

## U.S. Hands Off Libya! Defend the Soviet Union!

# Reagan's Terrorism

APRIL 22—With its dead-of-the-night bombing of Libya on April 14, the United States has proclaimed in blood its criminal policy of assassination and mass terror against anyone and any government the White House perceives to be opponents of Ronald Reagan's "free world." This was no "surgical military strike," as the Reaganites claimed, but a *murder mission* to kill Qaddafi and terrorize the Libyan population. As the Pentagon later admitted, Libyan army bases were not the targets—they bombed Qaddafi's residential compound in Tripoli, his alternate headquarters in Benghazi, his personal transport aircraft. The civilian casualties may be embarrassing to Reagan's accomplice, British prime minister Margaret Thatcher (herself responsible for the gratuitous murder of hundreds of Argentine sailors during the Falklands/Malvinas war), but they were expected too. Anti-personnel cluster bombs were dropped on Benghazi. Washington wanted a visible blood-letting. As one reporter in Tripoli noted:

"The American attacks on a missile base at Surt and on Libyan vessels in the Gulf of Sidra last month, although they may have cost the lives of more than 60 Libyan sailors, made so little impact on this country's major cities that Qaddafi domestically was able to claim the engagement as a victory."

—*Washington Post*, 15 April

So Reagan has his "victory": he managed to kill Qaddafi's adopted baby daughter and to kill and maim more than 100 civilians. After two days of stories of gunfire in the streets and rumors of coups and Qaddafi's death—purposeful wishful thinking by American intelligence—the Libyan leader went on TV to denounce the bombing as barbaric and "crazy." "We tell Tripoli that he does not need to protect his children and his people," he said. "We are not like you. We do not bombard cities." Western reporters visited the

U.S. Murder Mission targeted Qaddafi and family, massacred civilians in their homes. Here, Tripoli after F-111 blitz.



hospitals where they saw surviving victims of the raid with broken arms and legs, faces and bodies full of shrapnel. In a middle-class residential neighborhood reduced to rubble they spoke to outraged Libyans: "See now who the terrorists are," said one. "This is the terror of the Americans."

In the U.S. it was a media hit, timed so that millions could hear the bombs dropping, live, on the evening TV news. Three-quarters of all Americans reportedly approved of this terror raid according to an instant popularity poll. "Rambo" Reagan flexes his muscles and the public cheers—and then cancels

their planned European vacations *en masse* out of fear of terrorist reprisals. For months, with all his "warnings" that American tourists are terrorist targets, his ordering of U.S. citizens to leave Libya, etc., Reagan has been *daring* Palestinian refugees, Qaddafi or anyone enraged by the crimes of American imperialism to respond by criminally attacking, holding hostage or killing individual Americans. Not only are such random, indiscriminate terrorist attacks abominable crimes, they are playing Reagan's game, helping him whip up war fever in an American population that ever since Vietnam has resisted every attempt to drag them into another dirty, losing colonial war.

The U.S. is creating terrorism with its own far more deadly state terror. Even former U.S. president Jimmy Carter recognized this. Referring to the death of Qaddafi's 15-month-old daughter Hana in the bombing of Tripoli, Carter remarked that if someone had killed his daughter Amy 17 years ago, "I would have sworn as long as my life existed, I would retaliate" (*New York Post*, 18 April). And not everyone in Reagan's America is caught up with Rambo-mania. The family of Peter Kilburn, the librarian at the American University in Beirut who was slain by Lebanese terrorists in retaliation for the U.S. raid,

continued on page 10

## Who Bombed Berlin Disco?

Something is fishy about Reagan's story, the pretext for the U.S. terror-bombing of Tripoli. The La Belle discothèque in West Berlin was bombed April 5, killing a black American GI, Kenneth Ford, and a Turkish woman, Nermin Haney, and injuring 230 others. The White House claims the disco was bombed by agents acting under Libyan orders, a charge which was bought wholesale and echoed *ad nauseam* in the American bourgeois press. The lead editorial in the 20 April *New York Times* claims that "proof of Libyan complicity" is affirmed because "skeptical Democrats in Congress" and "West Germany's Chancellor Kohl" believe it.

Well, we know about "skeptical" Democrats. If it's so believable, where is it? The fact of the matter is, they haven't released one shred of evidence. Nothing.

What the *Times* (and others) did not see fit to print, and effectively hid for a number of days, was the vital fact that the soldier killed was black and La Belle was a well-known soul music club frequented by black GIs and foreign workers. When we read of this in the 7 April *Los Angeles Times*, we wondered. In the scenario worked out in Washington months ago to "get Qaddafi," the bombing of the Berlin disco fell in the time slot assigned by Reagan for *Libyan* terrorism. Qaddafi may not be very

likeable, but as the head of an Islamic North African country, it doesn't seem reasonable or likely that he would order the mass murder of blacks and Muslims. Indeed, it seems much more like the modus operandi of *fascist* killers, who have launched numerous murderous attacks on Turks in West Germany and West Berlin. And when we began checking into the various accounts, we found that a *neo-Nazi* outfit had claimed the heinous bombing of the La Belle disco. This lead was buried, except for some whispers in Berlin.

In the U.S., where the state-sponsored "terrorism" scare is being

continued on page 9



We print here two letters, edited for space, from the Freedom Socialist Party and our replies.

## An Un-Tied Front of Refugees from Trotskyism

New York, New York  
March 26, 1986

Editor  
*Workers Vanguard*  
Dear Editor:

Your article on the San Francisco Trotskyist Regroupment Conference ("Anti-Trotskyist Regroupment Flunks," *WV* [No. 393], 12/13/85) is another in an unbroken series of the Spartacist League's sectarian denunciations of the U.S. left, especially its Trotskyist sector. Once again you show a preference for arrogant, infantile and sensationalistic polemics over comradely discussion and analysis of ideas—a tendency which ultimately pulverizes the Trotskyist traditions you claim to uphold. What a wildly contradictory position for a group that claims to be the sole inheritor of Trotskyism on U.S. soil!

We take issue with your assertion that there was nothing revolutionary about the San Francisco conference. It was the first attempt at a national discussion of Trotskyist regroupment since the final shattering of the SWP by its total abandonment of Permanent Revolution. This fact alone gave the conference revolutionary significance. And that is why the Freedom Socialist Party (FSP) and the Committee for a Revolutionary Socialist Party (CRSP) endorsed it.

The conference did not succeed in forging programmatic agreement; in fact, fundamental disagreement prevailed over whether regroupment

should be a programmatic or merely tactical matter. Attendees also disagreed over the issues, and the approach to them, that must be dealt with before regroupment and the revitalization of American Trotskyism can take place....

You write that anyone proposing to seriously discuss Trotskyism and the SWP must come to grips with the Spartacist League. Here we agree. But in dealing with you since the Freedom Socialist Party's departure from the SWP in 1966, we have been forced to conclude that your chronic male chauvinism, ultraleftism, homophobia and racism tear at any prospects for productive political engagement in the Trotskyist regroupment arena. For years, you have sneered and jeered at the FSP and CRSP without once deigning to deal with the socialist feminist content of our programs. Instead you prefer to indulge in name-calling, as you did in the article....

Having side-stepped some of the key issues we raised at the conference—the reasons for the degeneration of the SWP, the relation of Permanent Revolution to the struggles of women, people of color and lesbians and gays, and the key role of Trotskyists in the coming American revolution—you fabricate your own target for polemic. You write that *everyone* at the San Francisco conference has abandoned the Trotskyist position on the Russian question. This is not true. The FSP upholds this tenet of Trotskyism. But blinded by your disdain for the Polish workers'

struggle to break the bonds of the bureaucratic police state, you rigidly conclude that if we do not agree with you on Poland, we no longer adhere to the Trotskyist analysis of the Soviet Union as a degenerated workers' state and the necessity to defend it unconditionally against capitalism. Wrong, wrong, wrong.

It is indeed unfortunate that you could not muster the journalistic integrity to accurately describe the political tendencies at the San Francisco conference and state straightforwardly what you think of regroupment as a tactic for the regeneration of U.S. Trotskyism. This is the central political question which your article so deliberately avoids.

Sincerely,  
Stephen Durham  
for the Freedom Socialist Party  
and Committee for a  
Revolutionary Socialist Party

*WV* replies: Stephen Durham of the FSP/CRSP talks of the need for programmatic agreement in the "Trotskyist regroupment arena," reports on a conference of grouplets where by his own admission the participants disagreed on everything from A to Z, and then whines that our article "Anti-Trotskyist Regroupment Flunks" concluded there was nothing revolutionary about this gabfest. He complains about our "name-calling," after accusing the Spartacist League of "male chauvinism," "homophobia" and "racism."

Admitting that his "regroupment" is programmatic a very disunited front, Durham then claims he upholds the Trotskyist position on the Russian question...and hails Polish Solidarność. For that matter, the other refugees from Trotskyism at the San Francisco conference (TO, ISL, WSL), as well as the various expellees from the SWP who didn't show (SA, SU, FIT), are all "united" on this point. And this is precisely what unites them with the anti-

communist, anti-labor right. In December 1981, Clara Kaye's FSP joined with the far-right Libertarian Party—followers of Milton Friedman, mastermind of union-busting and mass starvation from Pinochet's Chile to Thatcher's Britain—demonstrating in San Francisco against the Polish regime's last-minute crackdown which stopped Solidarność' counterrevolutionary power bid. FSPers marched alongside Libertarians who chanted "Socialism is tyranny!" and carried signs saying "Smash the Red Tyrants." Whatever this is, Trotskyism it ain't.

All one has to do is to listen to any Reagan speech to know that the commander in chief of U.S. imperialism aims to destroy the Soviet Union...and not in the distant future. It's pretty hard to drum up sympathy among class-conscious workers for counterrevolutionary terrorists like the Nicaraguan contras and Afghan mujaheddin. So "Solidarity with Solidarity," the one "union" Ronald Reagan loves, has become the main social-democratic battle cry of Western imperialism's anti-Soviet war drive. Durham claims Solidarność represents the Polish workers' struggle to "break the bonds of the bureaucratic police state." And replace it with what? In late 1981, Lech Walesa & Co. called on the IMF bankers' cartel to take over the Polish economy. Today, the official Solidarność leadership has come out for the restoration of capitalism in an even more shameless manner: they want a stock market in Poland!

The Spartacist League has from its inception sought a *revolutionary regroupment* in a Trotskyist party Trotsky would have recognized: this is at the heart of our struggle to reforge the Fourth International. You can read about it in a collection of our basic documents, the SL's *Marxist Bulletin* No. 9. As for our analysis of the demise of the SWP, we refer our readers to the Spartacist pamphlet, *The SWP: An Obituary*. ■

### Defend Colonial Peoples Against Imperialism

*When Mussolini's Italy invaded Emperor Haile Selassie's Ethiopia in 1935, Trotskyists gave unconditional military support against this colonial aggression, and denounced the "neutralists" of the centrist London Bureau and British Independent Labour Party who claimed this colonial war was simply a dispute between dictators. A July 1936 resolution of the Fourth International stated:*



TROTSKY



LENIN

The struggle against war, properly understood and executed, presupposes the uncompromising hostility of the proletariat and its organizations, always and everywhere, toward its own and every other imperialist bourgeoisie....

The struggle against war and its social source, capitalism, presupposes direct, active, unequivocal support to the oppressed colonial peoples in their struggles and wars against imperialism. A "neutral" position is tantamount to support of imperialism. Yet, among the announced adherents of the London Bureau congress are found ILPers who advocate leaving the courageous Ethiopian warriors against marauding Italian fascism in the lurch on the grounds of "neutrality," and "Left" Poale Zionists who are even at this moment leaning upon British imperialism in its savage campaign against the legitimate, even if confused, struggle of the Arab peasantry.

—"Resolution on the Antiwar Congress of the London Bureau," *Documents of the Fourth International—The Formative Years (1933-1940)* [1973]

## Still "Contra Socialists"

Seattle, Washington  
March 26, 1986

*Workers Vanguard*  
Dear Editor,

What the Spartacist League gives with one hand, it takes away with the other.

The Freedom Socialist Party appreciated *Workers Vanguard's* 1/31/86 [*WV* No. 396] article "Government Hands Off FSP!" and we thank you for refraining from sectarianism when fundamental rights of radicals are at stake. We also appreciate the endorsements and donations the Spartacist League and Partisan Defense Committee sent to aid our campaign to repel the witchhunt against us and to defend the right to privacy and freedom of association.

Yet alongside this article is another which blasts us as "Contra Socialists"! We ask, if the FSP has made "an unholy alliance with Reagan's Miskito contra terrorists" against the Sandinistas as

you assert, how on earth could we have the principles to fight the bourgeois courts on disclosure of internal party records? Why would we care about protecting the rights of other Left parties?

It is absurd to accuse the FSP of any degree of support to the contras. We have unconditionally delended Nicaragua against imperialist attack. Yet, unlike many other Left groups, we criticize the Sandinistas when we see them act in a fashion that threatens the revolution.

The Sandinistas' racist and chauvinist policy toward the Miskito, Sumo, and Rama Indians is a tragically unnecessary repetition of the historical disasters caused by revolutionaries who rejected the just demands of oppressed nations and drove them into the arms of counterrevolution....

Lenin wrote brilliantly on the rights of oppressed nations and on the duty of revolutionaries in oppressor nations to

*continued on page 8*

## WORKERS VANGUARD

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

DIRECTOR OF PARTY PUBLICATIONS: Liz Gordon

EDITOR: Jan Norden

PRODUCTION MANAGER: Noah Wilner

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Linda Jarreau

EDITORIAL BOARD: Jon Brule, George Foster, Liz Gordon, Jan Norden, James Robertson, Reuben Samuels, Joseph Seymour, Marjorie Stenberg, Noah Wilner (Closing editor)

*Workers Vanguard* (USPS 098-770) published biweekly, except 2nd issue August and with 3-week interval 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. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Workers Vanguard*, Box 1377, GPO, New York, NY 10116.

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

No. 402

25 April 1986



Miskito contras plunder dead Sandinista soldiers. "Self-determination," FSP?



## ET Wants Unions to Police Workers Ed Meese Unionism

As Big Brother Ed Meese and the Reaganites in Washington gear up for a Moral Majority pot-and-porn crack-down, out in the heart of "Reagan Country" compulsory drug testing of workers has already touched off an uproar. While Los Angeles police chief Daryl Gates and Orange County state senator John Seymour have called for random urine tests for all workers, the Machinists union is suing General Dynamics for violating constitutional protection of privacy with its arbitrary drug testing of employees (*Los Angeles Times*, 10 April). The misleaders of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU), on the other hand, have gone along with the PMA maritime bosses in ordering compulsory "screening" for drug and alcohol use by new-hires on the docks.

We denounced such totalitarian controls in our article "Down with Meese's Drug Witchhunt!" (*WV* No. 400, 28 March). It should be clear to any fighter for labor's rights that this sinister form of capitalist control will be used to intimidate and tyrannize the workforce and frame up union activists. With their drug testing the bosses make no bones about the fact that they're after speedup and putting liability for accidents on the workers. Yet, incredibly, in the face of

this cynical employer offensive, one Howard Keylor, in his misnamed "Militant Longshoreman" (3 January) newsletter, calls on the ILWU to "exercise union discipline as part of the effort to help our brothers overcome their problem"! What this amounts to is calling for *union narcs*!!

Keylor claims this is "a traditional union solution to the problem of brothers who use substances that affect their functioning." Like hell! Stan Gow, a member of the Local 10 exec board and long-time Trotskyist on the waterfront, sharply denounced this crap:

"The argument is that since the PMA, or the government, raise it, therefore there must be *A PROBLEM*. And therefore, for reformist-minded people like Keylor, what better 'solution' than using the union as the bosses' cat's paw to subject the workers to one more form of regimentation for the anti-Soviet war drive. Reagan and his crony Jerry Falwell would love it."

Gow, a spokesman for the Militant Caucus in the union and a supporter of the Spartacist League, has forthrightly fought against this "moral rearmament" witchhunt. But Keylor, as the main public spokesman for the former "External Tendency" (now self-proclaimed "Bolshevik Tendency"), is legitimizing the maritime employers' anti-drug

campaign with his call for a union detox campaign.

What's next, Howard, "union-controlled" lie detector tests? This is no joke. The drawn-out Coors brewery strike was touched off in part by the company's use of lie detectors on job applicants, covering everything from marijuana and sex to "subversive, revolutionary or communist activities." Adolph Coors is a major Reagan backer, who has kicked in big bucks to finance the CIA's contra terrorist war against Sandinista Nicaragua.

Henry Ford had his own "morals" experts for spying on workers, lest they engage in extramarital sex, unauthorized absenteeism, left politics or whatever. It took bloody fights to build trade unions to protect the workers against this crap. Now the ET/BT proposes that a bunch of fat-cat bureaucrats be given the power to police the workers' "morals." So what about policing their politics, or their productivity? Millions of workers today are bedeviled by company spies, like the "beakies" in New York transit, whose job is to make sure that workers calling in sick are really home in bed. Perhaps Howard would like to see this function too taken over by the unions?

Keylor's despicable position on drugs

contains the germ of the whole outlook of a reformist labor party: to take "control" of all the shit of capitalist society, from running bankrupt industries to policing prostitutes. And what about keeping an eye on AIDS carriers, compulsive gamblers, vivisectionists? Where does it stop? The ET line is closely related to the idea that prison guards and police should belong to the unions. This view used to be popular in Britain, but after the miners strike workers discovered that cops are not just friendly bobbies. In less than two steps this program of making the unions responsible for "resolving" social evils under capitalism leads to joining company boards of directors and participation in capitalist governments. Keylor aspires to be another "Sir Harold" Wilson.

In World War II, the then-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party raised the "proletarian military policy" of trade-union control of military training. This mistaken notion was an opening toward social patriotism, and contrasted sharply with the SWP's principled, internationalist opposition to the imperialist war and defense of the Soviet Union. But for Howard Keylor, his policy of "proletarian Meesism" is a return to his Stalinist-reformist roots. In fact, even before he and the other ET/BT quitters individually fled from Spartacist politics in the hard times of Reagan's America, Keylor continued to hold the Stalinist line of supporting the imperialist Allies in WWII.

This is not simply a "historical" question. During the war it led Keylor's

*continued on page 8*

## Another U.S. Spy Satellite Goes Kaboom Titan Up, Up and Away

The Central Intelligence Agency snoops at Langley have got a real problem. While Reagan & Co. blithely claim that American high technology will build a "Star Wars" shield to provide one hundred percent protection against thousands of nuclear warheads (so that the U.S. could strike at Russia with impunity), the CIA has been trying to get one single photographic reconnaissance satellite into space for the last nine months—without success. The latest attempt failed on April 18, when a Titan 34D rocket carrying the half-billion-dollar KH-11 spy satellite blew up in a spectacular fireworks display seconds after liftoff at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California.

Last August another KH-11 launching also failed when the Titan rocket went astray, forcing the range safety officer to blow it up. That's over a billion dollars worth of hardware lost right there. (Not that Reagan cares: he'll just chop another billion out of social programs like school lunches or Social

Security—certainly it's not the military budget that will get squeezed.) "It means that the United States is currently dependent on a single reconnaissance satellite in space," moaned military space expert Paul Stares of the Brookings Institution in Washington (*New York Times*, 19 April). "If it should fail, the U.S. would have no spy satellites over the Soviet Union"—and no way to launch another.

The space shuttle had been slated to be the main launch vehicle for U.S. military/spy satellites, but that system has been grounded since the January 28 Challenger disaster. The CIA's latest model spy-in-the-sky, the KH-12, is too big and heavy to be carried by anything but the shuttle, so that too is grounded. The CIA had relied on the USAF's handful of Titan rockets as a fallback to launch the current model KH-11, but now that's fallen through too. To top it off, the *New York Times* (22 April) reports that "the payload destroyed last Friday was apparently the nation's last KH-11."

"It's a real crisis," moaned think tank expert Stares. So far this year, the Soviets have successfully launched 23 military/intelligence satellites, while the U.S. has only gotten one into orbit. With this lopsided scorecard, it's getting kind of difficult for Reagan & Co. to sell their "Star Wars" scheme. From their first-strike Pershing 2 and MX missiles to their plans for a net of space-based battle stations, American high-tech know-how is supposed to guarantee pinpoint accuracy, and provide a "shield" that's supposed to work perfectly the first time it's switched on, untested. Reagan's Silicon Valley fantasies are literally going up in smoke, and that's a good thing.

Curiously, the U.S. Titan rocket has segmented solid rocket boosters like those used to launch the Challenger—with the joints sealed by those notorious O-rings which are the probable cause of the shuttle disaster. "The Titan exploded at a time when only the boosters were supposed to be firing," noted the *Times*. Apparently there was an "inquiry" after the last Titan failed, but "no design changes resulted." Sounds like the work of the same bunch who built the shuttle. No one was killed by the Titan, but the Challenger carried seven human beings, at least some of whom probably believed they were expanding man's knowledge, rather than preparing for World War III by providing a backdrop for Reagan's planned "Star Wars" State of the Union speech that day.

The latest leaks about the Challenger affair add more fuel to this political powder keg. Enhanced photography of the disaster shows that the crew cabin was not destroyed in the initial explosion but broke away in one piece:

"There is a consensus developing among NASA engineers and officials who have seen this imagery that the seven-member Challenger crew may not have been subjected to fatal or debilitating g-loads [gravity forces], and that it is likely some or all of them were conscious and aware of the crisis as the crew module fell for 3-4 min. until impact."

—*Aviation Week & Space Technology*, 21 April

In short, the crew could have survived if they had had ejection seats, as the original shuttle Columbia had—but these safety mechanisms were eliminated on the Challenger in order to squeeze in a few more pounds of spy satellite. No wonder that NASA suddenly dropped an iron curtain of secrecy around the



Half-billion-dollar fireworks at Vandenberg AFB.

ocean recovery operation when the remains of the crew and cabin were found.

At first the secrecy was supposed to be in deference to the families and to preserve the "dignity" of the dead and all that, but it's gone on for weeks. The crew cabin is still excluded from the exhibit of shuttle parts shown to reporters and the public. And there's more behind the curtain, namely the telltale tapes:

"NASA...has not revealed whether flight recorders, recovered from the wreckage and now being processed at the Johnson Space Center in Houston, contain the crew's final words."

—*Philadelphia Inquirer*, 10 April

They have certainly listened to these tapes by now, but they've been wrapped in secrecy by NASA in the same way that Air Force radar tapes of the KAL 007 spy plane have been "disappeared." What are they protecting—Nixonite "national security"? If anyone's "security" is at stake, it's Reagan's political neck. You can be sure that if the astronauts were conscious in those last agonizing moments before impact, they would have recorded some choice comments about the people who sent them on this disaster mission. Did they? We'd like to know. ■

### 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. 5:00-9:00 p.m. Sat. 11:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m.  
161 W Harrison St. 10th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois Phone (312) 663-0715

#### New York City

Tues. 6:00-9:00 p.m. Sat. 1:00-5:00 p.m.  
41 Warren St. (one block below  
Chambers St. near Church St.)  
New York, NY Phone (212) 267-1025



# Who Was Behind the "Bulgarian Connection"?

## Pope Plot Frame-Up Flops

It was billed as the "Trial of the Century." The "pope plot" trial in Rome was supposed to prove Reagan's charges that the Soviet Union was an "Evil Empire," sinister source of international terrorism, by "proving" the USSR was behind the shooting of Pope Wojtyla via a "Bulgarian Connection." As we noted in "Whose Kill Pope Plot?" (WV No. 315, 15 October 1982), "The 'Pope Plot' Against Andropov" (WV No. 323, 11 February 1983) and "Shot Pope, Thinks He's Christ" (WV No. 382, 28 June 1985), the whole spectacle was based on a Western smear campaign, intended to mobilize public opinion behind Reagan's war drive against the Soviet Union.

Instead it ended up the flop of the century. The Bulgarian concoction began unraveling farcically from the first day of the pope plot trial, as crazy fascist Mehmet Ali Agca, the man who pulled the trigger, howled that he was really Jesus Christ, lying on the stand and repeatedly changing his story (at least 115 times by one count)! Further, it came out that Italian intelligence officials had secretly visited Agca in prison, and other high-level officials linked to the right-wing "P-2" (*Propaganda Due*) conspiracy had enlisted the Mafia to get Agca to implicate Soviet-bloc countries. On March 29 an Italian court was finally forced to acquit "for lack of evidence" the three Bulgarians and Turks accused of conspiring with Agca to murder the pope.

As San Francisco journalist Warren Hinckle noted when the presiding judge first called for the acquittal of the

Reagan's Cold War, Antonov is now free (after a vindictive last-minute delay in releasing him). However, the qualified acquittal leaves the Italian courts free to go after him. Antonov's attorneys intend to appeal the verdict to win full vindication and compensation for this persecuted and deeply wronged man.

If this frame-up had gone through, the so-called "free" press would be hailing it as proof positive of "Communist evil," portraying former Soviet leader Andropov as the devil incarnate who ordered Christ's vicar rubbed out. Given the ambiguous acquittals, a new "inquiry" into the supposed "Bulgarian Connection" has already been launched in Rome. But this doesn't faze the "pope plotters." An "instant movie" resurrecting the plot has already appeared on Italian TV. The *New York Times*, which shamelessly pushed the "Soviet plot" story, has busily been wiping the egg off its face with a sullen editorial about unsolved "riddles" and "mysteries" in the case. And even after the prosecution asked the court to acquit for lack of proof, the *Wall Street Journal* declared it's "beside the point" if Antonov goes free and Moscow declares victory: "We can't imagine there are very many people in the West who still harbor doubts about who tried to kill the pope." Following Goebbels, they figure that if the lie is big enough, and repeated often enough, it will stick.

### The Bulgarian Concoction

In Reagan's first days in office, then secretary of state Al Haig announced that "international terrorism" would be the central focus of the administration. Working in tandem with Haig a band of New Right propagandists was already feeding smear jobs on a Soviet "terror conspiracy" to the media. The *New York Times* in particular, which prides itself on being the nation's "journal of record," became an early and aggressive purveyor of the "red terrorism" scare. On 2 November 1980, the week before the Reagan election, the *New York Times Magazine* published a Robert Moss special titled "Terror: A Soviet Export." And only weeks after Reagan's inaugural, the *Times Magazine* (1 March 1981) featured a story by Claire Sterling claiming to have "massive proof" that "the Soviet Union and its surrogates... have provided the weapons, training and sanctuary for a worldwide terror network." We called it "The Terror Times" (WV No. 276, 13 March 1981) noting that:

"'International terrorism' is the Reagan code word for a war drive against the Soviet Union, just as 'Human Rights' was Carter's."

At the same time, writing in the *Village Voice* (4 March 1981) columnist Alexander Cockburn pointed to a tight little church of "ideologists of terrorism" including Sterling, Moss, Arnaud de Borchgrave (now editor of the anti-communist Sun Myung Moon cult's *Washington Times*), Michael Ledeen, Edward Luttwak, Walter Laqueur, Martin Peretz (*New Republic*), Norman Podhoretz and Midge Decter (*Commentary*), with General Haig and Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick as the high priest and priestess. Pretty soon we will see this team go into action, quoting each other and becoming the "authorities" on the Bulgarian Connection they themselves concocted. What's notable is how the "connections" discovered by these "terrorism" experts are afterwards raised as accusations by Agca himself.

On 13 May 1981 Turkish fascist hitman Agca shot the pope in St. Peter's Square. One week after the shooting the first article appeared charging the Soviet Union with complicity, in the right-wing Milano paper *Il Giornale Nuovo*, a known CIA asset. The author: Michael Ledeen. On 3 September 1981, the private British Thames TV company airs a film on the "plot," featuring Solidarność' Anna Walentynowicz breathing heavily, "I fear the attempt on the Pope's life was a Soviet conspiracy intended to suppress the Polish workers' movement." Thames TV "source" for

Kalb special on the "Bulgarian Connection." Featured consultant: Claire Sterling. Research by Paul Henze.

These "Soviet connection" stories were floating for more than a year and a half before Agca himself—the only source the prosecution ever came up with to "prove" any of these stories—said anything about it. Only in November 1982—18 months after Agca's arrest, 17 months after his first three-day trial in which he was declared a "lone fanatic"—did Agca finally name some Bulgarians in court. Thereupon Sergei Antonov was arrested as a



After four years in detention as victim of anti-Soviet frame-up, Sergei Antonov with his sister upon his release in Rome.

the story: *Il Giornale Nuovo*.

In November 1981, an article in the NATO magazine *Atlantic Community* accuses the Soviets of conspiring to assassinate Pope Wojtyla. Author: Paul Henze, whose credentials include his stint as head of the CIA station in Turkey and as aide to Polish-born Cold Warrior Brzezinski on the National Security Council. This "terrorism expert," whose "investigation" is widely cited as proof for the Bulgarian Connection, argues that proof shouldn't be necessary, that it only serves Soviet interests to insist on a "minimalist, legalistic approach" and "documentary evidence" to prove this charge!

Then in September 1982, *Reader's Digest* published Sterling's "exclusive report" on "The Plot to Murder the Pope," using Henze's "research." That same month NBC-TV aired a Marvin

"suspect" (though it wasn't until October 1984 that Martella got around to actually indicting Antonov, the other Bulgarians and Turks).

### The "Connection" Connection

So how did the "connections" supplied by Sterling, Ledeen, Henze & Co. get passed to Agca in his "high security" prison cell? *Washington Post* correspondent Michael Dobbs, one of the few holdouts against the media's slavish prostration before the disinformers, has documented how Agca had access to magazines, papers and TV which repeated much of the Henze/Sterling thesis. And whatever "facts" he didn't have could well have been supplied by coaching. By whom? Italian defense minister Lagorio told the Italian parliament that members of the SISMI and SISDE intelligence agencies had visited Agca, without the knowledge of prosecuting judge Martella, on 29 December 1981. Further, *L'Espresso* (23 June 1985) interviewed Giovanni Pandico, the state's witness in a Naples Mafia trial, who said that Pietro Musumeci, deputy chief of SISMI, used a Mafia chief in Ascoli prison to offer Agca a deal in 1982 to free him if he'd implicate the Soviet Union. (Agca began to "sing" shortly afterward.)

But why did it take so long for the "Bulgarian Connection" story to develop, especially when it was floated immediately after the shooting? For one thing, only a week after Agca shot the pope, a major scandal exploded in the Italian press. It was revealed that Italian military and intelligence services were riddled at the highest levels with members of the ultraright "masonic" lodge, P-2, members of whom (including Musumeci) were accused of setting up a secret "Super S" (Super SISMI) group of "plumbers" tied to organized



The "Anti-Communist Connection": Pope meets hitman Agca in 1983.

accused Bulgarian officials, "The whole pipe dream blew up last week like the space shuttle Challenger" (*San Francisco Chronicle-Examiner*, 2 March). "The 'Papal Plot' thesis stank from the beginning of disinformation," he said, "as its principal proponents were a couple of Red Scare novelists, a Reaganoid right-wing think tanker and a female journalistic hack with more cheesy intelligence service connections than Tugboat Annie had ropes."

Though the gang of Western "dezinformatsiya" experts who pushed this Big Lie against the USSR almost from the moment Wojtyla was shot failed in court, they did manage to destroy one man's life: Bulgarian airline clerk Sergei Antonov. Antonov was arrested in 1982 and spent 19 months behind bars, finally changed to house arrest due to his rapidly failing health, and was then forced to appear in court in a steel cage. "Free Antonov!" we demanded for this political prisoner of



The "pope of counterrevolution" stars in 1982 NBC-TV "disinformation" special.



crime and fascist groups. Those on the P-2 list suddenly found themselves dumped out of their jobs, lacking direct access to the levers of power so crucial in fabricating a plot. Moreover, many of them had their hands full trying to stay out of the line of fire in the scandal over the collapse of the Vatican-connected Banco Ambrosiano and the mysterious death of its head, P-2 member Roberto Calvi.

Take the case of Francesco Pazienza, whose name came up at the trial: at one point in the tumultuous proceedings the judge called for *pazienza* ("patience") and Agca said, "Yes...I met Francesco Pazienza. He asked me to collaborate." Pazienza, currently in jail in the U.S. in connection with the Calvi/Ambrosiano affair, was a former top aide in the Italian spy agency SISMI and a member of P-2. While denying he himself coached Agca, Pazienza said other intelligence agents had told the gunman to finger Bulgaria. The former SISMI bigwig has also been linked to Italian fascist terrorist Stefano delle Chiaie, charged with directing the 1980 bombing of the Bologna train station that killed and maimed hundreds. And delle Chiaie was reportedly on the run with Turkish fascist Gray Wolves leader Abdullah Catli, a close associate of Agca (*Village Voice*, 24 December 1985). Earlier, according to *CovertAction* (No. 23, Spring 1985):

"Italian investigators have shown that SISMI, Pazienza, and Michael Ledeen, perhaps working through Super S, together lured President Jimmy Carter's brother Billy into a compromising relationship with Col Qaddafi during the 1980 Reagan presidential campaign. After Reagan's election Ledeen was more powerful than previously (he is at present working under contract to the Pentagon and the State Department)."

The Israeli Connection

The "pope plotters" feed at the same troughs: Sterling, Ledeen and Moss all testified before Alabama Senator Jeremiah Denton's terrorism committee, and they all buzz around the Georgetown University Center for Strategic and International Studies. Many of the principals in the "pope plot" business got together in Jerusalem in July 1979, where they founded the "Jonathan Institute." Named after an Israeli commando killed in the Entebbe raid, this outfit first launched the line later taken up by the Reagan administration that the Soviet Union was the center of an international terror network. (This, of course, whitewashes Israel's own state terror against the Palestinians, portraying it as front-line defense of the "free world.") The 1979 conference brought together Israeli intelligence officers with a large Anglo-American contingent, including Claire Sterling, Arnaud de Borchgrave and future vice president Bush, former CIA deputy director for intelligence Ray Cline and British M16/CIA "assets" Robert Moss



Big Liars for hire: J. Jesus Angleton and his star disinformers. They cook up a plot, then "expose" it, then quote each other as proof. Then it goes respectable in the *New York Times*.

and Brian Crozier, among others. So is it all just a big CIA disinformation plot? Well, there's a strange twist—the leading "pope plotters" vehemently attack the CIA for not buying their story. In her lurid potboiler, *The Time of the Assassins* (1983), Claire Sterling complains about the "mounting irritation" of "Western secret services, including the CIA" with the pope plotters' antics, and she even accuses the U.S. spy agency of "unaccountably taking the Bulgarian line." Curiouser and curiouser. Ah, but there is someone who knows everything in the world is a Kremlin plot, who knows the CIA is riddled with Soviet moles, has plenty of axes to grind, and has—or had—terrific Israeli intelligence connections. Agca keeps screaming he's "Jesus Christ," which is pretty funny coming from somebody who's some kind of Turkish anti-Christian fanatic. Maybe he got the name wrong. Maybe he meant...James Jesus Angleton.

Moss and de Borchgrave are big fans, of course—in their Cold War spy novel *The Spike* Angleton is "Nick Flowers," the bounced head of CIA counterintelligence who proves to gullible reporters that the "Western media" is riddled with Soviet disinformation agents. Angleton and his top aides were dumped from the CIA in 1974. And as Fred Landis points out in *CovertAction* (No. 18, Winter 1983):

"The story of an international Israeli-CIA Terror Network begins with James Jesus Angleton, former head of counterintelligence at CIA and Catholic zealot. While stationed in Rome he set up a network of 60 media agents and controlled CIA-Israeli MOSSAD collaboration. Over a period of 20 years, many of Angleton's media agents were recruited from the staff of *Newsweek* [where de Borchgrave worked for 17 years] or *The Washington Post* in Rome. Claire Sterling was one of these; Michael Ledeen is her protégé; Robert Moss is a fellow traveller."

But that's not all: Angleton may actually have given Israel the bomb. "The veteran journalist Tad Szulc has quoted 'sources close to' Angleton as confirming that the C.I.A. secretly aided the Israelis with technical nuclear information in the late 1950's," wrote Seymour Hersh (*New York Times Magazine*, 25 June 1978): "This fits in with something I had been told by a high-level C.I.A. official—that Angleton, then in charge of C.I.A. liaison with Israeli intelligence, gave the Israelis similar technical information in the mid-60's."

There still remains one genuinely mysterious question about this "pope plot": If the Bulgarians and Soviets didn't set up Agca, who did? Assuming, that is, anybody at all did—back in 1979 Agca himself, while still in Turkey, had threatened to off "crusade commander [pope] John Paul." Agca's Turkish connections among the fascist Gray Wolves were the only genuine links the three-year investigation was able to

prove. So what about these youth squads of the Turkish National Action Party? A recent pamphlet titled *Bulgarian Connection: CIA & Co.* (1986) put out by the USSR's Novosti Press Agency points to Paul Henze's own well-documented ties to these fascist killers. It reports that in 1979, after a massacre of hundreds by the Gray Wolves, where a U.S. embassy officer was photographed giving orders, CIA man Henze had a bitter argument with the editor of the liberal *Milliyet*, Abdi Ipekci. Shortly afterward, Ipekci was gunned down in the street. Agca, the man convicted of murdering Ipekci, was later sprung from jail with the aid of the Gray Wolves.

The proposition in the Novosti pamphlet is that *all* the "pope plotters," from Agca to Henze, conspired to kill the pope. Frankly, this seems a bit like that Agatha Christie Orient Express story where everybody did it. Still, who knows what evil lurks in the hearts of

disgruntled ex-CIA factions? As to who done it, we'd just like to note the connections between the P-2 plotters, the Italian fascists and high Vatican officials, some of whom were less than pleased with the elevation of a Polish pope.

Reichstag Fire to Pope Plot: Preparation for War

The disinformers' "pope plot" was just too much to swallow, Agca just too unstable and crazy, to make a really successful "Big Lie." While Reagan himself and "the Company" officially stayed out of this one, they were perfectly willing to let it roll. The Reagan administration is up to its neck in its own anti-Soviet "Big Lies," notably its attempt to smear the Soviet Union over the shooting down of Korean Air Lines Flight 007, a U.S. spy plane provocation in which Reagan & Co. deliberately sacrificed the lives of over 200 innocent passengers. Currently the "Qaddafi terror connection" is running at hysterical full blast, a "surrogate" for the Soviet Union and sinister *casus belli* to justify imperialist aggression.

The Reaganites, with the help of the Cold War liberals, keep producing such anti-Soviet myths and broadcasting them at full blast with the imperialist propaganda machine because *they themselves think like, act like and are the real terrorists*. Who else runs around the world openly attempting to assassinate heads of state? And they come from a long tradition.

The 1933 "Reichstag Fire" trial, presided over by Hitler lieutenant Hermann Göring, tried to finger Bulgarian Communist leader Dimitrov for burning down the German parliament. Like the "pope plot" trial of today, the Nazis' effort backfired spectacularly. Nonetheless it was a prelude to Hitler's Anti-Comintern Pact and World War II. Today's "Big Lie" campaigns against the Soviet Union are even more deadly, for behind them looms the shadow of nuclear Armageddon. ■

A Spartacist Pamphlet \$1.00

**Solidarność: Polish Company Union for CIA and Bankers**

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

# Subscribe!

## WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Biweekly of the Spartacist League

<input type="checkbox"/> \$5/24 issues of <i>Workers Vanguard</i> (includes <i>Spartacist</i> ) International rates	<input type="checkbox"/> \$2/4 issues of <i>Women and Revolution</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Renewal \$20/24 issues—Airmail \$5/24 issues—Seamail	<input type="checkbox"/> \$2/10 introductory issues of <i>Workers Vanguard</i> (includes <i>Spartacist</i> )
<input type="checkbox"/> \$2/9 issues of <i>Young Spartacus</i>	

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

402

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



# The Living Hell of Apartheid South Africa

By Alan Roux

In his Pulitzer Prize-winning account of life in white supremacist South Africa, *Move Your Shadow* (New York, 1985), Joseph Lelyveld tells of a visit to a wealthy Afrikaner farm and a desolate camp for blacks nearby on the open veld (plains) of the Orange Free State. At the end of the day, he watches as both are blotted out by a huge dust storm. He reflects that "the dust storm was exactly what the producer of a second-rate TV documentary might have seized on for his fade-out on such a day. But I had grown mistrustful of all South African metaphors. The thought of an inevitable catastrophe was frightening, but even more frightening was the thought that it could be indefinitely deferred." Lelyveld looks at South Africa through the eyes of an American liberal, but here he comes to a conclusion most liberals shy away from, as they take refuge instead in mealy-mouthed rhetoric of "peaceful change."

A long-time *New York Times* foreign correspondent, Lelyveld is currently the *Times* London bureau chief and has been mentioned as a contender for the succession to powerful Executive Editor A.M. Rosenthal, who is scheduled to retire. Politically, Lelyveld identifies himself as "a naive democrat who believes in what a South African Cabinet member dismissed as 'simplistic Western solutions.'" Though he is on target about the tendency of American liberals "to misconstrue the conflict, to talk about human rights and living standards while fuzzing the central issue of power," he is basically indulgent toward what he calls the "earnest but inconsistent dabbling" of U.S. imperialism in southern Africa. The strong point of Lelyveld's powerful narrative is not his political conclusions, but his sharp newsman's eye for the hideous contra-

dictions in the land of apartheid which cry out for revolution.

Lelyveld found the title for his book in a handbook of phrases in *Fanagalo*, the *lingua franca* which originated with the influx of men from many different black tribes to work South Africa's gold mines. *Fanagalo* consists chiefly of expressions used by the racist white foreman to order black workers around. *Susa lo-mtunzi gawena* ("move your shadow") was listed in the phrase book as one of several handy expressions for white golfers to use on their black caddies. It's an apt metaphor for life in South Africa, where the apartheid rulers fear even the shadow of the black man falling on their special preserve of white privilege. Such concrete details that illuminate the anatomy and pathology of social relations under apartheid, so violently contradictory yet so deep-rooted—these are the stuff of *Move Your Shadow*.

This book is Lelyveld's summing up of what he personally saw and heard during his tour as the *Times* correspondent in South Africa. He does not devote much attention to news events or to well-known South African political figures such as P.W. Botha, the Mandelas and Bishop Tutu; nor does he explain the origins of apartheid in settler colonialism and capitalist development. But combining a journalist's tenacity with a novelist's command of the language, Lelyveld fills a need in the literature on South Africa for a reasonably comprehensive book that gives you the harsh feel of life under apartheid. Having grown up in South Africa, I expected that reading *Move Your Shadow* would bring back many memories. But it is a measure of this perceptive account that I continually found myself reflecting as if for the first time on things that had seemed simply normal when I was there—it was like being given a sharper lens.

One recollection concerned my nine months as a conscripted *troepie* in the apartheid army. To a *troepie* who showed any lack of obedience, the redneck Afrikaner corporals would

scream, "*Jy raak wit, troep!*" ("You're acting white, private!"). At the time and since, I don't recall anyone reflecting on the irony of one white disparaging the "whiteness" of another in an institution dedicated to slaughtering blacks. In South Africa the domination of white over black is the relation of master and subordinate, stamped on the whole society; to tell a *troep* he can't act "white" is the clearest way of telling him he has no rights.

## "A Nation of Sleepwalkers"

*Move Your Shadow* represents a powerful application of Lelyveld's principal maxim as a journalist: that each person is an expert on the circumstances of his life. Instead of just reciting statistics on black migrant labor in South Africa, he makes the acquaintance of migrant workers employed in his apartment building and, on their annual leave, drives them the soul-destroying hundreds of miles back to the starving KwaZulu bantustan where their families are forced to live. Perhaps his most memorable eyewitness reporting concerns the insane apartheid project that is the latest bantustan, KwaNdebele.

In order to create KwaNdebele, the Botha regime uprooted hundreds of thousands of blacks—destroying neighborhoods in Pretoria, evicting labor tenants from white-owned farms, expropriating landowning agricultural communities (so-called "black spots")—and dumped them in the rural ghettos known as "closer settlements." To get there, Lelyveld writes, "You drove through the Pretoria suburbs and then through more than forty miles of rich [white] farm country before you hit it; then you could drive another forty miles, and it was seldom out of sight: a serpentine stream of metal shanties and mud houses the metal roofs of which were typically weighted down by small boulders to keep them from blowing off in the Transvaal's violent hailstorms. Such sights can be seen in other countries, usually as a result of famines or wars. I don't know where else they

have been achieved as a result of planning."

KwaNdebele has no economy of its own. The only jobs are in distant Pretoria. But the apartheid social engineers are prepared to invest heavily to keep KwaNdebele's people in the status of perpetual "commuters." The South African government's subsidy for bus transport between KwaNdebele and the Pretoria area works out to more than \$1,000 per passenger per year—it adds up to more than KwaNdebele's "gross national product"! Lelyveld rode the 2:40 a.m. bus KwaNdebele workers must endure just to get to work each day and got the riders to tell their own stories:

"John Masango...said he worked six days a week at a construction site near Benoni, an industrial town forty miles on the far side of Pretoria, taking three buses each way. Even at the concessional rates arranged by the authorities for KwaNdebele, the total bus fares he paid out in a week gobbled up one-quarter of his wages. He was fifty-three years old, and on days when he was not required to work overtime, he could get back to Kameelrivier by eight-thirty at night! Only on Sundays did he ever see his home or his family in the light of day. With four hours' sleep at home and a couple of hours' sleep on the bus, he managed to stay awake at work."

In Pretoria, KwaNdebele is viewed "as a tremendous success for the racial planners," he reports. A high official said seriously blacks didn't want to live in towns: "They were much happier with their own kind out in the hush. The Afrikaans term he used was *doodgelukkig* ('dead happy')." That seemed singularly apt for emergent KwaNdebele, a nation of sleepwalkers." Lelyveld reminds himself that the KwaNdebele "commuters" are more fortunate than many South African blacks—they at least have jobs and "live with" their families.

These journeys measure the gulf (the moat?) apartheid has dug between black and white. While the nature of apartheid is brutally clear to the blacks who live under it, the whites who live off it are experts in masking the reality of

Peter Magubane



White police state rules by terrorizing black majority.



Bantustan system is key to super-exploitation of black labor.



oppression from themselves. This applies to all ruling groups, but reaches fantastic proportions in "white South Africa." Having uprooted millions, apartheid ensures that "Hardly anywhere do whites now have to live near blacks...and hardly anywhere is it even necessary for them to see where blacks live, except occasionally at a distance from a passing car." For the whites, "the resentment in the depths, among blacks and browns, is beyond their comprehension."

Throughout the book, Lelyveld dissects the racist consciousness of whites, from the kept "sociologists" who lament that the black "national character" is "inimical to growth," to the *baas* on the farm who "knows the black" but not the real name of his oldest servant. "If whites took the long view, they would be in a panic," Lelyveld observes. In fact, panic is not far below the surface; but the whites' overwhelming monopoly of force gives them the luxury of projecting "any version of reality they please," from the myth of "separate development" under apartheid to the recent delusion that apartheid is being reformed out of existence.

This delusion in particular is annihilated in *Move Your Shadow*. Lelyveld has actually been the *New York Times* correspondent in South Africa twice, and this has given him a certain vantage point on the evolution of apartheid. He was first sent there after covering the racist murder of three civil rights workers in Mississippi during the "freedom summer" of 1964. When Lelyveld arrived in South Africa in 1965 the apartheid rulers had crushed all organized opposition and they booted him out eleven months later. In 1980 they let him return, apparently hoping to impress him with their "reform" program—or did they perhaps just want him to see how firmly they were still in control?

The changes Lelyveld found in "white South Africa" are rather bizarre. The dour Afrikaner who in the '60s cited scripture to sanctify apartheid is now an "arriviste puritan" aping every Western consumer fad. Clad by Gucci, he mixes with blacks at casinos and fancy restaurants; he dares to be regaled by Richard Pryor tapes. Apartheid too is reclothed, in jargon borrowed from American sociology, and dismissed as passé. But the reality, which Lelyveld graphically documents in thousands of miles of travel throughout the bantustans, those barren fragments of land where millions have been sent to starve, is that apartheid has been and is being relentlessly extended. When the umpteenth *verligte* ("enlightened") Afrikaner rhetorically asks him if he sees any changes, Lelyveld replies, "Yes, I never imagined they would be able to carry apartheid so far."

#### "W-A-R"

*Move Your Shadow* was not written to demonstrate a political thesis, but the cumulative effect of its description makes a statement of cardinal importance: apartheid is a social structure as elaborate, as entrenched, and as inimi-



**Achilles' heel of apartheid capitalism is dependence on black labor. Militant gold miners are in forefront of powerful black union movement.**

cal to all forms of human emancipation as slavery was in the South, or tsarism in Russia. No amount of reformist tinkering, "responsible" imperialist statesmanship and divestment "pressure" will eradicate it. It will take social revolution to topple the edifice of apartheid slavery which has created glittering empires for the "Randlords" while the black toilers who dig the gold are denied every right.

In the chapter titled "Controlled Strength," Lelyveld depicts not just the nightmare of surveillance and torture in which the South African security police envelop their opponents, but also the enormous capacity for racist violence of the white population at large. There is a licensed private gun for every white adult male. After two bull terriers break their chains and kill the household's black maid, the SPCA is besieged by whites wanting to buy the dogs.

In "W-A-R," Lelyveld delineates the military weakness of the African National Congress, the emphasis on martyrdom. He understands that Nelson Mandela "has become the living symbol of his movement and the personification of the bondage of his people." But *why* have the ANC and the allied South African Communist Party (SACP) proven unable to lead a revolution in the land of apartheid, where the dramatic social contradictions have repeatedly reached the boiling point? The pressure cooker of apartheid's social oppression and social contradictions compel Lelyveld to see beyond his frequently stated liberal anti-communist prejudices. Thus, he writes of the SACP:

"South African security men tirelessly spread the ancient allegation that the minuscule, antediluvian Communist party which has dutifully followed Moscow's line on Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Afghanistan, dominates Umkhonto we Sizwe ('Spear of the Nation'), the [ANC's] underground military arm.... If this is so, then the effect for many blacks is not to lower the prestige of Umkhonto we Sizwe but to raise that of the Communist party."

Lelyveld would not be surprised at the appearance of the Soviet red flag with its hammer and sickle at funerals for black militants over the last year. He goes on:

"The immediate attraction is its supposed extremism—ideology comes later, if at all—because the choice for blacks between 'moderate' and 'radical,' as it is defined by whites in South Africa, is a choice between reaching some accommodation with apartheid and insisting on full citizenship."

In fact the combination of the ANC's call to "make the townships ungovernable," appeals for an international boycott and meetings with leading capitalists like Anglo American's Gavin Relly, are all part of a program in which militancy is employed in the service of pressuring apartheid capitalism to reform itself and, ultimately, finding accommodation with it.

"South Africa could be worse than Belgium and Northern Ireland and Lebanon all rolled into one," an Afrikaner law professor told Lelyveld, "underscoring with a curious combination of pride and alarm the possibilities of racial and ethnic strife." *Move Your Shadow* anatomizes the social divisions fostered by apartheid that could pro-

duce such a disaster. Apartheid, pyramid-like, not only keeps white over coloured (mixed-race) over Indian over black, but maintains a complex hierarchy among the blacks. A fortunate few may own homes in segregated areas within "white" South Africa. The KwaNdebele "commuters," less fortunate, are still better off than the migrant workers, who are in turn better off than those who can only starve in the bantustans or seek work illegally.

Talking with a young man cast to the bottom of this pyramid, Lelyveld finds him blaming the blacks who have jobs for his plight. Lelyveld describes also the grotesque little black tribal despotisms that police the bantustans for apartheid. When rural blacks are to be forcibly moved from land they have cultivated for decades to the bare *veld* in a bantustan, workers from a distant tribe are employed to do it. In the tribal violence of recent months we have seen the success of apartheid divide-and-rule tactics in inflaming divisions.

#### "South Africa Awaits Its Lenin"

*Workers Vanguard* has, uniquely on the left, warned that so long as the national principle predominates, there is a danger of a multi-sided communal-race war in which blacks would today be overwhelmingly the victims. The black nationalists cannot overcome the divisions fostered by apartheid—witness the confrontations between the largely Xhosa United Democratic Front and Gatsha Buthelezi's Zulu *impis*, and between black township youth and migrant workers this past year. But with its six-million-strong black working class as the motor force for proletarian revolution, the class principle can prevail in South Africa.

The biggest weakness of Lelyveld's book, a direct result of his liberal politics, is his denial of the significance of the black workers movement. He measures the distance between white and black, but he does not show the utter dependence of "white South Africa" on black labor. His discussion of the black trade unions falls in the chapter, "Controlled Strength," where he describes the roundups, the hideous torture of union militants, the tremendous courage of those who persist in the face of inhuman cruelty.

Lelyveld is markedly defeatist about

the black unions, commenting on the "touching but basically dizzy sense of invincibility," the "atmosphere of a revival" in the union headquarters, raising an eyebrow when told "that the power of the new black unions would ultimately put an end to the pass laws, the migrant labor system, and the Group Areas Act." "On subsequent trips to East London and Port Elizabeth," he writes, "I saw how hope was systematically cut down to size, how the reality of white power in South Africa gradually made itself felt."

But there is a reason for the tremendous energy and hope unleashed with the explosion of black unionism—organized as *workers*, black militants had touched on the source of power, the motor force of social revolution. The black unions today are no longer just "green branches...regularly pruned," as Lelyveld writes. As organized workers stand up for their rights against the apartheid bosses, the whole range of apartheid practices is thrown into flux. A small but interesting example is the fate of *Fanagalo*, the artificial language of apartheid command. With black miners now organized in a powerful union, the bosses can no longer simply tell superexploited migrant workers what to do. As contracts are thrashed out, as the miners raise their demands, *Fanagalo* is proving to be increasingly obsolete.

With hundreds of thousands of members, organized now in every important industry of this heavily industrial country, the black unions have the power to bring the country to a standstill. The power, but not the program, Lelyveld notes that the ANC in "nearly a quarter century of exile has failed to produce a South African *What Is To Be Done?*" Or, as *Newsweek* correspondent Ray Wilkinson put it last September, for which he was expelled from the country, "Their revolution awaits its Lenin." As we have insisted:

"The black proletariat is still being used as cattle to haul the ideological cart of nationalism. A Bolshevik party must be built to lead a victorious struggle for 'amandla' power, for the oppressed, through workers' revolution."

—"South Africa: Razor's Edge," *WV* No. 376, 5 April 1985

What is lacking in South Africa today is revolutionary leadership at the head of the burgeoning black workers movement. In the course of his book, Lelyveld makes several allusions to the history and literature of 19th century Russia. But even more important than historical similarities is the unique legacy left us by the Bolshevik Party that led the workers to power in October 1917. That legacy is embodied in the Trotskyist internationalist program of permanent revolution, which holds that the emancipation of the oppressed nation can only be achieved through the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

A South African Bolshevik party must be centered on the black proletariat, and integrate the vanguard of the coloured and Indian oppressed masses as well as revolutionary whites. A book such as *Move Your Shadow* arouses the determination to smash apartheid; the international Spartacist tendency, inheritor of the lessons of October, has the program to do it. ■



**Armed white population determined to defend its privileges.**

#### South Africa: Razor's Edge

Order your packet featuring a selection of articles from **Workers Vanguard and Revolution**.

\$1.00

Order from:  
Spartacist Publishing Co.  
Box 1377 GPO  
New York, NY 10116





# "Contra Socialists"...

(continued from page 2)

respect those rights. He left no doubt that it was up to workers of the oppressor nations to prove their dedication to the principles of liberation, even to the point of allowing the oppressed nations to secede and set up their own state. If the workers of the larger state remained the perpetrators of national oppression after the revolution, the responsibility was theirs for the inevitable reaction against the revolution.

In Nicaragua, THE policy question facing the Sandinistas now is whether to recognize the Indians' right to self-determination, in this case autonomy, i.e., control over their own land and resources. The Sandinistas refuse to do so, as they have since 1979.... Their current "autonomy" plan, unilaterally drawn up by Minister of the Interior Borge's office, in essence denies the right to self-determination. It allows for Indian "control" over the land and resources, but only within the framework of national economic development—dictated out of Managua! Some autonomy! That's why the Indians have withdrawn from negotiations for the present.

In the "Contra Socialists" article, *Workers Vanguard* never states its position on the autonomy issue. Calling Brooklyn Rivera a CIA agent is not an answer, it is diversionary slander. However, in a companion piece in the same issue entitled "Sandinistas and Miskitos," you deny that the Miskitos are a nation and insist that "nationalism" in any case is wrong in this era of imperialist decay. You are wrong on both counts.

First, the Nicaraguan Indians are nations by Leninist criteria. They are an "historically evolved, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and psychological makeup manifested in a common culture." They have survived as small nations through some 500 years of Spanish, English, U.S., and Nicaraguan encroachment.

*Workers Vanguard* asserts that Nicaraguan Indians are not nations because 100,000 Mestizos (people of Indian and Spanish ancestry) have immigrated to the Atlantic Coast from the Pacific region and are now the majority in the Indians' homelands. By that logic, the Palestinians are no longer a nation because the Jews are now the majority in the Israeli settler state! Or U.S. Indians are no longer nations because they are outnumbered by whites. Indian territory is not economically viable, according to *Workers Vanguard*. But by all accounts, the Indians carry on their traditional economic activity as best they can under pressure of Sandinista relocations

and war....

*Workers Vanguard's* blanket condemnation of nationalism in general is also wrong. There are democratic national demands—prime among them the right to self-determination—that must be supported even in this era of capitalist decay. This is because imperialist hegemony is based on the denial of the right to self-determination, just as it was in Lenin's day. That's why he supported this nationalist demand unconditionally....

All this serves to illustrate why vanguard organizations must listen to the most oppressed, whose demands for national, racial, and sexual equality strike directly at the ensemble of inequalities which divide all workers and keep the capitalist system intact. Only those can lead who first get in step with the march of the most oppressed toward liberation and wed it to the conscious struggle for socialism.

*Workers Vanguard* has cleverly made up new words—polyvanguardism and sectoralism—to describe this program. The FSP calls it by its right name: Leninism.

In struggle,  
Robert Crisman

*WV* replies: Reading the letter by FSP spokesman Robert Crisman, you would hardly know that U.S. imperialism is waging a war of counterrevolutionary terror against Nicaragua—or that his organization supports one wing of the contras. *Freedom Socialist* (Summer 1985) hailed Miskito Indian leader Brooklyn Rivera and published an interview with him without a word of criticism. This is what caused us to label the FSP "contra socialists."

You say it is a "diversionary slander" to call Rivera a CIA agent. But as we reported in *WV* No. 396, former contra leader Edgar Chamorro has flatly stated: "Brooklyn Rivera was receiving funds from the CIA." So what does that make you, brother Crisman? A "socialist" left cover for counterrevolution, like Max Shachtman over the Bay of Pigs, when he supplied laborite arguments for the gusanos, those squalid leftovers from Batista's dictatorship. Today you play Shachtman's role for Rivera and his off-and-on ally, former Somoza police agent Steadman Fagotto.

You say that for the Sandinistas, "THE policy question...is whether to recognize the Indians' right to self-determination...." With this focus, it's no wonder you get dragged into the contras' wake. In Nicaragua, the question is whether or not a U.S.-dominated capitalist class can reconsolidate its class rule, or whether it will be eliminated by social revolution along with the power of its institutionalized ideological matrix, the Catholic church.

As we pointed out in our article on "Sandinistas and Miskitos," the FSLN's sometime persecution of ethnic minorities is of a piece with its acquiescing to

the church hierarchy and siphoning off to the Nicaraguan capitalists much of the vital national resources needed to fight imperialism. These policies are all reflections of a petty-bourgeois nationalist program. At issue in Nicaragua is the question of social revolution. The Sandinistas are equivocal. You are on the other side.

The Sandinistas, at least, fight arms in hand and mobilize the masses to fight U.S. imperialism. This is why, to the best of our ability, we raised dollars for the Nicaraguan government to use as it sees fit, while not hiding our very worried criticism of the direction in which Sandinista policy is going. The Spanish Republic at least held out the promise of revolution after winning the war (which they lost). In Nicaragua, where so much of the economy was in



Miskito guerrillas visit Nicaraguan town under cease-fire agreement with Sandinistas.

the hands of a single family, the overthrow of the Somoza dynasty opened the door to social revolution. But rather than committing themselves to complete the revolution, the Sandinistas want to stop short.

As for diversions, consider the smokescreen Crisman throws up over whether the Miskitos are a pre-national tribal people or a full-fledged nation. In *WV* No. 396 and in previous articles we sharply criticized the Sandinistas' nationalist treatment of Indian peoples and English-speaking blacks on the Atlantic Coast, and clearly advocated regional autonomy. The fundamental fact the FSP wants to ignore is that Rivera & Co. subordinated themselves to U.S. imperialism.

Being a member of a national minority is not a license for counterrevolution. Looking back in history, does the FSP back the fascistic Ukrainian, Byelorussian or Lithuanian nationalists who fought with Nazi Germany against Stalin's Russia in World War II? Does it retrospectively side with the Georgian Mensheviks or Ukrainian nationalists under Simon Petlyura against the Red Army of Lenin and Trotsky?

Imperialism frequently seeks to use minority peoples against what it sees as the main enemy. Sikhs provided the backbone of the British colonial army in India, while Nepalese Gurkhas constituted the elite shock troops. The British organized various Indian tribes against the American colonists in the War of Independence. The Dutch maintained order in their East Indian colony (today Indonesia) with native soldiers recruited specially from the South Molucca islands. The Americans formed a "secret army" of Meo tribesmen in Laos, just as they are doing today with the Miskitos in Nicaragua.

In the abstract, it's as absurd to pretend the Miskito Indians are a nation rather than a tribe as to claim that the 262 American Indian tribes are so many nations seeking self-determination from the United States. But over Nicaragua, this is not just idle sophistry, for the different programs are backed by guns. Rivera calls not just for "aboriginal rights" but for MISURASATA control of the Atlantic Coast, an anti-democratic program which would mean a Miskito dictatorship over the black and mestizo town of Bluefields, for example. And given Rivera's CIA ties, it would mean handing over half of Nicaragua's territory to Ronald Reagan

as a staging ground for wiping out the Nicaraguan Revolution.

For Bolsheviks, the question of social revolution stands higher than the national question, which is part of the overall democratic program. Lenin favored the right of Poland to secede from the tsarist empire. But at the height of the imperialist First World War, he wrote:

"To raise the question of Poland's independence today, with the existing alignment of the neighbouring imperialist powers, is really to...plunge into narrow-minded nationalism and forget the necessary premise of an all-European or at least a Russian and a German revolution."

—V.I. Lenin, "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up" (July 1916)

One of the most succinct presentations of the Leninist position on the national question concerned the Ukraine in late 1917, when the Central Rada, dominated by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalist parties, suppressed the Kiev soviet and arrested its Bolshevik leaders. The Soviet government sent an ultimatum, authored by Lenin, to the Rada which simultaneously 1) recognized the independence of the Ukrainian People's Republic, 2) refused to recognize the Rada as its government, and 3) gave it 48 hours to stop aiding the White Guard counterrevolutionaries.

Self-determination for the Miskitos? Doesn't the FSP care if the Miskitos are fighting for soviet power or Yankee power? In fighting for soviet power, we are fighting for workers democracy, not a nationally delimited, bureaucratically deformed regime—i.e., another Cuba. A proletarian internationalist regime in Managua would offer regional autonomy for the Atlantic Coast population, just as the Bolsheviks did for numerous tribal peoples in the Caucasus and Central Asia. Such a policy might well have prevented any significant number of Miskitos from going over to the contra camp. But as long as various Miskito forces take up arms on behalf of U.S. imperialism, they must be militarily smashed or otherwise induced to lay down their arms. ■

## Ed Meese Unionism...

(continued from page 3)

former Communist Party comrades to scabberd in the name of the "anti-fascist coalition." In 1984, as he worked hand in glove with Stalinist supporters like Leo Robinson in sabotaging an SF dockers' boycott of a South African ship, Keylor hailed the ILWU's 1939 boycott of scrap iron to Japan as a model (see "Battle Over Union Action at South Africa Ship," *WV* No. 368, 7 December 1984). Yet this was simply a part of Roosevelt's imperialist sanctions, to strangle Japan economically in order to force it to go to war! It led straight to the A-bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. If that boycott was so great, how about calling on the workers to boycott American imperialism which was embarking on a global expansion?

Today, Reagan & Co. are trying to frame everyone from the Sandinistas to union militants on charges of terrorism and drugs. Yet it's precisely the U.S. spy agencies, working hand in glove with the Afghan mujaheddin and Nicaraguan contras, who are up to their necks in drugs-for-guns trafficking. Keylor's drug program is class collaboration masquerading as concern for "safety." Consider what it would mean in practice. Suppose his union naves nab someone smoking a joint, what then? Dock their pay? Is the union supposed to supply straitjackets to force members to go "cold turkey"? Howard Keylor is a canting hypocrite and a renegade, and the bosses have uses for such types. In his desperate efforts to secure a niche in the ILWU bureaucracy Keylor is offering himself up as an anti-drug narc and an anti-red narc, to keep the union in the straitjacket of reformist politics. ■

### SPARTACIST LEAGUE/U.S. LOCAL DIRECTORY

National Office: Box 1377 GPO, New York, NY 10116 • (212) 732-7860

#### Atlanta

Box 4012  
Atlanta, GA 30302

#### Boston

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

#### Chicago

Box 6441, Main PO  
Chicago, IL 60680  
(312) 663-0715

#### Cleveland

Box 91037  
Cleveland, OH 44101  
(216) 621-5138

#### Detroit

Box 32717  
Detroit, MI 48232

#### Los Angeles

Box 29574, Los Feliz Sta.  
Los Angeles, CA 90029  
(213) 384-7616

#### Madison

c/o SYL, Box 2074  
Madison, WI 53701  
(608) 257-8625

#### New York

Box 444, Canal St. Sta.  
New York, NY 10013  
(212) 267-1025

#### Norfolk

Box 1972, Main PO  
Norfolk, VA 23501

#### Oakland

Box 32552  
Oakland, CA 94604  
(415) 835-1535

#### San Francisco

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

#### Washington, D.C.

Box 75073  
Washington, D.C. 20013  
(202) 636-3537

#### Toronto

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

### TROTSKYIST LEAGUE OF CANADA



# Berlin Disco...

(continued from page 1)

trumpeted as the marching song on the road to World War III against the Soviet Union, whatever the White House says is printed as truth, unless proved otherwise. Among the few media in America not buying the White House story whole hog is the black press, which is none too pleased by the Reaganites' bloody assault on a North African country. "Libya Bombing Gets No Cheers," headlined the front page of the *Amsterdam News* (19 April), noting that while Reagan asserted that "Libya was responsible for the nightclub bombing and the Trans World Airline bombing... the President presented no evidence to support his allegations."

By now the American public is used to White House spokesman Larry Speakes' Newspeak and all the verbal contortions surrounding the "overt/covert" war against Nicaragua, where Congress openly discusses how much funding to give the "secret" CIA-financed contra war. Now we are told that the U.S.' "incontrovertible evidence" of Libyan involvement is "too sensitive to discuss." Whereupon Reagan gets on the tube with the story of intercepted cables and broken codes supposedly proving that "orders... sent from Tripoli to the Libyan People's Bureau in East Berlin" directed the Berlin bombing. If there really were secrets they're trying to protect, this procedure is guaranteed to blow anything or anybody's cover. When Qaddafi was asked about the "secret message," he just laughed, saying, "We defy them, we challenge them, to publish it."

Both Libya and East Germany have explicitly denied the U.S. charges. On April 9, UPI reported from Tripoli that "Khadafi said he was not responsible for the TWA and West Berlin attacks, and he challenged the Reagan administration to prove its claims. 'This is an old story,' he said. 'The world has not heard any evidence or any proof about this old story. It is only an excuse for aggression against an independent state.'" On April 10, the East German foreign ministry issued a statement expressing disgust and indignation over the bombing, calling it a "criminal act" which they had nothing to do with. Again after the U.S. terrorist assault on Libya, AP (17 April) reported, "East Germany denied today that the Libyan Embassy in East Berlin had orchestrated the April 5 bombing of a West Berlin discotheque."

And Washington keeps changing its story. The first version was the one about the "communique" which U.S. intelligence said they "intercepted from Colonel Qaddafi to his envoys in East Berlin congratulating them on a job well done." This was floated for a few days, then they withdrew it and subsequently officials "flatly denied" all knowledge of it. As political/intelligence analyst Leslie Gelb wrote of the daily shifting accounts: "Officials' assertions that the evidence is 'strong but inconclusive,' or

that it is 'incontrovertible' tend to be tied to their policy stances. For example, several who say the evidence is definitive seem to favor a strong military response" (*New York Times*, 12 April). Such blatant "news management" led Robert MacNeil on the MacNeil-Lehrer TV news show to comment on the "nearly universal skepticism" concerning the Reaganites' story. As for the West German government, they continued to label the "evidence" of a Libyan link "not completely clear"—until the U.S. attack, whereupon Helmut Kohl declared it fact.

## "Signature of the Nazis"

Nine days after the West Berlin incident, the *New York Times* (14 April) ran a story belatedly reporting that the American soldier was black, and that there was something strange about the disco bombing:

"But one of the mysteries of La Belle is why Colonel Qaddafi would approve an assault on a disco patronized heavily by black G.I.s and foreigners from third world nations."

"One of the dead in the blast was a 21-year-old black soldier, Sgt. Kenneth Terrance Ford, and the other was a 28-year-old Turkish woman, Nermin Haney; among the 230 wounded were a number of Arabs. A curious mixture of victims for an Islamic revolutionary and professed defender of the downtrodden."

Curious, indeed. Particularly in view of the fact that several groups had taken "credit" for the bombing, including supposed leftists and an Arab group, but "none with known ties to Libya," according to the 6 April *Washington Post*. What has not been reported here is that one of the groups claiming to be the authors of the indiscriminate terror at the La Belle disco was a fascist organization.

On April 6 *Die Wahrheit*, newspaper of the West Berlin section of the East German Communist Party, wrote of the bomb investigation that "the right-radical spectrum is no longer being excluded," particularly given the claim from the "Wehrsportgruppe Hess," or "Hess Defense Sport Group." Rudolf Hess, a leading Hitler deputy, imprisoned for life in Berlin's Spandau jail, has been the object of repeated fascist campaigns for his release. One of the leading fascist terror groups in West Germany was the notorious Wehrsportgruppe Hoffmann, since banned. Is the "Wehrsportgruppe Hess" the old Hoffmann gang in new guise?

On April 7, *Die Wahrheit* wrote that La Belle was "known as a meeting place for foreign citizens," raising speculation concerning right-wing elements and "certain tendencies hostile to foreigners, which even extend to the head of the [Berlin] Senate." The article reported that "slogans calling for the persecution of foreigners" were found scrawled nearby the disco, reinforcing the view that the bombing could be the work of fascists. Exactly one week before, on March 29, a powerful bomb exploded in Berlin at a meeting of the local German-



La Belle disco was popular among black GIs, a fact hushed up in American press. Kenneth Ford's mother holds photo of son killed in bomb blast.

Arab Friendship Association, in the Turkish district of Kreuzberg, injuring seven people.

And on April 8, *Unsere Zeit*, newspaper of the West German Communist Party, published a commentary titled, "The Signature of the Nazis," noting that the disco bombing looked more like the work of the fascist perpetrators of the Bologna railway station bombing that killed 80 people in 1980 or the Oktoberfest bombing of the Munich beer festival by neo-Nazis that same year.

As we go to press we learn that these reports have finally broken through the wall of silence. An article by Norman Birnbaum in *Der Spiegel* (21 April) reports:

"The 'proofs' of Qaddafi's responsibility for the Berlin disco explosion have reportedly convinced everyone—except for the West Berlin State Security."

"These officials deserve respect. In a city where the word 'protecting power' causes so many to snap to attention, it takes courage to so directly contradict an American president."

"The more is said about Qaddafi's guilt, the more I recall the former CIA official who commented on every revelation by our government on Central America with professional disdain: 'I personally produced much better fabrications.' "Because the disco was a friendly atmosphere for black Americans and Turks, it is not unthinkable that Berlin neo-Nazis were at work here."

The West Berlin police are evidently not pursuing this line of inquiry. This is hardly surprising. Consider the recent scandal surrounding the forced resignation of West Berlin's interior minister and deputy mayor, Heinrich Lummer. According to *Der Spiegel* (7 April), Lummer funneled several thousand German marks in Christian Democratic Party funds to a fascist outfit. Lummer has also been implicated in supplying arms to the fascist Lebanese Phalange and was a bosom buddy of Bashir Gemayel, whose assassination was the pretext for the Phalangists' mass slaughter at the Sabra and Shatila Palestinian refugee camps. Now West Berlin police have announced the arrest of a "stateless Palestinian," probably from one of the camps, on "suspicion of involvement" in the disco bombing; the alleged connection was not specified.

## Reagan-Hitler: Lying Provocation

Speaking in the United Nations Security Council April 18, the Libyan ambassador, Dr. Ali Treiki, accused the U.S. of pursuing "a campaign of aggression and provocation":

"What is the problem that exists between the United States and Libya? It is the same problem that exists between the United States and all small peoples, beginning with Nicaragua and Grenada and extending to Viet Nam, to Angola, to Ethiopia, to the Palestinian people and to the people of Namibia. The United States has fallen prey to the arrogance and madness of power, and it wants to become the world's policeman. Any party that does not agree to become a vassal and agent of the United States is an outlaw, a terrorist, a communist and a devil."

Treiki said the U.S. had "attempted to forge documents, which were subse-

quently proven to be fabrications," and recalled "the famous 'Ems cable,' fabricated by Bismarck when he wished to carry out aggression against France."

Bismarck's forged cable totally distorting a report from the French ambassador was the pretext for the 1870 Franco-Prussian War. In September 1939, the Nazis had recourse to the same method of lying provocation. They dressed German concentration camp inmates in Polish uniforms, trucked them up to the frontier and then shot them, claiming "self-defense" against a Polish attack on Danzig. As William Stevenson wrote in *A Man Called Intrepid—The Secret War*, Hitler's "ruse" worked:

"The *New York Times* reported that regular Polish Army troops took part in an attack on German positions and that this was the signal for a general offensive by Polish forces. The lie confused the British—bound by treaty to help Poland if she was attacked first—long enough to make intervention too late."

And, of course, there was the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin incident in which the U.S. falsely claimed they were fired on by the North Vietnamese: this Big Lie was used to provide the "legal" basis for the entire Vietnam War.

We ask, *cui bono*—who benefits? The La Belle bombing is oh-so-convenient for the Americans. In Reagan's attack on Libya in March, high U.S. officials admitted the whole purpose of the Sixth Fleet's move into the Gulf of Sidra was a provocation against Qaddafi: "If he sticks his head up we'll clobber him. We're looking for an excuse." There is no reason to believe this is any different.

The U.S. is now on war footing, and the imperialist press has been conscripted: it is no accident that the *New York Times* has been sounding like Hitler's *Völkischer Beobachter* these days. As columnist Alexander Cockburn said in a speech on American news coverage at the New School for Social Research:

"The basic technique of the Reagan administration has been to endlessly reiterate falsity. The president says black is the same as white. The press will initially worry about this and say, well, most people seem to agree that black isn't the same as white. Eminent academics are consulted; they say, no, there are definite distinct differences between black and white."

"Now Reagan keeps at it—that is his genius, and his tremendous, and in a way reasonable, contempt of the media and of their senility.... He says no, black is unquestionably the same as white, there's a report from the Heritage Foundation to prove it. Then the media begin to fear that they might be excessively critical of the president, and they say, well, black is the same as grey, after all, when you look at it, to a degree, and grey possibly bears some identity to white, and therefore you can see that, in a characteristic leap, a conflation of these stages, it is true that black is the same as white, as the president says."

—WBAI, 6 March

That was before the bombing of Libya. Today when The President says the evidence is "irrefutable," they don't have to see it to believe it. Reagan said it, they all read it. Did the fascists bomb La Belle discotheque? We don't know, but Reagan's story stinks. ■

## Spartacist Forum

**Labor Needs Revolutionary Leadership to Win!**

## Union-Busting and Government Terror in Reagan's America

Speakers:

**Ed Karlsten**, Spartacist 1985 candidate for Manhattan Borough President, former member and candidate for president, TWU Local 100

**Gene Herson**, member, National Maritime Union

**Striking TWA flight attendant**

Friday, May 2, 7:30 p.m.

Borough of Manhattan Community College, Room N402

For more information: (212) 267-1025

**NEW YORK CITY**





## Down, Down Reagan!

A team of journalists from the international Spartacist tendency went to Tripoli in late March as Reagan attacked in the Gulf of Sidra. Sixteen years ago the British colonialists were booted out of their military bases in Libya, followed by dismantling of American bases. Now Libyan masses are demonstrating against U.S. imperialist aggression.

## Reagan's Terrorism...

(continued from page 1)

condemned Reagan's attack on Libya. "I don't think Peter will be the only one that will be sacrificed," said his sister-in-law.

U.S. imperialism's West European allies felt compelled to distance themselves from this blatant state-sponsored terrorism. Mass protests hit the streets in London, Athens and Madrid; demonstrators battled cops in Germany: it was an atmosphere not seen since the Vietnam War. In Italy, dozens of factories were shut down by work stoppages to discuss the attack. In Afghanistan and Nicaragua, both under Reagan's guns, tens of thousands rallied in defiance of U.S. imperialism. In Managua, elementary school children rallied for peace outside embassies while factory workers marched with placards protesting U.S. intervention in Central America and the bombing of Libya. The pro-Sandinista newspaper *Nuevo Diario* wrote: "Yesterday it was Grenada, today Libya and tomorrow Nicaragua."

Reagan explicitly linked Libya to Nicaragua in his global counterrevolutionary plans, using the Tripoli bombing to try to push through arms aid for the CIA's anti-Sandinista contra terrorists. "If necessary, we will do it again," said the president. And in the future, they won't bother with pretexts—they'll undertake "preemptive strikes" against "terrorism," meaning anyone on the White House list of "outlaw states" is at risk. Their ultimate target, of course, is the Soviet Union. In the classic style of Cold War brinkmanship, they think they can terrorize the Russians into abject capitulation. The Libyan strikes will embolden the imperialists in their anti-Soviet war drive, aimed at "rolling back" the 1917 October Revolution and restoring unhindered capitalist domination of the world.

As a team of journalists from the international Spartacist tendency which visited Tripoli in March, during Reagan's earlier attack, stated in a declaration to the press:

"We have come to Libya whilst the U.S. imperialist 6th Fleet was threatening to repeat its criminal aggression against the Libyan state, in order to reassert concretely with our presence here the ISI's deep respect and support for the just cause of Libyan independence and territorial integrity against assault by U.S. imperialist aggression. "The terrorist actions of the U.S. imperialists against Libya are part and parcel of the war preparations of the USA and NATO powers against the

Soviet Union, Nicaragua, Cuba, Afghanistan, Poland, and any other country that is perceived as an obstacle to imperialist domination."

### Cops of the World

Increasingly, the president of the United States has been proclaiming a sort of "super-sovereignty" that smacks of the Roman Empire. Following the seizure last fall of the Achille Lauro cruise ship by Palestinian hijackers, Reagan declared, "You can run but you can't hide." To prove it, he ordered F-14 fighter jets to skyjack an Egyptian airliner carrying the hijackers, forcing it to land at a NATO base in Sicily, and then tried to kidnap them to the U.S. This was only stopped by a guns-drawn standoff between Italian soldiers and the Americans' Delta Force "anti-terrorist" hit squad. (This imperial attitude was also displayed in the U.S.' demand that New Zealand must receive

that "the only good one is a dead one." Reagan is rightly bracketed with mass murderers like General Sharon, the architect of the Sabra and Shatila massacre of defenseless Palestinian refugees. The Israeli air strike on a Palestinian camp in Tunisia last year that left over a hundred men, women and children dead, was a virtual trial run for the Americans' Tripoli raid.

In recent articles, columnist Alexander Cockburn has pointed out that compared to 282 Israelis killed by Palestinian violence between 1967 and 1982, some 20,000 Palestinians were killed in Lebanon during Israel's 1982 invasion. And while Amnesty International has documented 14 known cases of political killings or attempted killings by Libyan "hit teams," U.S.-armed, trained and funded armies and death squads have killed more than 100,000 Central Americans in the last decade. Even Zionist state terror pales before the nuclear-armed terrorist in the White House.

While the Israelis applauded and Reagan got Thatcher's permission to use his British-based F-111 bombers, the terror raid was disowned by most West European governments. One paper described it as the biggest split in NATO since Vietnam. France in particular earned the Pentagon's ire by refusing to allow the U.S. bombers to cross their airspace en route to Libya, forcing them to fly an extra 1,200 miles in each direction. Was the bombing of the French embassy in Tripoli the Americans' reply? (No overflight? Take that!) But the difference between Reagan and the European bourgeoisies (and their social democratic lackeys) is essentially tactical—having far more to do with geographic proximity to Libya (and dependence on Libyan oil) than anything else. Mitterrand is no stranger to state terrorism, as his lethal operation against Greenpeace in New Zealand and his dispatching of troops to Chad and New Caledonia show.

The U.S. attacks on Libya were planned nine months ago, long before the bombing of the West Berlin disco or the Rome/Vienna airport massacre, which provided the excuse. As the London *Sunday Times* (30 March) revealed, the Reaganites wanted to pick on somebody to restore U.S. imperialist prestige on the cheap and send a message to the Soviet Union:

"At a White House meeting of the national security planning group in July [1985] there was general agreement that a target must be chosen... Libya was the soft option with Gaddafi able to count only on words to support his leadership. The Arab world and the Soviet bloc would not back him with muscle...

"In December [1985], at Bolling Airbase outside Washington, a special conference attended by mainstream policymakers from the White House, Pentagon, State Department and intelligence services agreed [on] a broad outline for action."


So Qaddafi, a military client of the Soviet Union and small-time Arab nationalist strongman whose own terrorism has never been shown to touch anybody abroad except Libyan dissidents, was chosen to take the rap for all the world's terrorist incidents. The mad bombers in Washington not only picked their target, they laid out a precise schedule, and the computer tape is still running...

### Reagan's Murder, Inc.

At first Reagan tried to pretend that the bombing raid on Libya was an act of "self-defense" (!), supposedly, in Mafia language, to provide Libyan colonel Qaddafi with "incentives and reasons to alter his criminal behavior." The world was supposed to take Reagan's word that Qaddafi was responsible for the indefensible terror bombing of a discotheque in West Berlin (see "Who Bombed Berlin Disco?" in this issue). But for Reagan this was just the excuse he wanted to strike again at Libya.

In fact, the Reagan administration has a policy of assassination, and is openly bragging about it. "U.S. Tried to Kill Khadafy" headlined the reactionary *New York Post* (18 April). Film footage played on American TV showed they had Qaddafi's tent in their cross hairs. The National Security Council had even drafted a statement describing Qaddafi's death as "fortuitous"; another administration official said it would be "serendipity." And War Secretary Weinberger was quoted by the *New York Post* as saying that Qaddafi had "forfeited his right to occupy space on the planet." The Libyan leader is labeled a "mad dog"—and we all know what you're supposed to do to a mad dog: shoot it. Last time they put dump trucks in front of the White House, Stinger missiles across the street, even plastic snakes in the trees to ward off bomb-carrying pigeons—all because of a mythical Libyan plot to kill Reagan. But it's the Libyan "White House" that was bombed, not the one in Washington, D.C.

It was a small-scale practice run for Reagan's nuclear first-strike plans against the Soviet Union, which call for "decapitating" the Kremlin in the first few minutes of World War III. Presidential spokesman Larry Speakes declared in his announcement of the raid on Libya that the U.S. struck at "command and control systems, intelli-



Sydney, Australia: Spartacists denounce Reagan's terror bombing of Libya.

its nuclear ships.) Reagan and the rest of the American ruling class desperately want to regain the imperialist hegemony they lost in the Vietnam War. They think they are still the cops of the world.

Reagan's bombing was welcomed most enthusiastically by the Israelis. One Jerusalem "terrorism expert" boasted that the air strikes against Tripoli and Benghazi are "the kind of method which until now has been identified exclusively as the 'Israeli method'" (*Washington Post*, 17 April). These "Israeli methods"—modeled on Adolf Hitler's policy of *Schrecklichkeit* or terrorizing the populace—are as American as the murderous proposition



gence, communications," or "CI" in Pentagonese. This "decapitation" policy was laid out in Jimmy Carter's Presidential Directive 59 in 1980. Of course, murdering foreign leaders is ostensibly prohibited by federal law. But this legal wrinkle will be ironed out by a bill introduced by Senator Jeremiah Denton, to "permit the President to order the assassination of a foreign head of state under some circumstances" (*New York Times*, 18 April).

The Pentagon warmakers think that their laser-guided "smart" bombs will give them the pinpoint accuracy to accomplish this ultimate terrorist strike. And the main lesson they have drawn from the bombing of Tripoli was that high tech works. *Time* (28 April) called the raids "A Lethal Video Game." But Operation FI Dorado Canyon was something less than the "flawless success" claimed by Weinberger and Reagan. Fully one-third of the F-111 bombers had to abort their missions because of mechanical failure, and their targeting can't have been too good unless they really intended to "take out" a chicken farm two miles away from a Libyan air base, killing 300 chickens! This, and the explosion on launching of the U.S.' last two Titan missiles and the Challenger space shuttle, does not augur well for Reagan's "Star Wars" plans.

In the fevered war atmosphere being whipped up by Washington, we will no doubt soon see a new game in the video arcades—"Kill Qaddafi"—using the actual tapes from the Tripoli bombing run. Three direct hits on Qaddafi's tent and you get a free game, plus a visit from your Air Force recruiter. But World War III won't be a video game in which white middle-class America escapes without casualties.

### Democrats Salute Their Commander in Chief

Predictably, the Libya raid received bipartisan support from Democratic "doves," who are no less anti-Soviet than their Republican colleagues, and eager to show it. When news of the bombing reached Democratic Party leaders at a New York fund-raiser, they instantly snapped to attention. "I think all Americans would stand with the commander in chief at this moment," said Senator Ted Kennedy, while House leader Tip O'Neill lambasted the lily-livered Allies in Europe. The *New York Times* poked holes in some of the sillier lies—pointing out, for instance, that the bomb damage in civilian areas of Tripoli could not have been caused by Soviet-made antiaircraft missiles falling back to earth. But the *Times* (15 April) editorial, "The Terrorist and His Sentence," concluded they could only "approve and applaud" Reagan's assassination attempt.

Initially, Americans seemed mostly to be buying Reagan's line. Indeed, 77 percent of Americans surveyed supported the raid on Libya, though barely half



the black population did. But the reactionary triumphalist mood is brittle. When Reagan moves to send "American boys" to die on foreign soil, he will find the "Vietnam syndrome" very much alive and still in his way. It's one thing for U.S. bombers to rain down death on Libya with virtual impunity. But to take and hold Nicaragua would cost many thousands of American lives.

The working class must stand militarily with Libya against the aggressions of U.S. imperialism. As Leon Trotsky, co-leader with Lenin of the Russian October Revolution, wrote during the 1930s when European social democrats refused to defend colonial Ethiopia even against the Italian fascist Mussolini, on grounds that Ethiopia was led by a repulsive monarchical dictatorship:

"If Mussolini triumphs, it means the reinforcement of fascism, the strengthening of imperialism, and the discouragement of the colonial peoples in Africa and elsewhere. The victory of [Ethiopia], however, would mean a mighty blow not only at Italian imperialism but at imperialism as a whole, and would lend a powerful impulsion to the rebellious forces of the oppressed peoples. One must really be completely blind not to see this."

—"On Dictators and the Heights of Oslo" (April 1936)

The fake-left believed that Reagan "spoke loudly and carried a small stick" because their stock-in-trade is peddling illusions that the Democratic Party could be pressured to restrain Reagan. The knee-jerk response by the Democrats and the liberal press in lining up with Reagan over Libya gives the lie to this. The Democrats hate Qaddafi because, like Reagan, they link him with Russia. And when it comes to bombing babies and other innocent civilians, the Democrats will go with their big



In Reagan's bombsights: White House assassins aim to kill Qaddafi and family, murdering infant daughter and badly injuring young sons.

brother in the White House, whether it's in Tripoli, Managua or Philadelphia.

### Defend the Soviet Union!

Within two days of the terror raids on Libya, Washington was blaming it all on the Russians. "We urged the Soviets and East Germans to restrain the Libyans," State Department spokesman Bernard Kalb said. "Had they done so, this entire cycle of events would have been avoided." Indeed, even before the U.S. Sixth Fleet sailed last month toward the Gulf of Sidra, its ships had been engaged in a brazen provocation within Soviet territorial waters outside its major Black Sea naval installation at Sevastopol. The Soviets would have been entirely within their rights to have blown those Navy warships out of the water. Recognizing that this could mean world war, the Soviets said, "we showed patience and restraint"—"this time."

Reformists like the U.S. Communist Party don't defend the Soviet Union because with their inveterate tailing after the liberal Democrats they are beholden to the American capitalists. Blinded by illusions in détente, the CP's initial response to the KAL 007 spy plane affair was to deny that the Russians shot it down—they couldn't believe that the Soviets would defend their borders against a provocation which they had every right to believe was a military incursion. And only recently CP head Gus Hall astounded Gorbachev by suggesting that he had a duty to come to a summit in the U.S., no matter what (*Daily World*, 12 March). That just happens to be Reagan's line! The American CP's reaction is a capitulation to the anti-Soviet climate of Reagan's America.

The Stalinist rulers in Moscow are no

less wedded to the illusions of "peaceful coexistence," the direct consequence of their treacherous program of "socialism in one country" rather than international proletarian revolution. Even as the Soviets were breaking off a planning meeting for the summit in the wake of the Libya bombing, Gorbachev was unveiling a new initiative for reducing conventional arms. But the NATO imperialists are only interested in disarming the Russians. For them, Reaganite rhetoric aside, "détente" served to hold back the Soviet missile program while the U.S. rebuilt its nuclear arsenal which had deteriorated under the impact of the Vietnam War. For the Kremlin bureaucrats to be bargaining with the Americans over the disarmament of the Soviet Union is a betrayal of the October Revolution.

In his July 1932 "Declaration to the Antwar Congress at Amsterdam," Leon Trotsky trenchantly exposed the fraud of "disarmament":

"Without the slightest confidence in the capitalist programs for disarmament or arms limitation, the revolutionary proletariat asks one single question: *In whose hands are the weapons?* Any weapon in the hands of the imperialists is a weapon directed against the working class, against the weak nations, against socialism, against humanity. Weapons in the hands of the proletariat and of the oppressed nations are the only means of ridding our planet of oppression and war."

The imperialist war drive can only be answered by revolutionary class struggle. The working people of America, united with their class brothers around the world, must rise to their historic mission and disarm the bloody imperialists by smashing capitalist class rule and establishing the revolutionary regime of workers power. ■

## Hands Off Libya...

(continued from page 12)

"Rambo's daughter," as the *Guardian* (17 April) put it, sees herself as "a fellow crusader against evil empires of any kind."

In this situation the Labour Party and the pseudo-revolutionary left have done all they can to deflect any challenge to the Tory government and British imperialism. Labour leader Neil Kinnock, who supported the bloody Falklands/Malvinas adventure, counterposes to Reagan/Thatcher's bloodthirsty provocations an alternative imperialist policy of isolating Libya until "the pressure of commercial, economic, financial, diplomatic and political sanctions squeezed the life out of the Gaddafi regime" (*Times*, 17 April). What NATO loyalists like Kinnock and the Social Democratic Party are concerned about is that this latest action will exacerbate opposition to the Atlantic alliance and the presence of U.S. bases here. A columnist in the pro-Atlanticist *Guardian* (14 April) on the eve of the attack expressed open

concern that "Rambo Reagan has achieved the impossible: he has made getting rid of the bases look not only conceivable but perhaps desirable."

Meanwhile the fake-revolutionaries, tailing after Labour "lefts" like Tony Benn, push anti-Americanism while providing a "left" cover for the anti-Soviet war drive which is the motive for the terror-bombing of Tripoli. The call for today's rally was the social-patriotic slogan, "Protect Britain and World Peace." These "Little England" nationalists focus on American imperialism, parodying Liebknecht's stirring internationalist appeal from World War I by turning it into the slogan, "The main enemy is abroad!" At today's demonstration, Tony Cliff's anti-Soviet Socialist Workers Party even initiated the burning of an American flag—but, conspicuously, you didn't see the Cliffites igniting a Union Jack.

And the Banda/Slaughter WRP flatly refused to join in in chants of "Defend the Soviet Union!" at various demonstrations, with the bogus argument that the Soviet Union has done nothing to defend Libya! Funny, those looked like Tupolev transports and Soviet SAMs the U.S. was targeting. Far from unconditionally defending the

USSR in the face of an imperialist attack which even the bourgeois press recognizes is aimed at the homeland of the October Revolution, these fake-Trotskyists are looking for a "Third Camp" position. They join with the Labour-loyal fake-left—from the CP Stalinists to the centrist Workers Power—in focusing on the demand for U.S. bases out of Britain.

Ronald Reagan, with the avid assistance of Margaret Thatcher, is tugging the trip wires for thermonuclear World War III. In the midst of this war danger, there is real interest in a revolutionary-internationalist alternative to the popular front pacifist nationalism supplied by the fake-left. Spartacist comrades sold more than 150 papers on the Tuesday evening demonstration, almost 600 more today. Many were eager to read our eyewitness report from Tripoli, "Under Reagan's Guns in Libya," in the current issue of *Workers Hammer*, and scores of *Workers Vanguard* were sold to those who wanted to read the paper of the American Trotskyists who defend Libya and the Soviet Union against imperialism. We say: "Reagan/Thatcher Hands Off Libya! Defend the Soviet Union! The Main Enemy Is at Home!" ■



Photo distributed in Libya shows Qaddafi with baby daughter Hana, murdered by Reagan.



# WORKERS VANGUARD

## MOVE Survivor Puts State on Trial

# Free Ramona Africa!

"Free Ramona Africa—Put the murderers in jail!" chanted 150 protesters before a Philadelphia city hall courtroom on April 14. But that was not to be in Reagan's America. Ramona Africa is the sole adult survivor of the Philly cop firebombing of the black MOVE commune. In an hour-long statement read before her sentencing she told the packed courtroom: "I'm here simply because I'm a MOVE member and I survived" one of the most grotesque racist crimes in this deeply racist country. In her powerful indictment of state murder Ramona stated she was "tried, convicted and sentenced on May 13."

On that date one year ago, in a terrorist conspiracy that ran from the Reagan White House to the Philadelphia city hall of black Democrat mayor Wilson Goode, police dropped a bomb burning alive eleven black MOVE

members including five children and burning down 61 homes in the black neighborhood. Because they could not burn to death this courageous 30-year-old black woman last May 13, the authorities robbed her of freedom from that day, first holding her on \$2 million bail, then framing her up on "riot" charges. On April 14, Judge Michael R. Stiles put Ramona behind bars for up to seven years.

Shortly after the Philadelphia judge pronounced sentence, a U.S. terror strike bombed babies, homes and embassies in Libya. As two score prison guards and cops led Ramona from the courtroom, proud and unbowed, she shouted to her supporters: "You all didn't expect anything? Down with this rotten system!" Free Ramona Africa and all MOVE prisoners! American workers revolution will avenge MOVE martyrs!

Gralish/Philadelphia Inquirer

Ramona defiant after sentencing in racist Philly court, April 14.




## British Trotskyists Say: The Main Enemy Is at Home!

# "Reagan/Thatcher Bloody Hands Off Libya!"

LONDON, April 19—More than 10,000 people converged on the American embassy here today in protest against the barbarous bombing raid over Libya, joining tens of thousands of other demonstrators in the rest of Britain and throughout Western Europe. The Anglo-American terror-bombing of Tripoli and Benghazi has unleashed a wave of opposition and outrage throughout Britain, in distinct contrast to the muted response here to last month's U.S. provocation in the Gulf of Sidra by the Sixth Fleet. Only hours after news of the attack broke, several thousand demonstrators came out onto the streets, many of them headed straight for Thatcher's official residence at Downing Street. Hostility to the already deeply despised Tory (Conservative) government of Margaret Thatcher is visible, vociferous and rising. There are even serious divisions in her own party and throughout ruling circles.

The Spartacist League of Britain has thrown its forces into these demonstrations, hammering home the connection between Reagan/Thatcher's criminal assault on the Libyan people and the imperialist anti-Soviet war drive. While most of the left has either taken a dive on defence of Libya or sought to amnesty their "own" bourgeoisie through push-



London, April 15: After protest outside U.S. embassy (above), Spartacist League of Britain led marchers to Downing Street behind banner reading "Down with Reagan! Down with Thatcher! For Workers Revolution!"

ing social-patriotic anti-Americanism, the SL has fought for effective united-front action in defence of Libya. Our central banner in today's demonstration read, "Reagan/Thatcher Bloody Hands Off Libya! Defend the Soviet Union!"

On the evening of April 15, immediately after the attack, an SL contingent joined a protest called by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament outside the

U.S. embassy in Grosvenor Square. Our chant "Reagan, Thatcher, hands off Libya!" was picked up by many of the several hundred demonstrators there, which included a contingent from the Banda/Slaughter Workers Revolutionary Party (WRP), as well as supporters of the pro-Moscow opposition within the Communist Party, the Communist Campaign Group. But both the Stalin-

ists, who shortly wandered off, and the ostensibly Trotskyist WRP refused to join in our chants of "Defend the Soviet Union!" instead counterposing: "U.S. bases out of Britain!"

To underscore the full and enthusiastic complicity of the Thatcher government in Reagan's bloody operation, the SL contingent led the demonstration, including the WRP contingent, on a march from the American embassy to Downing Street. As the march approached Downing Street—with an SL banner at its head reading, "Down with Reagan! Down with Thatcher! For Workers Revolution!"—it was greeted enthusiastically by many of the demonstrators already there. The CND honchos tried to push the line that what was criminal about the American aggression and Thatcher's involvement was that it set the British people up for "terrorism." But the general tenor of the crowd was one of outrage at both Reagan and Thatcher, and fear that their insane war provocations would trigger nuclear world war.

Broad sectors of the population already revile Thatcher for her year-long civil war against the miners and her attempts to incite a racist bloodbath in the inner city ghettos last autumn. They remember her own role as a war criminal in ordering the cold-blooded murder of several hundred Argentine sailors aboard the cruiser *Belgrano* during the Falklands/Malvinas war. The Libya bombing has plunged the Thatcher government into even deeper crisis, provoking opposition not only on the Tory backbenches, but within her own Cabinet. A poll conducted the day after the bombing registered opposition by two-thirds of the British population to the attack; an even greater number opposed British participation. One BBC news commentator noted that Thatcher was getting "bouquets in the U.S. and brickbats at home." While America's other NATO allies expressed discomfort over Reagan's murderous raid,

continued on page 11