean waters on the day of the coup. 'But to hold only the 'ultras' and the

CIA responsible for the coup is to ignore the bulk of the Chilean bourgeoisie."

—*WV Supplement*,
13 September 1973

Why were Chilean workers unarmed on that fateful September 11? Because Allende had signed a "Statute of Constitutional Guarantees" preventing him from touching the military hierarchy and outlawing workers militias. Because the UP did not veto and allowed the military to carry out a draconian "Arms Control Law," terrorizing factories and slum districts with their searches. Because the reformists preached faith in the "constitutionalist" officers like Schneider, Prats... and Pinochet.

The road to the hell of September 1973 was paved by the policies of the Unidad Popular, the so-called "via chilena." At the heart of this treacherous program of class collaboration was the popular front. Already in the Spanish Civil War of 1936-39, Stalin had used the People's Front to tie the workers to the "progressive" bourgeois parties and "democratic" generals—and thus head off proletarian revolution, which was and is the only road to victory over the fascists. Chile went through this experience in the '40s; ending in the concentration camps of Popular Front president González Videla, who "betrayed" his erstwhile Communist Party allies, just as Pinochet "betrayed" Allende. They did not, however, betray the interests of their own class, the bourgeoisie.

The Trotskyists warned of the impending catastrophe in Chile and put forward a communist program to fight it. Already in 1970 we wrote:

"It is the most elementary duty for revolutionary Marxists to irreconcilably oppose the Popular Front in the election and to place absolutely no confidence in it in power. Any 'critical support' to the Allende coalition is class treason, paving the way for a bloody defeat for the Chilean working people when domestic reaction, abetted by

international imperialism, is ready."

—*Spartacist* No. 19,
November-December 1970

Although Allende's UP desperately tried to restrain the Chilean working class, it became clear to the bourgeoisie that the mobilization and demands of the masses were running outside the bounds of capitalism. Workers were taking over factories, peasants seized landed estates not on the agrarian reform list, in the industrial belts around the cities *cordones industriales* arose as embryonic organs of dual power. The reformists, particularly the CP, tried to sabotage the workers' militancy; centrists like the MIR generally tailed after it. But, tragically, no one was building a Leninist vanguard party which could lead those struggles not only against the capitalists but over the opposition of the misleaders of labor who block the road to revolution.

Liberal Imperialist Arrogance

At the end of *Missing*, Ed Horman (played by Jack Lemmon) tells U.S. embassy officials complicit in his son's death that "I'm glad I live in a country where people like you are put in jail." Many audiences applaud the righteous indignation of this conservative Christian Scientist businessman whose eyes have at last been opened. But it's a lie, as is soon shown by the movie itself. The Horman family couldn't even get the courts to release information about the murder of Charles; their suit was thrown out because the key evidence is still classified as state secrets. Moreover, the idea that the brutal military coups of Latin America are simply the result of "Hispanic violence" is a U.S. liberal (not to say racist) myth. The atrocities in Santiago's National Stadium belong not only to Pinochet's sadistic killers but also to the antiseptic suburbanites of the U.S. Milgroups who eat Skippy peanut-butter sandwiches while training Latin American torturers in techniques first

developed by the Nazis.

Audiences who see *Missing* today can't help but think of El Salvador, where the U.S. is once again backing a brutal, sadistic dictatorship that murders its own people by the tens of thousands. And there is one parallel that can't be missed—between Charles Horman and the four American nuns murdered last year by the Salvadoran National Guard. A central aspect of the liberal imperialist arrogance of *Missing* is the fact that the only dead person anyone in the film cares about is the lone American. As *Village Voice* film critic Andrew Sarris put it: "It is as if an American father were looking for his son in Auschwitz, and complaining to the authorities that an American boy did not belong with all these other corpses." It reminds one of the Jane Fonda genre of Vietnam war movies as well, where the main (and often only) casualties of the war are fucked-up Viet vets. Sure, as the reformists keep saying, "American guns kill American nuns" in El Salvador—but they also kill 30,000 Salvadorans!

Missing has moved and angered many in its audiences. But the lesson of the Chilean coup is not one of despair and tragedy. The Chilean workers were dealt a bloody defeat, but they can and will fight again. They must be armed not only with guns but also with a revolutionary program to combat the disastrous illusions in a "peaceful road to socialism" that ultimately became a bloody road to counterrevolution. Today all manner of reformists promise to repeat the tragic Allende experience. In Chile "the people united" were defeated, and endlessly chanting the opposite will not make it so. Only the Trotskyists of the Spartacist League have consistently fought for workers revolution to smash the junta, the only program which can avenge the deaths of thousands of heroic militants martyred on the altar of the popular front. ■

Falklands...

(continued from page 1)

episodes in the epoch of imperialist decay, the wave of chauvinist hysteria which has swept Britain is no less disgusting and dangerous for it. Thatcher proclaims "aggression" anywhere must be repelled, as if Britain were still the world's policeman. What right does a two-bit power like Britain have to police global "aggression"? Why not Bangladesh? Labour Party leader Michale Foot leaps to congratulate Thatcher and Her Majesty's armed forces. Royal Navy recruiting posters have been found tacked up on factory notice boards.

All the blather about defending British sovereignty in the Falklands or the rights of the 1,800 Falklands "kelpers" is sheer imperialist cant. Britain seized the Falklands from Argentina in the early nineteenth century. So turnabout is fair play. The Shetlands and Orkneys, after all, were only pledged to Scotland by the Danish monarchy 400 years ago in lieu of a royal dowry. If the British want to stand on their claim to the Falklands, they should return the Shetlands and Orkneys to Denmark. More serious is the case of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, which had a population larger than the Falklands. There the British colonialists drove those people from their homes in order to give an unpopulated island to the U.S. Navy.

The Labour Party has sought to prevent the Tories from outflanking it in popular jingoism, while simultaneously warning against another Suez-type humiliation. The right wing of the party has, predictably, more or less paralleled the American position for a negotiated solution. The Labour MP from Langley, Virginia, Denis Healey, rose in Parliament to "express the gratitude of the House to Mr. Haig" and then shuttled off to New York himself.

But in all this it is the *enfant terrible* of the Labour left, Tony Benn, whose policies are most in line with the real capacities and interests of British capitalism. Recognizing that Britain is in no position to get into a war over a group of islands 8,000 miles away, Benn warns that if the fleet is not withdrawn, "it will end in tragedy for this country." Both the anti-Communist right and the fake left portray Benn as a veritable red revolutionary. In fact, he is now acting as the only rational voice for British capitalism. Contrast Benn with Lenin, who saw in World War I a bloody, irrational conflict that was ripping up the normal functioning of the bourgeois order, and creating historic revolutionary opportunities.

American Impotence Exposed

Perhaps the most striking thing about this bizarre world crisis is that it highlights the weakness of the United States as self-styled leader of the "free world." The night before Argentina seized the Falklands, the president of

the United States spoke on the phone for almost an hour with Argentine strongman Galtieri (the longest such call Reagan's had with any foreign leader) trying to convince him not to do it. But to no avail. And Haig's effort to emulate his mentor Kissinger's shuttle diplomacy has only made him an international laughing stock.

In 1956, at the height of the short-lived "American century," Eisenhower and Dulles simply called off the British/French/Israeli invasion of Egypt over the Suez Canal, a humiliation which still rankles the Tory establishment. Britain couldn't even win the "cod war" with tiny Iceland in the early 1970s because the Americans told them to lay off. Washington was afraid that if the British won, it would endanger the NATO airbase at Keflavik. But times have changed.

It is especially painful for U.S. imperialism that Britain is now attempting to recapture its imperial glory at the expense of the Argentine junta. Since taking office the Reagan administration has fervently wooed the bloody anti-Communist butchers in Buenos Aires. Last year the White House pressed



Argentine strongman Galtieri.

Congress into removing the ban against arms shipments to Argentina, a leftover from Carter's "human rights" hypocrisy. Last November at a state dinner in Washington hosted by Pentagon superhawk Caspar Weinberger, Galtieri declared that the third world war had already begun in the Americas, a war between the "free world" led by the U.S. and Soviet Communism. The Argentine military had volunteered its elite units to help overthrow petty-bourgeois radical Sandinistas in Nicaragua and suppress leftist insurgency in El Salvador. No doubt Galtieri believed these services on the Central American front of imperialism's Cold War II entitled him to some compensation, namely, the Malvinas. No doubt he also figured that his good friend Reagan would smooth over the decrepit British lion's ruffled fur.

It was therefore anything but an accident that the very night of the Falklands Islands seizure, Reagan's UN ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick was indulging her preference for "authoritarian" regimes by attending a dinner at the Argentine embassy. Very possibly Kirkpatrick thinks that Margaret Thatcher is all right as far as she goes, but she's ruling on the basis of something unstable known as bourgeois democracy rather than a tested "moderately authoritarian" government like Argentina's. The British were not amused. Her Majesty's ambassador to Washington, Sir Nicholas Henderson, asked how would Americans have felt if he had been wine and dined at the Iranian embassy the night of the Teheran hostage seizure.

So with the British pushing their imperial pretensions to the hilt and the U.S. unable to simply call Thatcher to order, the Reagan administration is forced to make the excruciating choice between the anti-Communist junta to the south and the anti-Communist Tories across the Atlantic. While many Reaganites may feel more at home with

Galtieri's Argentina than with a Britain filled with Bennites and "Bolshies," Washington has increasingly realized it must line up with its more important ally, Britain.

Fake-Lefts Cheerleading for Galtieri

Just a few days before the seizure of the Falklands, the Argentine junta was confronted with a 15,000-strong demonstration by the General Confederation of Labor in Buenos Aires, which was suppressed with large-scale arrests. Fearing a wave of labor unrest, Galtieri designed his Malvinas adventure as a *nationalist diversion* to outflank the Peronists. And, so far, it has been a successful maneuver in defusing class struggle with chauvinist demagoguery. But Argentina's leftists and trade unionists should think well that the first fruits of taking the Malvinas could be the establishment of an Argentine prison island for the luckiest of the *desaparecidos* ("disappeared") on one of its barren outcrops.

Addicted to Third World nationalist enthusing, virtually the entire fake left in the U.S. (and to a lesser extent in



British "Iron Lady" Thatcher.

Europe) has taken up the Argentine cause. What makes this even more despicable is that most of these self-styled Marxists admit that the Falklands adventure is a "cynical, desperate attempt to divert attention from Argentina's economic crisis" (*Guardian*, 21 April). Having said this, these groups then proceed to join the diversion!

"Hands Off Argentina!" screamed a recent issue of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) organ, the *Militant* (23 April), taking as good coin the junta's claim that the Falklands are Argentine. Of course, the British claim to sovereignty is based on the military triumphs of a now-tattered colonial empire. (Spain got the Malvinas when the pope divided the world between it and Portugal. But by then Henry VIII of Britain had broken from the Roman church.) Claiming the continuity of the Spanish domains, for 149 years the Argentine bourgeoisie has had an appetite to restore its control over the islands. This extenuated legal quibble should be of interest only to nationalists, not Marxists. It is the task of the communists to pursue workers revolution, not to dress up dubious arguments for a revanchist adventure.

It says much about the supposedly "anti-imperialist" cause that it is supported by the Salvadoran junta (a fact favorably reported by the SWP!), while in Madrid 20,000 fascists marched on behalf of Argentina and for a Spanish invasion of Gibraltar. Argentina's other main Latin American supporters are the Guatemalan junta, which claims the ex-British colony of Belize, and Venezuela, which has territorial designs on the former British Guiana. However, Pinochet's Chile, which is disputing the Beagle Channel Islands with Argentina, and Figueiredo's Brazil, whose claims on the Iguazu Falls conflict with those of Buenos Aires, are notably less than enthusiastic in supporting fellow general Galtieri.

On what grounds do self-styled socialists support Argentina's seizure of the Falklands? On the grounds of national self-determination? The 1,800 Falklands kelpers speak English and are fanatically loyal to the non-existent British empire. The Falklands are hundreds of miles from the Argentine mainland. There are, in fact, hundreds of such sparsely populated or uninhabited islands which have long been bones of contention among the various imperialist powers and, with the decline of European colonialism, among the local bourgeois states. It is not the business of Marxists to take sides in these squalid territory-grabbing disputes.

The attempt to paint the Falklands adventure as a legitimate anti-imperialist struggle has reached ridiculous heights with the fake-Trotskyist SWP. The 23 April *Militant* likened the Galtieri junta to a union bureaucracy forced to lead a strike. It then lifted a passage from an article by Trotsky on the Sino-Japanese war, simply changing the countries: "British patriotism is the hideous mask of worldwide robbery. Argentine patriotism is legitimate and progressive." Trotsky in 1937 was talking about defending the Chinese nation against Japanese conquest and oppression. Japan had launched a full-scale invasion of China, seizing major cities like Peking, bombing the population and installing a puppet government. Has Britain invaded Argentina? No one in the world thinks that the Falklands squabble is at all comparable. In the Falklands the British are *not* oppressing Argentina nor, in fact, any Argentines.

In contrast to petty-bourgeois radicals and reformists of all stripes, we think that as long as these two viciously anti-working class regimes go at one another, it's a good thing if they grind up their respective military machines. Marxists are revolutionary defeatists on both sides in the present conflict. The potential for a massive class upsurge in Argentina is obvious and Thatcher too is hated by Britain's workers. The Argentine proletariat must not be taken in by the nationalist diversion over the Falklands, but must continue the struggle to smash Galtieri's bloody junta. And the Spartacist League/Britain, section of the international Spartacist tendency, calls on British workers to fight for their own class power, eradicating the last vestiges of Britain's sordid and brutal imperialist history. The main enemy is at home! ■

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 _____

304


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

Just Out! Spartacist

(English Edition)
No. 34, Summer 1982

- From El Salvador to Detroit: It Is Desperately Necessary to Fight!
- SL/U.S. Faces the Reagan Years: For Labor Action to Bring Down Reagan!
- El Salvador: Revolution or Death!

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



"Freeze" ...

(continued from page 1)

wants such a freeze too... as soon as he can "close the window of vulnerability." Translated from the jargon of the Defense Establishment all of this means: "Let's disarm the Russians." On both sides the argument is how to make U.S. imperialism stronger against the USSR. There is firm agreement for a massive military buildup and the drive toward nuclear first strike capability aimed at the Soviets. The arguments are over *how* best to advance U.S. imperialism's global objectives.

McGeorge Bundy, former National Security Adviser to Kennedy and Johnson, and Robert McNamara, their defense secretary, have come out against nuclear "first use" in Europe. In an article in *Foreign Affairs* (Spring 1982) written in consultation with Ted Kennedy and co-signed by the author of the 1950s Cold War policy of containment, George Kennan (for some time a détente liberal), and by Nixon's arms control negotiator, Gerard Smith, they declare that the U.S.'s present policy of "flexible response" isn't flexible enough for them. Their "no first use" policy for Europe is a demand for a more powerful and more usable conventional military in Europe. Worried about the "political will" of the allies, they want more American troops and firepower in Europe.

Bundy and McNamara are good examples of the new "doves" of imperialism. In two administrations they developed and carried out policies of mass murder in the dirtiest war of modern history, Vietnam. Conventional? Sure it was. By 1969 the level of U.S. bombardment had reached nearly *two Hiroshimas per week*—130,000 tons a month rained down on a largely defenseless civilian population (Noam Chomsky, *At War With Asia*). These men helped design the policies of the most insidious chemical torture and high tech hell used against the Vietnamese workers and peasants. The phosphorous bombs and napalm scorched

the earth while sensors beeped electronic death on bombed-out moonscape countryside. McGeorge Bundy called his policy of bombing Vietnam and Laos into smoking craters "the most restrained in modern warfare." No doubt he has similar "restraint" in mind when he gently chides the Reaganites for their refusal to declare for "no first use."

The Freezing of America

All sides in this intrabourgeois debate are prepared to blow up the world. But Reagan and Haig have made a spectacular show of it, scaring sane people everywhere with their talk of "limited nuclear war," "demonstration shots," and "winning" a nuclear exchange. Such talk has helped the freezers, who are able to bring thousands onto the streets, many in search of survival, some in search of peace, but mainly to pressure the "lawmakers" into forcing a different "mix" in the Pentagon's war arsenal.

The freezing of America has thus appealed to wide sections of "middle America," including stolid pro-Reagan New Englanders and Southern promilitary conservatives, from town meetings to campuses to Congress. The establishment churches are at the organizational center along with eco-faddists, some multimillionaires, sections of the Defense Establishment and groups of liberal professionals. But it is Teddy Kennedy who hopes to ride the tide of the new campaign to the White House in 1984. And that is why the reformist left tails this campaign as a *really* popular front against Reagan.

Ground Zero and the freezers claim millions of Americans are involved in the activities on hundreds of campuses and cities. A number of states will have nuclear freeze initiatives on the ballot, most importantly California. This activism has the quality of a moral uplift movement. For "Ground Zero Week" in April, symbolic nuclear weapons were detonated all over the place. Runners in the Boston Marathon learned how much of their skin would have been



Der Spiegel

Imperialist "freezers" target Soviets.

melted off as they headed for the finish line at ground zero. There is a "run for life" event in North Carolina, a "puppets for peace" show in Albuquerque, hundreds of teach-ins, hot air balloons over San Francisco and even a "swim for peace" by an endangered seal in New England.

The largest rally so far in the freeze campaign was in Chicago April 19, where about 20,000 turned out, mobilized largely by the Methodists and, unofficially, the Catholic church. Conservative Republicans and every front group of just about every group on the left showed up. The Businessmen Opposed to Nuclear War were there with their slogan, "Build businesses not bombs"; and the Communist Party (CP) fronts with their classless slogan, "End the arms race not the human race." The Communist Workers Party called upon the "Soviet People" to build such a movement in their own country, presumably so they would be disarmed before imperialism.

The crowd was lily-white, decidedly middle-class and patriotic. Jesse Jackson's PUSH sent one minister and the only union represented was the CP-influenced United Electrical workers.

This is no accident. The mainstream freezers have a conscious and explicit policy of not wanting to look too radical or too black. They have rejected tying the matter of the nuclear buildup to the racist attack on social services. They have excluded El Salvador and U.S. support to the bloody junta as "divisive." There were so many U.S. flags at the Chicago rally, so much patriotism, that when some fascists of the America First Committee showed up with their red-white-and-blue armbands, the crowd couldn't tell whether or not they were with the rally.

But despite the thoroughly bourgeois character of the Chicago rally, the Spartacist League sold more than 400 pieces of Trotskyist literature. The freeze campaign attracts many who are just fed up with the nuclear reactionary in the White House and who want to protest the drive to World War III. It doubtless attracts some young activists new to politics who at first will be taken in by this Orwellian "peace" campaign for a more streamlined imperialist war. To those who want to oppose the warmakers in the Pentagon, to those whose impulses are genuinely anti-militarist, we say: smashing imperialism is the road to peace.

The freeze campaign is not a contest between the sane and the madmen, a moral battle against a technological golem, the aware vs. the "psychically numb," the decent vs. the destructive. It is part of imperialism's war against the working class. And the defense of the Soviet Union against imperialism draws the class line. The Soviet Union, despite its Stalinist bureaucratic degeneration, ended capitalist rule in 1917, and the capitalists have been trying to reconquer it ever since. What is posed is not an abstract "arms race." The U.S. missiles are pointed directly at Moscow, and this will continue as long as capitalism exists. And the Soviets had better have missiles to defend themselves. In the irrational system of capitalism, war is not madness, but a logical consequence. Peace will come only through the final disarmament of the bourgeoisie by the victorious revolutionary proletariat. ■

Deportations...

(continued from page 12)

these attacks into impotent liberal protests. In place of a class-struggle fight this bunch pushes narrow community organizing based on pro-Democratic Party "people united" rhetoric. Spurred by Reagan's revoking of the "Silva letters"—which lured tens of thousands of undocumented workers into the open on the false promise of a limited "amnesty"—the Coalition mobilized 2,000 angry protesters in downtown Los Angeles March 13.

Coalition leaders were so intent on restricting the demonstration to Latin nationalism and liberal protest that they organized a 100-man goon squad to wall off the demonstration from "outsiders"—like the communists of the Spartacist League (SL). The Coalition even passed out a leaflet that warned against "disrupters" and resurrected Stalin's slanderous amalgam, lumping together "reactionaries, ultra-leftists or police agents." When a group of SL supporters and union militants arrived at the assembly site for the march, a goon demanded that a placard be taken down which said, "Stop the Deportations! Full Citizenship Rights for All Undocumented Workers!" Another intervened to prevent an interested demonstrator from buying a copy of *Workers Vanguard*. Chief thug Rodriguez then blew his top and raged, "You're excluded! We'll do everything necessary to keep you out of the march!"

The SL comrades and supporters withdrew across the street to demonstrate, chanting "¡Abajo la migra!" Among the placards (in English and Spanish) carried by SLers were: "De-

fend Mexican Workers! Down with the INS!" and "No to Imperialist Intervention in El Salvador!" But the Coalition reformists couldn't stomach the SL's call for a military victory to the leftist rebels in El Salvador and the chant, "Remember Bay of Pigs, remember Vietnam—Democratic Party, we know which side you're on!" Despite the exclusion SL supporters were able to sell almost 100 newspapers and pamphlets to demonstrators looking for a program to fight Reagan's war on working people here and abroad.

Among those excluded by the CP-supported Coalition thugs were phone workers in the Militant Action Caucus (MAC). A theme of the MAC campaign for delegate to Communications Work-

ers of America (CWA) convention this July has been for the union to mount a labor-centered demonstration to demand full citizenship rights for all foreign-born workers, no deportations, and asylum for Central American refugees from junta terror. A MAC motion to the CWA Local 11502 local meeting March 18 demanded that "our Local call on the L.A. Central Labor Council to organize and build this as a demonstration of the entire L.A. labor movement in conjunction with the Black and Latino masses!" As a MAC leaflet said:

"Our union brass looks the other way and for years [has] refused to organize and provide decent contracts for immigrant workers. But if Reagan's attacks go unchecked, if his treatment of

PATCO, if his attacks on our class brothers and sisters of Mexico and Latin America go unanswered, we are next. Reagan intends to drive the 'foreigners' out and bust the unions to enforce sweatshop conditions on *all* workers.... Labor has the power to stop Reagan cold, let's use it." ■

On Recruiting Blacks...

(continued from page 2)

Moreover, many black people have an anarchistic distrust of all institutions, the communist vanguard party not excepted. This attitude, though certainly understandable, is a barrier not only to blacks joining an organization which is at present mostly white, but also to black members coming forward as cadres and leaders of the Spartacist League. And our goal is nothing less than this (and well worth "five times as much trouble"). If Dave Mann is not just interested in point-scoring, we refer him to a post-conference article of some years ago in *WV* No. 166, 15 July 1977, "Forging a Black Trotskyist Cadre," for a discussion of objective and subjective obstacles to the development of a black communist cadre.

It is not by glorifying the present consciousness of blacks but by speaking the truth about the many-sided effects of racial oppression that an American communist vanguard can struggle to overcome those effects among its potential black recruits and cadre. And here the SL/U.S. has had some success. Our black comrades are not likely to quit when the going gets rough for they understand they have no future short of a communist victory. ■

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 32552
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) 384-7793

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

Cleveland
Box 91954
Cleveland, OH 44101
(216) 621-5138

Detroit
Box 32717
Detroit, MI 48232
(313) 868-9095

Houston
Box 26474
Houston, TX 77207

Los Angeles
Box 29574
Los Feliz Station
Los Angeles, CA 90029
(213) 663-1216

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

WORKERS VANGUARD

Racist Deportation Dragnet

Stop Reagan's Raids!

APRIL 27—In an unprecedented massive operation, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) yesterday launched a week-long nationwide roundup of foreign workers with coordinated raids on factories, construction sites and offices coast-to-coast. In the first day alone, some 1,000 people were seized as the hated *la migra* swooped down on plants where workers were beginning the morning shift. Many thousands more are to be dragged off their jobs and thrown out of the country in the week-long terror campaign explicitly designed to whip up chauvinist sentiment against "illegal aliens." To denounce the INS roundup, the Spartacist League called emergency demonstrations in San Francisco, Los Angeles and New York. These protests received wide attention as the first opposition to Reagan's racist dragnet.

INS officials announced that the operation will encompass 200 to 300 job sites in at least ten target cities. Grotesquely named "Project Jobs," these Gestapo-like sweeps are designed to spread the idea that the immigrant workers are taking jobs away from "real Americans." INS spokesmen told the *San Francisco Chronicle* (24 April) that the object of the raids is to arrest aliens in "attractive jobs that would otherwise be available to U.S. citizens and permanent residents." With the downturn in the economic cycle and the ravages of Reagan's "supply-side economics" sending unemployment soaring over the 10 million mark, the raids are a



Downing/LA Herald Examiner

Hated La Migra agents round up foreign workers after raiding a clothing manufacturer in Los Angeles.

deliberate ploy to scapegoat foreign-born workers for the crisis of the capitalist system.

Vicious INS roundups, border police raids, support to the Salvadoran junta—all are presented by the administration as a drive to "seal the borders" of the U.S. from a "Communist threat" that is supposedly creeping its way north across the Rio Grande. Meanwhile, black Haitians languish in Reagan's racist concentration camps while anti-Communist refugees from Poland and

Cuba are welcomed with open arms. But the vast numbers of undocumented foreign workers involved—estimated at up to 6 million now in the U.S.—indicate that this low-wage sector is an integral part of the American economy, just like the *Gastarbeiter* (guest workers) exploited by West German capitalists and then sent home at every downturn in the capitalist economic cycle. Traditionally these workers have been ignored and often victimized by the labor fakers, not just of the job-trusting

construction trades but also by "progressives" like Cesar Chavez (who called for the INS to arrest "illegal" Mexican farm workers). In contrast the Spartacist League has put forward a class-struggle program of organizing the "undocumented" and fighting for their protection through full citizenship rights for all foreign-born workers.

Simultaneous demonstrations called by the Spartacist League were held today in San Francisco and Los Angeles, attracting the attention of lunch-time crowds as well as much of the media and press. Signs and chants of the picketers focused in particular on the deportation of Salvadoran refugees who have fled torture and death at the hands of ultra-rightist death squads and the U.S.-backed murderous junta. In San Francisco the picket line protest was joined by representatives of the Socialist Party, the Coalition for Haitian Asylum and the Comité Luterano Latino. Spartacist spokesman Diana Coleman denounced Reagan's racist ploy:

"Mexican and Salvadoran workers did not cause Chrysler to go belly-up. Mexican workers did not make GM at Fremont close. They didn't make Detroit into a vast sea of unemployment.... They are saying that these people who came up here as migrant laborers or to work as maids in the hotels are responsible for unemployment in this country. It's just a lie."

—Stop INS raids! No deportations!
—Full citizenship rights for all foreign-born workers and their families!
—Asylum for refugees of Salvadoran junta terror! ■

Stop Deportations of Mexican Workers, Salvadoran Refugees!

LOS ANGELES—The Latino working-class neighborhoods of this city are under a virtual state of siege as Reagan's Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) steps up its drive against "illegal aliens." *La migra*, as the hated INS is known to its victims, has tripled its daily factory raids. On April 6 in a raid at Sasson Jeans, 180 people were rounded up and terrorized, many of whom have already been sent back to Mexico. Meanwhile the feds randomly detain Latinos in bus depots and train stations and throughout the *barrios*. Undocumented Mexican workers have even been snatched up as they drop their children off at school. And the management of the Los Angeles Dodgers threatened to have star pitcher Fernando Valenzuela deported as an "illegal alien" over a contract dispute. Prime targets of this racist campaign have been political refugees from right-wing terror in Latin America. Up to 300 refugees are deported to El Salvador every week

from L.A. alone. For these exiles, delivery into the clutches of Reagan's dictator friends means torture and death.

The chauvinist campaign to divide American workers against their foreign-born class brothers is intended to ensure the common defeat of both. The working class alone has the social power to shut down the factories and means of transport that is needed to smash Reagan's deportation drive. But the entire AFL-CIO leadership, from Cesar Chavez to Lane Kirkland, has lined up with the bosses against foreign-born workers. Working-class militants must demand that the labor movement fight for full citizenship rights for all foreign-born workers and asylum for refugees from right-wing terror.

The nationalists and Communist Party (CP) Stalinists in the Coalition for Visas and Rights for the Undocumented seek instead to channel the outrage over

continued on page 11

Los Angeles, March 13: Spartacist contingent will not be silenced by Stalinist thugs!



WV Photo