

Outrage!

Carter's Secret Service Drags CWA Delegate Off Convention Floor!

Spartacist League Press Release

DETROIT, July 16—In front of hundreds of stunned delegates, U.S. Secret Service agents this afternoon grabbed union official Jane Margolis, handcuffed her and dragged her protesting off the floor of the 41st Annual Convention of the Communications Workers of America (CWA). Shortly before President Jimmy Carter was scheduled to speak before the body, agents surrounded Margolis, 32, an elected delegate and member of the executive board of CWA Local 9410 (San Francisco), as she was standing with her delegation. Without warning they rushed her from the hall and locked her in an adjoining room. When outraged delegates rushed to the speakers' microphones to protest this criminal assault, the mikes were abruptly turned off.

White House officials at first denied that anyone had been detained, but changed the story after a CBS newsman reported accidentally finding Jane Margolis in a back room to which she had been abducted by the agents. This is the first known time that the Secret Service has invaded a union convention and seized a union officer. Margolis has announced that she intends to seek maximum legal redress for this outrage.

Out of sight of the convention delegates federal agents manhandled Jane, threatening to hold her incommunicado for days—on the basis of "reports" from unidentified "sources"—

for suspicion of threatening the life of the president. While she was being subjected to interrogation and refused access to a lawyer, Detroit police told Margolis she was under arrest on unspecified charges. Thirty-five minutes later she was released, without explanation, but subjected to continued intensive surveillance by the Secret Service even after returning to the convention floor.

Jane Margolis is a spokesman for the Militant Action Caucus, an opposition group in the union which has repeatedly protested government interference in the labor movement, particularly by the CIA in Latin America. Earlier in the day she was prevented by the chair from presenting a motion that the union convention not allow itself to be used as a platform for the anti-labor strike-breaking policies of the Democrats. Clearly, a key purpose of the hamfisted, blatantly illegal action by the Secret Service was to keep union delegates from registering any dissent against Carter and his energy speech.

In New York, James Robertson, National Chairman of the Spartacist League/U.S., immediately issued a vehement protest upon learning of the seizure of Margolis, an SL supporter and long-time personal friend. "What the Secret Service did to Jane is an outrage against organized labor," he said. "We don't have kings here. According to the laws, every citizen is supposed to have equal rights. But Jimmy Carter's personal goons simply march into a union convention and mug a woman who is an elected union official! Furthermore, Jane Margolis



Jon P. Fishback

A CWA delegate snapped this photo as Margolis was illegally seized.

was in that meeting by right—Jimmy Carter was an invited guest."

"We demand that Jane Margolis be released immediately," said Robertson, "so that she can resume her place with her delegation carrying out union

business. And we demand that this Jimmy Carter apologize in his speech, both to Jane and to the entire CWA membership, for his unprecedented attack on the union. Jane Margolis never shut down any gas pumps!" ■

Jane Margolis: "One Critic Carter Didn't Hear"

"I'm going to reach out," said Jimmy Carter in his Sunday night sermon, and reach out he did. Through the long arm of his Secret Service goons, he "reached out" and mugged class-struggle militant Jane Margolis right on the floor of the Communications Workers of America (CWA) Convention (see accompanying Spartacist League Press Release). The fact that Mar-

golis was an elected delegate to the convention with the right and responsibility to present her views was obviously a matter of no concern to Carter. For the capitalist class which this peanut baron represents, the rights of working people and the integrity of their labor organizations can be violated at their whim. Carter himself, on the other hand, is protected by a

host of *lèse majesté* laws which give his armed thugs the right, among other things, to grab all "suspicious" persons for preventive detention.

Jane Margolis was suspected of planning to do something which was absolutely intolerable to Carter—exercise her democratic right to speak out on the floor of the convention of her trade union and expose his little energy confidence game for the cheap hustle that it is. So, she was subjected to "preventive" gagging. But the only "weapon" that this trade-union militant had pointed at the heart of the president was the simple truth that the energy crisis is not a crisis of confidence or faith or prayer or the rest of Carter's empty "born again"

hokum, but a crisis of *capitalism*. And it is *real*; not in our hearts and minds but in the streets!

Carter had said, "I'm listening to the voices of Americans," but, in the words of the *San Francisco Examiner* (July 18) headline, Jane Margolis was "One critic Carter didn't hear." Carter is so manifestly unpopular, his support so shallow and his program such an obvious con game that he can't risk the slightest encounter with the truth. What if this trade unionist had punctured Carter's hot air balloon?

Jane Margolis has the right to say what she went to the convention to say, and the working people have the right to hear it. *WV* asked her for the statement she would have made, and we publish it on page 4.

Proletarian Poland

Dear Comrades:

As "Pilgrimage for Anti-Communism" (*WT* No. 234, 22 June 1979) pointed out, the Western press presented the Pope's recent tour as if the entire Polish nation had been on its knees to the Holy See. As against this bourgeois vision of "Catholic Poland," it is important that Marxists uphold and restore the history of proletarian Poland—the Poland of Rosa Luxemburg and Leo Jogiches, Julian Marchlewski and Felix Dzerzhinsky and so many others, of the SDKPiL (Social Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania), and of their revolutionary antecedents in the Proletariat Party led by Ludwick Warsinski in the 1880s. The long and often stormy history of Polish Marxism, its international importance and contribution of so many leaders to the Communist International and the Russian and German parties, its deep roots and mass influence among the Polish working class, represent a proud tradition of communist proletarian struggle.

Not the least of the Stalinists' crimes is their deformation and breaking of this tradition—including the bloody annihilation of many Polish communists during Stalin's purges—as Isaac Deutscher's "The Tragedy of the Polish Communist Party" makes clear. Gierek's shamefaced attempt to pass off the Pope's



Leo Jogiches and Rosa Luxemburg

anti-communist tour as a "victory" only reveals what a vast gulf separates his regime from this revolutionary Marxist tradition. The great revolutionary Rosa Luxemburg forthrightly denounced the Polish clergy's reactionary appetites to the workers of Krakow, understanding that this was a vital educational task in consolidating them under the banner of Marxism during the great proletarian uprisings of 1905:

"The clergy, no less than the capitalist class, lives on the backs of the people, profits from the degradation, the ignorance and the oppression of the people. The clergy

and the parasitic capitalists hate the organized working class, conscious of its rights, which fights for the conquest of its liberties."

She warned that the Church would not cease its attempts to mislead it with "honeyed words," concluding that "he who defends the exploiters and who helps prolong this present regime of misery is the mortal enemy of the proletariat, whether he be in a cassock or the uniform of the police" ("Socialism and the Churches," Krakow, 1905). The Vatican and Polish Catholic hierarchy have not altered their reactionary appetites one iota since these words were written.

As the *WT* article pointed out, the Polish working class has fought for its economic and political rights against the Stalinist regime, in the context of upholding the socialized property forms of the Polish deformed workers state. To carry through the workers' struggles to the end—for political revolution against the Stalinist regimes, and international socialist revolution against capitalism—requires the political rearming of the working class. The history of Polish Marxism will be a powerful weapon in the hands of the Polish proletariat, which will once again play its part in the battle for world communism.

Comradely,
H.C.

Brownshirts in the Green Swamp

Koblenz
West Germany
17 May 1979

To the Editor:

Concerning your two articles on nuclear power, I want to add the following in order to point out the reactionary conclusions of the international ecology movement and its "left" auxiliaries.

A logical culmination of this movement took place near the town of Koblenz, West Germany, in the last weeks of April. On April 21 members of the German Maoist KPD jointly marched with fascists of the youth organization of the NPD (National-Democratic Party of Germany) against a nuclear reactor under construction near Koblenz.

What happened?

Since the beginning of the '70s, many committees have existed in opposition to the reactor. Their opposition strengthened after the Harrisburg accident, because the reactor in dispute is of the Harrisburg type built by Babcock & Wilcox. Thus, two demonstrations took place (on April 21 and April 28) in the suburb Mülheim-Kärlich and Koblenz, with 800 and 3000 participants respectively. One of the main organizers of the latter demonstration was a group around the life-stylism paper, "Koblenzer Blatt" (KOB, organized by members of the Koblenz KPD branch together with some ecofreaks).

At the same time, the fascists learned to use the unexpected opportunities of a broad petty-bourgeois movement. The "Junge Nationaldemokraten" (Young National-Democrats), youth group of the [neo-Nazi] NPD, called into existence the "Grüne Zelle Koblenz" (GRZ, Green Cell of Koblenz), publishing the paper, "Grüne Fahne" ("Green Banner"). They took over all the anti-nuclear demands, leading an ecology-oriented electoral campaign and fighting for "a new ecology consciousness"—in a nutshell, joining the green swamp.

On April 21 they all got along very well: burghers liberals, ecofreaks, Maoists and... the fascists, with the sun shining on their T-shirts. To be sure, there were no attempts to crowd out the brown goons at all.

The half-hearted attempts by the KOB to distance themselves are contradictory. In KOB No. 4 we read: "The people present (at an electoral meeting of the Green Cell) evidently stated that there's no common interest between them and neo-fascist organizations..." (p. 12). On page 13, however, we hear from the KOB that at a meeting of some "green groups from the North Rheinland" in February, they both accepted the AUD, which the Maoists used to call fascist, as "in spite of the name, not a right-wing group," and on April 28 debated with... the Green Cell.

On April 28 the fascists were not allowed to take part in the second demonstration, but they leafleted their

paper without resistance. Only after being asked about the fascists by a sympathizer of the TLD (Trotzkistische Liga Deutschlands—German section of the iSt) did the Maoists have a reason to make a small protest against the presence of the GZK through their bullhorn. But for nukes sake, it wasn't an honest one. In the last issue of KOB we can wonder about an "analysis" of the Green Cell: "I don't want to say about the GZK that it's a Nazi set-up, but I think we must keep a watchful eye..." Shame on you! The members of the fascist Cell have been openly acting as fascists in this town for six years at least, and their connection with the Junge Nationaldemokraten and other rightist groups is well-known by every political person here—last not least by the KPD editor of the KOB. But why fight against the fascists at all? We get instead, the "solidarity of all living against the Green Death" (KOB), which, according to the speaker at the demonstration, includes "everybody, whatever his political perspective may be."

The counterrevolutionary consequences of the fetishistic "green" unity—and the hardened de facto collaboration of the Maoist charlatans—cannot be demonstrated better than by this actually consummated common bloc of self-proclaimed communists with Nazis.

Comradely,
Karl K.

Editorial Note

Australian SWP Cheers The Deer Hunter

When Michael Cimino's *The Deer Hunter* brought audiences to cheer for U.S. imperialism's murderous war in Vietnam, communists who sat through it gritted their teeth in repressed outrage. But the press of the Australian Socialist Workers Party (SWP) cheered right along: "A subtle and immensely revealing work," raved Renfrey Clarke in the SWP's *Direct Action* (26 April) about a film even many bourgeois liberal commentators recognized as a sensationalist piece of reactionary propaganda.

Clarke's incredible thesis? Cimino's film is really directed against the war, if perhaps unconsciously: "Cimino's statements on the Vietnam war are ambiguous. But we are able to hate the conflict for the tragedy it inflicts on the film's heroes," the three steel worker buddies who go to Vietnam. The film's notorious Russian roulette scene depicting the NLF guerrillas as sadistic torturers turns reality inside out to make heroes and victims of the real torturers and mass murderers—the U.S. imperialist forces (see "*Deer Hunter Lies*," *WT* No. 230, 27 April 1979). To Clarke,



however, such matters as who tortured whom in Vietnam are beside the point in a film in which the "dramatic purpose is to develop themes hostile to U.S. intervention. In particular... the theme of arbitrary violence..." And he finds in the "impassioned camaraderie" of the patriotic protagonists "a powerful, if politically undeveloped, working-class solidarity."

Tragedy? "What about the tragedy U.S. imperialism's 'heroes' inflicted on the Vietnamese in the course of that filthy, counterrevolutionary war?" asks *Australasian Spartacist*, the newspaper of the Spartacist League of Australia and New Zealand, in an article condemning *The Deer Hunter* and exposing the SWP review ("*Deer Hunter Lies... and SWP Loves It*," *Australasian Spartacist* No. 64, June 1979). Class solidarity? "Clarke might just as well label a pack rape by working-class youth as 'impassioned camaraderie.' 'Kill a few for me,' is the parting farewell of one of [the trio's] co-workers; and Michael [the hero] kills more

continued on page 9

IMG Drags Its Feet

British Spartacists Lead Defense of Iranian HKS

LONDON, July 14—Fifteen supporters of the Hezb-e Kargar-e Sosialist (Socialist Workers Party—HKS) remain in prison in Iran, but their comrades of the United Secretariat (USec) continue to sabotage their defence. The fake-Trotskyist USec, having preached political confidence in Khomeini's "Islamic Revolution," must now oppose the urgently needed united-front defence of the HKS. Instead, it humbly petitions the reactionary regime which threatens to kill supporters of the HKS and the Fedayeen guerrillas, begging Khomeini to desist from the campaign against "satanic Marxists" which has always been a key part of the mullahs' programme.

Apparently blinded by the opportunist illusions which are its stock-in-trade, the USec acts as if the fanatical Islamic clergy ruling Iran are just democrats in turbans. Thus they prefer to split the defence of the HKS rather than risk the slightest taint of association with opposition to the mullahs' reactionary regime. In the U.S. the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) physically excluded the Spartacist League from HKS defence actions under the cover of shameless Stalin-style lies. And the Australian SWP abandoned its own demonstration rather than be seen with the advocates of proletarian opposition to the mullahs.

Now in Britain supporters of the USec's International Marxist Group (IMG) are squirming as the international Spartacist tendency is militantly defending the HKS comrades while the IMG drags its feet.


It took more than a month for the IMG to get around to calling its first defence activity, a picket of the Iran Air offices in London on July 7. The IMG's publicity consisted of one small box on the back page of *Socialist Challenge*, which appeared two days before the

protest. When an SL/B contingent of some 20 comrades arrived at the designated time, not a single other individual was present. Ten minutes later IMG leader Steve Potter and one supporter finally ambled up with some placards and watched grimly while the SL chanted such slogans as "Free the Fedayeen and HKS—Stop the persecution of the Iranian left!", "Down with all the ayatollahs—For a workers revolution in Iran!" and "No asylum for the shah—The workers must rule Iran!"

After 20 minutes another handful of IMGers arrived, swelling their ranks to seven or eight (out of a membership on paper of about 300 in London alone!). Five supporters of the Workers Socialist League also turned up in the end, seeming as unhappy as the IMG about the determined Spartacist presence which rescued what would otherwise have been a pathetic shambles. At the conclusion of the picket, the handful of IMGers joined with the SL to chant slogans demanding the freeing of the Fedayeen and HKS militants.

A tiny back-page report on the picket in the next issue of *Socialist Challenge* complained that the turnout had been "disappointing" and urged "all *Socialist Challenge* supporters" to appear the next Saturday. The SL/B immediately contacted the IMG and other left-wing organisations to urge a coordinated united-front defence around the slogans: "Stop repression of the Iranian left!", "Free the imprisoned HKS and Fedayeen supporters!" and "Stop Khomeini's government attacks on the national minorities of Iran!"

The IMG flatly refused. Thus, July 14 saw a repeat performance of the week before. The 30 SL supporters who began the picket were eventually joined by a dozen or so IMG members and sympathisers, including a group of Iranians, along with another four from the Workers Power grouping and two from



Spartacist Britain

Who defends the HKS? The IMG contingent on the left or the Spartacist contingent on the right?

Workers Action. Again, SL placards and chants dominated the picket.

The IMG's Iranian supporters, who must feel acutely the repressive reality of Khomeini's regime that the IMG wilfully obscures, took up such SL slogans as "Down with the mullahs, down with the generals—Workers must rule Iran!" The demonstration concluded with a united chant of "Stop persecution of Iranian left—Free the Fedayeen and HKS!" and the protestors then sang "The Internationale" in English and Persian.

The IMG's refusal to work for a mass working-class-centred united-front defence of the HKS—or even bring out a small fraction of its own membership for the demonstration—reveals more than its notorious ineptitude and dilettantism. How, for example, can IMG national secretary Brian Grogan mobilise his membership to oppose Khomeini's repression? After all, a few short months ago he was touring Britain to recount his joy in chanting "Allah Akbar" ("god is great") on the streets of Teheran! Last year the IMG claimed that SL/B slogans like "Down with the shah! Down with the

mullahs!" were "counterrevolutionary" and supported calling on the cops to exclude Spartacist contingents from anti-shah demonstrations.

It ought to be obvious to everyone that kneeling to fanatical anti-communist Khomeini is no way to free the endangered militants in Iran. Yet the IMG continues to grovel before the reactionary theocrat. Its Ad-Hoc Committee to Defend Iranian Socialists suggests that a "model telegram" be sent to the ayatollah's Islamic Revolutionary Council pleading, "We friends of the Iranian Revolution [!] call for the release of the 15 HKS members jailed in Ahwaz." And the IMG's defence leaflet for the July 7 demonstration goes out of its way to deny that the imprisoned HKS supporters are in any way "subversives."

A strong, united defence of the HKS, Fedayeen and all other Iranian leftists under the gun is a burning necessity. Yet like its USec brethren, the IMG is determined to cover for the Islamic theocracy, even if that means watching its comrades go to the wall. Stop the sectarianism and passivity—For united-front defence of the Iranian left! ■

Anwar Defense Committee Formed

The fight to reinstate Keith Anwar, militant steel worker fired by Inland Steel Company for refusing to cross a picket line, has moved ahead with the formation of the Keith Anwar Defense Committee. The Committee is dedicated not only to winning Anwar's job back, but to defending all those USWA members who have recently come under attack for honoring picket lines.

Organized around the demands: "that Inland Steel immediately reinstate Keith Anwar with full seniority and back pay" and "defend all union members victimized for honoring picket lines," the Committee is urgently seeking support in the form of endorsements, donations and help with the work of publicizing the case.

Anwar, an apprentice millwright at Inland's 24-Inch Bar Mill and a member of USWA Local 1010, was fired on May 18 because he refused to cross the picket line of striking USWA Local 8180, a small local employed inside the Inland facility by Apex Steel and Supply Company. Other militants at the U.S. Steel Southworks plant in Chicago and at Gary Works in Gary, Indiana have also been disciplined for honoring railroad workers' and iron workers' picket lines.

These militants are on the front lines of the fight for the labor principle that "picket lines mean: don't cross!" It is crucial that all trade unionists support the Anwar case. A vigorous labor mobilization to turn this firing around could put a stop to company efforts to break down the traditions of labor solidarity and could reverse an attack which ultimately strikes at the foundations of the union itself. "Inland is trying to deny me the right to advocate labor militancy and to engage in union activity," as Anwar wrote in the June issue of the USWA Local 1010 *Steel Worker*. "An injury to one is an injury to all" is an old labor tradition and a good one."

The Keith Anwar Defense Committee has been endorsed by a number of USWA officials, including the vice president of Local 1010, Anwar's own local, and the president of Local 8180, the local whose lines Anwar honored. Over \$600 has already been collected by the pre-existing Keith Anwar Defense Fund, for Anwar's legal expenses in pursuing his case before the National Labor Relations Board. These funds came primarily from steel workers, but there have been donations from the Partisan Defense Committee, *WV*

readers and supporters as far away as Massachusetts, California and Montreal. One unionist wrote: "By sticking to principles you can perhaps make a successful stand for proletarian tradition and necessity. It would be a great victory if you could return to work.... Enclosed find a day's pay."

The Committee has begun to generate publicity in the press of the Chicago and northern Indiana area. Articles have appeared in the *Hammond Times*, the *Gary Post Tribune*, the *Chicago Defender*, Chicago's black-oriented daily newspaper, and the *Daily Calumet* of South Chicago. WJOB Radio in Hammond aired an interview with Anwar and broadcast a statement of support by USWA District 31 director Jim Balanoff regarding the case.

But the defense of Anwar and other militants took its biggest step forward on June 30 when the USWA District 31 Conference passed a resolution pledging "all available resources to reverse these attacks" and demanding "that Inland Steel reinstate Keith Anwar with full seniority and back pay" (see *WV* No. 235, 6 July 1979). Local 1010 has voted to endorse this stand. And on June 27, Anwar was invited to address a meeting of USWA Local 65 at Southworks. The

meeting adopted a motion co-sponsored by two steel workers who were disciplined for honoring Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks (BRAC) picket lines, Tom Knight and

continued on page 11

WORKERS VANGUARD

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

EDITOR: Jan Norden

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Charles Burroughs
PRODUCTION: Darlene Kamiura (Manager)
Noah Wilner

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Karen Wyatt

EDITORIAL BOARD: Jon Brule, George Foster, Liz Gordon, James Robertson, Joseph Seymour, Marjorie Stamberg

Workers Vanguard (USPS 098-770) 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. 236

20 July 1979

"Whose union is this anyway,

WV Interview with Jane Margolis

"Because I Denounce Carter's Anti-Labor Party"

JANE: I'm an elected delegate to the CWA Convention and I'm an Executive Board member in San Francisco Local 9410 of the CWA. Today Jimmy Carter was invited by our International officers to address the Convention. Early this morning, as soon as the Convention convened, I attempted to get the floor to make a motion that the CWA not allow itself to be used as a platform for the anti-labor strikebreaking policies of Jimmy Carter. I was not recognized by the Chairman of the Convention. I was not allowed to make the motion. Later on in the afternoon, about 3 o'clock, an hour before Jimmy Carter was to come to speak to the Convention, I was standing on the floor of the Convention. I was approached by a Secret Service agent who told me that they wanted to ask me questions in a back room. I told them that I did not want to talk to them until I got legal advice.... They then grabbed me and physically dragged me out of the Convention hall. I was surrounded by several Secret Service men and the Detroit police. They handcuffed me...

WV: Right there on the Convention floor, in front of all the delegates?

JANE: It was right outside the Convention floor they handcuffed me. They handcuffed me behind my back, and took me around to a back room in the back of the auditorium. I was protesting the whole way. When I got in the back they were saying that they wanted to ask me questions. I insisted that I was not going to speak to them without a lawyer. They told me that they had every right to detain me. When they had handcuffed me the Detroit police told me that I was under arrest and that I was going to be taken to the Detroit jail.

WV: For what? Under arrest for what?

JANE: Just that I was under arrest.

They said that they had every right, the Secret Service, to ask me questions and I had to answer them. When I was in the back room they kept me handcuffed for a while...

WV: Did they let you talk to anybody when they had you in that back room?

JANE: No.

WV: People couldn't get in?



Jane Margolis at CWA convention. "I had every right to be on that convention floor. Jimmy Carter was a guest."

JANE: No. I asked for a lawyer and they said...[w]e have every right to detain you for 72 hours.

WV: For 72 hours?

JANE: 72 hours while the president is in the vicinity. And I said, why am I here? And they said, we have from a source that you were threatening the life

of the president. I said, what is your source? They said they do not know the source, but they have from a source that I was threatening the life of the president. I said, no way was I threatening the life of the president. What I was was an elected delegate...and I was going to practice my democratic right of speaking on the Convention floor.

WV: So they never said where they got this supposed report?

JANE: No....

WV: When they were dragging you off the floor, did it cause any commotion?

JANE: Yes...there was a bit of a ruckus. It was in the back of the Hall. Glenn Watts said...

WV: Now he's the president of the union, right?

JANE: Yes, he's the International President of the union. What he did was he told delegates to ignore the disrupt-

came back...was that it was about 20 minutes before Jimmy Carter was going to be coming to the Convention. The procedure that they used for the question-and-answer period was that the first 20 people in line at the different microphones would be the people that would be able to ask questions.... When it was announced to get in line at the microphone, I got in line...and I was number 15 to get there. I was then read off as one of the 20 people that would be asking questions of the president. They had us sitting in a separate section. I was being watched by Secret Service men.... [A]t delegate number 12 they cut off the discussion and Jimmy Carter said that he had been there for 55 minutes and he was departing from the Convention.

WV: So it sounds pretty clear that the reason that they did this was in order to prevent there being any dissent.

JANE: Exactly. And it was clear to other delegates. A delegate who did get to speak came up to me afterwards and said, "If I had known that all 20 of us couldn't speak I would have given my seat to you." Other delegates came up to me and said, "Look it, I may not agree with everything you've said, but you have every right to be at this Convention and say what you want." Delegates were pretty outraged, appalled...

WV: Do you plan to lodge any protest about this tomorrow at the union meeting?

JANE: Yes. We're going to issue a leaflet. The point that we want to make to the delegates is that I am an elected Executive Board member, I am an elected delegate to this Convention and I was sent here by my membership. This is a union Convention. I had every right to be on that Convention floor. Jimmy Carter was a guest. I had more right to be on that Convention floor than he did. And his Secret Service escorted me off. Every trick in the book was put up in order to avoid criticism of Jimmy Carter on national press coverage and on TV. And that it's a real outrage that the President is invited to the Convention and the Secret Service and the same government agencies that are going to be used against workers in a national strike in 1980—against phone workers—these same government agencies were used to get me off my Convention floor, arrest me, handcuff me, slander my character, all to keep any public criticism of Jimmy Carter from getting on the floor.

WV: Now, you are a spokesman for the Militant Action Caucus. Could you just mention briefly what the MAC stands for?

JANE: The Militant Action Caucus, we are a caucus inside the CWA. We are all CWA members. We want to fight to form a militant class-struggle leadership inside the CWA. We want to stop company collaboration on the part of our union leadership. We are fighting for a national phone strike in 1980 to stop the loss of jobs that is resulting from extreme automation. We want to fight for a shorter workweek with no loss in pay.... We believe in no support to the Democratic and Republican Parties. Not a dime, not a vote to the strikebreaking capitalist parties. And we stand for a workers party that will fight for a workers government that will expropriate industry and form a planned rational economy. Also this year at the Convention we are planning...to try and change the constitution for the local right to strike so that locals will be able to use the power of striking without the sanction of the International (who never gives it)... And we plan on contacting as many delegates as possible and trying to form a national opposition to fight for a militant leadership in the CWA. ■

What the Secret Service Wouldn't Let Jane Margolis Say

(continued from page 1)

Brothers and Sisters,

Jimmy Carter came here today to get approval from the working people for his energy program—the program that blames us for the energy crisis because of our "greed," our "gas guzzling" and our "self-indulgence." While they hop around the country in their Lear jets and limousines, the capitalists would like to convince us that it is our duty to make sacrifices for the good of the country, to settle for the 7 percent guideline while the cost of living soars at 14 percent.

The present oil shortage is a well-known ripoff for Big Oil. The problem is that this rotten system delivers the profits to the peanut bosses, the oil magnates and the Ma Bells while we cannot even get enough gas for our cars.

The CWA convention must not be turned into a platform for the racist anti-labor Democratic Party of Jimmy Carter. I want to remind the delegates how in 1978 when the heroic miners shut down the coalfields for the right to strike and for adequate health and safety

protection Carter invoked the slave-labor Taft-Hartley injunction to break their strike. Let's remember how in the face of soaring black unemployment and desperate ghetto poverty, Carter's callous response was simply that "life is unfair." Nor have we forgotten how he threatened to break our own proposed CWA strike in 1977 and how he will undoubtedly try to again if we prepare for the solid coast-to-coast phone strike we need next year!

I came to this convention on the platform—"Not a dime, not a vote for the strikebreaking Democrats and Republicans!" This is the program I ran on. This is the program on which I was elected to my local Executive Board and on which I have twice in a row been elected a delegate to this convention. In Carter's speech last night he told us to "stop cursing and start praying." We say it's time to start fighting! And our fight must be to break labor's ties to the bosses' parties and to form a powerful workers party to lead us as we struggle for a workers government. ■

tion in the back of the hall. There were a number of delegates from the West Coast and from my own delegation that were planning on having a walkout from the Convention in protest. First several of them tried to get the microphone on the Convention floor and protest to the International officers that I had been dragged off the Convention floor. The microphone was turned off, they were not recognized. They were not allowed to speak to the Convention. Watts had told people to ignore the disruption in the back of the hall. I was detained for about 30 to 35 minutes and then I came back in to the Convention. When I came back in to the Convention...

WV: Now wait a minute. They dragged you off the Convention floor, handcuffed you, said you were under arrest but with no charges—and they say that they have information that you're threatening the life of the president—and then they let you go?

JANE: Right. And then they let me go.

WV: Did they have any explanation for this?

JANE: ...[T]here was some kind of negotiations going on in an adjoining room which I do not know about. But there were several Secret Service men in there having a discussion and then they came back in and they released me.

WV: Some union delegates went to the Secret Service and protested?

JANE: Apparently my president Jim Imerzel went to the Secret Service and to the International and protested....

WV: I understand that after you were released you came back onto the Convention floor. Were you allowed to speak then?

JANE: Okay, what happened when I

Carter's or the members'?"

CBS-TV Newsman Exposé

Secret Service Stonewall

We publish below excerpts from a transcript of a "Special Report on the President in Detroit" which was aired on Channel 2 TV (WJBK) Detroit, July 16, 11:30 p.m.

TOM GREENE: His [Carter's] speech [at the CWA convention] was brief. He took only 12 questions from the audience. Most of the questions were friendly. One person that wanted to ask the president some hard questions was earlier taken from Cobo Hall in handcuffs by the Secret Service men who were reportedly told that she was a threat to Mr. Carter. She was later released, too late, that is, to ask the questions that she claimed the president couldn't really handle very well about his labor record.

MURRAY FELDMAN: You know if he had let it work down the line, there would be a lot of people asking hard questions.

GREENE: There sure would be.

FELDMAN: Thank you, Tom.

* * * * *


FELDMAN: But apparently President Carter has done much in solving his credibility problem, at least with the Communications Workers of America meeting in Detroit. Most of them are pleased and happy with the day's events. But there is one person who may be a little bit bitter. Tom Greene was an eyewitness to part of an incident earlier

today when you were walking into Cobo Hall, Tom, and it appeared to us, to the reporters, as if somebody was trying to be silenced.

GREENE: Well, that was the feeling I got. This is purely accidental. I was stumbling around trying to find the room that the President was in because we get lost going in, but, there was this young lady in a room with a policeman, Ron Suskin, who used to be the president of D.P.O.A. [Detroit Police Officers Association], and she says, "Are you my lawyer?" I said no. She said, "Well, I'm being held here. I'm under arrest." I said, "For what?" She said, "Because I have a speech here that I wanted to deliver against Mr. Carter." It was her contention that she was being silenced by the Secret Service as a way to avoid any kind of an embarrassing situation for the president. She felt that the questions were going to be stacked by favorable people who are friends of Mr. Carter who would ask him only the kinds of questions that he could answer very well and handle easily. And she never did, as you know. She did eventually get back into Cobo. They released her, but she got in at a point where she could not be up front and get a chance to ask a question.

HARRY GALLAGHEN: She had been what, detained by the Secret Service, Secret Service bodyguard or whatever...

GREENE: I asked them, you know, Harry, we talked about this earlier, you



Carter's Big Sermon comes to Cobo Hall, July 16.

WV Photo

said why; I asked them. They wouldn't even acknowledge that they had her. I said, "But she's in the other room." They said, "Don't know nothing about it."

FELDMAN: So some people, some of the delegates had told me, described her as a socialist, or at least a socialist in belief, whatever that means. But you see, they were disappointed that the people were apparently hand-picked. At least it appeared that way.

GREENE: There wasn't a real cross-section.

FELDMAN: Hand-picked to talk to the president.

GREENE: Yeah, no matter what they tell you, it was not a cross-section of the 4,000 people in that room.

GALLAGHEN: Well, we all got to look

at the fact though that this of course was a political gathering for the president too. It was all set up. There was a large friendly group there, the Communications Workers generally patted him on the back. So I don't think we could say that he just came into a group that he didn't know and for which there was no organization at all.

GREENE: Oh no. No, that's normal.

FELDMAN: It was a group that the White House was darn sure would be friendly to the...

GREENE: Exactly. You see he needed this coming off of last night, and coming down from the mountain. He needs all this. You know, they want to give him the runway. ■

Secret Service Quizzes S.F. Union Leader

San Francisco Chronicle

San Franciscan handcuffed

One critic Carter didn't hear

Special to The Examiner
DETROIT — A militant San Francisco member of the Communications Workers of America was detained for 40 minutes by Secret Service agents yesterday, shortly before President Carter was scheduled to address the union convention.

Jane Margolis, 32, an executive board member of CWA Local 9410, said she was surrounded by about a half-dozen Secret Service agents, dragged off the floor of Cobo Hall and handcuffed in a back room.

There, she said, she was told she was being held for threatening Carter's life.

"I told them that was totally absurd," Margolis said in a telephone interview. "You know they

let me go if I had threatened the president.

"I didn't want the convention to be a cover for Carter's anti-labor policies and an opportunity for him to blame us for inflation," she said.

She spoke against Carter at last year's convention and said her anti-Carter positions are well-known in the union, where she speaks for the militant action caucus.

Margolis said she was also prevented from making a motion to prohibit Carter from addressing the convention. In addition, she said, the number of delegates to be permitted to question Carter was reduced from 20 to 12. She was 15th in line, she said.

Margolis who is a D.P.O.A. member...

San Francisco Examiner

Tuesday, July 17, 1979



Jane Margolis struggles to free herself from Secret Service men.

Delegate Says She Was Stopped From Questioning the President

The New York Times

Police seize, question woman delegate at Cobo

By ROBERT E. ROACH
News Staff Writer

A left-wing woman delegate was dragged from the floor of a union convention in Detroit's Cobo Hall by Secret Service agents shortly before President Carter spoke yesterday.

The woman, Jane S. Margolis, a self-proclaimed San Francisco militant, said afterward that her forcible removal from the hall prevented her from challenging the President for his "austerity, anti-labor, strike-breaking policies."

Ms. Margolis said she was handcuffed in a corridor and questioned for about 40 minutes before being released.

threat to the life of the President, and that they could detain me for up to 72 hours while the President was in the vicinity," Ms. Margolis said.

MS. MARGOLIS was one of 20 persons scheduled to ask questions of the President in his nationally-televisioned appearance yesterday before the convention of the Communications Workers of America (CWA) in Cobo Hall.

She was released and returned to the hall in time to present her question... but she was 15th on the list, and the President cut off questioning after receiving the 14th question.

Mr. Carter had announced...

longer than his schedule originally had allotted.

"I had every intention to speak out against him, but they (the union leaders and Secret Service) obviously didn't want that to get out on national television," Ms. Margolis said.

"Our union convention should not be used as a forum for Jimmy Carter's anti-labor views."

Ms. Margolis was indignant about her removal from the floor of the convention.

"I'm an elected delegate and he was only a guest," she said later. "I had every right to be on that floor for every moment of that convention."



The Detroit News

a motion in the morning session opposing Mr. Carter's appearance...

When she refused to walk her out of the hall...

Imperialists and OPEC: Rivals or Partners?



World Oil Blow Out

Jimmy Carter's July 15 sermon about the need for "faith in America" brought no amazing grace for working people angry over the gas lines, the highest inflation rate in decades and a recession bringing mounting layoffs. To justify his demands for increased sacrifice, Carter needed some villains in the temporal world to blame for the condition of the economy. He came up with the old standby: the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). Carter quoted one of the "voices of the people" he said he listens to: "Our neck is stretched over the fence and OPEC has the knife." And he added: OPEC "is the direct cause of the long lines that have made millions of you spend aggravating hours waiting for gasoline, a cause of the increased inflation and

unemployment that we now face," a threat to "our economic independence and the very security of our nation," "a clear and present danger to our system." This is the language of war.

The announcement by the oil cartel in June of a new rise in crude oil prices made OPEC easy to scapegoat. Carter's chief advisor on domestic policy, Stuart Eizenstat, practically jumped on it. In a memorandum leaked to the press, he had urged his boss:

"We have a better opportunity than ever before to assert leadership over an apparently insoluble problem, to shift the cause of inflation and energy problems to OPEC...."

"Use the OPEC price increase as the occasion to mark the beginning of our new approach to energy. It must be said by you—and by us—time and again publicly to be a watershed event. We must turn the increase to our advantage by clearly pointing out its devastating economic impact and as justification of our efforts against the OPEC cartel...."

—New York Times, 8 July

Blaming the Arab oil sheiks is nothing new. In June the leaders of the major imperialist powers arrived at Tokyo's Akasaka Palace in 124 limousines for a two-day "energy summit." They emerged to tell the working masses of their countries to conserve oil and to

"...deplore the decisions taken by the recent OPEC conference.... The unwarranted rises in oil prices agreed to are bound to have very serious economic and social consequences. They mean more worldwide inflation and less growth. That will lead to more unemployment, more balance of payments difficulty and will endanger stability in developing and developed countries of the world alike."

—New York Times, 30 June

And when Carter retreated to Camp David to prepare his alibis, he had not forgotten how well this gambit seemed to work in the 1973-74 oil crisis.

The OPEC chiefs point out in their defense that they are only catching up with four years of global inflation and the depreciation of the dollar. The run-up in the open-market oil price earlier this year benefited mainly the largely American middlemen and speculators. Most OPEC oil was sold under long-term contracts at less than half the going free-market price. Moreover, the recession they are supposed to have caused had already begun *before* the latest OPEC price action and *before* the gasoline "shortage."

But the anti-OPEC propaganda spewed out by American ruling circles is more than an alibi intended for domestic consumption. American capitalists don't want to pay \$20 for a barrel of imported oil which costs 10 cents to produce. When Carter's man writes of "our efforts against the OPEC cartel," he doesn't mean just diplomacy or developing synthetic fuel. Not far behind Carter's martial rhetoric is the imperialist arsenal.

Last year the Pentagon got the go-ahead for a special mobile force of 100,000 for use in the Middle East or Persian Gulf. Now Washington is upgrading contingency plans to "use military force to preserve the oil flow," according to *New York Times* military writer Drew Middleton (4 July). The U.S. is putting together a large strike force capable of offering the sheiks a deal they can't refuse.

Even the suave, diplomatic Saudi oil minister, Sheik Yamani, is forced to take account of the military threats. One gets a sense of his nervousness as he protests perhaps too much:

"If some people are thinking of a possible physical occupation of the oil fields, they can forget it. It cannot be done. The people would never stand for it. Sabotage of a few parts could halt production for years. And then where would we all be? No, we must think positively."

—Newsweek, 9 July

The reformist left has responded to the oil crisis by simultaneously acting as

lawyers for the oil sheiks and boosting chauvinist isolationism. "The charges against OPEC are all lies," says the Socialist Workers Party's Dick Roberts (*Militant*, 13 July). Roberts makes much of the argument that the U.S. could be self-sufficient if only the oil companies wouldn't hold back production (something Carter and Henry Jackson will be happy to hear). For the SWP, it is all a question of the reallocation of resources under capitalism, the old social-democratic illusion of less guns, more butter. Their denial that OPEC has any real effect on the American economy can only mean that U.S. military intervention would be an insane adventure, an *irrational* act of chauvinist militarism. Thus Roberts implicitly accepts the imperialist premise that *if* OPEC *did* inflict serious damage to the U.S. economy, then the U.S. would be justified in taking over the Arab oil states.

As revolutionary internationalists, our principled objection to U.S. occupation of the Near East oil fields is not based on conjunctural economic calculations, on whether the current OPEC oil price hike is really responsible for the high price of gas. The proletariat must stand opposed to all imperialist looting, first and foremost that of its "own" rulers. Whatever the role of OPEC in the world capitalist economy, for the


the Near East, U.S. crude oil prices remained higher than world market prices for the next 15 years. (West Europeans paid and still pay much more for gasoline than Americans, but that is due to much higher sales taxes.) With the American market suddenly cut off, a flood of oil was redirected toward Europe and so drove down the world price.

The "Seven Sisters" (the five American and two British firms which dominate world oil) then demanded of the oil producing countries a cut in the posted price on which these countries base their royalties and taxes. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries was formed in 1960 to resist this price cut. In this it was successful, but with inflation the real price of oil fell throughout the 1960s, and the oil companies were able to dominate the weak OPEC group.

1970 marked a turning point for OPEC and the world oil market. Col. Qaddafi's newly-fledged "revolutionary Islamic" regime in Libya took advantage of its good bargaining position (the closing of the Suez Canal and the cutting off of the Syrian pipeline to the Persian Gulf) to demand a large increase in both the posted price and state royalty. The oil companies could have walked out at that point, leaving Qaddafi's oil rigs to rot in the desert sun,



Plain Truth



OPEC price explosion benefits Rockefellers, sheiks, but not the workers who produce oil.

working class "the main enemy is at home."

So Carter says OPEC is the villain and the reformist left portrays it alternatively as victim and hero. Carter says OPEC is totally responsible for the sad shape of the U.S. economy, the reformist left says OPEC has nothing whatever to do with the present agonies of U.S. capitalism. What is the truth about OPEC and the oil crisis? Why have oil prices increased ten times since 1970, 50 percent in the past six months? Are the OPEC and the imperialists partners or rivals?

In fact, the oil sheiks and the oil companies are acting in cahoots in a mutually profitable partnership. And the economics of the oil crisis begins a few decades ago.

1970-72: U.S. Encourages OPEC

Seeking to make the U.S. militarily self-sufficient, the Eisenhower administration in 1959 limited oil imports to about 10 percent of total consumption. This had a big impact on the world oil market. Since it costs much more to extract oil from American fields than in

but instead, after much and sometimes bitter high-level international haggling, the oil majors accepted the price hike. In the final negotiating session, Qaddafi's oil man, Abdul Jalloud, said he would be executed if he settled for less than \$3.30 a barrel increase. Fortunately for him, he walked away with his price. So began the OPEC price explosion.

The U.S. State Department, through its leading Arabist, James Akins, was actively involved in the critical Libyan negotiations. It advised the oil companies to accept the price hike, knowing full well that all the OPEC countries would follow suit. Why? First, in 1970 the U.S. imported relatively little Near Eastern oil. Washington/Wall Street therefore calculated that American industry would gain competitive advantage over the West Europeans and Japanese if OPEC prices rose. Secondly Nixon/Kissinger hoped to gain favor with the Arab rulers—at the expense of German and Japanese consumers. It is hardly a diplomatic secret that the U.S. government encouraged Qaddafi and the OPEC price hawks in the early 1970s, and its role is

routinely denounced to this day by pro-Zionist oil experts like M.A. Adelman.

Between 1970 and the beginning of 1973 the posted price of Saudi light crude rose from \$1.80 to \$2.59. But in the same period the actual world market price more than doubled! In other words, the Seven Sisters raised their prices more than did OPEC, as they *always* do when the market is tight.

In giving OPEC the green light in the early 1970s, the Nixon administration assumed that the U.S. was still largely self-sufficient in oil. But this assumption proved false, and the policy soon backfired. In 1970 American domestic oil production peaked. With the feverish economic boom of 1971-73, the oil import controls were first relaxed and finally ended in April 1973—just about the time the world price rose above the American.

This changed situation led to the passage in the U.S. of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act in November 1973, which attempted to prevent oil prices in the U.S. from rising as fast as the now skyrocketing world prices. "Old" oil, from wells in operation before 1973, was fixed substantially below the world price, while newly developed fields were to receive the world price. (Of course, this initiated the "old" oil into "new" multi-billion-dollar scams.) In addition, gasoline, heating oil and other petroleum products were subject to price controls.

This price control system has, not surprisingly, been a key target for big oil ever since. Because the oil industry, like other capitalist industry, is run along profit-maximizing lines, the post-1973 price controls simply cause the companies to periodically sabotage and disrupt the economy. When right-wing California senator S.I. Hayakawa said that the gasoline "shortage" would disappear if the price rose to \$3 a gallon, he was expressing a certain capitalist rationality.

1973-1978: War and Oil Crisis, Glut and Stagnation

When the October 1973 war between Egypt/Syria and Israel broke out, the Saudis launched their long-talked-about "oil weapon"—an oil boycott of the U.S. and a progressive cutback in total Arab oil production. This was a political—not an economic—move, designed to push Washington into pressuring Israel out of the occupied territories. This tactic, if successful, would have guaranteed not the national liberation of the Palestinian people but rather their new subjugation by the Egyptian, Jordanian or Syrian bourgeois states. The political nature of the boycott was clearly demonstrated by the fact that the shah of Iran, always an OPEC price hawk, *expanded* production during this period. Of course, Pahlavi expected to be well rewarded for his services to American and Israeli interests.

The "oil weapon" turned out to have a rather low megatonnage, certainly

insufficient to persuade the U.S. to force Israel out of the West Bank. By late December the Saudis, probably recognizing that Washington would not budge and might even retaliate, decided to abandon the boycott. But as compensation for laying down the "oil weapon" OPEC *quadrupled* the price of oil to \$11.60 a barrel.

The oil majors were pleased enough at the big price jump, although they would have preferred it to have been more gradual and not associated with the anti-Israel boycott. But while the Seven Sisters and a few New York banks which handle Arab money gained from \$11 oil, the American capitalist class in general was hurt by it. The cries of anguish and outrage within American (and West European) ruling circles were genuine, if exaggerated.


The Arab nationalists and their fake-left hangers-on portrayed the 1973 oil embargo as an "anti-imperialist" response by "Third World" countries. In October 1973 *The Call*, newspaper of the Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) (then the October League) spoke for many of these mindless "Third World" cheerleaders when it said: "The question facing Libya, Saudi Arabia and other countries in that part of the world is, fight—or be ruined." In its latest issue (9 July) *The Call* has carried its slavish capitulation to the OPEC countries to the extreme of comparing them to the *working class*:

"Furthermore, oil prices had remained frozen for nearly two years in countries like Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, while the prices of industrial goods to the OPEC countries have risen steadily. The situation is not very different from that of workers seeking wage increases to offset the effects of inflation and getting blamed by the government for causing inflation."

But the oil crisis is hardly a concerted attack on international imperialism by its colonial victims. To begin with, the oil consumers are *not* limited to the imperialist countries. As is well known, the 1973 OPEC price hike hit hardest the *backward*, not the advanced, capitalist countries. It is obvious that India, Kenya or Peru could less afford \$11 oil than the U.S., which, moreover, prints the currency with which it pays OPEC (no small advantage). From 1973 to 1975 the outstanding debt of the non-oil exporting backward countries went up over 50 percent! This financial catastrophe was not caused solely by the OPEC price explosion, but that certainly was a very big factor.

Partners with the OPEC cartel are such well-known "anti-imperialists" as the Rockefellers and Mellons, whose take on a barrel of oil reportedly climbed from \$6.80 to \$8.20 between 1973 and 1975. As Saudi oil minister Sheik Yamani said in 1975, when he was making a big show of being a price moderate:

"The ones who want that [much higher prices] are, first and foremost, the oil



companies. Obviously, when the prices rise, their profits increase."
—*New York Times Magazine*, 14 September 1975

Obviously!

In fact, the OPEC countries do not control the oil prices themselves but with and through the Seven Sisters. When in 1975 the deep world slump sharply curtailed demand for oil and so tended to drive down the price, Aramco (consortium of Exxon, Mobil, Socal and Texaco) cut its Arabian production by a whopping 2.5 million barrels a day (mb/d) to restore a tight market.

So far from being an attack on imperialism, the 1973 OPEC quadrupling of the oil price transferred a large share of economic surplus from the backward as well as the advanced countries to some of the most *reactionary, parasitic elements of world capitalism* (the Rockefeller empire, the Arabian monarchy, the shah of Iran).

In January 1974 Nixon's war minister, James Schlesinger (now the hapless energy secretary) told the Arabs that there would be increasing public clamor to use force if they continued the boycott. One of the reasons that the U.S. ruling class did not resort to a military solution in 1974 was that it believed that the OPEC price leap would soon reverse itself. The assumption was that continuing global inflation would erode the real price of oil imports; that once market demand fell, the OPEC cartel would come apart through competitive price-cutting and that \$11 oil would spur an enormous expansion of production and opening of new fields, especially outside the OPEC area. These expectations were in part—but only in part—fulfilled.

Inflation did reduce the relative cost

of OPEC oil. Additionally, the sharp depreciation of the dollar, in which the OPEC price is fixed, further shrank the exchange value of a barrel of oil on the world market. Despite a few money price hikes, the real (relative) price of crude oil fell almost 20 percent between 1974 and the end of 1978.

Throughout this period there was a relative glut of oil, and by 1978 the OPEC cartel began to look ragged. Some countries, like Iraq and Kuwait, opened up bargain basements in "lower quality" crude.

But the expectation that the fourfold increase in oil prices in 1973 would stimulate a vast expansion in productive capacity simply did not materialize—and *not* because the world is running out of oil.

1979: What Happened?

In brief, the American oil companies created an entirely artificial shortage of gasoline in order to force through price decontrol. They did this by (a) *not* importing crude oil amply available on the world market and (b) *not* refining and marketing the crude oil they did have.

The Saudis did cut back production early in the year, presumably to show displeasure over the Camp David "separate peace" between Egypt and Israel. That action probably pushed up the open ("spot") market price but *in no way* caused the U.S. gasoline crunch. That particular rip-off was manufactured wholly in the U.S.A.

What about the supposed world oil shortage caused by the Iranian crisis? In January-April of this year crude oil production in the Persian Gulf states was only 500 million barrels/day (mb/d)

continued on page 9



U.S. troops train for desert action in 1973 war/oil crisis.

Newsweek

Betrayal in Boston—Why Not Beirut?

Revisionists in Glass Houses...

Ernest Mandel & Co. of the fake-Trotskyist "United Secretariat" are used to abandoning one political line for a new one (more in line with their current opportunist appetite) without giving it another thought. But sometimes the cynical crew at the head of the USec are unpleasantly surprised to find their previous betrayals thrown back at them by indignant followers who had taken them seriously and assimilated the last revisionist turn all too well. So it was recently when a heated dispute broke out between the USec and its Lebanese supporters involving a range of what should be, for Marxists, principled differences.

The dispute arose in the aftermath of a criminal Palestinian commando operation on the Tel Aviv-Haifa road in March 1978 in which 37 Israelis were killed and 76 wounded. Using this pretext, Israel carried out a massive invasion of southern Lebanon, turning 200,000 Lebanese and Palestinians into refugees and massacring nearly 1,000 (see "Zionists Grab Southern Lebanon," *Workers Vanguard* No. 198, 24 March 1978). The U.S., fearful lest this full-scale operation by its Zionist ally upset the fragile balance of power and status quo in the Near East, insisted on an immediate session of the UN Security Council to demand Israel's withdrawal and replacement by UN troops. When the troops were sent, the USec issued a statement on 22 March (reprinted in *Intercontinental Press*, 10 April 1978) denouncing this "dispatch of 'blue helmets'" whose "job can only be to protect the new status quo from the Palestinian movement once the Zionist army has carried out its mopping up operations" and concluding with the demand: "No to UN intervention."

However, at the same time the USec's section in Lebanon, the Revolutionary Communist Group (RCG), was welcoming the UN intervention. The 1 May 1978 *Intercontinental Press* reprinted an interview with a member of the group's Executive Committee who claimed that the intervention had a "dual character," directed "both against the Israeli occupation and against the armed Palestinians." The RCG spokesman stated that, "insofar as [the UN forces] are able to force the Israeli army out of southern Lebanon and to protect the Lebanese border against Zionist intervention, we support the UN forces; to do anything else would be to allow the occupation to continue."

Even for the shameless opportunists of the USec, its Lebanese section's "critical support" to the UN must have

been a public embarrassment. Opposition to the UN intervention in southern Lebanon should have been an elementary position for any Marxist. It was the UN partition dismembering the Palestinian nation which gave birth to the Zionist state of Israel. UN "cease-fires" and the UN troops to monitor them have provided imperialist sanction and border guards for each act of Israeli expansionism from the 1948 war to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon last year. That consignment to southern Lebanon became the fourth such "peacekeeping" force stationed in the Near East after Cyprus, the Golan Heights and the Sinai.

Accentuating the USec's embarrassment, the first soldiers to arrive in southern Lebanon under the UN flag were sent by Israel's historic ally, the Shah of Iran! While the USec's Lebanese group was welcoming the Shah's soldiers in "blue helmets" as liberators of southern Lebanon from Zionist aggression, the USec's Iranian group, the Sattar League, was denouncing the UN forces and Iran's participation as a "reactionary plot against the right of self-determination of the Arab people" ("Get the Shah's Troops Out of Lebanon Now!", statement issued by the Political Committee of the Sattar League on 7 April, reprinted in *Intercontinental Press*, 24 April 1978).

The public counterposition generated an exchange of correspondence between the USec and its Lebanese section (since reprinted in the American Socialist Workers Party's *International Internal Discussion Bulletin*, May 1979). In a letter dated 17 April, the USec took the RCG to task for backing a UN force which the USec labeled an "army that serves imperialism." Furthermore the RCG had also uncritically defended the Palestinian raid seized on by the Zionists as a pretext for the invasion, saying that "it is not our business to make moral or pseudo-political judgments on this operation." The USec letter objects that an operation targeting all Israelis indiscriminately "does not help assure the long-term mobilization of the Palestinian masses in struggle" and "harms the goal of dividing the Zionist camp and winning the Israeli workers to support the rights of Palestinians." (We should say so.) And the USec criticized the RCG's liquidationist bloc with a nationalist/guerrillaist splinter group, the Palestinian Liberation Front, during the invasion.

Why so late with sage advice against liquidating into petty-bourgeois nation-



Rubinger/Time

Lebanese USec group learned well from SWP betrayal in Boston, welcomed UN troops in Near East (above).

alist "armed struggle"? Too late for the Bolivian USec militants massacred at Teoponte, attempting to carry out the guerrillaist prescriptions of the USec's 1969 Ninth World Congress. And it was the same USec whose leading French section declared, following the senseless kidnapping by Palestinian commandos and resulting slaughter of innocent Israeli athletes at Munich in 1972, that "the action of Black September must be unconditionally supported" (*Rouge*, 30 September 1972).

But now these one-time armchair Guevarists are pursuing more respectable appetites toward the reformist bureaucracies of the mass European workers parties. They now find it expedient to distance themselves with tactical objections from indiscriminate terrorist acts committed in the name of the oppressed, without acknowledging that such acts are indefensible in principle.

Federal Troops to Boston? Why Not UN Troops to Lebanon?

The RCG did not have so short a memory as the USec leaders might have hoped. So now they hear that UN troops must be opposed because they are an imperialist force? The RCG thought it was reminded of "a little analogy":

"Take a city in the United States, Boston, for example.... You know that during the racial violence in Boston the

American Trotskyists did more: they organized a campaign demanding the intervention of federal troops! If memory serves us right, the USec Bureau approved of this campaign."

Correct: the USec's Mandelite majority did endorse the despicable SWP campaign to bring civil rights to Boston on the bayonets of the armed forces of U.S. imperialism. The USec can't have it both ways. If they are willing to betray in Boston, then why not in Beirut?

The RCG goes pretty far in the course of defending its position as fully consistent with the USec's revisionist methodology. The RCG has discovered that "The relationship of forces inside the UN (and outside the UN!) have evolved, and evolved considerably since the Korean War!" According to them, "today the USSR and China participate as permanent and full members with veto rights... the relationship of forces within the General Assembly is no longer favorable to the imperialists." Thus, "UN troops are no longer an imperialist intervention force; they rather constitute an army charged with preserving the status quo jointly agreed by American imperialism and the Stalinist bureaucracy" (emphasis in original). But that "status quo" happens to be a world market dominated by imperialism in which those countries where capitalism has been overthrown are encircled and threatened with social counterrevolution. The RCG portrays the UN as a kind of global popular front with the "relation of forces" becoming increasingly unfavorable to imperialism. Thus the RCG applies to the United Nations, that modern-day imperialist "den of thieves" as Lenin aptly called its predecessor, the Pablist objectivism learned in the USec.

Where Did RCG Guerrillaism Come From?

Who, furthermore, taught the RCG to liquidate into a "left wing" Palestinian commando group? The RCG knows. Bitterly, they ask how the USec can criticize a strategy of which it is the architect:

"It can be described by a spot formula: a 180 degree turn. How can it be described otherwise when the leadership of our International after having advocated a 'guerrillaist orientation' for our Latin American embryos, an orientation scarcely 'implanted among the toiling masses,' comes around to re-

continued on page 11



No side was "progressive" in Lebanon civil war, 1976. Christian militias slaughtered Muslims in Karantina (left); Palestinian militias (right) joined in Muslim reprisals.

World Oil Blowout...

(continued from page 7)

or all of 2.5 percent less than in the same period last year. But in this period Nigeria upped its output by 800 mb/d, more than offsetting the small drop in the Persian Gulf. In short, during this famous "world oil shortage" the OPEC countries as a whole were pumping more oil than last year!

Yet between December and April crude oil imports into the U.S. fell about ten percent. Obviously, the companies were diverting crude from the U.S. to other markets. It is a known fact that they did not buy crude available on the open market, arguing that it was not sufficiently profitable to sell it in the U.S.

But in any case the companies had plenty of crude; they simply didn't refine it into gasoline. According to official industry statistics, crude oil stockpiles increased 11 percent between late February and the end of June (*Oil and Gas Journal*, 2 February and 2 July). Through this April refineries were running at only 85 percent compared to 90 percent in 1977.

Even energy secretary Schlesinger, no anti-big-oil radical, tried to save his job by chiding the companies for their refining policies, which he termed "unduly conservative" and "not in the national interest." But while Schlesinger was trying to panic everybody over lack of Iranian oil, his department was importing large amounts of crude for the so-called Strategic Petroleum Reserve and burying it in caverns in the ground!

Few American working people follow statistics on world oil production, refinery runs, stockpiling, etc., but there was, nevertheless, a widespread certainty that it was the blackmailing oil companies, not the Arab sheiks, who were the principal villains. The timing of the gas "shortage" with big oil's and Carter's decontrol campaign was just too damned neat to be a coincidence.

The Solution to the Oil Crisis

While the immediate U.S. gasoline "shortage" was artificially created, there are long-term factors making for recurrent oil crises in the capitalist world. Oil

Carter's "Synthetic Solution":

Higher Prices, Higher Profits

After all the sermonizing, moralizing and breast-baring, what is Carter's great all-American answer to "the energy crisis"? A crash synthetic fuel program. From a strictly technical standpoint it's possible. If cost is no object, as is the case in total war, an advanced industrial country can replace its crude oil imports with synthetics.

Nazi Germany did it in World War II. Between 1938 and 1943 Germany's crude oil imports fell from 5.0 to 2.7 billion tons, but synthetics more than made up the difference, increasing from 1.6 to 5.7 billion tons (U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey, *The Effects of Strategic Bombing on the German War Economy* [1945]). But war-time Germany's synthetic fuel program required no small share of its total industrial resources, for example, about 10 percent of finished steel products.

Synthetic fuel is expensive, more expensive than OPEC oil. The lowest cost estimate for producing oil through coal liquification is about \$25 a barrel or 25 percent higher than the world market price of crude petroleum. So the result of the synthetic "solution" will be higher gas and fuel prices, greater profits for the oil companies and probably also for OPEC.

But working people in this country are fed up with the typical capitalist solution of ever higher prices. While American workers do not have a generalized anti-capitalist consciousness, they know the oil companies are ripping them off and they want to get *Big Oil*. The demand for those sweating on the gas lines and shop floors is for the government to expropriate the oil industry, to produce gas and heating fuel for use not profit.

as a source of energy is an important overhead capital cost. An increase in the relative price of oil reduces industrial profits and transfers this surplus-value to the owners of the fields and the petroleum industry.

Over a century ago Marx analyzed how an increase in the exchange-value of raw material can lead to a crisis:

"More must be expended on raw material, less remains for labor, and it is not possible to absorb the same quantity of labor as before. . . . [It] is impossible because a greater portion of the product has to be converted into raw material, thus leaving less for conversion into variable capital [money-capital expended directly on labor]. Reproduction cannot be repeated on the same scale. A part of fixed capital stands idle and a part of the workers is thrown out on the streets [emphasis in original]."

—K. Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Chapter XVII

It is not surprising therefore that industrial capitalists in general favor cheap energy and this sometimes brings them into conflict with coal, oil, electric power, etc. interests. That is why most

advanced capitalist countries have wholly or partially nationalized oil companies. Even before World War I, for example, the British imperialist government set up Anglo-Persian Oil (now British Petroleum), keeping 50 percent ownership.

The American (and West European and Japanese) capitalists have a serious interest in securing Near Eastern oil and not at exorbitant prices, and they have reminded the Persian Gulf satraps that they could get hurt if they pushed things too far.

There is at present plenty of oil in the ground. Proven reserves are 30-35 times current production and can be extracted for a fraction of the present world market price. Saudi Arabia can maintain its existing production for at least the next 60 years at a cost of 10-15 cents a barrel, and new areas like Alaska's North Slope and the southern Gulf of Mexico are potentially very important sources of oil. Furthermore, oilfields which would have been grossly uneconomical to exploit at pre-1970 prices would now be highly profitable. Yet,

against the basic rule of textbook capitalist economics, an enormous increase in price has led to a falling off in the expansion of productive capacity. The reason why: the Seven Sisters/OPEC cartel does not want to break the price.

The big companies have not used their "obscene profits" to find more oil but rather to buy coal mines, uranium deposits and nuclear reactors and generally to transform themselves into conglomerates. In one of the largest such deals on record, Mobil paid \$1.2 billion for Montgomery Ward, the mail order house. Exxon is now offering over \$1 billion for Reliance Electrical, an electrical manufacturer.

Like the Seven Sisters, the oil-producing countries have chosen *not* to expand their capacity. New, potentially big exporters, notably Mexico, have been careful not to flood the market and break the OPEC price. The Saudis have done little to expand their pumping capacity, in part as a bargaining weapon against Israel. In 1972, for example, Yamani offered to produce 20 mb/d (twice its present 1979 capacity) if Washington would drop its support to Zionism.

That the world market price of an important raw material like oil is now 200 times the cost of production is a particularly glaring instance of how capitalism strangles economic life and impoverishes the masses. A global socialist system would be able to produce more than enough oil until the world economy could be shifted mainly to the likes of nuclear fusion and solar energy, but capitalism is incapable of rational economic planning.

Just as the world oil crises are caused by the collaboration of the imperialist multinationals and feudal rulers of the Persian Gulf, so a *revolutionary internationalist* solution requires the *unity* of the working classes in the advanced capitalist countries and the Near East. In Arabia's great Ghawar oilfield, Palestinian workers slave for a few dollars a day so that Sheik Yamani can jet-set with Exxon chairman Clifton Garvin. In California and New York workers swelter waiting to buy gas so that Clifton Garvin can jet-set with Sheik Yamani. The solution to the oil crisis is to overthrow the parasitic scum atop Houston's Exxon building as well as in the oil ministry in Riyadh in order to build a workers world. ■

Deer Hunter...

(continued from page 2)

than a few NLF in expressing his 'class solidarity' for Nick and Steve [his buddies]."

Clarke's review has scandalized even the usually shameless SWP. In Sydney, SWP ranks are reportedly squirming, trying to get off the hook by blaming the author personally (a frequent SWP

writer and public spokesman). But this won't do, because the question remains: How could an ostensibly socialist organization print such a bizarre and disgusting defense of lying, reactionary propaganda? The answer is that it is entirely consistent with the SWP's historic refusal to draw the class line in the Vietnam War.

The side of the working class was the *other side* in Vietnam. It was this fundamental fact of the class struggle

which the SWP deliberately ignored when they refused to call for military victory to the Vietnamese workers and peasants against U.S. imperialism and Saigon. Furthermore, today the SWP writes about "working-class solidarity" in philistine glorification of the most backward, chauvinist "camaraderie." But in the antiwar movement the SWP actively opposed Spartacist calls for labor strikes against the war. Instead, spreading social-patriotic and pacifist

illusions, the SWP built an alliance with the McGoverns and Hartkes, the imperialist "doves" who opposed the war as contrary to the best interests of U.S. imperialism.

Is it really so surprising that those who yesterday marched to "bring our boys home" today applaud Cimino's "Big Lie" in the service of imperialist rearmament as an indictment of the "tragedy" and "violence" inflicted on "our boys"? ■

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 seamount.

—includes *Spartacist*

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

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

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

P.O. Box 32717
Detroit, MI 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. 92010

San Francisco

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

Santa Cruz

c/o SYL
Box 2842
Santa Cruz, Ca. 95063

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

Somozaland

"The revolution taking place in Nicaragua is no ordinary political movement pitting left against right, or civilians against the military. Rather, it is a national mutiny in which almost every sector of the country—left and right, rich and poor—is united against a dynastic dictatorship that is now sustained exclusively by the 7,500-man National Guard, and that enjoys political support only from Somoza's own Liberal Party." So wrote the perceptive American reporter Alan Riding a year ago in the *New York Times Magazine* (30 July 1978). And last month, when the State Department tried to gain support for a "moderate" interim government to "peacefully" replace Somoza while leaving his mercenary National Guard intact, it found no takers even among conservative businessmen. In fact, at the end only those capitalists whose family fortunes are intimately linked to Somoza's own fate had not passed into the camp of the Sandinista-led rebellion.

In order to understand the background to this state of affairs, it is necessary to take a look at how Nicaragua became a sort of "Somoza, Inc." Since the 19th century the history of Nicaragua has been dominated by the intervention of American imperialism, with the willing acceptance of the docile native (*criollo*) bourgeoisie. In 1855 the American William Walker, the original "filibusterer" (adventurer), was invited by the Nicaraguan Liberal Party to lead their civil war against the Conservatives. Walker, who had previously staged an unsuccessful attempt to found an "independent republic" in the Mexican territories of Baja California and Sonora, defeated the Conservative army...and thereupon set up his own government. For the remainder of the century American and British imperialists disputed over whose "sphere of influence" included Nicaragua and its possible Pacific-Caribbean canal route.


But the modern history of Nicaragua began with the U.S.-sponsored overthrow of the Liberal regime of José Santos Zelaya in 1909 and the imposition, through "dollar diplomacy" and "big stick" interventions, of a series of puppet governments. The hapless Nicaraguan president had made the fatal mistake of negotiating loans and canal plans with Japan and Great Britain. As punishment, Teddy Roosevelt's successor, William Howard Taft, had Zelaya removed and from 1912 to 1925 a Marine expeditionary force occupied the country. In order to guarantee repayment of a \$2 million debt the U.S. government took over the Customs House while U.S. bankers took over the Banco de Nicaragua and the national railroad. The 1916 Bryan-Chamorro treaty gave the U.S. rights to a Nicaragua



Augusto César Sandino



La Prensa



UPI

Top, Anastasio Sr., Luis and "Tachito" in 1954: dynastic dictatorship made in USA. Bottom, 1972 earthquake killed 10,000; "Tachito" lined pockets from devastation.

canal and a 98-year lease for naval bases.

From 1916 to 1923 members of the powerful Conservative Chamorro family ran the Nicaraguan government for the U.S. When a maverick Conservative won the 1924 elections, dissatisfied loser Emiliano Chamorro led a coup d'état and called on the U.S. to back him. Two thousand Marines intervened to defeat the Liberals and the U.S., reshuffling the political deck, imposed the presidency of Adolfo Díaz. The Liberal generals, with the exception of Augusto César Sandino, surrendered and agreed to accept a U.S.-supervised election in 1928, providing it would be won by the Liberal Party (it was). For six years the Marines unsuccessfully attempted to put down Sandino's revolt, which ended only after the U.S. troops withdrew in 1933. In that time the U.S. built the National Guard and placed Anastasio Somoza García at its head. A "peace" with Sandino was arranged through the good offices of Somoza's patron, the U.S. ambassador Arthur Bliss-Lane, who invited Sandino to a dinner party at the presidential palace on February 21, 1934 where Somoza's Guardsmen assassinated the nationalist leader.

Like the rich *criollo* families he succeeded in power, Somoza and his sons Luis and Anastasio ("Tachito," the current dictator) proved loyal servants of U.S. imperialism. At one point the portrait of U.S. ambassador Turner Shelton even appeared on a Nicaraguan \$3 bill! With its bloody repressions and shameless service to Wall Street interests, the Somoza dynasty achieved infamy as the quintessential American

puppet dictatorship in Latin America. But the main concern of the Somozas has always been enriching themselves in office. By the time Somoza I was assassinated in 1956 he had amassed a tremendous fortune and left his sons an empire known to Latin Americans as "Somozalandia."

The Somoza family fortune has been estimated by the Spanish magazine *Cambio 16* (22 October 1978) at more than \$1.5 billion. This is quite a tidy sum in a country of only 2.5 million people and with a per capita gross national product in 1977 of only \$8.30 per person. Somoza holdings include the national airline, the national shipping line, Mercedes Benz and other auto distributorships, a newspaper, TV and radio stations, tobacco, oil and construction companies, an estimated 20-30 percent of the arable land in Nicaragua, fishing companies, meat packers and the country's major Pacific port (named—what else?—Puerto Somoza). The bloodthirsty Somoza even bankrolled a vampire industry known as "Plasmaférisis" which exported blood plasma extracted from Nicaraguans to the U.S.

Somoza's properties, amounting to an estimated 40 percent of the Nicaraguan economy, are not even disguised through phony holding companies or front men. A government agency called the "Office of Supervision and Control of the Properties of General Anastasio Somoza Debayle" openly administered the tyrant's empire. But the full extent of Somoza's interests in Nicaraguan concerns and his foreign holdings can only be guessed. Long ago Nicaraguan entrepreneurs learned that the only way

to avoid ruinous taxes and bribes was to give "Tachito" a piece of the action. In addition the dictator owns Miami real estate, a foreign publishing house and the coal mines of Colombia.

He also "owns" at least two U.S. Congressmen, Charles Wilson of Texas and John Murphy of New York, co-leaders of the "Somoza lobby" of Cuban expatriates and other reactionaries who continue to trumpet that the alternative to Somoza is "Castro Communism" in Nicaragua. When Jimmy Carter's new ambassador showed up in Somoza's office some weeks ago to "request" the dictator's resignation he found to his surprise that Somoza had invited the Staten Island Democrat Murphy to sit in on the negotiations. Somoza did not survive in power for so long without cultivating intimate ties with rich and powerful American sponsors. Former Ambassador Turner Shelton (he of the \$3 bill) had run the Bahamas financial operations of Nixon friend Bebe Rebozo, and Somoza's "hospitality" once extended also to Howard Hughes, who spent a couple of years ensconced in a Managua penthouse.

"The Rebellion of the Bourgeoisie"

For years the traditional aristocratic families and small businessmen were willing to tie their fortunes to the Somozas' profiteering. Disaffection with Somoza among businessmen dates from the shameless legal looting and ruinous speculation that followed the catastrophic earthquake of 1972. As described by Francisco Lainez, founding president of the Banco Central de Nicaragua, in his book *Terremoto 72: Élite y Pueblo*, Somoza used the disaster (which claimed 10,000 lives and left a quarter of a million homeless) to garner immense profits. Downtown Managua was demolished and reconstruction prohibited—in order to force the relocation of the business community on "safer" suburban real estate owned by Somoza and his cronies, who demanded extortionate rents for the once-worthless land. Millions of dollars in international aid was appropriated by Somoza and distributed through the network of local Liberal Party patronage bosses to *el Jefe's* friends. Earthquake damages were vastly inflated in order to secure huge loans from foreign governments and banks. The money was distributed to Somoza-owned construction firms through the Somoza-owned Banco de Centroamérica with the excess cash disappearing into the dictator's pocket.

Even by the standards of a banana republic the corruption and profiteering were outrageous. Moreover, the capitalist families not cut in on Somoza's riffs began to feel the pinch. It was this, rather than any "democratic" principles, which motivated the bourgeois opposition to the regime. At first the dissident businessmen tried various negotiations and pressure tactics in Managua and Washington, but to no avail. Meanwhile, however, in 1975 the Sandinista guerrillas split into two rival "Marxist" factions and a third (*tercerista*) faction arose which explicitly renounced any talk of socialist revolution and looked for bourgeois allies. In a well-publicized incident in May 1977, Joaquín Cuadra Chamorro, the richest lawyer in Nicaragua, paid a clandestine visit to his only son Joaquín Cuadra Lacayo, a leader of the *terceristas* and heir to the family wealth. The elder Cuadra came back endorsing the Sandinista front. In an interview with the *New York Times* Alan Riding he explained why:

"He said the guerrillas wanted to ally themselves with other groups and that I could play a role. So we reached an

agreement with the clear understanding that socialism was not possible for Nicaragua. I saw my role as trying to rescue our youth from radicalism."
—*New York Times Magazine*, 30 July 1978.

Shortly thereafter the Group of Twelve (Los Doce), composed of academics, priests and businessmen (including Cuadra), was formed as spokesman for the *terceristas* in the bourgeois opposition.

The Nicaraguan working masses have risen against decades of murderous rule by Somoza, Inc., vowing to avenge the unarmed youths rounded up and murdered in Estelí, León and Masaya after last fall's failed insurrection. With the cry "Death to Somoza," workers and poor peasants answer the massacre of hundreds of peasants in the northern mountains in 1977 and the callous profiteering of the avaricious dynasty after the tragic earthquake. At the same time, Nicaraguan capitalists and the "moderate" Sandinista leaders are trying to "rescue" the country from the possibility of a social revolution in "Somozalandia." While calling for military victory to the Sandinista-led insurrection, Trotskyists do not look to the Chamorros and Cuadras as the "democratic" saviors of Nicaragua. Instead we demand: No more Somozas—Workers to power! ■

Nicaragua...

(continued from page 12)

that it was the destruction of Fulgencio Batista's Cuban army by Castro's July 26 Movement that opened up the possibility of a revolutionary transformation of Cuban society. So in order to win Washington's blessing for the provisional government the FSLN softened its original hard-line insistence that Somoza's praetorian guard be demolished. In mid-June a junta spokesman announced that "deserters" from the National Guard would be welcome in a new "nationalist army." Under U.S. pressure the junta announced on July 12 that with the exception of Guard soldiers guilty of "grave crimes against the people," the post-Somoza armed forces could incorporate the entire Guard. Finally, the junta caved in completely and indicated that the mass murderers and torturers who wanted to escape would be allowed to do so.

Will the agreement with Somoza's U.S. patrons put a halt to the revolutionary ferment in Nicaragua? For the last two years, the armed clashes have been led by the dominant *tercerista* ("Third") faction of the FSLN, which is closely tied to leading business circles and firmly committed to maintaining a capitalist framework. A *tercerista* column proceeding from Costa Rica launched the current offensive. But meanwhile, the more leftist Prolonged People's War (GPP) Sandinista faction has taken power in the northern towns. And in the capital of Managua there have reportedly arisen numerous defense committees, led by the FSLN's Proletarian Faction and its pro-Moscow Stalinist allies, which have drawn considerable numbers of workers and poor into the fighting. As the civil war dragged on, the social/political situation began to open up in the direction of a mass insurrection. The deal with Washington was aimed at cutting short this possibility.

Revolutionary Trotskyists emphatically denounce the FSLN's decision to allow Somoza's mercenary officers, drenched in the blood of Nicaragua's working people, to retain their posts after the dictator's downfall. Rather than "deploring" so-called "excesses" of the working masses who have conducted summary trials and executions of National Guard criminals, we call for the systematic creation of popular

tribunals to mete out revolutionary justice to Somoza's butchers. Communists in Nicaragua must demand the formation of workers militias, not the reconstitution of the bourgeois army. Such militias, based on the organs of working-class self-defense which have sprung up in Managua and other cities, could serve as the basis for a new state power, one which could expropriate not only Somoza's ill-gotten holdings but those of *all* the Nicaraguan and foreign capitalists.

The rebel junta, which has now been told by U.S. envoy Bowdler that "you are the government of Nicaragua," was set up by the petty-bourgeois FSLN leaders precisely in order to head off the possibility of anti-capitalist social revolution. While in the months of bitter fighting proletarian revolutionaries stood on the side of the insurgency led by the FSLN against Somoza and the National Guard, we give no political confidence whatsoever to the "government of national reconstruction" and its plans for a capitalist Nicaragua without Somoza.

The Sandinista-sponsored junta is a straitjacket imposed on the masses in order to strike a deal with Washington, which exerted tremendous pressure via the Latin American bourgeois regimes (Panama, Costa Rica, Venezuela) which were a principal support of the FSLN. The State Department signaled approval by finally okaying the departure of Somoza. Whether or not the Nicaraguan working people will submit to the yoke is another question. Hatred must run deep against the bloody butchers who murdered thousands of courageous youth, leaving their bodies to rot in the streets until the Red Cross buried them in ubiquitous mass graves. And after the slaughter of the last year and a half, it will not be easy to voluntarily disarm *los muchachos* ("the kids") who bore the brunt of the fighting.

As the erstwhile "business opposition" to Somoza scrambles to secure influence in the new regime, working-class revolutionaries must seek to turn political into social revolution. Raising demands to defend the masses (workers militia) and root out the dictatorship (smash the National Guard, set up people's tribunals to try the Somozaist criminals), we seek to build mass opposition to the deal imposed by Washington. Calling for political independence from the FSLN-backed junta, for thorough-going agrarian revolution and expropriation of all the exploiters, we seek to block the imposition of a new capitalist regime (whether dominated by traditional Conservative Party families or a more left-leaning "popular front"). But what is tragically missing in Nicaragua today is the key element, a revolutionary Trotskyist party, to carry the anti-Somoza struggle forward to lasting victory—to a workers and peasants government, a Central American workers republic and a Socialist United States of Latin America. ■

Revisionists...

(continued from page 8)

proaching our Lebanese embryo for having participated in an anti-imperialist resistance war waged by the entirety of the political mass movement of its country?"

Just as the USec squandered a layer of subjectively revolutionary Latin American youth, it bears responsibility for miseducating this important group of Arab militants. They could have become more than another group of "far left" Arab nationalists, had not Mandel *et al.* criminally misled them. The RCG adapted to petty-bourgeois nationalism under enormous pressures for disorientation in a small, beleaguered and backward country. They have themselves been the targets of the Palestinian nationalists they tail, as they were in December 1973 when their militants in

Beirut were set upon by armed nationalist thugs for the "crime" of handing out a leaflet co-signed by the Israeli USec group.

When the savage, inter-communal bloodletting between Muslims and Christians broke out in 1976, the RCG placed itself in the camp of the "progressive" Muslim "left." But they were not blind to the fighting "which never went beyond a religious framework," the "revenge by the Muslim, progressive and Palestinian forces... no less brutal" than the Christian militias, the "increasing depoliticization of the majority of the combatants" as described by two RCG leaders in the book, *Comprendre le Liban* (Understanding Lebanon).

The most consistent Pabloists have often ended up by becoming identical politically with the non-proletarian forces they started out tailing opportunistically. The RCG has gone a long way down the road toward outright bourgeois nationalism, the reactionary consequences of which they have at times been forced to confront concretely. In the framework of the USec, there was no alternative to propose. Yet in Lebanon and the Near East as a whole, the Trotskyist program of international working-class solidarity and proletarian-led socialist revolution could have a powerful impact in cutting across the cycle of national/communal conflict intractable within the framework of capitalism. It is a crime that the USec, in the guise of Trotskyism, slipped the Arab militants who looked to it for leadership the crassest opportunism. ■

Demo...

(continued from page 12)

capitalist provisional government, but of a Trotskyist party...."

The SL speaker ended with a call for a Central American workers republic in a Socialist United States of Latin America.

Comrade Silva's remarks were followed by those of a spokesman for Sandinistas for Socialism, who called for a "workers and peasants government, a government based on the expropriation of the landlords, a government based on the expropriation of the manufacturing means of production of the bourgeoisie..." (our translation). But the speaker's presentation, as well as the group's publications, reveal that the SSN hesitates between the program of revolutionary Marxism and nationalist reformism.

The SSN's contradictions are captured in its very choice of name: they have a desire to be "socialist" but do not break from the popular-nationalist tradition which bears the name of Augusto Sandino, the Liberal Party general who led a guerrilla struggle against the U.S. Marine occupation of Nicaragua from 1927-1933. Hence they are "Sandinistas for Socialism" and, moreover, for socialism "in Nicaragua." With this myopic nationalist world view the SSN has flinched from the hard imperatives of revolutionary strategy and program. Moreover, struggle for programmatic clarity would threaten the SSN's notion of a "family of the Nicaraguan left." Their journal, *Rayo Negro*, simply reprints without comment articles from a wide variety of sources: Amnesty International, the "Proletarian Tendency" of the FSLN,

Sandino's memoirs, the "United Secretariat of the Fourth International" (USec) and its Nicaraguan affiliate. Members of Sandinistas for Socialism have recently described themselves as Trotskyists. But they barely mention the key task—construction of a Trotskyist party—and do not say that it must be built through politically combating the petty-bourgeois nationalist Sandinista movement and tradition. Nor has it criticized the pseudo-Trotskyist USec.

Significantly, Sandinistas for Socialism has failed to take an unambiguous position on the key question facing revolutionaries in Nicaragua: class opposition to the bourgeois provisional junta sponsored by the FSLN. At the rally the SSN speaker said that "We do not believe that the five-member junta represents the historic interests of the peasants and workers of Nicaragua. But we are firmly convinced that only a military victory of the anti-Somozaist rebels will open up in Nicaragua a process of mobilization in which we who are for socialist and revolutionary objectives are going to continue on until the end." This leaves the door open to supporting the junta as a necessary stage in the revolutionary "process." In contrast, SL placards demanded: "No to popular fronts—Workers to power!"

Thus, the Sandinistas for Socialism is not a revolutionary organization but an eclectic, centrist grouping. The choice facing the SSN is clear: to continue along the road of Nicaraguan-centered "movementism" and become loyal left-critics of the junta or to look beyond the narrow confines of Nicaraguan nationalism, assimilating the lessons of the more than half century of life-and-death struggle between Stalinism and Trotskyism. Most recently the terrible consequences of Stalinist/social-democratic class collaborationism were seen in Chile, where tens of thousands of workers and leftists died because the popular front led them to the bloody debacle of the Pinochet coup. Those who seek to be genuine proletarian revolutionaries in Nicaragua must break sharply with the Sandinista tradition in order to take up the struggle for reorganizing the Fourth International on firm revolutionary principles. The alternative is to follow the path of left-wing *sandinismo* to eventual betrayal. ■

Anwar...

(continued from page 3)

Damon Lewis. Their resolution condemned the recent dropping of Knight's and Lewis' grievances by the International and declared "that USWA Local 65 pledges its defense of all union militants victimized for honoring picket lines."

The local USWA tops have voted for these resolutions and declared to the press that they support Anwar's reinstatement. But a vigorous rank-and-file mobilization will be necessary to make sure these promises and pledges of support are carried out by the no-strike USWA bureaucracy. The trade-union leaders who have been herding workers across picket lines for years cannot be relied upon to defend militant workers whose actions of solidarity expose the leadership's class-collaborationist policies.

A victory for Anwar will be a victory for the principles of union solidarity and the program of class struggle. ■

Spartacist League/Spartacus Youth League Public Offices

—MARXIST LITERATURE—

Bay Area

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

Chicago

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

New York

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

WORKERS VANGUARD

**Smash the National Guard!
No Asylum for Butcher Somoza!**

Sandinista Victors Make Deal With Carter

Just ten days after pledging that "I'm ready to fight to the death," Anastasio Somoza Debayle, the bloodthirsty dictator whose family ran Nicaragua in the interests of U.S. imperialism for more than four decades, packed his bags and climbed into his private Lear jet that would take him into exile in the U.S. As his regime crumbled around him last month Somoza blustered that "I'm not going to abandon my military men like the shah of Iran." But when the word came from Washington that an "orderly transition" had been arranged to the U.S.' satisfaction, the shah of Nicaragua rounded up 100 of the top commanders of his mercenary National Guard and lit out for Miami, where the thousands of counterrevolutionary Cuban *gusanos* and assorted deposed Latin American dictators should make the *somocistas* feel right at home.

"History will say I'm right," the tyrant declared just before he fled his Hitler-style concrete bunker in Managua. But the Nicaraguan masses who heroically shed their blood to rid the country of the Somoza dynasty will regret the departure of "Tacho" and his gang only

because it has cheated them of their just revenge for 40 years of torture and murder at the hands of Somoza's National Guard. Six hundred thousand Nicaraguans are homeless and 20,000, most of them civilians, have died in the fighting according to the Red Cross. Yet the U.S. imperialists deliberately prolonged the agony of the Nicaraguan workers and peasants by insisting on iron-clad guarantees against leftist domination of the post-Somoza government.

As we go to press, the deal at the top seems to be taking hold. U.S. envoy William Bowdler, who handled negotiations in San José, Costa Rica, reportedly told the Sandinista-backed junta that they now had the crucial vote: Jimmy Carter's. Appropriately the first token of recognition was a jump rope, presented to junta member Violetta Chamorro. Meanwhile, Somoza and his commanders are getting home free: after looting and raping the country for 40 years, they receive safe passage through the good offices of the Catholic Church to retirement in Miami or Honolulu. The FSLN tops guaranteed that there



Sandinista guerrillas in Managua gun battle.

Lochon/Gamma-Liaison

would be no reprisals in order to avoid "another Iran," and Latin American foreign ministers will be invited to "supervise" the transition.

After a steady series of victories by the armed rebels of the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional (FSLN) had convinced Washington that Somoza could no longer effectively serve as the U.S.' Nicaraguan straw boss, attention shifted to the negotiating table in San José where representatives of the FSLN-sponsored "government of national reconstruction" bargained with Bowdler over the transition to a new regime. After deciding that direct military intervention was diplomatically unwise, the U.S.' trump cards were its control over the date of Somoza's departure, leverage over the Latin states which supply the FSLN with arms and control over the billions of dollars in reconstruction aid that the new government will need. Washington's carrot-and-stick diplomacy was designed to prevent the destruction of the National Guard, which the U.S. views as a bulwark against the possibility of a "second Cuba," and to force the inclusion of

more right-wing elements in the FSLN-supported junta.

The FSLN leaders have proven to be nothing if not willing to compromise. The five-member junta includes only one Sandinista and of the twelve members named so far in an 18-person cabinet, eleven are businessmen or technocrats and only one a guerrilla leader. The planning and economy minister named by the junta, Roberto Mayorga, is former Secretary General of the Central American Common Market and has flatly declared that "the state should not be administering farms and industries" (*New York Times*, 10 June). The U.S. eventually agreed to accept the makeup of the rebel junta, which already includes three representatives of the anti-Somoza bourgeoisie, in exchange for the capitulation to the U.S. by the junta and the FSLN on the key question of the National Guard.

However eager the Sandinistas and their bourgeois allies have been to prove their loyalty to "free enterprise" imperialism, the U.S. remembered all too well

continued on page 11

100 March at Anti-Somoza Demo in L.A.

LOS ANGELES, July 11—"U.S./OAS: Hands Off Nicaragua! Military Victory to the Anti-Somoza Rebels!" These chants echoed through the streets of downtown Los Angeles July 6 as more than 100 demonstrators marched to the Nicaraguan consulate, calling for the overthrow of the bloody Somoza dictatorship and protesting the U.S.' "Big Stick" proposal to send a "peace-keeping" force to the aid of their puppet ruler. The Los Angeles united-front demonstration was jointly sponsored by the Spartacist League (SL) and the Sandinistas por el Socialismo en Nicaragua (SSN). While the SL and SSN acted in opposition to the U.S.-sponsored Somoza dynasty and for the military victory of the insurgency against it, the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) refused to endorse or participate in the demonstration. So did the Revolutionary Socialist League, which sent a single token supporter. Both

groups justified this abstention on the basis that they supported the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional (FSLN).

As the spirited demonstration passed through the crowded and predominantly Hispanic downtown shopping district on its way to the Somoza consulate the protesters took up chants in English and Spanish. SL slogans included "Carter's human rights means Somoza/Pinochet!" "¡Ni olvido, ni perdón, Somoza al paredón!" (Neither forget nor forgive, Somoza to the wall!), and "Down with butcher Somoza, for a workers and peasants government!" The SSN militants carried two banners reading: "E.U. fuera de Nicaragua" (U.S. out of Nicaragua), and "Por un gobierno obrero-campesino" (For a worker-peasant government). SSN supporters chanted slogans such as "Luchar, vencer, obreros al poder" (Struggle, win, workers to power), and

"Que muera el somocismo, que viva el socialismo" (Death to Somozaism, long live socialism).

At a brief rally in front of the consulate SL spokesman José Silva addressed the crowd in English and Spanish, calling for military victory to the insurgency led by the FSLN but warning that,

"The blood of the toiling masses must not have been spilled in vain.... Only the Trotskyists are committed to take the anti-Somoza struggle through to the end, smashing capitalism, not only in Nicaragua but throughout the Americas. The Trotskyist program of permanent revolution demands the end of the latifundia [big landlords' holdings] through radical agrarian revolution and the expropriation of industry and commerce under a workers and peasants government. Such revolutionary tasks require the leadership not of the petty-bourgeois FSLN, who have already named a junta of five to head a

continued on page 11



Spartacist League marches in L.A. protest.

WV Photo