

## Palestinians Shafted Again

# Carter's Near East Peace Baloney

MARCH 26—Today marked the signing of the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty in a ceremony on the South Lawn of the White House. President Carter called this the major achievement of his administration and said solemnly, "Peace has come." We say, "Baloney."

This treaty is a license for continued Israeli aggression against the surrounding Arab states. It "legalizes" the Zionist state's denial of the national rights of the Palestinians. And it calls for a major jump in the direct military involvement of U.S. imperialism in the Near East.

It does not mean peace for the Palestinians. It does mean a greater threat to the Soviet Union and its allies in the region. It is not a pact for peace but a spur to wider war.

The treaty is the culmination of the theatrical pilgrimage of Egyptian president Anwar Sadat to Jerusalem in November 1977; of the marathon 12-day Camp David summit between Israeli prime minister Menachem Begin, Sadat and U.S. president Carter; and of Jimmy Carter's own desperate mid-March "shuttle diplomacy" between Cairo and Jerusalem. This was the "separate peace" which Sadat had vowed he would never sign, and it spelled nothing but more war and national oppression for both the Arab and Hebrew working masses.

For Egypt the accords provide complete return of the Israeli-occupied Sinai peninsula in two stages over three years. For Israel there is an end to the state of war, full diplomatic relations with Cairo and the right to purchase Sinai oil. Carter got a publicity coup and the basis for an anti-Soviet Near East alliance. But for the long-suffering Palestinians, despite all the talk of a "linkage" between the treaty and West Bank "autonomy," there was only the bitter prospect of continued subjugation under the Zionist boot.

Seeking to soften Arab hostility to the pact, Egyptian prime minister Khalil was reported as claiming that under its provisions Israel would withdraw to its pre-1967 borders and East Jerusalem would again come under Arab control. But the very next day Begin exposed this hoax, categorically stating in his opening speech to the Knesset (parliament) debate on the treaty:

"Dr. Khalil, Israel will never return to the pre-1967 lines. Secondly, Dr. Khalil, mark my words, united Jerusalem is the eternal capital of Israel. It will never be divided again. Thirdly, Dr. Khalil, in Judea, Samaria [Zionist designations of the area comprising the West Bank] and Gaza there will never be a Palestinian state."

—New York Times, 21 March

"Autonomy," said the Israeli prime minister, applied not to "territories" but only to "the persons."

A "Pax Americana" the treaty was



Streeky/Camera 5



Carter says "Peace has come." Not for the Palestinians.

dubbed by Arab states of the "rejection front," and in this they were certainly correct. As the obsequious Sadat put it in trying to ingratiate himself with his new patron, "Jimmy Carter has done it. This show is his show." Not only was the Egyptian-Israeli "peace" treaty negotiated under U.S. auspices, but it presages a massive escalation of American military involvement in the Near East. Billions of dollars of military aid will flow to Egypt and Israel, and a

permanent U.S. presence (bases and naval fleets) to protect the "oil lanes" is being proposed.

The appetite for a direct U.S. military presence in the region has been a constant under the Nixon, Ford and Carter administrations. Now, with the fall of the shah of Iran, one of the pillars of Washington's Near East policies, and his replacement by a fanatically Islamic and pro-Palestinian regime, the State Department and Pentagon are frantical-

ly seeking to put together a new anti-Soviet alliance. However, the fallout from Iran's Islamic revolution has been contradictory from the standpoint of U.S. imperialism's strategic options.

On the one hand, the spectre of Khomeini has hardened the Israeli ruling class against making any significant concessions on the grounds that "moderates" like Sadat to whom the concessions are made may not be around long. As Moshe Dayan put it, Iran shows that in his part of the world, a country that has been a "friend of Israel" can become a friend of Arafat very suddenly. Logically the uncoupling, even if temporary, of its important Iranian connection should make Washington even more committed to line up Egypt and Saudi Arabia on its side. Ergo more U.S. pressure on Israel for concessions. But the foreign policy of an imperialist ruling class never simply corresponds to its long-term strategic interests. And the right-wing "who lost Iran?" backlash domestically strengthens, at least for a while, the pro-Zionist lobby in the U.S.

### U.S. Imperialist Jingoism Revives

Jimmy Carter desperately needed this treaty. His inability, after all the fanfare of Camp David, to wring some kind of agreement from Sadat and Begin had contributed to escalating criticism of his foreign policy from all shades of bourgeois political opinion as indecisive, incompetent and impotent. His ratings in public opinion polls plummeted as he managed to antagonize both the right wing and liberals within his own party, as well as conservative Republican neanderthals. This criticism turned into a barrage as the Carter administration stood helplessly on the sidelines while Washington's No. 1 gendarme guarding the strategically vital flow of oil from the Persian Gulf, the Iranian monarchy, was toppled.

Carter was supposed to be the small-town businessman and born-again Baptist Sunday school teacher who would remoralize America after Vietnam and Watergate, allowing the U.S. to resume an interventionist role as the leading, though no longer hegemonic, imperialist power. Instead he has been immersed in his own "peanutgate" financial scandals while covering for the antics of his bigoted alcoholic brother. Carter's attacks on social services, his fat raises for the Pentagon budget and his anti-Soviet "human rights" crusade only whetted the appetites of Republican Party reactionaries like Ronald Reagan, who compares Carter to Neville Chamberlain at Munich, and Tennessee senator Baker who claims

continued on page 10

## Labor Must Break All Ties to AIFLD!

# Stalinists Defend CIA Front at Bay Area Chile Meet

SAN FRANCISCO—The Ships Clerks Hall of International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) Local 34 was the setting March 24 for a "Trade Union Conference on Chile," one of those periodic get-togethers so beloved by the Communist Party (CP) as a sounding board for its class-collaborationist politics. At these "progressive" confabs the main enemy is always those who stand for uncompromising class struggle, as at the 1975 Bay Area Chile conference where the Stalinist organizers launched an unsuccessful thug attack on a militant warehouseman protesting the presence of a capitalist politician, Democratic Congressman Leo Ryan, at a labor meeting.

While it did not come to blows at this year's gathering, the CP and its sundry supporters were caught in an excruciating contradiction over whether to tail the "human rights" campaign of U.S. imperialism or call for breaking labor ties to the Yankee spy agencies. In the end the Stalinists chose Jimmy Carter, bureaucratically suppressing any motions denouncing the notorious CIA-backed American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD).

While the conference was endorsed by a number of run-of-the-mill Bay Area trade-union bureaucrats grooming their "socially concerned" images such as Walter Johnson, president of Local 1100 of the Department Store Clerks, and Herb Mills, secretary of ILWU Local 10, the donkey work was accomplished by old-time Stalinist hacks like Archie Brown, retired longshoreman and well-known CP leader. With his decades of experience as errand boy for ex-ILWU leader Harry Bridges and the Democratic Party, Brown was naturally on stage as the conference's "official convenor."

The sparks began to fly from the moment the chairman routinely pushed to adopt the agenda, scheduled to open with an address by the "honorable Diane Feinstein, mayor of San Francisco." This prompted a protest from an Amalgamated Transit Workers Union delegate, Margaret Martinson, who reminded the delegates that Feinstein was a "vicious anti-labor strikebreaker" in the 1976 San Francisco city workers strike. Moving to bar Mayor Feinstein from the conference, Martinson warned against tying the American and San Francisco labor movements to the Democratic Party. Brown's cohorts

nervously tried to squelch the motion as being "out of order," as Feinstein was already entering the hall. The chairman managed to wriggle out of this tight spot only by heavy-handedly ordering the agenda accepted without a vote, ignoring the protests of several longshore delegates.

But the conference's big fight began when delegate Jane Margolis, a militant recently elected to the executive board of the Communications Workers of America (CWA) Local 9410, rose to propose a workshop on the need for labor to break all ties with AIFLD, the State Department's Latin American "labor front" and brainchild of CWA founder Joe Beirne. Margolis, a member of the Militant Action Caucus which has fought for years to break the CWA's connection to the agency, distributed copies of a caucus resolution denouncing AIFLD which she had presented to the '78 CWA convention.

One would think Margolis' proposal for a workshop on the AIFLD at the Chile conference would be an open-and-shut case. So notorious is the agency that many Latin Americans bitterly refer to the American labor federation as the AFL-CIA. The AIFLD's sinister operations have included infiltrating CIA spies into labor organizations, destroying legitimate unions to replace them with yellow company unions, as well as playing a direct role in the overthrow of both the Goulart government of Brazil in 1964 and the Allende government of Chile in 1973, both of which were replaced by brutal military dictatorships. But in their cringing fear of angering the union tops, the CP supporters and fellow travelers did everything they could to kill Margolis' proposal.

Thus Stalinist hack Jack Weintraub, vice-president of Teamsters Local 85, argued against even a workshop (!) on the idiotic parochial grounds that since the AIFLD is connected to the AFL-CIO, it is "improper" for unions not affiliated to the AFL-CIO to tell the latter what to do about their "internal" affairs! Jim Imerzel, recently elected president of CWA Local 9410, chimed

in behind Weintraub and was later rewarded by being named secretary of a continuations committee. Weintraub & Co. then rammed through a vote to defeat the proposed workshop on the AIFLD, an action which further alienated a number of independent trade-union delegates who were already enraged by the presence of Mayor Feinstein.

However hard it tried, the CP wasn't able to suppress the issue so easily. In a workshop on legislative action Jane Margolis put forward a motion calling for abolishing AIFLD. This drove Archie Brown into a frenzy, screaming "Table it, table it!" at the top of his voice. The CP looked so pathetic that Fred Hirsh, a Stalinist fellow traveler whose 1974 pamphlet exposed the AIFLD role in the Chilean coup, was sheepishly explaining that the delegates should not be so quick to abolish such CIA fronts, but to look instead for way to use them and "turn them around!"

What was behind this grotesque about-face by the CP and its "democratic" friends was revealed in the keynote speech by Mario Navarro Castro, general secretary of the Central Unica de Trabajadores de Chile (CUT), the Chilean labor federation banned by Pinochet. According to Navarro, the much-touted AFL-CIO threat to boycott Chilean goods was abandoned this January when a deal was concluded between Pinochet and Peter Grace, president of the W. R. Grace Corporation as well as AIFLD chairman. Grace and George Meany apparently abandoned the boycott in exchange for promises from Pinochet for certain trade-union freedoms, such as the right to assemble, pay dues, bargain collectively, strike (as long as the strikes do not involve "third parties") and so on.

But, as Navarro bitterly explained, these promises are useless since all genuine trade unions have been smashed or driven underground, leaving only the junta-approved "unions" to enjoy these freedoms—most probably the AIFLD unions! However, Navarro refused, when approached, to intervene

in the AIFLD dispute on the conference floor. It was apparent that the Stalinists do not want to openly condemn the AIFLD because it could upset George Meany and his "popular front" with Jimmy Carter, Peter Grace and Pinochet!

At the conference Stan Gow and Howard Keylor, members of the ILWU Local 10 executive board and publishers of the *Longshore Militant*, put forward a motion calling for a "permanent embargo on the transportation of military goods to Chile" and for a two-week boycott of all trade to Chile, to press demands for the release from prison of Chilean trade unionists and other victims of the Pinochet junta. Predictably, their motion was suppressed by the Stalinists in favor of yet another paper resolution for the open-ended "boycott on all goods to and from Chile," which by their own admission has already been sabotaged by the AIFLD! Ironically, in his speech Navarro, whose popular-front rhetoric generally matched that of the conference organizers, criticized the "total boycott" conception as being too vague, arguing that a successful boycott must be linked to concrete objectives.

In the ILWU itself the Stalinists have an unbroken all-talk, no-action record. While Local 10 has had a position since 1973 in favor of a boycott of Chilean goods, the only time the union tops actually boycotted military shipments to Pinochet was after it received the approval of Senator Edward Kennedy, who saw the boycott as a pressure tool to use on Carter. Now the Stalinists have gone one step further and turned themselves into apologists for the bloody AIFLD, all in the name of Jimmy Carter's "human rights." The CP's present tack is to call for the CIA to get out of the AIFLD, i.e., leaving intact this imperialist tool on whose board sit the heads of major U.S. corporations and which is financed by the U.S. government! While the treacherous Stalinists may delude themselves into thinking they can "use" the CIA, in fact the only aid they will get is when the CIA needs the CP to derail the workers struggles, in Chile or elsewhere. ■

## WORKERS VANGUARD

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

EDITOR: Jan Norden  
PRODUCTION MANAGER: Darlene Kamiura  
CIRCULATION MANAGER: Karen Wyatt  
EDITORIAL BOARD: Jon Brule, Charles Burroughs, George Foster, Liz Gordon, James Robertson, Joseph Seymour  
Published biweekly, skipping an issue in August and a week in December, by the Spartacist Publishing Co., 260 West Broadway, New York, NY 10013. Telephone: 966-6841 (Editorial), 925-5665 (Business). Address all correspondence to: Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, NY 10001. Domestic subscriptions: \$3.00/24 issues. Second-class postage paid at New York, NY.

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

No. 228 30 March 1979

Jerusalem, Israel  
12 March 1979

Dear Friends:

I liked very much the several pieces of analysis about the Chinese invasion of Vietnam, which you have published in your No. 226 (2 March) issue. I want to add, however, that this invasion may turn out after all to be only a *diversion*, and that the real imperialist attack may come quite soon in the Middle East in the form of an Israeli "preventative" attack on the eastern and northern fronts, with Sadat's neutrality secured, with or without a "treaty." The Israeli Labor Party, is *more* in favour of such an attack than Begin, but it has powerful allies inside the present government for such a policy, especially General Ezer Weizman and also General Ariel Sharon (who only differ whether to obtain a hidden or an open support from the USA for such a policy).

Sincerely yours,  
Israel Shahak

*WV Replies:* A war between the U.S. and USSR may indeed be ignited in the Near East. But given the anti-Soviet objectives of imperialism, the U.S. has good reason to try to use the nationalist Chinese Stalinists as their cat's paw in Southeast Asia.

16 March 1979

Dear *WV*,

This is to call your attention to a contradictory formulation in the article "China Get Out!" (*WV* No. 226, 2 March):

"And it is equally unclear whether the Vietnamese Stalinists have the capacity to create an essentially federated state in which the peoples and sub-peoples of Indochina can freely choose their national destiny."

As *WV* correctly says in the next paragraph:

"We do not place political confidence in the Vietnamese Stalinists to overcome

the national question—on the contrary, we call for the working class to carry out a political revolution to oust the heirs of Ho Chi Minh and replace them with soviets. That is the only road to a genuine democratic socialist federation of Indochina."

*WV* was correct to suggest that a Hanoi-dominated Indochinese federation would not necessarily be so oppressive of the Cambodians that the majority of them would want an independent state. Despite the well-publicized discontent among non-Russians in the USSR, there is also evidence that many national minorities (Armenians, for example) favor being part of the present federated state, which brings to them very considerable economic advantages. However, like their Kremlin counterparts, the Hanoi Stalinists, nationalist bureaucrats that they are, will certainly *not* grant the Cambodian people the democratic *right* of national self-determination.

Comradely,  
John Sharpe

## Letters

WORKERS VANGUARD

# Khomeini Continues Persian Domination

## Kurds Revolt

### For the Right of Kurdish Self-Determination

MARCH 27—For the last four days yet another popular challenge to the consolidation of the new "Islamic Republic" has been met with bullets as Kurdish rebels battled government troops in the streets of Sanandaj. More than 500 have been killed according to latest reports. The unstable Khomeini government and the rebels have agreed to a cease-fire and "negotiations," but the situation remains explosive. Despite the government's token concessions including a Kurdish governor, the Kurds continue to demand national "autonomy."

Thus after clashes with leftist guerrillas who refused to turn in their weapons when the mullahs toppled the shah and after women took to the streets to protest the attempt to impose the suffocating veil, now it is the turn of national minorities—a majority of the population of Iran—to resist Khomeini's reactionary rule.

Another sector of the Iranian population is being taught the meaning of Khomeini's Shi'ite Islamic Republic at the cost of their lives—systematic subjugation of women, anti-communist terror for the left and great Persian chauvinism for the national minorities: the rule of the ayatollahs and pious *bazaari* capitalists will be based on national oppression as much as was the Pahlavis' "peacock throne." From the Arabs of the southwestern province of Khuzistan to the Azerbaijanis of the Northwest and the Baluchis of Iran's poorest province in the East, the national demands are being suppressed by Khomeini's mullahs and their theocratic militias in league with remnants of the shah's army.

The most dramatic battle between the Kurdish partisans and Khomeini's forces took place in the provincial city of Sanandaj where the Kurds had taken into their own hands the task of disarming the shah's army. Clashes broke out between Kurdish nationalists, themselves Sunni Muslims, and Khomeini's regular troops. So the Shi'ite

imam denounced the heretics and called upon his mullah militia to aid the police and army "to smash the bandits." When a local religious leader appointed by Khomeini then took charge of the arsenal and began transferring the weapons of Sanandaj to Shi'ite areas, the Kurds protested. Their protests were answered with rifle fire from the troops, and on Sunday, March 18, an enraged Kurdish population stormed Sanandaj's police headquarters and radio and television station and besieged the local garrison of 2,000 men. The garrison's commander, Colonel Safar, was captured and marched to the radio station from which he broadcast an appeal to the garrison to surrender. The troops refused.

Khomeini came to their rescue with helicopter gunships, which strafed the streets of the city, killing several hundred Kurds. The local Kurdish forces were bolstered by additional men from throughout the region. The siege of the army base continued for several days as all attempts at a truce broke down. Negotiations only began with the arrival of Ayatollah Taleghani, dispatched by Khomeini, on March 21. The Kurds agreed to pull back in return for the release of nearly 200 hostages held by the garrison, and the various chieftains and mullahs began bargaining for a greater share of local government posts.

The Guevarist Fedayeen guerrillas played a significant role in the fighting in alliance with self-styled "Marxist-Leninist" groups such as the "Revolutionary Organization of Kurdish Workers." But the March 23 issue of *Le Monde* reports that these groupings have subordinated themselves to the traditional feudalist Kurdish leaders like Mohammed Ahmad Moftizadeh, a religious figure reportedly tied to the Barzani clan. These "moderate" holy men and tribal chiefs have offered to support Khomeini's Islamic Republic rather than a democratic secular regime in return for "autonomy."

### Iran: Prison House of Oppressed Nations

As in tsarist Russia, where the Great Russian minority of 47 percent domi-



Abbas/Gamma-Liaison

Kurdish guerrillas battle Khomeini's Islamic army in Sanandaj.

nated a huge empire, so it is in Iran where only two fifths of the population is Persian. The Kurds are the fourth most numerous people in the Near East with some estimates as high as six million. They are an indigenous Aryan people who for thousands of years inhabited the mountainous regions separating the historical centers of Anatolia, Mesopotamia and the Iranian plateau. Tribal, pastoral and nomadic in the main, the Kurds have often fallen victim to the more centralized, economically advanced societies surrounding them. But their isolation has also prevented their integration and complete absorption into those societies. Today their nation is partitioned by five state powers.

Since Iran shares a 1,000-mile border with the Soviet Union, there is an overlap of nationalities between northern Iran and the Soviet Caucasus and Central Asia. These nationalities, especially the Azerbaijanis, have been the bridge by which the Russian Revolution spread its influence through the Near and Middle East. Before World War I many Iranian Azerbaijanis who went to work in the Baku oil fields were exposed to Marxist propaganda and returned to build a nucleus of Iranian social democracy, the *Markaz-e Gheibi*. The 1905 Russian Revolution was not

without its echo in Iranian Azerbaijan and Kurdistan. Multi-class formations (*anjomans*), resembling soviets were established in Tabriz and Kirmanshah. Likewise, under the impact of October, revolutionary ferment swept Iran, including the so-called "Soviet Republic of Gilan" in the northern province of Iran, adjoining Azerbaijan to the soviets formed in Kirmanshah by the revolutionary Russian soldiers.

At the same time Iran's border with the Soviet Union has also been seen by the imperialists as the soft underbelly of Soviet power, a staging area for counterrevolutionary penetration. To prevent the extension of the October Revolution into Iran and to build a base against the Soviet Union, British imperialism backed the building of a strong, centralized state power by Reza Khan (father of the now-deposed shah). The British supported the coup of this son of a peasant, who rose to the rank of colonel in the tsar's cossack brigade stationed in Iran, against the old Persian Qajar dynasty. Thus while Kemal Atatürk compacted a Turkish nation-state out of the disintegrating Ottoman empire in struggle against imperialist partition schemes, Reza Shah, who is often falsely compared to Atatürk, by contrast restabilized an archaic multinational empire with the imperialists' blessing.

The replacement of British imperialism by the U.S. as the dynasty's chief backer did not mean the slightest change in this structure. In the case of national minorities extending across national boundaries the Iranian state collaborated closely with its neighbors in suppressing nationalist guerrillas—for example aiding Pakistan's suppression of the Baluchis. With the collapse of the monarchy the national question is once again a touchstone of the Iranian revolution. *But it is precisely in the struggle against the Kurds that Khomeini is attempting to forge the new military force to impose both Islamic rule and continued Persian domination.*

The last major threat to the Persian central power occurred at the end of World War II when British imperialism and the USSR squared off in Iran. Under the tutelage of Soviet military occupation forces, "democratic republics" were established in Azerbaijan and Mahabad in Kurdistan. But when the Red Army pulled out, the Azerbaijani "republic" ignominiously collapsed. The Soviet Stalinist bureaucracy cynically abandoned it partly under the pressure of U.S. imperialism, but primarily because the Iranian government had promised an oil concession in

*continued on page 9*



Simonpietri/Syigma

Mustafa Barzani.



Atrique-Asie

Barzani holds council of war.

# Good Riddance to Workers' Power

After a decade of the most wretched labor reformism performed as New Left hi-jinx, the International Socialists (I.S.) has done something every class-conscious worker can applaud: it has ceased publication of *Workers' Power* (*WP*).

*WP*'s demise occurs in the context of demoralization and exacerbated cliquish hostilities which render the I.S. extremely unstable. The latest clique feud in this congenitally clique-ridden organization rages over the usual subject: how best to serve the various labor out-bureaucrats who have been the I.S.'s constant preoccupation since it began union implantation. For the majority, Joel Geier wants to tail the so-called "reform movement." The "left" opposition is Steve Zeluck/Pete Camarata and their Political Solution Caucus (PSC) which wants to run equally fast behind the so-called "rank and file movement." So the clique sparks fly; the documents are written; and once again, there is no programmatic difference about "what we've learned in the trade unions." Both sides have learned that the "socialist" I.S. is an unnecessary burden to reformist union "work" and irrelevant to the I.S.'s real job—the manipulation of Teamsters for a Democratic Union (TDU), the I.S. creature upon which rests both sides' dwindling hope of broad reformist influence.

## Bad Rubbish

Both sides were anxious to scrap the *WP* garbage organ, a "left" caricature of pulp journalism.

In the open letter which was sent to *WP* subscribers to announce its dissolution, the I.S. explained that the working class had failed to appreciate its press: "Workers' Power was quite consciously designed and planned to be a newspaper presenting news of struggle, and revolutionary socialist politics, to an audience which was becoming active in union or community struggles for the first time.... "From 1975 until today, we have found that the possibilities for building rank and file movements in the unions ... have greatly increased. But the audience for an agitational revolutionary newspaper has not. As a result Workers' Power faced the risk of becoming a paper published in a political vacuum without any real contact or dialogue with the workers whose ideas we are trying to influence."

*WP* was a political vacuum, an insult to trade-union militants. It was indeed "quite consciously designed and planned" to be a fake mass paper, dedicated to the petty-bourgeois work-erist proposition that philistinism is the

only language the proletariat can understand.

What made *WP* an "agitational revolutionary newspaper" in the mind of the I.S. was its cynical claim that it was winning workers to the I.S. by explaining that capitalism was evil and socialism good. Every Christmas, for instance, *WP* would take up the task of exposing for the neediest the fact that the rich were living extravagantly. One year a front-page headline exposed "What the Rich Are Buying this Xmas"; the \$8.50 towels and fur coats could not

free from all this talk of "socialism," even in primer terms.

So the open letter announces a new "broad-based labor newspaper based on the rank and file and union reform movements developing in the working class today. Such a paper would not be published by the IS or any other political group...." In short, *WP* was not backward enough. An internal document of the majority caucus spells out the character of the new "extremely exciting project": "The reform movement needs a publication of its own." "It

applies enough pressure on the party of big business, then liberal Democrats like Edward Kennedy and Bella Abzug will really become "friends of labor."

Such a perspective is not fundamentally different from the DSOC scheme to form a "labor party" within the Democratic Party. Indeed, *Changes* all but openly advocates work within the Democratic Party as part of the liberal/labor coalition. In the "Letter from the Editor" which appears by way of a policy statement, *Changes* says: "As this [Democrat/bureaucrat]



**Workers Power: Finally Got the News.**

escape the vigilant journalists of *WP*. And I.S.'s special brand of economism was given the "pedagogical" touch in articles like "Socialism: What's in it for you?" (12 September 1977).

The *WP* idea of a "dialogue" with working-class militants was the most condescending movie reviews, TV "guides" and pop-culture commentary. It patiently explained, for instance, "The Politics of Blue Jeans." It treated the trivial seriously and trivialized the serious. True proletarian inspiration was evidently to be found in the TV series "All in the Family," as the 17 October 1977 *WP* headlined "Gay Rights: If Archie Bunker Sees the Light, Why Can't Anita?" And for the youth market *WP* glorified punk and reggae music as intrinsically "anti-establishment" and "the soul of revolution."

Who can forget *WP*'s behind-the-scenes exposés—like the time the paper "set out to discover the real truth about Muzak"? Will *New York Times* resident gourmet Craig Claiborne find it in his stomach to forgive the I.S. populist-moralists for having attacked him for eating the world's most expensive free meal (won in a contest)? Perhaps the all-time low was reached with the campaign to help the I.S.'s Red Tide youth supporters collect 500 pairs of shoes for the Rhodesian nationalist ZANU guerrillas: "We say, if they're willing to take up arms and fight, we will provide shoes to walk with."

## Changes... But Not for the Better

In dumping their newspaper, the I.S. evidences not a pang of shame. On the contrary, these patronizing cynics like the stupidity of *WP*. Instead of recognizing that there never was an audience for this junk, the I.S. has decided that *WP* was too left-wing for the workers, too explicit for its "reform movement" and "rank and file" work. Better to be

will have to reflect different points of view within the reform movements." But there is one point of view that will be banned on principle: "while it will have a class point of view, it cannot be the advocate of socialism, for that would cut it off from too much of the union reform movement" (Labor Perspectives Convention Resolution, November 1978). The prototype of this paper is of course the TDU's *Convoy*, but another labor-liberal newsletter has recently appeared called *Labor Notes* with an I.S.er as editor and TDU's Pete Camarata on the editorial board. It embodies the politics of *WP* sans "blue jeans," sans "socialism," sans everything but the limpest trade-union reformism.

And what about "socialism"? That will be relegated to another new publication called *Changes*. While the I.S. is doing its best to build the "reform movement" (of out-bureaucrats) with a "workers' paper," it is also sniffing around for possibilities of social-democratic regroupment with people like NAM. So *Changes* is *WP* reformism out of its academic closet. If *WP* was a college boy's version of something for workers to read, *Changes* in its first issue promises to be these same cynics at work on a parody of a theoretical journal.

If anything, *Changes* is even more open and enthusiastic over the prospects of an all-American popular front in the form of a liberal Democratic Party/labor coalition floated in Detroit by UAW president Doug Fraser. In an article entitled "Labor, Liberals Lose Together at Democratic Mini-Con," *Changes* enthuses:

"These days, it's not just radicals who are characterizing the Democrats as a party of big business. The new coalition, a sign of deeper political undercurrents, could be the beginnings of a rift in the [Democratic] party that could widen into a chasm."

In other words, if the labor movement

coalition is forced to organize pressure on the Carter administration, on its budget proposals or health care, or jobs, it will contribute to building a movement that goes beyond union and contract fights—a movement that can give working people a greater impact on events....

"As the most conscious workers come to understand the limits of capitalism, through their own attempts to reform it, they become the key to building a workers' revolutionary party in this country."

The internal majority document on "Labor Perspectives" says that in the unions "calls for an immediate break with the DP are not possible... we do not propose to raise the labor party as an agitational slogan in the unions at this time" (of course, they do favor "education" for a labor party...). Indeed, the Democratic Party is the logical home for American social democrats, but whether or not the I.S. or a section of it enters the party of Jimmy Carter will depend on the posture of the liberal wing of the trade-union bureaucracy.

## Is the TDU "Unlike You, Harry"?

Despite the madly shifting formats of I.S. publications and the frenzied cliquish squabbling, the I.S. retains one "principle" of unity: the TDU. All wings of the organization wish to cling to its one live opportunist prospect. The present sharp clique fight is in one sense a fight over the treasure of Pete Camarata's personal reputation. And it is the Zeluck minority which has Camarata.

This fact is the key to understanding the otherwise unintelligible distinction made by the PSC clique between a "reform movement" of out-bureaucrats like Sadlowski and a "rank and file" movement.

Certainly no real programmatic difference can be discerned between the

*continued on page 11*



WV Photo

**Pete Camarata.**

# SWP Discovers Capitalism in Cambodia

ADAPTED FROM  
AUSTRALASIAN SPARTACIST  
NO. 61, MARCH 1979

The recent outbreak of shooting wars between rival Stalinist regimes in Southeast Asia has posed a serious test for would-be Marxists. Seizing upon Hanoi's lightning strike to topple the Pol Pot gang in Cambodia and the subsequent Chinese invasion of Vietnam, various bourgeois commentators (once again) proclaimed the death of proletarian internationalism. Of course, for those "communists" who simply act as loudspeakers for one or another ruling bureaucracy, the response was easy: like the RCA Victor mascot, they just hark to their master's voice. Lapdogs of the Kremlin bayed against the "U.S. puppets in Peking" while Maoist running dogs, taking their cue from Carter/Brzezinski, were yapping at Vietnamese "bandits."

Only Trotskyism, with its analysis of the counterrevolutionary nationalism of the Stalinists, could provide a revolutionary explanation of the fighting in Indochina. But once again the misnamed United Secretariat of the Fourth International (USec) proved unequal to the task. As on so many issues in the past (Portugal, Angola, Guevarist guerrillism, Chinese "cultural revolution"), a survey of the USec press on the Vietnamese intervention in Cambodia revealed diametrically counterposed lines: the Spanish *Combate* claimed that Vietnam and its Kampuchean puppet were carrying out a "defense of the socialist achievements in Indochina," while the French *Rouge* demanded "Vietnamese Troops Must Leave Cambodia" (quoted in *Intercontinental Press*, 12 February).

Most curious of all the responses in the USec to the explosive events in Indochina has been that of the American Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and its subsidiaries elsewhere. Jack Barnes & Co. accused Peking of "acting in the interests of American imperialism" by invading Vietnam, then opposed demonstrations outside the Chinese Mission to the UN as being directed at the "wrong address" (*Militant*, 9 March). On the other hand, it backed Hanoi's ouster of Pol Pot as a "necessary step" toward the overthrow of capitalism in Cambodia. Pol Pot's Democratic Kampuchea was "capitalist," according to the SWP? That's what they say, and their membership has been having more than a little difficulty defending this shift in line.

Thus, for example, the Australian SWP initially published an article by local leader Allen Myers condemning the Vietnamese overthrow of the Phnom Penh regime as "a major setback" and denouncing both regimes as "privileged bureaucracies committed to 'socialism in one country'" (*Direct Action*, 25 January). Two weeks later they reprinted without explanation an article by Fred Feldman of the American SWP supporting the invasion and referring to Pol Pot's Cambodia vaguely as a "bizarre authoritarianism based on the labor of a militarized peasantry." And then in its March 1 issue *Direct Action* announced—four years after the fall of Lon Nol—that "what [the Khmer Rouge] had established was not a workers state but a particularly brutal



New York Times

Pol Pot's Cambodia: depopulated cities, forced collectivization. SWP says Stalinist atrocities equal capitalism.

and oppressive capitalist government."

Brutal and oppressive, yes—but capitalist? With the crushing of the venal Lon Nol puppet dictatorship in 1975, the victorious Stalinists not only suppressed what there was of a capitalist class in Cambodia, but also collectivized everything in sight and even eliminated currency! True. Pol Pot's paranoid bureaucratic irrationality created a regime which raved about the territorial claims of the ancient Khmer empire, extolled muscle power as an alternative to "foreign" machinery and murderously purged a whole layer of Khmer Rouge cadres trained in Vietnam. When the Hanoi army toppled him in January they were greeted more as liberators than as hated conquerors. But despite the atrocities of Pol Pot & Co., the overthrow of capitalist/landlord rule was a gain for the Cambodian masses. As Trotskyists we defend the gains won in the entire region as a result of the military defeat of U.S. imperialism, its native puppets and exploiters, while calling for the political revolution to oust all the Stalinist bureaucracies, replacing them with workers soviet rule.

Not for the SWP, however. In their

long "theoretical" treatise explaining that post-1975 Cambodia was "capitalist," Fred Feldman and Steve Clark write:

"If Pol Pot's Kampuchea was a workers state, even with grave bureaucratic distortions, then revolutionary socialists would have to defend the possibility that such a state can come into being, and in *no way whatsoever* mark a social and historical advance for the working class."

—*Intercontinental Press*,  
26 February

Certainly, every socialist should find the murderous xenophobic and anti-working-class policies of Pol Pot deeply repugnant. Unlike many opportunists who uncritically tailed the Indochinese Stalinists, from the beginning we denounced the Khmer Rouge's brutal depopulation of the Cambodian cities (see "Indochina: Deformed Revolution," *WV* No. 72, 4 July 1975). But to say that there is "nothing" for the working class to defend in Kampuchea is a direct attack on the Indochinese revolution. And to square this with its formal claim to Trotskyism, the SWP has to resort to endless theoretical and factual contortions.

To begin with there is the question of

South Vietnam. The SWP argues that China's invasion of Vietnam was undertaken because of imperialist hostility to the overthrow of capitalism in the south...last year:

"After delaying for nearly three years, in the hope of reaching an accommodation with imperialist and native capitalist forces, the Vietnamese rulers moved decisively, beginning in March 1978, to sweep away capitalism throughout South Vietnam...."

—*Militant*, 19 January

As Marxists we pointed out following the NLF/DRV victory of May 1975 that the capitalist state apparatus of the Saigon regime had been smashed and replaced by that of the North Vietnamese bureaucratically deformed workers state; that the Vietnamese bourgeoisie was in flight, its power as a class broken; and that the new regime would be forced, simply as a defensive measure, to establish a nationalized economy. The SWP, however, would have us believe that after the triumphal end to decades of fighting—a world event of historic proportions—a separate South Vietnamese state based on a capitalist economy still existed; and that three years later capitalism was quietly smashed by a bureaucratic flick of the wrist. This is a barely disguised "Trotskyoid" version of the Stalinist myths of "two-stage revolution" and "peaceful transition to socialism."

The claim that capitalism continues to exist in Cambodia is based on a string of factual distortions and inventions. Feldman and Clark claim that the nationalizations under Pol Pot "are in the same family with the extensive nationalizations by regimes in Egypt, Burma, Mozambique and Angola"—that they were "the actions of a new bourgeoisie gestating in the state apparatus." It is true that the nascent bourgeoisie of the ex-colonial countries has frequently resorted to more or less extensive nationalizations, to aid in primitive capitalist accumulation and as a source for private profit through corruption. But in none of these countries have *all* the means of production and distribution been taken over by

the state. As for their claim that the Cambodian economy is still "under the thumb of imperialism," that is pretty difficult in a situation where trade with capitalist countries was effectively reduced to zero.

The SWP has a hard time explaining away the importance of the sweeping collectivization measures. The "formal abolition" of money is dismissed as "temporary" and "artificial." That is true, certainly, but it doesn't make it any more possible to run a capitalist economy without money. As for the agricultural communes, these are described as "qualitatively different from the agrarian policies accompanying any revolutionary social overturn anywhere in the world, even those carried out in a distorted and bureaucratic way." This is accompanied by a recital of the horrors of life under Pol Pot: abolition of all social services, 12-hour day, militarization of labor. We have ourselves repeatedly denounced the extreme degree of bureaucratic irrationality and brutality by the Khmer Rouge regime. But is this truly unprecedented?

continued on page 8

# STEEL WORKER

PARIS, MARCH 23

**T**oday is the march on the capital in solidarity with Lorraine steel workers who have been fighting for more than three months against announced layoffs by the thousands in that hard hit industry and region. The national demonstration, called by the CGT labor federation, has been planned for weeks. The CGT bureaucracy wants to put itself at the head of the movement in order to keep it from getting out of hand. The angry steel workers from the North want to draw in the working class of the Paris region, key to any significant labor struggle in France. Will the march head off the explosive movement or be a launching pad for a vast strike action against the rigid anti-labor "rationalization" program of the Giscard/Barre government? The next few hours will tell.

Lorraine, at least, is on a war footing. Longwy, Denain, Valenciennes—all scenes of recent battles—are represented with big contingents. One hundred eighty buses, six special trains have brought them to five assembly points in the "red belt" of working-class suburbs crowning the capital region. From there they will converge on Place de la République, the Union Square of Paris. *France-Soir* reports, "Longwy: Only Children and Elderly Stayed Behind." But where is the Parisian proletariat? By the end of the march only 80,000-100,000 participants are counted, far less than the 500,000 to a million marchers which the unions and the left have brought out on other occasions. It's sabotage.

In addition to the Stalinist-dominated CGT, the march was

## March on Paris

endorsed by the Lorraine branches of the social-democratic-led CFDT labor federation and even the clerical CFTC, a "union" created on the papal encyclical *Rerum Novarum* but which has a working-class base among the coal miners. Sections of the FEN, the unitary teachers union, are present and also delegations of steel workers from Germany and Belgium. Both the Communist Party (PCF) and Socialist Party (PS) have endorsed. But the national leaders of the CFDT and the right-social-democratic Force Ouvrière (FO) have denounced the demonstration as a PCF electoral maneuver. CFDT chief Edmond Maire called it "the march of



Steel workers demonstrate outside headquarters of Usinor trust in Paris in December.

Couderel/L'Express

the cantonal elections," which are being held Sunday. But that still doesn't explain the low turnout.

A simple fact: just under two thirds of the demonstrators are from the provinces. Just by itself, and certainly with the PCF/PS endorsements, the CGT could fill the streets of Paris. The explanation: even though it was their march, the CGT didn't call for a general strike of all sectors in the Paris region. At Renault-Billancourt, rightly considered the beacon of the French working class, *L'Humanité* reports that "the CGT and CFDT agreed to call for a work stoppage of two hours." So only a tiny minority of Billancourt's tens of thousands of workers are here. The largest Paris contingents are of striking workers: the stock exchange employees, out since February 27; workers of the Crédit du Nord bank, also on strike for several weeks.

The contingents from the North and East are easily recognizable by their helmets and their fighting spirit. Their banners announce the presence of virtually all the factories and villages of the region. They have brought along small bands, noisemakers, etc., and an impressive number of red flags. Several times the demonstrators break into singing the *Internationale*. The usual slogans: "Giscard, if you stay we'll kick you in the ass!" "Everything for us, nothing for them!" There is also an impressive number of municipal officials with tricolor sashes indicating their role in the bourgeois state as well as the nationalism of the CGT campaign. On

the signs you can read the PCF slogans: "Paris must not become a suburb of Bonn!" Along the march route we pass the offices of *L'Humanité*, literally covered with French flags and a banner hanging out: "Fight for our demands, our regions, our country!"

Faced with a massive outcry against the mounting unemployment and continuing inflation, the government has adopted the policy of the carrot and the stick. Today it is the stick. In addition to the usual display of tough CGT marshals to keep leftists from "contaminating" the rest of the marchers, the streets are lined with the CRS riot police and Gardes Mobiles stationed on every block, alternating on left and right sides, ready to break up the demonstration. Deploying such a massive number of cops against the marchers for the first time is an obvious government provocation. Three times in recent weeks the steel workers at Denain and Longwy have battled the cops in near-insurrectional conditions, attempting to storm police stations. Every contingent from the North breaks into jeers and booing whenever they run into the "forces of order."

All along the march the police attempt to provoke incidents, succeeding briefly at the Place de la République. In addition, there are a number of "autonomes," anarcho-spontanéists, who want to "spoil" the promenade-like atmosphere. At Place de l'Opéra, the destination point, there are no speeches, no mass rally, nothing but loudspeakers with the CGT brass telling everyone to go home peacefully. The

cops use the "autonomes" as a pretext to break up half the demonstration, leaving the miners and steel workers hesitating between following the orders of the bureaucrats or going on with the march even if it means a major confrontation with the cops. Finally they roll up their banners, but with bitter feelings in their breasts and an angry question on their lips: why couldn't a demonstration this strong have repelled the police and achieved its aims.

The battles with the cops go on as night falls, with more than 100 shop windows broken and 60 riot police injured. The next day the Stalinists demand a government investigation to see who provoked the violence, blaming it in general on provocateurs. No doubt there were provocateurs, and the autonomes' action simply fed the lies of the bourgeois media and the Stalinists, who slander the militant actions at Denain and Longwy as the work of "outsiders." The answer was not to turn the march into a giant street battle, much as the demonstrators would burn with desire to teach the cops a lesson after their bloody attacks on earlier protests in the North. The fundamental obstacle to a successful demonstration of power which could put the government against the wall was the reformist leadership of the workers movement. Stalinist and social democratic alike.

Whether by calling a march without focus or by boycotting it, their common concern has been to prevent an explosion of working-class militancy. That is why the Parisian proletariat was not mobilized; that's why there was no mass rally at the end. "Let the workers blow off steam, then send them home." Trotskyist revolutionaries would seek to reach the demonstrators with the demand that a genuine "march on Paris" be built to muster forces for an unlimited general strike for expropriation of the steel trusts and against the capitalist government's austerity policies and layoffs—for full employment and protection against inflation by a sliding scale of wages and hours. It was necessary to combat popular-front illusions that this could be solved simply by putting the reformists and their bourgeois bloc partners in the ministerial chairs—for a "new 68" that goes all the way, workers to power! What the steel workers need now is not simple militancy—that they have plenty of already—but a perspective for victory. ■



Cops battled demonstrators outside Gare de l'Est in Paris March 23.

France-Soir

# ROCK FRANCE

PARIS

**T**he last several months have been marked by the eruption of workers' struggles and violent confrontation with the police throughout France. Although focusing on steel, where workers are facing the immediate prospect of tens of thousands of layoffs, the unrest covers a whole range of sectors of the working class, white collar and blue collar; both in Paris and the provinces. It has led to a number of spectacular actions, often in areas not previously known for working-class militancy, including battles with the CRS riot police, street barricades, plant occupations, kidnapping of management personnel, shutting down whole cities for a day, taking over television stations and, on at least four occasions, armed assaults on police stations. The press has been screaming "warnings," brandishing the spectre of May 1968, while the government threatens a crackdown and refuses to budge from its viciously anti-working-class program to "rationalize" the economy by letting all but the most profitable firms go under.

The most dramatic actions have occurred in three steel towns in the industrial basins of northern and northeastern France. They began last December when the leading French steel trust Usinor announced the layoff of 5,000 workers in Denain and another 500 in nearby Valenciennes. In the Lorraine steel region just south of Luxembourg an additional 5,900 job cuts were announced in the mills of Longwy. A protest demonstration was held there on December 19 attracting some 20,000 marchers; in addition, all commerce was shut down for 24 hours in an *opération ville morte* (dead city). On the windows of closed shops leaflets were posted in the form of funeral announcements proclaiming that Longwy would live or die with steel. On a giant slagheap, 400 feet high, outside town the workers perched an enormous SOS which is visible for miles around.

That was only the start. From then until the end of January there were a number of actions, including blocking roads into Longwy, lightning occupations of administrative offices, and similar guerrilla tactics. These were announced by a clandestine radio station, "Radio SOS Jobs," run by the local CFDT union. Then on January 27 some 1,200 workers at the Usinor mill in Denain escaped from the control of the bureaucrats and sacked the main accounting office, after which they clashed with the CRS riot police. Two days later several hundred workers at the Chiers mill at Longwy burst into a meeting of the managing committee and seized three leading company officials whom they held as hostages in the plant, demanding a stop to the layoffs. Before dawn a squad of local police attacked and snatched the managers, although a dozen cops were injured in the fight.

Trying to stay on top of things, the local unions call a demonstration to protest the cop brutality. But at the end it gets out of hand as several hundred workers and youth lay siege to the police headquarters of Longwy. For over an hour they bombard the commissariat with bolts and paving stones, while the police trapped inside defend themselves by shooting out tear gas grenades. Meanwhile, also on the 29th, workers at steel company offices in Metz invade the administrative offices and burn a large number of files. The workers dump 18 railway carloads of ore in the courtyard

of the factory and a load of cement in front of the offices. They then go on strike, causing one blast furnace to be banked. Both at Metz and Longwy the CGT union federation accuses "riot specialists, outside elements and provocateurs" of causing the militant action.

Using their traditional tactics of "capturing" the leadership of a movement outside their control, the Stalinist and social-democratic union leaders call a one-day strike of the metallurgical sector for February 16. Demonstrating the workers' will to fight, the strike is 90 percent effective and extends also to other industries in the North and Lorraine. It is accompanied by big demonstrations, notably at Valen-

For two hours the commissariat is bombarded by molotov cocktails, and the next morning the outside walls of the station are found peppered with holes from carbine bullets. The PCF deputy and CGT representative try in vain to restrain the demonstrators, and finally manage to deflect the siege by calling for an assault on the local offices of the Union Patronal (management association). The building is totally sacked: furniture, files, everything thrown out the windows and burned on the spot, even the crystal chandeliers and a grand piano (*Le Monde*, 25 February).

Once again the Stalinist-led CGT accuses provocateurs of being responsible for what was in reality a mass revolt

town, the workers called out the morning shift and surrounded the police station with several thousand protesters. Repeatedly PCF and CGT officials attempted to disperse the demonstrators, announcing in a leaflet that company executives had agreed to suspend the layoffs. According to *Le Monde* (9 March), workers tore up the leaflet, shouting, "It's not the time to talk but to act." *Le Matin* of the same date reported that when the bureaucrats tried to get the demonstrators to go back to the plant, one steel worker protested: "We won't let ourselves be maneuvered like in 1968."

Finally calm was restored in Denain and the bureaucrats received the bourgeoisie's congratulations. "[CGT leader Georges] Séguéy was wildly applauded. He deserved it. He had recovered Denain by reassuring the populace, by assuring them they had won, by promising that everything would be taken care of and that moreover it was all planned out. Nothing of course was improved but everyone returned home quickly in the driving rain. A policeman murmured, "Thank you, Mr. Séguéy" (*Le Figaro*, 10 March). Indeed, nothing was improved, for on March 14 the Usinor bosses announced the mill at Denain would be shut down.

These are spectacular actions, to be sure, but essentially guerrilla or "apache" tactics. While an impressive sign of the workers' militancy, they cannot substitute for mass mobilization and strike action throughout the industry. The local CFDT union, which has more or less broken with its national federation since the ranks refused to settle for promises of "industrial plans" and negotiations, is behind many of these commando actions. This "rebel" section nevertheless toes the CFDT (and CGT) line on the essential point: no national, unlimited strike in steel to stop the layoffs. And in this treachery they are supported not only by the PCF and the Socialist Party (PS), but also by most of the self-proclaimed "Trotskyist" centrist groupings.

## The Steel Crisis and the Workers Movement

The crisis in French steel has been brewing for some time and is indicative of the not-so-rosy economic future offered to European workers by the capitalists' Common Market. Interestingly, the first step taken toward the eventual creation of the European Economic Community (EEC) was the European Coal and Steel Community, formed in the early 1950s, which eliminated tariffs on basic metallurgical products. Now the entire European steel industry is in a crisis of overproduction, leading to a wave of economic nationalism fanned in particular by the Stalinists. The government of President Giscard d'Estaing has proposed to answer this crisis with a retrenchment plan that would mean 20,000 layoffs in the industry in the next two years. By 1980 a total of 50,000 jobs in steel would have been eliminated in six years and the industry would employ only 118,000 in all of France.

The reformists do not question the government steel plan as such: for them it is a question of negotiating its application, presenting alternative industrial projects, etc. In response the government of Prime Minister Barre has concocted a scheme for "reconversion societies" to find temporary work for laid-off steel workers. One is tempted to recall the National Work-

*continued on page 9*



Steel workers outside building of employers' federation in Longwy.

Der Spiegel



Longwy steel workers take over bank in January.

Der Spiegel

ciennes; at Sedan another police station is attacked.

The bureaucrats hope they have cooled things down, but once again Longwy takes the lead. On February 22 the steel workers take over a bank and the local television transmitter, demanding that the state network broadcast the truth about their situation instead of the usual lies. During the night they are brutally driven out by 150 police in squad cars; an hour later the workers, from the CFDT federation, regroup to counterattack, but on arriving at the transmitter they find it empty of cops and occupied by a group of workers from a neighboring factory.

Together they return to the center of Longwy to once again assault the police station. At 3 a.m. factory sirens blast calling the steel workers for a meeting. Hundreds arrive, bringing with them a bulldozer. To prevent reinforcements, all access roads into town are cut off.

by the workers of Longwy. Once again they try to bring things back under control by calling a one- and two-hour work stoppage for the entire metalworking sector of industry. And once again it doesn't work. This time the scene shifts to the city of Denain, south of Belgium, a stronghold of the Communist Party (PCF) and the setting in which Emile Zola wrote his novel of a coal miners' strike, *Germinal*.

On March 7 a group of workers at the Usinor mill had left for the border to stop trains and trucks bringing in foreign steel (part of the PCF effort to turn steel workers' protests in the direction of national chauvinism). While standing around talking, the workers were suddenly attacked by CRS riot police. Then as they returned to Denain the union buses were stopped by the CRS in the middle of a forest, their windows broken and tear gas shot inside. When they finally arrived back in

# Cambodia...

(continued from page 5)


In order to make their case that Cambodia is some kind of unique, bizarre capitalist authoritarianism, Feldman and Clark whitewash the brutality of other Stalinist regimes. What about Stalin's forced collectivizations, often carried out at gunpoint and resulting in *millions* of deaths? In China during the 1958-60 Great Leap Forward the Central Committee had to pass a resolution *limiting* the workday to 12 hours. And after the peak of the Cultural Revolution of the late 1960s, militarization was so extreme that the People's Liberation Army was placed in charge of *all* jurisdictions (communes, factories, neighborhoods). The article tries to claim that elsewhere "working-class mobilizations" were "decisive, even though subjected to bureaucratic direction and control," including in Soviet-occupied Eastern Europe in the late 1940s. This is simply a myth—the East European nationalizations were totally bureaucratic in their execution.

The SWP's "explanation" of its characterization of Pol Pot's Cambodia as capitalist is an outlandish collection of half-truths, tautologies and outright idiocies. But what is important is the methodology. At least in Vietnam it could point to the Chinese-dominated petty commerce that had not yet been nationalized; in Cambodia *no private enterprise whatsoever* existed under the Khmer Rouge. There were no profits, no capitalist accumulation, no competition, no money: some capitalism! With this schema, all Feldman and Clark would have to do is substitute new empirical data and examples to "prove" that the Russia of Stalin and his heirs was—"state capitalist."

## Testing the "Third Camp" Waters

What's behind all these theoretical acrobatics over an event which took place four years ago? The answer: tailing after bourgeois anti-communism. Obviously, to be against "Democratic Kampuchea" doesn't take much political guts these days. The Khmer Rouge regime was everybody's example of "violating human rights." Liberal Democratic senator George McGovern, an old SWP favorite from the anti-Vietnam War days, was the first major figure to urge U.S. intervention against Pol Pot, but not the only one. Recently even the conservative columnist William Safire, an ex-Nixon staffer, supported Vietnam against Cambodia, because "any puppet government would be better than the bloodbathers of Pol Pot" (*New York Times*, 26 February).

The SWP's analysis of the Indo-Chinese revolution has always figured prominently in its long-term aspiration to become the party of U.S. social democracy. The antiwar movement of the 1960s provided the SWP with its first real opportunity to cozy up to a section of the American bourgeoisie,



"Mass democracy" in Democratic Kampuchea.

Reich/Paris Match

which hinged on demonstrating its "Third Camp" neutrality between imperialism and the deformed/degenerated workers states. In the 1960s the SWP denied that a social revolution was even taking place in Indochina (since if it were they would obviously be duty-bound to call for military victory of the Stalinist NLF, something its liberal allies could not stomach). The real issue, they said, was a democratic one—self-determination. With this theoretical fig-leaf, the SWP paved the way to a class-collaborationist bloc with a defeatist section of the U.S. bourgeoisie.

Now they are at it again—performing theoretical hocus-pocus in order to avoid any taint of connection with the despised Pol Pot regime. Feldman and Clark tell us:

"But the nationalization of property is not by itself sufficient to establish a workers state. The intervention by the workers—the only force in modern society capable of establishing and maintaining a progressive economic structure—is needed."

Of course, this is the exact same argument used by proponents of the theory of "state capitalism" to claim that capitalism was not overthrown in China, Vietnam, Cuba, etc. As a long-time SWPer, now a supporter of the Spartacist League, noted at a March 9 SWP forum in the San Francisco Bay Area on China's invasion of Vietnam:

"The description you gave could just as easily have been applied to Poland, Hungary or any other of the East European countries. The workers, you say, did not participate in the nationalizations in Cambodia. They also didn't participate in them in East Europe.... Your description of Cambodia is a classic, Shachtmanite, state-capitalist position."

With the Chinese invasion of Vietnam, the SWP had only to extend its fabrication one step further to provide a means of ducking the issue of defense of the Soviet Union, Vietnam's patron. According to the SWP, capitalist Cambodia spearheaded a "triple alliance" with the U.S. and China "which threatened the very existence of the Vietnamese workers state." China's invasion was designed to prevent Hanoi's new client regime from "establish[ing] a workers state in Kampuchea" (*Direct Action*, 22 February). Thus the SWP wished away the whole *anti-Soviet* character of the U.S./China alliance, barely mentioning even the possibility of Soviet intervention. Defending Vietnam is one thing; lining up with the militarily powerful USSR would be an unforgivable act of disloyalty to the U.S. ruling class.

Imitating social democrats and "Third Campers" of all stripes, the SWP points to the very real crimes of the Stalinist bureaucracies in order to refuse to defend the degenerated/deformed workers states against imperialism. To justify his abandonment of Soviet

defensism in 1940, Max Shachtman denied the Marxist understanding that property forms are decisive in determining the class character of a state, insisting instead on the necessity for *political* control by the working class. The SWP has now lifted a page from Shachtman, arguing that Cambodia is not a workers state because "The Kampuchean working class had no stake whatsoever in the nationalization of property, carried out without its participation..." (*Intercontinental Press*, 26 February).

In recent years the SWP has been preparing the groundwork for a refusal to defend the Soviet degenerated workers state against U.S. imperialism:

## "Allah über Alles?"

You can really see why we call them fake-lefts when you watch all the opportunists falling over themselves trying to outdo each other in grovelling before the "Islamic Revolution" in Iran. Socialist Workers Party (SWP) spokesman Cindy Jaquith's nauseating defense of the *chador*, the head-to-foot veil which is a symbol of the feudal oppression of women, was bad enough. Only a week before tens of thousands of women were marching in Teheran against "holy man" Khomeini's orders to don the veil, Jaquith was defending it as a symbol of resistance to the shah!

Now from England we receive a report of another disgusting example. Two weeks ago, Brian Grogan, national secretary of the International Marxist Group (IMG—fraternally linked to the SWP), gave a talk in Birmingham about his recent trip to Iran. Like Jaquith's talks in the U.S., it was a combination radical travelogue and public relations spiel for Khomeini. His message was mass action in the streets. And naturally Grogan was marching along with them in the demonstration to greet the returning ayatollah, and chanting their chants. The enthusiasm was so great, he reported, that despite his "anti-religious prejudices," this self-styled Marxist soon found himself crying out, "Allah Akbar!" (God is Great!)

"That might shock some purists," said Grogan, looking directly at Spartacist League supporters in the room. But you see, he went on, the slogan was only religious in form. For weeks the shah's helicopter gunships had been flying overhead shooting at the masses. So in shouting "Allah Akbar" the people were saying, "We are great, you (the helicopters) are small," Sort of "the

power of allah is greater than the man's technology," it seems. Later, during the discussion period, a visiting American auto worker and supporter of the Spartacist tendency challenged Grogan to explain how chanting "Allah Akbar" was any more Marxist than carrying pictures of Khomeini, as the Fedayeen guerrillas have been doing. Without a moment's hesitation, Grogan pulled out his wallet and removed his own "Khomeini card" which he proudly displayed to the audience. No difference at all, you see, except that the Fedayeen are back in Iran where they are now facing the threats and blows of Khomeini's Islamic police and army.

Eduard Bernstein, the grandfather of such "socialist" opportunists, said "the movement is everything, the goal is nothing." The desire to be with the masses at all costs, the inability to swim against the stream and tell the truth to the working class, is invariably at the root of great betrayals. Grogan's remarks remind us of the following description by an erstwhile German socialist, Konrad Hänisch, describing his feelings after the SPD voted for war credits on 4 August 1914:

"[on the one hand] this driving, burning desire to throw oneself into the powerful current of the general national tide, and, on the other, the terrible spiritual fear of... surrendering oneself to the mood which roared about.... I shall never forget the day and the hour this terrible tension was resolved:...until one could, for the first time in almost a quarter century, join with a full heart, a clean conscience and without a sense of treason in the sweeping stormy song: 'Deutschland, Deutschland über alles!'"

—quoted in Carl Schorske, *German Social Democracy, 1905-1917*

Really felt good, didn't it Brian?

## YOUNG SPARTACUS

MONTHLY NEWSPAPER OF THE SPARTACUS YOUTH LEAGUE

Make checks payable/mail to: Spartacus Youth Publishing Co. Box 825, Canal Street Station New York, NY 10013

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
City \_\_\_\_\_  
State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

228

**SUBSCRIBE NOW!**

\$2/9 issues



# France...

(continued from page 7)

shops of Louis Blanc—except that today the government is manufacturing more unemployment. The Stalinists of the PCF and CGT leadership, for their part, are doing their best to deflect the workers' anger onto the dangerous path of national chauvinism, turning the proletarians of one country against their class brothers and sisters elsewhere. Thus the French Stalinists have opposed Spanish entry into the EEC and campaign for the imposition of quotas on Italian wine imported into France. In the steel crisis it is the same story: at the December 19 demonstration at Longwy, the PCF banner read, "Lorraine Will Not Be the Vassal of West Germany."

The other main tack of the reformists is to detour the workers' struggles into dead-end electoralism. Thus when thousands of layoffs at the Usinor mill in Thionville (near Longwy) were announced in the fall of 1977, the Stalinists and social democrats held a "solidarity" march in Paris, then sent the workers home with promises of relief if the popular-front Union of the Left won in the March 1978 legislative elections. The Union of the Left lost, and in any case the company proceeded to close the plant. Currently there is no doubt that the March 23 "march on Paris" was in part an electoral maneuver aimed at the cantonal elections, being held two days before the voting on the decisive second round. And in mid-March the reformist union leaders went along with the Gaullists' maneuver for a special session of the national assembly on the steel crisis.

What is the response of the "far left"? They eagerly go along with attempts to channel the struggle into an electoralist framework. Both the LCR and the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste (OCI) of Pierre Lambert make the center of their propaganda the call for a PS-PCF government. Thus the OCI writes:

"It's a question of expressing the will of the masses... who ask the leaders of the PCF and PS: why do you call on this Assembly, whose majority represents a minority of the country, when what is necessary is to get rid of it and bring to power a government of your parties."

—*Informations Ouvrières*, 14-21 March

But even a PCF-PS government in the parliamentary framework of bourgeois rule would not be able to solve the steel crisis, which is based in the cyclical crises of the capitalist economy. Only through expropriating the ruling class and thus laying the basis for a planned economy can there be a real answer to the mass unemployment threatening European steel workers.

Moreover, the "unity" of which the centrist pseudo-Trotskyists are so fond is by no means the unity of the workers movement against the bourgeoisie, but rather a call to establish the basis for a new popular front. The LCR sums up their policy in the following manner:

"The two majority workers parties, the PS and the PCF, must stop their policy of division and, in spite of their disagreement, unite in struggle on the side of the workers and put their candidates in the government."

—*Rouge*, 9-15 February

The "policy of division" which the Pabloists complain about refers to the split-up of the Union of the Left in the wake of its defeat in March 1978. Throughout that election campaign both the OCI and LCR lambasted the Stalinists and social democrats, particularly the PCF, for squabbling that threatened the electoral appeal of the popular front.

The bourgeois class character of this electoral alliance of reformist workers parties with a capitalist party (the Movement of Left Radicals) was passed over in silence. And since the breakup of this class-collaborationist bloc, the central call of the LCR and OCI is for its reconstitution under the codeword of "unity" and the slogan of a PCF-PS

government (the same slogan with which they called for votes to Union of the Left candidates in March 1978).

But instead two different popular fronts are now looming: the PCF is looking to the Gaullist RPR of Chirac to form a "union of the people of France" on the basis of the most nauseating anti-"boche" chauvinism (the Communist Party's chief slogan in the upcoming elections to the EEC "parliament" is "No to a German Europe!"); and important sectors of the PS leadership are giving an ear to Giscard's talk of a "center-left" coalition.

This popular-front electoralism is a dangerous diversion to the embattled



Der Spiegel

## French steel town threatened with extinction.

steel workers, whose jobs are on the line. The response of the workers movement must begin with a strike of the entire steel industry, together with occupation of plants threatened by mass layoffs, demanding expropriation of the steel barons and the preservation of every job. But the economic crisis extends far beyond this one sector; layoffs and cutbacks in government employment are threatened everywhere. And the working class has responded with a wave of strikes and other job actions: rotating strikes in the post office, periodic shutdown of rail service, a television blackout, etc. The situation is ripe for the urgent demand of a general strike to achieve the steel workers' demands and institute a sliding scale of wages and hours, to protect all workers against unemployment and inflation.

Yes, the crisis is political, unlike the claims of the CFDT that the answer is pure-and-simple trade unionism plus negotiating a phony "plan" with Giscard's technocrats. The reactionary government which seeks to "rationalize" the economy by eliminating jobs must be ousted by a revolutionary mobilization of the proletariat, not a parliamentary combination of the reformist misleaders. The spectre of a "new 68" is indeed appropriate, only this time the working class must not let itself be maneuvered, as the steel worker in Denain put it, but must instead *take the power*. Strike committees must be elected in every enterprise and locality, and coordinated in a national strike committee. Such committees could be the embryos of dual power, the basis of a future workers government.

The answer must be internationalist. Anti-"bocheism," to paraphrase August Bebel's remark about anti-Semitism, is "the socialism of fools." The German proletariat is the powerhouse of the continent and key to the European socialist revolution. Furthermore, the French steel crisis comes at the same time as a German steel strike which also faced the question of layoffs and demanded a 35-hour workweek. (That strike was miserably sold out by the union tops.) The German and French steel workers must join their struggles against the threat of mass unemployment. Not the bosses' Common Market—Not the nationalist poison of the bureaucrats—But a socialist United States of Europe! ■

## Kurds Revolt...

(continued from page 3)

northern Iran to the USSR. The Soviet army did not occupy Iranian Kurdistan, but the Mahabad regime soon shared the fate of its Azerbaijani analogue.

Because the program of Mahabad's Kurdistan Republic was kept strictly within a nationalist framework, i.e., simply self-government and the use of the Kurdish language, it relied entirely on the old feudal ruling elite. Qazi Mohammed was elected president over a council of tribal leaders. Even the meager reforms introduced in Azerbaijan frightened Qazi Mohammed and his supporters. They actually went to Teheran to propose an anti-Azerbaijan bloc to the shah and the British. When the shah moved to crush the Kurdish state, it relied for its defense solely on the Iraqi Kurdish feudal leader mullah Mustafa Barzani, who had been driven into Iran by the British and the Iraqi monarchy.

Given the balkanization and belated social development of the Kurdish nation, there has been a historic tendency to look for allies beyond its borders. Not only have many Kurds looked to the Soviet Union for help, but the Kurdish movement in Iraq had an evolution closely intertwined with that of the Iraqi Communist Party and its Kurdish section. When both the Iraqi CP and the USSR subordinated the Kurdish question in the interests of a diplomatic alliance between the Soviet Union and the bonapartist military regime of the Arab nationalist Ba'athists, this betrayal opened the door to Barzani's accommodation with the shah of Iran and the CIA. When the shah reached an understanding with the Ba'athist colonels all aid to the Kurds suddenly ceased, as they had served their purpose, and the aged tribal chieftain was completely discredited. Ironically Barzani died earlier this month in Washington, D.C., just as the Kurdish nation rose against the Iranian state.

Barzani's connection to the U.S. and his funding through the CIA have given the followers of the so-called "Arab revolution" an excuse to back off from the fundamental recognition of the right of independence for the Kurds. Thus while recognizing in the abstract the right of Kurdish self-determination, the Iranian fake-Trotskyist followers of Ernest Mandel indicated that it might be put into question if:

"...with the rise of the Arab revolution, and in particular with the intensification of the class struggle in Iraq, U.S. imperialism tries to manipulate the Kurdish national movement under the leadership of Barzani to use it as a bastion of reaction against Arab revolution."

—Azar Najmi, "Nationalism and National Struggles in the Middle East," [SWP] *International Internal Discussion Bulletin*, December 1973

"Can the Arab Revolution Afford Another Garrison State in Kurdistan?" asks Najmi undoubtedly referring to Israel, whose Hebrew-speaking people are also denied the right of self-determination by the revisionists in the name of the "Arab revolution."

For Leninists recognition of the right of self-determination does not depend on whether or not the nationalists are getting their aid from "clean" sources. During World War II nationalists in Indonesia, Burma and India all received aid from Japanese imperialism. Did this

mean that they did not have the right to independence from their colonial oppressors? The Stalinists, speaking in support of "democratic" imperialism said no. But for Trotskyists support for the right of self-determination does not depend on the foreign policy of the Kremlin. Receiving aid from the CIA does not disqualify a nation from its right to secede from an oppressor nation. With all their talk of imperialist manipulation those who denied the Kurdish right of self-determination were simply supporting Iraqi Arab nationalism against that of the Kurds.

The international Spartacist tendency recognizes the right of the nations of the Middle East to self-determination while battling politically against all forms of nationalism. We do not recognize the right of self-determination only for "good" nationalists. They are all the actual or potential exploiters and oppressors of their "own" workers and peasants. And unlike the SWP and others who preached the new dawn of Khomeini, we warned the oppressed nationalities of Iran of their fate under the clerical reactionary mullahs. But for the SWP and others the national question was answered when Khomeini denounced Israel and set up the PLO Arab nationalists in the Israeli embassy. Even many Kurds were fooled into believing that they might get a better deal under the mullahs than the shah. Now they know the truth.

It is understandable that the embattled Kurds of Iran look to Iranian leftist groupings like the Fedayeen for aid. But for all their militancy, the Fedayeen only offer a perspective of pressuring Khomeini. And the capitulation of the United Secretariat's Iranian section (in which Mandelites and SWP supporters are united on the basis of the SWP's parliamentary cretinism) before Khomeini is even more abysmal.

Khomeini has betrayed no one. He is pursuing the course he had forthrightly promised all along: the construction of a Persian chauvinist Muslim theocracy. Yet the call for proletarian revolution to overthrow the mullahs' dictatorship remains conspicuously absent from the pages of the press of the United Secretariat. The international Spartacist tendency remains unique in its intransigent opposition to Khomeini.

Proletarian revolutionists in Iran must fight every instance of national oppression, and must therefore militarily defend the right of the Kurdish people to self-determination, up to and including the right to separate if they so choose. But a political struggle must be waged not only against Persian nationalism but against Azerbaijani, Kurdish or Baluchi nationalism, fighting for the class independence of the toilers from their "own" exploiters.

The full achievement of the democratic tasks posed by the Kurdish national struggle can only take place within a framework that is profoundly internationalist—the multi-national dictatorship of the proletariat in a socialist federation of the Near and Middle East. Under the leadership of a genuine Trotskyist vanguard party, the strategic Iranian proletariat will play a crucial role in its establishment. For a workers revolution to overthrow Khomeini! For an Iranian workers and peasants government! ■

## SALES BLITZ—WV No. 226—Final Totals

Area	Blitz Quota	Total Sold	Percentage
Berkeley/Oakland	450	670	149
Boston	250	331	132
Chicago	500	688	138
Cleveland	275	440	160
Detroit	600	1026	171
Los Angeles	400	580	145
New York City	450	587	130
San Francisco	425	724	170
Trotskyist League of Canada	—	332	—
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3350</b>	<b>5378</b>	<b>161</b>

# Peace Baloney...

(continued from page 1)

"there is a growing view that America is a patsy and we never retaliate."

Answering his critics, Carter proclaimed in a February 20 speech at Georgia Tech: "Let me repeat, in the Middle East, in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in the world we will stand by our friends." Secretary of Defense Harold Brown was even more blunt when he declared on the 26 February "Face the Nation" television program: "The United States is prepared to defend its vital interests with whatever means are appropriate, including military force when necessary, whether that's in the Middle East or elsewhere." The Egyptian/Israeli treaty fits into this perspective, but more was needed. So in recent weeks the administration has pulled out all the stops to provide a convincing show of force.

To demonstrate that the U.S. was not a "patsy," Carter chose the unlikely Arabian backwater of Yemen. Saudi-backed North Yemen was involved in a local war with forces attacking from the pro-Soviet People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (formerly the British colony of Aden) to the south. Seeing an opportunity to "resist Soviet expansion" on the cheap while doing a favor for his Saudi friends, Carter ordered the aircraft carrier Constellation up into the Arabian Sea and bypassed Congress to ship \$360 million worth of military hardware to North Yemen on an emergency basis, along with 200-plus American military personnel in "training teams."

## \$5 Million Gets a "Peace" Treaty...

While U.S. "multinational" merchants of death are slapped on the wrist when they bribe foreign governments to win military contracts, the American government has no such scruples about bribing its clients in Cairo and Jerusalem to extract a treaty from them. When defense secretary Brown visited Cairo in February Sadat eagerly suggested that he replace the shah as the American policeman for the region. As a symbolic gesture he sent 200 Egyptian soldiers to replace Iranian troops recently withdrawn from the sultanate of Oman. In return, the Egyptian *rais* (leader) requested a little baksheesh, in the form of an enormous shopping list of weaponry, including 300 advanced F-16 fighters, 600 tanks, 2,000 armored personnel carriers, etc. Israeli officials made it clear that the price of any treaty in which they gave up the Sinai would be equally expensive.

With the new alignment in the Near East, both Egypt and Israel are strategic allies of the U.S., and their combined military firepower far surpasses the Soviet-supplied Syrians and Iraqis. Since the 1973 war Israel alone has received \$10 billion in arms deliveries from the U.S., more than six times the

total American aid to the Zionist state from its birth in 1948 to 1967. Syria/Iraq, on the other hand, have received no more than half that amount from the Kremlin. So in contrast to the strategic balance in past Near East wars, today Israel substantially outguns the combined forces of the "rejection front" states and can even mobilize a larger army. No wonder the Syrians (who have 30,000 troops tied down in Lebanon) fear a Zionist attack in the wake of the

would considerably elevate the U.S. role as arbiter in the region and thus push both the Soviet Union and its allies into a precarious defensive position:

"In such a polarized situation the U.S. and Soviet Union could become prisoners of their own client states. In a war between Israel and Syria, the Russians, cut off from the possibility of playing a role in a general Near East settlement, might see themselves forced to intervene ever more directly to prevent the defeat

rolled by Saudi Arabia and the oil sheikhs for years. If they needed additional reasons to give them cold feet about joining up with Carter's new anti-Soviet alliance the Saudis need only look at the history of its predecessor, CENTO. Popular opposition to the U.S.-engineered Baghdad Pact was one of the sparks which sent the Iraqi masses into the streets in 1958 and brought down King Faisal, seen as a puppet of the imperialists. With discontent continuing to build in the Egyptian working class, it is an open question whether Sadat will suffer a similar fate.



On the phone with Begin: arranging the Pax Americana.



Get this, then we tell them we're for a democratic secular Palestine.

Egyptian/Israeli "peace" treaty. Washington would like to tie this \$5 billion package to a new anti-Soviet military alliance in the Near East, modeled on the long-defunct CENTO—the stillborn mid-1950s brainchild of John Foster Dulles.

## ...But Will It Buy an Alliance?

From the very beginning of the current Near East "peace" gambit we have warned that "Separate Peace Means Wider War." An Egypt-Israeli treaty

of their remaining allies if they are to avoid being frozen out of this strategic region altogether. But Washington will not tolerate direct Soviet intervention against Israel. Much more so than in the Arab-Israel wars of 1967 and 1973, a separate Israeli-Egyptian peace followed by a military showdown between Israel and Syria could become the spark setting off World War III."

—"War Danger Behind Cairo Peace Talks," *WV* No. 186, 23 December 1977

With the fall of the shah, this inherent logic of a separate peace under American auspices was heightened as Washington looked desperately for a new alliance to bolster its weakened position in the "arc of crisis." Carter hopes to consolidate a bloc of U.S. client states including Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, North Yemen and the Persian Gulf oil kingdoms, whose main target would be the Soviet Union.

Will it work? The signing of the Egypt/Israel treaty has considerably complicated Washington's relations with the Saudis and their clients, who are facing a unanimous Arab League mandate to slap an economic and military boycott on Egypt. The Saudis have noted that Iran's backing for Israel, even with massive American support, did not contribute to the longevity of the Pahlavi dynasty. Moreover, their fanatical Islamic fundamentalism feels more ideological kinship with Khomeini than with the shah, while Arafat, though presented as a "radical" in the Western press, has been bank-

## Palestinians Shafted Again

Purportedly the treaty is "linked" to a timetable for Palestinian "self-rule" in the Israeli-occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. In reality, Sadat and Begin simply agreed to make a "good faith" effort to complete negotiations on "autonomy" within a year, with the U.S. acting as overseer and the Palestinians excluded (as usual) from the bargaining. In any case, "self-rule" is nothing but a hoax dreamed up by the former Irgun terrorist and mass murderer of Deir Yassin, Menachem Begin.

Begin's program is a thinly veiled call for forced population transfers of the Arab population out of the West Bank. All land not formally owned by Palestinians would be taken over by the Israeli state or handed out to Zionist settlers. The Israeli army would patrol the entire area and control an Arab police which would be confined to purely local affairs. This is what Begin means by "autonomy" of "persons" and not "territories." And to drive home the point that the Israel/Egypt peace meant continued murderous oppression of the Palestinians, as the final negotiations were going on, fanatical Zionist settlers went on a rampage through the West Bank town of Rumallah, shooting and beating up Arab students.

Carter's visit to Jerusalem and announcement of the "peace" treaty were greeted with mass Palestinian protests on the West Bank. Two Arab youth were murdered by the Israeli army in the town of Halhul and in response a general strike was declared in Rumallah. But it is not just the oppressed Palestinians who are in ferment. While the vague peace sentiment widespread among the Israeli population following the 1973 war has been largely captured by the Carter/Begin/Sadat gambit, the Israeli working class has been hard hit by an economic crisis without precedent in the history of the Zionist state. On the same day that the cabinet was debating the draft treaty, the Histadrut, Israel's corporatist labor federation, called a general strike against rising prices and the removal of state subsidies from basic foods. Out of a workforce of 1,250,000, one million workers walked off their jobs.

Although the strike's demands were entirely economic, the Hebrew-speaking workers of Israel face the same Zionist rulers as the West Bank Palestinians. But the Israeli workers are not going to fight beside their Arab class brothers to replace the Zionist theocratic state of Butcher Begin with an "Islamic Republic" headed by Ayatollah Khomeini's disciple Arafat and subsidized by Saudi charity. What is needed is an Arab-Hebrew revolutionary workers party which recognizes the right of self-determination for both the Palestinian and Hebrew peoples, which fights for Israel's unconditional and immediate withdrawal from the occupied territories and for the overthrow of both the Zionist state and the Islamic rulers, whether demagogic nationalist colonels or reactionary sheikhs. Together with other Trotskyist parties in the Arab states, they would fight as part of a reborn Fourth International to establish the only possible framework for a just and lasting peace in the region: a socialist federation of the Near East. ■

# WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Biweekly of the Spartacist League

24 issues—\$3. Introductory offer (6 issues): \$1. International rates: 24 issues—\$12 airmail/\$3 seamail.

—includes Spartacist

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

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

228

# Teamsters...

(continued from page 12)

tionably be squandered if left to Fitzsimmons & Co. The ranks must present an organized force capable of countering the will of the membership to the inevitable bureaucratic sellout. Mass meetings are essential in order to debate strategy and tactics and to respond to the immediate danger of strikebreaking injunctions. Membership decisions must be executed under the leadership of democratically elected strike committees which would have the authority to organize mass pickets at every terminal and warehouse. By coordinating efforts at a regional and national level, strike leaders could appeal to unionized rail, maritime and airline freight handlers when struck cargos are diverted to other transportation systems. In the event that injunctions or troops (as in Ohio in 1970) are ordered against the Teamsters, the entire labor movement must be prepared to answer with militant action.

## TDU: Reformist Dead-End

The Fitzsimmons gang is corrupt and violent, but it sits atop a volcano of membership discontent. It is widely discredited among the militant rank and file, and could easily lose control of a strike. But there is no genuine alternative to replace it. The most prominent group of dissident IBT members, often lionized by the liberal capitalist media, is Teamsters for a Democratic Union (TDU). The TDU program, however, is not qualitatively different from that of Fitzsimmons. It simply asks for "more." TDU's *Convoy* concedes, in fact, that the IBT bargainers have raised "some excellent proposals," only doubting that

"Fitz" will fight for them. And while Fitzsimmons at least called for a 35 percent wage and benefit increase, TDU "think[s] money isn't a major issue this year" (*Convoy* No. 34, February 1979).

In fact, it is not surprising that TDU played down the issue of wages, because this is the question on which a confrontation with the government is likely.



WV Photo

Detroit TDU rally in 1977. "Reformers" call on bosses' government to clean up union.

Integral to the TDU program is its strategy of seeking to pressure the bourgeois state into siding with the working class. Thus the group has sponsored numerous lawsuits against the Teamster bureaucracy, while TDU co-leader Pete Camarata even testified at Congressional hearings on alleged abuse of the union's pension funds by IBT officials. Calling on the capitalist state to get rid of the corrupt Teamster bureaucracy is patently futile; indeed, the present Fitzsimmons regime originated in just such a government purge of the old Hoffa leadership!

In addition, such a strategy is bound to breed illusions in the bosses' government. At a time when a central antagonist of the Teamsters is that same government, such illusions quickly become fatal. And, in fact, during the entire contract period TDU has simply tail-ended Fitzsimmons and his strategy of seeking "exemptions" from the wage

made no serious preparations to build a militant strike, and moreover has a history of kowtowing to the government. Thus this reformist outfit may well find itself back in the bind it was in when the Detroit Teamsters wildcatted against Fitzsimmons' national settlement in 1976. The Teamsters for a Decent Contract (TDU's predecessor) was suddenly catapulted into a position of de facto leadership, only to cave in to a federal court order one day later and advocate a return to work with a promise from local IBT officials that there would be no victimizations. This ignominious collapse was palmed off as a TDU victory!

Even if the group were to grow substantially, the Teamsters union could no more advance behind the TDU banner than did the miners behind one-time "reformer" Arnold Miller. To win in April the Teamsters must forge a leadership which is committed to militant union action, forming elected strike committees, and a program including the following demands:

- 1) Break the guidelines—for a big increase in wages and pensions with full COLA protection! Slash the workweek without a pay cut—no forced overtime!
- 2) Down with company productivity schemes! For a full-time safety committee in every terminal with the power to stop work! For the right to refuse assignment on unsafe equipment! For the right to strike over grievances!
- 3) Organize the unorganized!
- 4) Defy government strikebreaking injunctions! No to arbitration! Government out of the IBT!
- 5) Dump the Democrats and Republicans! For a workers party based on the trade unions to fight for a workers government! ■

# Workers' Power...

(continued from page 4)

I.S.-run TDU and the Sadlowski "reform movement." Both represent the "progressive" wing of business unionism. Camarata is notorious for trying to find new ways to bring the Teamsters into the courts and the government into the union. And his "leftist" patron Zeluck (whose own redbaiting "rank and file" work in the teachers' union embarrasses even the I.S.) is no leftist; in fact, he argues that it was a "sectarian error" for the I.S. to leave the United National Caucus of the UAW.

But for factional purposes, the minority is quick to seize on *WP's* coverage of local Teamster elections in the fall/winter of 1977:

"Here Pete C. was running for election as representative of TDU. Pete Karazogian was running with the classic 'out' reform group, Concerned Members. *WP* headlined: 'Vote for the Two Petes.' Its article did nothing to distinguish between the approach of the two groups...."

No doubt this was galling to comrade Camarata. But factional flattery to Camarata aside, there's not a dime's worth of difference between "the Two Petes" from the standpoint of program.

Even in clique fights there are moments of partial truth. Steve Zeluck playing the "left" oppositionist is a revolting impostor, but he does have plenty to say about the Geierite I.S.:

"At the 1977 TDU Convention we invited Harry Patrick of the UMWA to be the keynote speaker and made him

an honorary member of the TDU. We did this despite the fact that by this time the MFD [Miners for Democracy] had shown its true colors time and again. The MFD leaders in power since 1973, had tried again and again to smash wildcat strikes.... Moreover in the months before the TDU convention the UMWA leadership was trying to crush another mass wildcat and Patrick was going along with them. He even appeared on TV to urge miners to go back to work. Nonetheless, we put forward Patrick to the TDU convention. Whatever we intended this to mean, and whatever Patrick actually said, there was a strong message which was inevitably conveyed: 'Here's Harry Patrick. He's a progressive official. He and the MFD got elected and succeeded in cleaning up the UMWA. We want the TDU to become an organization like the MFD, to act like the MFD did.'" —I.S. Internal Bulletin No. 10, 7 November 1978

According to another Zeluck document:

"Even worse [than inviting Patrick] is the fact that one of our leading speakers, in effect, helped Patrick to conceal his line on the wildcats. Our speaker, referring to Fitzsimmons as one who is admired by the capitalists and politicians because 'he doesn't let the ranks run riot,' then added, 'unlike you, Harry.' This strongly implied that Harry had no objection to the ranks 'running riot,' which in turn implies that Harry supported, or at least tolerated the wildcats....

"In short, a bureaucrat was allowed to use our platform and even, at the end, to be voted in as an honorary member of TDU, at the urging of one of our leaders." [original emphasis]

—"The Politicization of the TDU," September 1977

And the I.S. consciously sought to avoid raising the issue of racial oppression at the TDU convention, pandering

to assumed attitudes of racism among TDU members. Zeluck recounts that before the convention the I.S. decided not to raise the question of Bakke and affirmative action, and if it came up to table the issue to a steering committee:

"What happened then was that we surrendered a chance to raise this vital politicizing issue. For, as things turned out, the resolution did in fact almost come up at the end of the convention, at the initiative of one of our own black members. But in the name of 'no time' it was tabled, with the evident encouragement of K. who was in the chair...." [original emphasis]

Then, it seems, the black I.S.ers—schooled in "caucus formation"—threatened to form a black caucus to get a Bakke resolution on the floor. Zeluck tells what happened next:

"The imperative need for the Bakke resolution was amply demonstrated by the clear racist response of a top TDU leader. He objected to Blacks' right to a caucus and threatened to form a white caucus in response."

These stories are not disputed in the internal documents of the majority.

## I.S. Got No Reason to Live

The social-democratic New Left workerists of the I.S. thought opportunist

ism would bring them success. They tailed the union bureaucrats and hailed the Labor Department—of course all in the name of the "rank and file." They got nowhere:

"We watched for signs of an emerging movement.... We thought we saw the beginnings as a mass rank and file upheaval in the early 70's, but it lost its momentum.... For the IS times were hard. Sticking it out in the working class cost the IS two splits and the loss of some talented cadre. For a period, the political perspectives of the IS seemed up in the air."

—I.S. majority "Convention Resolution"

And they still are. The I.S. has no reason for independent political existence. What it wants to do in the unions, the "reform"/"rank and file" groups already do better. What it wants to do outside the unions is done better by the official social democrats, NAM, the SWP.

All that the I.S. can devise is more ways—like dumping *WP*—to hide in the unions, the better to serve the bureaucrats. Where to go from here? Let us offer our suggestion: You have taken a step in the right direction by scuttling that awful paper; wouldn't it be another favor to the working class to go all the way? ■

## Spartacist League/Spartacus Youth League Public Offices

—MARXIST LITERATURE—

### Bay Area

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

### Chicago

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

### New York

Monday through  
Friday: 6:30-9:00p m.  
Saturday: 1:00-4:00p m.  
260 West Broadway  
Room 522  
New York, New York  
Phone: (212) 925-5665

## SPARTACIST LEAGUE LOCAL DIRECTORY

### National Office

Box 1377, GPO  
New York, N.Y. 10001  
(212) 925-2426

### Ann Arbor

c/o SYL, Room 4102  
Michigan Union  
University of Mich.  
Ann Arbor, Mich. 48109  
(313) 663-9012

### Berkeley/Oakland

Box 23372  
Oakland, Ca. 94623  
(415) 835-1535

### Boston

Box 188  
M.I.T. Station  
Cambridge, Mass. 02139  
(617) 492-3928

### Chicago

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

### Cleveland

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

### Detroit

Box 663A, General P.O.  
Detroit, Mich. 48232  
(313) 868-9095

### Houston

Box 26474  
Houston, Texas 77207

### Los Angeles

Box 26282, Edendale Station  
Los Angeles, Ca. 90026  
(213) 662-1564

### New York

Box 444, Canal Street Station  
New York, N.Y. 10013  
(212) 925-5665

### San Diego

P.O. Box 142  
Chula Vista, Ca. 92016

### San Francisco

Box 5712  
San Francisco, Ca. 94111  
(415) 863-6963

### Santa Cruz

c/o SYL  
Box 2842  
Santa Cruz, Ca. 95061

## TROTSKYIST LEAGUE OF CANADA

### Toronto

Box 7198, Station A  
Toronto, Ont.  
(416) 593-4138

### Vancouver

Box 26, Station A  
Vancouver, B.C.  
(604) 733-8848

### Winnipeg

Box 3952, Station B  
Winnipeg, Man.  
(204) 589-7214

# WORKERS VANGUARD


## Strike to Bust the Wage Freeze!

# Teamsters: Get Carter!

On March 31 the International Brotherhood of Teamsters (IBT), the largest union in the U.S., will have an unequalled opportunity to defend the livelihoods of millions of American workers from the ravages of inflation by dealing a crushing blow to Jimmy Carter's 7 percent wage guidelines. For on midnight of that day the Master Freight Agreement, which sets the wages and working conditions for 300,000 Teamster truck drivers and warehouse workers across the country, will expire. The government's wage controls are already in plenty of trouble. Galloping inflation and soaring profits are rousing workers' anger and all that is needed is a good, solid shove to push them into action. And right now it's up to the Teamsters to do it.

While Carter has sought to depict his "voluntary" wage-price guidelines as a call for equal sacrifice from business and labor, this claim now has almost zero credibility among trade unionists. Recently the rate of inflation has consistently exceeded 10 percent, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics just announced that for February prices rose at an annual rate of 15.4 percent, over twice the 7 percent limit on wages! Only a few days previously the Department of Commerce reported that corporate profits had risen 26 percent in 1978. Even arch-conservative AFL-CIO chief George Meany felt compelled to accuse big business of "the grossest demonstration of price gouging since the opening days of the Korean War."

Meanwhile, the Carter administration has been anything but conciliatory to the Teamsters. White House "inflation fighter" Alfred Kahn, chairman of the Council on Wage and Price Stabili-



Teamsters: they can stop the country overnight.

Sauro/New York Times

ty, recently slammed the IBT demand for a 35 percent hike over three years as "an act of aggression against the American people." Moreover the government has insisted that a 58 cent cost-of-living increase which would have been due April 1, be counted against the yearly "guideline" on the new agreement. Should Carter continue to insist on imposing the 7 percent wage limit in the face of double-digit inflation, there is every likelihood of a massive confrontation with the IBT.

As Teamster locals met last weekend to vote overwhelmingly to give the International authorization to call a strike, the government was threatening everything from Taft-Hartley to economic sanctions. In particular, Kahn is brandishing government deregulation of the trucking industry as a club against IBT demands. This is a threat only because for IBT head Frank Fitzsimmons, the preservation of Team-

ster jobs, wages and working conditions is entrusted to federal agencies like the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has traditionally allowed the carriers to pass wage increases on to consumers. In reality, militant union organizing for IBT scale is the answer to the encroachments of non-union carriers and owner-operators on non-regulated freight routes.

Since the government took the lead in holding down Teamster wage demands, the industry spokesman, Trucking Management, Inc., opened up with a barrage of non-monetary "take away" proposals. *WV* has obtained a copy of the TMI bargaining demands, dated 14 December 1978, which includes: slashed wages for new hires (70 percent for 12 months, full pay only after two years); refusal to "dovetail" seniority rights when one company acquires another's trucking permits; changes in work rules to no longer require consent of union locals; complete elimination of separate ratification of supplemental agreements; and deletion of a commitment to continue multi-employer bargaining with the IBT. Other takeaways included requiring employees to pay their own health and welfare contributions for each day off; the right to fire employees for failure to report accidents and even traffic citations; and increased right to hire "casuals" permanently denied seniority.

On March 2, TMI added its wage proposal: an insulting 85 cents per hour—well under Carter's guidelines—spread over three years! The union is calling for \$1.75 in new wages over three years (plus 58 cents in COLA due April 1) as part of an overall package boosting wages and benefits by about 38 percent.

Both sides are likely to modify their demands somewhat, but the carriers demonstrated their actual intentions in the bitter, 18-week California grocery strike which was finally crushed in November. Thanks to bureaucratic treachery, that strike was a dress rehearsal for disaster... and the bosses know it. Tom Schumacker, director of the California Trucking Association, remarked, "Many of our people are saying 'By golly, the food company people hung in there, took an 18-week Teamster strike in one of the union's strongholds. We ought to do the same thing if we have to.'"

IBT militants, too, must learn the lessons of this betrayal. In a struggle which saw a Teamster picket killed, a government raid and seizure of a striking local's records, and the mobilization of a 2,500-man scab army, IBT head Fitzsimmons made every effort to sabotage the strike. His initial denial of strike sanctions, his sellout proposals, withdrawal of pickets from crucial regional distribution centers and the refusal to strike the Safeway chain nationwide resulted in eventual defeat. That is Fitzsimmons' real program.

The lengthy negotiation period could have been used to rally the ranks for strike action. Instead IBT bargainers demanded secret talks while hinting of union willingness to extend the contract if a settlement is near on March 31. Then, after Fitzsimmons warned that federal interference would force the union to "negotiate from a strike position," he invited the government's top labor negotiator, mediator Wayne Horowitz, into the bargaining. Fitzsimmons has repeatedly pinned his hopes on wheedling special exemptions from the guidelines, and even when threatening to strike he has hinted at calling selective work stoppages at one or two carriers rather than a nationwide shutdown—supposedly in order to "circumvent" Taft-Hartley.

If Fitzsimmons does call a strike on April 1, he will do so reluctantly, to dissipate rank-and-file militancy. (In 1976 he okayed the first nationwide truck drivers' strike, then ordered two thirds of the striking drivers back to work even before a tentative agreement was reached.) Moreover, IBT car haulers and workers in the giant United Parcel Service chain will stay on the job when the freight haulers go out. The numerous separate freight contracts which the IBT bureaucracy tolerates benefit only the carriers. Teamster militants must demand that their leaders shut down the entire trucking industry and bargain for a single national contract. All out on April 1—no extensions! No selective strikes—for a nationwide shutdown!

### For Militant Strike Committees

The enormous social power of a nationwide Teamster strike will unques-

*continued on page 11*



Militant Ohio Teamsters wildcat in 1970. Same National Guard unit which tried to break their strike shot the Kent State students.